

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	Effects of specific and non-specific court footwear on anterior cruciate ligament loading during a maximal change of direction manoeuvre
Type	Article
URL	https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/19303/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1080/19424280.2017.1363822
Date	2017
Citation	Sinclair, Jonathan Kenneth and Stainton, Philip (2017) Effects of specific and non-specific court footwear on anterior cruciate ligament loading during a maximal change of direction manoeuvre. <i>Footwear Science</i> . pp. 1-7. ISSN 1942-4280
Creators	Sinclair, Jonathan Kenneth and Stainton, Philip

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19424280.2017.1363822>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

1 **Effects of tennis shoes and running footwear on anterior cruciate ligament loading**
2 **during a maximal change of direction manoeuvre.**

3 **Word count:** 3450

4 **Key words:** Biomechanics, anterior cruciate ligament, sports, footwear, injury.

5
6 **Abstract**

7 The aim of the current investigation was to examine the effects of tennis shoes and running
8 footwear on the loads experienced by the ACL during a maximal change of direction task.
9 Thirteen male participants performed maximal change of direction movements in tennis
10 shoes and running footwear. Lower limb kinematics were collected using an 8 camera motion
11 capture system and ground reaction forces were quantified using an embedded force
12 platform. Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) loading was examined via a musculoskeletal
13 modelling approach and the frictional properties of the footwear were examined using ground
14 reaction force information. Differences in ACL loading parameters between footwear were
15 examined using one-way repeated measures ANOVA and multiple regression analyses were
16 used to determine frictional predictors of ACL loading. Peak ACL force was significantly
17 larger in the tennis shoes (2308.35 N) in relation to running footwear (1859.21 N) conditions.
18 In addition, it was shown that the peak rotational moment was a significant predictor of peak
19 ACL force in the tennis shoes (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.68$) and running footwear (Adjusted $R^2 =$
20 0.61) conditions. The findings from the current investigation indicate that the specific tennis
21 shoes examined in the current investigation may place athletes at increased risk from ACL
22 pathology during maximal change of direction movements. However, further exploration

23 using a more ecologically valid research design is required before this notion can be truly
24 substantiated.

25

26 **Introduction**

27 Racquet court sports such as tennis are associated with repeated high-intensity, intermittent
28 movement bouts, with rallies of between 5–20 seconds (Fernandez et al., 2006). Whilst
29 biomechanical literature has predominantly focussed on linear running, this mode of
30 locomotion is not ecologically relevant to the majority of sporting movements, particularly in
31 court sports (Lees, 2003). Court sports such as tennis require players to perform an array of
32 different movements including jumping, and rapid changes of direction/ cutting manoeuvres
33 (Hewit et al., 2013). The ability to quickly change direction is important for effective
34 performance in racquet court sports, allowing players more time to execute their strokes and
35 providing a mechanism to gain positional advantage on the court (Baker & Newton, 2008).

36

37 Tennis is associated with a high rate of knee pathologies in relation to other athletic
38 disciplines, with the anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) accounting for 11% of all knee injuries
39 (Majewski et al., 2006). ACL injuries are extremely serious and can lead to long term
40 absence from competitive sport (Olsen et al., 2004). ACL injuries typically lead to long term
41 discomfort at the knee, which forces many athletes to permanently withdraw from training/
42 competition. Indeed, Roos et al., (1995) demonstrated that only 30 % of competitive
43 footballers remained active 3 years after suffering an ACL injury. Even after full
44 physiological recovery from ACL injury, athletes typically fail to return to their previous

45 levels of function, as statistically significant performance decrements have been observed in
46 relation to non-injured controls (Carey et al., 2006).

47

48 In addition, athletes who experience an ACL pathology are statistically more likely to
49 experience degenerative knee osteoarthritis in relation to non-injured controls (Øiestad et al.,
50 2009). Thus **experiencing an ACL** injury serves to reduce engagement with sport/ physical
51 activity but also leads to chronic pain and disability in later life (Ajuied et al., 2014). In the
52 US alone over 175,000 ACL reconstruction surgeries are conducted annually, with directly
53 associated costs in excess of over \$2 billion and total allocated costs of \$3.4 billion (Gottlob
54 et al., 1999).

