

1 **Using a Bayesian network to classify time to return to**
2 **sport based on football injury epidemiological data**

3

4 Kate K.Y. YUNG^{1,2}, Paul P.Y. Wu^{2,3}, Karen aus der Fünt⁴, Anne Hecksteden^{5,6}, Tim Meyer⁴

5 1. Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Faculty of Medicine, The Chinese
6 University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong

7 2. School of Mathematical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane,
8 QLD, Australia

9 3. ARC Centre of Excellence in Mathematical and Statistical Frontiers (ACEMS),
10 Melbourne, VIC, Australia

11 4. Institute for Sports and Preventive Medicine, Saarland University, Saarbrücken,
12 Germany

13 5. Institute of Sports Science, Universität Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

14 6. Institute of Physiology, Medical University Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

15

16

17 ORCID

18 Kate K. Yung 0000-0003-1906-4111

19 Paul P.Y. Wu 0000-0001-5960-8203

20 Karen aus der Fünt 0000-0002-6269-5069

21 Anne Hecksteden 0000-0003-3390-9619

22 Tim Meyer 0000-0003-3425-4546

23 **Abstract**

24 **Objective**

25 The return-to-sport (RTS) process is multifaceted and complex, as multiple variables may
26 interact and influence the time to RTS. These variables include intrinsic factors of the player,
27 such as anthropometrics and playing position, or extrinsic factors, such as competitive pressure.
28 Providing an individualised estimation is often challenging, and yet clinical decision support
29 tools are often rare in the industry. This study aims to demonstrate the functions of a Bayesian
30 network by the use of a set of basic epidemiological data.

31

32 **Methods**

33 To exemplify the use of Bayesian network in sports medicine, such as providing an
34 individualised estimation time to RTS for individual players, we applied Bayesian network to
35 a set of basic epidemiological data. Bayesian network was used as a decision support tool to
36 model the epidemiological data and to integrate clinical data, non-clinical factors and expert
37 knowledge. Specifically, we used the Bayesian network to capture the interaction between
38 variables in order to 1) classify days to RTS and 2) injury severity (minimal, mild, moderate
39 and severe).

40

41 **Results**

42 Retrospective injury data of 3374 player seasons and 6143 time-loss injuries from seven
43 seasons of the professional German football league (Bundesliga, 2014/2015 through
44 2020/2021) were collected from public databases and media resources. A total of twelve
45 variables from three main categories (player's characteristics and anthropometrics, match
46 information and injury information) were included. The key response variables are 1) **days to**
47 **RTS** (1-3, 4-7, 8-14, 15-28, 29-60, >60 , and 2) **severity** (minimal, mild, moderate and severe).
48 As there are more than two categories, producer's and user's accuracy was used to reflect the
49 sensitivity and specificity of the model. The producer's accuracy of the model for days to RTS
50 ranges from 0.24 to 0.97, while for severity categories range from 0.73 to 1.00. The user's
51 accuracy of the model for days to RTS ranges from 0.52 to 0.83, while for severity categories,
52 it ranges from 0.67 to 1.00.

53

54 **Conclusions**

55 The Bayesian network can help to capture different types of data to model the probability of
56 an outcome, such as days to return to sports. In our study, the result from the BN may support
57 coaches and players in predicting days to RTS given an injury, 2) support team planning via
58 assessment of scenarios based on player's characteristics and injury risk and 3) provide
59 evidence-based support of understanding relationships between factors and RTS. This study
60 shows the key functions and applications of the Bayesian network in RTS, and we suggest
61 further experimenting and developing the Bayesian network into a decision-supporting aid.

62

63 **1. Background**

64 **1.1. Challenges in return to sport decision making**

65 Return to sport (RTS) is when an injured athlete can return to full unrestricted team training
66 without modifications in duration and/ or activities(1-3). Forecasting or estimating the return
67 date of an injured athlete is crucial for team planning, performance optimisation, and game
68 strategy development. By having an estimated return date, medical staff can create an
69 individualised rehabilitation plan to gradually improve the athlete's condition and mitigate re-
70 injury risk. The predicted timeframe also helps coaching staff to adjust their game plans and
71 strategies, maximising the team's chances of success.

72 There is a growing acknowledgement that athletes operate within a complex system
73 and are subject to the influences of a multitude of variables(4, 5). These factors include
74 previous injury history, current injury, body mass index, playing positions, sociological factors,
75 psychological status, and the nature of the sports event(4). Accurately predicting an athlete's
76 RTS can be a challenging task for medical staff due to the intricate interactions between various
77 variables and their influence on injuries. The human body's complexity and the system's highly
78 intricate nature further complicate the task. Understanding these interactions and their impact
79 on injuries becomes crucial for providing accurate prognoses and projecting a range of the
80 likely RTS time (e.g., there is a 75% chance for the player to return between 4-5 weeks). This
81 could help medical staff and athletes to prepare for both ends of the scenario.

82 Large-scale epidemiological studies have made promising strides in providing valuable
83 insights into the expected time to RTS for major injuries in football at the population level(6-
84 9). These studies describe the risk factors for a disease or injury and the extent of the
85 problem(10). Medical staff can use them as a starting point for estimating the time to RTS(11).
86 This approach aligns with the “anchor and adjust” strategy(12), which can be used to optimise
87 predictive accuracy, especially when making decisions in uncertain scenarios (e.g., injury).
88 However, typical epidemiological studies are intended to offer correlations and data based on
89 groups to reflect population-level insights and trends. While this data is valuable for
90 highlighting general patterns and insights, a tool to translate population-level data into
91 individual-level assessments and allow for personalised estimations would be helpful.

92 Due to the complex systems, forecasting the time to RTS based on individual
93 characteristics can be challenging. There are several reasons why this process is not

94 straightforward. First, personal characteristics and other factors, such as age and playing
95 position, are recommended to be considered in the Strategic Assessment of Risk and Risk
96 Tolerance framework(13). However, quantifying and synthesising these information in the
97 clinical reasoning process can be difficult. For example, what is the difference between the
98 rehabilitation time required for a 20-year-old striker versus a 30-year-old defender with a same
99 type of hamstring strain injury? Second, synthesising useful information from broad
100 population-level epidemiological data covering entire leagues and multiple seasons and then
101 personalising it to a specific player-context is almost cognitively infeasible for a single
102 individual or even a small group of individuals. There is a lack of tool to help translate the
103 sheer volume and complexity of the population-level data and tailor them on an individual
104 level. Third, medical staff, like any other humans, are susceptible to various decision-making
105 challenges. They have limited information processing capacity (14) and face potential
106 cognitive biases(15, 16). Human judgment can be vulnerable, particularly when it comes to
107 statistical and probabilistic reasoning(17). Without an objective and reliable decision tool
108 specifically designed to provide individualised RTS estimations, medical staff often rely
109 heavily on their clinical experience and population-level epidemiological data.

