

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

17 **Abstract**

18 **Objective:** To investigate the immediate effects of intermittent vibrational stimulation on gait
19 and stair ambulation among patients two months post anterior cruciate ligament
20 reconstruction.

21 **Design:** Randomized, parallel, 2-group- randomized controlled trial.

22 **Setting:** Hospital setting.

23 **Participants:** There were 27 male and female participants aged 18-45, two months post-
24 ACLR, and a convenience sample of 24 healthy controls.

25 **Interventions:** The participants were randomly assigned to two groups. One group received a
26 device designed to apply intermittent vibrational stimulation above and below the knee; the
27 other received a sham device.

28 **Main Outcome Measure(s):** The main outcomes were the knee sagittal kinematics during
29 gait at three speeds and stair ascent and descent. The assessment was performed with and
30 without one of the study devices.

31 **Results:** Compared to the sham device, intermittent vibrational stimulation significantly
32 increased the minimum knee flexion angles while walking at normal, slow, and fast paces and
33 stair ascent.

34 **Conclusion:** Intermittent vibrational stimulation affects the lower limb kinematics during
35 rehabilitation for individuals post-ACLR. However, further research is necessary to confirm
36 long-term benefits and establish optimal application parameters.

37 **Keywords:** ACL Injuries; Kinematics; Rehabilitation; Gait; Lower Extremity

38

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

39 **Abbreviations**

- 40 ACL – (Anterior cruciate ligament)
- 41 ACLR – (Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction)
- 42 IMU – (Inertial measurement unit)
- 43 IVS – (Intermittent vibrational stimulation)

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

44 **Introduction**

45 Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries are a prevalent concern, especially among active
46 young people.¹ Such injuries lead to extended changes in everyday life and sports activities.
47 They are followed by a lengthy rehabilitation process, usually lasting at least nine months
48 before returning to the activity levels before the injury.² Despite rehabilitation efforts, many
49 individuals still experience persistent ambulatory changes in everyday activities such as
50 walking and ascending or descending stairs.³⁻⁵

51 The reported ambulatory alterations after ACL injury have clinical implications, indicating a
52 need for exploring novel approaches to address these changes. Quadriceps weakness post-ACL
53 injury first associated with ‘quadriceps avoidance gait’ by Berchuck et al. (1990)⁶ can present
54 a barrier to rehabilitation. This type of gait can cause asymmetry and reduced walking speed,
55 leading to changes in joint movement patterns, affecting joint mechanics and loading, and
56 potentially contributing to osteoarthritis (OA).^{7,8} Increased risk of developing premature OA
57 presents a long-term and unresolved risk following ACL injury and motivates to seek new
58 approaches to mitigate this risk. The gait changes noted above, as well as the risk of developing
59 OA, suggest the need for modifiable gait metrics associated with premature OA.

60 A new intervention (*KneeMo*[®]) uses intermittent vibrational (IVS) to apply to sensory nerves
61 that signal pain as well as mechanical stimuli such as vibration. It uses the properties of the
62 somatosensory system to gate pain and enhance function, as previously described in detail.^{3,9,10}
63 However, the specific effects of IVS on the kinematics of the lower limb following ACLR,
64 particularly during the early phase of rehabilitation, remain inadequately explored.

65 While walking has received considerable attention in ACL rehabilitation research, the
66 biomechanics of stair ambulation remain relatively understudied.⁴ Yet, there is evidence that

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

67 joint loading and knee flexion are altered during stair use after ACLR surgery, highlighting the
68 need for early interventions.^{11,10}

69 The importance and challenges of early-phase rehabilitation have been previously described
70 and provide the motivation for evaluating new interventions. Specifically, Buckthorpe et al.
71 (2020) have reported that mid-stage rehabilitation after ACLR is an important timeframe for
72 interventions addressing altered gait patterns to prevent long-term limitations.¹² Implementing
73 gait retraining techniques during this phase can improve aberrant gait patterns. Therefore,
74 investigating the effects of IVS at the two-month post-ACLR mark is particularly important to
75 assess its efficacy as an early rehabilitative intervention. Moreover, employing a sham device
76 as a control helps reduce potential placebo effects, where participants may anticipate benefits
77 solely from receiving an intervention. By comparing the effects between the groups, we can
78 more confidently attribute any observed improvements to the vibration device.

79 Traditionally, kinematic analysis is done using optoelectronic camera-based motion capture
80 systems within the controlled environment of a movement laboratory. While accurate, it can
81 potentially limit the ecological validity. Inertial measurement units (IMUs) present a promising
82 alternative, enabling kinematics data collection outside the lab setting.

83 We aim to address this research gap by evaluating the influence of IVS on knee kinematics in
84 individuals two months post-ACL reconstruction using IMUs outside the laboratory. Our
85 primary objective is to assess the effects of IVS on the knee sagittal plane movements during
86 overground walking and stair ascent and descent. Additionally, we aim to examine the sagittal
87 plane movements of the hip and ankle during these movements. We hypothesized that
88 individuals receiving a device applying IVS to the knee during ambulation would demonstrate
89 increased knee flexion angles compared to those in the sham device group.

90

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

91 **Methods**

92 **Study design**

93 The study was a randomized controlled trial with a parallel 2-group before and after design and
94 followed the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) Statement.¹³

95 The institutional review board of Rambam Health Care Campus approved this study protocol
96 (0089-21-RMB), registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05001594). The procedures are in accord
97 with the ethical standards of the Helsinki Declaration. All of the participants gave their written
98 informed consent to enter the study.

