

Title

“The Running Injury Continuum: A qualitative examination of recreational runners’
description and management of injury”

Author Information

Aisling Lacey^{1,2}, Enda Whyte^{1,3}, Sinéad O’Keeffe^{1,3}, Siobhán O’Connor^{1,3},
Aoife Burke^{1,3} and Kieran Moran^{1,2}

¹ School of Health and Human Performance, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland

² Insight SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics, Ireland

³ Centre for Injury Prevention and Performance, School of Health and Human Performance,
Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland

The Running Injury Continuum: A qualitative examination of recreational runners' description and management of injury

1. Abstract

Introduction: A critical step in understanding and preventing running-related injuries (RRIs) is appropriately defining RRIs. Current definitions of RRIs may not represent the full process of injury development, failing to capture lower levels of injury that many athletes continue to train through. Understanding runners' description and management of the injury development process may allow for a more appropriate examination of all levels of injury. This study aimed to examine recreational runners' description and management of the injury development process. **Methods:** A qualitative focus group study was undertaken. Seven semi-structured focus groups with male (n=13) and female (n=18) recreational runners took place. Focus groups were audio and video recorded, and transcribed verbatim. Transcripts were reflexively thematically analysed. A critical friend approach was taken to data coding. Multiple methods of trustworthiness were executed. **Results:** Runners describe injury on a nine-level continuum, ranging from injury-free to career-ending injury. There are lower and higher levels of injury. Each level of injury is described across four categories of descriptors; physical description, outcome (effect on running and daily life), psychological description, and management. **Conclusion:** The Running Injury Continuum is a tool that can be used for injury surveillance (for healthcare professionals and researchers) and for research investigating RRI risk factors. Healthcare professionals, researchers and coaches must ensure they monitor the development of all levels of RRIs, across all categories of descriptors. Runners need to be educated regarding appropriate self-management strategies for lower level injuries, with access to evidence-based information being a critical management tool.

Key words: Running-related injuries, injury development process, lower level injuries, higher level injuries

2. Introduction

Despite recreational running being an extremely popular physical activity and sport (1–3), it is associated with high rates of injury (4,5), with prevalence rates as high as 66% (6). The vast majority of running-related injuries (RRIs) are overuse injuries (7) which occur when excessive, repetitive loads are applied to tissues beyond their adaptive capability (8–10). While RRIs develop from the interaction between multiple risk factors (8,11,12), there is little consensus on what these risk factors are (13,14). This is potentially due to a commonly employed approach that uses definitions of injury that are limited, focusing on injuries causing time-loss, rather than capturing the process of injury development (15–17).

Clearly, a critical step in understanding and ultimately preventing RRIs is appropriately defining a RRI. Traditionally, time-loss from activity has been the main criterion for defining overuse injuries, with the duration of time-loss determining severity (18). The current consensus definition of a RRI expands on this definition to also include training restriction or the need for medical attention as criteria (19). Although this approach broadens the scope of a RRI, it may not represent the full process of injury development, failing to capture the *lower levels of injury* that many athletes continue to train through (18). It has been acknowledged that *lower levels of injury* exist prior to those that cause time-loss, as evident from: (i) a general physiological perspective as represented in the Well-Being Continuum (20), (ii) a general sports perspective through the development of the Oslo Sports Trauma Research Centre Overuse Injury Questionnaire (OSTRC-Q) (18,21), and (iii) directly from capturing runners' perceptions of RRIs through the Injury Pathway model (22).

Understanding runners' perceptions of RRIs may allow for a more appropriate examination of these *lower levels of injury*. Only five studies appear to have reported on runners' perception of the process of injury development (22–26), with just two studies alluding to runners' perception of *lower levels of injury* (22,25). These studies reported that RRIs are perceived as progressive, with injury 'categories' suggested in one, although not described further (25), and the identification of a 'complaint' level in the process of injury development (prior to time-loss, training restriction or seeking medical attention) (22). However, it is unclear if this 'complaint' level of injury is a single level, or if it comprises multiple unique levels of injury. Therefore, a greater understanding of this process of injury development (i.e., runners' description and management of each level of this process) is clearly needed if researchers and clinicians are to better understand the gradual and multifactorial nature of RRIs, their risk factors, and ultimate prevention.

It is also important for future research aiming to identify RRI risk factors to understand how *lower levels of injury* may interact with other risk factors to develop into a significant injury (i.e., as per the consensus definition (19)) (20), or indeed, how these *lower levels of injury* may themselves be risk factors for injury (20). An example of such a scenario may be as follows (Fig 1). At the time of a runner's initial biomechanical assessment, they are observed to land with a highly extended knee. Subsequently, this results in a *lower level injury* ('complaint') in their knee; however, they then go on to develop a significant injury in their Achilles tendon. Without having the knowledge of the *lower level injury* at the knee, the researcher/clinician may have concluded that the extended knee was directly causative of the Achilles injury, and therefore falsely identify it as a risk factor for Achilles tendon injuries. In reality, the *lower level injury* at the knee may have resulted in the runner changing their running technique (e.g. adopting a more forefoot running technique to reduce loading on the knee) which placed greater loading on the Achilles tendon (27,28), leading to injury. By

monitoring the presence of the *lower level injury* at the knee, the researcher/clinician would better understand how this may have changed the runner's technique, which was actually the true risk factor for the Achilles injury. In addition, with the dynamic relationship between multiple risk factors and the onset of injury, it is also important to understand how runners react to this process of injury development (i.e. a *lower level injury*), and how they manage all levels of injury. This may not only help to differentiate between various levels of injury, but also provide insight into how these levels act as potential risk factors themselves for further injury (23,25). Not considering these *lower levels of injury* could potentially mask important information that is relevant in identifying risk factors for injury. Therefore, the aim of the present study was to explore recreational runners' description of injury, and their management of the process of injury development.




Fig 1 Example of a scenario which highlights the importance of monitoring *lower level injuries*

3. Methods

3.1 Design

Focus groups were deemed an appropriate method of data collection as they can yield rich, in-depth data through the interaction of participants (29–31), and can enhance personal accounts by benefitting from the rapport built in a homogeneous sample with shared experiences (32). Phenomenology was deemed a suitable methodological approach as it focuses on the lived experiences of humans, eliciting insightful accounts of individuals' subjective experiences regarding a certain topic (33,34). Although previously thought to be unsuitable in phenomenological research (35,36), focus groups can provide greater understanding of the phenomenon of interest (37) as a well-facilitated focus group can produce greater spontaneity, curiosity, and openness to new perspectives on familiar experiences (37–39). Interpretative phenomenology suggests that researchers cannot completely remove themselves from the studied phenomenon (40) and considering how their own biases may affect their interpretation (41), researchers should aim to explain the lived experiences of participants, rather than solely convey them (41,42).

A semi-structured focus group schedule was developed during several brainstorming meetings between researchers (AL, EW, SOK, and KM [Supplementary material A]). Question content, sequencing, phrasing and timing were discussed during meetings. The schedule was tested on colleagues to determine its appropriateness, and then used in the pilot study (details below). Ethical approval was granted by the local university's Ethics Committee. The Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research was adhered to (43) (Supplementary material B).

3.2 Participants

A purposive sample of 31 adult recreational runners were recruited. Between April and June 2022 local running clubs were contacted via email or telephone and asked to distribute research information and contact details of researchers to potential participants.

Those interested then contacted the researchers. Eligible participants were recreational runners (someone running at least once per week for the previous six months (44)), aged 18 years or older, and had no previous education or training in musculoskeletal injuries (e.g., Athletic Therapist or Physiotherapist). All participants reported previously experiencing a lower level injury.

3.3 Pilot study

A pilot study was conducted to test the focus group schedule and develop an ‘order of themes’ document (used to organise the coding of focus groups [Supplementary material C]). Five male and five female participants were recruited as a convenience sample, aged 23.8 ± 5.9 years. Two focus groups were moderated by two researchers (AL and SOK), each taking place in-person, on University grounds, and lasted 59.7 ± 5.6 minutes. Focus groups were audio and video recorded, and transcribed verbatim.

3.4 Main study procedures

Data was collected between April and June 2022. Participants were organised into groups based on their availability to attend, running background and age. Seven focus groups were moderated by two researchers (AL and SOK) and lasted 83.9 ± 18.1 minutes. On arrival to each focus group, participants were introduced to one another by the moderators, and a casual conversation (not recorded) took place prior to starting. Authors (AL and SOK) had access to participants’ identifying information during data collection. Participants provided informed consent before commencing. Each focus group began with a brief introduction and the aims of the study were outlined (Supplementary material A). Participants were encouraged to speak freely, ask each other questions, and were given the opportunity to ask the moderators questions at any point. Firstly, participants were asked how they would define

a RRI, and then how they would describe a RRI (approx. 10 minutes of discussion).