110 Data scientists have the potential to develop decision support tools that can effectively
111 synthesise broad epidemiological data and personalise it to specific player-contexts,
112 overcoming the cognitive limitations faced by individuals. These tools can provide valuable
113 additional information that would otherwise be challenging for a single human to process. In
114 practical setting, data scientists can take charge of setting up and maintaining the decision
115 support tool, while users such as medical staff and coaches utilise the tool in planning for an
116 athlete's RTS, making necessary adjustments for the team, and ensuring the team remains
117 competitive. This collaboration between data scientists and end users can lead to more
118 informed decision-making and strategic planning.

119 Developing a computer-based decision support tool that uses a complex systems
120 approach may be helpful to overcome the previous challenges and offer a competitive
121 advantage in forecasting RTS(18). Specifically, the key differentiator of a complex systems
122 approach in RTS is the explicit modelling of factor interactions that could be queried and used
123 by medical staff in multiple ways. This includes but is not limited to understanding the strength
124 of influence of different variables and predicting the outcome based on custom RTS scenarios.

125 Computer-based decision support tools can be divided into predictive and descriptive
126 modelling(19). Predictive modelling can be used for injury diagnosis, severity estimation, and
127 rehabilitation planning. In particular, the Bayesian network (BN) is well suited for providing
128 injury prognosis in sports, due to its capacity to model complex systems and to integrate clinical
129 data, non-clinical factors and expert knowledge. However, it has not been used for such
130 purpose.

131 **1.2. About the Bayesian network**

132 A BN is a graph-based modelling method where the relationships between variables
133 (nodes) are represented with arrows (arcs). The presence of an arc denotes the influence of one
134 node on another, and the absence of one assumes conditional independence(20). In Figure 1,
135 we illustrated how the parent nodes and a child node can be related using graph-based
136 modelling. While real data often contains a mixture of discrete and continuous variables, BN
137 structure learning algorithms often assume the random variables are discrete. This type of BN
138 is called the discrete BN, which involves discretising continuous variables in the dataset into
139 categories. Although some information is lost when continuous data are categorised(21), there
140 are merits of using the discrete Bayesian network that worth discussing.


141 In practical settings, people often find it easier to work with discrete representations
142 rather than continuous data. Discrete variables tend to be more interpretable, facilitating
143 abstract reasoning(22). For example, word tokens often enable fast and exact processing(22).
144 Consider the comparison between the words "tall" and "short" versus the numerical values
145 "183cm" and "150cm". Some may find the discrete terms are easier to grasp and apply in
146 reasoning. Given the complexity of the human body and interacting processes involved in RTS,
147 discretisation may help capture the resolution of data available and relevant to the decision
148 support scenario at hand(23).

149 However, it's important to note the disadvantages to discretising continuous
150 variables(24). Discretisation can lead to information loss, as the finer details and nuances
151 captured by continuous data may be overlooked. By converting continuous variables into
152 discrete categories, we sacrifice the precision and granularity inherent in the original data.
153 Additionally, the choice of how to discretise the variables can introduce subjectivity and bias
154 into the analysis and therefore, it is crucial to ensure transparency in how variables are
155 discretised to mitigate these potential issues.

156 BNs provide a platform for inferring state probabilities given observations, referred to as
157 evidence, of one or more nodes in the network. In the discrete BN, the relationship between
158 parent nodes and a child node can be quantified using conditional probability tables (CPTs).
159 The CPT reflects the probability of child node states (or outcomes) given every possible
160 combination of parent node states(25). As new evidence comes in, changes may be brought to
161 the node's marginal probability(26), which is known as the posterior probability. The posterior
162 probability is the updated probability of a hypothesis or event after considering new evidence.
163 They combine prior beliefs with the likelihood of the data to provide an updated estimate of
164 the event's probability.

165 BNs can perform both predictive and diagnostic inference. For example, medical staff
166 can use the former to predict the outcome of an injury for a given clinical diagnosis,
167 anthropometric and match factors (predictive inference); but can also enter the injury severity
168 as an observation to examine what injury factors could explain that observation (diagnostic
169 inference). As an important feature to end users who may not be familiar with statistics, the
170 BN provide visuals to facilitate understanding and supporting decision making across teams of
171 users, such as, among athletes, coaching staff, medical and non-medical personnel.

172 Figure 1 A graph-based modelling showing nodes (A to F) and arcs (arrows). A is the
173 parent of B, while B is the child of A; B is the parent of C and D, while C and D are the children
174 of B; and so on. A is the ancestor of B, C, D, E and F, while B, C, D, E and F are the descendants
175 of A; and so on. The arrows indicate the direction of influence.



177 Another key feature of a BN is that medical staff can integrate and visualise data from
178 multiple sources into a single BN, such as clinical data, empirical evidence and expert
179 knowledge(27), or a combination of both them(28). Expert knowledge can be invaluable when
180 empirical data is scarce or unavailable. It also plays a significant role in developing models,
181 selecting data or variables, estimating parameters, interpreting results and determining the
182 uncertainty characteristics. Since the BN can be customised based on the experts'
183 knowledge(29, 30), it may be appealing for small sample size research in elite sports
184 research(31-33), where some data may be missing or not be feasible to collect (e.g., limitations
185 in applied settings)(27). BNs have been used to support clinical decisions(34-37), analyse
186 complex systems in ecology (23, 38, 39) and logistics(40).

187 **1.3. Study objectives**

188 The objective of this study was to demonstrate the use of a Bayesian network and its
189 potential use in becoming a decision support tool for medical staff for RTS. Specifically, a
190 discrete BN was modelled based on a set of basic epidemiological data to demonstrate how
191 medical staff can use BN to understand (i) the most influential variable to the outcomes (section
192 3.3), (ii) the strength of influence of different variables (section 3.3), and to (iii) demonstrate
193 its use with a case scenarios (section 4.2). The paper is structured as follows: Section 2
194 describes the methodology, including study design and steps to construct a BN; Section 3
195 describes the results; Section 4 discusses the results and application of the BN in a clinical
196 setting; Section 5 provides an overall conclusion of the study.

197 **2. Method**

198 **2.1. Study design**

199 The study is a retrospective analysis of prospectively collected injury data from the German
200 professional men's highest football league (Bundesliga) between 2014/2015 - 2020/2021.
201 Neither research ethics board approval nor a trial registration was required as all data were
202 collected from publicly available sources(9, 41). We reported the result with reference to the
203 Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis Or
204 Diagnosis (TRIPOD) statement(42).

205 **2.2. Participants**

206 Players who played in the Bundesliga in the above-mentioned seven seasons were included in
207 the study. Injured players who did not return to the Bundesliga in the same season and those
208 without complete data were excluded from the analysis. All participants were identified using
209 a publicly available database, including Kicker Sportmagazin™, and clubs' official websites.
210 Data collection was performed via methods established in previous investigations(9, 43). The
211 data has been collected according to the Fuller et al. consensus statement for football injury
212 research and the same definitions have been the same throughout the 7 seasons(44). 3374 player
213 Bundesliga seasons were registered over the seven seasons from 2014/2015-2020/2021. A total
214 of 6653 time-loss injuries were recorded. After removing injuries without complete data, 6143
215 time-loss injuries remained.