55

56 Injuries to the ACL are predominantly non-contact in nature, in that the ligament is damaged
57 without any physical interaction between athletes (Boden et al., 2009). ACL pathologies
58 occur mechanically when excessive loading is experienced **by the** ligament itself (Smith et
59 al., 2012). Non-contact ACL pathologies typically involve decelerations, cutting movements,
60 sudden changes of direction, or landings from a jump (Olsen et al., 2004). Athletes are
61 particularly at risk when the foot is in an everted closed-chain position at footstrike, the tibia
62 is rotated internally, and the knee is minimally flexed (Shimokochi & Shultz, 2008).

63

64 **Like all footwear, tennis shoes are designed in order to improve performance and to attenuate**
65 **injury. The mechanical characteristics of tennis shoes are traditionally designed specifically**
66 **in order to attenuate axial impact loading and promote lateral stability.** In addition to this, the
67 rapid changes of direction that are commonplace during tennis, means that friction at the

68 outsole-surface interface is important to reduce undesirable levels of movement of the shoe
69 relative to the surface (Carre et al., 2014). The frictional properties of athletic footwear are
70 typically investigated in biomechanical analyses using both the peak translational coefficient
71 of friction and rotational friction moment (Frederick, 1993). In tennis in particular, the
72 frictional characteristics of sports footwear can affect both performance and the risk of injury
73 (Frederick, 1993). Excessive friction can lead to injury due to overloading of the soft tissues
74 in the lower extremities (Thomson et al., 2015), whereas insufficient friction can cause
75 excessive foot motion relative to the surface, which causes decrements in performance
76 (Frederick, 1993).

77

78 Tennis players typically wear either court specific footwear or running shoes, however tennis
79 footwear has received relatively little attention in biomechanical literature. Luethi et al.,
80 (1986) investigated the effects of tennis shoes with flexible and stiff midsoles, during a lateral
81 hopping task. Their results indicated that the flexible footwear condition was associated with
82 significantly larger peak vertical impact forces and peak angles of foot inversion. Strauss et
83 al., (2009) explored the effects of multi-court, hard, grass and clay court specific tennis
84 footwear during a running forehand drive, on hard, grass and clay surfaces. Their findings
85 showed that on a hard court the specific footwear reduced the vertical load rate in comparison
86 to the multi-court footwear. Conversely on the grass court, the specific footwear increased the
87 vertical load rate in comparison to the multi-court footwear. Herbaut et al., (2015) identified
88 the effects tennis shoe drop on the kinetics and kinematics of junior tennis players during an
89 open-stance forehand. Their results indicated that the lower drop footwear condition was
90 associated with a reduced vertical impact peak and also a less dorsiflexed ankle angle at the
91 instance of foot contact. Finally, Sinclair, (2017) examined the effects of court specific,
92 minimalist and running trainers during a change of direction task. The findings showed that

93 the instantaneous load rate and peak tibial accelerations were significantly larger in the
94 minimalist and court specific footwear compared with the running trainers. In addition, the
95 peak angle of inversion was revealed to be significantly larger in the minimalist compared to
96 the court footwear and running trainers. However, there is currently no quantitative
97 information relating to the effects of tennis footwear on the loads experienced by the ACL
98 during change of direction movements.

99

100 Therefore, the aim of the current investigation was to examine the effects of tennis shoes and
101 running footwear on the loads experienced by the ACL during a maximal change of direction
102 task. Research of this nature may provide important new information to athletes regarding the
103 selection of appropriate footwear for the prevention of ACL injuries during tennis based
104 activities.

105

106 **Methods**

107 *Participants*

108 Thirteen male court athletes volunteered to take part in this study. The mean characteristics of
109 the participants were: age 23.15 ± 2.66 years, height 177.91 ± 4.55 cm and body mass $75.11 \pm$
110 5.74 kg. All were free from lower extremity pathology at the time of data collection and
111 provided written informed consent. The procedure was approved by a University ethics
112 committee STEMH 512.

113

114 *Experimental footwear*

115 The footwear used during this study consisted of, running footwear (New Balance 1260 v2),
116 and tennis shoes (Hi-Tec Indoor Lite) (shoe size 8–10 in UK men’s sizes) (Figure 1). The
117 running footwear had an average mass of 0.285 kg, heel thickness of 25 mm and a heel drop
118 of 14 mm. The running footwear tread pattern was a mixture of circular and elliptical grooves
119 with a discontinuity between the rear and forefoot components. Whereas the tennis shoes had
120 an average mass of 0.368 kg, heel thickness of 28 mm and a heel drop of 10 mm. The tennis
121 shoes tread pattern was predominantly a curved herringbone configuration and also had
122 discontinuity between the rear and forefoot components.