Participants were prompted to elaborate on their descriptions and asked to draw (as a group) their description of RRIs on a whiteboard (approx. 45 minutes of discussion). They were then asked how they manage RRIs, and asked to insert these descriptions on their drawing (approx. 30 mins). Conversation pursued naturally, not being led by the moderators, but with the moderators prompting participants to give as much detail as possible. Participants were asked to complete a short individual questionnaire gathering demographic information, training practices, and injury history. Additionally on this questionnaire, participants were asked to draw their individual perception of how a RRI progresses (approx. 5 mins). On closing the focus groups, participants were given another opportunity to ask questions or provide additional information. The progressive nature of RRIs was not described to participants, nor was the concept of levels of injuries.

A reflective and iterative approach was taken to focus group moderation. Following each focus group, moderators discussed their perception of each focus group, expressed their opinions on the appropriateness of the focus group schedule, and discussed how they could potentially improve for the next group. During the main data collection phase, both moderators included additional probes to encourage further explanation of some points raised and to encourage all participants to share their perceptions.

3.5 Data analysis

Frequencies and descriptive statistics were generated from the questionnaire responses using SPSS (IBM Corporation; version 27) and all participants were given an identification number and coded by self-identified gender (e.g., male 4 = M4, female 2 = F2) in order to maintain anonymity. All focus groups were audio and video recorded. Audio recordings were sent to an external transcription service to be transcribed verbatim. On their

return, the primary author reviewed the transcripts alongside the video recordings, corrected any discrepancies, inserted nuance (to account for sarcasm and gestures), and assigned dialogue to the according speaker.

The transcribed focus groups were coded by the primary author using NVivo (QSR International; release 1.6.2) (Fig 2). A reflexive thematic analysis approach was taken to data analysis according to Braun and Clarke's principles (45,46). This process followed six recursive phases: (i) the primary author familiarised herself with the data by reading the transcripts, correcting discrepancies, adding nuance, and re-reading the transcripts, (ii) brief labels (codes) were generated to identify important aspects of the data, (iii) themes were generated through examining and organizing the codes, (iv) themes were then reviewed against the whole dataset, and developed further, (v) developed themes were then refined, defined and named, and (vi) the data were organised into a written report (45,46).

An 'order of themes' document was developed during the pilot phase, and was reflexively updated based on the developing, merging and expanding themes and sub-themes in order to organise the codes, sub-themes, themes and core categories (Supplementary material C). Additionally, as a level of data triangulation, the primary author reviewed each group's whiteboard drawing alongside the corresponding transcript and video recording. Further detail from the transcript was added to each drawing, which clarified these visual representations and ensured consistency between transcripts and drawings. All seven drawings were combined to develop the final nine-point continuum. The final Running Injury Continuum was arrived at based on how participants described each level and where they placed each level. Constant comparative analysis took place, beginning after transcription of the first focus group and continued throughout data collection (47). A similar sample size has been used in previous research and allowed for the collection of a rich description from participants regarding RRIIs (48,49).




Fig 2 Data analysis and the Running Injury Continuum development process

3.6 Trustworthiness

Throughout the data collection and analysis phases, regular discussions on the developing codes, sub-themes, themes and core categories ensued (between AL, EW, SOK and KM), which challenged and facilitated multiple interpretations of the data (Fig 2). To further enhance the analytical process (50) and to ensure reliability and rigour of results presented (51), a critical friend approach was taken between researchers. The critical friend approach encourages reflexivity in the co-construction of knowledge (51,52), and facilitates the exploration of multiple interpretations of the data, reducing the potential for researcher bias (50,53). Firstly, researchers (AL and SOK) met on multiple occasions to reflexively discuss and review the 'order of themes' document. After all focus groups had been coded by the primary author, a percentage (approximately 30%) of the transcripts were coded by another experienced qualitative researcher (SOK), using the 'order of themes' document as a guide. Taking a critical friends approach again, researchers (AL and SOK) met on multiple occasions to discuss their interpretations of the transcripts, challenging each other's interpretations of the data. Codes, sub-themes, themes and core categories were critically reviewed and discussed. The process facilitated the development of additional codes, while some existing sub-themes were merged/expanded.

Trustworthiness was further enhanced via investigator triangulation. Researchers (AL, SOK, EW and KM) met on several occasions throughout the data collection and analysis phases to review the coding of the data and discuss individual interpretations. On finishing data collection and analysis, a wider group of researchers (AL, EW, SOK, SOC, AB and KM) met to discuss their interpretations of the findings. Multiple interpretations of the data were presented and discussed during meetings, coding was further refined, and a consensus on the final report was reached.

Additionally, all individual transcripts and whiteboard drawings were returned to participants within four weeks of their focus group, giving participants the opportunity to alter their individual dialogue and/or group drawing. We also ensured that each participant was satisfied with our interpretation of their discussion. No requests were received to alter group drawings or individual dialogue. Furthermore, multiple examples of direct quotations from participants are presented, enhancing the accuracy and trustworthiness of findings. A broad and diverse contribution from participants is also included, reducing the likelihood of individual bias (54).

4. Results

4.1 Demographics

Seven focus groups were conducted with 18 (58%) female and 13 (42%) male recreational runners. Participants were aged 39.7 ± 12.7 years (range 20-65 years). The majority of runners had been running for more than 5 years ($n=17$, 55%), fewer running 1-3 years ($n=10$, 32%), and the least amount running 4-5 years ($n=4$, 13%). Participants trained either 2-3 times per week ($n=16$, 52%) or 4-6 times per week ($n=15$, 48%), with the majority of runners participating in organised running events ($n=27$, 87%). Most ($n=17$, 55%) runners

predominately trained on their own, with the remainder training in small (n=7, 23%) or large (n=7, 23%) groups. Injury prevention was ‘very’ or ‘extremely’ important to the majority of runners (n=21, 68%), with fewer stating that it was ‘slightly’ or ‘moderately’ important (n=9, 29%), and just one participant reporting it was ‘not at all’ important (n=1, 3%). Further details on training practices are detailed in Table 1.

According to the consensus definition of injury (19), most runners reported having a previous RRI (n=27, 87%), while few reported never having a RRI (n=4, 13%). Nineteen participants had at least one RRI in the previous 12 months (n=19, 70%). Further details on RRI history are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Running practices and injury history

Preferred running event (n=31)*			
<5km	n=5 (16%)	<i>Marathon</i>	n=3 (10%)
5km	n=21 (67%)	<i>Ultramarathon</i>	n=1 (3%)
10km	n=18 (58%)	<i>Triathlon</i>	n=1 (3%)
16km	n=4 (13%)	<i>Other</i>	n=1 (3%)
<i>Half marathon</i>	n=6 (19%)		
Weekly mileage (n=31)			
<10 km/week	n=1 (3%)	31-40 km/week	n=1 (3%)
10-20 km/week	n=12 (39%)	41-50 km/week	n=5 (16%)
21-30 km/week	n=10 (32%)	>50 km/week	n=2 (7%)
Amount of missed training with worst ever RRI (n=27)			
<1 week	n=2 (7%)	4-6 weeks	n=2 (7%)
7-10 days	n=4 (15%)	>6 weeks	n=13 (48%)
2-3 weeks	n=5 (19%)	<i>Unsure</i>	n=1 (4%)

*: multiple choice available, RRI: running-related injury

4.2 Runners' description of injury

Runners described RRIs and the process of injury development on a nine-level continuum, with each level increasing in severity of injury (Fig 3). The nine levels of RRI identified were: 'running smooth' (no injury), 'discomfort', 'niggle', 'twinge', 'persisting niggle', 'non-responding niggle', 'injury: short-term effect', 'injury: long-term effect', and 'career-ending injury'. Runners described each level of the Running Injury Continuum in terms of four key categories of descriptors: physical description, outcome (effect on running and effect on daily life), psychological description and management (Fig 4).