216 **2.3. Construction of the Bayesian network**

217 The modelling process and validation were performed in GeNIe 2.0 (Bayes Fusion, LLC)(45).
218 There are four main steps to creating and validating a BN:

- 219 1) Identify the variables (nodes) of the BN and the key response variables. In this
220 study, the key response variables are the (i) severity of the injury (*severity*) and
221 (ii) days to RTS (*days_rts*). They are used to evaluate the performance of the
222 BN. The nodes and sources of information are outlined in Table 1.
- 223 2) Learn the graphical structure of the BN and display the relationships between
224 all the nodes.

- 225 3) Learn the probability distribution governing the relationships between the nodes.
 226 4) Validate the BN to evaluate how well the BN can classify injury based on the
 227 key response variables: (i) *severity* and (ii) *days_rts*.

228 **2.3.1. Step 1: Identify the main variables**

229 This model is intended to capture the conditional probabilistic relationships among personal
 230 characteristics, match and injury information. The variables in this study are commonly
 231 included in epidemiologic studies (46) and we have summarised them in Table 1.

232 All time-loss injuries that occurred during football competitions and training sessions
 233 were included, and the day of the injury is counted as day zero. A time-loss injury is when a
 234 player cannot fully participate in training or competition due to injury(44). RTS is defined as
 235 when the player has received medical clearance to allow full participation in training and is
 236 available for match selection(2). Details of the injury (type of injury, body region, contact/non-
 237 contact injury, training or match) were labelled based on the Fuller et al. consensus of data
 238 collection in football(44). The time of the season was based on an injury epidemiologic study
 239 in European football(47). Personal characteristics and anthropometrics, match information and
 240 the above information are used as the explanatory variables for constructing the model.

241 We are interested in determining the days to RTS, therefore, the two key response
 242 variables in this model are injury severity (*severity*) and days to RTS (*days_rts*). Injury severity
 243 (*severity*) was categorised according to the days of absence in match or training as outlined by
 244 the Fuller et al. consensus statement on football injury studies(44): minimal (1–3 days), mild
 245 (4–7 days), moderate (8–28 days), or severe (>28 days). We further create a new variable based
 246 on days to RTS (*days_rts*) to evaluate if the model could classify the days to RTS into more
 247 precise categories. There are two additional categories in *days_rts* as compared to *severity*: 1-
 248 3, 4-7, 8-14, **15-28**, 29-60, >**60** days. In context, these variables form the nodes in the BN. In
 249 particular, *days_rts* directly maps to *severity*, except that severity has fewer states, combining
 250 the last two in *days_rts* into one (i.e., any injuries taking more than 28 for RTS is classified as
 251 severe). A summary of the variables and source of the data are presented in Table 1.

252 Table 1 Summary of data type and source of information.

Category	Variable (<i>node name in the BN</i>)	Source
----------	---	--------

Personal characteristics and anthropometrics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age (<i>age</i>) • Height (<i>height</i>) • Weight (<i>weight</i>) • Main playing position (<i>main_position</i>) 	Kicker Sportmagazin™ and clubs' official website
Match information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time of the season (<i>time_season</i>) • Training or match (<i>training_game</i>) 	Ligainsider, official team websites, injury reports, official team press releases and professional statistical websites.
Injury information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of injury (<i>type_injury</i>) • Body region (<i>body_region</i>) • Contact/non-contact (<i>contact_noncontact</i>) • Severity (<i>severity</i>) • Days to RTS (<i>days_rts</i>) 	

253

254 **2.3.2. Step 2: Define the graphical structure**

255 We incorporated expert knowledge to constrain the search to help ensure graph structures
256 produced are consistent with clinical science (See Supplementary Information Figure 1). We
257 first specified the temporal order of the variables, ensuring there were no arcs from variables
258 that occurred later (e.g., injury) to nodes happening earlier (e.g., main playing position).
259 Following this, KY helped establish the relationships (arcs) within the graphical structure.
260 Notably, our key response variable, *days_rts*, was directly linked to severity in the graphical
261 structure. This mapping was based on the definition of severity outlined in the Fuller et al.
262 consensus statement on football injury studies, which defines severity by the duration of
263 unavailability for full training(44). This mapping was done manually based on clinical
264 knowledge and could not be learnt from algorithms. Finally, with the constraints in place, we
265 use the Bayesian Search algorithm in GeNIe 2.0 to find the best-fitted network for the optimal
266 network configuration that aligns with the collected data and expert knowledge(20, 48).

267 **2.3.3. Step 3: Define the probability distribution**

268 There are multiple ways to discretise continuous data, including manual, unsupervised
269 and supervised. Each method offers distinct advantages, such as improved model performance,
270 easier interpretation, and computational efficiency(49). Manual discretisation involves
271 manually defining thresholds or categories to discretise the continuous data. This approach
272 provides flexibility and allows domain experts to incorporate their knowledge, ensuring that

273 the categories align with relevant domain-specific consensus statements and the specific needs
 274 of the analysis. Unsupervised discretisation involves using clustering algorithms to identify
 275 natural groupings or patterns in the data. These clusters can then be treated as discrete
 276 categories. This is particularly useful when prior knowledge or predefined categories are
 277 unavailable(50). Supervised discretisation utilises labelled data to guide the discretisation
 278 process. Machine learning algorithms or decision trees can be employed to learn optimal
 279 thresholds or categories that maximise predictive performance. This method can enhance both
 280 model performance and interpretability(50).

281 We manually discretised the continuous data based on domain-specific decision
 282 categories to maximise usability across various practitioner types and clubs. Specifically, the
 283 continuous data are discretised based on categories that are easy to apply practically or with
 284 reference to relevant consensus statements. We discretised *age*, *height*, and *weight* into three
 285 categories that were representative of the typical values observed in the sample, to create
 286 uniform count categories that were both meaningful and easy to interpret. *severity* was
 287 discretised based on the Fuller et al. consensus of epidemiological data collection into four
 288 categories (minimal, mild, moderate and severe)(44). *days_rts* was discretised into six
 289 categories: 1-3, 4-7, 8-14, 15-28, 29-60, >60 days, with reference to the Fuller et al. consensus
 290 of epidemiological data collection(44). Descriptions of the nodes and categories are
 291 summarised in Table 2. We used the Expectation Maximisation (EM) algorithm in GeNIe 2.0
 292 to determine the probability distribution (parameter learning) of the dataset(51, 52).

