

**TITLE PAGE**

**The Effect of Surface on Knee Landing Mechanics and Muscle Activity during a single-leg landing task in Recreationally Active Females.**

## Abstract

**Objective:** Investigate the effect of surface on frontal plane knee angle, knee moment and muscle activity.

**Design:** Randomised cross over.

**Setting:** University Laboratory.

**Methods:** Twenty females performed single-leg hop-landings onto sand, grass and firm surfaces. Kinematic, kinetic and muscle activity data were obtained. Compatibility curves were used to visualise parameter estimates alongside P- values, and S-value transforms.

**Results:** Knee angle for firm-sand (mean difference ( $\bar{d}$ ) = -2.2°; 95% compatibility interval (CI): -4.6 to 0.28,  $p = 0.083$ ,  $s = 3.6$ ) and firm-grass ( $\bar{d} = -1.9$ ; 95% CI: -4.3 to 0.5,  $p = 0.125$ ,  $S = 3$ ) yielded < 4 bits of reputational information against the null hypothesis (H). 5 bits ( $p = 0.025$ ) of information against H were observed for knee moment between firm-sand ( $\bar{d} = 0.17$  N.m/kg-1.m-1; 95% CI: 0.02 to 0.31) with similar effects for firm-grass ( $\bar{d} = 0.14$  N.m/kg-1.m-1; 95% CI: -0.02 to 0.29,  $p = 0.055$ ,  $S = 4$ ). Muscle activity across surfaces ranged from almost no ( $S=1$ ) reputational evidence against H (Quadriceps and Hamstrings) to 10-13 ‘bits’ against H for lateral gastrocnemius (lower on sand).

**Conclusions:** Our study provides valuable information for practitioners of the observed effect sizes for lower-limb landing mechanics across surfaces in asymptomatic females.

**Keywords:** sand, knee abduction moment, frontal plane, muscle activity.

## Introduction

Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) tear is a serious injury most prevalent in sports that include jump-landing (Agel *et al.*, 2005). Approximately 70% of ACL tears are non-contact injuries (Boden *et al.*, 2000), often involving a unilateral landing (Bisciotti *et al.*, 2019) occurring ~50ms post- impact (Koga *et al.*, 2010; Krosshaug *et al.*, 2007). Female athletes appear to have increased susceptibility to ACL injury, with a 2-3 times increased risk compared to their male counterparts (Montalvo *et al.*, 2019). Whilst anatomical differences and hormonal changes have been cited as potential causative mechanisms (Wojtys *et al.*, 2002), an excessive valgus position of the knee upon landing is frequently proposed (Ford *et al.*, 2003; Decker *et al.*, 2003; Koga *et al.*, 2010; Olsen *et al.*, 2004). The increased (mal)alignment of the lower extremity on landing is associated with increased knee abduction moment (KAbM) (Miyamoto *et al.*, 2023; Sigurdsson *et al.*, 2021), predicting ACL injury risk with 73% specificity and 78% sensitivity (Hewett *et al.*, 2005).

Effective muscle control and subsequent increases in co-ordination and stability are crucial for preventing excessive KAbM and protecting the ACL (Donnell-Fink *et al.*, 2015; Hewett *et al.*, 2005; Morgan *et al.*, 2014). Females have been shown to activate the quadriceps more than males during the landing phase (Hughes and Dally, 2015), which may cause significant anterior tibial translation and subsequent ACL strain (DeMorat *et al.*, 2004). Preferential activation of the lateral over medial quadriceps, hamstrings and gastrocnemius has also been noted in females (Palmeiri-Smith *et al.*, 2009; Landry *et al.*, 2007) and may limit their ability to resist abduction loads, increasing KAbM, knee valgus and subsequent ACL injury risk (Letafatkar *et al.*, 2015).

Interventions aiming to improve muscle control and reduce landing knee valgus and KAbM are integral to ACL injury prevention and rehabilitation programmes. Jump training programmes in isolation have been shown to be as effective at reducing landing knee valgus, and potential ACL injury risk, as those with additional balance and strength training components (Herrington, 2010; Petushek *et al.*, 2019). However, these programmes are frequently performed on firm surfaces which exacerbate musculoskeletal loading, potentially increasing injury risk (Pereira *et al.*, 2021). The use of sand as an alternative training surface has been advocated (Binnie *et al.*, 2014; Rago *et al.*, 2019), with jumping and plyometric tasks on sand during injury prevention and rehabilitation programmes highlighted as one of the main uses in professional sport (Richardson *et al.*, 2022). The absorption qualities of sand reduce peak deceleration forces encountered upon impact with the training surface (Gaudino *et al.* 2013). A significant reduction in peak vertical ground reaction force (vGRF) has also been demonstrated during jumping tasks on a sand compared to firm surface (Giatsis *et al.*, 2022) highlighting the potential for the use of sand in jumping programs aimed at both injury prevention and rehabilitation in the lower limb.

Empirical evidence for sand-based training has revealed a plethora of advantages when compared to a firm surface including; reductions in muscle soreness, exercise induced muscle damage, recovery time (Impellizzeri *et al.*, 2008; Miyama and Nosaka, 2004; Singh *et al.* 2014), improved muscle control strategies (Pinnington *et al.*, 2005; Panebianco *et al.*, 2021; Sharma and Chaubey, 2013; Sebastia-Amat *et al.*, 2020) and improvements in a range of firm ground performance measures (Mirzaei *et al.*, 2014; Arazi *et al.*, 2014; Ozen *et al.*, 2020; Hammami *et al.*, 2022).