Fig 3 The Running Injury Continuum

Name of stage		Running smooth	Discomfort	Niggle	Twinge	Persistent niggle	Non-responsive injury	Injury: short term effect	Injury: long-term effect	Career-ending injury
Outcome	Physical description	Pain-free	Tightness Tiredness DOMS Temporary	Awareness Low pain Repeated	Darting pain Intense Temporary	Low/Mild pain Persistent	Medium pain Constant	Severe discomfort High/Sharp pain	Extreme discomfort Severe pain	Very high pain
	Effect on running	No effect	No effect	No effect Reduced load Altered warm up	Stop mid-session. Reduced load (mid-session)	No effect Reduced load. Rest days	Reduced load. Stop running: short-term	Stop running: short term	Stop running: long term Unable to run	Unable to run. Never running again
	Effect on daily life	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	Pain during day. Conscious effort to offload	Pain during day. Conscious effort to offload	Pain during day. Conscious effort to offload	Pain during day. Conscious effort to offload
Management	Psychological description	Happy place	Mental fatigue	Caution	Caution	Concern. Anxiety	Anxiety	Anxiety	Anxiety. Frustration	Frustration. Depression
	Self-management	None	None	None	Additional stretching. Reduce load. Stop mid-session	Reduce load. Rest days	Short-term rest	Short-term rest	None	None
	External management	None	None Friends. Online resources.	None Friends. Online resources.	Friends. Online resources	Friends. Online resources. Athletic Therapist /Physiotherapist	Friends. Athletic Therapist /Physiotherapist	Athletic Therapist /Physiotherapist	Medical specialist. Athletic Therapist /Physiotherapist	Medical specialist. Surgery
		<i>Lower level injuries</i>					<i>Higher level injuries</i>			

1 **Fig 4** Description and management of each level of the Running Injury Continuum. DOMS: Delayed Onset Muscle Soreness. * Athletic
 2 Therapist/Physiotherapist

3 **4.3 The Running Injury Continuum**

4 **4.3.1 Running smooth**

5 ‘Running smooth’ was described as “*zero pain*” (M4), “*smooth*” (M3) and
6 “*completely perfect*” (M9). Runners did not describe a negative physical complaint, a
7 negative outcome, or a negative psychological reaction with this level.

8 In relation to managing this first level, some participants suggested they would
9 complete injury prevention exercises because they “*don’t want injury to happen*” (F11), so
10 they “*try to prevent it by doing [their] stretching*” (F11). However, some runners also
11 suggested that no management strategies would be taken at this level, suggesting that they
12 would be “*complacent*” (F10) when injury free, and they would “*wait for something to*
13 *happen and then treat it*”(F10), being “*reactive rather than proactive*” (F10) to injury
14 management.

15

16 **4.3.2 Discomfort**

17 ‘Discomfort’ was described with terms and phrases such as “*tightness*” (F17),
18 “*tiredness*” (M3), “*a little bit of pain*” (F6), and “*stiffness*” (F3). Many participants also
19 suggested that this level could be associated with previous training (i.e., delayed onset muscle
20 soreness [DOMS]) and “*being tired from running the previous day*” (M3). They described it
21 as something “*temporary*” (M8) and that they “*know that [it] will go away*” (F16);

22

23 “*I think discomfort is fairly mild, no injury. Discomfort is something that is there. It*
24 *isn’t going to stop you... You could have discomfort on one run and go out two days*
25 *later and it is gone*” (F11)

26

27 Some participants described this level of injury as a “*satisfying pain*” (F6) and
28 perceived that if they experience discomfort, it means they have worked hard and completed
29 a good session, but they are also confident that it will not persist into a more serious injury;
30 “*There is a good tightness. Like your quads after a speed session*” (F18). However, some
31 runners described this level as a “*precursor to injury*” (M1) and suggested that further injury
32 can develop from this level because “*you have planted the little injury seed... the injury is on*
33 *its way*” (M4). With regard to the outcome, this level was not suggested to cause a negative
34 effect on running, with participants suggesting that “*you’d definitely run*” (F6) and complete
35 full training at this level; “*you don’t back off your mileage because you are tight*” (F15).
36 Additionally, this level did not have a negative effect on a runner’s daily life, however, some
37 runners associated this level with ‘mental fatigue’ and described how they “*don’t feel*
38 *mentally strong*” at this level (M3).

39 The majority of runners take no management strategies at this level because “*you*
40 *know you will recover in half a day, in two days, three days*”(M8) and continuing training is
41 the best management strategy; “*for the stiffness one, the treatment of that one probably*
42 *would be to go for a run... to loosen it out*” (F3). Some participants however described using
43 self-management strategies such as stretching at this level; “*it will remind me to do the*
44 *stretching that I know I should be doing anyway*” (M1). Additionally, some runners may look
45 to external sources such as YouTube for appropriate stretches/exercises; “*I find myself*
46 *YouTubing quite a lot. If I have a pain in my calf, I just do a five minute exercise that I find*
47 *on YouTube and it will be gone that day*” (M7), or casually chat to their running friends about
48 the complaint: “*but only by the by, if it came up in conversation I might mention it*” (F10).

49

50 **4.3.3 Niggle**

51 ‘Niggle’ was a term used by all participants in all focus groups with different
52 descriptions presented. In its mildest form, some runners physically described a ‘niggle’ as
53 being more “*aware*” (M13) or “*conscious*” (F8) of a certain body part, describing it as “*not*
54 [*being*] *the same as the other side* [of the body]” (M1), or suggested it is “*background noise*”
55 (F10). Other runners described a ‘niggle’ as something slightly more severe, with phrases
56 such as “*background pain*” (F15), and “*a pain that shouldn’t be there*” (M4). The majority
57 of participants described a ‘niggle’ as something “*repeated*” (F8), “*persistent*” (F3) and
58 “*something that lingers*” (F11): “*discomfort can come and go, whereas a niggle is sort of*
59 *always there*” (F10). In relation to the outcome, the majority of participants continue full
60 training with a ‘niggle’, with the perception that runners are “*quite high functioning with a*
61 *niggle*” (F17). Many runners described a ‘niggle’ as “*not bad enough*” (F7) to stop training,
62 and suggested that they can “*cope with a niggle*” (F11), “*ignore it a lot of the time*” (F13), or
63 they can “*run through it*” (F18). Some also described how they feel pressure to continue
64 training with a ‘niggle’, whether it is due to running with a group: “*if I am with a group I am*
65 *like ‘oh I need to keep going’, but I’d probably be making it worse*” (F11), or whether it’s a
66 personal desire to continue:

67

68 “*you are chasing the high, chasing the endorphins. When you just get that niggle...*
69 *you really just keep pushing yourself... And then because it is not an external thing, you can't*
70 *see it, you can just kind of ignore it*” (F13)

71

72 However, this level of injury can begin to affect running for some runners, causing
73 them to “*start reducing [their] mileage because the niggle has hit*” (F17), or to complete a
74 more vigorous warm up because they feel “*I should warm up properly if I have a niggle*”
75 (F17). There was no effect to a runner’s daily life, but as a psychological description, some

76 suggested they are “*cautious*” (F5) of a ‘niggle’ and that it can affect their motivation to
77 train; “*it makes the run harder to complete mentally, rather than it stops you running*” (F6).

78 Some runners don’t practice any management strategies at this level because they
79 suggested that ‘niggles’ can resolve on their own, they “*get away with a lot of niggles*” (M4)
80 or they can “*ignore it*” (M11). However, some runners use self-management strategies and
81 alter their training at this level, describing how “*niggles encourage me to stretch*” (F15).
82 Some may also “*take a day or two off*” (F15) or reduce their training load, “*not run as far*”
83 (F2), or “*slow down*” (F5). Some may also use additional therapeutic modalities such as
84 foam rolling at this level; “*You know that roller that is over in the corner of the front room*
85 *that you occasionally use, that is when you use it*” (M3). Some participants described that
86 they would also turn towards external management strategies, such as online resources or
87 asking their running friends for advice or support; “*it might come from an external source...
88 somebody says, ‘maybe you should have that looked at’... if you complained about it enough
89 to somebody else, rather than deciding yourself*” (F9).

90 As well as describing a ‘niggle’ in terms of its physical and psychological
91 descriptions, its outcome, and management, many participants reported that ‘niggles’ are
92 “*inevitably a fact of running*” (F6), that “*runners constantly have niggles*” (F16) and they
93 live in “*Niggle City*” (F17). Many participants did not perceive a ‘niggle’ to be an ‘injury’,
94 but described that it can contribute to the development of an ‘injury’; F16 - “*it could turn into
95 an injury, but I wouldn’t consider it an injury*”. Many participants reported that they perceive
96 ‘niggles’ to be an “*early warning sign*” (M11), a “*potential injury*” (M13), or the “*root to an
97 injury*” (F17).