293

294 Table 2 Description of data set variables.

	Node name	Description	Categories (States)
1	<i>age</i>	Age at the start of the season.	<24, 24-27, >27
2	<i>height</i>	Height at the start of the season (cm)	<180,180-186, >186
3	<i>weight</i>	Weight at the start of the season (kg)	<75, 75-81, >81
4	<i>bmi</i>	Body mass index (BMI)	<22.8, 22.8-23.8, >23.8
5	<i>main_position</i>	Playing location in the field	Goalkeeper, defender, midfield and attacker

6	<i>body_part</i>	The body part which was injured	Head/face, neck/cervical spine, shoulder/clavicular, upper arm, elbow, forearm, wrist, hand/finger/thumb, sternum/ribs/upper back, abdomen, lower back/ pelvis/ sacrum, hip /groin, thigh, knee, lower leg/Achilles tendon, ankle, foot/toe
7	<i>type_injury</i>	The type of injury that occurred	Fractures and bone stress, joint and ligament, muscles and tendon, haematoma/contusions/bruise, laceration and skin lesion, central/peripheral nervous systems, other injuries ¹
8	<i>contact_non contact</i>	Whether the injury occurred was contact or non-contact	Contact, non-contact
9	<i>training_match</i>	Whether the injury occurred during a competition or training session	match, training
10	<i>time_season</i>	Part of the season in which the injury occurred	Preseason (Jul-Aug), fall (Sep-Nov), Winter (Dec-Feb), spring (Mar-May)
11	<i>days_RTS</i>	Days to return to competition or training session (days)	1-3, 4-7, 8-14, 15-28, 29-60, >60
12	<i>severity</i>	The severity of the injury	Minimal (1-3 days), mild (4-7 days), moderate (8-28 days), severe (>28 days)

¹ Injuries grouped as 'other' include bursitis, peritonitis, capsular tears, chondral lesion, with no individual category accounting to more than 1% of the injuries.

296 **2.3.4. Step 4: Validation of the BN**

297 A crucial element of learning is to validate the model. Validation was performed on the two
298 target nodes, i.e., *severity* and *days_rts*, which are the main outcomes of interest. Ten-fold
299 cross-validation was performed where the dataset was split into ten parts of equal
300 probability(53). The model was trained on nine parts and tested on the remaining tenth part of
301 the unseen data (holdout test sets). The process was repeated ten times, with a different part of
302 the data being used for testing. The model evaluation technique implemented in GeNIe keeps
303 the model structure fixed and re-learns the model parameters during each of the folds. We
304 compiled the results of the test splits to report the producer's and user's accuracy(54). The
305 producer's accuracy is calculated by dividing the total number of correctly classified injury
306 severity by the total number of actual occurrences of injury of that severity. Producer's accuracy
307 is analogous to sensitivity in binary classification, as it represents the true positive rate for each
308 category.

309
$$\text{Producer's accuracy} = \frac{\text{True positive}}{\text{True positive} + \text{False negative}}$$

310 The user's accuracy is calculated by dividing the total number of correctly classified
311 injury severity by the total classified true occurrences of injury of that severity. Similar to
312 specificity, it represents the correctness of the model's predictions within each category. User's
313 accuracy provides insights into the precision of the model's predictions for each category.

314
$$\text{User's accuracy} = \frac{\text{True positive}}{\text{True positive} + \text{False positive}}$$

315 By considering both the producer's and user's accuracy, we can evaluate the model's
316 performance in terms of both sensitivity (ability to classify correctly) and specificity (accuracy
317 of predictions within each category). This is particularly relevant when dealing with models
318 that have multiple categories, such as our current model's injury severity classification.

319 **3. Results**

320 **3.1. Demographics**

321 The demographics and the main playing positions of injured players are shown in
322 Supplementary Table 1. The breakdown of injury by nature of injury (contact or non-contact),
323 event (match or training), body region, and types of injuries are available in Supplementary
324 Table 2.

325


326 **3.2. Bayesian network**

327 The network and the probability distribution of each variable are presented in Figure 2. The
328 model's producer's accuracy in classifying *days_rts* and *severity* is presented in Table 3. In
329 terms of categorising *days_rts*, the producer's accuracy ranges from 0.24 to 0.97, with the best
330 performance for shorter days (i.e., below 3 days) and the worst performance for the mid-range
331 category (i.e., 8-14 days). In classifying the injury's severity, the producer's accuracy ranges
332 from 0.73 to 1.00, with the best performance for severe and the worst for minimal. In terms of
333 categorising *days_rts*, the user's accuracy ranges from 0.52 to 0.83, with the best performance
334 for days 3-7 and the worst performance for the mid-range category (i.e., 8-14 and 15-28 days).
335 In classifying the injury's severity, the producer's accuracy ranges from 0.67 to 1.00, with
336 >0.90 in all categories except minimal.

337 In our model, the type of injury and the injured body region are directly connected to
338 *days_rts* (Figure 2). The percentages indicate the distribution of values under each variable,
339 while the blue arrows indicate how factors influence one another (Figure 2). Based on the
340 sensitivity analysis, the type of injury and the injured body region are most influential to the
341 *days_rts*, followed by age, contact or non-contact injury and the nature of the event (training
342 or match) (see Figure 2). Time of the season, weight, and height only had a minor influence on
343 the result. The time of the season is also associated with the nature of the event (training or
344 match) and the *type of injury*, which is supported by empirical evidence(55).

345

346 Figure 2 Structure and network probability of the Bayesian network. The percentages indicate
 347 the distribution of values under each variable, while the blue arrows indicate how factors
 348 influence one another.



349

350

351 Table 3 The model's producer's and user's accuracy of classifying days to RTS and severity
 352 of the injuries.

Days to RTS categories	Number of occurrences	Producer's accuracy	User's accuracy
Below 3	1403	0.97	0.73
Days 3-7	1576	0.67	0.83
Days 8-14	1042	0.24	0.52
Days 15-28	888	0.76	0.52
Days 29-60	686	0.59	0.66
60 and above	548	0.61	0.57
Overall	6143	0.66	0.66

Severity categories	Number of Occurrences	Producer's accuracy	Users' accuracy
Minimal	1235	0.73	1.00
Mild	1930	0.85	0.67
Moderate	1773	0.98	0.90
Severe	1205	1.00	0.98
Overall	6143	0.88	0.88

353

354 **3.3. Sensitivity analysis, feature selection and strength of influence**


355 A sensitivity analysis was performed using built-in functionality in GeNIe to determine the
356 influence of the individual nodes. Sensitivity analysis helps determine the influence of
357 observing the states of specific nodes (i.e., prior and conditional probabilities) on the output
358 variables (i.e., posterior probabilities)(56), which in this case, are the days to RTS and severity
359 of the injury (Figure 3). This can help to support the selection of key variables to be included
360 in a model (feature selection). Results of the sensitivity analysis are visually summarised in the
361 form of tornado charts in Supplementary Information 2.

362

363 Figure 3 Feature selection of the Bayesian network

364 Red-coloured nodes: contain variables important for calculating posterior probability
365 distributions in *days_rts*. Key: A darker red colour indicates a higher degree of influence. Grey-
366 coloured nodes: the node has no influence on the posterior probability distributions of *days_rts*.

367



368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

Highly sensitive variables affect the inference results more significantly. Identifying the highly sensitive variables directs medical staff to specific areas to focus on to affect the BN's outcome. As an example, in Figure 3, we have set *days_rts* as the key response variable. Nodes coloured in red contain variables important for calculating posterior probability distributions in *days_rts*. Grey-coloured nodes have no influence on the posterior probability distributions of *days_rts*, as determined by data and knowledge. Based on the sensitivity analysis, *body_region*, *injury_type* and *contact_noncontact* are the most influential to the outcome in *days_rts* (Figure 3). A numeric form of the strength of influence of different variables can be found in Supplementary Information Table 3.

