

Title Page

Effects of a forefoot strengthening protocol on explosive tasks performance and propulsion kinetics in athletes: a single-blind randomized controlled trial

Romain Tourillon^{1,2,*} ; François Fourchet^{2,3} ; Pascal Edouard^{1,4} ; Jean-Benoît Morin^{1,5}

1. University Jean Monnet Saint-Etienne, Lyon 1, University Savoie Mont-Blanc, Interuniversity Laboratory of Human Movement Sciences (EA 7424), F-42023, Saint-Etienne, France
2. Physiotherapy department and motion analysis lab, Swiss Olympic Medical Center, La Tour Hospital, 1217 Meyrin, Switzerland
3. SFMKS Lab, French Sport Physiotherapy Association, Paris, France
4. Department of Clinical and Exercise Physiology, Sports Medicine Unit, University Hospital of Saint-Etienne, Faculty of Medicine, Saint-Etienne, France
5. Sports Performance Research Institute New Zealand (SPRINZ), Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

***Corresponding author:**

Romain Tourillon, PT, MSc, CMP., University Jean-Monnet Saint-Etienne, Lyon 1, University Savoie Mont-Blanc, Interuniversity Laboratory of Human Movement Sciences, F-4023, Saint-Etienne, France. E-mail: romain.tourillon@univ-st-etienne.fr

Short title:

Effects of a forefoot strengthening protocol on propulsion performance in athletes: a randomized controlled trial

Protocol registration:

This randomised controlled trial was reviewed and approved by the Committee for the protection of persons (CPP Ouest III – Poitiers, number: 2022-A00376-37), and was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (Identifier: NCT05574322).

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Funding:

Financial support was obtained for this project by the University of Saint-Etienne and Saint-Etienne Métropole AAP Recherche 2022.

Contributor details:

Romain Tourillon: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft, Funding acquisition

François Fouchet: Conceptualization, Methodology, Resources, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition

Pascal Edouard: Resources, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision

Jean-Benoît Morin: Conceptualization, Methodology, Resources, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition

1 **Abstract**

2 **Purpose:** To investigate the effects of an 8-week “periodized high-load” forefoot strengthening
3 protocol on athlete’s metatarsophalangeal joints (MTPj) flexion torque, MTPj flexors volume,
4 sprint acceleration, cutting, and jumping overall performance and kinetics.

5 **Methods:** Twenty-eight highly-trained athletes were randomized into a TRAINING or control
6 group. Following a 4-week control period, TRAINING performed an 8-week forefoot
7 strengthening protocol (2 sessions per week) followed by a 4-week detraining period.
8 CONTROL group athletes were asked to continue their usual activities. During weeks 1, 5, 14
9 and 18, we assessed MTPj flexion torque, MTPj flexors volume, maximal sprint acceleration,
10 90-degree cutting, vertical and horizontal jumps, and foot-ankle hops. A linear mixed model
11 was used along with individual statistical analyses using the minimal detectable change (MDC).

12 **Results:** TRAINING significantly and substantially increased MTPj flexion torque and MTPj
13 flexors volume (effect size [ES]: 1.36-1.96; $p < 0.001$) with 92% of athletes exceeding the MDC.
14 Subsequently, TRAINING induced significant improvements in cutting and horizontal jumping
15 performance (ES: 0.53-1.14; $p < 0.01$) with 42 to 67% of athletes exceeding the MDC. These
16 gains were partly attributed to enhanced medio-lateral ground reaction force transmission
17 during cutting and increased propulsive horizontal force production and transmission during
18 jumping (ES: 0.38-0.57; $p < 0.05$). Despite no effects on overall sprint acceleration performance,
19 vertical propulsion kinetics at maximal speed improved in TRAINING after intervention (ES:
20 0.87-1.19; $p < 0.01$). No significant differences were found between the results of the
21 interventional and detraining period demonstrating potential long-lasting effects.

22 **Conclusion:** An 8-week “periodized high-load” forefoot strengthening protocol allowed to
23 improve MTPj maximal torque and MTPj flexors volume. This strength gains led also to

24 cutting, horizontal jump overall performance and kinetics improvement as well as greater
25 maximal speed propulsion kinetics. MTPj strength capacity may exert a more substantial impact
26 on performance and kinetics on horizontally and medio-lateral-oriented explosive movements
27 than on vertically-oriented ones.

28

29 **Keywords:**

30 metatarsophalangeal joint strength, cutting, force production, force transmission, horizontal
31 jumping, maximal speed.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43 Manuscript

44 1 Introduction

45 The human foot is a complex structure that comprises multiple joints and degrees of freedom,
46 and plays a crucial role in modulating lower limb energetics (1,2). Recent biomechanical studies
47 have shown that the foot can dissipate ~18% and generate ~12% of the net centre of mass
48 energy during rapid tasks such as running, jumping or hopping (1–3). Beyond its contribution
49 to lower limb energetics, the foot functions as an efficient/modulating lever during propulsion,
50 facilitating the rapid transfer of force from ankle plantar flexors to the ground through to its
51 forefoot region (1,2,4,5). Notably, studies have shown that the reduction in metatarsophalangeal
52 joint (MTPj) stiffness results in decreased positive foot-ankle power during the push-off phase
53 of rapid tasks (1–3). These findings suggest that both the extrinsic foot muscles toe flexors
54 (EFMtf), including the *flexor hallucis longus* and *flexor digitorum longus*, and the intrinsic foot
55 muscles (IFM) actively stiffen the forefoot by generating moments around the MTPj. This
56 action accelerates the center of mass and enhances lower limb force transmission to the ground
57 during propulsion (4,6). Moreover, MTPj strength has been shown to be moderately correlated
58 ($r = 0.38-0.55$) with performance in explosive tasks such various vertical jumps (7), agility tests
59 (8) and more recently, propulsion kinetics at maximal speed during sprinting (9). For these
60 reasons, the potential importance of a “stronger” forefoot to athletic performance enhancement
61 has been widely argued (10–12).

62 However, evidence remains contradictory, and questions persist regarding whether a “stronger”
63 forefoot can indeed enhance sport performance and propulsion kinetics in explosive tasks.
64 Although several intervention studies have demonstrated increased toes or MTPj flexion
65 strength following various strength training protocols (11–15), these gains have not consistently
66 translated into overall performance in explosive tasks, and not in highly-trained populations.

67 For instance, vertical jump height has improved after 6 and 12 weeks of forefoot strengthening
68 protocols in some studies (12,13), while no significant changes were observed after 4, 7 and 8
69 weeks in others (11,14,15). Notably, all studies reported improvements in the horizontal jump
70 length (11–14), suggesting a potentially greater impact of forefoot strengthening on
71 horizontally oriented explosive movements compared to vertically oriented ones. Regarding
72 sprint acceleration, one study reported an improvement in 50-m dash sprint time after 8 weeks
73 of toe flexion strength training (14); however the results used a stopwatch for performance
74 evaluation, which may introduces significant sources of error and limit accuracy. Conversely,
75 a more recent study found no improvement in sprint performance and ground reaction force
76 (GRF) kinetics after 4 weeks of strength training (15). As for cutting tasks, no study to our
77 knowledge has investigated the effects of a forefoot strengthening protocol on cutting time,
78 despite the moderate correlation found between these features (8).

79 Given these inconsistencies, it is possible that the generic protocols and exercises used in these
80 studies, such as the “*short foot, tower curl*” or “*sitting toes isometric flexion*”, while effective
81 in eliciting some MTPj’ strength gain (~+30%), may not be sufficiently relevant for enhancing
82 MTPj biomechanical function during explosive movements (11,16). Moreover, most studies
83 included moderately trained participants and training is testing protocol leading to potential bias
84 toward greatest strength and athletic performance enhancement as it has been shown that these
85 protocols design and exercises are not as effective for trained and highly-trained athletes
86 (15,16). Therefore, this study aims to investigate the effects of an 8-week forefoot strengthening
87 protocol using a “periodized higher-load approach” on (1) MTPj flexion torque (primary
88 outcome), (2) MTPj flexors cross-sectional area (CSA), (3) foot morphology, (4) sprint
89 acceleration, cutting and jumping overall performance, and (5) GRF propulsion kinetics in
90 highly-trained athletes. Based on our clinical experience, and some previous results, we
91 hypothesized that our forefoot strengthening protocol would induce significant MTPj strength

92 gains and foot muscles hypertrophy. Furthermore, consistent with the literature, we
93 hypothesized, that these strength gains would positively affect horizontal jumping performance
94 (11–14), as well as propulsion kinetics at maximal speed during sprint acceleration (9).

95 **2 Methods**

96 **2.1 Overall study design**

97 This study was a single-center, single-blind randomized controlled clinical trial reviewed and
98 approved by the Committee for the protection of persons (CPP Ouest III – Poitiers, number:
99 2022-A00376-37) and registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (Identifier: NCT05574322). To produce
100 the present manuscript, we used the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT)
101 (17) (Figure 1). The overall study procedure design is presented in Figure 2 and details of the
102 intervention and outcomes measurements are presented in the paragraphs below. The entire
103 study (intervention, outcomes and data collection) was conducted at the University of Saint-
104 Etienne within the Interuniversity Laboratory of Human Movement Sciences from January
105 2023 to June 2024 and all participants gave written informed consent before the beginning of
106 the study.

107 *Figure 1. CONSORT (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials) flow diagram illustrating*
108 *the flow of participants through the study.*

109 *Figure 2. Forefoot strengthening protocol intervention design (MTPj, metatarsophalangeal*
110 *joints; dom, dominant; non-dom, non-dominant; GRF, ground reaction forces)*

111 **2.2 Participants**

112 Athletes were recruited from sport science university community and internal network by using
113 infographics and newspaper advertisements. Athletes were eligible for inclusion if they met the
114 following criteria: (1) age between 18 and 40 years and (2) practicing at a regional or national

115 level in the following sports: soccer, rugby, track and field, basketball, handball, volleyball or
116 tennis. Exclusion criteria were: (1) reported foot or ankle pain within the previous 6 months,
117 (2) leg or foot fracture within the past year or severe foot deformity, (3) history of at least one
118 surgery to the lower limb within the past 6 months, (4) prior foot strengthening experience in
119 the past 6 months, (5) contraindication to neuromuscular electrical stimulation (NEMS) such
120 as pacemaker, seizure disorder, or pregnancy and (6) score of Foot Ankle Ability Measure for
121 sport subscale <80% and Cumberland Ankle Instability Tool \leq 23 points (18,19).