98

99 **4.3.4 Twinge**

100 A ‘twinge’ was described as a “*darting pain*” (M7) or an “*intense, quick, sharp pain*”
101 (F6), that is intense enough to cause a runner to “*stop and walk*” (F3) mid-session, or to stop
102 their session completely; “*I might stop if I had a darting pain*” (F4). However, a twinge was
103 described as something temporary, short-lived, and typically a once-off; “*by the time it*
104 *happens, it is gone*” (F3). Runners described that it would not be felt during the next session,
105 and they would “*forget about it*” (M7). There was no description of an effect on a runner’s
106 daily life, but participants described “*caution*” (F7) at this level.

107 In relation to management, all runners use some sort of self-management strategy by
108 this level; “*if I had a darting pain I would do something. I wouldn't just keep on running with*
109 *that one*” (F4). Some runners described that “*stretching would come in here*” (M11), they
110 would “*stop and walk*” (F3), or do “*slower runs*” (F7) at the onset of a ‘twinge’. Some
111 participants also suggested they would continue to consult friends, asking “*what do you*
112 *think? What would you do?*” (M9), and online resources “*you would definitely Google it*”
113 (M9).

114

115 **4.3.5 Persisting niggle**

116 A ‘persisting niggle’ was described as a progression of a ‘niggle’, however, it differs
117 because it was described as more severe and more persistent. Progressing from milder terms
118 (such as tightness or tiredness) used to describe a ‘niggle’, a ‘persisting niggle’ was
119 associated with a description of pain, with “*low-medium*” (F2) pain and “*mild pain*” (F12)
120 being suggested. It was also described as “*persistent*” (M5) and as occurring on “*consistent*
121 *occasions, consistent runs*” (F4).

122

123 *“Having the same niggle a few runs in a row, where you know it is not a niggle anymore. If it*
124 *happens again the next week, and the next week, it doesn't become a niggle anymore, it*
125 *becomes a problem where you know it is not going to go away” (M7)*

126

127 In relation to the outcome, some runners will continue to train fully at this level
128 because *“it is tolerable to keep running”* (F6) and they want to *“take a chance”*(M7) and
129 hope that it will not progress to a further level. However, the majority of runners will change
130 their training at this level by *“decreasing [their] load”* and *“hopefully [going] back to no*
131 *injury”* (F9). Some runners may also take additional rest days; *“I might stop and take a little*
132 *bit of a rest, but be back at it. The pain wouldn't need to go. It would just need to be a bit*
133 *better and then I would go again”* (F4). There was still no description of this level affecting a
134 runner’s daily life, however, in relation to the psychological description, this level inspired
135 the first mention of associated concern and *“anxiety”* (F7).

136 With regard to management, self-management strategies progress from previous
137 levels with further alterations to training being made. Some runners will *“decrease [their]*
138 *load”* (F9) because they *“can’t go full tilt”* (F2), while others will *“take a break for a few*
139 *days”* (F3). As external strategies, there is a continuation of consulting friends and getting
140 *“peer advice”* (F6), as well as using the internet: *“using Google because it’s the go-to”*
141 (M9). This level is associated with the first mention of obtaining medical professional
142 attention from an Athletic Therapist/Physiotherapist. Some participants described that they
143 would be *“looking for physio support”* (F2) because they *“probably should go and get it*
144 *looked at”* (F2).

145

146 **4.3.6 Non-responding niggle**

147 A ‘non-responding niggle’ was described as the point at which all attempts to manage
148 complaints thus far have failed, and runners are at a “*crossroads*” (M4) because their ‘injury’
149 is “*not responding*” (M4). Participants described how it is more evident that they need to
150 make a decision at this level of whether they continue running (with altered training), stop
151 running (for an unknown period of time), or seek external medical attention.

152 Physically, this level was described as causing “*more intense*” (F15) pain that is
153 “*getting worse*” (F16) and is increasingly persistent to the point of being “*constant*” (F16). It
154 was described as pain that “*doesn’t stop*” (F4) despite management attempts being made. In
155 relation to the outcome, some runners will continue training, although with a reduced training
156 load, because they are “*not prepared to leave seriously*” (M3). Furthermore, some runners
157 normalised running with this level of injury and suggested that “*everybody runs with an*
158 *injury... I have never met anybody who didn’t run with an injury*” (M9). However, others
159 suggested that they “*shouldn’t be running*” (F3) at this level, and that they will stop training
160 in the short-term: “*middle of the road to me is where we are going to rest for a week*” (M9).
161 This level was the first mention of a negative effect on a runner’s daily life, with description
162 of “*pain filter[ing] through the rest of your day*” (F9) and pain being present “*as you’re*
163 *walking around*” (F18). Participants suggested that they will begin to make conscious
164 decisions and efforts to protect this level of injury; “*I might choose to bring the dog to a field*
165 *and throw a stick and let him run, rather than me having to walk the 4km with him*” (F15).
166 With regard to a psychological description, runners would become increasingly anxious at
167 this level, thinking “*do I need to worry here?*” (F16).

168 In relation to management, some runners continue with self-management strategies by
169 choosing to take a short-term break from training; “*I would rest myself. Ease up for a week*
170 *and see how it felt*” (M9), while others will seek external advice because these are “*the*
171 *injuries where we run out of ideas of how to treat it [ourselves]*” (M3) and they are at “*the*

172 *point where you go to a physio*” (F15). Some participants also described how they would still
173 consult their running friends or *“someone who has a lot of running knowledge”* (M7) for
174 advice or support.

175

176 **4.3.7 Injury: short-term effect**

177 An ‘injury: short-term effect’ was described as causing *“severe discomfort”* (M6),
178 *“dull pain”* (F12), and *“really sharp pain”* (M10). It was described as causing runners
179 *“constant pain”* (F12) if they continue to run, and getting progressively worse; *“I’ll keep*
180 *going and make it worse until I have to stop”* (M13). Additionally, some runners perceived
181 that this level would cause a physical sign or a *“visible effect”* (F6) of an injury, such as
182 limping or swelling. In relation to the outcome, this level will cause a *“short-term stoppage”*
183 (F6) to running (i.e., days/weeks) for the majority of runners, and was referred to as a
184 *“stopping injury”* (M13) where they cannot continue to train. It will also continue to affect a
185 runners’ daily life, with *“pain outside of running, pain in work”* (F12) and having an effect
186 on decisions such as *“taking the car instead of walking somewhere”* (F7). Runners are also
187 becoming increasingly anxious at this level and describe that an injury which *“stops you*
188 *running... really messes with your head”* (M7).

189 As well as being described as a progression along the Running Injury Continuum,
190 some participants described this level of injury as one which has an acute onset (e.g., muscle
191 strain or joint sprain), causing a short-term stoppage to running (i.e., for a number of weeks);
192 *“a sudden injury where you just have to come to a standstill”* (F5). At this level, external
193 management strategies take over as the primary method of management, with participants
194 describing that they *“need some sort of intervention”* (M6). Participants suggested that
195 Athletic Therapists/Physiotherapists are their primary sources of medical intervention, and
196 they feel they *“have to go to physio now because it is not going away”* (M11). Few runners

197 will continue to self-manage this level by taking a short-term rest (i.e., weeks) from training,
198 and described this level as the “*point you need to realise you have to rest, cut back*” (F12).

199

200 **4.3.8 Injury: long-term effect**

201 With ‘injury: long-term effect’, there was less emphasis placed on the physical
202 description, although some runners still described “*extreme discomfort*” (M6) and “*very high*
203 *pain*” (M6), with a greater focus on the outcome. At this level, all runners have stopped
204 running in the long-term (i.e., months or longer) because they are unable to run and describe
205 being “*out of action for a few months*” (M3). Similar to the previous level, runners’ daily
206 lives are affected and conscious decisions are made to offload the injured area. As a
207 psychological description, runners are increasingly anxious and becoming frustrated; “*the*
208 *injury is about the frustration of not being able to do what you want to do*” (M9).

209 By this level, all participants are using external management strategies, with runners
210 turning towards interventions from medical specialists or “*the correct doctor*” (M6). Some
211 will continue to consult an Athletic Therapist/Physiotherapist to dictate the most appropriate
212 course of action, however, runners described that this level needs specialist intervention;

213

214 “*When I have gone to the physio four times, five times, and the physio says ‘look,*
215 *what I have done should have helped it, it is not helping it, so there is obviously something*
216 *else wrong here, so my advice is you need to get referred to a consultant’*” (M11).

