Acute effects of static stretching to hamstrings on spatiotemporal variables and leg kinematics in late swing at maximal sprint speed phase and its relationship with Nordic hamstring strength

Short title: Acute effects of static stretching to hamstrings on maximal sprint speed

Yusuke Ozaki* and Takeshi Ueda

Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hiroshima University,
Higashihiroshima City, Japan

*Corresponding author

E-mail: yozaki@hiroshima-u.ac.jp (YO)

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the acute effects of static stretching of the hamstrings on maximal sprint speed and its spatiotemporal variables, and lower limb kinematics during the late swing phase, and its relationship with Nordic hamstring strength. Sixteen healthy male college sprinters were asked to sprint 80 m without static stretching and with static stretching of the hamstrings for 120 s per leg before the sprint, and both conditions were counterbalanced. The knee flexion peak force and torque were measured using the Nordic hamstring. The differences between no static stretch and static stretch, and their relationship with Nordic hamstring strength were investigated. The results showed that the touchdown distance and support time increased, and flight distance decreased in under static stretch conditions with a decrease in maximal sprint speed. Moreover, under static stretch conditions, the angular velocity of knee extension at contralateral release was lower, while the theoretical hamstring length (difference between knee angle and hip angle) at ipsilateral touchdown was greater. In addition, the lower the peak force and torque of the Nordic hamstring, the more significant the decrease in maximal sprint speed, increase in support time, decrease in flight distance, and decrease in peak angular velocity of hip extension at static stretch. Furthermore, the more significant the decrease in maximal sprint speed at static stretch, the smaller the peak theoretical hamstring length at the no static stretch. Therefore, it is suggested that long-term static stretching immediately before sprinting in sprinters with poor Nordic hamstring strength and low hamstring compliance during the late swing phase may induce unfavorable kinematics to prevent hamstring strain injury and maximal sprint speed reduction.

Keywords: hamstring strain injuries, maximum sprint speed, Nordic hamstring, kinematics, athletics

Introduction

Maximal sprint speed (MSS) is an important motor skill related to performance in sports that require high-speed sprinting, such as track and field, soccer, and rugby [1, 2]. During high-speed sprints, the incidence of hamstring strain injuries (HSI) is increased [3, 4]. HSI has a significant impact on an athlete's career because of the high re-injury rate and prolonged withdrawal from competition [5, 6]. Therefore, presenting a scientific perspective on HSI prevention is an important research topic for improving the efficiency of training for high-speed running ability improvement and high performance in competitions.

During the late swing phase (the phase from maximal hip flexion to ground contact) in this MSS phase, the hamstrings are more active because of the eccentric deceleration of hip flexion and knee extension movements [7]. In addition, the length and strain of the hamstring muscle-tendon units that contribute to hip extension and knee flexion reach their peak [8, 9]. Therefore, HSI is thought to occur more frequently during the late swing phase [10–15].

HSI risk is associated with a short hamstring fascicle length [16, 17] and poor eccentric muscle strength [16, 18–21], and training protocols have been developed to reduce HSI risk [22]. In particular, hamstring eccentric training has become popular as a typical training to reduce the risk of HSI because it can lengthen the fascicle length, improve eccentric strength with a longer hamstring, and strengthen the ability of the hamstring to resist excessive muscle stretching [23–30].

Hamstring muscle-tendon unit stiffness has also been reported as an HSI risk [5, 31, 32]. This is because the high compliance of the muscle-tendon units contributes to energy absorption during the muscle-tendon unit extension [33]. The stiffness of the muscle-tendon units is partially due to muscle stiffness [34, 35]. Therefore, static stretching before sport-specific training that acutely improves the compliance of muscle-tendon units is recommended and is frequently performed among track and field sprinters, where HSI often

occurs [6, 36, 37]. Recent studies have shown that static stretching of the hamstrings improves eccentric muscle strength at longer muscle lengths, highlighting the benefits of static stretching in HSI prevention [29, 30, 38, 39]. Thus, while the injury-preventive effects of static stretching were previously questioned, the value of using static stretching has recently been reconsidered for certain injuries [40].

However, static stretching impairs the subsequent explosive strength [41, 42]. In sprinting, static stretching immediately prior to exercise, including the hamstring, impairs performance from 5–40 m [42]. In contrast, Kistler et al. [43], reported that in the 100 m sprint, static stretching acutely impaired sprint speed at 20–40 m but did not further impair sprint speed at 60 m thereafter. The MSS phase in the 100 m sprint is approximately 40–60 m, which requires a higher eccentric torque in hip extension and knee flexion and higher activation levels in the hamstrings than in the acceleration phase [44–46]. Nevertheless, if MSS is not impaired by static stretching of the hamstrings, then static stretching to increase hamstring compliance is a beneficial means of HSI prevention in athletes' competitions and training where MSS is required.

However, static stretching of the hamstrings decreases the hamstring–quadriceps ratio [47], which is an HSI risk [21, 48, 49]. Therefore, relative hamstring strength reduction may promote hamstring muscle-tendon unit lengthening (that is, excessive hip flexion and knee extension) during the late swing phase, resulting in running kinematics that is unfavorable for HSI prevention [50, 51]. In addition, hamstring muscle volume is an important indicator of sprint performance [52]. Based on the above, we cannot dismiss the possibility that static stretching of the hamstring alone may produce undesirable kinematics and changes in spatiotemporal variables for HSI risk reduction and MSS improvement. In contrast, because many studies have reported minimal negative effects of static stretching in highly trained elite

athletes [53–58], this level of performance and muscle strength may influence the acute effects of static stretching.

However, no studies have investigated the acute effects of static stretching of the hamstring alone on the MSS phase, and the relationship between spatiotemporal variables and kinematics during sprinting, performance level, and muscle strength level. These findings may be useful as guidelines for athletes, coaches, and physical therapists concerned with achieving MSS.

Therefore, this study aimed to determine the acute effects of static hamstring stretching on MSS and its spatiotemporal variables and kinematics during the late swing phase, and its relationship with hamstring strength and performance levels. The hypotheses of this study are as follows: (1) Static stretching of the hamstrings prior to sprinting acutely decreases sprint speed by decreasing step rate and increasing knee joint angle during the late swing phase. (2) The lower the hamstring strength, the greater the decrease in sprint speed owing to static stretching.

Materials and methods

Participants and experimental procedures

Participants were 16 collegiate sprinters (100 m personal record [PR]; 11.25±0.50 sec; Height: 173.22±5.97 cm; Mass: 68.00±5.81 kg, age: 21.56±2.25 years). In addition, two participants with HSI injuries from the previous year were included in this study. The two HIS injury dates were 4 months earlier, and they had already returned to the competition. All participants were recruited during the period September-October 2022. All participants were informed of the experimental procedures and risks, and they provided written informed consent prior to participation in the study. The experiment was conducted without discomfort

to the participants and in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. The local ethics review board (Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hiroshima University) approved the experimental protocol (approval number: 2021063). Measurements were performed in a within-subject experimental design and were counterbalanced in the no static stretch (NS) and static stretch (SS) conditions. NS and SS measurements were taken at least 48 h apart. Participants performed a designated warm-up protocol that included 800-m running, dynamic stretching with hurdles, sprint drills with skipping, three 50-m sprints with a gradual increase in speed with each sprint, and a 30-m start dash with a starting block. Two 80-meter sprints with starting blocks were performed. Considering the effects of fatigue and the residual effect of static stretching (in SS trials) is 10–20 min [59], a 10-min rest period was provided between trials. The SS group performed a static stretching protocol prior to the first 80-m sprint trial and then completed the first 80-m sprint trial within 5 min. After static stretching, the athletes were allowed to practice one or two block clearances before starting the 80-m sprint trial. SS was performed by passive static straight leg raising to stretch the hamstring. The participant was placed supine on the mat, the contralateral hip and knee were stabilized in full extension, and the leg to be stretched was pushed by the investigator until the participant complained of discomfort. The knee was maintained at full extension and maximum hip flexion. A brief stretch of approximately 20 s is insufficient to decrease the passive stiffness of the muscle-tendon unit [60-62]. Therefore, the process of stretching the legs was continued for 30 s and repeated four times for each leg with a 10-s rest between stretches [39]. The same spike shoes were worn for both the NS and SS in the 80 m sprint trials, and the starting block placement was similar between the two conditions.