123

124 @@@ FIGURE 1 NEAR HERE @@@

125

126 *Procedure*

127 Participants were instructed to perform maximal 180° cutting manoeuvres whilst striking an
128 embedded force platform (Kistler, Kistler Instruments Ltd., Alton, Hampshire; length, width,
129 height = 0.6 x 0.4 x 0 m) with their right (dominant foot) foot. The force platform sampled at
130 1000 Hz. Participants commenced their trials from 6 m away from the force platform. This
131 distance was selected as being approximately half the width of a tennis court and was deemed
132 to be typical of the distances that tennis players may be expected to run and then change
133 direction (Sinclair, 2017). Participants ran straight ahead for 6 m then planted their dominant
134 foot on the force plate, and then changed direction to move 180° to their initial direction of
135 motion. The stance phase was delineated as the duration over which > 20 N of vertical force
136 was applied to the force platform (Sinclair et al, 2011).

137 Participants were given time to familiarize themselves with the experimental setup, this was
138 conducted until they were able to confidently achieve the required foot position on the force

139 platform. Five successful trials were obtained in each footwear condition. A successful trial
140 was defined as one in which the foot made full contact with the force platform and there was
141 no evidence of gait modifications due to the experimental conditions. The order in which
142 participants performed in each footwear condition was counterbalanced. To ensure that
143 participants utilized a similar approach velocity in each of the experimental footwear; the
144 linear velocity of the pelvic segment was quantified. The approach velocity during the first
145 trial was calculated and a maximum deviation of 5 % from this velocity was allowed
146 throughout data collection for each participant.

147

148 Kinematics and ground reaction force information were synchronously collected. Kinematic
149 data were captured at 250 Hz via an eight camera motion analysis system (Qualisys Medical
150 AB, Goteburg, Sweden). Lower extremity segments were modelled in 6 degrees of freedom
151 using the calibrated anatomical systems technique (Cappozzo et al., 1995). To define the
152 segment co-ordinate axes of the right foot, shank and thigh, retroreflective markers were
153 placed unilaterally onto the 1st metatarsal, 5th metatarsal, calcaneus, medial and lateral
154 malleoli, medial and lateral epicondyles of the femur. To define the pelvis segment further
155 markers were positioned onto the anterior (ASIS) and posterior (PSIS) superior iliac spines.
156 Carbon fiber tracking clusters were positioned onto the shank and thigh segments. The foot
157 was tracked using the 1st metatarsal, 5th metatarsal and calcaneus markers and the pelvis
158 using the ASIS and PSIS markers. The centers of the ankle and knee joints were delineated as
159 the mid-point between the malleoli and femoral epicondyle markers, whereas the hip joint
160 centre was obtained using the positions of the ASIS markers. This method placed the hip joint
161 centre 14% of the ASIS breadth medially, 19% posteriorly, and 30% distally from the
162 ipsilateral (Right) ASIS (Bell et al., 1999). Static calibration trials were obtained in each
163 footwear allowing for the anatomical markers to be referenced in relation to the tracking

164 markers/ clusters. The Z (transverse) plane was oriented vertically from the distal segment
165 end to the proximal segment end. The Y (coronal) plane was oriented in the segment from
166 posterior to anterior. Finally, the X (sagittal) plane orientation was determined using the right
167 hand rule and was oriented from medial to lateral.

168

169 *Processing*

170 Dynamic trials were digitized using Qualisys Track Manager in order to identify anatomical
171 and tracking markers then exported as C3D files to Visual 3D (C-Motion, Germantown, MD,
172 USA). Ground reaction force and kinematic data were smoothed using cut-off frequencies of
173 25 and 12 Hz with a low-pass Butterworth 4th order zero lag filter. Euler knee joint angles
174 were calculated using an XYZ sequence of rotations and knee joint moments were calculated
175 using Newton-euler inverse dynamics within Visual 3D.