99 A single researcher, a physiotherapist with eight years of clinical experience and three years of
100 experience in a motion analysis lab, conducted all measurements.

101 **Participants**

102 The inclusion criteria comprised males and females aged 18-45 who had undergone ACLR
103 surgery at Rambam Health Care Campus two months prior. Exclusion criteria included failure
104 to provide informed consent, a history of previous ACL injury, prior lower limb injuries, and
105 any active cardiovascular, neurological, or respiratory conditions.

106 Additionally, a control group comprising healthy participants was recruited. The inclusion
107 criteria for the control group were healthy males and females aged 18-45 without any lower
108 limb pain. The exclusion criteria were a previous lower limb surgery or injury, active
109 cardiovascular, neurological, or respiratory conditions, and failure to provide informed consent.

110 **Research protocol**

111 Using an online random number sequence generator, the participants were randomized into two
112 groups; one group received an IVS device (*KneeMo*[®]), while the other group received a 3D-
113 printed sham device without vibration. Both devices were positioned on the participant's

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

114 injured leg using straps above and below the knee, providing pressure. However, only the IVS
115 device delivered external vibration stimulation. The vibration was synchronized to the gait
116 cycle and activated just before the heel strike and is described in detail elsewhere.¹⁴ Due to the
117 nature of the intervention, participants were not blinded, but the sham device was made to look
118 and feel like the IVS device.

119 The participants first walked, ascended, and descended stairs without any device (baseline) and
120 then walked and ambulated stairs with a device (IVS or sham). Each participant completed
121 three repetitions of walking along a 20-meter corridor at three paces: self-selected normal, slow,
122 and fast. The instructions for each condition were as follows and similar for all the participants.
123 For the self-selected pace: "Walk across the corridor at your normal speed," for the slow pace:
124 "Walk across the corridor at a slow speed," and for the fast pace: "Walk as fast as possible
125 across the corridor" .¹⁵ Participants then ascended and descended a 20-step staircase (rise=
126 17cm, run= 30cm) at their comfortable pace for three repetitions. The cycles of each participant
127 were then averaged and used for the analysis.

128 Data were recorded at 120 Hz using seven IMU sensors (XSENS Awinda, Full citation.)
129 attached to the participants' lower limbs using Velcro straps: Upper leg (x2), lower leg (x2),
130 feet (x2), and pelvis (x1).¹⁶ The Participants acclimated to the sensors before data collection,
131 initially walking without any device (baseline phase) and then with either the IVS or sham
132 device, depending on randomization (intervention phase).

133 The main outcomes included knee sagittal kinematics, with secondary outcomes focusing on
134 hip and ankle sagittal kinematics (Figure 1).

135 **Data and statistical analysis**

136 The normality of the data distribution was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Demographic
137 differences between groups and between the injured and the left leg of the healthy controls

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

138 were compared using the student t-test. Two-way mixed ANOVA tests evaluated between-
139 group (group = IVS vs. sham device) and within-group (time = walking without a device -
140 baseline phase. vs. walking with the IVS or sham device - intervention phase) differences of
141 the different kinematic data, with significant interactions further evaluated using the ANOVA
142 pairwise comparison. Effect sizes were reported using Partial Eta squared (partial η^2).

143 An additional comparison was made between the ACLR cohort's injured leg and the healthy
144 participants' left leg using an independent-sample t-test. The statistical significance was set at
145 $p < .05$, and analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 29).

146 A priori power analysis was conducted to determine the minimum sample size required to
147 detect a medium effect based on an f-test and a within- and between-group interaction statistical
148 test using G*Power (Version 3.1.9.7). The results indicated that the required sample size to
149 achieve 80% power for detecting a medium effect (0.25), at a significance of $\alpha = .05$, was $n=34$.

150 Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, data collection was slower and stopped earlier than planned.
151 Therefore, the final sample size is smaller than the planned number. With 27 participants
152 instead of 34, our planned type 2 error rate increased from 20% (80% power) to 30% (70%
153 power).

154 The funding sources were not involved in the design, collection, analysis, and interpretation of
155 data or the writing of this report.

156

157

Results

158 Participant characteristics

159 A total of 27 participants post-ACLR and 24 healthy controls were recruited between February
160 2022 and October 2023 (Table 1). The mean age of the ACLR participants was 23.5 ± 5.7 years,

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

161 with a mean weight and height of 75.8 ± 11.6 kg and 177 ± 0.1 cm, respectively. Data for stair
162 ambulation from one ACLR participant was corrupted, resulting in 26 participants being
163 included in the stair ambulation analysis (Figure 2). The sagittal kinematics during gait and
164 stair ascent of the injured and contralateral knee together with the left leg of the healthy
165 participants are presented in Tables 2 and 3 and Appendices 1 and 2 for the hip and ankle.

166 **Effects of vibration on the knee kinematics**

167 **Minimum knee flexion angle**

168 As detailed in Table 3, statistically significant interactions between intervention and time were
169 observed for knee minimum flexion angles during normal walking ($F(1, 25) = 7.60$, $p = .007$,
170 partial $\eta^2 = .233$) and slow walking ($F(1, 25) = 6.32$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .208$).