The Nordic hamstring (NDH) was used to measure hamstring strength. The NDH was adopted because of its proven HSI risk reduction effectiveness, simplicity, and practicality

[63]. NDH measurements were performed within 2 weeks of the 80 m sprint trial for the two conditions.

Prior to NDH measurements, two sets of three NDH were performed as a familiarization session. The NDH measurements were then taken after a minimum of 72 h. Prior to the measurements, the participants performed a specified warm-up that included 5 min of pedaling (2 kp, 60 rpm) on a stationary aerobike (PowerMax V II, COMBI, Japan), dynamic stretching with hurdles, and three sets of five squat jumps. To measure NDH, a dedicated NDH strength instrument (N3, Easytech, Italy) with a pressure gauge attached to the heel was used. The participants' ankles were fully immobilized, holding full hip extension, and the elbows bent. The participant then leaned forward at the slowest possible motion with the elbows on the body side and hands open [64]. Once the participants lost control of their forward lean, they were allowed to increase their speed and fall forward. NDH was measured three times with a 2-min rest in between.

Experimental setup

A high-speed camera (EX-100F, CASIO, Tokyo, Japan) was used to capture video at 240 frames/s for the 52.5–60 m section and the MSS section of the 80 m sprint test [65]. The camera was positioned 20 m to the right of the center of the analysis section, with the optical axis perpendicular to the direction of the sprint. Prior to trial filming, markers were placed in a rectangular pattern on the ground in the center of the filming area at intervals of 1.2 m in the lateral direction and 2.5 m in the direction of the sprint. To calibrate the aspect ratio, images were taken with a 2-m calibration pole held vertically and horizontally at the center of the marker.

Data analysis

Video images were captured on a personal computer, and a skilled examiner manually digitized 21 body feature points at 120 Hz using a video motion analysis system (Frame-DIAS V, DKH Retail Limited, Cheltenham, United Kingdom). The participants wore elastic black tights over their entire body, and 30 white markers were attached to each participant's body and shoes to ensure that body feature points could be identified. The markers were positioned at the top of the head, upper margin of the sternum, right and left tragion, acromion, greater trochanters, medial and lateral epicondyles, styloid process of the radius and ulna, head of the third metacarpal bone, medial and lateral epicondyle of the femur, medial and lateral malleolus, and heel and toe (on shoes). All markers were applied by the same examiner to ensure consistency in the marker location. The participants' measurement variables were calculated using a two-dimensional four-point real-length conversion method based on the calibrations. Center of mass (CM) coordinates were obtained using the inertial parameters of the 14-segment model reported by Ae [66]. All trials were digitized from 10 frames before the left foot touchdown until 10 frames after the next left foot touchdown. Based on the digitized data, actual coordinate values were obtained for each trial, with the x-axis for the sprint direction and the y-axis for the vertical direction. The obtained two-dimensional coordinates were smoothed for each coordinate component of each analysis point using a Butterworth digital filter, after determining the optimal cutoff frequency using the residual analysis method [67]. The actual cutoff frequencies in the sprint and vertical directions were in the ranges of 8–14 Hz and 4–15 Hz, respectively.

Variables

Fig 1 shows the definitions of the variables calculated in this study. The trial with the highest MSS among the two trials was used for the analysis.

198 **Fig 1. Definition of calculated variables in this study.** TD distance, touchdown distance;
199 RL distance, release distance; ST, support time; FT, flight time; SL, step length; SR, step
200 rate.

201

202 ## Spatiotemporal variables

203 • **Maximal sprinting speed (MSS [m·s^{-1}])**: The average horizontal speed from the first
204 left foot touch-down to the next left foot touchdown.
205 • **Step length (SL [m])**: Horizontal displacement of the center of mass divided by 2 in two
206 steps from the first left foot touching down to the next left foot touching down.
207 • **Step frequency (SR [step·s^{-1}])**: Reciprocal of the time required for two steps from the
208 first left foot touchdown to the next left foot touchdown divided by 2.
209 • **Touch-down distance (TD-distance [m])**: Horizontal distance between the toe and
210 center of mass at the moment the toe touches down.
211 • **Release distance (RL-distance [m])**: Horizontal distance between the toe and center of
212 mass at the moment of the toe release.
213 • **Support time (ST [s])**: Time required from the moment the toe touches down and the
214 moment the toe is released.
215 • **Flight time (FT [s])**: the time required from the moment of toe release to the moment of
216 opposite-toe touchdown.
217 • **Support distance (m)**: Horizontal displacement of the center of mass from the moment
218 the toe touches down to the moment it is released.
219 • **Flight distance (m)**: Horizontal displacement of the center of mass from the moment of
220 the toe release to the moment of touchdown of the opposite toe.

The average value in the two steps during the first left-toe touchdown and the subsequent left-toe touchdown was used to maintain the reliability of the values in TD distance, RL distance, ST, FT, Support distance, and flight distance.

Kinematic variables

Kinematic analysis in this study was performed from the moment of the release of the left toe (contralateral leg) to the moment of the touchdown of the right toe (ipsilateral leg). This is because it corresponds to the late swing phase, which has the highest hamstring muscle-tendon unit elongation, strain, and HIS [10–15].

- **Hip angle (°), Hip angular velocity (°・s^{-1})**: angle and angular velocity formed by the line connecting the upper margin of the sternum, right greater trochanter, and right knee.
- **Knee angle (°), Knee angular velocity (°・s^{-1})**: Angular velocity formed by the line connecting the right greater trochanter, right knee, and right ankle.
- **Combined angle (°)**, angle obtained by subtracting the hip angle from the knee joint angle. The combined angle is a measure of the theoretical hamstring muscle-tendon unit length [50].

For statistical analysis, the values at contralateral toe release, peak values during the late swing phase, and ipsilateral toe touchdown were used.

To assess measurement repeatability, the same investigator analyzed these variables twice for 10 participants, spaced at least 48 h apart. The intraclass correlation coefficient for the two analyses averaged 0.893 ± 0.055 (lowest 0.774, highest 0.972). The smallest coefficient of variation was the MSS (0.4 %), and the largest was the combined angle at RL (9.4%). These were recognized as having good intrarater reliability. A series of mixed-model analysis of variances were also performed to examine the effects of the measurement date and

245 order of NS and SS. The results showed no significant measurement date effects, order
246 effects, or interactions for any of the variables.
247

248 # NDH strength

249 • **NDH peak force ($N \cdot kg^{-1}$)**: The average of the measured peak force of the left and right
250 feet divided by the body weight.
251 • **NDH peak torque ($Nm \cdot kg^{-1}$)** : Peak force multiplied by the lower leg length of the
252 participant.

