

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

~~NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.~~

26 **Abstract**

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

47

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

50

51 **Introduction**

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

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

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

70 Hamstring muscle-tendon unit stiffness has also been reported as an HSI risk [5, 31,
71 32]. This is because the high compliance of the muscle-tendon units contributes to energy
72 absorption during the muscle-tendon unit extension [33]. The stiffness of the muscle-tendon
73 units is partially due to muscle stiffness [34, 35]. Therefore, static stretching before sport-
74 specific training that acutely improves the compliance of muscle-tendon units is
75 recommended and is frequently performed among track and field sprinters, where HSI often

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

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

91 However, static stretching of the hamstrings decreases the hamstring–quadriceps ratio
92 [47], which is an HSI risk [21, 48, 49]. Therefore, relative hamstring strength reduction may
93 promote hamstring muscle-tendon unit lengthening (that is, excessive hip flexion and knee
94 extension) during the late swing phase, resulting in running kinematics that is unfavorable for
95 HSI prevention [50, 51]. In addition, hamstring muscle volume is an important indicator of
96 sprint performance [52]. Based on the above, we cannot dismiss the possibility that static
97 stretching of the hamstring alone may produce undesirable kinematics and changes in
98 spatiotemporal variables for HSI risk reduction and MSS improvement. In contrast, because
99 many studies have reported minimal negative effects of static stretching in highly trained elite

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

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

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

114

115 **Materials and methods**

116 **Participants and experimental procedures**

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

124 to the participants and in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. The
125 local ethics review board (Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hiroshima
126 University) approved the experimental protocol (approval number: 2021063). Measurements
127 were performed in a within-subject experimental design and were counterbalanced in the no
128 static stretch (NS) and static stretch (SS) conditions. NS and SS measurements were taken at
129 least 48 h apart. Participants performed a designated warm-up protocol that included 800-m
130 running, dynamic stretching with hurdles, sprint drills with skipping, three 50-m sprints with
131 a gradual increase in speed with each sprint, and a 30-m start dash with a starting block. Two
132 80-meter sprints with starting blocks were performed. Considering the effects of fatigue and
133 the residual effect of static stretching (in SS trials) is 10–20 min [59], a 10-min rest period
134 was provided between trials. The SS group performed a static stretching protocol prior to the
135 first 80-m sprint trial and then completed the first 80-m sprint trial within 5 min. After static
136 stretching, the athletes were allowed to practice one or two block clearances before starting
137 the 80-m sprint trial. SS was performed by passive static straight leg raising to stretch the
138 hamstring. The participant was placed supine on the mat, the contralateral hip and knee were
139 stabilized in full extension, and the leg to be stretched was pushed by the investigator until
140 the participant complained of discomfort. The knee was maintained at full extension and
141 maximum hip flexion. A brief stretch of approximately 20 s is insufficient to decrease the
142 passive stiffness of the muscle-tendon unit [60-62]. Therefore, the process of stretching the
143 legs was continued for 30 s and repeated four times for each leg with a 10-s rest between
144 stretches [39]. The same spike shoes were worn for both the NS and SS in the 80 m sprint
145 trials, and the starting block placement was similar between the two conditions.

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

148 [63]. NDH measurements were performed within 2 weeks of the 80 m sprint trial for the two
149 conditions.

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

161

162 **Experimental setup**

163 A high-speed camera (EX-100F, CASIO, Tokyo, Japan) was used to capture video at
164 240 frames/s for the 52.5–60 m section and the MSS section of the 80 m sprint test [65]. The
165 camera was positioned 20 m to the right of the center of the analysis section, with the optical
166 axis perpendicular to the direction of the sprint. Prior to trial filming, markers were placed in
167 a rectangular pattern on the ground in the center of the filming area at intervals of 1.2 m in
168 the lateral direction and 2.5 m in the direction of the sprint. To calibrate the aspect ratio,
169 images were taken with a 2-m calibration pole held vertically and horizontally at the center of
170 the marker.

171

172 **Data analysis**

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

193

194 **Variables**

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

197

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 [$\text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$]):** 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 [$\text{step} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$]):** 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.

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

224

225 **Kinematic variables**

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

- 230 • **Hip angle (°), Hip angular velocity (°·s⁻¹):** angle and angular velocity formed by the
231 line connecting the upper margin of the sternum, right greater trochanter, and right knee.
- 232 • **Knee angle (°), Knee angular velocity (°·s⁻¹):** Angular velocity formed by the line
233 connecting the right greater trochanter, right knee, and right ankle.
- 234 • **Combined angle (°),** angle obtained by subtracting the hip angle from the knee joint
235 angle. The combined angle is a measure of the theoretical hamstring muscle-tendon unit
236 length [50].