The acute effects of surface on landing mechanics during jump-landing tasks hold the potential to advance our understanding, particularly in the context of applying this knowledge to jump-based training programs on sand surfaces. However, it is important to acknowledge that the existing evidence in this area is limited and requires further replication. Reductions in KAbM have been reported previously (Richardson *et al.*, 2020a) during single- leg jump tasks on sand compared to firm surfaces. Furthermore, decreased knee valgus in females specifically during a single-leg landing task on sand compared to firm has been demonstrated (Richardson *et al.*, 2020b). However, neither study included a comparison with an additional control surface (e.g., artificial grass) which might also be used during jump training in (p)rehabilitation scenarios (Impellizzeri *et al.*, 2008) and could offer equally effective alternatives to sand. Further, the use of a detailed 6 degrees of freedom lower body model, to assess kinematic and kinetic responses on the different surfaces may overcome limitations noted for two-dimensional (2D) approaches (Richardson *et al.*, 2020b) and the limited (Plug-in-gait) marker-set used in the earlier study. Finally, identifying the magnitude of change in muscle activation of lower limb muscles would provide insight into the muscle activation strategies evoked when the lower limbs are challenged by various surfaces. Taking the limitations into consideration and sparsity of evidence; Further information is required to ascertain the magnitude and direction of effect of surface on lower body landing mechanics.

Therefore, the purpose of our study was to investigate the influence of landing surface on frontal plane knee angle (FPKA), KAbM, peak vGRF and muscle activity (hamstrings, quadriceps, gastrocnemius) during a single-leg hop (SLH) onto sand, pliable grass and firm ground. Our research hypothesis was that KAbM, FPKA (valgus) and vGRF would reduce, and muscle activation would increase when landing in sand compared to the other surfaces.

## **Materials and Methods**

### *Participants*

Twenty-three females who participated in a minimum of three hours of sporting activity per week and were involved in jump-related sports (e.g., basketball, soccer, volleyball, rugby) were recruited from a university population. Three females were excluded, two for previous ACL injury and one for a lower limb injury within the last six months. Subsequently, twenty participants (age:  $23.4 \pm 4.8$  years; body mass:  $65.3 \pm 12.7$  kg; height:  $1.63 \pm 0.08$ m) undertook testing on one occasion repeating all conditions in a randomised order. All participants had no history of ACL injury or other knee pathology, previous significant lower limb fracture or surgery, and were injury-free for six months prior to data collection. All participants provided written informed consent, with the study approved by the University's ethics committee (No.035/19), in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

### *Procedures*

Prior to data collection, the participant's age (years), height (m), and mass (kg), were collected. To standardise jump-landings, participants were fitted with standard plimsoll shoes to control shoe-surface interface and were instructed to refrain from caffeine use at least 24h prior, and strenuous muscular exercise 48h prior to testing. A sub-maximal warm-up was performed which included 5-min on a stationary bike at a self-selected pace of 25% of the participants perceived maximum at a moderate resistance (5/10) (Walsh *et al.*, 2012) followed by a supervised and standardised dynamic stretching protocol, consisting of the following exercises (light jog across 10 m, leg cross-overs, high knee-pull, high lunge-pull, high knees-to-chest, quadriceps pull, hip cradle, lunge with twist, reverse kick, high kicks/reach, spiderman, skip-

hop, back pedal and high kicks), each performed for approximately 30 s (Avedesian *et al.*, 2018).


Subsequently, participants performed five familiarisation trials of the SLH on each of the surfaces, followed by a series of five SLH's (from a 30 centimetre [cm] height) on firm, sand and pliable grass surfaces performed in a randomised order (generated via a computer randomiser). The SLH landing was chosen due to its test-retest reliability during 3D measurement of knee kinematics and kinetics (Myer *et al.*, 2015). Five successful trials were recorded for each participant on each surface, with the requirement for success being; 1) the landing was controlled whereby the participant kept their balance when landing on the dominant leg (defined as the leg used to kick a ball for maximum distance), ensuring the contralateral leg made no contact with the ground on landing, 2) the impact phase of the movement occurred on a precisely located force platform, and, 3) participants landed with a 'stop and hold' for several seconds. No instructions were given for their arm or hand position to mimic a natural SLH. Participants were instructed to hop forward and down onto the floor, sand, or grass from a 30 cm height. A predetermined floor marker 30 cm from the participants' starting position was used to standardise the landing position (Figure 1). Trials where the subjects hopped in an upward direction prior landing were discarded and subsequently repeated.

The sand (particle size 0.02–0.2 mm) (Building Sand; Wickes, United Kingdom) was placed in a purpose-built pit allowing for lateral displacement of the sand and transmission of forces onto and from the force plate. Previous testing within our laboratory indicated that the participants mass recorded by the force plate was the same with and without the sandpit, and

the centre of pressure also remained accurate with a sand covering, so inverse dynamics could be performed (Richardson *et al.*, 2020a). The sand was at a depth of 10cm and placed directly on top of the force plate (Kistler, Model 9281CA, Kistler Group, Winterthur, Switzerland). The stiffness of each surface was assessed via ten repetitions of a 4.5kg clegg-hammer (SD instrumentation, Wiltshire, England) dropped from a height of 0.457m in line with previously used methods (Pinnington and Dawson, 2001; Binnie *et al.*, 2013). This device measures the peak impact deceleration force exerted by the surface. The stiffnesses were; sand ( $368.5 \pm 41.3\text{N}$ ), grass ( $1182.5 \pm 151.8\text{N}$ ) and firm ( $1587 \pm 191.4\text{N}$ ). The sand was stored in the lab at a controlled ambient temperature of 20.5°C.