253 The NDH peak force and torque intraclass correlation coefficients for the three
254 measurements were 0.904 and 0.912, respectively. The coefficient of variations were 4.02 ±
255 2.06 % in both cases. Thus, they were accepted as having good inter-measurement reliability.
256 The trial with the highest NDH peak force for three measurements was used in the analysis.
257

258 # Statistical analyses

259 Paired t-tests were used to test for differences in NS and SS variables. Effect sizes
260 were categorized as small (0.20–0.49), medium (0.50–0.79), large (0.80–1.19), very large
261 (1.2–1.99), or huge (>2.0) according to Cohen's effect size [68]. Pearson's product-rate
262 correlation coefficient was calculated to examine the relationship between NDH strength and
263 the amount of change in variables from NS to SS. Statistical analyses were performed using
264 statistical processing software (IBM SPSS Statistics v20.0, IBM, Japan). Each variable was
265 presented as mean ± standard deviation (SD). The amount of change (Δ) in variables from NS
266 to SS is shown as mean ± standard error (SE). The statistical significance level was set at $p <$
267 5%.
268

Results

Table 1 shows the values of the spatiotemporal variables in the NS and SS conditions, and the differences between the conditions. The MSS was lower in 11 of 16 participants in the SS condition and higher in five participants in the SS condition (mean ±SD; -2.47±4.37 %).

Table 1. Values and differences of spatiotemporal variables in NS and SS conditions

Variables	NS (mean±SD)	SS (mean±SD)	Δ mean±SE (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)	Differences (*p*-value)	Cohen's d (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)
MSS ($m \cdot s^{-1}$)	9.55±0.42	9.31±0.46	−0.24±0.11 (−0.48/0.01)	**0.043***	−0.553 (−1.298/0.192)
SL (m)	2.11±0.11	2.08±0.11	−0.03±0.02 (−0.07/0.01)	0.104	−0.295 (−1.029/0.439)
SF ($step \cdot s^{-1}$)	4.52±0.13	4.47±0.13	−0.05±0.03 (−0.12/0.02)	0.175	−0.359 (−1.095/0.377)
TD distance (m)	0.34±0.03	0.37±0.04	0.03±0.01 (0.01/0.04)	**0.009****	0.752 (−0.006/1.510)
RL-distance (m)	0.54±0.04	0.53±0.04	−0.01±0.01 (−0.02/0.01)	0.349	−0.175 (−0.907/0.556)
ST (s)	0.095±0.005	0.099±0.006	0.004±0.001 (0.001/0.007)	**0.013***	0.731 (−0.025/1.488)
FT (s)	0.127±0.005	0.125±0.007	−0.002±0.001 (−0.005/0.001)	0.168	−0.302 (−1.036/0.433)
Support distance (m)	0.89±0.05	0.91±0.07	−0.02±0.01 (−0.01/0.05)	0.179	0.314(−0.421/1.049)
The flight distance (m)	1.22±0.08	1.17±0.09	−0.05±0.02 (−0.09/−0.02)	**0.006****	−0.606(−1.354/0.142)

276 *<0.05, *p***<0.01

277 MSS, maximal sprint speed; SL, step length; SR, step rate; TD distance, touchdown distance;
278 RL distance, release distance; ST, support time; FT, flight time. Each variable was expressed
279 as mean ± standard deviation, and the difference between NS and SS (Δ) was expressed as
280 mean ± standard error. Bolded items indicate statistically significant differences. The Δ and
281 Cohen's d reflect SS - NS rather than NS -SS

282

283 Some of them exhibited a velocity decrease of 1.37 m/s. SS tended to have a smaller
284 hip angle, larger knee angle, and larger combined angle than NS during the late swing phase
285 toward ipsilateral touchdown (Fig 2).

286

287 **Fig 2. Changes in the hip angle, knee angle, and combined angle during the late swing**
288 **phase**

289

290 In particular, the combined angle was significantly larger in SS than in NS at the
291 ipsilateral touchdown moment (Table 2).

292

293 **Table 2. Values and differences of kinematic variables in NS and SS conditions**

Variables	NS (mean±SD)	SS (mean±SD)	Δ mean±SE (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)	Differences (*p*-value)	Cohen's d (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)
Hip angle at RL (°)	105.4±7.01	104.41±8.72	−1.00±1.38 (−3.93/1.94)	0.481	−0.127(−0.857/0.604)
Peak hip flexion angle (°)	104.53±7.17	103.8±8.65	−0.73±1.41 (−3.73/2.28)	0.614	−0.092(−0.822/0.638)

Hip angle at TD (°)	140.15±6.83	138.58±7.51	−1.57±1.24 (−4.21/1.08)	0.226	−0.219(−0.952/0.513)
Knee angle at RL (°)	74.84±13.40	74.07±13.21	−0.77±1.43 (−3.81/2.27)	0.597	−0.058(−0.788/0.672)
Peak knee extension angle (°)	157.1±6.79	159.12±6.89	2.02±1.07 (−0.26/4.30)	0.078	0.298(−0.437/1.032)
Knee angle at TD (°)	152.11±6.55	154.27±6.87	2.16±1.29 (−0.60/4.91)	0.116	0.323(−0.412/1.058)
Combined angle at RL (°)	-30.56±14.37	-30.34±14.52	0.23±1.85 (−3.71/4.16)	0.905	0.016(−0.714/0.745)
Peak combined angle (°)	26.28±8.31	28.42±10.05	2.14±1.22 (−0.46/4.74)	0.100	0.234(−0.499/0.966)
Combined angle at TD (°)	11.97±6.73	15.69±7.80	3.72±1.46(0.60/6.85)	**0.023***	0.514(−0.229/1.257)
Hip angular velocity at RL (°·s^{-1})	-98.8±151.48	-55.73±155.97	43.07±20.72 (−1.10/87.24)	0.055	0.282(−0.452/1.016)
Peak hip extension velocity (°·s^{-1})	434.54±90.11	423.17±67	−11.38±21.61 (−57.44/34.68)	0.606	−0.144(−0.875/0.586)
Hip angular velocity at TD (°·s^{-1})	302.25±113.73	300.14±125.63	−2.11±42.20 (−92.06/87.83)	0.961	−0.018(−0.747/0.712)
Knee angular velocity at RL (°·s^{-1})	1086.72±129.71	1042.06±174.46	−44.66±20.57 (−88.50/−0.83)	**0.046***	−0.293(−1.027/0.442)
Peak knee extension velocity (°·s^{-1})	1200.53±119.22	1224.94±153.55	24.41±25.89 (−30.77/79.59)	0.361	0.179(−0.053/0.910)
Knee angular velocity at TD (°·s^{-1})	-287.88±130.59	-308.04±201.46	−20.16±41.45 (−108.51/68.20)	0.634	−0.120(−0.850/0.611)

p*<0.05

RL, Contralateral release; TD, ipsilateral touchdown. Items in bold are those with significant correlations. Δ and Cohen's d reflect SS-NS rather than NS.