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

239 To assess measurement repeatability, the same investigator analyzed these variables
240 twice for 10 participants, spaced at least 48 h apart. The intraclass correlation coefficient for
241 the two analyses averaged 0.893 ± 0.055 (lowest 0.774, highest 0.972). The smallest
242 coefficient of variation was the MSS (0.4 %), and the largest was the combined angle at RL
243 (9.4%). These were recognized as having good intrarater reliability. A series of mixed-model
244 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 ($\text{N} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$):** The average of the measured peak force of the left and right
250 feet divided by the body weight.
- 251 • **NDH peak torque ($\text{Nm} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$) :** 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 $4.02 \pm$
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 \pm standard deviation (SD). The amount of change (Δ) in variables from NS
266 to SS is shown as mean \pm standard error (SE). The statistical significance level was set at $p <$
267 5% .

268

269 Results

270 Table 1 shows the values of the spatiotemporal variables in the NS and SS conditions,
 271 and the differences between the conditions. The MSS was lower in 11 of 16 participants in
 272 the SS condition and higher in five participants in the SS condition (mean \pm SD; -2.47 ± 4.37
 273 %).

274

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

Variables	NS (mean \pm SD)	SS (mean \pm SD)	Δ mean \pm SE (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)	Differences (<i>p</i> -value)	Cohen's d (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)
MSS (m·s ⁻¹)	9.55 \pm 0.42	9.31 \pm 0.46	-0.24 \pm 0.11 (-0.48/0.01)	0.043*	-0.553 (-1.298/0.192)
SL (m)	2.11 \pm 0.11	2.08 \pm 0.11	-0.03 \pm 0.02 (-0.07/0.01)	0.104	-0.295 (-1.029/0.439)
SF (step·s ⁻¹)	4.52 \pm 0.13	4.47 \pm 0.13	-0.05 \pm 0.03 (-0.12/0.02)	0.175	-0.359 (-1.095/0.377)
TD distance (m)	0.34 \pm 0.03	0.37 \pm 0.04	0.03 \pm 0.01 (0.01/0.04)	0.009**	0.752 (-0.006/1.510)
RL-distance (m)	0.54 \pm 0.04	0.53 \pm 0.04	-0.01 \pm 0.01 (-0.02/0.01)	0.349	-0.175 (-0.907/0.556)
ST (s)	0.095 \pm 0.005	0.099 \pm 0.006	0.004 \pm 0.001 (0.001/0.007)	0.013*	0.731 (-0.025/1.488)
FT (s)	0.127 \pm 0.005	0.125 \pm 0.007	-0.002 \pm 0.001 (-0.005/0.001)	0.168	-0.302 (-1.036/0.433)
Support distance (m)	0.89 \pm 0.05	0.91 \pm 0.07	-0.02 \pm 0.01 (-0.01/0.05)	0.179	0.314(-0.421/1.049)
The flight distance (m)	1.22 \pm 0.08	1.17 \pm 0.09	-0.05 \pm 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 \pm standard deviation, and the difference between NS and SS (Δ) was expressed as
 280 mean \pm 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 \pm SD)	SS (mean \pm SD)	Δ mean \pm SE (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)	Differences (p -value)	Cohen's d (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)
Hip angle at RL ($^{\circ}$)	105.4 \pm 7.01	104.41 \pm 8.72	-1.00 \pm 1.38 (-3.93/1.94)	0.481	-0.127(-0.857/0.6 04)
Peak hip flexion angle ($^{\circ}$)	104.53 \pm 7.17	103.8 \pm 8.65	-0.73 \pm 1.41 (-3.73/2.28)	0.614	-0.092(-0.822/0.6 38)

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(-0.714/0.744)
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(-0.747/0.711)
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(-1.027/0.441)
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(-0.053/0.911)
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(-0.850/0.610)

294 $p^* < 0.05$

295 RL, Contralateral release; TD, ipsilateral touchdown. Items in bold are those with significant

296 correlations. Δ and Cohen's d reflect SS-NS rather than NS.