217

218 **4.3.9 Career-ending injury**

219 With a ‘career-ending injury’, there is less attention on the physical description,
220 although severe pain and “*the worst possible pain you could imagine*” (F6) was suggested,
221 and more significance to the outcome. This is a level which “*stops you running, forever*”

222 (F3), is a “*permanent*” (M10) injury and a “*show stopper*” (M3). Some suggested that this
223 level would significantly affect their daily life where “*you can't do ordinary stuff, even in*
224 *your household duties*” (M5), with associated feelings of frustration and depression regarding
225 their injury.

226 Some runners described using external management strategies as final attempts to
227 manage this level of injury, with “*need[ing] surgery*” (F4) being suggested as a potential
228 strategy. However, as the worst possible injury suggested by runners, it was described that
229 they would never run again.

230

231 **4.4 Individual perception**

232 It is important to note that many participants suggested that runners’ description of
233 injury and their management of the process of injury development is “*not the same for*
234 *everyone*” (M8) and “*there are a whole host of external factors that inform your perception*
235 *of it*” (F10). Such factors include their running habits and history, individual factors, and
236 injury-related factors (Supplementary material C).

237 With regard to running habits and history, some participants suggested that
238 description and management of injury is “*based on your experience*” (M9) and “*the length of*
239 *time people are running, or the experience [they] have with injury*” (F17). Participants
240 suggested that more experienced runners will have a better understanding of the levels of
241 injury, and manage these levels more appropriately: “*newbie runners... they don't know what*
242 *a niggle is*” (M2). Additionally, participants described how a runner’s “*motivational factors*”
243 (F9) influence their management of the process of injury development: “*it boils down to what*
244 *your objectives are*” (M10). Runners suggested that those who are more competitive or those
245 training for a specific goal will continue training with a *lower level injury*, rather than
246 reducing their load because “*sometimes the benefits just outweigh the risks*” (F12).

247 In relation to individual factors, participants suggested that description and
248 management of injury “*depends on the person*” (F15), and can vary from runner to runner:
249 “*some of your definitions of niggles would not be mine*” (M1). Some participants also
250 discussed how a runner’s daily life can influence their description and management of injury,
251 with factors such as “*state of mind*” (F3) on a particular day or their menstrual cycle making
252 someone feel “*sluggish*” (F6) influencing their description and management of injury.
253 Additionally, some female participants suggested that having children to care for will
254 influence their management of injury because they “*can't afford to be laid up in a bed*” (F2):
255

256 “*the person who doesn't have children, or can have all that time to rest before and*
257 *after the run, they might be more likely to do the run [while having a lower level injury]... If*
258 *you had to come home and you go, 'right, if I go for a run this morning I will not be able to*
259 *do the nursery football with the children after school because I will be in pain'*” (F9)
260

261 Finally, participants also suggested that injury-related factors, such as previous
262 injuries and “*how impacted you have been by injury in the past*” (F11) will influence how a
263 runner describes and manages all levels of injury. Participants described that they would
264 “*intervene earlier if it is something [they] have had before... and go quicker through the*
265 *[management] steps*” (F8), compared to an injury they have never had.
266

267 **5. Discussion**

268 This study provides a qualitative insight into how recreational runners describe injury and
269 manage the process of injury development. By capturing the lived experiences of athletes, the
270 authors present a comprehensive representation of RRI, highlighting their progressive,
271 overuse nature.

272

273 **5.1 The Running Injury Continuum**

274 The Running Injury Continuum (Fig 3) reflects runners' descriptions of RRIs from
275 injury-free to career-ending injury, and is made up of nine levels of injury, each increasing in
276 injury severity. The nine levels are categorised into *lower* and *higher level injuries*. *Lower*
277 *level injuries* span between 'discomfort' to 'non-responding niggle', while *higher level*
278 *injuries*, which are most associated with the RRI consensus definition (19), span between
279 'injury: short-term effect' to 'career-ending injury'. Runners described each level of injury
280 using four categories of descriptors: physical description, outcome (the effect on running and
281 on daily life), psychological description, and management (self-management, and external
282 management strategies). This is a bi-directional continuum, on which runners can progress or
283 regress, either increasing or decreasing in injury severity depending on their management of
284 each level. During injury development (or recovery), runners do not have to progress through
285 the immediate succeeding (or preceding) level of injury (e.g., runners can progress from a
286 'niggle' straight to a 'non-responding niggle').

287 Both end-levels of the continuum (i.e., 'running smooth' and 'career-ending injury')
288 were clearly described by participants, with a high level of agreement achieved amongst all
289 participants. However, there was variance in opinion regarding the seven levels in-between,
290 with some overlapping descriptions across adjacent levels. This is captured in the term
291 'continuum' which is "a continuous sequence in which adjacent elements are not always
292 perceptibly different from each other, but the extremes are quite distinct" (55). It also reflects
293 runners' perception of the progressive and regressive nature of RRIs. While the categories of
294 descriptors used to differentiate levels of injury were sometimes not individually unique (e.g.,
295 caution was used to psychologically describe both 'niggle' and 'twinge'), it was possible to
296 differentiate between levels of injury by comparing across *all* categories of the descriptors

297 used (e.g., ‘niggle’ was described as a repeated low pain, whereas ‘twinge’ was described as
298 a temporary darting pain). The term ‘niggle’ was the most commonly used term to suggest a
299 *lower level injury*, used by every participant in every focus group. From our findings, a
300 ‘niggle’ can be defined as: ‘*a repeated physical sensation (discomfort or low pain) with*
301 *which a runner can continue to run*’. However, the level ‘discomfort’ is the first level of a
302 complaint along the Running Injury Continuum and initiates the progression of *lower level*
303 *injuries*. From this complaint of temporary discomfort or tightness, the Running Injury
304 Continuum advances into three distinct levels of progressive and worsening ‘niggles’: the
305 ‘niggle’, the ‘persisting niggle’, and the ‘non-responding niggle’. These three entities
306 describe levels of injury which become increasingly more severe in terms of their physical
307 description, their outcome (effect on running and daily life), their psychological description,
308 and the management strategies required. However, amongst these three levels of niggle, there
309 is a further *lower level injury* that does not follow this progressive nature; the ‘twinge’. A
310 ‘twinge’ can be defined as: ‘*an acute onset of pain resulting in an immediate outcome (either*
311 *a reduction in training load within a session, or the stoppage of a training session), but*
312 *which does not persist to the next session*’.

313 The Running Injury Continuum supports previously published representations of
314 overuse injuries. A comparison can be made between our participants’ description of
315 escalating levels of injury severity and the Well-Being Continuum (20), which describes the
316 escalating levels of biological and physiological tissue damage associated with overuse injury
317 development. Our findings also support the Injury Pathway which represents runners’ own
318 views on the process of RRI development (22). While other papers have implicitly referred to
319 an ‘early phase of injury’ during the injury development process, using phraseology such as
320 “early phase” (18), “early symptoms” (24) and “injury category” (25), to the best of our
321 knowledge, only one study has explicitly identified and named a *lower level injury* during

322 this process: the ‘complaint’ stage of the Injury Pathway (22). However, our study explores
323 this to a greater extent and appears to be the first to explicitly provide sub-categories within
324 this phase. Additionally, with the later phase of injury development, rather than concluding
325 the process of injury development at a single point termed “injury” (as with the Injury
326 Pathway (22)), we have identified further sub-categories within this later phase (i.e., *higher*
327 *level injuries*) which map with the consensus definition (19). Furthermore, we provide a rich
328 and in-depth account of runners’ description and management of the process of injury
329 development, in both the early and late phases.

330 The OSTRC Overuse Injury Questionnaire (OSTRC-O) is a widely cited tool for
331 surveilling overuse injuries in sport research (21). It acknowledges lower level injuries in that
332 it recognises the importance of non-time loss injuries, and does so through monitoring both
333 the characteristics of pain (physical descriptor) and effect on running (outcome) (18).
334 However, our findings build upon the OSTRC-O, indicating the importance of capturing
335 additional categories of descriptors, including the psychological response to injury and the
336 management strategies used, both of which can impact injury development (22,26,56).
337 Additionally, in studies investigating risk factors for injury, it may be beneficial for
338 researchers to determine the specific level of injury (e.g. niggle) experienced by athletes, as
339 these *lower level injuries* have the potential to not only interact with other possible risk
340 factors for injury (increasing injury risk), but also to potentially act as risk factors for injury
341 themselves (Fig 1). By using regular surveillance and capturing this level of detail,
342 researchers could be provided with significant insight into: the risk factors for RRIs, the
343 development process of RRIs, and understanding how the consequences of injury change
344 during this process.