When hopping onto the sand from a 30cm height, a 40cm box was used to account for the change in height. The pliable grass surface (Sherwood 30mm, Artificial Grass Direct Ltd, UK) which was 3cm in depth was placed directly over the force plate. When hopping onto the pliable grass surface from a 30cm height a 33cm high box was used to account for the change in height. For the SLH, participants were instructed to stand on their dominant leg and position their toes as close as possible to a predetermined marker at the edge of the box. After each landing on the sand surface, the sand was raked before the next jump to ensure an evenly distributed surface and consistent 10cm depth. Participants were given 1-minute rest between each repetition and a standardised 3-minute rest between surface conditions to avoid the effects of fatigue. Following completion of 5 successful jumps on each surface participants were asked to perform a cool down consisting of 5-minutes on a stationary bike at a self-directed pace and 3 x 60 second static stretches of the following muscles: gluteus maximus, quadriceps, hamstrings, and gastrocnemii.





**Figure 1.** An illustration of the experimental set up.

### *3D Motion Capture and Electromyography*

Three-dimensional kinematics were captured with twelve Vicon MX cameras sampling at 200 Hz (Vicon Nexus v12, Vicon Motion Systems Ltd, Oxford, UK). These were synchronised with a Kistler force plate and Delsys electromyography (EMG) system (Delsys Trigno, Delsys Inc, Boston, USA) both sampling at 2000 Hz for kinetic and muscle activity data respectively. For each trial, the Vicon software sent a digital pulse to the Delsys and Kistler systems, beginning the data acquisition across all systems at the same time. The cameras were calibrated the morning of data capture following procedures outlined as per the user manual. Forty-four, 14mm retro-reflective markers were attached to the overlaying skin of each participant to create a lower body 6-degrees of freedom model including pelvis, thigh, shank, and foot segments. Markers were placed over the following landmarks: anterior superior iliac spines, posterior superior iliac spines, iliac crests, greater trochanters, medial and lateral femoral condyles, medial and lateral malleoli, posterior calcanei, and the head of the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> metatarsals (Alahmari *et al.*, 2020). Tracking markers were mounted on technical clusters on the thigh and

shank. The same individual (primary author) placed the markers on all participants. A static trial was taken for each participant in a neutral (standing) position, with each foot on the force plate, following marker placement. Following skin preparation, surface EMG electrodes were placed on the overlaying skin of the vastus lateralis (VL), vastus medialis (VM), lateral hamstring (LH), medial hamstring (MH) and lateral gastrocnemius (LG) and secured with double-sided tape and additional micropore tape. We followed SENIAM guidelines described by Hermens *et al* (1999) to standardise EMG electrode placement.

#### *Data processing and reduction*

Marker trajectories were processed in Vicon Nexus (version 2.2) and exported (via .C3D file) alongside the GRF data to Visual 3D (Version 5, C-motion, MD, USA) for subsequent calculation of inverse dynamics. Trajectory and GRF data were filtered using a zero-lag fourth order Butterworth filter (10 Hz) (Kristianslund *et al.*, 2012; Ford *et al.*, 2003). A biomechanical model was defined within Visual 3D to determine joint angles and moments. For the knee joint, we created a virtual shank segment to align precisely with the segment coordinate system for the thigh to set the knee angle to zero degrees in the standing trial effectively normalising the knee angle to the static pose. The knee moment was resolved into local coordinate system of the thigh segment (Mizner *et al.*, 2012). In Visual3D, positive frontal (y) plane knee angles and moments reflect knee adduction (varus) in the right knee, and negative values reflect knee abduction (valgus) for angles and moments, this is reversed in the left knee. Two out of the twenty participants landed on their left leg. Therefore, to compare changes in knee adduction/abduction in our cohort, we reversed the sign so right and left knee data were comparable. External knee moments are described in this article.

Raw GRF and EMG signals alongside the modelled outputs (from Visual3D) were imported in MATLAB (MathWorks, 2021, version 2019b) and processed via a custom-designed programme. The vGRF data were low-pass filtered using a zero-lag second order (50 Hz) Butterworth filter (Brown *et al.*, 2014) and used to determine point of impact. Initial contact (IC) was determined as the first point above 20 N using a descending for-loop from the peak vGRF. Fifty milliseconds post-landing (i.e., IC) was used to extract our outcome measures of interest, with non-contact ACL injuries often occurring at this approximate time point (Koga *et al.*, 2010; Krosshaug *et al.*, 2007). The EMG signal was high-pass filtered (20 Hz) to remove the DC offset followed by a linear envelope which included full wave rectification and a 2<sup>nd</sup> order low-pass (3 Hz) Butterworth filter (Winter, 2009). EMG signals were normalised to the peak EMG amplitude observed during the landing phase (from initial contact to peak knee flexion) for each participant, from all trials, across all conditions. This normalisation approach allowed for the comparison of muscle activity across different tasks (Cronin *et al.*, 2015) and has been shown to reduce inter-individual variation (Cronin *et al.*, 2015).