297

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)	<i>p</i> -value	Correlation coefficient (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)	<i>p</i> -value
ΔMSS ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)	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

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

Δ Knee angle at TD ($^{\circ}$)	-0.076 (-0.551/0.436)	0.780	-0.050 (-0.532/0.457)	0.854
Δ Combined angle at RL ($^{\circ}$)	0.377 (-0.146/0.736)	0.150	0.305 (-0.225/0.695)	0.251
Δ Peak combined angle ($^{\circ}$)	-0.120 (-0.581/0.399)	0.657	-0.153 (-0.603/0.371)	0.571
Δ Combined angle at TD ($^{\circ}$)	-0.205 (-0.636/0.324)	0.447	-0.212 (-0.641/0.317)	0.430
Δ Hip angular velocity at RL ($^{\circ}\cdot s^{-1}$)	0.146 (-0.378/0.598)	0.591	0.054 (-0.454/0.536)	0.841
Δ Peak hip extension velocity ($^{\circ}\cdot s^{-1}$)	0.565 (0.096/0.829)	0.023*	0.626 (0.190/0.856)	0.009**
Δ Hip angular velocity at TD ($^{\circ}\cdot s^{-1}$)	-0.099 (-0.567/0.417)	0.715	-0.106 (-0.572/0.411)	0.696
Δ Knee angular velocity at RL ($^{\circ}\cdot s^{-1}$)	-0.129 (-0.587/0.392)	0.634	-0.149 (-0.600/0.374)	0.582
Δ Peak knee extension velocity ($^{\circ}\cdot s^{-1}$)	0.089 (-0.425/0.560)	0.742	0.149 (-0.374/0.600)	0.582
Δ Knee angular velocity at TD ($^{\circ}\cdot s^{-1}$)	-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 Δ MSS and each variable in the NS. There was
 320 no significant correlation between Δ MSS and MSS under NS conditions ($r=-0.419$, $p=0.106$).
 321 There was a significant positive correlation between Δ MSS 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	Δ MSS	
	Correlation coefficient (Lower/Upper 95 % CI)	<i>p</i> -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

326 $p^* < 0.05$

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

330

331 Discussion

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

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

344

345 **Effect of static stretch on hamstrings on MSS and lower limb**

346 **kinematics**

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

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

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

374 Static stretching, which reduces the passive stiffness of the hamstrings, also generates
375 knee flexion peak torque at longer hamstring lengths during accelerated sprinting and
376 isokinetic strength measurements [29, 30, 38, 39]. This is a favorable change for HSI
377 prevention [38, 39, 76, 77]. If the SS condition in this study was also adapted to produce peak
378 knee flexion torque with longer muscle length, it can be concluded that there is a partial
379 benefit for HSI risk reduction. However, this study did not calculate lower-limb kinetics,
380 which limited our reference to this aspect of the study. In contrast, knee extension and hip
381 flexion velocity at contralateral release decreased at SS conditions in the present study. Early
382 generation of large knee flexion and hip extension eccentric torques is necessary for early
383 control of faster-moving lower limb motion. Sprinters begin to exert hip extension torque and
384 decelerate their thighs from mid-swing [45]. However, if static stretching suppresses hip
385 extension torque or delays the timing of peak torque generation, early deceleration of the
386 lower limb, which swings forward at a high speed, will not be possible. Therefore, by
387 purposely suppressing the forward swing speed of the lower limb, the demand for fast
388 eccentric contraction and early large-torque exertion at the hamstrings may have been
389 avoided. Thus, static stretching may have the potential to reduce the risk of HSI during the
390 MSS phase by suppressing high-speed hip extension-flexion motion. However, despite the
391 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