379 **4. Discussion**

380 This study demonstrates the applicability of a BN in an epidemiological dataset to project
381 rehabilitation timelines and provides evidence-based support to RTS decisions. We integrated
382 personal characteristics and anthropometrics, match information and injury information to
383 construct a BN that may inform the days to RTS and injury severity.

384 **4.1. The BN in the context of RTS**

385 In this model, we use a hybrid approach in constructing the BN; that is, we have
386 combined clinical knowledge and data-driven learning (Bayesian Search algorithm) when
387 constructing the graphical structure. This is because constructing the BN using pure algorithmic
388 approaches (i.e., unsupervised learning) can sometimes produce graph structures with
389 unreasonable arcs, such as the model attempting to explain age with severity. However, if we
390 use a pure domain approach, we may miss some of the patterns and linkages between variables
391 that were not observed by clinicians' eyes. Therefore, we opted to use a hybrid approach when
392 constructing the BN.

393 The BN model may help medical staff working in the Bundesliga to view athletes and
394 injuries with a complex systems approach. For example, the model captured the complex
395 relationships between the time of the season, the injury type and injury occurrence (Figure 2).
396 Specifically, in our BN model, the time of the season correlates with the weather, which is then
397 associated with the ground condition (55) and injury occurrence(57, 58). As a key feature of a
398 complex systems approach, the BN can explicitly model the factor interactions/relationships
399 and query in multiple ways, such as comparing the outcomes of custom RTS scenarios (section
400 4.2), understanding the most influential factors (section 3.3) and the strength of influence
401 (section 3.3).

402 To our knowledge, no study in the Bundesliga has studied the correlations of the above
403 factors, so we use an example from the English Premier League (EPL) to illustrate the possible
404 correlations. In the EPL, the ground condition tends to be drier in the preseason. Warm, dry
405 and hard surfaces may be associated with higher injury occurrence(57, 58), possibly due to a
406 higher level of shoe-surface traction influence (59) and faster running speed(60). On the
407 contrary, wet and muddy ground is associated with lower injury occurrence(58), possibly due
408 to changes in playing style (e.g., more tackles) and reduced shoe-surface traction. While the

409 time of the season affects the injury occurrence, there has been no direct effect on days to RTS.
410 Analysing these complex relationships would be difficult without the use of computers and
411 advanced statistical modelling.


412 The model is more accurate for classifying injuries into 4 categories under *severity*
413 (sensitivity = 0.75 – 1.00), compared to 6 categories *days_rts* (sensitivity = 0.24 – 0.97). This
414 is not surprising because the increase in the number of categories challenged the model to
415 provide a higher accuracy. The model is most accurate in classifying injuries with shorter
416 *days_rts* (days below 3, sensitivity = 0.97) and least accurate in classifying mid-range injuries
417 (days 8-14, sensitivity = 0.24). A possible explanation is that injuries with minimal days of
418 absence have particular injury patterns, for example, they may be upper body injuries and
419 hematoma/contusion/bruise injuries. The model is least accurate for classifying mid-range
420 injuries (8-14 days), possibly because the model lacks information that may differentiate the
421 prognoses. This information may be the extent of tissue damage (e.g., the sub-classification of
422 muscle injury) and the specific location of the injury (e.g., involvement of central tendon
423 injury).

424 **4.2. Illustrative application of the BN**

425 Here, we use a hypothetical case study to demonstrate the practicability of using the
426 BN in classifying the days to RTS and the injury severity of a player. We input the player's
427 characteristics and anthropometrics, match information and injury information into the BN
428 constructed earlier. The probability distribution is shown in Figure 4

429 *A player (age: 25, weight: 77kg, height: 185cm, attacker) playing in the German professional*
430 *football league sprained his ankle ligament in a non-contact injury and pulled out of the*
431 *preseason training session. The coach would like to know when the player is available for*
432 *selection.*

433 Figure 4 Bayesian network of the case study.



434

435 The BN indicates the joint multivariate probability distribution: the likelihood of the
 436 injury to be minimal is 63%, mild 24%, moderate 12% and severe 1% (Figure 4). The
 437 likelihood of RTS below 3 days is 52%, 3-7 days is 33%, 7-14 days is 10%, 14-28 days is 4%,
 438 28-60 days and more than 60 days are less than 1%, respectively. This information, in
 439 combination with clinical assessment, may be used to support coaches and players in predicting
 440 days to RTS and support team planning by assessing the number of players available for
 441 training and competition.

442 In Figure 4, the thickness of the arcs indicates the strength of influence. Medical staff
 443 can use the strength of influence analysis to understand the local relationships among the
 444 variables in a network and how they contribute to the posterior marginal probability (i.e.,
 445 outcome) for each node in the network (Figure 4). The strength of influence calculates the
 446 average effect of changing the state of a parent node on the probability distribution of states in
 447 the child node(61). The arcs are normalised, thus the thickest arc indicates the one with the
 448 highest influence. From Figure 4, the nature of the injury (contact or non-contact) is related to

449 the injury type and the body region. Injury type and body region are directly associated with
450 the *days_rts*. Medical staff may use *days_rts* in conjunction with the clinical knowledge to
451 project the rehabilitation timeline.

452 **4.3. Practical application and future developments**

453 The software we used for constructing the BN, GeNIe 2.0, could be used as a decision
454 support tool by sports practitioners, including but not limited to coaches, team managers, sports
455 science and medical staff. Once the BN has been constructed, for example, with the use of
456 GeNIe 2.0, the end users do not need any machine-learning knowledge or advanced computer
457 skills to use the BN. Instead, the only input from the sports practitioners is to collect and input
458 the players' characteristics into the BN. The new data from every week or season can be input
459 into the system's database by data scientists (either in-house or third party) to ensure the model
460 is up-to-date. As technology continues to advance, the process of constructing and utilising BN
461 is expected to become easier and more efficient. This increased ease of use may encourage
462 medical staff to invest their efforts in learning and adopting BNs to support their decision-
463 making processes.

464 When planning for RTS for an athlete, the BN can provide a personalised risk analysis
465 from broad epidemiological data, as exemplified in section 4.2 "Illustrative application of the
466 BN". While the results of the BN for estimating time to RTS align with existing clinical systems
467 and therefore some practitioners may question the need for a computational decision support
468 tool, it is important to see the potential benefits of integrating BN into sports medical practice
469 in future. Conventional clinical guidelines often apply universally to all individuals regardless
470 of age, sex, sport, or level of play. Consequently, they are not intended to offer an
471 individualised approach to RTS estimation. Given that athletes' diverse needs and
472 circumstances, coupled with the growing emphasis on personalised and precision medicine, a
473 more tailored approach to estimating RTS becomes essential. In this regard, the incorporation
474 of BN can serve as a valuable addition to sports medical practice to improve decision making.

475 In our previous example in section 4.2, we explained the use of BN with a return-to-
476 sport (RTS) scenario and estimated the time to RTS based on a player's basic characteristics.
477 However, it is important to note that this study is a pilot for future studies, and the potential
478 applications of BN extend beyond this specific use case. They can be leveraged for various
479 purposes, such as forecasting expected performance or injury risk in a game by considering

480 factors like personal characteristics, opponent playing style, and recent training and game
481 performance. While in this study, the BN yield similar results to existing clinical systems, its
482 true benefits lie in its ease of use, efficiency, and the capacity to incorporate a wider range of
483 data into the decision-making process. Moreover, BN's ability to identify the strength of
484 influence allows medical staff to address the variables that significantly impact outcomes, a
485 task that cannot be adequately addressed by conventional clinical guidelines alone. By
486 leveraging BN, medical staff may enhance their decision-making processes and provide more
487 tailored and effective care to athletes.