171 Post-hoc analysis revealed a statistically significant simple effect of group on the knee
172 minimum flexion angle that was higher in the IVS group compared to the sham device at
173 normal walking (mean difference = 4.60° , S.E. = 1.37° , $p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .309$) and at slow
174 walking (mean difference = 4.67° , S.E. = 1.40° , $p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .316$). Moreover, there
175 was a statistically significant difference at fast walking with a higher knee minimum flexion
176 angle in the IVS group (mean difference = 4.04° , S.E. = 1.57° , $p = .017$, partial $\eta^2 = .208$).

177 Furthermore, there was a statistically significant simple effect of time on the knee minimum
178 flexion angle that was higher during the intervention phase in the IVS group at normal walking
179 (mean difference = 3.44° , S.E. = 0.73° , $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .610$) and at slow walking (mean
180 difference = 3.14° , S.E. = 0.72° , $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .588$). Similarly, a significant difference
181 was found in fast walking during the intervention phase in the IVS group (mean difference =
182 2.25° , S.E. = 0.81° , $p = .015$, partial $\eta^2 = .354$).

183 An independent-sample t-test was conducted to assess whether there were differences in knee
184 minimum flexion angles between the ACLR IVS group's injured leg and the healthy

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

185 participants' left leg. The results revealed that during the baseline phase, while walking at a
186 normal pace, the injured knee of the ACLR group exhibited greater flexion ($1.9^\circ \pm 3.4$)
187 compared to the knee of healthy participants ($-3.4^\circ \pm 3.8$), a statistically significant mean
188 difference of 5.3° (95% CI [2.9, 7.7], $p < .001$). Similar differences were observed at both slow
189 walking (mean difference of 5.6° , 95% CI [3.5, 7.7], $p < .001$) and fast walking (mean
190 difference of 5.1° , 95% CI [2.0, 8.2], $p = .002$).

191 During the intervention phase, the injured knee of the ACLR group was more flexed ($5.3^\circ \pm$
192 3.8) compared to the healthy participants, with a statistically significant mean difference of
193 8.8° (95% CI [6.2, 11.3], $p < .001$). The same was true at both slow walking (mean difference
194 of 8.6° , 95% CI [6.2, 11.1], $p < .001$) and at fast walking (mean difference of 7.4° , 95% CI
195 [4.3, 10.4], $p = .002$).

196 **First peak knee flexion angle**

197 No statistically significant interaction was found between intervention and time for the first
198 peak flexion angles at any walking speed. However, there was a statistically significant main
199 effect of time that showed a difference in the first peak flexion angle at normal walking speed
200 ($F(1, 25) = 6.47$, $p = .018$, partial $\eta^2 = .206$) and at slow walking speed ($F(1, 25) = 14.59$, $p <$
201 $.001$, partial $\eta^2 = .378$).

202 Post-hoc analysis revealed a statistically significant simple effect of time on the first peak
203 flexion angle that was higher at the intervention phase in the IVS group at normal walking
204 speed (mean difference = 1.77° , S.E. = 0.76° , $p = .036$, partial $\eta^2 = .278$). A statistically
205 significant simple effect of time was also found at slow walking speed both in the sham device
206 group (mean difference = 0.80° , S.E. = 0.29° , $p = .021$, partial $\eta^2 = .396$) and in the IVS group
207 (mean difference = 2.35° , S.E. = 0.72° , $p = .006$, partial $\eta^2 = .452$).

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

208 An independent-sample t-test found no significant differences between the injured leg of the
209 ACLR IVS group participants and the healthy participants' left leg.

210 **Second peak knee flexion angle**

211 There was no statistically significant interaction between the intervention and time on second
212 peak flexion angles across all walking speeds. Furthermore, no statistically significant main
213 effects of time or group were observed. An independent-sample t-test revealed no significant
214 differences between the injured leg of the ACLR IVS device group and the left leg of the
215 healthy participants.

216 **Stairs ambulation**

217 Table 4 shows a statistically significant interaction between the intervention and time
218 concerning the knee maximum angle ($F(1, 25) = 5.88, p = .023, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .197$). Post-hoc
219 tests revealed a statistically significant simple effect of time on the knee maximum angle,
220 indicating a decrease during the intervention phase in the IVS group (mean difference = 1.88° ,
221 S.E. = $0.69^\circ, p = .018, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .362$).

222 Furthermore, a significant main effect of time emerged regarding the knee minimum angle
223 ($F(1, 25) = 6.31, p = .019, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .208$). Post-hoc tests revealed a significant simple effect
224 of time on the knee minimum angle (mean difference = 2.06° , S.E. = $0.93^\circ, p = .047, \text{partial } \eta^2$
225 = $.271$) indicating an increase during the intervention phase in the IVS group.

226 There were no statistically significant interactions or main effects during stair descent.

227 **Effects of vibration on the ankle kinematics**

228 There were no statistically significant interactions for the ankle kinematics across any of the
229 walking measurements (Table 5). However, a significant main effect of time was identified,

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

230 showing differences in the ankle maximum angle at slow ($F(1, 25) = 8.54, p = .007, \text{partial } \eta^2$
231 $= .263$) and fast walking paces ($F(1, 25) = 11.14, p = .003, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .308$).

232 Post-hoc analyses revealed a significant simple effect of time on the ankle maximum angle for
233 slow walking (mean difference = 0.77° , S.E. = 0.30° , $p = .023, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .338$) and fast
234 walking (mean difference = 0.93° , S.E. = 0.30° , $p = .009, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .396$), with higher angles
235 observed during the intervention phase in the IVS group.