298 Hip angular velocity was smaller in NS for contralateral release and tended to be
299 higher in NS than in SS by approximately 25 % to 50 % (Fig 3, Table 2).
300
301 **Fig 3. Changes in hip and knee angular velocities during the late swing phase**
302
303 During the contralateral release, NS had significantly higher knee angular velocity
304 than SS, and although not significantly, SS had higher knee angular velocity than NS up to
305 around the 90th percentile (Fig 3, Table 2).
306 The measured NDH peak force was 266.06 ± 50.41 N (body mass ratio; 3.95 ± 0.87 N
307 kg^{-1}) and NDH peak torque was 116.70 ± 22.09 Nm (body mass ratio; 1.73 ± 0.37 Nm kg^{-1}).
308 Table 3 presents the relationship between the amount of change in each variable across the
309 conditions and NDH strength. There was a significant correlation between ΔMSS and NDH
310 peak force ($r=0.532$, $p<0.05$) and peak torque ($r=0.510$, $p<0.05$).
311
312 **Table 3. Relationship between the amount of change in each variable in NS and SS and**
313 **NDH strength**

Variables	NDH-peak-force (N/kg)		NDH-peak-torque (Nm/kg)	
	Correlation coefficient (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)	*p*-value	Correlation coefficient (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)	*p*-value
ΔMSS ($m \cdot s^{-1}$)	0.532 (0.049/0.813)	**0.034***	0.510 (0.019/0.803)	**0.044***
ΔSL (m)	0.380 (−0.143/0.737)	0.147	0.372 (−0.152/0.732)	0.156

ΔSF (step·s^{-1})	0.391(−0.130/0.743)	0.135	0.367 (−0.157/0.730)	0.162
ΔTD distance (m)	−0.26 (−0.670/0.270)	0.330	−0.209 (−0.639/0.319)	0.436
ΔRL-distance (m)	−0.093 (−0.563/0.422)	0.732	−0.088 (−0.559/0.426)	0.746
ΔST (s)	−0.605 (−0.847/−0.156)	**0.013***	−0.549 (−0.821/−0.073)	**0.028***
ΔFT (s)	0.203 (−0.325/0.635)	0.450	0.171 (−0.354/0.615)	0.526
ΔSupport distance (m)	−0.222 (−0.646/0.308)	0.409	−0.171 (−0.614/0.355)	0.527
ΔFlight distance (m)	0.623 (0.184/0.855)	**0.010****	0.571 (0.106/0.832)	**0.021***
ΔHip angle at RL (°)	−0.291 (−0.688/0.239)	0.274	−0.285 (−0.684/0.246)	0.286
ΔPeak hip flexion angle (°)	−0.323 (−0.706/0.205)	0.222	−0.321 (−0.704/0.208)	0.226
ΔHip angle at TD (°)	0.163 (−0.362/0.610)	0.546	0.199 (−0.329/0.632)	0.459
ΔKnee angle at RL (°)	0.207 (−0.322/0.637)	0.442	0.119 (−0.400/0.581)	0.660
ΔPeak knee extension angle (°)	0.186 (−0.342/0.624)	0.491	0.201 (−0.327/0.634)	0.455

ΔKnee angle at TD (°)	−0.076 (−0.551/0.436)	0.780	−0.050 (−0.532/0.457)	0.854
ΔCombined angle at RL (°)	0.377 (−0.146/0.736)	0.150	0.305 (−0.225/0.695)	0.251
ΔPeak combined angle (°)	−0.120 (−0.581/0.399)	0.657	−0.153 (−0.603/0.371)	0.571
ΔCombined angle at TD (°)	−0.205 (−0.636/0.324)	0.447	−0.212 (−0.641/0.317)	0.430
ΔHip angular velocity at RL (°·s^{-1})	0.146 (−0.378/0.598)	0.591	0.054 (−0.454/0.536)	0.841
ΔPeak hip extension velocity (°·s^{-1})	0.565 (0.096/0.829)	**0.023***	0.626 (0.190/0.856)	**0.009****
ΔHip angular velocity at TD (°·s^{-1})	−0.099 (−0.567/0.417)	0.715	−0.106 (−0.572/0.411)	0.696
ΔKnee angular velocity at RL (°·s^{-1})	−0.129 (−0.587/0.392)	0.634	−0.149 (−0.600/0.374)	0.582
ΔPeak knee extension velocity (°·s^{-1})	0.089 (−0.425/0.560)	0.742	0.149 (−0.374/0.600)	0.582
ΔKnee angular velocity at TD (°·s^{-1})	−0.107 (−0.572/0.410)	0.693	−0.082 (−0.555/0.431)	0.762

314 p*<0.05, p**<0.01

315 NDH, Nordic hamstring; MSS, maximal sprint speed; SL, step length; SR, step rate; TD
316 distance, touchdown distance; RL, distance, release distance; ST, support time; FT, flight
317 time. RL, Contralateral release. TD, ipsilateral touchdown. Items in bold are those with
318 significant correlations

319 Table 4 shows the relationship between ΔMSS and each variable in the NS. There was
320 no significant correlation between ΔMSS and MSS under NS conditions (r=-0.419, p=0.106).
321 There was a significant positive correlation between ΔMSS and the peak combined angle
322 under NS conditions (r=0.560, p<0.05).
323
324 **Table 4. Relationship between the amount of MSS change by condition and each**
325 **variable at NS conditions**

Variables in NS	ΔMSS	
	Correlation coefficient (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)	*p*-value
MSS	−0.419 (−0.757/0.097)	0.106
SL	−0.323 (−0.706/0.206)	0.222
SF	−0.050 (−0.533/0.457)	0.854
TD distance	0.266 (−0.264/0.673)	0.319
RL distance	−0.260 (−0.670/0.270)	0.331
ST	0.234 (−0.296/0.654)	0.382
FT	−0.160 (−0.607/0.365)	0.555
Support distance	−0.128 (−0.587/0.392)	0.636
Flight distance	−0.349 (−0.720/0.177)	0.185
Hip angle at RL	−0.099 (−0.567/0.417)	0.716
Peak hip flexion angle	−0.052 (−0.534/0.456)	0.849
Hip angle at TD	−0.308 (−0.697/0.222)	0.246
Knee angle at RL	0.171 (−0.355/0.614)	0.528
Peak knee extension angle	0.271 (−0.259/0.676)	0.31
Knee angle at TD	0.017 (−0.483/0.509)	0.95

Combined angle at RL	0.207 (−0.322/0.637)	0.441
Peak combined angle	0.560 (0.089/0.826)	**0.024***
Combined angle at TD	0.329 (−0.199/0.709)	0.213
Hip angular velocity at RL	0.268 (−0.263/0.674)	0.316
Peak hip extension velocity	−0.255 (−0.666/0.276)	0.341
Hip angular velocity at TD	−0.037 (−0.523/0.468)	0.893
Knee angular velocity at RL	0.399 (−0.121/0.747)	0.126
Peak knee extension velocity	0.421 (−0.094/0.758)	0.104
Knee angular velocity at TD	−0.348 (−0.720/0.178)	0.186

$p^*<0.05$

MSS, maximal sprint speed; SL, step length; SR, step rate; TD distance, touchdown distance; RL distance, release distance; ST, support time; FT, flight time. RL, contralateral release. TD, ipsilateral touchdown. Items in bold are those with significant correlations.