488 Computational models are more likely to be implemented in applied sports settings if
489 their accuracy, interpretability and functionality fit with the operation framework of a sports
490 organisation(62). In this case, BN provides an intuitive visualisation of the complex
491 relationship of injuries, which medical staff may understand even with little or no experience
492 in computer analytics. This may increase the model's transparency and may improve the
493 medical staff's trust in the model(63). In terms of practical applicability, medical staff can use
494 the model to create scenarios that facilitate the evaluation of different management options or
495 the development of rehabilitation protocols for players with various positions or injuries
496 occurring at different times during the season. These scenarios enable the assessment of the
497 combined effects of risk factors(27). This may enable them to proactively manage injury risk,
498 and in case of injury, make more accurate predictions regarding the days to RTS for individual
499 athletes based on epidemiological evidence. The BN can be modified to suit the specific context
500 as determined by the user and updated with new information when available. In summary, BNs
501 seem promising for modelling the relationships of variables in a complex system and may be
502 further explored to support clinical decision making.

503 The epidemiological data we used in this study is static; thus, we use a BN to represent
504 the system as a time-aggregated model. However, most systems, including athletes, have been
505 well recognised to change over time(4, 64). To capture the change over time and the feedback
506 loops, a BN can be further extended into a dynamic Bayesian network (DBN)(65). DBN is an
507 extension of BNs and replicates the BN model at discrete points in time (time slices) and
508 captures temporal relationships between the variables. DBNs can represent complex questions,
509 such as how changes in rehabilitation training load affect the time to RTS in athletes with
510 different demographic and anthropometric characteristics. Modifiable variables, such as
511 rehabilitation training exposure, can be collected continuously over time as time-series
512 data(66). Although DBN are more complex than BNs, DBNs have also been applied in medical

513 diagnosis or prognosis (67-69) and are a promising avenue for further investigation in an injury
514 modelling context.

515 **4.4. Limitations**

516 The proposed BN model has limitations that should be considered when interpreting its results.
517 Firstly, it is important to recognise that the model was constructed using data solely from the
518 Bundesliga, and therefore, the generalisability of the results to other leagues or levels of play
519 is limited. Second, the quality of the input variables directly impacts the model's predictive
520 accuracy. In the case of our BN, it was constructed using basic epidemiological data sourced
521 from public databases. While this approach maximises the availability of injury events for the
522 model, it lacks pertinent information related to prognosis, such as diagnosis (e.g., structural
523 damage or functional disorder) and the precise location of the injury (e.g., involvement of
524 central tendon in hamstring injury)(70). An accurate diagnosis of an injury plays a vital role in
525 determining prognosis(11, 71). For instance, the recovery time to RTS can vary significantly
526 between a minor partial tear in the hamstring muscle (requiring 17 days to RTS) and a moderate
527 partial tear (requiring a longer time of 36 days to RTS). Therefore, the lack of detailed
528 diagnostic information can impact the model's graphical structure and prediction accuracy.

529 Further studies may consider including more information into the model, such as quality
530 and duration of rehabilitation training, RTS performance, reinjury incidence, the importance of
531 upcoming competition, the remaining contract length, the club's geographical regions and the
532 players' transfer value. Potentially, depending on the purpose of the model, we can integrate
533 epidemiological data from other larger datasets into the model to enlarge the database to reduce
534 the chance of overfitting and improve result transportability.

535 Comparing the machine-learned BN with the existing scientific understanding of injury
536 and recovery would also be a valuable future avenue of research. This comparison can provide
537 insights into the performance and predictive capabilities of a complex model that incorporates
538 a wide range of variables in contrast to a simpler model, such as an epidemiological one. By
539 doing so, researchers can evaluate the added value of BN as a decision-support tool.

540 **5. Conclusion**

541 This discrete BN provides a decision support tool to help medical staff, coaches and players
542 manage injury. The BN has a high producer accuracy, ranging from 0.73 to 1.00 in predicting
543 severity and provides a graphical representation of the investigated interdependencies. Medical
544 staff can use BN to understand the strength of influence of different variables on the outcome
545 and analyse the outcome based on custom RTS scenarios. This information may help medical
546 staff evaluate different injury scenarios and better respond to individual player's rehabilitation
547 and team planning. BNs seem promising for modelling the relationships of variables from
548 multiple sources and can be further explored to support clinical decision making.

549

550 **Acknowledgement**

551 Our Bayesian network was built using GeNIe Modeler (BayesFusion 2019), available free of
552 charge for academic research and teaching use from <https://www.bayesfusion.com/>. The
553 authors would also like to thank Tobias Tröb and Abed Hadji for the data collection and injury
554 database management.

555 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

556 As the study data stems from publicly available media data, no ethical approval was needed. A
557 consent to participate was not necessary as the study does not contain any person's individual
558 data.

559 **Consent for Publication**

560 Not applicable as the study does not use any persons' individual data.

561 **Conflicts of interest/ Competing interests**

562 KY, PW, KadF, AH and TM declare that they have no competing interests.

563 **Funding**

564 No funding was received for this research.

565 **Authors' contribution**

566 KY, PW and TM conceptualised and designed the study. KadF led the data collection, checked
567 all data for medical plausibility, and refined parts of the database. KY analysed, constructed,
568 and interpreted the Bayesian network with technical support from PW. AH, PW and TM
569 supervised the study. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