236 During the baseline phase, while walking at a slow pace, the ankles of the ACLR group's
237 injured legs exhibited less plantarflexion ($-14.0^\circ \pm 7.9$) compared to those of healthy
238 participants ($-19.1^\circ \pm 7.3$), resulting in a statistically significant mean difference of 5.1° (95%
239 CI [0.1, 10.1], $p = .04$). Conversely, during the intervention phase, the ankles of the ACLR
240 group's injured legs demonstrated more dorsiflexion ($16.8^\circ \pm 2.3$) compared to healthy
241 participants ($14.6^\circ \pm 3.1$), with a statistically significant mean difference of 2.2° (95% CI [0.2,
242 4.2], $p = .02$).

243 **Stair ambulation**

244 As seen in Table X, there was a statistically significant interaction between the intervention
245 and time on the ankle minimum angle ($F(1, 25) = 4.86, p = .037, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .168$). Post-hoc
246 tests revealed a statistically significant simple effect of time on the ankle minimum angle (mean
247 difference = 4.58° , S.E. = 1.91° , $p = .032, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .306$), indicating a higher angle during
248 the intervention phase in the IVS group.

249 Furthermore, there was a statistically significant main effect of time regarding the ankle
250 maximum angle ($F(1, 25) = 4.65, p = .041, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .162$). Post-hoc tests found a statistically
251 significant simple effect of time on the ankle maximum angle (mean difference = 2.86° , S.E. =
252 1.17° , $p = .030, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .313$) that was higher at the intervention phase in the IVS group.

253 There were no statistically significant interactions or main effects during stair descent.

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

254 **Effects of vibration on the hip kinematics**

255 There were no statistically significant interactions or main effects for the hip kinematics in any
256 measurements (Appendix 3 and 4) during walking or stair ambulation. An independent-sample
257 t-test found no significant differences between the injured leg of the ACLR IVS group and the
258 healthy participants' left leg.

259 **Effects of IVS on the lower limb kinematics**

260 As detailed in Table 6, IVS is associated with changes in lower limb kinematics across various
261 activities. For knee kinematics, the minimum knee flexion angles during slow, normal, and fast
262 walking paces increased by 4.67°, 4.60°, and 4.04°, respectively. During stair ascent, the
263 minimum knee flexion angle also increased by 2.06°, whereas the peak knee flexion angle
264 decreased by 1.88°.

265 Similarly, the ankle joint increased the maximum angle during slow and fast walking paces
266 (0.77° and 0.93°) and both the minimum and maximum angles during stair ascent (4.58° and
267 2.86°). On the contrary, the hip kinematics did not show significant changes in any of the
268 evaluated activities.

269

270

Discussion

271 We investigated the effects of IVS on lower limb kinematics in individuals two months post-
272 ACLR. Our findings demonstrated that IVS increased the knee's minimum flexion angle across
273 slow, normal, and fast walking paces. Further, IVS significantly increased the first peak knee
274 flexion angle during the slow and normal paces.

275 Given that the typical duration of the gait cycle is approximately 0.98-1.07 seconds,¹⁷ the
276 observed difference between the minimum knee flexion angle just before heel strike and the

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

277 first peak at weight acceptance is approximately 100 milliseconds. We speculate that IVS might
278 cause a stronger quadriceps contraction and has a pain reduction effect during the stance phase,
279 where the participant has his weight on the injured leg, lasting from heel strike to weight
280 acceptance.¹⁸ Therefore, future investigations should assess the effects of different timings of
281 the IVS to induce vibration at a specific location during the gait cycle.

282 Comparing this study's findings with those of other studies, our results align with a previous
283 study that utilized IVS for knee pathologies⁹, albeit in an older population with mixed knee
284 pathologies. This study reported a trend toward higher knee flexion during the loading response
285 ($16.4^{\circ} \pm 5.5$ control, $16.9^{\circ} \pm 5.3$ IVS), although it did not specifically assess the minimum knee
286 flexion angle. The bigger differences in the current study may be due to the more acute nature
287 of ACLR.

288 Further, another study examining different vibration modalities' effects on muscle activation
289 during squatting demonstrated improved quadriceps activation among patients four years post-
290 ACLR, highlighting the applicability in this population. However, this study didn't report on
291 the kinematic changes of the lower limb following the IVS.¹⁹ In alignment with our research,
292 Blackburn et al. (2020) demonstrated that vibration therapy could effectively improve gait
293 biomechanics linked to posttraumatic knee osteoarthritis, further supporting the idea of the
294 potential of different vibrational interventions in enhancing long-term joint health post-ACL
295 reconstruction.²⁰

296 Next, we found kinematic changes during stair ascent while using the IVS device, with a
297 significantly higher minimum flexion angle compared to the sham group. This finding contrasts
298 a previous study by Fischer et al. (2021), who observed no changes in the knee flexion angle
299 during stair ascent and a reduction in the knee flexion angle during stair descent among patients

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

300 with knee pain.¹⁴ This inconsistency may be due to their study's older and heterogenous
301 population.

302 The clinical implications of the observed changes in knee kinematics are significant for
303 individuals undergoing post-ACLR rehabilitation, suggesting a potential for IVS to improve
304 quadriceps avoidance gait, potentially reducing the risk of posttraumatic osteoarthritis by
305 enhancing the knee's ability to absorb force during weight acceptance.