176

177 A musculoskeletal modelling approach was utilized to quantify ACL loading, as described
178 and validated by Dai & Yu, (2012). This approach has been shown to be sufficiently sensitive
179 to resolve differences in ACL force during different movements (Dai & Yu, 2012) and also as
180 a function of different prophylactic mechanisms (Sinclair & Taylor, 2017). The face validity
181 of the current model has been evaluated from three key aspects in the literature. Firstly, Dai
182 & Yu, (2012) showed that the model exhibited a high level of consistency with the values
183 provided from in vivo ACL loading investigations (Cerulli et al., 2003; Taylor et al., 2011).
184 Secondly, the timing of ACL injuries in dynamic tasks occurs within the first 50 ms after the
185 initial foot contact (Krosshaug et al., 2007). The timing of the peak ACL force estimated
186 using this model by both Dai & Yu, (2012) and Sinclair et al., (2017) was shown to be < 50

187 ms, which is consistent with this data and supports the face validity of the model. Thirdly
188 Brown et al., (2012) demonstrated that landing with increased knee flexion reduced in vivo
189 peak ACL loading. The data provided by Dai & Yu, (2012) supported this notion as they
190 showed that peak ACL force was greater when landing with reduced knee flexion.

191

192 Firstly, the tibia-anterior shear force (TASF) was calculated, which was undertaken using a
193 modified version of the model described in detail by Devita & Hortobagyi, (2001). Our
194 model differed only in that gender specific estimates of posterior tibial plateau slope
195 (Hohmann et al., 2011), hamstring-tibia shaft angle (Lin et al., 2009) and patellar tendon-tibia
196 shaft angle (Nunley et al., 2003) were utilized.

197

198 ACL loading was determined in accordance with the below equation. Key input parameters
199 into this model were TASF, transverse plane knee moment, coronal plane knee moment and
200 also in vitro information based on the data of Markolf et al., (1995), which were extrapolated
201 as a function of the knee flexion angle measured during the current study. The first
202 component (F_{100}) of the above equation was mediated via by the TASF. ACL forces caused
203 by a 100 N TASF at different knee angles were obtained by digitizing and fitting a
204 polynomial curve to the data described by Markolf et al., (1995), who examined ACL forces
205 in vitro when a 100 N TASF was applied to cadaver knees from 0-90° of knee flexion. F_{100}
206 was extrapolated using the knee flexion data from the current investigation. The second
207 component (F_{10TV}) was caused by the knee transverse plane moment. The ACL forces
208 caused by a 10 Nm transverse plane knee moment, across the different knee angles were
209 obtained by digitizing and fitting a polynomial curve to the data of Markolf et al. (1995).
210 F_{10TV} was similarly extrapolated as a function of the knee flexion data from the current

211 investigation. The final aspect ($F10CR$) was caused by the knee coronal plane moment. The
212 ACL forces caused by a 10 Nm coronal plane knee moment, across the different knee angles
213 were again obtained by digitizing the data reported by Markolf et al. (1995). $F10CR$ was
214 extrapolated using the knee flexion data from the current investigation.

215

$$216 \text{ ACL load} = (F100 / 100 * \text{TASF}) + (F10TV / 10 * \text{transverse plane knee moment}) + (F10CR$$
$$217 / 10 * \text{coronal plane knee moment})$$

218

219 From the musculoskeletal model, peak ACL force (N) was extracted. In addition, ACL
220 average (N/s) and instantaneous load rates (N/s) were quantified. Average load rate was
221 obtained by dividing the peak ACL force by the duration over which the peak force occurred
222 and instantaneous load rate was quantified as the peak increase in force between adjacent data
223 points. Finally, ACL impulse (N·s) during the stance phase was quantified using a trapezoidal
224 function.

225

226 In addition, the peak translation coefficient of friction (μ) of each footwear was determined
227 from the ratio of horizontal and vertical force components during the initial period of
228 shoe motion (Stiles & Dixon, 2006). The peak rotational moment of the ground reaction force
229 (Nm) was used to describe the rotational friction characteristics of the footwear (Holden &
230 Cavanagh, 1991).