### *Statistical Analyses*

We used a frequentist framework to analyse our data. Our selected response variables of interest were differences in discrete local optima for the frontal plane knee angle, knee moment, peak vGRF and EMG activity of lower limb muscles on landing from a SLH task on firm, grass and sand surfaces (pre-specified in ClinicalTrials.gov). We did not perform formal sample size (*n*) calculations *a priori*, our sample size justification is based upon resource limitations (Lakens, 2022). To reflect on the power of our study to detect a range of effect sizes and improve the informational value of our work we performed sensitivity power analysis (based on fixed *n*, and  $\alpha$ -level = 0.05). (Analysis outlined in Supplementary material 1; Section 1).

266

267 Data were analysed in RStudio (version 2022.12.0.353). To answer our research question,  
268 differences in outcome measures were analysed using a random-intercepts model (mixed  
269 approach) via the lme4 package (Bates *et al.*, 2015) which accounts for individual differences  
270 in the data. For our model *Surface* was specified as a fixed factor (categorical) and participant  
271 ID as the random effect allowing each participant's intercept to vary. Satterthwaite's  
272 approximation method was used for the calculation of t-tests and subsequent p-value via the  
273 lmerTest package. The behaviour of the residuals were checked visually and were acceptable  
274 for the assumptions of normality (via QQ plots), constant variance (residuals vs. predicted),  
275 and independence (auto-correlation of residuals). The random variance of participant ID,  
276 expressed as an SD (0.95 CI via parametric bootstrapping), is reported as supplementary  
277 material (Supplementary material 1; Section B) for the main outcomes to demonstrate the  
278 between-participant variance in the response variable.


279

280 We have approached our analysis cautiously aiming to provide a nuanced interpretation of our  
281 data and have attempted to replace '*confidence with compatibility and surprise*' (Rafi and  
282 Greenland, 2020). To avoid dichotomising our inferences, our observations are based on the  
283 magnitude and uncertainty of each outcome whether it is close to zero or not and reporting the  
284 observed p-value as a measure of the degree of compatibility between the target hypothesis and  
285 background model (Greenland, 2017) which encompasses all auxiliary assumptions. Thus, we  
286 make no reference to  $\alpha$ - levels or decisions per se (Greenland, 2019). Our primary analysis  
287 involved using estimates from the model to obtain compatibility curves via the *concurve*  
288 package (Rafi and Vigotsky, 2020) for the estimated mean response between the reference  
289 surface (e.g., firm) and the other two surfaces. The compatibility curve contains horizontally


stacked compatibility intervals (CI), estimated via the profile likelihood method, at every possible level (e.g., 95%, 90%, 75%) to visualise estimates consistent with model and all background assumptions used to compute the test statistic. Thus, we present relevant information for alternative hypotheses (non-nil effect sizes within the region of high compatibility for a given CI) as well as the nil-null (target) hypothesis (H). To preserve space, only curves for frontal plane knee angle and moment at 50ms are presented. We visualised the curves for all our outcomes to inform our inferences. The point estimate and 95% CI alongside the exact p-value (to 3 decimal places) and corresponding S-value transform is presented for all interactions. The S-values provide a measure of ‘surprise’ or amount of reputational information in the form of ‘bits’ or binary digits (e.g.,  $p = 0.05$  provides 4.3 bits of information) the P value supplies against our model, calculated by taking the negative base-2 logarithm of the P value ( $-\log_2(p)$ ) (Rafi and Greenland, 2020).

## Results

Descriptive statistics (mean and SD) for the dependent variables are displayed in Table 1, Ensembled average waveforms for knee angle (y), knee moment (y) and EMG between IC and 50 ms (loading phase) are presented to further aid interpretation (Figure 2a and 2b). Model outcomes for comparisons of dependent variables between surfaces are displayed in Table 2.



**Figure 2a.** Ensembled average waveforms for knee angle (y), knee moment (y) between IC and 50 ms (loading phase).



**Figure 2b.** Ensembled average waveforms for EMG (VM, VL, LG, MH, LH – top to bottom) between IC and 50 ms (loading phase).

**Table 1.** Mean  $\pm$  SD for primary outcomes across the three surfaces (n= 20).

| Surface                                              | Firm           | Sand          | Grass          |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Outcome</b><br>(at 50ms unless stated)            |                |               |                |
| Knee moment (y) (Nm $\cdot$ kg $^{-1}$ .m $^{-1}$ )  | -0.2 (0.2)     | -0.1 (0.3)    | -0.1(0.3)      |
| Knee angle (y) (deg)                                 | 3.4 (8.7)      | 1.5 (7.7)     | 1.2 (6.6)      |
| Peak vGRF (N)                                        | 2791.1 (544.5) | 1927.9(270.0) | 2866.7 (477.2) |
| vGRF(BW)                                             | 4.6 (1.2)      | 3.2 (0.7)     | 4.8 (1.0)      |
| VM_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase) | 0.65 (0.22)    | 0.59 (0.25)   | 0.62 (0.22)    |
| VL_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase) | 0.59 (0.22)    | 0.57 (0.27)   | 0.61 (0.23)    |
| LG_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase) | 0.65 (0.20)    | 0.50 (0.13)   | 0.69 (0.21)    |
| MH_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase) | 0.69 (0.19)    | 0.70 (0.19)   | 0.70 (0.17)    |
| LH_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase) | 0.58 (0.23)    | 0.57 (0.20)   | 0.65 (0.26)    |


Abbreviations: vGRF, vertical ground reaction force; BW, body weights; EMG, electromyography; VM, vastus medialis; VL, vastus lateralis; LG, lateral gastrocnemius; MH, medial hamstrings; LH, lateral hamstring. For knee moment and angle negative values reflect abduction and positive values reflect adduction.