306 **Study Limitations**

307 It is important to acknowledge this study's limitations. It is important to note that the findings
308 are from a relatively small sample size, which may affect the generalizability of the results to
309 a broader population. However, the statistical significance achieved despite the small cohort
310 underscores the potential efficacy of the intervention. Next, the lack of blindness may introduce
311 bias. In our study, the nature of the intervention—where participants were aware of the device's
312 activation (IVS or sham)—presents a potential limitation. Still, our analysis focused on
313 objective kinematic measurements, which are less susceptible to bias.

314 Further, this study primarily evaluated the immediate kinematic effects of IVS, providing
315 insights into early rehabilitation outcomes. However, the long-term clinical significance of
316 these changes remains unexplored. Additionally, while inertial measurement sensors offer
317 ecological validity, they lack optimal validity compared to camera-based motion capture
318 systems; therefore, healthy controls are included for accurate comparisons.¹⁶

319 Future research with larger sample sizes is essential to validate these findings, explore the
320 intervention's applicability across diverse populations and activities, and focus on the long-
321 term effects and clinical implications of IVS in ACLR populations.

322

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

323

Conclusions

324 IVS around the knee and synced to the gait cycle increase knee flexion during gait at different
325 speeds and stair ascent. Further research is needed to explore the long-term effects of IVS and
326 the clinical meaning of these changes.

327

328

329

330


331

Acknowledgments

332 KneeMo devices were provided by SDI SomaTX Design Inc.

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR


334 **Figure 1.** Points of interest during the gait cycle in the knee, hip and ankle joints.



359 Gait cycle graphs for each of the lower limb joints with the points of interest marked for each
360 of the joints.

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

361 **Figure 2.** CONSORT Flow Diagram



Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

364 **Table 1.** Demographics of the participants.

	Participants with ACLR (n=27)			Healthy Participants (n=24)
	Sham Group (n=12)	IVS Device Group (n=15)	p	
365 Age (years)	25.8 ± 7.1	21.7 ± 3.7	.066	28.6 ± 5.8
366 Sex (%)				
367 Males	10	11		13 (54.2)
368 Females	2	4		11 (45.8)
369 Height (m)	1.81 ± 0.1	1.75 ± 0.1	.060	1.68 ± 0.1
370 Weight (kg)	79.3 ± 9.8	73.3 ± 12.2	.175	65.0 ± 15.0
371 The time between injury and reconstruction (days)	255 ± 194	214 ± 152	.555	N/A
372 Graft (%)				
373 Hamstrings	9	8		N/A
BTB	2	3		
374 Quadriceps	0	4		
Allograft	1	0		

375 Two-sided paired sample t-test. *Significant at P<.05

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

376 **Table 2.** Knee sagittal angle of the participants while walking by group.

Walking Pace	Angle°	ACLR (n=27)		p-value	Healthy Participants (n=24)		p-value
		Injured	Contralateral		Left	Right	
Slow	Minimum	1.1 ± 3.1	-3.3 ± 2.3	<.001	-3.5 ± 3.3	-2.7 ± 3.3	.155
	First Peak	10.2 ± 5	9.4 ± 7.6	.486	6.9 ± 8.2	8 ± 7.6	.103
	Second Peak	55.6 ± 6.1	60.7 ± 4.5	<.001	59 ± 4.3	60.3 ± 3.9	.098
Normal	Minimum	1 ± 3.1	-3.8 ± 2.6	<.001	-3.4 ± 3.8	-2.7 ± 3.5	.058
	First Peak	12.8 ± 4.9	14.1 ± 6.5	.287	14.8 ± 6.5	15.3 ± 7.1	.347
	Second Peak	60.1 ± 7	63.3 ± 5.1	.003	62.2 ± 3.8	63.3 ± 4.3	.111
Fast	Minimum	2.1 ± 4	-2.5 ± 2.8	<.001	-2 ± 4.6	-1.6 ± 3.7	.529
	First Peak	16.2 ± 5.1	21.4 ± 4.7	<.001	20.2 ± 6	21.4 ± 6.7	.100
	Second Peak	61.1 ± 5.4	62.9 ± 4.6	.047	61.6 ± 4.1	62.2 ± 4.3	.390

377 Two-sided paired sample t-test for both legs of each cohort. *Significant at P<.05

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

378 **Table 3.** Baseline and Intervention Sessions, Angle Differences, and Effect Sizes for Knee
 379 Angles During Walking at Three Different Paces.

Walking Pace	Angle°	Group	Baseline (without device)	Intervention (with device)	Group by Time Interaction (p-value)	Main Effects (p-value)	
						Time	Group
Slow	Minimum	Sham	-0.3 ± 2.7	0.5 ± 2.8	.019*	<.001*	.007*
		IVS	2.1 ± 2.9	5.1 ± 4.1			
	First Peak	Sham	9.1 ± 4.1	9.9 ± 4.1	.07	<.001*	.25
		IVS	11.1 ± 5.6	12.9 ± 5.6			
	Second Peak	Sham	54.2 ± 5.6	54.9 ± 4.4	.66	0.76	.34
		IVS	56.8 ± 6.3	57.3 ± 6.9			
Normal	Minimum	Sham	-0.1 ± 2.4	0.7 ± 3.1	.007*	<.001*	.011*
		IVS	1.9 ± 3.3	5.3 ± 3.9			
	First Peak	Sham	11.6 ± 4.7	12.1 ± 4.9	.16	.018*	.15
		IVS	13.8 ± 4.9	15.6 ± 5.4			
	Second Peak	Sham	58.5 ± 8.3	59.8 ± 5.1	.14	.70	.45
		IVS	61.4 ± 5.7	60.6 ± 6.3			
Fast	Minimum	Sham	0.9 ± 2.8	1.3 ± 3.2	.06	.008*	.045*
		IVS	3.1 ± 4.6	5.4 ± 4.6			
	First Peak	Sham	15.4 ± 5.1	15.5 ± 4.4	.56	.42	.37
		IVS	16.8 ± 5.1	17.5 ± 5.6			
	Second Peak	Sham	59.6 ± 5.1	62.2 ± 5.6	.47	.30	.27
		IVS	59.5 ± 4.3	61.5 ± 5.9			