Discussion

The main finding of this study was that static stretching of the hamstrings for 120 s per leg resulted in a significant decrease in MSS via increased touchdown distance and ST, decreased flight distance, decreased knee extension angular velocity at contralateral release, and increased combined angle during the later phase of late swing. Increased hamstring muscle-tendon unit length during the late swing phase and longer touchdown distance in the early stance phase may increase hamstring strain [11, 69-71]. Thus, it is suggested that relatively long-term static stretching of the hamstrings may not only decrease immediately following MSS but may also induce some kinematic changes associated with HSI risk. Furthermore, the lower the NDH strength, the more significant was the decrease in MSS, increase in ST, decrease in flight distance, and decrease in peak hip extension angular

velocity in the SS. Thus, improving NDH strength may help minimize the negative effects of static stretching on the hamstrings.

Effect of static stretch on hamstrings on MSS and lower limb kinematics

In this study, under SS conditions, the sprint speed at 52.5–60.0 m was lower than in NS conditions. This result differs from that of Kistler et al. [43], who observed a significant speed reduction only at 20–40 m during a 100 m sprint. Kistler et al. [43], also stretched muscles other than the hamstrings, whereas only the hamstrings were stretched in the present study. Thus, this difference in results can be explained by the differences in the stretched parts of the body. The decrease in MSS at SS in this study was caused by an increase in touchdown distance, which was associated with braking impulses in the support phase [72], an increase in ST, which was strongly associated with MSS [1,2], and a decrease in flight distance. Hip flexion and knee extension were more prominent because the combined angle at the moment of touchdown was greater in SS than in NS, indicating that these kinematic changes were caused by the increased touchdown distance. This may also be because the function of the hamstrings, which decelerates the forward-moving thighs and lower legs during the swing phase and promotes active touch down close to the body [73], was impaired by static stretching. Relatively strong quadriceps contractions can produce angular momentum at the knee joint, which exceeds the mechanical limits of the hamstrings [74]. Therefore, in the present study, in which only the hamstrings were stretched, static stretching may have decreased the hamstring–quadriceps ratio and promoted knee extension during the late swing phase, which could have negatively affected the mechanics of MSS acquired.

In contrast, Ruan et al. [39] did not observe a decrease in sprint speed or knee flexion and hip extension peak torque after static stretching of the hamstrings in a 10-m sprint. The

MSS phase requires more eccentric power from the hamstrings in hip extension and knee flexion than the acceleration phase [45–47]. In addition, compared to the acceleration phase, MSS enhancement requires a higher level of strong ground strike action with early switching of hip flexion-extension and early deceleration of knee extension [2, 45, 75]. Therefore, the MSS phase was more likely to be negatively affected by static stretching of the hamstrings. Based on the above, it may be advisable to refrain from relatively long-term static stretching of the hamstrings only immediately prior to competitions where a high MSS is required.

Static stretching, which reduces the passive stiffness of the hamstrings, also generates knee flexion peak torque at longer hamstring lengths during accelerated sprinting and isokinetic strength measurements [29, 30, 38, 39]. This is a favorable change for HSI prevention [38, 39, 76, 77]. If the SS condition in this study was also adapted to produce peak knee flexion torque with longer muscle length, it can be concluded that there is a partial benefit for HSI risk reduction. However, this study did not calculate lower-limb kinetics, which limited our reference to this aspect of the study. In contrast, knee extension and hip flexion velocity at contralateral release decreased at SS conditions in the present study. Early generation of large knee flexion and hip extension eccentric torques is necessary for early control of faster-moving lower limb motion. Sprinters begin to exert hip extension torque and decelerate their thighs from mid-swing [45]. However, if static stretching suppresses hip extension torque or delays the timing of peak torque generation, early deceleration of the lower limb, which swings forward at a high speed, will not be possible. Therefore, by purposely suppressing the forward swing speed of the lower limb, the demand for fast eccentric contraction and early large-torque exertion at the hamstrings may have been avoided. Thus, static stretching may have the potential to reduce the risk of HSI during the MSS phase by suppressing high-speed hip extension-flexion motion. However, despite the decrease in hip flexion and knee extension velocity in contralateral release, the knee

392 extension velocity was higher at SS conditions than at NS conditions from around 25% late
393 swing, and the combined angle was larger than in NS toward an ipsilateral touchdown. This
394 change is similar to the finding reported by Wolski et al. [78], who showed that repeated
395 sprint fatigue reduced maximal hamstring strength, increased combined angle, and decreased
396 sprint speed, and that increased lengthening stress may be a risk factor for HIS. The increased
397 touchdown distance causes overstride [79, 80] and increase the horizontal braking impulse in
398 the support phase [72]. This early support phase (5% of the support phase) is another phase of
399 increased HSI risk owing to the increased demand for hamstring forces to resist hip flexion
400 and knee extension caused by large ground reaction forces [69,70]. Thus, it is suggested that
401 static stretching may produce some kinematics during the MSS phase, from the late swing
402 phase to the early support phase, which is unfavorable for HSI risk. In addition, long-term
403 static stretching of the hamstrings only just prior to a sprint, even if performed during the
404 sprint training phase, should be used with caution because it may cause the athlete to learn
405 kinematics that is not desirable for preventing HSI.
406

407 Characteristics of NDH strength and kinematics in sprinters who
408 are prone to acute impairment at MSS due to static stretching

409 Many previous studies reported no harmful effects of static stretching in highly
410 trained elite athletes [53–58]. In this study, the higher the hamstring strength level, the
411 smaller the decrease in the MSS. NDH reduces HSI risk by extending the fascicle length and
412 increasing knee flexion eccentric torque with a longer hamstring length [23–28]. NDH
413 strength also correlates with lean angle during NDH measurement, with higher NDH muscle
414 strength at larger knee angles [64]. Thus, athletes with low hamstring compliance and
415 eccentric torque in the limb position, where knee extension and hip flexion are promoted,
416 may be unable to adapt to eccentric torque exertion when the combined angle increases in the

late swing due to static stretching, resulting in lower MSS. The evidence suggests that participants with a higher ΔMSS had smaller peak combine angles in the NS. This may be a kinematic feature resulting from a failure to accommodate torque exertion at longer hamstring lengths. Therefore, increased NDH strength is recommended as a condition for athletes who require MSS, not only to reduce the risk of HSI during high-speed sprints but also to minimize or eliminate the acute negative effects of long-term static stretching.

Limitations

The kinematic analysis in this study used a two-dimensional analysis, which may have resulted in less accurate measurements. There were no significant main effects or interactions of the NS and SS measurement order or date on the variables; however, the effects of weather and wind speed could not be completely eliminated. Furthermore, the hamstring compliance of the participants may have influenced the results of this study. However, this study did not assess participants' hamstring compliance, and the extent to which compliance was altered by static stretching was unclear. In addition, two participants with HSI injuries from the previous year were included in the study. The history of HSI injury may have influenced the results of this study, because the effects on lower limb kinematics and kinetics on the injured leg during maximal sprinting may persist even 5 years after injury [81]. In addition, the mechanics of the late swing phase may be influenced by those of the prior recovery phase [78]. Therefore, further studies are required to broaden the scope of future analyses. In this study, only the MSS phase was analyzed. The findings of this study should be applied because even participants who did not experience a decrease in MSS due to static stretching may have experienced a negative effect on sprint speed during the acceleration phase.

Conclusion

Under SS conditions, the touchdown distance increased, flight distance decreased, and ST increased as the MSS decreased. In addition, the greater the MSS reduction due to SS, the lower the NDH peak force and torque, and the smaller the peak combining angle under NS conditions. Therefore, athletes with poor hamstring strength and low compliance with long hamstrings should avoid long-term static stretching immediately before high MSS. Under SS conditions, the knee extension velocity at contralateral release was lower, while the combined angle was larger at ipsilateral touchdown. This suggests that long-term static stretching of the hamstring immediately prior to high-speed sprints may induce kinematics that is undesirable for HSI prevention.