### *Frontal plane knee angle and moment*


For FPKA, there was  $\leq 4$  bits of reputational information against the target hypothesis for firm vs. sand and firm vs grass. We observed almost no information ( $S = <1$  bit) against the null hypothesis of no effect for grass vs. sand. Whilst zero (nil effect) was one of the possible effect sizes compatible with our background model data, the compatibility curves (Figure 3a and 3b) shows negative effect sizes as large as  $-4.6^\circ$  difference for sand, and  $-4.3^\circ$  difference for grass are also compatible with the data, given the background model and contain the same information (4 bits) against the model as positive effect sizes of  $0.5^\circ$  and  $0.3^\circ$  which could be considered less practically important (Table 2). For knee abduction moment, we observed 5 bits of reputational information against the target hypothesis for firm vs. sand which would be




as surprising as seeing five heads in a row conditioned on a fair coin toss. Similar effect sizes were observed in the region of high compatibility for firm-grass (Figure 4a and 4b).




**Figure 3a** (A, B), shows the p value function, and corresponding S- value for frontal plane angle (firm-grass). The red line denotes the null (zero) hypothesis. The horizontal black line provides the effect sizes for  $p = 0.05$  (95% CI).



**Figure 3b** (C, D) shows the p value function, and corresponding S-value for frontal plane angle (firm-sand). The red line denotes the null (zero) hypothesis. The horizontal black line provides the effect sizes for  $p = 0.05$  (95% CI).



**Figure 4a** (A, B) shows the p value function, and corresponding S- value for Knee Abduction Moment (firm-grass). The red line denotes the null (zero) hypothesis. The horizontal black line provides the effect sizes for  $p = 0.05$  (95% CI).



**Figure 4b** (C, D) shows the p value function, and corresponding S-value for Knee Abduction Moment (firm-sand). The red line denotes the null (zero) hypothesis. The horizontal black line provides the effect sizes for  $p = 0.05$  (95% CI).

#### *EMG*

Almost no reputational information ( $S\text{-value} \leq 1$  for nearly all comparisons) against the target hypothesis was observed for VM, VL, MH and LH (Table 2) for firm vs. sand vs. grass. However mean muscle activity of the LG muscle was 15%-19% lower on sand compared to firm and grass surfaces which constituted 10-13 bits of reputational information against the target hypothesis (Table 2).

#### *vGRF*

The comparison of vGRF on firm vs sand (MD = 862.1N; 95% CI: 715.2 to 1011,  $p < 0.00001$ ,  $S = 52$ ) and grass vs. sand (MD = 938.7N; 95% CI: 790.8 to 1086.6,  $p < 0.00001$ ,  $S = 49$ ) yielded substantial reputational evidence against the target hypothesis whilst only 2 bits of information against H were observed for firm vs. grass (see Table 2 for body weight adjusted).

**Table 2.** Between surface differences for selected response variables.

|                                                             | Firm-Sand                                         | Firm-Grass                                    | Grass-Sand                                        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Outcome (at 50ms unless stated)</b>                      |                                                   |                                               |                                                   |
| <b>Knee angle (y) (deg)</b>                                 | -2.2 (-4.6 to 0.28)<br>P = 0.083<br>S = 4         | -1.9; (-4.3 to 0.5)<br>P = 0.125<br>S = 3     | -0.26; (-2.17 to 2.70)<br>P = 0.829<br>S = 0.3    |
| <b>Knee moment (y) (N.m/kg<sup>-1</sup>.m<sup>-1</sup>)</b> | 0.17 (0.02 to 0.31),<br>P = 0.025<br>S = 5        | 0.14 (-0.02 to 0.29)<br>P = 0.055<br>S = 4    | -0.03; (-0.17 to 0.12)<br>P = 0.724<br>S = 0.5    |
| <b>Peak vGRF (N)</b>                                        | 862.1 (715.2 to 1011.0)<br>P = <0.00001<br>S = 52 | -75.6 (-223.5 to 72.3)<br>P = 0.311<br>S = 2  | 938.7 (790.8 to 1086.6)<br>P = <0.00001<br>S = 49 |
| <b>vGRF (BW)</b>                                            | 1.4 (1.7 to 1.2)<br>P = <0.00001<br>S = 42        | -0.1(-0.4 to 0.1)<br>P = 0.378<br>S = 2       | 1.6 (1.3 to 1.8)<br>P = <0.00001<br>S = 45        |
| <b>VM_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase)</b> | 0.06 (-0.02 to 0.14)<br>P = 0.118<br>S = 3        | 0.03 (-0.05 to 0.10)<br>P = 0.487<br>S = 1    | 0.03 (-0.04 to 0.11)<br>P = 0.375<br>S = 1        |
| <b>VL_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase)</b> | 0.02 (-0.08 to 0.12)<br>P = 0.609<br>S = 1        | -0.02 (-0.11 to 0.08)<br>P = 0.755<br>S = 0.4 | 0.03 (-0.06 to 0.13)<br>P = 0.478<br>S = 1        |
| <b>LG_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase)</b> | 0.15 (0.07 to 0.24)<br>P = 0.001<br>S = 10        | -0.03 (-0.12 to 0.05)<br>P = 0.437<br>S = 1   | 0.19 (0.10 to 0.27)<br>P = 0.0001<br>S = 13       |
| <b>MH_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase)</b> | -0.01 (-0.08 to 0.06)<br>P = 0.796<br>S = 0.4     | -0.01(-0.08 to 0.07)<br>P = 0.853<br>S = 0.1  | 0.0 (-0.07 to 0.07)<br>P = 0.941<br>S = 0.1       |
| <b>LH_EMG ratio (relative to peak during landing phase)</b> | 0.02 (-0.07 to 0.10)<br>P = 0.697<br>S = 0.5      | -0.07 (-0.15 to 0.01)<br>P = 0.097<br>S = 3   | 0.09 (0.00 to 0.20)<br>P = 0.043<br>S = 5         |