380 Abbreviations: IVS (Intermittent Vibrational Stimulation)

381 Two-way mixed ANOVA. *Significant at P<.05

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

382 **Table 4.** Baseline and Intervention Sessions, Angle Differences, and Effect Sizes for the
 383 Lower Limbs Angles During Stair Ascent.

Joint	Angle°	Group	Baseline (without device)	Intervention (with device)	Group by Time Interaction (p-value)	Main Effects (p-value)	
						Time	Group
Hip	Minimum	Sham	13.7 ± 6.9	14 ± 8.4	.47	.73	.52
		IVS	11.9 ± 11.2	11.1 ± 10			
	Maximum	Sham	64.8 ± 7.7	65 ± 8.5	.23	.33	.45
		IVS	63.2 ± 9.1	61.5 ± 9.5			
Knee	Minimum	Sham	13.9 ± 4.9	14.5 ± 4.8	.18	.019*	.85
		IVS	12.9 ± 4.5	14.9 ± 5.1			
	Maximum	Sham	83.2 ± 7.8	83.5 ± 7.9	.023*	.093	.47
		IVS	82.2 ± 6.8	80.3 ± 6.7			
Ankle	Minimum	Sham	-6.8 ± 5.8	-7.4 ± 7.4	.037*	.10	.55
		IVS	-11.2 ± 6.9	-6.6 ± 10.4			
	Maximum	Sham	22.7 ± 3.9	23.1 ± 6.3	.13	.041*	.91
		IVS	21.3 ± 4.5	24.1 ± 5.7			

384 Abbreviations: IVS (Intermittent Vibrational Stimulation)

385 Two-way mixed ANOVA. *Significant at P<.05

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

386 **Table 5.** Baseline and Intervention Sessions, Angle Differences, and Effect Sizes for Ankle
 387 Angles During Walking at Three Different Paces.

Walking Pace	Angle°	Group	Baseline (without device)	Intervention (with device)	Group by Time Interaction (p-value)	Main Effects (p-value)	
						Time	Group
Slow	Minimum	Sham	-15.5 ± 4.8	-14.8 ± 3.6	.24	.68	.91
		IVS	-14.1 ± 7.9	-15.6 ± 8.5			
	Maximum	Sham	16.6 ± 2.1	17 ± 2.1	.37	.007*	.72
		IVS	16.1 ± 2.4	16.9 ± 2.3			
Normal	Minimum	Sham	-19.4 ± 6.5	-19.7 ± 6.1	.74	.51	.78
		IVS	-19.7 ± 8.6	-20.7 ± 5.9			
	Maximum	Sham	16.3 ± 2.4	15.7 ± 3.2	.29	.13	.71
		IVS	16.4 ± 2.7	16.3 ± 2.8			
Fast	Minimum	Sham	-23.1 ± 7.6	-22.5 ± 8.7	.33	.98	.44
		IVS	-24.5 ± 5.7	-25 ± 4.9			
	Maximum	Sham	14.7 ± 2.9	15 ± 3.1	.09	.003*	.57
		IVS	13.7 ± 3.4	14.6 ± 3.4			

388 Abbreviations: IVS (Intermittent Vibrational Stimulation)

389 Two-way mixed ANOVA. *Significant at P<.05

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

390 **Table 6.** The Effects of intermittent muscle vibration on the lower limb kinematics during
 391 walking at different paces and stair ambulation.

Variables (Angle°)	Walking			Stair ambulation	
	Slow	Normal	Fast	Ascent	Descent
Knee					
Minimum	↑ 4.67°	↑ 4.60°	↑ 4.04°	↑ 2.06°	—
First peak	↑ 2.35°	↑ 1.77°	—	↓ 1.88°	—
Second peak	—	—	—	N/A	
Hip					
Minimum	—	—	—	—	—
Maximum	—	—	—	—	—
Ankle					
Minimum	—	—	—	↑ 4.58°	—
Maximum	↑ 0.77°	—	↑ 0.93°	↑ 2.86°	—

392 ↑ = increased angle. ↓ = decreased angle.