Acknowledgments

None.

Data availability statement

The raw data supporting this article will be made available by the authors without any undue reservation.

References

1. Rabita G, Dorel S, Slawinski J, Sàez-de-Villarreal E, Couturier A, Samozino P, et al. Sprint mechanics in world-class athletes: A new insight into the limits of human locomotion. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2015;25: 583-594. doi: 10.1111/sms.12389.

2. Clark KP, Weyand PG. Are running speeds maximized with simple-spring stance mechanics? J Appl Physiol (1985). 2014;117: 604–615. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.00174.2014.
3. Duhig S, Shield AJ, Opar D, Gabbett TJ, Ferguson C, Williams M. Effect of high-speed running on hamstring strain injury risk. Br J Sports Med. 2016;50: 1536–1540. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095679.
4. Ruddy JD, Pollard CW, Timmins RG, Williams MD, Shield AJ, Opar DA. Running exposure is associated with the risk of hamstring strain injury in elite Australian footballers. Br J Sports Med. 2018;52: 919–928. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096777.
5. Green B, Bourne MN, van Dyk N, Pizzari T. Recalibrating the risk of hamstring strain injury (HSI): A 2020 systematic review and meta-analysis of risk factors for index and recurrent hamstring strain injury in sport. Br J Sports Med. 2020;54: 1081–1088. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-100983.
6. Edouard P, Pollock N, Guex K, Kelly S, Prince C, Navarro L, et al. Hamstring muscle injuries and hamstring specific training in elite athletics (track and field) athletes. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19: 10992. doi: 10.3390/ijerph191710992.
7. Yu B, Queen RM, Abbey AN, Liu Y, Moorman CT, Garrett WE. Hamstring muscle kinematics and activation during overground sprinting. J Biomech. 2008;41: 3121–3126. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2008.09.005.
8. Nagano Y, Higashihara A, Takahashi K, Fukubayashi T. Mechanics of the muscles crossing the hip joint during sprint running. J Sports Sci. 2014;32: 1722–1728. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2014.915423.
9. Schache AG, Dorn TW, Blanch PD, Brown NA, Pandy MG. Mechanics of the human hamstring muscles during sprinting. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2012;44: 647–658. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e318236a3d2.

10. Danielsson A, Horvath A, Senorski C, Alentorn-Geli E, Garrett WE, Cugat R, et al. The mechanism of hamstring injuries – A systematic review. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2020;21: 641. doi: 10.1186/s12891-020-03658-8.

11. Kenneally-Dabrowski CJB, Brown NAT, Lai AKM, Perriman D, Spratford W, Serpell BG. Late swing or early stance? A narrative review of hamstring injury mechanisms during high-speed running. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2019;29: 1083-1091. doi: 10.1111/sms.13437.

12. Huygaerts S, Cos F, Cohen DD, Calleja-González J, Guitart M, Blazevich AJ, et al. Mechanisms of hamstring strain injury: Interactions between fatigue, muscle activation and function. Sports (Basel). 2020;8: 1–15. doi: 10.3390/sports8050065.

13. Thelen DG, Chumanov ES, Best TM, Swanson SC, Heiderscheit BC. Simulation of biceps femoris musculotendon mechanics during the swing phase of sprinting. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2005;37: 1931–1938. doi: 10.1249/01.mss.0000176674.42929.de. Available from: 0000176674.42929.de.

14. Heiderscheit BC, Hoerth DM, Chumanov ES, Swanson SC, Thelen BJ, Thelen DG. Identifying the time of occurrence of a hamstring strain injury during treadmill running: A case study. Clin Biomech (Bristol Avon). 2005;20: 1072–1078. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2005.07.005.

15. Schache AG, Wrigley TV, Baker R, Pandy MG. Biomechanical response to hamstring muscle strain injury. Gait Posture. 2009;29: 332–338. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2008.10.054.

16. Timmins RG, Bourne MN, Shield AJ, Williams MD, Lorenzen C, Opar DA. Short biceps femoris fascicles and eccentric knee flexor weakness increase the risk of hamstring injury in elite football (soccer): A prospective cohort study. Br J Sports Med. 2016;50: 1524–1535. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095362.

514 17. Timmins RG, Shield AJ, Williams MD, Lorenzen C, Opar DA. Biceps femoris long
515 head muscle architecture a reliability and retrospective injury study. Med Sci Sports
516 Exerc. 2015;43: 2663–2670. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000507.
517 18. Fousekis K, Tsepis E, Poulmedis P, Athanasopoulos S, Vagenas G. Intrinsic risk
518 factors of non-contact quadriceps and hamstring strains in soccer: A prospective study
519 of 100 professional players. Br J Sports Med. 2011;45: 709–714. doi:
520 10.1136/bjsm.2010.077560.
521 19. van Dyk N, Bahr R, Whiteley R, Tol JL, Kumar BD, Hamilton B, et al. Hamstring
522 and quadriceps isokinetic strength deficits are weak risk factors for hamstring strain
523 injuries: A 4-year cohort study. Am J Sports Med. 2016;44: 1789–1795. doi:
524 10.1177/0363546516632526.
525 20. Opar DA, Williams MD, Timmins RG, Hickey J, Duhig SJ, Shield AJ. Eccentric
526 hamstring strength and hamstring injury risk in Australian footballers. Med Sci Sports
527 Exerc. 2015;47: 857–865. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000465.
528 21. Croisier JL, Ganteaume S, Binet J, Genty M, Ferret JM. Strength imbalances and
529 prevention of hamstring injury in professional soccer players: A prospective study.
530 Am J Sports Med. 2008;36: 1469–1475. doi: 10.1177/0363546508316764.
531 22. Van Dyk N, Behan FP, Whiteley R. Including the Nordic hamstring exercise in injury
532 prevention programmes halves the rate of hamstring injuries: A systematic review and
533 meta-analysis of 8459 athletes. Br J Sports Med. 2019;53: 1362-1370. doi:
534 10.1136/bjsports-2018-100045.
535 23. Potier TG, Alexander CM, Seynnes OR. Effects of eccentric strength training on
536 biceps femoris muscle architecture and knee joint range of movement. Eur J Appl
537 Physiol. 2009;105: 939–944. doi: 10.1007/s00421-008-0980-7.

538 24. Timmins RG, Ruddy JD, Presland J, Maniar N, Shield AJ, Williams MD, et al.
539 Architectural Changes of the Biceps Femoris Long Head after Concentric or Eccentric
540 Training. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2016;48: 499–508. doi:
541 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000795.
542 25. Ribeiro-Alvares JB, Marques VB, Vaz MA, Baroni BM. Four Weeks of Nordic
543 Hamstring Exercise Reduce Muscle Injury Risk Factors in Young Adults. J Strength
544 Cond Res. 2018;32: 1254–1262. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001975.
545 26. Bourne MN, Duhig SJ, Timmins RG, Williams MD, Opar DA, Al Najjar A, et al.
546 Impact of the Nordic hamstring and hip extension exercises on hamstring architecture
547 and morphology: Implications for injury prevention. Br J Sports Med. 2017;51: 469–
548 477. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096130.
549 27. Alonso-Fernandez D, Docampo-Blanco P, Martinez-Fernandez J. Changes in muscle
550 architecture of biceps femoris induced by eccentric strength training with Nordic
551 hamstring exercise. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2018;28: 88–94. doi:
552 10.1111/sms.12877.
553 28. Lovell R, Knox M, Weston M, Siegler JC, Brennan S, Marshall PWM. Hamstring
554 injury prevention in soccer: Before or after training? Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2018;
555 28: 658-666. doi: 10.1111/sms.12925.
556 29. Herda TJ, Cramer JT, Ryan ED, McHugh MP, Stout JR. Acute effects of static versus
557 dynamic stretching on isometric peak torque, electromyography, and
558 mechanomyography of the biceps femoris muscle. J Strength Cond Res. 2008;22:
559 809–817. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e31816a82ec.
560 30. McHugh MP, Nesse M. Effect of stretching on strength loss and pain after eccentric
561 exercise. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2008;40: 566–573. doi:
562 10.1249/MSS.0b013e31815d2f8c.