Abbreviations: vGRF, vertical ground reaction force; BW, body weights; EMG, electromyography; VM, vastus medialis; VL, vastus lateralis; LG, lateral gastrocnemius; MH, medial hamstrings; LH, lateral hamstring. For knee moment and angle negative values reflect abduction and positive values reflect adduction.

## Discussion

The aim of our study was to investigate the influence of different surfaces (sand, grass and firm) on frontal plane knee angle, KAbM, vGRF and muscle activity (hamstrings, quadriceps, gastrocnemius) upon landing from a SLH in females. The main findings were, 1) Comparisons between surfaces for knee angle yielded  $\leq 4$  bits of information against the target hypothesis. Though effects as large as -4.6 and -4.3 were observed in the 95% compatibility interval. 2) Effect sizes in line with a reduction in KAbM ( $\sim 0.3 \text{ Nm} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^{-1}$ ) on sand and grass compared to firm were more compatible and less surprising as seeing no effect, with approximately 5 bits of reputational information against the target hypothesis observed. 3) Almost no reputational information against the target hypothesis in muscle activation across the surfaces for VM, VL, MH, LH was observed though CI were wide and more data is required. LG activation on the sand surface was reduced compared to grass and firm and yielded substantial information against the target hypothesis, and 4) Substantial reputational information against the target hypothesis for comparisons in peak vGRF for sand compared to grass and firm were observed. Effect sizes (alternative hypothesis) in favour of lower peak vGRF on sand constituted to  $\leq 4.3$  bits of reputational information against them.

To the authors' knowledge, this is the first study to provide detailed evidence for the magnitude of change and associated levels of compatibility in frontal plane angle, KAbM, vGRF, and lower limb muscle activation during a SLH landing on a firm, sand and grass surface for female (recreationally trained) athletes. As such, there is limited evidence with which to directly compare findings. Our cohort generally landed with healthy landing patterns and could be considered 'good landers' with 85% of participants landing below the knee abduction angle (KAA) thresholds ( $4.6^\circ$ - $6.3^\circ$ ) for ACL injury risk set previously for females (Bates *et al.*, 2020;

Hewett *et al.*, 2005) (Figure 2), and the mean frontal plane knee angle across surfaces reflect knee varus. Thus, any observable adjustments in knee landing mechanics because of surface might be smaller with our current cohort. This is inconsistent with previous work which demonstrated reductions in knee valgus ( $\sim 5^\circ$ ) when landing on a sand compared to firm surface, with females landing in  $\sim 12^\circ$  of valgus on a firm surface, and thus could be considered an ‘at risk’ population (Richardson *et al.*, 2020b) with greater scope to improve. It should be noted that we used 3D motion capture, whereas the aforementioned authors calculated the frontal plane projection angle via a 2D approach which is susceptible to perspective and parallax errors. As such, the two approaches only show moderate correlation and are not interchangeable (Alahmari *et al.*, 2020), making direct comparison difficult. The compatibility curve (Figure 3b) shows the range of compatible effect sizes for firm vs. sand and thus effect sizes where  $p > 0.05$ . Whilst zero is one of the plausible effect sizes, an effect size of  $\sim -4.6$  (counter-null) would have the same  $p$  value as no effect and shares the same bits of information against the statistical model. It is interesting to note that the range of effect sizes we observed are smaller than previous work (Richardson *et al.*, 2020b) and point in the opposite direction. It is not clear whether this means that sand (or grass) might have exacerbated the amount of valgus an individual landed in with our cohort, or allows individuals who land in adduction, to land closer to the midline when landing on these surfaces. It is feasible to suggest that the range of effect sizes we observed in our cohort may not be practically meaningful and therefore the landing patterns between surfaces, when the individuals are generally ‘good landers’, are practically equivalent to each other, though at this time there is not consensus on the smallest effect size of interest. We suggest researchers should now compare surfaces on participants who land consistently with  $KAA > 5^\circ$  (Bates *et al.*, 2020; Hewett *et al.*, 2005) on firm surfaces, or compare landing mechanics across surfaces between ‘good’ and ‘poor’ landers.