570 6. Reference

571

- 572 1. Waldén M, Mountjoy M, McCall A, Serner A, Massey A, Tol JL, et al. Football-
573 specific extension of the IOC consensus statement: methods for recording and reporting of
574 epidemiological data on injury and illness in sport 2020. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*.
575 2023;57(21):1341-50.
- 576 2. Ardern CL, Glasgow P, Schneiders A, Witvrouw E, Clarsen B, Cools A, et al. 2016
577 Consensus statement on return to sport from the First World Congress in Sports Physical
578 Therapy, Bern. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2016;50(14):853-64.
- 579 3. Pol R, Balagué N, Ric A, Torrents C, Kiely J, Hristovski R. Training or Synergizing?
580 Complex Systems Principles Change the Understanding of Sport Processes. *Sports Medicine*
581 - Open. 2020;6(1):28.
- 582 4. Yung KK, Ardern CL, Serpiello FR, Robertson S. Characteristics of Complex
583 Systems in Sports Injury Rehabilitation: Examples and Implications for Practice. *Sports*
584 *Medicine - Open*. 2022;8(1):24.
- 585 5. Balague N, Torrents C, Hristovski R, Davids K, Araújo D. Overview of complex
586 systems in sport. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*. 2013;26(1):4-13.
- 587 6. Hallen A, Ekstrand J. Return to play following muscle injuries in professional
588 footballers. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2014;32(13):1229-36.
- 589 7. López-Valenciano A, Ruiz-Pérez I, Garcia-Gómez A, Vera-Garcia FJ, De Ste Croix
590 M, Myer GD, et al. Epidemiology of injuries in professional football: a systematic review and
591 meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2020;54(12):711.
- 592 8. Lu D, McCall A, Jones M, Kovalchik S, Steinweg J, Gelis L, et al. Injury
593 epidemiology in Australian male professional soccer. *Journal of Science and Medicine in*
594 *Sport*. 2020;23(6):574-9.
- 595 9. aus der Fünten K, Tröb T, Hadji A, Beaudouin F, Steendahl IB, Meyer T.
596 Epidemiology of Football Injuries of the German Bundesliga: A Media-Based, Prospective
597 Analysis over 7 Consecutive Seasons. *Sports Medicine - Open*. 2023;9(1):20.
- 598 10. Hägglund M, Waldén M, Bahr R, Ekstrand J. Methods for epidemiological study of
599 injuries to professional football players: developing the UEFA model. *British Journal of*
600 *Sports Medicine*. 2005;39(6):340-6.
- 601 11. Ekstrand JK, Werner; Spreco, Armin; van Zoest, Wart; Roberts, Craig; Meyer, Tim;
602 Bengtsson, Håkan. Time before return to play for the most common injuries in professional
603 football: a 16-year follow-up of the UEFA Elite Club Injury Study. *British Journal of Sports*
604 *Medicine*. 2019:bjsports-2019-100666.
- 605 12. Hecksteden A, Keller N, Zhang G, Meyer T, Hauser T. Why Humble Farmers May in
606 Fact Grow Bigger Potatoes: A Call for Street-Smart Decision-Making in Sport. *Sports Med*
607 *Open*. 2023;9(1):94.
- 608 13. Shrier I. Strategic Assessment of Risk and Risk Tolerance (StARRT) framework for
609 return-to-play decision-making. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2015;49(20):1311-5.
- 610 14. Miller GA. The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our
611 capacity for processing information. *Psychological review*. 1956;63(2):81-97.
- 612 15. Blumenthal-Barby JS, Krieger H. Cognitive Biases and Heuristics in Medical
613 Decision Making:A Critical Review Using a Systematic Search Strategy. *Medical Decision*
614 *Making*. 2015;35(4):539-57.
- 615 16. Yung KK, Ardern CL, Serpiello FR, Robertson S. A Framework for Clinicians to
616 Improve the Decision-Making Process in Return to Sport. *Sports Medicine - Open*.
617 2022;8(1):52.

- 618 17. Tversky A, Kahneman D. Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases.
619 Science. 1974;185(4157):1124-31.
- 620 18. Kawamoto K, Houlihan CA, Balas EA, Lobach DF. Improving clinical practice using
621 clinical decision support systems: a systematic review of trials to identify features critical to
622 success. *BMJ*. 2005;330(7494):765.
- 623 19. Han J. Data mining concepts and techniques, third edition. 3rd ed ed. Kamber M, Pei
624 J, editors. Waltham, Mass.: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers; 2012.
- 625 20. Heckerman D, Geiger D, Chickering DM. Learning Bayesian Networks: The
626 Combination of Knowledge and Statistical Data. *Machine Learning*. 1995;20(3):197-243.
- 627 21. Binney ZO, Mansournia MA. Methods matter: (mostly) avoid categorising continuous
628 data – a practical guide. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2024;58(5):241-3.
- 629 22. Cartuyvels R, Spinks G, Moens M-F. Discrete and continuous representations and
630 processing in deep learning: Looking forward. *AI Open*. 2021;2:143-59.
- 631 23. Wu PP-Y, Mengersen K, McMahon K, Kendrick GA, Chartrand K, York PH, et al.
632 Timing anthropogenic stressors to mitigate their impact on marine ecosystem resilience.
633 *Nature Communications*. 2017;8(1):1263.
- 634 24. Kim SK, Frisby CL. Gaining from discretization of continuous data: The
635 correspondence analysis biplot approach. *Behav Res Methods*. 2019;51(2):589-601.
- 636 25. Fenton N, Neil M. Risk assessment and decision analysis with Bayesian networks. .
637 Boca Raton: Chapman and Hall/CRC.; 2018.
- 638 26. Eugene C. Bayesian Networks without Tears. *AI Magazine*. 1991;12(4).
- 639 27. Fuster-Parra P, Tauler P, Bennasar-Veny M, Ligeza A, López-González AA, Aguiló
640 A. Bayesian network modeling: A case study of an epidemiologic system analysis of
641 cardiovascular risk. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*. 2016;126:128-42.
- 642 28. Howard RA. The Foundations of Decision Analysis Revisited. In: von Winterfeldt D,
643 Miles Jr RF, Edwards W, editors. *Advances in Decision Analysis: From Foundations to*
644 *Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007. p. 32-56.
- 645 29. Heckerman DE, Nathwani BN. Toward normative expert systems: Part II.
646 Probability-based representations for efficient knowledge acquisition and inference. *Methods*
647 *of information in medicine*. 1992;31(2):106-16.
- 648 30. Constantinou A, Fenton N. Things to know about Bayesian networks. *Significance*.
649 2018;15:19-23.
- 650 31. Hecksteden A, Kellner R, Donath L. Dealing with small samples in football research.
651 *Science and Medicine in Football*. 2021:1-9.
- 652 32. Mengersen KL, Drovandi CC, Robert CP, Pyne DB, Gore CJ. Bayesian Estimation of
653 Small Effects in Exercise and Sports Science. *PLOS ONE*. 2016;11(4):e0147311.
- 654 33. Hecksteden A, Forster S, Egger F, Buder F, Kellner R, Meyer T. Dwarfs on the
655 Shoulders of Giants: Bayesian Analysis With Informative Priors in Elite Sports Research and
656 Decision Making. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*. 2022;4.
- 657 34. Olmedilla A, Rubio VJ, Fuster-Parra P, Pujals C, García-Mas A. A Bayesian
658 Approach to Sport Injuries Likelihood: Does Player's Self-Efficacy and Environmental
659 Factors Plays the Main Role? *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2018;9(1174).
- 660 35. Dimitrova L, Petkova KG, editors. *Bayesian Network - Based Causal Analysis of*
661 *Injury Risk in Elite Rhythmic Gymnastics*2014.
- 662 36. Lau CL, Mayfield HJ, Sinclair JE, Brown SJ, Waller M, Enjeti AK, et al. Risk-benefit
663 analysis of the AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccine in Australia using a Bayesian network
664 modelling framework. *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.09.30.21264337.
- 665 37. El Khediri S, Thaljaoui A, Alfayez F. A Novel Decision-Making Process for COVID-
666 19 Fighting Based on Association Rules and Bayesian Methods. *The Computer Journal*.
667 2021.