122 **2.3 Randomisation and blinding**

123 After the session 2 (during week 5) at the end of baseline/control period, athletes were randomly
124 allocated using a random permuted block randomization (1:1 training group allocation) into: 1)
125 forefoot strengthening group (TRAINING) or 2) a control group (CONTROL) (Figure 1). The
126 randomization sequence was prepared at the University Hospital of Saint-Etienne by an
127 independent operator who generated the allocation sequence using REDCap web application.
128 The operator (RT) who performed all the data collection was blinded to the intervention
129 allocation until the end of the study.

130 **2.4 Intervention**

131 The participants in the TRAINING group undertook an 8-week forefoot strengthening protocol
132 consisting of one supervised session in a gym with at least one strength and conditioning student
133 (sometimes two) and one unsupervised session at home each week (16 sessions in total).
134 Detailed program and exercise execution for the forefoot strengthening protocol are provided
135 in S2. Forefoot strengthening protocol supporting information. In brief, athletes followed a
136 multi-components protocol with 5 exercises aimed at enhancing the “propulsing foot”. The
137 supervised session included 3 exercises: “*forefoot iso-push + NMES*”, “*1st ray dynamic iso-*
138 *hold*” and “*forefoot rebound jumps*” following resistance training fundamentals (progressive
139 overload, variation, specificity, volume, intensity, etc) adjusted every two weeks in training

140 blocks. The unsupervised session comprised 2 exercises performed at home: “*foot-bridge iso-*
141 *hold + NMES*” and “*forefoot iso wall push*” for which participants were provided an NMES
142 device to use throughout the protocol (20). Compliance and fidelity were monitored by filling
143 a training log with compliance defined as the proportion of prescribed exercises completed, and
144 fidelity as the extent to which participant executed the prescribed exercises, sets, repetitions
145 and target loads (21,22). Participants rated the difficulty of each session using a perceived
146 exertion scale (RPE) out of 10 (Borg’s CR-10) (23). Participants in the CONTROL group did
147 not perform (and were not informed about) the forefoot strengthening protocol, and were
148 instructed to maintain their regular sporting activities (weekly sport volume) during the
149 intervention period.

150 **2.5 Outcomes**

151 **2.5.1 Procedures**

152 At the beginning of the first session (week 1), limb dominance was determined using three
153 unskilled tasks and three skilled tasks (24) whereas . Our primary outcome (MTPj maximal
154 isometric flexion torque) was then assessed across seven time points: 1) pre-training at the
155 beginning of the baseline/control period (week 1); 2) pre-training at the end of the 4-week
156 baseline/control period (week 5); 3,4,5) three times during the 8-week training period (week 7,
157 week 9 and week 11); 6) post-training at the end of the training period (week 14) and 7) post-
158 training at the end of the 4-week detraining period (week 18). In parallel, our secondary
159 outcomes (MTPj flexors CSA, foot morphology, sprint acceleration, cutting and jumping
160 overall performance and kinetics) were assessed across four time points at week 1, week 5,
161 week 14 and week 18 (Figure 2). Baseline values of all primary and secondary outcomes were
162 calculated as the mean of session 1 (week 1) and session 2 (week 5) and were compared to
163 session 3 (week 14) to assess the acute effects, and to session 4 (week 18) to evaluate post-
164 detraining effects (Figure 2).

165 ***2.5.2 Primary outcome: Metatarsophalangeal joint (MTPj) maximal isometric flexion***
166 ***torque***

167 MTPj maximal isometric flexion torque was assessed with the MTPj in approximately ~30°
168 dorsiflexion using a custom-built dynamometer equipped with a 6-component force sensor
169 (Nano 25, ATI Industrial Automation, Garner, NC). This dynamometer showed a good test-
170 retest reliability (ICC = 0.85 [95%CI: 0.73, 0.92]) for measuring maximal isometric MTPj
171 flexion torque in healthy athletes (25). Following the methodology of a previously protocol (9),
172 athletes were instructed to “push as hard” as possible during five 5-second contractions with a
173 1-minute rest interval between each effort. Trials were excluded if heel detachment or knee
174 extension was observed (examiner decision). If the coefficient of variation (CV) among the
175 three highest attempts exceeded 5%, additional contractions were required. Force signal was
176 recorded at 1000 Hz using a power-lab data system (16/30-ML880/P, ADInstruments, Bella
177 Vista, Australia), visualized via Labchart software (v7, ADInstrument) and analyzed using a
178 custom-written Python code. The highest force value from the five contractions was considered
179 for further analyses as the “MTPj maximal isometric pushing force” on the z-axis, “MTPj
180 maximal isometric gripping force” on the y-axis, and “MTPj maximal isometric total force” on
181 the yz-resultant time series. The corresponding torques around the MTPj were assessed by
182 multiplying the absolute force by the length of the first ray (total foot length minus truncated
183 foot length) using the Arch Height Index Measurement System (JAKTOOL Corporation,
184 Cranberry, NJ) (26). Additionally, maximal isometric quadriceps (MIQt) and ankle plantar
185 flexors torque (MIPFt) were measured using an isokinetic dynamometer (Con-Trex MJ, CMV
186 AG, Dubendorf, Switzerland) with data visualization and analysis conducted following
187 previously mentioned procedures (9). These evaluations were done only on the dominant side
188 for time constraint and were aimed to monitor the evolution of maximal strength in other

189 muscular groups along the forefoot strengthening protocol as they may also influence force
190 production and transmission in the ground.

191 **2.5.3 Secondary outcomes: MTPj flexors cross-sectional area (CSA) and foot**
192 **morphology**

193 Ultrasound scans were conducted by an experienced operator using a portable musculoskeletal
194 ultrasound system (Esaote, My Lab Sigma, Serie 7410, Genova, Italy) equipped with a 4–15
195 MHz (maximum depth 5 cm) wideband linear array probe. Due to the presence of multiple IFM
196 and EFMtf (~14 muscles) and time constraint, the cross-sectional area of the *abductor hallucis*
197 (AbH) and the *flexor digitorum longus* (FDL) was assessed as they represent both IFM and
198 EFMtf muscle group respectively. Each athlete laid in supine position with the foot-ankle in a
199 stable neutral position at zero degrees and the posterior aspect of the knee supported in
200 approximately 15 degrees of flexion (27). Muscle location was determined based on established
201 protocols (27,28). The CSA of the AbH was obtained along a scanning line perpendicular to
202 the long axis of the foot at the anterior aspect of the medial malleolus. The CSA of FDL was
203 imaged on a transverse line drawn at 50% of the distance between the medial tibial plateau and
204 inferior border of the medial malleolus on the medio-posterior aspect of the tibia. Care was
205 taken to maintain good contact between the probe and skin without applying excessive pressure.
206 All ultrasound images were saved, decoded, and measured by the same operator using Image J
207 software (National Institute for Health, Bethesda, MD, USA). The mean of three measurements
208 were taken on each site (AbH, FDL) and retained for statistical analysis with the probe
209 repositioned between each recording. Foot posture was assessed in a relaxed bipedal standing
210 position using the Foot Posture Index–6 item version (FPI-6) (29), while the foot morphological
211 deformation was assessed using the Arch Height Index Measurement System (26). Consistent
212 with previous methodologies, 1 and 2-dimensional foot morphological deformation was
213 assessed using “navicular drop”, “arch height flexibility” and “foot mobility magnitude” (30).

214 **2.5.4 Secondary outcomes: Sprint acceleration, cutting and jumping tasks**

215 Kinetic data for all explosive tasks were collected using a segment of ~5.4-m (6x900 mm) force
216 platforms (Kistler, Winterhur, Switzerland) embedded in the laboratory ground and interfaced
217 with a laptop running BioWare software (version 5.11, Kistler Instruments Inc., Amherst, NY,
218 USA), with a sampling rate of 2000 Hz. Standardized shoes with a minimalist index of 95%
219 (Saguaro™) were provided to minimize the effect of varying shoe material properties on the
220 performance and kinetic variables measured. The detailed protocol for these tasks is available
221 in S3. Study protocol details supporting information and has been previously described (9). For
222 the sprint acceleration task, participants performed maximal accelerations under three
223 conditions (31): “high-acceleration”, “medium-acceleration”, and “low-acceleration”, allowing
224 for the analysis of GRF over the 0-6 m, 7-13 m and 30-36 m sections, respectively (31). For the
225 cutting task, participants were instructed to “run as fast as possible” for 5 m, make a single and
226 complete foot contact with the force platform, execute a 90° turn, and then sprint “as fast as
227 possible” again for an additional 5 m to the finish line. The jumping tasks involved performing
228 a “vertical and horizontal CMJ”, with participants instructed to “jump as fast and as high as
229 possible” or “as fast and as far as possible”, while keeping their hands on their hips throughout.
230 The best performance trial for each explosive task was retained for statistical analysis.
231 Performance metrics included the best sprint and cutting time, recorded using timing gates
232 system (Microgate, Bolzano, 113 Italy), jump height for “vertical CMJ” based on the impulse-
233 momentum relationship (32) and jump length for “horizontal CMJ”. GRF signals were filtered
234 using a Butterworth low-pass digital filter at a cutoff frequency of 50 Hz. A custom MATLAB
235 script (Mathworks, R2022b, Natick, MA, USA) was used to compute discrete GRF variables
236 as for previous sprint (31,33), cutting (34,35) and jumping (32,36) biomechanics studies. These
237 variables, assessed during the contact phase for sprinting and cutting, and the propulsive phase
238 for jumping, included (a) the impulse (integral over time) of the vertical (F_z) and/or horizontal