469 Knee abduction moments were observed (Table 1, Figure 2) at 50ms post impact across  
 470 surfaces. Frontal plane moments during landing have been demonstrably associated with ACL  
 471 injury/injury risk in athletes (Boden *et al.*, 2000; Hewett *et al.*, 2005; Krosshaug *et al.*, 2016;  
 472 Myer *et al.*, 2015). Higher loads are likely to have greater influence on ligament strain, which  
 473 is supported by cadaveric impact simulations, with only the highest risk and rupture loading  
 474 profiles demonstrating increases in ACL strain (Bates *et al.*, 2019a; 2019b). Myer *et al* (2011)  
 475 reported that female athletes who exceeded a threshold of 25.3 N.m during landing had a 6.8%  
 476 risk for subsequent ACL injury compared with a 0.4% risk in athletes who were below this  
 477 threshold. Richardson *et al.* (2020a) previously reported KAbM values of 17.3 (5.9) N.m  
 478 during the landing of a SLH task from a 30 cm height in a predominantly female cohort, which  
 479 reduced to 14.8 (5.2) N.m (or by approximately  $0.04 \text{ Nm}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}$ ) when landing on a sand  
 480 surface compared to firm. We also observed effect sizes in line with a reduction in KAbM  
 481 ( $\sim 0.3 \text{ Nm}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}$ ) on sand and additionally grass compared to firm, which were more  
 482 compatible and less surprising as seeing no effect, with approximately 5 bits of reputational  
 483 information against the target hypothesis observed (Table 2). It is possible that the observed  
 484 changes in KAbM, despite landing in knee varus, were a result of differences at the foot/ankle  
 485 (Dempsey *et al.*, 2012; Teng *et al.*, 2017; Tait *et al.*, 2022), hip (Pollard *et al.*, 2010), and trunk  
 486 (Shimokochi *et al.*, 2013; Chijitatsu *et al.*, 2020; Taniguchi *et al.*, 2022). Furthermore, when  
 487 landing on a soft compared to firm surface, the compliance of the surface allows the body to  
 488 sink into it resulting in lower vGRF (Gaudino *et al.*, 2013; Giatsis *et al.*, 2022), which was  
 489 evident in our study for sand specifically (Tables 1 and 2) and might contribute to a decreased  
 490 KAbM. Given the importance placed on reducing KAbM during landing to help prevent ACL  
 491 injuries (Sugimoto, Myer, Foss, & Hewett, 2015), practitioners may wish to consider the use  
 492 of sand or grass surfaces when planning ACL injury prevention or rehabilitation programs with  
 493 females, which involve a single leg jump landing component. Whilst the reduced KabM on

sand and grass may have the potential to reduce ACL injury risk, it may also enable an accelerated rehabilitation program because jumping activities could potentially be implemented more safely at an earlier stage in the process. However, this is speculative, and the magnitude of reduction in KAbM that is practically meaningful is currently unknown and thus our data should be interpreted cautiously. To develop our preliminary findings, future research should look to establish whether jump training on these surfaces provides the stimulus needed to reduce KAbM on landing during firm ground performance, and whether the differences exceed minimally detectable or clinically important differences.

Minimal differences were noted in the normalised sEMG activity of the VM, VL, MH, LH muscles at 50 ms post-landing across the firm, grass and sand surfaces, with almost no reputational information (less than one heads) against the target hypothesis (Table 2). Larger differences (and more precision) in the EMG activity of the LG muscle (~ 15-19%) were found and were lower on the sand compared to both the firm and grass surface (Table 2). The gastrocnemius may play an elevated role in supporting the knee during single- leg landing (Nyland et al., 2010) working in conjunction with or replacing the forces required by the hamstrings to counter quadriceps force and stabilise the knee through joint compression, reducing subsequent ACL strain and valgus loading (Morgan *et al.*, 2014). The substantial decrease in vGRF noted on sand compared to firm and grass, may indicate a lower requirement to absorb these forces and stabilise the knee on this surface. However, this alone does not explain the observed range of effect sizes for other lower limb muscles when landing on sand compared to firm and grass surfaces. Kinematic changes at the ankle in addition to the knee on landing may also be responsible for the reductions noted in LG on the sand surface and warrants future investigation.



519 Previous authors (Panebianco *et al* 2021; Smith, 2006; Sebastia-Amat *et al.*, 2020) have  
520 suggested that the deformation of sand increases the requirements for dynamic stability upon  
521 contact with the surface, compared to firm ground, and has been demonstrated in walking,  
522 running and balance tasks. During drop jump tasks, Peng *et al.* (2023) demonstrated increases  
523 in lower limb muscle activation (quadriceps, hamstrings and gastrocnemius) 30-60ms post  
524 landing on sand compared to firm surfaces, across a range of drop heights (30-60cm). It is  
525 proposed that the increased muscle activation patterns noted on sand help an individual cope  
526 with the unstable nature of the surface and could improve stability if repeatedly exposed to the  
527 surface (Pinnington *et al.*, 2005; Rafols Parellada *et al.*, 2020). However, the nature of the SLH  
528 task differs to running and change of direction tasks, where a backward movement of the foot  
529 due to the deformation of sand may require further stabilisation to prevent slippage (Gaudino  
530 *et al.*, 2013) compared to a ‘land and hold’ action during the SLH. Further, a lower degree of  
531 muscle activation has also been reported for drop-landing compared to countermovement jump  
532 and drop- jump tasks (Ambegaonkar *et al.*, 2011; Arianasab *et al.*, 2017) where stability is  
533 likely required in the eccentric phase of the task in preparation for an immediate explosive  
534 forward (and upward) movement. Therefore, the ‘land and hold’ nature of the SLH with the  
535 addition of the shock absorption qualities of sand (reduced vGRF) may reduce the perturbations  
536 to the postural system, and any observable difference in EMG between surfaces may be trivial,  
537 as we observed. The reduced mechanical demand as surface stiffness decreases has been noted  
538 previously in single-leg landing tasks (Hollville *et al.*, 2020). From a practical standpoint, if  
539 the mechanical demands on the musculoskeletal system are reduced in jump-landing compared  
540 to countermovement jump and drop- jump tasks on sand, this may limit muscular adaptations  
541 following training interventions that involve only jump- land activities on this surface.  
542 Furthermore, the greatest differences in terms of muscle activation during running and change-