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

423

424 **Limitations**

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

441

442 **Conclusion**

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

452

453 **Acknowledgments**

454 None.

455

456 **Data availability statement**

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

459

460 **References**

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

- 464 2. Clark KP, Weyand PG. Are running speeds maximized with simple-spring stance
465 mechanics? *J Appl Physiol* (1985). 2014;117: 604–615. doi:
466 10.1152/jappphysiol.00174.2014.
- 467 3. Duhig S, Shield AJ, Opar D, Gabbett TJ, Ferguson C, Williams M. Effect of high-
468 speed running on hamstring strain injury risk. *Br J Sports Med*. 2016;50: 1536–1540.
469 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095679.
- 470 4. Ruddy JD, Pollard CW, Timmins RG, Williams MD, Shield AJ, Opar DA. Running
471 exposure is associated with the risk of hamstring strain injury in elite Australian
472 footballers. *Br J Sports Med*. 2018;52: 919–928. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096777.
- 473 5. Green B, Bourne MN, van Dyk N, Pizzari T. Recalibrating the risk of hamstring strain
474 injury (HSI): A 2020 systematic review and meta-analysis of risk factors for index
475 and recurrent hamstring strain injury in sport. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020;54: 1081–1088.
476 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-100983.
- 477 6. Edouard P, Pollock N, Guex K, Kelly S, Prince C, Navarro L, et al. Hamstring muscle
478 injuries and hamstring specific training in elite athletics (track and field) athletes. *Int J*
479 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19: 10992. doi: 10.3390/ijerph191710992.
- 480 7. Yu B, Queen RM, Abbey AN, Liu Y, Moorman CT, Garrett WE. Hamstring muscle
481 kinematics and activation during overground sprinting. *J Biomech*. 2008;41: 3121–
482 3126. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2008.09.005.
- 483 8. Nagano Y, Higashihara A, Takahashi K, Fukubayashi T. Mechanics of the muscles
484 crossing the hip joint during sprint running. *J Sports Sci*. 2014;32: 1722–1728. doi:
485 10.1080/02640414.2014.915423.
- 486 9. Schache AG, Dorn TW, Blanch PD, Brown NA, Pandy MG. Mechanics of the human
487 hamstring muscles during sprinting. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2012;44: 647–658. doi:
488 10.1249/MSS.0b013e318236a3d2.

- 489 10. Danielsson A, Horvath A, Senorski C, Alentorn-Geli E, Garrett WE, Cugat R, et al.
490 The mechanism of hamstring injuries – A systematic review. *BMC Musculoskelet*
491 *Disord.* 2020;21: 641. doi: 10.1186/s12891-020-03658-8.
- 492 11. Kenneally-Dabrowski CJB, Brown NAT, Lai AKM, Perriman D, Spratford W,
493 Serpell BG. Late swing or early stance? A narrative review of hamstring injury
494 mechanisms during high-speed running. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2019;29: 1083-
495 1091. doi: 10.1111/sms.13437.
- 496 12. Huygaerts S, Cos F, Cohen DD, Calleja-González J, Guitart M, Blazeovich AJ, et al.
497 Mechanisms of hamstring strain injury: Interactions between fatigue, muscle
498 activation and function. *Sports (Basel).* 2020;8: 1–15. doi: 10.3390/sports8050065.
- 499 13. Thelen DG, Chumanov ES, Best TM, Swanson SC, Heiderscheit BC. Simulation of
500 biceps femoris musculotendon mechanics during the swing phase of sprinting. *Med*
501 *Sci Sports Exerc.* 2005;37: 1931–1938. doi: 10.1249/01.mss.0000176674.42929.de.
502 Available from: 0000176674.42929.de.
- 503 14. Heiderscheit BC, Hoerth DM, Chumanov ES, Swanson SC, Thelen BJ, Thelen DG.
504 Identifying the time of occurrence of a hamstring strain injury during treadmill
505 running: A case study. *Clin Biomech (Bristol Avon).* 2005;20: 1072–1078. doi:
506 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2005.07.005.
- 507 15. Schache AG, Wrigley TV, Baker R, Pandy MG. Biomechanical response to hamstring
508 muscle strain injury. *Gait Posture.* 2009;29: 332–338. doi:
509 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2008.10.054.
- 510 16. Timmins RG, Bourne MN, Shield AJ, Williams MD, Lorenzen C, Opar DA. Short
511 biceps femoris fascicles and eccentric knee flexor weakness increase the risk of
512 hamstring injury in elite football (soccer): A prospective cohort study. *Br J Sports*
513 *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.

- 612 47. Costa PB, Ryan ED, Herda TJ, Walter AA, Defreitas JM, Stout JR, et al. Acute
613 effects of static stretching on peak torque and the hamstrings-to-quadriceps
614 conventional and functional ratios. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2013;23: 38-45. doi:
615 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2011.01348.x.
- 616 48. Yeung SS, Suen AM, Yeung EW. A prospective cohort study of hamstring injuries in
617 competitive sprinters: Preseason muscle imbalance as a possible risk factor. *Br J*
618 *Sports Med*. 2009;43: 589–594. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2008.056283.
- 619 49. Freckleton G, Pizzari T. Risk factors for hamstring muscle strain injury in sport: A
620 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2013;47: 351-358. doi:
621 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090664.
- 622 50. Wilmes E, De Ruiter CJ, Bastiaansen BJC, Goedhart EA, Brink MS, Van der Helm
623 FCT, et al. Associations between hamstring fatigue and sprint kinematics during a
624 simulated football (soccer) match. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2021;53: 2586-2595. doi:
625 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002753.
- 626 51. Small K, McNaughton LR, Greig M, Lohkamp M, Lovell R. Soccer fatigue, sprinting
627 and hamstring injury risk. *Int J Sports Med*. 2009;30: 573–578. doi: 10.1055/s-0029-
628 1202822.
- 629 52. Nuell S, Illera-Domínguez V, Carmona G, Macadam P, Lloret M, Padullés JM, et al.
630 Hamstring muscle volume as an indicator of sprint performance. *J Strength Cond Res*.
631 2021;35: 902-909. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003976.
- 632 53. Egan AD, Cramer JT, Massey LL, Marek SM. Acute effects of static stretching on
633 peak torque and mean power output in National Collegiate Athletic Association
634 Division I women's basketball players. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2006;20: 778-782. doi:
635 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.