239 (Fy) and/or medio-lateral GRF (Fx); (b) the effective impulse of the vertical GRF i.e. the
240 product of the stance phase duration by the average vertical GRF applied above body-weight;
241 (c) the net impulse of the horizontal GRF and the impulse of the positive (propulsive)
242 component of the horizontal GRF; (d) the ratio of forces (RF), i.e the ratio of the step- or phase
243 averaged Fy or Fx component divided by the resultant of the step- or phase averaged GRF
244 (FTot); and (e) the contact time defined by the events of foot-strike and toe-off from the raw
245 GRF data (Fz threshold of 20 N for sprinting and 10 N for cutting). Finally, participants
246 performed a jumping task called “Foot-Ankle Rebound Jumps” (FARJ) (37,38). This test
247 showed excellent test-retest reliability (ICC = 0.92 [95%CI: 0.81, 0.96]) for assessing foot-
248 ankle reactive strength metrics and stretch-shortening cycle (SSC) capacities in athletes (39).
249 Athletes were instructed to jump “as high as possible” while keeping their lower limbs fully
250 extended, and to push against the ground “as quickly as possible” with only a plantarflexion of
251 the ankle and the MTPj during eight jumps (37,38). From the contact and flight time measured
252 with an optoelectronic system (Optojump Next, Microgate, Bolzano, 113 Italy) the mean
253 reactive strength ratio of four jumps (excluding the first and last two jumps of the series) was
254 calculated as it showed the highest acceptable reliability and variability in athletes (39).

255 **2.5.5 Sample size**

256 The sample size was determined based on power calculations: using a conservative mean effect
257 size (Cohen’s $d= 1.84$) derived from all previously mentioned interventional studies (11–15).
258 For the primary outcome (MTPj flexion torque) a total sample size of 18 participants (N=9 per
259 group) was required. Then, with a 5% significance level, a power of 90% and accounting for a
260 20% drop-out rate, a minimal total of 22 participants (11 per group) was required.

261 **2.6 Statistical analyses**

262 Descriptive statistics was applied for all continuous variables, with means and standard
263 deviations reported. Employing an intention-to treat analysis, separate linear mixed effects

264 models (LMMs) were used to evaluate the impact of the TRAINING group on the primary
265 outcome (MTPj flexion torque). Comparable analyses were performed for secondary outcomes
266 related to MTPj flexors CSA, foot morphology, sprint acceleration, cutting and jumping overall
267 performance, and GRF propulsion kinetics in each explosive task. Full factorial models were
268 implemented, incorporating fixed effects for intervention group (TRAINING, CONTROL) and
269 time (baseline, week 14, week 18), along with a random effect to account for between-
270 participant variation. Effect sizes were derived from post-hoc contrasts from LMMs and
271 reported. Additionally, individual-level statistical analysis was employed due to its relevance
272 for sport scientists and practitioners in addition to group-average assessments (40,41). We
273 further examined whether individual changes in each group exceeded the established minimal
274 detectable change (MDC). MDC at a 95% confidence interval was calculated as:
275 $MDC = TE \times 1.96 \times \sqrt{2}$ where TE is the standard deviation of the differences of outcomes
276 during the baseline period between session 1 (week 1) and session 2 (week 5) divided by the
277 square root of 2: $TE = \frac{SD}{\sqrt{2}}$ (42,43). Individuals surpassing the MDC positively (increased
278 performance) were classified as “*positive responders*”, those exceeding it negatively (decreased
279 performance) were “*negative responders*”, while those not surpassing it were “*trivial*
280 *responders*”. The final conclusion of the effects of the forefoot strengthening protocol was
281 drawn at primary and secondary endpoint (week 14 and week 18) from both the linear mixed
282 effects models and individual-level analysis results. The level of significance set at $p < 0.05$ and
283 all data were analysed using JASP (Amsterdam 0.12.2.0).

284 **3 Results**

285 **3.1. Participants**

286 Of 36 individuals initially interested, a total of 28 athletes met inclusion criteria and were
287 enrolled in this study from January 2023 to June 2024 (Figure 1). Athletes practiced soccer

288 (n=6), track and field (n=6), basketball (n=9), handball (n=1), volleyball (n=3) and tennis (n=3).
 289 At baseline, there were no significant differences between TRAINING (n=14) and CONTROL
 290 (n=14) group for sex, age, dominance, height, weight, BMI, body fat percentage, weekly sport
 291 volume or foot-ankle patient-reported outcomes measures ($p>0.05$) (Table 1).

Table 1. Study participant characteristics at baseline

	TRAINING (n=14)		CONTROL (n=14)		p- value
	N (%)	Mean ±SD	N (%)	Mean ±SD	
Gender					
Female	3 (21.4%)		4 (28.6%)		0.663
Male	11 (78.6%)		10 (71.4%)		
Age (years)		23.1 ±4.9		21.6 ±2.7	0.377
Height (cm)		179.9 ±11.0		177.8 ±9.2	0.592
Mass (kg)		72.8 ±9.8		71.5 ±9.2	0.719
BMI (kg/m ²)		22.5 ±1.8		22.6 ±1.7	0.885
Body fat percentage (%)		17.4 ±5.5		19.2 ±4.3	0.343
Dominance					
Right	3 (21.4%)		2 (14.3%)		0.622
Left	11 (78.6%)		12 (85.7%)		
Weekly sport volume (hours/week)		9.6 ±4.9		7.2 ±3.4	0.139
FAAM sport dominant foot (%)		99.7 ±0.8		99.1 ±1.8	0.558
FAAM sport non-dominant foot (%)		98.5 ±3.1		98.7 ±3.3	0.949
CAIT score (dominant foot)		29.0 ±2.4		28.5 ±2.4	0.332
CAIT score (non-dominant foot)		28.6 ±2.0		27.4 ±3.4	0.230

BMI, Body Mass Index; FAAM, Foot and Ankle Ability Measure; CAIT, Cumberland Ankle Instability Tool.

292

293 Of the 14 individuals randomized to the TRAINING group, 2 athletes were unable to complete
294 the entire study protocol and were lost to follow-up after intervention resulting in a 14% drop-
295 out rate whereas one athlete reported pain/discomfort during a session (Figure 1).

296 **3.1 Compliance**

297 TRAINING group achieved a compliance level of $94.3\pm 23.3\%$ and $92.3\pm 27.9\%$ for the
298 supervised and unsupervised sessions respectively, with fidelity rates of $88.4\pm 24.5\%$ and
299 $92.3\pm 28.0\%$. Mean RPE levels were reported as 5.3/10 for supervised sessions and 4.5/10 for
300 unsupervised sessions.

301 **3.2. Primary outcome: MTPj maximal isometric flexion torque**

302 The results of linear mixed model and individual responses results are summarized in Table 2.
303 No significant differences were observed between sessions for the CONTROL group ($p>0.05$)
304 (Table 2). In contrast, the athletes in the TRAINING group significantly increased MTPj
305 maximal isometric flexion torque of their dominant and non-dominant foot for pushing and
306 total torque with large between-group effect size post-training period ($ES\approx 1.36-1.96$; $p<0.001$)
307 and post-detraining period ($ES\approx 1.34-1.72$; $p<0.001$), with improvements exceeding 1.6 to 2.5
308 times MDC scores, respectively. (Table 2, Figure 3). Individuals' responses analysis indicated
309 that 11 out of 12 (92%) athletes were classified as “*positive responders*” across this primary
310 outcome after both post-training and detraining periods (Figure 3).

311 *Figure 3. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and*
312 *individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)*
313 *post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) MTPj relative total torque – dominant*
314 *foot (Nm.kg) and C&D) MTPj relative total torque – non-dominant foot (Nm.kg).*

315

Table 2. Results of linear mixed model and individual responses comparing groups (TRAINING versus CONTROL) after post-training and post-detraining period for relative metatarsophalangeal joints maximal isometric flexion torque and foot muscles cross-sectional area (CSA)