- 668 38. Johnson S, Mengersen K, de Waal A, Marnewick K, Cilliers D, Houser AM, et al.
669 Modelling cheetah relocation success in southern Africa using an Iterative Bayesian Network
670 Development Cycle. *Ecological Modelling*. 2010;221(4):641-51.
- 671 39. Wu PP-Y, McMahon K, Rasheed MA, Kendrick GA, York PH, Chartrand K, et al.
672 Managing seagrass resilience under cumulative dredging affecting light: Predicting risk using
673 dynamic Bayesian networks. *Journal of Applied Ecology*. 2018;55(3):1339-50.
- 674 40. Wu PPY, Pitchforth J, Mengersen K. A Hybrid Queue-based Bayesian Network
675 framework for passenger facilitation modelling. *Transportation Research Part C-Emerging
676 Technologies*. 2014;46:247-60.
- 677 41. Beaudouin F, Demmerle D, Fuhr C, Tröb T, Meyer T. Head Impact Situations in
678 Professional Football (Soccer). *Sports Med Int Open*. 2021;5(02):E37-E44.
- 679 42. Heus P, Damen JAAG, Pajouheshnia R, Scholten RJPM, Reitsma JB, Collins GS, et
680 al. Uniformity in measuring adherence to reporting guidelines: the example of TRIPOD for
681 assessing completeness of reporting of prediction model studies. *BMJ Open*.
682 2019;9(4):e025611.
- 683 43. aus der Fünten K, Faude O, Lensch J, Meyer T. Injury Characteristics in the German
684 Professional Male Soccer Leagues After a Shortened Winter Break. *Journal of Athletic
685 Training*. 2014;49(6):786-93.
- 686 44. Fuller CW, Ekstrand J, Junge A, Andersen TE, Bahr R, Dvorak J, et al. Consensus
687 statement on injury definitions and data collection procedures in studies of football (soccer)
688 injuries. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2006;40(3):193-201.
- 689 45. Druzdzel MJ, editor SMILE: Structural Modeling, Inference, and Learning Engine
690 and GeNIe: a development environment for graphical decision-theoretic models. *Aaai/Iaai*;
691 1999.
- 692 46. Ekstrand J, Hägglund M, Waldén M. Injury incidence and injury patterns in
693 professional football: the UEFA injury study. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*.
694 2011;45(7):553-8.
- 695 47. Hägglund M, Waldén M, Ekstrand J. Risk Factors for Lower Extremity Muscle Injury
696 in Professional Soccer: The UEFA Injury Study. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*.
697 2013;41(2):327-35.
- 698 48. Cooper GF, Herskovits E. A Bayesian method for the induction of probabilistic
699 networks from data. *Machine Learning*. 1992;9(4):309-47.
- 700 49. Beuzen T, Marshall L, Splinter KD. A comparison of methods for discretizing
701 continuous variables in Bayesian Networks. *Environmental Modelling & Software*.
702 2018;108:61-6.
- 703 50. Liu H, Hussain F, Tan CL, Dash M. Discretization: An Enabling Technique. *Data
704 Mining and Knowledge Discovery*. 2002;6(4):393-423.
- 705 51. Dempster AP, Laird NM, Rubin DB. Maximum Likelihood from Incomplete Data via
706 the EM Algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological)*.
707 1977;39(1):1-38.
- 708 52. Lauritzen SL. The EM algorithm for graphical association models with missing data.
709 *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*. 1995;19(2):191-201.
- 710 53. Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman J. Model Assessment and Selection. *The Elements
711 of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. New York, NY: Springer
712 New York; 2009. p. 219-59.
- 713 54. Congalton RG. A review of assessing the accuracy of classifications of remotely
714 sensed data. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 1991;37(1):35-46.
- 715 55. Woods C, Hawkins R, Hulse M, Hodson A. The Football Association Medical
716 Research Programme: an audit of injuries in professional football—analysis of preseason
717 injuries. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2002;36(6):436-41.

- 718 56. Kjærulff U, Van Der Gaag LC, editors. Making sensitivity analysis computationally
719 efficient. Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 2013; Stanford, CA.
- 720 57. Orchard J. Is there a relationship between ground and climatic conditions and injuries
721 in football? *Sports medicine (Auckland, NZ)*. 2002;32(7):419-32.
- 722 58. Azubuike SO, Okojie OH. An epidemiological study of football (soccer) injuries in
723 Benin City, Nigeria. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2009;43(5):382-6.
- 724 59. Thomson A, Whiteley R, Bleakley C. Higher shoe-surface interaction is associated
725 with doubling of lower extremity injury risk in football codes: a systematic review and meta-
726 analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2015;49(19):1245-52.
- 727 60. Stanitski CL, McMaster JH, Ferguson RJ. Synthetic turf and grass: a comparative
728 study. *The Journal of sports medicine*. 1974;2(1):22-6.
- 729 61. Koiter JR. Visualizing inference in Bayesian networks: Delft University of
730 Technology; 2006.
- 731 62. Fernández J, editor *Decomposing the Immeasurable Sport: A deep learning expected*
732 *possession value framework for soccer*. MIT Slogan Sports Analytics Conference; 2019;
733 Boston, MA.
- 734 63. Bullock GS, Hughes T, Arundale AH, Ward P, Collins GS, Kluzek S. Black Box
735 Prediction Methods in Sports Medicine Deserve a Red Card for Reckless Practice: A Change
736 of Tactics is Needed to Advance Athlete Care. *Sports Medicine*. 2022.
- 737 64. Bittencourt NFN, Meeuwisse WH, Mendonça LD, Nettel-Aguirre A, Ocarino JM,
738 Fonseca ST. Complex systems approach for sports injuries: moving from risk factor
739 identification to injury pattern recognition—narrative review and new concept. *British*
740 *Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2016;50(21):1309-14.
- 741 65. Murphy KP, Russell SJ, editors. *Dynamic bayesian networks: representation,*
742 *inference and learning*2002.
- 743 66. Nielsen RØ, Malisoux L, Møller M, Theisen D, Parner ET. Shedding Light on the
744 Etiology of Sports Injuries: A Look Behind the Scenes of Time-to-Event Analyses. *Journal of*
745 *Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*. 2016;46(4):300-11.
- 746 67. Sandri M, Berchiolla P, Baldi I, Gregori D, De Blasi RA. Dynamic Bayesian
747 Networks to predict sequences of organ failures in patients admitted to ICU. *Journal of*
748 *Biomedical Informatics*. 2014;48:106-13.
- 749 68. van Gerven MAJ, Taal BG, Lucas PJF. Dynamic Bayesian networks as prognostic
750 models for clinical patient management. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*. 2008;41(4):515-
751 29.
- 752 69. Galan SF, Aguado F, Diez F, Mira J. NasoNet, modeling the spread of
753 nasopharyngeal cancer with networks of probabilistic events in discrete time. *Artificial*
754 *Intelligence in Medicine*. 2002;25(3):247-64.
- 755 70. Mueller-Wohlfahrt H-W, Haensel L, Mithoefer K, Ekstrand J, English B, McNally S,
756 et al. Terminology and classification of muscle injuries in sport: The Munich consensus
757 statement. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2013;47(6):342-50.
- 758 71. Ekstrand J, Askling C, Magnusson H, Mithoefer K. Return to play after thigh muscle
759 injury in elite football players: implementation and validation of the Munich muscle injury
760 classification. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2013;47(12):769.