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

393 **Suppliers**

394 SDI SomaTX Design Inc. Minden, Nevada

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

395 **References**

- 396 1. Murray MM, Vavken P, Fleming B. *The ACL Handbook*. New York, NY: Springer New
397 York; 2013.
- 398 2. Beischer S, Gustavsson L, Senorski EH, et al. Young Athletes Who Return to Sport
399 Before 9 Months After Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Have a Rate of New
400 Injury 7 Times That of Those Who Delay Return. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*.
401 2020;50(2):83-90.
- 402 3. Erhart-Hledik JC, Chu CR, Asay JL, Andriacchi TP. Longitudinal changes in knee gait
403 mechanics between 2 and 8 years after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Journal*
404 *of orthopaedic research : official publication of the Orthopaedic Research Society*.
405 2018;36(5):1478-1486.
- 406 4. Kaur M, Ribeiro DC, Theis J-C, Webster KE, Sole G. Movement Patterns of the Knee
407 During Gait Following ACL Reconstruction: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
408 *Sports medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*. 2016;46(12):1869-1895.
- 409 5. Kaur M, Ribeiro DC, Webster KE, Sole G. Knee biomechanics while navigating steps in
410 participants with anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction, between 2 and 10 years
411 following surgery. *Physical therapy in sport : official journal of the Association of*
412 *Chartered Physiotherapists in Sports Medicine*. 2020;46:70-76.
- 413 6. Berchuck M, Andriacchi TP, Bach BR, Reider B. Gait adaptations by patients who have a
414 deficient anterior cruciate ligament. *The Journal of bone and joint surgery. American*
415 *volume*. 1990;72(6):871-877.
- 416 7. Rudolph KS, Eastlack ME, Axe MJ, Snyder-Mackler L. 1998 Basmajian Student Award
417 Paper: Movement patterns after anterior cruciate ligament injury: a comparison of patients
418 who compensate well for the injury and those who require operative stabilization. *Journal*
419 *of electromyography and kinesiology : official journal of the International Society of*
420 *Electrophysiological Kinesiology*. 1998;8(6):349-362.
- 421 8. Favre J, Jolles BM. Gait analysis of patients with knee osteoarthritis highlights a
422 pathological mechanical pathway and provides a basis for therapeutic interventions.
423 *EFORT open reviews*. 2016;1(10):368-374.
- 424 9. Fischer AG, Erhart-Hledik JC, Asay JL, Chu CR, Andriacchi TP. Activating the
425 somatosensory system enhances net quadriceps moment during gait. *Journal of*
426 *biomechanics*. 2019;82:149-155.
- 427 10. Fischer AG, Erhart-Hledik JC, Asay JL, Chu CR, Andriacchi TP. Utilizing the
428 somatosensory system via vibratory stimulation to mitigate knee pain during walking:
429 Randomized clinical trial. *Gait & posture*. 2020;80:37-43.
- 430 11. Hall M, Stevermer CA, Gillette JC. Gait analysis post anterior cruciate ligament
431 reconstruction: knee osteoarthritis perspective. *Gait & posture*. 2012;36(1):56-60.
- 432 12. Buckthorpe M, Della Villa F. Optimising the 'Mid-Stage' Training and Testing Process
433 After ACL Reconstruction. *Sports medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*. 2020;50(4):657-678.
- 434 13. Boutron I, Altman DG, Moher D, Schulz KF, Ravaud P. CONSORT Statement for
435 Randomized Trials of Nonpharmacologic Treatments: A 2017 Update and a CONSORT
436 Extension for Nonpharmacologic Trial Abstracts. *Annals of internal medicine*.
437 2017;167(1):40-47.
- 438 14. Fischer AG, Erhart-Hledik JC, Asay JL, Andriacchi TP. Intermittent vibrational
439 stimulation enhances mobility during stair navigation in patients with knee pain. *Gait &*
440 *posture*. 2021;86:125-131.

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

- 441 15. Brinkerhoff SA, Murrah WM, Hutchison Z, Miller M, Roper JA. Words matter:
442 instructions dictate "self-selected" walking speed in young adults. *Gait & posture*. 2019.
- 443 16. Al-Amri M, Nicholas K, Button K, Sparkes V, Sheeran L, Davies JL. Inertial
444 Measurement Units for Clinical Movement Analysis: Reliability and Concurrent Validity.
445 *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*. 2018;18(3).
- 446 17. MURRAY MP, DROUGHT AB, KORY RC. WALKING PATTERNS OF NORMAL
447 MEN. *The Journal of bone and joint surgery. American volume*. 1964;46:335-360.
- 448 18. Corum M, Topkara B, Kokce M, et al. The reflex mechanism underlying the
449 neuromuscular effects of whole-body vibration: Is it the tonic vibration reflex? *Journal of*
450 *Musculoskeletal & Neuronal Interactions*. 2022;22(1):37-42.
- 451 19. Pamukoff DN, Pietrosimone B, Lewek MD, et al. Whole-Body and Local Muscle
452 Vibration Immediately Improve Quadriceps Function in Individuals With Anterior
453 Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*.
454 2016;97(7):1121-1129.
- 455 20. Blackburn T, Padua DA, Pietrosimone B, et al. Vibration improves gait biomechanics
456 linked to posttraumatic knee osteoarthritis following anterior cruciate ligament injury.
457 *Journal of orthopaedic research : official publication of the Orthopaedic Research*
458 *Society*. 2021;39(5):1113-1122.
- 459

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

460 **Figure legends**

461

462

463 **Figure 1.** Points of interest during the gait cycle in the knee, hip and ankle joints.