Variable	Group	BASELINE	POST-TRAINING					POST-DETRAINING				
		S1 (week 1) & S2 (week 5)	S3 (week 14)	S3 vs Baseline (Adjusted mean difference)		Between-Group differences	Individual responses	S4 (week 18)	S4 vs Baseline (Adjusted mean difference)		Between-Group differences	Individual responses
		Mean ±SD	Mean ±SD	Δ ± [95% CI]	ES + [95% CI]	ES + [95% CI]	Pos/ Triv/ Neg (% pos)	Mean ± SD	Δ ± [95% CI]	ES + [95% CI]	ES + [95% CI]	Pos/ Triv/ Neg (% pos)
DOMINANT FOOT												
Relative pushing torque (Nm/kg)	Training	0.25 ±0.08	0.33 ±0.07	0.08 [0.06; 0.09]***	1.80 [1.42; 2.17]	1.44 [1.04; 1.81]***	11/1/0 (92%)	0.33 ±0.07	0.07 [0.06; 0.09]***	1.70 [1.30; 2.08]	1.36 [0.98; 1.74]***	11/1/0 (92%)
	Control	0.25 ±0.05	0.25 ±0.06	-0.00 [-0.02; 0.02]	-0.01 [-0.38; 0.35]		1/11/1 (8%)	0.25 ±0.05	-0.00 [-0.02; 0.01]	-0.02 [-0.38; 0.33]		1/11/2 (7%)
Relative gripping torque (Nm/kg)	Training	0.08 ±0.03	0.10 ±0.04	0.02 [0.00; 0.03]*	0.43 [0.11; 0.78]		0/12/0 (0%)	0.10 ±0.04	0.02 [0.00; 0.03]*	0.49 [0.13; 0.84]		0/12/0 (0%)
	Control	0.07 ±0.02	0.08 ±0.03	0.01 [-0.00; 0.02]	0.25 [-0.13; 0.63]	0.25 [-0.13; 0.62]	0/13/0 (0%)	0.08 ±0.03	0.01 [-0.01; 0.02]	0.22 [-0.16; 0.60]	0.29 [-0.08; 0.66]	0/14/0 (0%)
Relative total torque (Nm/kg)	Training	0.26 ±0.08	0.35 ±0.07	0.07 [0.06; 0.09]***	1.80 [1.42; 2.15]	1.36 [1.00; 1.74]***	11/1/0 (92%)	0.34 ±0.07	0.07 [0.06; 0.09]***	1.70 [1.35; 2.08]	1.34 [0.98; 1.72]***	11/1/0 (92%)
	Control	0.26 ±0.05	0.26 ±0.05	0.00 [-0.01; 0.02]	0.07 [-0.28; 0.43]		1/11/1 (8%)	0.26 ±0.05	0.00 [-0.01; 0.02]	0.01[-0.33; 0.35]		1/11/2 (7%)
Abductor hallucis CSA (cm ²)	Training	2.27 ±0.27	2.49 ±0.23	0.18 [0.15; 0.21]***	2.27 [1.89; 2.65]	1.88 [1.51; 2.24]***	11/1/0 (92%)	2.50 ±0.23	0.19 [0.16; 0.22]***	2.41 [2.03; 2.78]	2.13 [1.75; 2.51]***	11/1/0 (92%)
	Control	2.21 ±0.23	2.18 ±0.24	-0.02 [-0.05; 0.01]	-0.24 [-0.60; 0.11]		0/13/0 (0%)	2.19 ±0.24	-0.02 [-0.05; 0.01]	-0.32[-0.70; 0.05]		0/13/1 (0%)
Flexor Digitorum Longus CSA (cm ²)	Training	1.77 ±0.26	1.94 ±0.26	0.18 [0.15; 0.21]***	2.60 [2.22; 2.99]	2.03 [1.66; 2.41]***	11/1/0 (92%)	1.95 ±0.27	0.19 [0.17; 0.22]***	2.78 [2.40; 3.15]	2.12 [1.75; 2.50]***	11/1/0 (92%)
	Control	1.66 ±0.14	1.66 ±0.15	-0.00 [-0.03; 0.02]	-0.06 [-0.42; 0.31]		0/12/1 (0%)	1.66 ±0.13	-0.00 [-0.03; 0.03]	0.01 [-0.38; 0.38]		0/14/0 (0%)
NON-DOMINANT FOOT												
Relative pushing torque (Nm/kg)	Training	0.23 ±0.07	0.31 ±0.07	0.07 [0.06; 0.09]***	2.02 [1.67; 2.40]	1.96 [1.56; 2.34]***	11/1/0 (92%)	0.30 ±0.07	0.07 [0.06; 0.08]***	1.89 [1.54; 2.27]	1.61 [1.23; 1.98]***	11/1/0 (92%)
	Control	0.23 ±0.06	0.22 ±0.06	-0.01 [-0.02; 0.01]	-0.19 [-0.54; 0.16]		0/12/1 (0%)	0.23 ±0.06	0.01 [-0.01; 0.01]	0.06 [-0.35; 0.47]		1/11/2 (7%)
Relative gripping torque (Nm/kg)	Training	0.07 ±0.03	0.09 ±0.03	0.02 [0.01; 0.03]**	0.68 [0.30; 1.02]	0.60 [0.22; 0.94]**	3/9/0 (25%)	0.10 ±0.03	0.03 [0.02; 0.03]***	0.94 [0.57; 1.29]	0.88 [0.54; 1.26]***	3/9/0 (25%)
	Control	0.08 ±0.02	0.08 ±0.01	-0.00 [-0.01; 0.01]	-0.04 [-0.38; 0.30]		0/13/0 (0%)	0.07 ±0.02	-0.01 [-0.01; 0.01]	-0.11 [-0.49; 0.23]		1/12/1 (7%)
Relative total torque (Nm/kg)	Training	0.24 ±0.08	0.32 ±0.07	0.08 [0.06; 0.09]***	2.05 [1.67; 2.43]	1.96 [1.56; 2.34]***	11/1/0 (92%)	0.32 ±0.07	0.08 [0.06; 0.09]***	2.02 [1.65; 2.40]	1.72 [1.35; 2.13]***	11/1/0 (92%)
	Control	0.24 ±0.06	0.23 ±0.06	-0.01 [-0.02; 0.01]	-0.16 [-0.54; 0.19]		0/12/1 (0%)	0.24 ±0.06	0.00 [-0.01; 0.01]	0.03 [-0.30; 0.38]		1/11/2 (7%)

ES, Effect Size; Pos, Positive; Triv, Trivial; Neg, Negative; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p<0.001

318

319

320 **3.3. Secondary outcome: MTPj flexors CSA**

321 No significant differences were observed between sessions for the CONTROL group ($p > 0.05$)
322 (Table 2). Regarding MTPj flexors CSA, athletes in the TRAINING group significantly
323 increased their AbH CSA and FDL CSA on their dominant foot with large between group effect
324 size after post-training period ($ES \approx 1.36-1.96$; $p < 0.001$) and post-detraining period ($ES \approx 1.34-$
325 1.72 ; $p < 0.001$) with improvements exceeding 2.9 to 3.4 times MDC scores, respectively.
326 Individuals' responses analysis indicated that 11 out of 12 (92%) athletes were classified as
327 “*positive responders*” across this secondary outcome after both post-training and detraining
328 periods (Figure 4). No significant differences were detected between sessions or groups for foot
329 morphology, MIQt, and MIPFt variables in either foot (See S4. Table 2 supporting
330 information).

331 *Figure 4. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and*
332 *individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)*
333 *post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) Abductor hallucis cross sectional area*
334 *(CSA) – dominant foot (cm^2) and C&D) Flexor digitorum longus cross sectional area (CSA) –*
335 *dominant foot (cm^2).*

336 **3.4. Secondary outcomes: Sprint acceleration, cutting and jumping overall** 337 **performance**

338 The main results from the linear mixed model and individual response analysis are presented in
339 Table 3, with secondary findings detailed in S4 Table 3 supporting information. No significant
340 differences between sessions were observed for the CONTROL group in any secondary
341 outcomes. In sprinting performance, the TRAINING group showed reductions in 10, 17 and
342 34-meter sprint times; however, these decreases were not statistically significant and fell below
343 the MDC thresholds, with only 0 to 33% of participants classified as “*positive responders*”
344 post-intervention (See S4. Table 3 supporting information). In cutting performance, the

345 TRAINING group significantly reduced 90° cutting times for both dominant and non-dominant
346 feet, with moderate between-group effect sizes post-training (ES=0.53; $p<0.01$) and post-
347 detraining (ES=0.61-0.65; $p<0.001$), though these reductions did not surpass MDC scores
348 (Figures 5 & 6). Post-training, 33% of athletes were positive responders for the dominant foot,
349 increasing to 42% post-detraining; for the non-dominant foot, the rates were 50% and 58%,
350 respectively. Concerning jumping performance, the TRAINING group significantly increased
351 vertical CMJ jump height and FARJ reactive strength ratio, with small to moderate between-
352 group effect sizes (ES=0.44-0.71; $p<0.05$), yet these gains did not exceed MDC scores (See S4.
353 Figure 1 supporting information) with only 0 to 17% of “*positive responders*” identified post-
354 intervention (See S4. Table 3 supporting information). Conversely, horizontal CMJ jump length
355 showed significant increases with large between-group effect sizes (ES=1.03-1.14; $p<0.001$)
356 post-training and detraining, surpassing MDC scores by 1.5 to 1.1 times, respectively (Figure
357 7). “*Positive responders*” accounted for 67% post-training and 58% post-detraining (Table 3).

358 *Figure 5. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and*
359 *individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)*
360 *post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) Cutting time – dominant foot (s);*
361 *C&D) Medio-lateral ratio of forces (RF) during cutting – dominant foot (%).*

362 *Figure 6. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and*
363 *individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)*
364 *post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) Cutting time – non-dominant foot (s);*
365 *C&D) Medio-lateral RF during cutting – non-dominant foot (%).*

366 *Figure 7. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and*
367 *individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)*

- 368 *post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) Horizontal CMJ jump length (m);*
- 369 *C&D) Horizontal concentric impulse – horizontal countermovement jump (CMJ) (BW.s).*

Table 3. Main results of linear mixed model and individual responses comparing groups (TRAINING versus CONTROL) after post-training and post-detraining period for overall performance during cutting and jumping and ground reaction force performance kinetics during sprinting, cutting and jumping