231

232 *Statistical analyses*

233 Means, standard deviations (SD) and 95 % confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated for
234 each outcome measure for both footwear conditions. Differences in ACL loading parameters
235 between footwear were examined using one-way repeated measures ANOVAs. Effect sizes
236 were calculated using partial eta² (η^2). The data was screened for normality using a Shapiro-
237 Wilk which confirmed that the normality assumption was met. In addition, multiple
238 regression analyses with peak ACL force as criterion and peak translation coefficient of
239 friction and peak rotational moment as predictor variables were conducted for each footwear
240 condition using a forward stepwise procedure. An alpha level of $P \leq 0.05$ was used
241 throughout as the criterion for statistical significance (Sinclair et al., 2013), and statistical
242 actions were conducted using SPSS v23.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA).

243

244 **Results**

245 Tables 1-2 and figure 2 present the ACL loading parameters that were obtained as a function
246 of the different footwear conditions examined as part of this investigation.

247

248 @@@ **TABLE 1 NEAR HERE** @@@

249 @@@ **FIGURE 2 NEAR HERE** @@@

250

251 *ACL loading parameters*

252 It was revealed that peak ACL force was significantly ($P = 0.009$, $\eta^2 = 0.55$) larger in the
253 tennis shoes in relation to the running footwear. In addition, ACL average load rate was
254 significantly ($P = 0.004$, $\eta^2 = 0.63$) larger in the tennis shoes in relation to the running

255 footwear. Finally, ACL instantaneous load rate was significantly ($P = 0.002$, $\rho\eta^2 = 0.69$)
256 larger in the tennis shoes compared to the running footwear.

257

258 *Frictional parameters*

259 @@@ TABLE 2 NEAR HERE @@@

260

261 Peak rotational moment was significantly ($P = 0.003$, $\rho\eta^2 = 0.64$) larger in the tennis shoes in
262 relation running footwear. In addition, peak translational coefficient of friction was
263 significantly ($P = 0.003$, $\rho\eta^2 = 0.63$) greater in the running footwear in relation to the tennis
264 shoes.

265

266 *Regression analyses*

267 The multiple regression analyses showed that for the tennis shoes (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.68$, $P <$
268 0.05), and running footwear (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.61$, $P < 0.05$) the peak rotational moment was a
269 significant predictor of peak ACL force.

270

271 Discussion

272 The aim of the current investigation was to examine the effects of tennis shoes and running
273 footwear on the loads experienced by the ACL during a maximal effort change of direction
274 task. To the authors knowledge this represents the first comparative investigation to quantify
275 the effects of different tennis footwear on ACL loading during a change of direction

276 movement. Quantitatively investigating the parameters linked to the aetiology of ACL injury
277 may provide tennis players with key clinical information regarding the selection of
278 appropriate footwear for their training/ competition.

279

280 Importantly the current investigation showed that ACL loading parameters were significantly
281 greater in the tennis shoes in relation to the running footwear. The mechanical aetiology of
282 ACL injury in athletic populations is caused by excessive loading of the ACL itself (Smith et
283 al., 2012). ACL injuries are considered to be extremely serious and habitually require
284 reconstructive intervention leading to long term absences from competition (Myklebust &
285 Bahr, 2004). Therefore, given the statistical increases in ACL loading in the tennis shoes, the
286 results from the current observation may be clinically relevant for tennis based athletes. It can
287 be conjectured based on the findings from this investigation that the specific tennis shoes
288 examined in this investigation may increase the risk from ACL injury during sport specific
289 change of direction movements.

290

291 In addition, it was also revealed that the tennis shoes were statistically associated with the
292 highest values for the peak rotational moment and the lowest values for the peak translational
293 coefficient of friction in relation to the running footwear. A likely explanation for this
294 observation is based on the tread patterns of each shoe outsole which are distinct between the
295 three footwear examined as part of the current study (Figure 1) (Valiant et al., 1985). This
296 observation concurs with the observations of Severn, et al., (2011) and Wannop &
297 Stefanyshyn, (2015) which indicates that manipulating the outsole patterns of different
298 footwear can alter both rotational and translational friction characteristics.

300 It also appears based on the findings from the current analysis that the tennis shoes were
301 effective in enhancing rotational friction but not optimal in promoting translational friction.
302 The frictional properties between the shoe and surface are an important determinant of
303 athletic performance, but high levels of friction at the outsole-surface interface may also be
304 related to increased risk of soft tissue injury (Wannop et al., 2009). There is currently no
305 agreement regarding the optimal frictional values that are required to provide sufficient
306 traction, but also attenuate risk from injury during sports movements (Frederick, 1993).
307 Importantly the current investigation showed that the rotational friction moment as opposed
308 to the translational coefficient of friction was a significant predictor of the peak ACL force in
309 all of the experimental footwear. This supports the proposition of Thomson et al., (2015) and
310 indicates that during maximal change of direction tasks the peak rotational moment is the
311 most clinically meaningful frictional parameter in relation to the development and prevention
312 of ACL pathologies.