345 Our findings highlight the importance of the psychological response to injury
346 experienced by runners. It is well accepted that athletes may experience psychological

347 distress in response to injury (57,58); however, due to the insidious nature and longevity
348 associated with RRIs, runners often experience significant and prolonged psychological
349 distress during the injury development process (59,60). Specifically, our findings suggest that
350 runners experience a progressive psychological response to injury that increases in severity as
351 the Running Injury Continuum progresses. Our findings support previous research which
352 highlights runners' experiences of psychosocial distress in response to overuse injuries
353 (26,60,61), with reports of frustration, fear, general psychosocial distress, and social
354 influences experienced by runners during the injury process (60). However, in contrast to
355 previous research which identified that these responses occur from injury onset (defined as
356 the point where runners perceive themselves to be injured, or pain is affecting their running)
357 (61), our findings indicate a psychological response that occurs from an earlier phase during
358 the injury development process. We identified the first description of a negative
359 psychological response to injury at the level of a 'discomfort', where runners describe
360 'mental fatigue'. This level identifies the start of a pathway of worry, concern and anxiety
361 experienced by runners during the injury development process. The capture of runners'
362 description of anxiety during these *lower level injuries* is a novel finding as, to the best of the
363 authors' knowledge, previous research has not reported such an extreme psychological
364 response at such an early phase of injury development. It is crucial that clinicians, coaches,
365 runners and other personnel involved with runners' well-being are aware of this finding and
366 understand the level of psychological distress experienced by runners, especially during the
367 early phases of injury development.

368

369 **5.2 Management**

370 Our results support previous research which identified runners' desire for autonomy
371 in the dealing with *lower level injuries* by predominantly using self-management strategies,

372 and concur with the finding that once runners lose this autonomy and require external
373 professional assistance, they perceive themselves as ‘injured’ (22). Typical self-management
374 strategies involve reductions in training load and using therapies such as ice, stretching or
375 general rehabilitation exercises to prevent or slow the progression of their *lower level injury*,
376 while maintaining some level of training. Our findings also agree with previous research
377 which reports runners’ reliance on non-evidence based sources of information (such as web-
378 based or peer advice and previous personal experience) to inform self-management of their
379 *lower level injuries* (22,26,60,62), as well as their reluctance to attend healthcare
380 professionals (HCPs), despite experiencing physical and psychosocial distress (60).
381 Participants suggested several reasons for not attending a HCP. Firstly, *lower level injuries*
382 are not severe enough to warrant HCP input. Secondly, some runners described wishful
383 thinking regarding their *lower level injury*, hoping that it will resolve on its own without the
384 need for HCP intervention. Wishful thinking is a bias pervading the management of persistent
385 musculoskeletal pain, where decisions and beliefs regarding an injury are based on what is
386 pleasing to imagine, rather than based on evidence, rationality or reality (63). Finally, runners
387 suggested that their previous experience with injury removes the need to attend a HCP. This
388 finding is similar to previous research in which runners have reported that those with more
389 running experience are better able to self-manage RRIs (22,26). It has also been suggested
390 that novice runners are more at risk for RRIs (64), while coaching or education (i.e.,
391 increasing runners’ understanding of the injury development process) is theorised to enhance
392 injury prevention (65).

393 The decision to seek HCP advice most often came at the level of ‘injury: short-term
394 effect’, and from this point on, as the injury becomes more severe or impactful, HCP advice
395 becomes more specialised. Runners described several reasons for seeking HCP advice.
396 Firstly, when their attempts to self-manage injury had failed, or their injury had become too

397 severe where they can no longer self-manage, similar to previous running-based research
398 (26). Secondly, they would attend a HCP because they are seeking validation of their injury,
399 typically in one of two ways. Runners are either seeking confirmation that they are actually
400 injured and the injury is not in their head (as often, there are no physical signs of injury and
401 they may be able to continue training); or they are looking for reassurance that their injury is
402 not as serious as they may be concerned about, and they are seeking guidance on continuing
403 their training.

404

405 **5.3 Implications**

406 Our findings have several implications for HCPs, coaches and researchers.

407

408 **5.1.1 Education**

409 It is clear that the education of runners regarding evidence-based information on
410 managing and preventing RRIs is required. Firstly, HCPs should be aware that runners
411 typically do not attend an HCP with a *lower level injury* because they believe they can be
412 primarily self-managed. While this is a positive finding in the sense that runners feel
413 empowered to self-manage their own *lower level injuries*, it is also clear that HCPs need to
414 educate their patients on appropriate self-management strategies, by directing them towards
415 trustworthy sources of information, ensuring runners are using evidence-based
416 recommendations to prevent and rehabilitate injury. Similarly, coaches, running clubs, and
417 governing bodies need to educate runners, encouraging them to use evidence-based practices
418 in the management of their injuries (e.g., Athletic Therapists/ Physiotherapists, evidence-
419 based sources of information). Secondly, there is a need for enhanced dissemination of
420 evidence-based information to runners. Researchers need to ensure their findings are freely

421 accessible to runners, disseminating findings in user-friendly formats (e.g., infographics,
422 podcasts, blog posts) using plain language, ensuring runners understand key information.

423

424 **5.1.2 Appropriate monitoring of RRIs**

425 Our findings highlight the importance of a wider scope of monitoring RRIs, not just
426 across all levels of injury, but across all categories of descriptors. Firstly, HCPs should
427 consider the potential importance of *lower level injuries* acting as risk factors for *higher level*
428 *injuries* (as discussed above), and appreciate that a runner presenting with a *higher level*
429 *injury* may have had a preceding *lower level injury*, in order to better manage the whole
430 continuum of injury. Secondly, when designing injury management strategies, HCPs should
431 understand that runners will likely have made attempts to self-manage their injury prior to
432 presenting to them, and these attempts should be taken into consideration. Finally, with the
433 emphasis placed by participants in the current study on the psychological description of each
434 level of injury, it is crucial that HCP's include biopsychosocial assessments when dealing
435 with recreational runners, ensuring this psychological response is captured, monitored and
436 incorporated into management strategies. HCPs should also educate their patients regarding
437 the psychological aspect of the process of injury development, and ensure patients understand
438 that it is normal to experience these responses (i.e. to experience anxiety or concern,
439 especially with a *lower level injury*) (60). Similarly, in helping athletes manage injuries,
440 coaches need to be aware of the importance of not only monitoring all levels of injury and
441 supporting athletes with appropriate management strategies, but also on monitoring athletes
442 across all categories of descriptors.

443 Future research should also broaden its scope of investigating RRIs (and overuse
444 injuries) to ensure that all categories of descriptors are captured in order to better understand
445 the wider impact of an injury. In particular, this will allow examination of whether *lower*

446 *level injuries* are risk factors for injury, and/or how they interact with other potential risk
447 factors (as described above, Fig 1).

448

449 **6. Strengths and Limitations**

450 A representative sample was included in the current study, gathering the perceptions of
451 runners of various ages and running backgrounds. We included a larger sample size of
452 runners compared to previous research (22,26), enhancing the reliability of our findings. We
453 employed a method of constant comparative analysis throughout the data collection and
454 analysis phases, enhancing the methodological rigour. Multiple coders with different research
455 and lifestyle backgrounds were involved, reducing the potential of researcher bias.
456 Furthermore, several methods of trustworthiness were executed to ensure appropriate
457 interpretation of findings and enhance the credibility of results.

458 The study's findings should also be considered in light of some limitations. Our
459 sample consisted of only Irish runners, therefore these findings may not be representative of
460 the global population of runners. In particular, specific terminology used (e.g. niggle) or
461 methods of management employed (e.g., access to clinicians) may not be consistent across
462 other nationalities or socio-demographics. Furthermore, as we only recruited recreational
463 runners, findings may differ with elite or novice runners. As the aim of this study was to
464 explore the lived experience of runners, it was necessary for participants to have previous
465 experience with *lower level injuries*; however, it is possible that different findings would be
466 reported from runners with less/no experience of *lower level injuries*. Given the adopted
467 terminology of 'niggle', 'persisting niggle' and 'non-responding niggle', a 'twinge' can be
468 viewed as a distinct level from these because of its associated sharp pain, its immediate effect
469 on running, and its presence for only one session. The location of 'twinge' between 'niggle'
470 and 'persisting niggle' or 'persisting niggle' and 'non-responding niggle' was not consistent

471 across all focus groups; however, its placement on the Running Injury Continuum was
472 arrived at because all participants described it as something more severe than a ‘niggle’,
473 while the majority described it as less severe than a ‘persisting niggle’.