Variable	Group	BASELINE	POST-TRAINING				POST-DETRAINING					
		S1 (week 1) & S2 (week 5)	S3 (week 14)	S3 vs Baseline (Adjusted mean difference)		Between-Group differences	Individual responses	S4 (week 18)	S4 vs Baseline (Adjusted mean difference)		Between-Group differences	Individual responses
		Mean ±SD	Mean ±SD	Δ ± [95% CI]	ES ± [95% CI]	ES ± [95% CI]	Pos/ Triv/ Neg (%)	Mean ± SD	Δ ± [95% CI]	ES ± [95% CI]	ES ± [95% CI]	Pos/ Triv/ Neg (%)
OVERALL PERFORMANCE												
Cutting time dominant foot (s)	Trainin g	0.99 ±0.06	0.96 ±0.07	-0.04 [-0.07; -0.00]*	-0.41 [-0.78; -0.05]		4/8/0 (33%)	0.94 ±0.06	-0.06 [-0.09; -0.03]***	-0.72 [-1.09; -0.34]		5/7/0 (42%)
	Contro l	0.99 ±0.05	0.97 ±0.08	-0.02 [-0.05; 0.01]	-0.21 [-0.59; 0.16]	-0.20 [-0.58; 0.17]	2/11/0 (15%)	0.98 ±0.06	-0.01 [-0.04; 0.02]	-0.08[-0.45; 0.29]	-0.61 [-0.96; -0.24]**	0/13/1 (0%)
Cutting time non-dom. foot (s)	Trainin g	1.04 ±0.08	0.96 ±0.06	-0.08 [-0.11; -0.04]***	-0.83 [-1.21; -0.46]		6/6/0 (50%)	0.96 ±0.06	-0.08 [-0.11; -0.05]***	-0.88 [-1.27; -0.50]		7/5/0 (58%)
	Contro l	1.00 ±0.07	0.99 ±0.06	-0.02 [-0.05; 0.02]	-0.19 [-0.56; 0.18]	-0.53 [-0.90; -0.16]**	0/13/0 (0%)	0.99 ±0.06	-0.01 [-0.04; 0.02]	-0.13 [-0.52; 0.25]	-0.65 [-1.01; -0.28]***	1/13/0 (7%)
Horizontal CMJ jump length (m)	Trainin g	2.08 ±0.31	2.24 ±0.26	0.13 [0.09; 0.17]***	1.27 [0.90; 1.65]		8/4/0 (67%)	2.21 ±0.27	0.09 [0.05; 0.13]***	0.92 [0.54; 1.29]		7/5/0 (58%)
	Contro l	2.12 ±0.22	2.13 ±0.24	-0.01 [-0.05; 0.03]	-0.09 [-0.47; 0.28]	1.14 [0.77; 1.51]***	1/12/0 (8%)	2.09 ±0.24	-0.03 [-0.06; 0.01]	-0.30 [-0.67; 0.07]	1.03 [0.66; 1.39]***	0/14/0 (0%)
GRF SPRINTING KINETICS												
30-35m effective vertical impulse (BW.s)	Trainin g	0.11 ±0.01	0.12 ±0.02	0.01 [0.00; 0.02]*	0.87 [0.16; 1.58]		3/1/0 (75%)	0.12 ±0.01	0.01 [0.00; 0.02]***	1.19 [0.47; 1.90]		3/1/0 (75%)
	Contro l	0.11 ±0.02	0.11 ±0.02	0.00 [-0.01; 0.01]	0.01 [-0.63; 0.63]	0.87 [0.24; 1.42]**	0/4/1 (0%)	0.11 ±0.02	0.00 [-0.01; 0.01]	0.04 [-0.55; 0.63]	1.19 [0.55; 1.74]***	1/5/1 (20%)
GRF CUTTING KINETICS												
Medio-lateral ratio of forces -dominant (%)	Trainin g	38.4 ±3.2	39.9 ±3.3	1.7 [0.1; 3.4]*	0.39 [0.02; 0.76]		4/8/0 (33%)	40.0 ±3.5	1.8 [0.2; 3.4]*	0.41 [0.03; 0.78]		4/8/0 (33%)
	Contro l	39.8 ±2.3	40.0 ±2.5	0.2 [-1.4; 1.8]	0.04 [-0.33; 0.41]	0.31 [-0.06; 0.68]	1/12/0 (8%)	40.0 ±2.4	0.2 [-1.4; 1.7]	0.05 [-0.32; 0.42]	0.34 [-0.03; 0.71]	1/13/0 (7%)
Medio-lateral ratio of forces - non-dom. (%)	Trainin g	36.7 ±3.9	39.5 ±4.0	2.9 [1.1; 4.7]**	0.59 [0.22; 0.96]		5/6/1 (42%)	40.4 ±4.8	3.8 [1.9; 5.7]***	0.75 [0.38; 1.12]		7/5/0 (58%)
	Contro l	38.6 ±2.9	39.3 ±2.7	0.6 [-1.2; 2.4]	0.12 [-0.25; 0.49]	0.42 [0.05; 0.79]*	0/13/0 (0%)	39.2 ±2.8	0.6 [-1.2; 2.3]	0.12 [-0.25; 0.49]	0.57 [0.20; 0.94]**	2/12/0 (14%)
GRF JUMPING KINETICS												
Horizontal concentric impulse (BW.s)	Trainin g	0.08 ±0.01	0.09 ±0.01	0.01 [0.00; 0.01]***	1.13 [0.57; 1.70]		5/7/0 (42%)	0.09 ±0.01	0.01 [0.00; 0.01]**	0.94 [0.38; 1.32]		5/7/0 (42%)
	Contro l	0.08 ±0.01	0.08 ±0.01	0.00 [-0.19; 0.76]	0.38 [0.02; 0.66]	0.38 [0.09; 0.76]*	1/12/0 (8%)	0.08 ±0.01	0.00 [-0.00; 0.00]	-0.05 [-0.57; 0.38]	0.47 [0.19; 0.76]**	0/13/1 (0%)

		I											
Concentric ratio of forces (%)	Trainin g	34.4 ±3.8	36.1 ±4.1	1.9 [0.7; 3.1]**	0.57 [0.20; 0.94]		3/9/0 (25%)	36.6 ±4.5	2.4 [1.1; 3.6]***	0.72 [0.35; 1.09]		4/8/0 (33%)	
	Contro l	36.5 ±3.7	36.9 ±3.6	0.4 [-0.8; 1.6]	0.13 [-0.24; 0.50]	0.42 [0.05; 0.79]*	0/12/1 (0%)	37.1 ±3.5	0.6 [-0.5; 1.8]	0.21 [-0.16; 0.58]	0.50 [0.12; 0.87]**	0/14/0 (0%)	

Non-dom., Non-dominant; CMJ, Countermovement Jump; ES, Effect Size; Pos, Positive; Triv, Trivial; Neg, Negative; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p<0.001

372 **3.5. Secondary outcomes: Specific GRF propulsion kinetics**

373 Significant results from the linear mixed model and individual responses are presented in Table
374 3. In sprinting kinetics, the TRAINING group significantly increased relative effective vertical
375 impulse at maximal speed (30-36 m), with large between-group effect sizes (ES=0.87-1.19;
376 $p<0.001$) post-training and detraining, surpassing MDC scores by 1.0 to 1.3 times (Table 3).
377 Three out of four athletes (75%) were classified as “*positive responders*” after the intervention
378 (Table 3). In cutting kinetics, the TRAINING group significantly increased their medio-lateral
379 force ratio for both dominant and non-dominant feet, with small effect sizes for the dominant
380 foot (ES=0.39-0.41; $p<0.05$) and moderate effect sizes for the non-dominant foot (ES=0.59-
381 0.75; $p<0.01$), although these improvements did not exceed MDC scores (Figure 5 & 6).
382 Between 33% and 58% of athletes were classified as “*positive responders*” after the
383 intervention, with approximately 56% of these athletes also improving their cutting time
384 performance. In jumping propulsion kinetics, the TRAINING group significantly increased
385 their relative concentric horizontal impulse and horizontal force ratio, with moderate to large
386 effect sizes (ES=0.57-1.13; $p<0.01$), yet these gains did not surpass MDC scores (Figure 7; See
387 S4. Figure 2 supporting information). Between 25 and 42% of athletes were classified as
388 “*positive responders*”, with approximately 72% of these athletes also improving their
389 horizontal CMJ jump length performance.

390 **4. Discussion**

391 As hypothesized, our findings revealed that the “periodized higher-load approach” used in this
392 study resulted in substantial and rapid increases in MTPj flexion torque and MTPj flexors CSA,
393 while no changes were observed in foot morphology. Additionally, these strength gains
394 contributed to significant enhancements in cutting and horizontal CMJ performance for a high
395 proportion of “*positive responders*” (42 to 67%), partly due to increased medio-lateral force

396 transmission to the ground during cutting and improved propulsive horizontal force production
397 and transmission during jumping. Although overall sprint performance and acceleration
398 kinetics remained unchanged post-protocol, we observed an increase in vertical propulsion
399 kinetics at maximal speed, confirming our first hypothesis (9). Finally, our results indicated that
400 all these improvements were observed at the immediate end of the protocol, but also tended to
401 last after protocol cessation (4 weeks), since no significant differences were found in
402 TRAINING athletes between the training and detraining periods.

403 **4.2. MTPj maximal isometric flexion torque and MTPj flexors CSA**

404 The results of this study showed that an 8-week “periodized higher-load approach” effectively
405 increases MTPj maximal isometric flexion torque by approximately 30% in both the dominant
406 and non-dominant foot in highly trained athletes. This finding confirmed that MTPj flexors
407 (EFM_{tf} and IFM) are responsive to high-load exercise protocols, achieving significant strength
408 gains within a short period, even in this trained population. The observed increase of MTPj
409 maximal isometric flexion torque aligns with existing literature, which reports an increase of
410 MTP flexion strength by 14% for Nagahara et al. after 4 weeks (15), 18% for Unger et al. after
411 6 weeks (13), 32% for Kokkonen et al. after 12 weeks (12), 35% for Hashimoto et al. after 8
412 weeks (14) and 43% for Goldmann et al. after 7 weeks (11). While our study's strength gains
413 vary from these previous studies, it is worth noting that the latter two (11,14) employed a
414 “testing is training” approach with untrained males, potentially biasing the results toward
415 greater strength increases. Moreover, our study yielded significant effect sizes (1.36-1.96),
416 exceeded MDC scores (1.6 to 3.4 times), and a high “*positive responders*” rate (92%), all based
417 on the variability measurements of our custom-made ergometer during the control period.
418 Although this allows a descriptive comparison with prior studies, our study's unique protocol
419 design and statistical analysis prevent direct comparisons. Notably, our protocol involved
420 significantly less volume (sixteen 35-min sessions) compared to previous studies, which