563 31. Watsford ML, Murphy AJ, McLachlan KA, Bryant AL, Cameron ML, Crossley KM,
564 et al. A prospective study of the relationship between lower body stiffness and
565 hamstring injury in professional Australian rules footballers. Am J Sports Med.
566 2010;38: 2058-2064. doi: 10.1177/0363546510370197.
567 32. Henderson G, Barnes CA, Portas MD. Factors associated with increased propensity
568 for hamstring injury in English Premier League soccer players. J Sci Med Sport.
569 2010;13: 397–402. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2009.08.003.
570 33. Witvrouw E, Mahieu N, Danneels L, McNair P. Stretching and injury prevention: An
571 obscure relationship. Sports Med. 2004;34: 443–449. doi: 10.2165/00007256-
572 200434070-00003.
573 34. Gajdosik RL. Passive extensibility of skeletal muscle: Review of the literature with
574 clinical implications. Clin Biomech (Bristol Avon). 2001;16: 87-101. doi:
575 10.1016/s0268-0033(00)00061-9.
576 35. Konrad A, Tilp M. The time course of muscle-tendon unit function and structure
577 following three minutes of static stretching. J Sports Sci Med. 2020;19: 52-58.
578 36. Magnusson SP, Simonsen EB, Aagaard P, Kjaer M. Biomechanical responses to
579 repeated stretches in human hamstring muscle in vivo. Am J Sports Med. 1996;24:
580 622–628. doi: 10.1177/036354659602400510.
581 37. McHugh MP, Cosgrave CH. To stretch or not to stretch: The role of stretching in
582 injury prevention and performance. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2010;20: 169–181. doi:
583 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2009.01058.x.
584 38. Nakao S, Ikezoe T, Nakamura M, Umegaki H, Fujita K, Umehara J, et al. Chronic
585 effects of a static stretching program on hamstring strength. J Strength Cond Res.
586 2021;35: 1924-1929. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003037.

587 39. Ruan M, Li L, Chen C, Wu X. Stretch could reduce hamstring injury risk during
588 sprinting by right shifting the length-torque curve. J Strength Cond Res. 2018;32 -
589 Issue 8 -: 2190-2198. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000002645.
590 40. Chaabene H, Behm DG, Negra Y, Granacher U. Acute effects of static stretching on
591 muscle strength and power: An attempt to clarify previous caveats. Front Physiol.
592 2019;10: 1468. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2019.01468, PMID: 31849713, PMCID:
593 PMC6895680.
594 41. ACSM. ACSM's resource manual for guidelines for exercise testing and prescription.
595 Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott. Williams & Wilkins; 2010.
596 42. Simic L, Sarabon N, Markovic G. Does pre-exercise static stretching inhibit maximal
597 muscular performance? A meta-analytical review. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2013;23:
598 131-148. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2012.01444.x.
599 43. Kistler BM, Walsh MS, Horn TS, Cox RH. The acute effects of static stretching on
600 the sprint performance of collegiate men in the 60- and 100-m dash after a dynamic
601 warm-up. J Strength Cond Res. 2010;24: 2280-2284. doi:
602 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181e58dd7.
603 44. Higashihara A, Nagano Y, Ono T, Fukubayashi T. Differences in hamstring activation
604 characteristics between the acceleration and maximum-speed phases of sprinting. J
605 Sports Sci. 2018;36: 1313-1318. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2017.1375548.
606 45. Dorn TW, Schache AG, Pandy MG. Muscular strategy shift in human running:
607 Dependence of running speed on hip and ankle muscle performance. J Exp Biol.
608 2012;215: 1944-1956. doi: 10.1242/jeb.064527.
609 46. Nagahara R, Matsubayashi T, Matsuo A, Zushi K. Alteration of swing leg work and
610 power during human accelerated sprinting. Biol Open. 2017;6: 633-641. doi:
611 10.1242/bio.024281.

47. Costa PB, Ryan ED, Herda TJ, Walter AA, Defreitas JM, Stout JR, et al. Acute effects of static stretching on peak torque and the hamstrings-to-quadriceps conventional and functional ratios. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2013;23: 38-45. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2011.01348.x.

48. Yeung SS, Suen AM, Yeung EW. A prospective cohort study of hamstring injuries in competitive sprinters: Preseason muscle imbalance as a possible risk factor. Br J Sports Med. 2009;43: 589–594. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.2008.056283.

49. Freckleton G, Pizzari T. Risk factors for hamstring muscle strain injury in sport: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med. 2013;47: 351-358. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090664.

50. Wilmes E, De Ruiter CJ, Bastiaansen BJC, Goedhart EA, Brink MS, Van der Helm FCT, et al. Associations between hamstring fatigue and sprint kinematics during a simulated football (soccer) match. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2021;53: 2586-2595. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002753.

51. Small K, McNaughton LR, Greig M, Lohkamp M, Lovell R. Soccer fatigue, sprinting and hamstring injury risk. Int J Sports Med. 2009;30: 573–578. doi: 10.1055/s-0029-1202822.

52. Nuell S, Illera-Domínguez V, Carmona G, Macadam P, Lloret M, Padullés JM, et al. Hamstring muscle volume as an indicator of sprint performance. J Strength Cond Res. 2021;35: 902-909. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003976.

53. Egan AD, Cramer JT, Massey LL, Marek SM. Acute effects of static stretching on peak torque and mean power output in National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's basketball players. J Strength Cond Res. 2006;20: 778-782. doi: 10.1519/R-18575.1.

636 54. Chaouachi A, Castagna C, Chtara M, Brughelli M, Turki O, Galy O, et al. Effect of
637 warm-ups involving static or dynamic stretching on agility, sprinting, and jumping
638 performance in trained individuals. J Strength Cond Res. 2010;24: 2001-2011. doi:
639 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181aeb181.
640 55. Magnusson SP, Aagaard P, Larsson B, Kjaer M. Passive energy absorption by human
641 muscle-tendon unit is unaffected by increase in intramuscular temperature. J Appl
642 Physiol (1985). 2000;88: 1215-1220. doi: 10.1152/jappl.2000.88.4.1215.
643 56. Unick J, Kieffer HS, Cheesman W, Feeney A. The acute effects of static and ballistic
644 stretching on vertical jump performance in trained women. J Strength Cond Res.
645 2005;19: 206-212. doi: 10.1519/R-14843.1.
646 57. Chaouachi A, Chamari K, Wong P, Castagna C, Chaouachi M, Moussa-Chamari I, et
647 al. Stretch and sprint training reduces stretch-induced sprint performance deficits in
648 13- to 15-year-old youth. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2008;104: 515-522. doi:
649 10.1007/s00421-008-0799-2.
650 58. Little T, Williams AG. Effects of differential stretching protocols during warm-ups on
651 high-speed motor capacities in professional soccer players. J Strength Cond Res.
652 2006;20: 203-207. doi: 10.1519/R-16944.1.
653 59. Ryan ED, Beck TW, Herda TJ, Hull HR, Hartman MJ, Costa PB, et al. The time
654 course of musculotendinous stiffness responses following different durations of
655 passive stretching. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2008;38: 632–639. doi:
656 10.2519/jospt.2008.2843.
657 60. Reiner MM, Tilp M, Guilhem G, Morales-Artacho A, Konrad A. Comparison of A
658 single vibration foam rolling and static stretching exercise on the muscle function and
659 mechanical properties of the hamstring muscles. J Sports Sci Med. 2022;21: 287-297.
660 doi: 10.52082/jssm.2022.287.