464 Gait cycle graphs for each of the lower limb joints with the points of interest marked for each
465 of the joints.

466

467

468 **Figure 2.** CONSORT Flow Diagram

469

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

470 **Appendix 1.** Hip sagittal angle of the participants by group

Walking Pace	Angle°	ACLR (n=27)		p value	Healthy Participants (n=24)		p-value
		Injured	Contralateral		Left	Right	
Slow	Minimum	-9.2 ± 5.3	-11.3 ± 5.4	.031*	-10.5 ± 8.4	-11.6 ± 5.3	.578
	Maximum	24 ± 4.6	26.2 ± 4.4	<.001*	24.7 ± 5.3	25.9 ± 4.5	.017*
Normal	Minimum	-11.1 ± 5.8	-13.5 ± 5.6	.017*	-13.8 ± 4.8	-13.3 ± 4.7	.237
	Maximum	27 ± 4.9	28.7 ± 4.3	.001*	29 ± 5.5	29.5 ± 4.8	.340
Fast	Minimum	-11.8 ± 6.2	-15.1 ± 6.1	.003*	-15.4 ± 5.1	-14.9 ± 4.5	.392
	Maximum	31 ± 6.1	32.6 ± 5.5	.008*	34.4 ± 7	34.8 ± 6.6	.297

471 Two-sided paired sample t-test for the right and left leg of each cohort.

472 Two-way mixed ANOVA. *Significant at P<.05

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

473 **Appendix 2.** Ankle sagittal angle of the participants by group

Walking Pace	Angle°	ACLR (n=27)		p value	Healthy Participants (n=24)		p-value
		Injured	Contralateral		Left	Right	
Slow	Minimum	-14.7 ± 6.6	-17.3 ± 5.7	.019*	-19.2 ± 7.3	-16.7 ± 6.1	.002*
	Maximum	16.4 ± 2.3	14.7 ± 2.4	.012*	14.6 ± 3.2	14.8 ± 3.6	.506
Normal	Minimum	-19.6 ± 7.6	-21.5 ± 6.1	.136	-22.2 ± 6.6	-20.9 ± 6.2	.070
	Maximum	16 ± 2.9	14.3 ± 3	.022*	15.4 ± 3.1	15.5 ± 3.7	.917
Fast	Minimum	-23.9 ± 6.5	-26.1 ± 5.6	.063	-26.5 ± 6.7	-25.4 ± 6.6	.147
	Maximum	14.1 ± 3.2	12.8 ± 2.9	.062	13.6 ± 3.3	14.2 ± 3.1	.169

474 Two-sided paired sample t-test for the right and left leg of each cohort.

475 Two-way mixed ANOVA. *Significant at P<.05

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

476 **Appendix 3.** Baseline and Intervention Sessions, Angle Differences, and Effect Sizes for Hip
 477 Angles During Walking at Three Different Paces

Walking Pace	Angle°	Group	Baseline (without device)	Intervention (with device)	Group by Time Interaction (p-value)	Main Effects (p-value)	
						Time	Group
Slow	Minimum	Sham	-9.4 ± 5.2	-9.8 ± 5.1	.55	.55	.91
		IVS	-9.1 ± 5.6	-10.3 ± 5.8			
	Maximum	Sham	24.4 ± 4.6	24.7 ± 4.7	.93	.42	.48
		IVS	23.5 ± 4.7	23.5 ± 5.1			
Normal	Minimum	Sham	-10.9 ± 5.7	-11.7 ± 5.2	.42	.47	.96
		IVS	-11.2 ± 6.1	-11.2 ± 5.6			
	Maximum	Sham	27.9 ± 4.5	27.6 ± 4.5	.39	.77	.51
		IVS	26.2 ± 5.2	26.7 ± 6.1			
Fast	Minimum	Sham	-11.3 ± 5.7	-12.1 ± 5.4	.57	.27	.81
		IVS	-12.2 ± 6.7	-12.4 ± 6.4			
	Maximum	Sham	31.8 ± 5.4	31.1 ± 5.7	.68	.31	.63
		IVS	30.4 ± 6.7	30.1 ± 7.1			

478 Abbreviations: IVS (Intermittent Vibrational Stimulation)

479 Two-way mixed ANOVA. *Significant at P<.05

Intermittent Vibrational after ACLR

480 **Appendix 4.** Baseline and Intervention Sessions, Angle Differences, and Effect Sizes for the
 481 Lower Limbs Angles During Stair **Descent** (n=26)

482

Joint	Angle°	Group	Baseline (without device)	Intervention (with device)	Group by Time Interaction (p-value)	Main Effects (p-value)	
						Time	Group
Hip	Minimum	Sham	13.1 ± 5.1	13.4 ± 5.1	.22	.45	.75
		IVS	12.8 ± 10.9	11.7 ± 10.4			
	Maximum	Sham	34.7 ± 7.1	36.2 ± 6.4	.06	.96	.35
		IVS	33.1 ± 9.5	31.6 ± 10.2			
Knee	Minimum	Sham	11.6 ± 4.9	12.8 ± 4.8	.64	.10	.85
		IVS	12.3 ± 5.3	12.9 ± 5.4			
	Maximum	Sham	78.7 ± 14.4	82.9 ± 7.8	.10	.38	.88
		IVS	80.9 ± 8.2	79.6 ± 10.2			
Ankle	Minimum	Sham	-25 ± 5.3	-24.8 ± 5.2	.87	.69	.46
		IVS	-23.4 ± 5.7	-23.1 ± 6.4			
	Maximum	Sham	27.1 ± 7.6	28.3 ± 5.5	.27	.84	.95
		IVS	28.3 ± 5.5	27.4 ± 8.6			

483 Abbreviations: IVS (Intermittent Vibrational Stimulation)

484 Two-way mixed ANOVA. *Significant at P<.05