421 involved much more sessions/volume (24–36 sessions) and much higher weekly session
422 frequencies (3 to 4) (11–14). These observations suggest that the overloading parameters (body
423 over-loading, forward lean, NMES, maximal isometric pushing, etc) and strength training
424 principles (volume, intensity, progression) used in our study were essential to maximize MTPj
425 strength gains in a time-efficient manner. This is further evidenced by our findings that MTPj
426 maximal isometric flexion torque improvement (+17%) was already significant and exceeded
427 the MDC scores by week 9, i.e. the middle of the protocol (Figure 3). Although our protocol
428 focused on “maximal strength” rather than hypertrophy, the TRAINING group also exhibited
429 a 9.2% increase in AbH and FDL CSA post-training and detraining periods, consistent with
430 previous studies reporting approximately 3.8% to 11.0% increases in AbH and FDL CSA after
431 either 8 weeks of daily walking in minimalist shoes (39) or an 8-week low-load toe flexors
432 strengthening protocol with multiple exercises (39–41). While the hypertrophy gains we
433 observed were comparable to those reported in earlier studies, it is noteworthy that these studies
434 involved more than twice our session volume (32 to 56 sessions) and were conducted in
435 untrained individuals, potentially explaining the hypertrophic effects observed in comparison
436 to our population. Similar to MTPj maximal isometric flexion torque, CSA improvements
437 (+5%) were significant very early, (week 9, middle of the protocol) and exceeded the MDC
438 scores (Figure 3). It is well established that strength gains result from a combination of neural
439 and structural factors, with early gains primarily attributed to neural adaptations rather than
440 structural changes (42,43). Therefore, the parallel increases in MTPj flexion torque and MTPj
441 flexors CSA during the first half of the protocol (+17% vs. +5%) suggest that EFMtf and IFM
442 responded similarly to other lower limb muscles and can be trained accordingly. Furthermore,
443 we demonstrated that these changes in muscle morphology did not lead to alterations in foot
444 morphology (e.g., posture, morphological deformation) (See S4. Table 3 supporting
445 information), which contradicts meta-analyses findings (44–46). This discrepancy regarding

446 foot posture may be due to the inherent variability and complexity of foot shape and posture
447 among individuals, and, above all, the difficulty some authors have found in modifying these
448 factors through foot strengthening (47,48). Additionally, while the Arch Height Index
449 measurement system is highly reliable for assessing foot length, width, and dorsal arch height
450 (19), the associated equations for calculating “navicular drop”, “arch height flexibility”, and
451 “foot mobility magnitude” exhibited high variability (coefficient of variation between 18% and
452 36%) over the study period, complicating accurate interpretation. Finally, although outside the
453 primary scope of this study, the observed improvements in MTPj maximal isometric flexion
454 torque and MTPj flexors CSA may have implications for designing rehabilitation and
455 prevention protocols for foot-ankle complex musculoskeletal disorders, as these parameters are
456 known risk factors for conditions such as plantar heel pain (49) or chronic ankle instability (50).

457 **3.2 Cutting**

458 In parallel with the enhancements in MTPj flexors strength and CSA, this study is the first to
459 demonstrate that these gains led to significant improvements in cutting and CMJ horizontal
460 performance, as well as maximal speed propulsion kinetics. Specifically, 40% to 58% of
461 athletes in the TRAINING group were classified as *positive responders* post intervention,
462 showing improved performance time with both the dominant and non-dominant foot. This non-
463 hypothesized effect is unprecedented in the literature, which has presented conflicting evidence
464 on this association. For instance, previous research showed a moderate correlation between
465 relative MTPj pushing strength and agility tests performance (8) while a more recent study
466 found no significant correlation between relative MTPj pushing torque and 90° cutting time,
467 but rather with ankle plantarflexors maximal isometric torque and foot-ankle reactive strength
468 (9). This novel finding might be explained by the fact that the forefoot is the primary zone of
469 peak plantar pressure during side cutting (44), with the MTPj serving as the sole ground contact
470 point for most athletes during the maneuver. Although the foot contributes approximately 14%

471 of the negative work and 3% of positive work during a 45° cutting task (45), our study suggests
472 that improved cutting times in some athletes may result from enhanced medio-lateral force
473 transmission via the MTPj. Indeed, our data revealed that approximately 56% of the “*positive*
474 *responders*” in cutting performance in the TRAINING group also exhibited medio-lateral force
475 ratios, particularly on the non-dominant foot. Given that peak concentric ankle power and ankle
476 plantar flexors isometric torque have been associated with 75° and 90° cutting time performance
477 (9,46), is it plausible that MTPj strength gains facilitate a better medio-lateral force transmission
478 through the ankle plantar flexors. We hypothesize that this force transmission improvement
479 stems from forefoot strength enhancements rather than ankle plantarflexors, as no changes in
480 MIPFt were observed throughout the study (See S4. Table 3 supporting information). The
481 greater rate of “*positive responders*” in the non-dominant foot could be attributed to limb
482 dominance effects during cutting, as previous research has shown that the non-dominant foot-
483 ankle muscles exhibit less neuromuscular control in the frontal plane during a 90° cutting task
484 compared to the dominant limb (47). The initially lower MTPj maximal isometric torque and
485 medio-lateral force ratio in the non-dominant foot before the protocol (Table 2 and 3) may have
486 biased these results towards greater improvements. For “*positive responders*” in cutting
487 performance who did not show an increased medio-lateral force ratio, performance
488 improvements may be attributed to enhanced horizontal force production to the ground (e.g.,
489 relative horizontal impulse), while one athlete improved cutting performance without any
490 significant GRF changes.

491 **3.3 Horizontal jumping**

492 In addition to cutting performance, the second major finding of this study was the improvement
493 in horizontal CMJ performance, with 58% to 67% of athletes in the TRAINING group classified
494 as “*positive responders*”. This finding supports our initial hypothesis and aligns with existing
495 literature, where all authors reported improvements in horizontal jump distance after 7 to 12

496 weeks of toe flexors strengthening protocol (11–14). The impact of MTPj strength on horizontal
497 jump length, rather than vertical CMJ jump height, can be explained biomechanically as athletes
498 must quickly move the trunk ahead of the feet during horizontal CMJ, resulting in MTPj
499 dorsiflexion angle and moments that are more than two and three times greater than during
500 vertical CMJ push-off (11). For optimal performance, the athlete’s body must lean forward
501 during the horizontal jump, shifting the center of force application anteriorly under the toes and
502 increasing the external MTPj moment arm (11,48). This forward lean causes MTPj flexors to
503 counteract the dorsiflexion moment, maintaining the body's segments above the feet in an
504 upright position and enabling them to operate within an optimal force-length relationship
505 (49,50). Notably, the importance of body forward lean, combined with body overloading, in
506 increasing MTPj flexors torque and activity was emphasized in our protocol exercises
507 instructions (see S2. Forefoot strengthening protocol supporting information). It is therefore
508 plausible that post-intervention MTPj strength gains allowed athletes to lean forward more,
509 optimizing their take-off angle for increased jump distance. Beyond potential biomechanical
510 enhancement of MTPj function and body orientation, our results suggest that horizontal CMJ
511 jump length improvements may also stem from enhanced concentric horizontal force
512 production and transmission for some athletes. Specifically, our findings indicate that
513 approximately 76% of “*positive responders*” in horizontal CMJ performance also showed
514 increases in either horizontal concentric impulse or concentric force ratio. As previously
515 mentioned, improved forward body lean during the push-off phase of the horizontal CMJ may
516 allow better body orientation for generating more concentric horizontal force through the MTPj
517 or transmitting more force horizontally, resulting in higher horizontal take-off velocity. We
518 believe that this force production and transmission do not result from quadriceps or ankle
519 plantar flexors strength gains, as MIQt or MIPFt remained unchanged throughout the study (See
520 S4. Table 3 supporting information). For “*positive responders*” in horizontal CMJ performance

521 who did not increased GRF during the propulsive phase, performance improvements may be
522 attributed to enhanced lower limb joints coordination during the flight phase, a key performance
523 indicator for jump length (51). Collectively, this study provides novel evidence of the
524 importance of MTPj in horizontally- oriented jumps rather than vertically-oriented ones.

525 **3.4 Maximal speed**

526 Finally, the last major finding of this study was the improvement of relative effective vertical
527 impulse at maximal sprinting speed (30 to 35 m) for a high proportion of “*positive responders*”
528 (75%) in the TRAINING group, despite no overall sprint performance gains. This finding
529 supports our primary hypothesis, as recent biomechanical research demonstrated that MTPj
530 maximal isometric pushing torque is moderately associated with relative effective vertical
531 impulse at maximal speed rather than with acceleration GRF features (9). These results have
532 significant implications, as previous studies have highlighted the importance of generating large
533 vertical forces over short contact times during the maximal speed phase to achieve higher
534 speeds (33). This study and the present results suggest that greater MTPj strength is crucial for
535 effectively producing high vertical force. This may be explained by the *flexor hallucis longus*
536 (largest volume of the EFMtf and IFM) maximal strength improvement inducing a better force
537 transfer from the proximal shank to the distal part of the foot while working in a near-isometric
538 manner (6). As there is an opposite plantarflexion at the ankle and dorsiflexion the MTPj during
539 the push-off phase (6), the importance of *flexor hallucis longus* maximal strengthening was also
540 emphasized in our protocol with a “*1st ray dynamic iso-hold*” exercise (see S2. Forefoot
541 strengthening protocol supporting information). However, while this GRF feature improved
542 potentially the maximal speed on the 30-35 m section, it did not translate into an overall 34-m
543 sprint time improvement (Table 3). This discrepancy could be due to the athletes’ sprinting 30
544 meters before reaching the force platforms, which may “dilute” kinetic performance and
545 associated sprint speed during a large portion of the task. These findings contrast with previous

546 studies reporting a 50-m dash sprint time improvement after an 8-week toe flexors strength
547 protocol (14) and no sprinting GRF kinetics improvement during a 50-m sprint (15). The
548 discrepancies might be explained by the use of a stopwatch sprint time evaluation in the first
549 study, which introduces significant sources of error, and the averaging of all the sprinting GRF
550 variables over the entire 50-m sprint in the latter study, preventing phase-specific analysis as
551 conducted in our study. Future interventional studies are needed to further elucidate the
552 influence of a well-designed MTPj flexion strengthening protocol on sprinting kinetics and
553 kinematics.