661 61. Sato S, Kiyono R, Takahashi N, Yoshida T, Takeuchi K, Nakamura M. The acute and
662 prolonged effects of 20-s static stretching on muscle strength and shear elastic
663 modulus. PLOS ONE. 2020;15: e0228583. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0228583.
664 62. Nakamura M, Ikezoe T, Nishishita S, Tanaka H, Umehara J, Ichihashi N. Static
665 stretching duration needed to decrease passive stiffness of hamstring muscle-tendon
666 unit. The Journal of Physical Fitness and Sports Medicine. 2019;8: 113-116. doi:
667 https://doi.org/10.7600/jpfsm.8.113.
668 63. Green B, Bourne MN, Pizzari T. Isokinetic strength assessment offers limited
669 predictive validity for detecting risk of future hamstring strain in sport: A systematic
670 review and meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med. 2018;52: 329–336. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-
671 2017-098101, PMID:29187349.64.
672 64. Nishida S, Nakamura M, Kiyono R, Sato S, Yasaka K, Yoshida R, et al. Relationship
673 between Nordic hamstring strength and maximal voluntary eccentric, concentric and
674 isometric knee flexion torque. PLOS ONE. 2022;17: e0264465. doi:
675 10.1371/journal.pone.0264465.
676 65. Ae M, Ito A, Suzuki M. The men's 100 metres. New Stud Athletics. 1992;7: 47–52.
677 66. Ae M. Body partial inertia coefficient of Japanese athletes and infants. Jpn J Sports
678 Sci. 1996;15: 155–162.
679 67. Wells RP, Winter DA. Assessment of signal and noise in the kinematics of normal,
680 pathological and sporting gaits. Human Locomotion. 1980;1: 92–93.
681 68. Cohen J. Statistical power analysis for the Behavioral Science (second edn.). New
682 York. 1988: Routledge.
683 69. Orchard JW. Hamstrings are most susceptible to injury during the early stance phase
684 of sprinting. Br J Sports Med. 2012;46: 88–89. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090127.

70. Sun Y, Wei S, Zhong Y, Fu W, Li L, Liu Y. How joint torques affect hamstring injury risk in sprinting swing-stance transition. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2015;47: 373–380. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000404.

71. Sugimoto D, Kelly BD, Mandel DL, d'Hemecourt DA, Carpenito SC, d'Hemecourt CA, d'Hemecourt PA. Running Propensities of Athletes with Hamstring Injuries. Sports. 2019; 7:210. doi: 10.3390/sports7090210.

72. Hunter JP, Marshall RN, McNair PJ. Relationships between ground reaction force impulse and kinematics of sprint-running acceleration. J Appl Biomech. 2005;21: 31-43. doi: 10.1123/jab.21.1.31.

73. Gregson W, Di Salvo V, Varley MC, Modonutti M, Belli A, Chamari K, et al. Harmful association of sprinting with muscle injury occurrence in professional soccer match-play: A Two-Season, league wide exploratory investigation from the Qatar stars league. J Sci Med Sport. 2020;23: 134–138. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2019.08.289.

74. Aagaard P, Simonsen EB, Magnusson SP, Larsson B, Dyhre-Poulsen P. A new concept for isokinetic hamstring: Quadriceps muscle strength ratio. Am J Sports Med. 1998;26: 231-237. doi: 10.1177/03635465980260021201.

75. Clark KP, Meng CR, Stearne DJ. 'Whip from the hip': Thigh angular motion, ground contact mechanics, and running speed. Biol Open. 2020;9: bio053546. doi: 10.1242/bio.053546.

76. Brughelli M, Mendiguchia J, Nosaka K, Idoate F, Los Arcos AL, Cronin J. Effects of eccentric exercise on optimum length of the knee flexors and extensors during the preseason in professional soccer players. Phys Ther Sport. 2010;11: 50-55. doi: 10.1016/j.ptsp.2009.12.002.

77. Brooks JH, Fuller CW, Kemp SP, Reddin DB. Incidence, risk, and prevention of hamstring muscle injuries in professional rugby union. Am J Sports Med. 2006;34: 1297-1306. doi: 10.1177/0363546505286022.

78. Wolski L, Pappas E, Hiller C, Halaki M, Fong Yan A. Is there an association between high-speed running biomechanics and hamstring strain injury? A systematic review. Sports Biomech. 2021: 1-27. doi: 10.1080/14763141.2021.1960418.

79. Souza RB. An evidence-based videotaped running biomechanics analysis. Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am. 2016;27: 217–236. doi: 10.1016/j.pmr.2015.08.006.

80. Simoni L, Pancani S, Vannetti F, Macchi C, Pasquini G. Relationship between lower limb kinematics and upper trunk acceleration in recreational runners. J Healthc Eng. 2020;2020: 8973010. doi: 10.1155/2020/8973010.

81. Higashihara A, Ono T, Tokutake G, Kuramochi R, Kunita Y, Nagano Y, et al. Hamstring muscles' function deficit during overground sprinting in track and field athletes with a history of strain injury. J Sports Sci. 2019;37: 2744–2750. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2019.1664030.


contralateral touch down
contralateral release
maximal hip flexion
ipsilateral touch down
Hip angle
Knee angle
Combined angle (°)
= Knee angle (°) − Hip angle (°)
TD distance
RL distance
Late swing phase
Support distance ST
Flight distance FT
SL, SR

Figure 1


contralateral release
ipsilateral touch-down
maximal
hip flexion
Hip anglar velocity (°·s-1)
600
500
400
300
200
100
0
-100
-200
extension
flexion
0
25
50
75
100
Late swing phase (%)
contralateral release
ipsilateral touch-down
maximal
hip flexion
Knee anglar velocity (°·s-1)
1500
1300
1100
900
700
500
300
100
-100
-300
-500
extension
flexion
0
25
50
75
100
Late swing phase (%)

Figure 3


contralateral release
ipsilateral touch-down
maximal hip flexion
Hip angle (°)
extension
flexion
150
140
130
120
110
100
90
NS
SS
0
25
50
75
100
Late swing phase (%)
contralateral release
ipsilateral touch-down
maximal hip flexion
Knee angle (°)
extension
flexion
180
160
140
120
100
80
60
0
25
50
75
100
Late swing phase (%)
contralateral release
ipsilateral touch-down
maximal hip flexion
Combined angle (°)
extension
shortening
40
30
20
10
0
-10
-20
-30
-40
-50
0
25
50
75
100
Late swing phase (%)

Figure 2