313

314 A potential limitation to the current analysis is that ACL loading parameters were quantified
315 using a musculoskeletal modelling approach. This was a requirement of the current
316 investigation given the impracticalities of obtaining in vivo measures of ligament loading
317 during dynamic movements. Although the current model has been shown to exhibit good face
318 validity (Dai & Yu, 2012), musculoskeletal models by definition are always subject to some
319 mathematical assumptions that may compromise their efficacy across a range of participants.
320 A further potential drawback is the laboratory based nature of the data collection protocol.
321 Specifically, the stiffness and frictional properties of the laboratory surface are likely to be
322 distinct from those experienced in field based testing scenarios in which participants perform

323 tennis specific movements in realistic conditions. The current investigation utilized a repeated
324 measures design and thereby the statistical comparison between footwear is sound, as
325 participants performed in the same conditions in both footwear. However, the ecological
326 validity of the procedure from a practical context was compromised as ACL loading may
327 have differed had participants performed on a tennis specific surface. Therefore, it is strongly
328 recommended that the current investigation be repeated using a field based data collection
329 protocol.

330

331 In conclusion; although the biomechanical effects of tennis shoes have been examined
332 previously; current knowledge regarding differences in ACL loading when performing
333 change of direction tasks is limited. The current investigation thus adds to the current
334 literature base by performing a comprehensive evaluation of ACL loading parameters when
335 performing a change of direction task in tennis shoes and running footwear. Importantly, the
336 current study showed ACL loading parameters were significantly greater in tennis shoes in
337 relation to the running footwear. The findings from the current investigation indicate that the
338 specific tennis shoes examined as part of this investigation may place athletes who undertake
339 court based activities at increased risk from ACL pathology during maximal change of
340 directions movements. However, further exploration using a more ecologically valid research
341 design is required before this notion can be truly substantiated.

342

343 References

- 344 1. Ajuied, A., Wong, F., Smith, C., Norris, M., Earnshaw, P., Back, D., & Davies, A.
345 (2014). Anterior cruciate ligament injury and radiologic progression of knee

- 346 osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The American Journal of Sports*
347 *Medicine*, 42, 2242-2252.
- 348 2. Baker, D.G., & Newton, R.U. (2008). Comparison of lower body strength, power,
349 acceleration, speed, agility, and sprint momentum to describe and compare playing
350 rank among professional rugby league players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning*
351 *Research*, 22, 153–158.
- 352 3. Bell, A.L., Brand, R.A., & Pedersen, D.R. (1999). Prediction of hip joint centre
353 location from external landmarks. *Human Movement Science*, 8, 3–16.
- 354 4. Boden, B.P., Torg, J.S., Knowles, S.B., & Hewett, T.E. (2009). Video analysis of
355 anterior cruciate ligament injury abnormalities in hip and ankle kinematics. *The*
356 *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 37, 252-259.
- 357 5. Cappozzo A., Catani F., Leardini A., Benedetti M.G., & Della Croce, U. (1995).
358 Position and orientation in space of bones during movement: Anatomical frame
359 definition and determination. *Clinical Biomechanics*, 10, 171–178.
- 360 6. Carey, J. L., Huffman, G. R., Parekh, S. G., & Sennett, B. J. (2006). Outcomes of
361 anterior cruciate ligament injuries to running backs and wide receivers in the National
362 Football League. *The American journal of sports medicine*, 34, 1911-1917.
- 363 7. Carré, M.J., Clarke, J.D., Damm, L., & Dixon, S.J. (2014). Friction at the tennis shoe-
364 court interface: how biomechanically informed lab-based testing can enhance
365 understanding. *Procedia Engineering*, 72, 883-888.
- 366 8. Dai, B., & Yu, B. (2012). Estimating ACL force from lower extremity kinematics and
367 kinetics. 36th annual meeting of the American Society of Biomechanics Gainesville,
368 Florida, 253-254.