554 **4.3. Training implications**

555 The results discussed above suggest two significant training implications. Firstly, the observed
556 improvements appear to have not only an acute impact but also a long-lasting effect of up to 4
557 weeks, as evidenced by the lack of significant differences between the training and detraining
558 periods. Notably, certain performance and GRF variables (e.g., effective vertical impulse at
559 maximal speed) even showed further increases post-detraining compared to the post-
560 intervention period (Table 3). This suggests a sustained learning effect in utilizing the MTPj
561 and forefoot region, even weeks after the protocol ended, as has been previously demonstrated
562 following a single session of foot electrostimulation under the medial arch (52). Additionally,
563 significant and rapid improvement in MTPj flexion torque and MTPj flexors CSA can be
564 achieved within just 4 weeks, not only after 8 weeks, when employing a “periodized higher-
565 load approach” in forefoot strengthening protocol. These findings are particularly relevant in
566 the “real world” and in the current context, where time efficiency is paramount.

567 **4.4. Strengths and limitations**

568 This study is the first in this area to utilize a three-phase design: control, intervention and
569 detraining. The control phase allowed for the measurement of TE and associated MDC across
570 the group, enabling the detection of performance changes at the replicated single-subject level

571 post-intervention. This individual statistical analysis, combined with typical group-style
572 statistical analyses (e.g., linear mixed model), is particularly valuable for sports scientists and
573 practitioners as it helps increase results' accuracy and clarify conclusions (35,36). Without this
574 more individualized approach, we might have erroneously concluded that our protocol
575 improved vertical CMJ jump height performance, whereas the group's improvement was below
576 the MDC threshold, with no individual "positive responders" (Table 3). Thus, similar trends
577 may have been overlooked in previous studies that relied solely on group-average assessments
578 (11–15).

579 The first limitation of this study was that experimental data for the various sprint acceleration
580 conditions were collected across multiple trials with three distinct starting points, a method
581 previously employed (31) due to the force plates dimensions (see Methods). Nonetheless, the
582 descriptive statistics of mean GRF data during sprint acceleration closely align with data from
583 single trials on a ~52-m force platform segment (33). Secondly, although ultrasonography is
584 not considered as the gold standard to evaluate foot muscles morphology, its reliability and
585 validity have been established elsewhere (27,28). Thirdly, factors influencing muscle training
586 adaptations, such as nutritional intake, were not controlled for practical reasons and may have
587 impacted some outcomes (e.g., CSA). Fourthly, we assessed maximal isometric contractions at
588 only one specific angle for the quadriceps and ankle plantarflexors due to experimental time
589 constraints. Thus, we cannot rule out that these muscles may have increased their dynamic
590 strength, rather than isometric strength, in some athletes in the TRAINING group, potentially
591 affecting overall performance and kinetics outcomes. Finally, the protocol was applied to a
592 sample of young (≤ 35 years) trained athletes, predominantly male (75%). Therefore, it is
593 plausible that the effects of this protocol may differ in less skilled, older athletes, or in a more
594 gender-balanced cohort.

595 **4 Conclusion**

596 In conclusion, this single blind randomized controlled trial showed that a “periodized higher-
597 load” foot strengthening approach led to significant and rapid improvements of MTPj flexion
598 torque and MTPj flexors CSA within 4 weeks and larger improvements after 8 weeks. These
599 strength gains enabled a significant number of athletes (“*positive responders*”) to achieve better
600 medio-lateral force transmission, enhancing cutting performance, improved propulsive
601 horizontal force production and transmission, thereby increasing CMJ horizontal performance,
602 and greater vertical propulsion kinetics at maximal speed. This supports the notion that MTPj
603 strength may have a more substantial impact on horizontally- and medio-laterally-oriented
604 explosive movements performance kinetics than on vertically-oriented ones.

605

606 **Acknowledgments & Conflict of Interest**

607 The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose. Financial support was obtained for this
608 project by the University of Saint-Etienne AAP 2022. The results of this study are presented
609 clearly, honestly, and without fabrication, falsification, or inappropriate data manipulation. We
610 would like to thank all the participants for their participation and Clément Moukoko, Sabri
611 Bouzouik and Thomas Monot for their help on data curation and forefoot strengthening protocol
612 supervision.

613 **References**

- 614 1. Farris DJ, Kelly LA, Cresswell AG, Lichtwark GA. The functional importance of human
615 foot muscles for bipedal locomotion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 29
616 janv 2019;116(5):1645-50.
- 617 2. Smith RE, Lichtwark GA, Kelly LA. The energetic function of the human foot and its
618 muscles during accelerations and decelerations. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 12 juill
619 2021;224(13):jeb242263.
- 620 3. Kessler SE, Lichtwark GA, Welte LKM, Rainbow MJ, Kelly LA. Regulation of foot and
621 ankle quasi-stiffness during human hopping across a range of frequencies. *Journal of*
622 *Biomechanics*. juill 2020;108:109853.
- 623 4. Farris DJ, Birch J, Kelly L. Foot stiffening during the push-off phase of human walking is
624 linked to active muscle contraction, and not the windlass mechanism. *J R Soc Interface*.
625 juill 2020;17(168):20200208.
- 626 5. Smith R, Lichtwark G, Farris D, Kelly L. Examining the intrinsic foot muscles' capacity to
627 modulate plantar flexor gearing and ankle joint contributions to propulsion in vertical
628 jumping. *Journal of Sport and Health Science*. juill 2022;S209525462200076X.
- 629 6. Péter A, Hegyi A, Stenroth L, Finni T, Cronin NJ. EMG and force production of the flexor
630 hallucis longus muscle in isometric plantarflexion and the push-off phase of walking. *J*
631 *Biomech*. 18 sept 2015;48(12):3413-9.
- 632 7. Yamauchi J, Koyama K. Importance of toe flexor strength in vertical jump performance.
633 *Journal of Biomechanics*. mai 2020;104:109719.
- 634 8. Yuasa Y, Kurihara T, Isaka T. Relationship Between Toe Muscular Strength and the Ability
635 to Change Direction in Athletes. *Journal of Human Kinetics*. 15 oct 2018;64(1):47-55.
- 636 9. Tourillon R, Michel A, Fourchet F, Edouard P, Morin JB. Human foot muscle strength and
637 its association with sprint acceleration, cutting and jumping performance, and kinetics in
638 high-level athletes. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2 mai 2024;42(9):814-24.
- 639 10. Tourillon R, Gojanovic B, Fourchet F. How to Evaluate and Improve Foot Strength in
640 Athletes: An Update. *Front Sports Act Living*. 11 oct 2019;1:46.
- 641 11. Goldmann JP, Sanno M, Willwacher S, Heinrich K, Brüggemann GP. The potential of toe
642 flexor muscles to enhance performance. *J Sports Sci*. 2013;31(4):424-33.
- 643 12. Kokkonen J, Bangerter B, Roundy E, Nelson A. Improved performance through digit
644 strength gains. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 1 mars 1988;59(1):57-63.
- 645 13. Unger CL, Wooden MJ. Effect of foot intrinsic muscle strength training on jump
646 performance. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*. nov 2000;14(4):373-8.

- 647 14. Hashimoto T, Sakuraba K. Strength Training for the Intrinsic Flexor Muscles of the Foot:
648 Effects on Muscle Strength, the Foot Arch, and Dynamic Parameters Before and After the
649 Training. *J Phys Ther Sci.* mars 2014;26(3):373-6.
- 650 15. Nagahara R, Yoshizuka K, Inoue S. Influence of increases in toe-flexor strength on sprint
651 and jump performances. *Journal of Trainology.* 20 août 2023;12(2):19-23.
- 652 16. Day EM, Hahn ME. Increased toe-flexor muscle strength does not alter
653 metatarsophalangeal and ankle joint mechanics or running economy. *Journal of Sports*
654 *Sciences.* 2 déc 2019;37(23):2702-10.
- 655 17. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 Statement:
656 updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMC Med.* 24 mars
657 2010;8:18.
- 658 18. Gribble PA, Delahunt E, Bleakley C, Caulfield B, Docherty CL, Fourchet F, et al. Selection
659 criteria for patients with chronic ankle instability in controlled research: a position
660 statement of the International Ankle Consortium. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* août
661 2013;43(8):585-91.
- 662 19. Geerinck A, Beudart C, Salvan Q, Van Beveren J, D'Hooghe P, Bruyère O, et al. French
663 translation and validation of the Cumberland Ankle Instability Tool, an instrument for
664 measuring functional ankle instability. *Foot and Ankle Surgery.* juin 2020;26(4):391-7.
- 665 20. Tourillon R, Bothorel H, McKeon PO, Gojanovic B, Fourchet F. Effects of a single
666 electrical stimulation session on foot force production, foot dome stability and dynamic
667 postural control. *Journal of Athletic Training [Internet].* 10 févr 2022 [cité 21 mai 2022];
668 Disponible sur: [https://meridian.allenpress.com/jat/article/doi/10.4085/1062-6050-](https://meridian.allenpress.com/jat/article/doi/10.4085/1062-6050-0561.21/477706/Effects-of-a-single-electrical-stimulation-session)
669 [0561.21/477706/Effects-of-a-single-electrical-stimulation-session](https://meridian.allenpress.com/jat/article/doi/10.4085/1062-6050-0561.21/477706/Effects-of-a-single-electrical-stimulation-session)
- 670 21. McKay CD, Verhagen E. « Compliance » versus « adherence » in sport injury prevention:
671 why definition matters. *Br J Sports Med.* avr 2016;50(7):382-3.
- 672 22. Gladdines S, Eygendaal D, van Boekel L, Verhagen E, Beumer A. How to optimise the
673 fidelity of exercises in an unsupervised golf injury prevention programme? A pilot study.
674 *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med.* 2024;10(1):e001681.
- 675 23. Lea JWD, O'Driscoll JM, Hulbert S, Scales J, Wiles JD. Convergent Validity of Ratings of
676 Perceived Exertion During Resistance Exercise in Healthy Participants: A Systematic
677 Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med Open.* 8 janv 2022;8:2.
- 678 24. Schneiders AG, Sullivan SJ, O'Malley KJ, Clarke SV, Knappstein SA, Taylor LJ. A valid
679 and reliable clinical determination of footedness. *PM R.* sept 2010;2(9):835-41.
- 680 25. Roma E, Michel A, Tourillon R, Millet G, Morin JB. Reliability and measurement error of
681 a maximal voluntary toe plantarflexion measurement process. *The Foot.* 3 avr 2024;In
682 revision.
- 683 26. Butler RJ, Hillstrom H, Song J, Richards CJ, Davis IS. Arch height index measurement
684 system. *Journal of the American Podiatric Medical Association.* 1 mars 2008;98(2):102-6.