474

475 **7. Conclusion**

476 Through capturing the lived experiences of recreational runners, we present the Running
477 Injury Continuum as a representation of the development process of RRIs. Expanding on
478 previous research (22–26), nine distinct levels of injury were identified in the current study,
479 with each level being described across four categories of descriptors: physical description,
480 outcome, psychological description, and management. For research purposes, the Running
481 Injury Continuum is a tool that can be used in both injury surveillance research and research
482 investigating risk factors for RRIs.

483 Our findings clearly highlight the importance of education and accessibility of
484 evidence-based information. HCPs need to educate their patients on appropriate self-
485 management strategies for RRIs, while researchers should ensure recreational runners have
486 access to evidence-based information, and can utilize this information in their running
487 practices. HCPs, coaches and researchers should broaden their scope of monitoring RRIs to
488 ensure that all levels of injury and categories of descriptors are captured, in order to better
489 understand the wider impact of RRIs, to more appropriately manage RRIs, and potentially
490 enhance injury prevention.

491

492 **8. Acknowledgements**

493 The authors would like to thank the focus group participants for their contributions.

494

495 **9. Author Contributions**

- 496 • Conceptualization: Aisling Lacey, Enda Whyte, Kieran Moran
- 497 • Methodology: Aisling Lacey, Sinéad O’Keeffe
- 498 • Formal analysis and investigations: Aisling Lacey, Sinéad O’Keeffe
- 499 • Writing – original draft preparations: Aisling Lacey, Enda Whyte, Kieran Moran
- 500 • Writing – reviewing and editing: Aisling Lacey, Enda Whyte, Sinéad O’Keeffe,
- 501 Siobhán O’Connor, Aoife Burke, Kieran Moran
- 502 • Funding acquisition: Kieran Moran
- 503 • Supervision: Enda Whyte, Kieran Moran
- 504

505 **10. References**

- 506 1. Janssen M, Scheerder J, Thibaut E, Brombacher A, Vos S. Who uses running apps and
507 sports watches? Determinants and consumer profiles of event runners' usage of running-
508 related smartphone applications and sports watches. *PloS ONE*. 2017;12(7).
- 509 2. Hulteen RM, Smith JJ, Morgan PJ, Barnett LM, Hallal PC, Colyvas K, et al. *Prev Med*.
510 2017;95:14–25.
- 511 3. Menheere D, Lallemand C, van der Spek E, Megens C, Vande Moere A, Funk M, et al.
512 The Runner's Journey: Identifying Design Opportunities for Running Motivation
513 Technology. In: *Proceedings of the 11th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer*
514 *Interaction: Shaping Society*. New York, NY, USA; 2020. p. 1–14.
- 515 4. Hollander K, Rahlf AL, Wilke J, Edler C, Steib S, Junge A, et al. Sex-Specific
516 Differences in Running Injuries: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis and Meta-
517 Regression. *Sports Med*. 2021;51:1011–39.
- 518 5. Kakouris N, Yener N, Fong DTP. A systematic review of running-related
519 musculoskeletal injuries in runners. *J Sport Health Sci*. 2021;(21).
- 520 6. Messier SP, Martin DF, Mihalko SL, Ip SL, DeVita P, Cannon DW, et al. A 2-year
521 prospective cohort study of overuse running injuries: the runners and injury longitudinal
522 study. *Am J Sports Med*. 2018;46(9):2211–21.
- 523 7. Kemler E, Blokland D, Backx F, Huisstede B. Differences in injury risk and
524 characteristics of injuries between novice and experienced runners over a 4-year period.
525 *Physician Sports Med*. 2018;46(6):485–91.

- 526 8. Bertelsen ML, Hulme A, Petersen J, Brund RK, Sørensen H, Finch CF, et al. A
527 framework for the etiology of running-related injuries. *Scandinavian J Med Sci Sport*.
528 2017;27:1170–80.
- 529 9. Edwards WB. Modelling overuse injuries in sport as a mechanical fatigue phenomenon.
530 *Exerc Sport Sci Rev*. 2018;46(4):224–31.
- 531 10. Kalkhoven JT, Watsford ML, Impellizzeri FM. A conceptual model and detailed
532 framework for stress-related, strain-related, and overuse athletic injury. *J Sci Med Sport*.
533 2020;23(8):726–34.
- 534 11. Meeuwisse WH, Tyreman H, Hagel B, Emery C. A dynamic model of etiology in sport
535 injury: the recursive nature of risk and causation. *Clin J Sport Med Off J Can Acad Sport*
536 *Med*. 2007 May;17(3):215–9.
- 537 12. Malisoux L, Nielsen RO, Urhausen A, Theisen D. A step towards understanding the
538 mechanisms of running-related injuries. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2015 Sep;18(5):523–8.
- 539 13. Hulme A, Nielsen RO, Timpka T, Verhagen E, Finch C. Risk and Protective Factors for
540 Middle- and Long-Distance Running-Related Injury. *Sports Med*. 2017;47:869–86.
- 541 14. Ceyskens L, Vanelderden R, Barton C, Malliaras P, Dingenen B. Biomechanical Risk
542 Factors Associated with Running-Related Injuries: A Systematic Review. *Sports Med*.
543 2019;49:1095–115.
- 544 15. Kluitenberg B, van Middelkoop M, Diercks R, van der Worp H. What are the Differences
545 in Injury Proportions Between Different Populations of Runners? A Systematic Review
546 and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med Auckl NZ*. 2015 Aug;45(8):1143–61.

- 547 16. Yamato TP, Saragiotto BT, Hespanhol Junior LC, Yeung SS, Lopes AD. Descriptors
548 Used to Define Running-Related Musculoskeletal Injury: A Systematic Review. *J Orthop*
549 *Sports Phys Ther.* 2015 May;45(5):366–74.
- 550 17. Kluitenberg B, van Middelkoop M, Smits DW, Verhagen E, Hartgens F, Diercks R, et al.
551 The NLstart2run study: Incidence and risk factors of running-related injuries in novice
552 runners. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2015 Oct;25(5):e515-523.
- 553 18. Clarsen B, Myklebust G, Bahr R. Development and validation of a new method for the
554 registration of overuse injuries in sports injury epidemiology: the Oslo Sports Trauma
555 Research Centre (OSTRC) overuse injury questionnaire. *Br J Sports Med.* 2013
556 May;47(8):495–502.
- 557 19. Yamato TP, Saragiotto BT, Lopes AD. A consensus definition of running-related injury
558 in recreational runners: a modified Delphi approach. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2015
559 May;45(5):375–80.
- 560 20. Soligard T, Schweltnus M, Alonso JM, Bahr R, Clarsen B, Dijkstra HP, et al. How much
561 is too much? (Part 1) International Olympic Committee consensus statement on load in
562 sport and risk of injury. *Br J Sports Med.* 2016 Sep;50(17):1030–41.
- 563 21. Clarsen B, Bahr R, Myklebust G, Andersson SH, Docking SI, Drew M, et al. Improved
564 reporting of overuse injuries and health problems in sport: an update of the Oslo Sport
565 Trauma Research Center questionnaires. *Br J Sports Med.* 2020 Apr;54(7):390–6.
- 566 22. Verhagen E, Warsen M, Silveira Bolling C. ‘I JUST WANT TO RUN’: how recreational
567 runners perceive and deal with injuries. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med.* 2021;7(3):e001117.