- 369 9. DeVita, P., & Hortobagyi, T. (2001). Functional knee brace alters predicted knee
370 muscle and joint forces in people with ACL reconstruction during walking. *Journal of*
371 *Applied Biomechanics*, 17, 297-311.
- 372 10. Fernandez, J., Mendez-Villanueva, A., & Pluim, B.M. (2006). Intensity of tennis
373 match play. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 40, 387-391.
- 374 11. Finch, C., & Eime, R. (2001). The epidemiology of squash injuries. *International*
375 *Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2, 1-11.
- 376 12. Frederick, E. C. (1993). Optimal frictional properties for sport shoes and sport
377 surfaces. In *ISBS Conference Proceedings Archive*.
- 378 13. Gottlob, C.A., Baker, C.L., Pellissier, J.M., & Colvin, L. (1999). Cost effectiveness of
379 anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction in young adults. *Clinical Orthopaedics and*
380 *Related Research*, 367, 272-282.
- 381 14. Herbaut, A., Simoneau, E., Barbier, F., Roux, M., Guéguen, N., & Chavet, P. (2015).
382 Lower shoe drop can reduce impact forces experienced by junior tennis players
383 performing an open-stance forehand. *Footwear Science*, 7, 112-113.
- 384 15. Hewitt, J.K., Cronin, J.B., & Hume, P.A. (2013). Kinematic factors affecting fast and
385 slow straight and change-of-direction acceleration times. *The Journal of Strength &*
386 *Conditioning Research*, 27, 69-75.
- 387 16. Holden, J.P., & Cavanagh, P.R. (1991). The free moment of ground reaction in
388 distance running and its changes with pronation. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 24, 891-
389 897.
- 390 17. Hohmann, E., Bryant, A., Reaburn, P., & Tetsworth, K. (2011). Is there a correlation
391 between posterior tibial slope and non-contact anterior cruciate ligament injuries?.
392 *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy*, 19, 109-114.

- 393 18. Lees, A. (2003). Science and the major racket sports: a review. *Journal of sports*
394 *sciences*, 21, 707-732.
- 395 19. Lim, B.O., Lee, Y.S., Kim, J.G., An, K.O., Yoo, J., & Kwon, Y.H. (2009). Effects of
396 sports injury prevention training on the biomechanical risk factors of anterior cruciate
397 ligament injury in high school female basketball players. *The American Journal of*
398 *Sports Medicine*, 37, 1728-1734.
- 399 20. Luethi, S.M., Frederick, E.C., Hawes, M.R., & Nigg, B.M. (1986). Influence of shoe
400 construction on lower extremity kinematics and load during lateral movements in
401 tennis. *International Journal of Sport Biomechanics*, 2, 166-174.
- 402 21. Majewski, M., Susanne, H., & Klaus, S. (2006). Epidemiology of athletic knee
403 injuries: A 10-year study. *The knee*, 13, 184-188.
- 404 22. Nunley, R.M., Wright, D., Renner, J.B., Yu, B., & Garrett Jr, W.E. (2003). Gender
405 comparison of patellar tendon tibial shaft angle with weight bearing. *Research in*
406 *Sports Medicine*, 11, 173-185.
- 407 23. Øiestad, B.E., Engebretsen, L., Storheim, K., & Risberg, M.A. (2009). Knee
408 osteoarthritis after anterior cruciate ligament injury a systematic review. *The*
409 *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 37, 1434-1443.
- 410 24. Olsen, O. E., Myklebust, G., Engebretsen, L., & Bahr, R. (2004). Injury mechanisms
411 for anterior cruciate ligament injuries in team handball a systematic video analysis.
412 *The American journal of sports medicine*, 32, 1002-1012.
- 413 25. Roos, H., Adalberth, T., Dahlberg, L., & Lohmander, L. S. (1995). Osteoarthritis of
414 the knee after injury to the anterior cruciate ligament or meniscus: the influence of
415 time and age. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage*, 3, 261-267.
- 416 26. Severn, K.A., Fleming, P.R., Clarke, J.D., & Carré, M.J. (2011). Science of synthetic
417 turf surfaces: investigating traction behaviour. *Proceedings of the Institution of*