- 685 27. Cameron AF, Rome K, Hing WA. Ultrasound evaluation of the abductor hallucis muscle:
686 Reliability study. *J Foot Ankle Res.* 25 sept 2008;1(1):12.
- 687 28. Mickle KJ, Nester CJ, Crofts G, Steele JR. Reliability of ultrasound to measure morphology
688 of the toe flexor muscles. *J Foot Ankle Res.* 4 avr 2013;6(1):12.
- 689 29. Redmond AC, Crosbie J, Ouvrier RA. Development and validation of a novel rating system
690 for scoring standing foot posture: the foot posture index. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon).*
691 janv 2006;21(1):89-98.
- 692 30. Tourillon R, Six A, Bothorel H, Fourchet F. Are foot posture and morphological
693 deformation associated with ankle plantar flexion isokinetic strength and vertical drop jump
694 kinetics? A principal component analysis. *Sports Biomechanics.* 24 mars 2023;1-15.
- 695 31. Schache AG, Lai AKM, Brown NAT, Crossley KM, Pandy MG. Lower-limb joint
696 mechanics during maximum acceleration sprinting. *J Exp Biol.* 15 nov
697 2019;222(22):jeb209460.
- 698 32. Linthorne NP. Analysis of standing vertical jumps using a force platform. *American Journal*
699 *of Physics.* nov 2001;69(11):1198-204.
- 700 33. Nagahara R, Mizutani M, Matsuo A, Kanehisa H, Fukunaga T. Association of Sprint
701 Performance With Ground Reaction Forces During Acceleration and Maximal Speed
702 Phases in a Single Sprint. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics.* avr 2018;34(2):104-10.
- 703 34. Spiteri T, Cochrane JL, Hart NH, Haff GG, Nimphius S. Effect of strength on plant foot
704 kinetics and kinematics during a change of direction task. *European Journal of Sport*
705 *Science.* nov 2013;13(6):646-52.
- 706 35. Havens KL, Sigward SM. Cutting Mechanics: Relation to Performance and Anterior
707 Cruciate Ligament Injury Risk. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise.* avr
708 2015;47(4):818-24.
- 709 36. McMahon JJ, Suchomel TJ, Lake JP, Comfort P. Understanding the Key Phases of the
710 Countermovement Jump Force-Time Curve. *Strength & Conditioning Journal.* août
711 2018;40(4):96-106.
- 712 37. Nagahara R, Naito H, Miyashiro K, Morin JB, Zushi K. Traditional and ankle-specific
713 vertical jumps as strength-power indicators for maximal sprint acceleration. *J Sports Med*
714 *Phys Fitness.* déc 2014;54(6):691-9.
- 715 38. Bosco C, Tarkka I, Komi P. Effect of Elastic Energy and Myoelectrical Potentiation of
716 Triceps Surae During Stretch-Shortening Cycle Exercise. *Int J Sports Med.* juin
717 1982;03(03):137-40.
- 718 39. Tourillon R, Fourchet F, Edouard P, Morin JB. Test-Retest Reliability and Usefulness of
719 a Foot-Ankle Rebound-Jump Test for Measuring Foot-Ankle Reactive Strength in Athletes.
720 *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 17 juill 2024;1-4.
- 721 40. Bishop C, Lake J, Loturco I, Papadopoulos K, Turner A, Read P. Interlimb Asymmetries:
722 The Need for an Individual Approach to Data Analysis. *J Strength Cond Res.* 1 mars
723 2021;35(3):695-701.

- 724 41. Harry J, Hurwitz J, Agnew C, Bishop C. Statistical Tests for Sports Science Practitioners:
725 Identifying Performance Gains in Individual Athletes. *The Journal of Strength and*
726 *Conditioning Research*. 25 oct 2023;
- 727 42. Charter RA. Effect on measurement error on tests of statistical significance. *J Clin Exp*
728 *Neuropsychol*. juin 1997;19(3):458-62.
- 729 43. Weir JP. Quantifying test-retest reliability using the intraclass correlation coefficient and
730 the SEM. *J Strength Cond Res*. févr 2005;19(1):231-40.
- 731 44. Husain E, Angioi M, Mehta R, Barnett DN, Okholm Kryger K. A systematic review of
732 plantar pressure values obtained from male and female football and the test methodologies
733 applied. *Footwear Science*. 1 sept 2020;12(3):217-33.
- 734 45. Liew BXW, Sullivan L, Morris S, Netto K. Mechanical work performed by distal foot-
735 ankle and proximal knee-hip segments during anticipated and unanticipated cutting. *Journal*
736 *of Biomechanics*. juin 2020;106:109839.
- 737 46. Marshall BM, Franklyn-Miller AD, King EA, Moran KA, Strike SC, Falvey EC.
738 Biomechanical factors associated with time to complete a change of direction cutting
739 maneuver. *J Strength Cond Res*. oct 2014;28(10):2845-51.
- 740 47. Wu CX, Liu HB, Zhao ZN, Wang YB, Luan ZL. Effects of movement direction and limb
741 dominance on ankle muscular force in sidestep cutting. *Medical Engineering & Physics*. 1
742 déc 2022;110:103914.
- 743 48. Jia SW, Lam WK, Huang Z, Baker JS, Ugbohue UC, Gu Y. Influence of
744 metatarsophalangeal joint stiffness on take-off performances and lower-limb biomechanics
745 in jump manoeuvres. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 19 mars 2022;40(6):638-45.
- 746 49. Goldmann JP, Brüggemann GP. The potential of human toe flexor muscles to produce
747 force: Toe flexor muscle strength. *Journal of Anatomy*. août 2012;221(2):187-94.
- 748 50. Saeki J, Iwanuma S, Torii S. Force Generation on the Hallux Is More Affected by the Ankle
749 Joint Angle than the Lesser Toes: An In Vivo Human Study. *Biology (Basel)*. 12 janv
750 2021;10(1):48.
- 751 51. Hay JG. Citius, altius, longius (faster, higher, longer): the biomechanics of jumping for
752 distance. *J Biomech*. 1993;26 Suppl 1:7-21.
- 753 52. Gaillet JC, Biraud JC, Bessou M, Bessou P. Modifications of baropodograms after
754 transcutaneous electric stimulation of the abductor hallucis muscle in humans standing
755 erect. *Clinical Biomechanics*. déc 2004;19(10):1066-9.

756

757

758

759 **Legends to figures**

760 Figure 1. CONSORT (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials) flow diagram illustrating
761 the flow of participants through the study.

762 Figure 2. Forefoot strengthening protocol intervention design (MTPj, metatarsophalangeal
763 joints; dom, dominant; non-dom, non-dominant; GRF, ground reaction forces).

764 Figure 3. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and
765 individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)
766 post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) MTPj relative total torque – dominant
767 foot (Nm.kg) and C&D) MTPj relative total torque – non-dominant foot (Nm.kg).

768 Figure 4. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and
769 individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)
770 post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) Abductor hallucis cross sectional area
771 (CSA) – dominant foot (cm²) and C&D) Flexor digitorum longus cross sectional area (CSA) –
772 dominant foot (cm²).

773 Figure 5. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and
774 individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)
775 post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) Cutting time – dominant foot (s); C&D)
776 Medio-lateral ratio of forces (RF) during cutting – dominant foot (%).

777 Figure 6. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and
778 individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)
779 post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) Cutting time – non-dominant foot (s);
780 C&D) Medio-lateral RF during cutting – non-dominant foot (%).

781 Figure 7. Group average and individual participant data displayed in time-series graphs and
782 individual mean differences changes in comparison to the minimal detectable changes (MDC)
783 post-training and detraining period. Subgraphs A&B) Horizontal CMJ jump length (m); C&D)
784 Horizontal concentric impulse – horizontal countermovement jump (CMJ) (BW.s).

785

786 **Legends to supporting information**

787 S1. CONSORT Checklist.docx

788 S2. Forefoot Strengthening Protocol.docx

789 S3. Study Protocol Details.docx

790 S4. Supplemental Tables & Figures.docx

791




Figure 1

CONTROL PERIOD (4 WEEKS)**SESSION 1
(WEEK 1)****SESSION 2
(WEEK 5)**

- MTPj flexion torque (dom. and non-dom. limb)
- Foot muscles cross-sectional area (dom. limb)
- Foot morphology (dom. and non-dom. limb)
- Quadriceps and ankle plantar flexors isometric torque (dom. limb)
- Sprint acceleration, cutting and jumping overall performance
- Sprint acceleration, cutting and jumping GRF propulsion kinetics (dom. and non-dom. limb)

INTERVENTIONAL PERIOD (8 WEEKS)**TRAINING GROUP ⇒ FOREFOOT STRENGTHENING PROTOCOL**

- MTPj flexion torque (dom. limb) at week 7, 9 and 11
- Foot muscles cross-sectional area (dom. limb) at week 9

CONTROL GROUP ⇒ MAINTAIN THEIR HABITUAL ACTIVITIES**DETRAINING PERIOD (4 WEEKS)****SESSION 3
(WEEK 14)****SESSION 4
(WEEK 18)**

- MTPj flexion torque (dom. and non-dom. limb)
- Foot muscles cross-sectional area (dom. limb)
- Foot morphology (dom. and non-dom. limb)
- Quadriceps and ankle plantar flexors isometric torque (dom. limb)
- Sprint acceleration, cutting and jumping overall performance
- Sprint acceleration, cutting and jumping GRF propulsion kinetics (dom. and non-dom. limb)

Figure 2




Figure 3







Figure 4







Figure 5







Figure 6







Figure 7