- 568 23. Jelvegard S, Timpka T, Bargoria V, Gauffin H, Jacobsson J. Perception of Health
569 Problems Among Competitive Runners: A Qualitative Study of Cognitive Appraisals
570 and Behavioral Responses. *Orthop J Sports Med.* 2016;4(12).
- 571 24. Johansen KK, Hulme A, Damsted C, Ramskov D, Nielsen RO. RUNNING INJURY
572 DEVELOPMENT: THE ATTITUDES OF MIDDLE- AND LONG-DISTANCE
573 RUNNERS AND THEIR COACHES. *Int J Sports Phys Ther.* 2017 Aug;12(4):634–41.
- 574 25. Wickström W, Spreco A, Bargoria V, Elinder F, Hansson PO, Dahlström Ö, et al.
575 Perceptions of Overuse Injury Among Swedish Ultramarathon and Marathon Runners:
576 Cross-Sectional Study Based on the Illness Perception Questionnaire Revised (IPQ-R).
577 *Front Psychol.* 2019;10:2406.
- 578 26. Peterson B, Searle A, Spink M, Hawke F, Callister R, Chuter V. Going their own way–
579 male recreational runners and running-related injuries: A qualitative thematic analysis.
580 Ruddock A, editor. *PLOS ONE.* 2022 Aug 25;17(8):e0273401.
- 581 27. Kulmala JP, Avela J, Pasanen K, Parkkari J. Forefoot Strikers Exhibit Lower Running-
582 Induced Knee Loading than Rearfoot Strikers. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2013
583 Dec;45(12):2306–13.
- 584 28. Burke A, Dillon S, O'Connor S, Whyte E, Gore S, Moran KA. Risk factors for injuries in
585 runners: A systematic review of foot strike technique and its classification at impact.
586 *Orthop J Sports Med.* 2021;9(9).
- 587 29. Kitzinger J. Focus groups. In: *Qualitative research in health care*, 3rd ed. Williston, VT,
588 US: BMJ Books; 2006. p. 21–31.

- 589 30. Queiros A, Faria D, Almeida F. Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative
590 research methods. *Eur J Educ Stud*. 2017;3(9):369–87.
- 591 31. Moser A, Korstjens I. Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling,
592 data collection and analysis. *Eur J Gen Pract*. 2018 Dec;24(1):9–18.
- 593 32. Flowers P, Knussen C, Duncan B. Re-appraising HIV Testing among Scottish Gay Men:
594 The Impact of New HIV Treatments. *J Health Psychol*. 2001 Dec;6(6):665–78.
- 595 33. Polit DF, Beck CT. *Essentials of nursing research: Appraising evidence for nursing*
596 *practice*. 8th ed. Philadelphia: PA: Wolters Kluwer; 2014.
- 597 34. Korstjens I, Moser A. Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 2: Context,
598 research questions and designs. *Eur J Gen Pract*. 2017 Oct 2;23(1):274–9.
- 599 35. Webb C, Kevern J. Focus groups as a research method: a critique of some aspects of their
600 use in nursing research. *J Adv Nurs*. 2001 Mar 16;33(6):798–805.
- 601 36. Van Teijlingen E. JAN Forum: your views and letters: *JAN Forum*. *J Adv Nurs*. 2003
602 Nov;44(4):436–7.
- 603 37. Bradbury-Jones C, Sambrook S, Irvine F. The phenomenological focus group: an
604 oxymoron? *J Adv Nurs*. 2009 Mar;65(3):663–71.
- 605 38. Palmer M, Larkin M, de Visser R, Fadden G. Developing an Interpretative
606 Phenomenological Approach to Focus Group Data. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2010 May
607 24;7(2):99–121.

- 608 39. Robertson LG, Anderson TL, Hall MEL, Kim CL. Mothers and Mental Labor: A
609 Phenomenological Focus Group Study of Family-Related Thinking Work. *Psychol*
610 *Women Q.* 2019 Jun;43(2):184–200.
- 611 40. Sloan A, Bowe B. Phenomenology and hermeneutic phenomenology: the philosophy, the
612 methodologies, and using hermeneutic phenomenology to investigate lecturers’
613 experiences of curriculum design. *Qual Quant.* 2014 May;48(3):1291–303.
- 614 41. Bush EJ, Singh RL, Kooienga S. Lived Experiences of a Community: Merging
615 Interpretive Phenomenology and Community-Based Participatory Research. *Int J Qual*
616 *Methods.* 2019 Jan 1;18:160940691987589.
- 617 42. van Manen M. *Researching Lived Experience, Second Edition: Human Science for an*
618 *Action Sensitive Pedagogy* [Internet]. Routledge; 2016 [cited 2023 Mar 23]. Available
619 from: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781315421056>
- 620 43. O’Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standard for reporting
621 qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med.* 2014;89(9):1254–1251.
- 622 44. Mulvad B, Nielsen RO, Lind M, Ramskov D. Diagnoses and time to recovery among
623 injured recreational runners in the RUN CLEVER. *PLoS ONE.* 2018;13(10):e0204742.
- 624 45. Bruan V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol.*
625 2006;3(2):77–101.
- 626 46. Braun V, Clarke V. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qual Res Sport Exerc*
627 *Health.* 2019 Aug 8;11(4):589–97.
- 628 47. Boeije H. A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of
629 qualitative interviews. *Qual Quant.* 2002;36:391–409.

- 630 48. Miller RM, Chan CD, Farmer LB. Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: A
631 Contemporary Qualitative Approach. *Couns Educ Superv*. 2018 Dec;57(4):240–54.
- 632 49. Middlebrook N, Heneghan NR, Falla D, Silvester L, Rushton AB, Soundy AA.
633 Successful recovery following musculoskeletal trauma: protocol for a qualitative study of
634 patients' and physiotherapists' perceptions. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2021 Feb
635 10;22(1):163.
- 636 50. McGannon KR, Smith B, Kendellen K, Gonsalves CA. Qualitative research in six sport
637 and exercise psychology journals between 2010 and 2017: An updated and expanded
638 review of trends and interpretations. *Int J Sport Exerc Psychol*. 2019;19(3):359–79.
- 639 51. Smith B, McGannon KR. Developing rigour in qualitative research: problems and
640 opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *Int Rev Sport Exerc Pyschology*.
641 2018;11(1):101–21.
- 642 52. Cowan D, Taylor IM. 'I'm proud of what I achieved: I'm also ashamed of what I done': a
643 soccer coach's tale of sport, status, and criminal behaviour. *Qual Res Sport Exerc Health*.
644 2016;8(5):505–18.
- 645 53. Sparkes AC, Smith B. *Qualitative Research Methods in Sport, Exercise and Health: From*
646 *Process to Product*. London: Routledge; 2013. 288 p.
- 647 54. Tracy SJ. Qualitative Quality: Eight 'Big-Tent' Criteria for Excellent Qualitative
648 Research. *Qual Inq*. 2010;16(10):837–51.
- 649 55. Oxford University Press. Definition of continuum [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Jan 23].
650 Available from:
651 https://www.google.com/search?q=definition+of+continuum&rlz=1C5CHFA_enIE1042I

- 652 E1042&oq=definition+of+continuum&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j0i51215j0i22i30i62512j0i22i
653 3012.3334j1j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8
- 654 56. Tranaeus U, Martin S, Ivarsson A. Psychosocial Risk Factors for Overuse Injuries in
655 Competitive Athletes: A Mixed-Studies Systematic Review. *Sports Med.* 2022
656 Apr;52(4):773–88.
- 657 57. Smith AM. Psychological Impact of Injuries in Athletes: *Sports Med.* 1996
658 Dec;22(6):391–405.
- 659 58. Wiese-bjornstal DM, Smith AM, Shaffer SM, Morrey MA. An integrated model of
660 response to sport injury: Psychological and sociological dynamics. *J Appl Sport Psychol.*
661 1998 Mar;10(1):46–69.
- 662 59. Flint FA. Integrating sport psychology and sports medicine in research: The dilemmas. *J*
663 *Appl Sport Psychol.* 1998 Mar;10(1):83–102.
- 664 60. Russell H, Wiese-Bjornstal D. Narratives of Psychosocial Response to Microtrauma
665 Injury among Long-Distance Runners. *Sports.* 2015 Jul 30;3(3):159–77.
- 666 61. van Wilgen CP, Verhagen EALM. A qualitative study on overuse injuries: The beliefs of
667 athletes and coaches. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2012 Mar;15(2):116–21.
- 668 62. Besomi M, Leppe J, Di Silvestre MC, Setchell J. SeRUN® study: Development of
669 running profiles using a mixed methods analysis. Jan YK, editor. *PLOS ONE.* 2018 Jul
670 10;13(7):e0200389.
- 671 63. Gojanovic B, Fourchet F, Gremeaux V. Cognitive biases cloud our clinical decisions and
672 patient expectations: A narrative review to help bridge the gap between evidence-based
673 and personalized medicine. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2022 Jun;65(4):101551.

- 674 64. Linton L, Valentin S. Running with injury: A study of UK novice and recreational
675 runners and factor associated with running related injury. *J Sci Med Sport*.
676 2018;21(12):1221–5.
- 677 65. Hespanhol LC, van Mechelen W, Verhagen E. Effectiveness of online tailored advice to
678 prevent running-related injuries and promote preventive behaviour in Dutch trail runners:
679 a pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *Br J Sports Med*. 2018 Jul;52(13):851–8.
- 680
681