- 685 70. Sun Y, Wei S, Zhong Y, Fu W, Li L, Liu Y. How joint torques affect hamstring injury
686 risk in sprinting swing-stance transition. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2015;47: 373–380.
687 doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000404.
- 688 71. Sugimoto D, Kelly BD, Mandel DL, d’Hemecourt DA, Carpenito SC, d’Hemecourt
689 CA, d’Hemecourt PA. Running Propensities of Athletes with Hamstring Injuries.
690 *Sports.* 2019; 7:210. doi: 10.3390/sports7090210.
- 691 72. Hunter JP, Marshall RN, McNair PJ. Relationships between ground reaction force
692 impulse and kinematics of sprint-running acceleration. *J Appl Biomech.* 2005;21: 31-
693 43. doi: 10.1123/jab.21.1.31.
- 694 73. Gregson W, Di Salvo V, Varley MC, Modonutti M, Belli A, Chamari K, et al.
695 Harmful association of sprinting with muscle injury occurrence in professional soccer
696 match-play: A Two-Season, league wide exploratory investigation from the Qatar
697 stars league. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2020;23: 134–138. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2019.08.289.
- 698 74. Aagaard P, Simonsen EB, Magnusson SP, Larsson B, Dyhre-Poulsen P. A new
699 concept for isokinetic hamstring: Quadriceps muscle strength ratio. *Am J Sports Med.*
700 1998;26: 231-237. doi: 10.1177/03635465980260021201.
- 701 75. Clark KP, Meng CR, Stearne DJ. ‘Whip from the hip’: Thigh angular motion, ground
702 contact mechanics, and running speed. *Biol Open.* 2020;9: bio053546. doi:
703 10.1242/bio.053546.
- 704 76. Brughelli M, Mendiguchia J, Nosaka K, Idoate F, Los Arcos AL, Cronin J. Effects of
705 eccentric exercise on optimum length of the knee flexors and extensors during the
706 preseason in professional soccer players. *Phys Ther Sport.* 2010;11: 50-55. doi:
707 10.1016/j.ptsp.2009.12.002.

- 708 77. Brooks JH, Fuller CW, Kemp SP, Reddin DB. Incidence, risk, and prevention of
709 hamstring muscle injuries in professional rugby union. *Am J Sports Med.* 2006;34:
710 1297-1306. doi: 10.1177/0363546505286022.
- 711 78. Wolski L, Pappas E, Hiller C, Halaki M, Fong Yan A. Is there an association between
712 high-speed running biomechanics and hamstring strain injury? A systematic review.
713 *Sports Biomech.* 2021: 1-27. doi: 10.1080/14763141.2021.1960418.
- 714 79. Souza RB. An evidence-based videotaped running biomechanics analysis. *Phys Med
715 Rehabil Clin N Am.* 2016;27: 217–236. doi: 10.1016/j.pmr.2015.08.006.
- 716 80. Simoni L, Pancani S, Vannetti F, Macchi C, Pasquini G. Relationship between lower
717 limb kinematics and upper trunk acceleration in recreational runners. *J Healthc Eng.*
718 2020;2020: 8973010. doi: 10.1155/2020/8973010.
- 719 81. Higashihara A, Ono T, Tokutake G, Kuramochi R, Kunita Y, Nagano Y, et al.
720 Hamstring muscles' function deficit during overground sprinting in track and field
721 athletes with a history of strain injury. *J Sports Sci.* 2019;37: 2744–2750. doi:
722 10.1080/02640414.2019.1664030.




Figure 1




Figure 3




Figure 2