- 418 Mechanical Engineers, Part P: Journal of Sports Engineering and Technology, 225,
419 147-158.
- 420 27. Shimokochi, Y., & Shultz, S.J. (2008). Mechanisms of noncontact anterior cruciate
421 ligament injury. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 43, 396-408.
- 422 28. Sinclair, J., Edmundson, C.J., Brooks, D., & Hobbs, S.J. (2011). Evaluation of
423 kinematic methods of identifying gait Events during running. *International Journal of*
424 *Sport Science & Engineering*, 5, 188-192.
- 425 29. Sinclair, J., Taylor, P.J., & Hobbs, S.J. (2013). Alpha level adjustments for multiple
426 dependent variable analyses and their applicability—a review. *International Journal of*
427 *Sport Science & Engineering*, 7, 17-20.
- 428 30. Sinclair, J. (2017). Effects of court specific and minimalist footwear on the
429 biomechanics of a maximal 180 cutting manoeuvre. *Human Movement*, 18, 29-36.
- 430 31. Sinclair, J., & Taylor, P.J. (2017). Effects of a prophylactic knee sleeve on anterior
431 cruciate ligament loading during sport specific movements. *Journal of Sport*
432 *Rehabilitation* (In press).
- 433 32. Smith, H.C., Vacek, P., Johnson, R.J., Slauterbeck, J.R., Hashemi, J., Shultz, S., &
434 Beynon, B.D. (2012). Risk factors for anterior cruciate ligament injury: a review of
435 the literature—part 1: neuromuscular and anatomic risk. *Sports Health*, 4, 69-78.
- 436 33. Stiles, V.H., & Dixon, S.J. (2006). The influence of different playing surfaces on the
437 biomechanics of a tennis running forehand foot plant. *Journal of Applied*
438 *Biomechanics*, 22, 14-24.
- 439 34. Strauss, D., Messenger, N., Utley, A., & Miller, S. (2009). Tennis footwear: An
440 investigation of impact characteristics. *Footwear Science*, 1, 52-53.

- 441 35. Thomson, A., Whiteley, R., & Bleakley, C. (2015). Higher shoe-surface interaction is
442 associated with doubling of lower extremity injury risk in football codes: a systematic
443 review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 49, 1245-1252.
- 444 36. Valiant, G.A., McGuirk, T., McMahon, T.A., & Frederick, E.C. (1985). Static friction
445 characteristics of cleated outsole samples. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*,
446 17, 156-159.
- 447 37. Wannop, J.W., Luo, G., & Stefanyshyn, D. (2009). Traction properties of footwear in
448 Canadian high school football. *Footwear Science*, 1, 121-127.
- 449 38. Wannop, J.W., & Stefanyshyn, D.J. (2016). The effect of translational and rotational
450 traction on lower extremity joint loading. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 34, 613-620.

451

452 **List of figures**

453 **Figure 1: Experimental footwear upper and outsoles (a. = court footwear upper, b. = court
454 footwear outsole, c. = running footwear d. = running footwear outsole).**

455 **Figure 2: ACL force as a function of different footwear (black = court footwear, grey =
456 running footwear).**

457 Table 1: ACL loading parameters (mean, SD & 95% CI's) as a function of the experimental footwear conditions.

	Court			Running footwear		
	Mean	SD	95% CI	Mean	SD	95% CI
Peak ACL load (N)	2308.35	380.01	2036.51-2580.20	1859.21	395.80	1576.07-2142.34
Time to peak ACL force (ms)	48.20	14.74	37.70-58.78	49.80	13.81	39.88-59.65
ACL average load rate (N/s)	54295.37	12832.58	45115.49-63475.24	42930.23	10059.78	35733.89-50126.56
ACL instantaneous load rate (N/s)	147762.11	41376.27	118163.31-177360.91	103200.24	24934.95	85362.85-121037.63
ACL impulse (N-s)	330.14	87.71	267.40-392.89	312.25	65.62	265.32-359.19

458

459 Table 2: Frictional parameters (mean, SD & 95% CI's) as a function of the experimental footwear conditions.

	Court			Running footwear		
	Mean	SD	95% CI	Mean	SD	95% CI
Peak rotational moment (Nm)	24.63	7.25	17.39-29.71	19.56	6.52	14.49-23.91
Peak translational coefficient of friction (μ)	0.57	0.07	0.53-0.63	0.64	0.08	0.58-0.70

460

461