of- direction tasks on sand compared to firm surfaces were found in the glutei muscles and tensor fascia latae (Rafols Parellada *et al.*, 2020; Pinnington *et al.*, 2005), which were not investigated in our study. Investigating muscle activation in these muscles when landing on different surfaces, would be beneficial, given the proposed contribution of gluteal muscle activity to reduced frontal plane landing angle and moments during single leg landing tasks (Llurda-Almuzara *et al.*, 2021; Maniar *et al.*, 2020; Neamatallah *et al.*, 2020; Dix *et al.*, 2019).

Our study is not without its limitations. We acknowledge that our observations are specific to a healthy recreationally active female cohort. This research paves the way for comparisons in poorer landers and across pathologic populations to allow wider generalisation. We appreciate that using a discrete time point for our outcomes may limit the ability to capture nuanced variations throughout the entire landing phase, which might be seen with other analysis techniques (e.g., statistical parametric mapping) which assess the continuous waveform. Additionally, EMG is prone to large between-participant variation, does not directly measure muscle force and evidence of a practically meaningful difference is lacking in the literature which would be useful to inform our inferences. It is possible that the characteristics of the sand surface such as granulation, moisture content, and depth contributed to different levels of stiffness between testing days which may have affected results (Pinnington and Dawson, 2001). Although we quantified surface stiffness and ensured a consistent depth of 10 cm for each SLH on the surface, we only used one type of sand, under single laboratory-controlled conditions. Future work should quantify the effects of different sand conditions (i.e., depth and stiffness) on lower limb kinematics, kinetics and muscle activity during jump landing tasks. Finally, whilst we have made every attempt to standardise our procedures and address background assumptions, we accept that there are uncertainties not captured in the statistical models which could explain our findings. We also acknowledge that values just outside the 95% CI also have

limited information against them and could be considered compatible. As such, advice on the role of sand for (p)rehabilitation should acknowledge and quantify these uncontrolled biases with consideration of cost to benefit ratios.

## **Conclusion**

Our study provides valuable information on the magnitude of changes in KAbM when landing on sand compared with a firm surface, and additionally a pliable grass surface. Observed differences in FPKA on sand compared to other surfaces were smaller in magnitude, less precise and pointed in the opposite direction to previous literature and our research hypothesis. This could be partially explained by the healthy landing strategies adopted by our participants across surfaces. It is not clear if the magnitude of differences we observed in KAbM and FPKA were of practical importance, and further work is required to establish these thresholds for both practitioners and researchers alike. Although larger effects for reduced LG on sand compared to grass and firm surfaces were observed, we found almost no reputational information against ‘no effect’ hypothesis in muscle activity for VM, VL, LH, and MH. Estimates of changes in vGRF were lower when landing on sand compared to firm and grass surfaces. Our findings are of interest to practitioners who consider the use of different surfaces in training, injury prevention or rehabilitation programmes with female athletes, which involve a jump landing component.

591    **Acknowledgements**

592    We would like to thank all participants for being part of this project.

593

594    **Data availability statement:**

595    The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author,  
596    [MR], upon reasonable request.

597

598    **Declaration of Interest Statement**

599    No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

600

601    **Funding**

602    None received.

603

604    **ORCID**

605    Mark C Richardson <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1484-5218>

606    Paul Chesterton <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9432-0675>

607    Abigail Taylor: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9864-6056>

608    William Evans <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2111-5408>

609

610

611

## References

- Agel J, Arendt EA, Bershadsky B. 2005. Anterior cruciate ligament injury in National Collegiate Athletic Association basketball and soccer: A 13-year review. *Am J Sports Med.* 33: 524–531.
- Alahmari A, Herrington L, Jones R. 2020. Concurrent validity of two-dimensional video analysis of lower-extremity frontal plane of movement during multidirectional single-leg landing. *Phys Ther in Sport.* 42:40-5.
- Ambegaonkar JP, Shultz SJ, Perrin DH. 2011. A subsequent movement alters lower extremity muscle activity and kinetics in drop jumps vs. drop landings. *J Strength Cond Res.* 25(10):2781-8.
- Arazi H, Mohammadi M, Asadi A. 2014. Muscular adaptations to depth jump plyometric training: comparison of sand vs land surface. *Interv Med Appl Sci.* 6(3):125–130.
- Arianasab H, Mohammadipour F, Amiri-Khorasani M. 2017. Comparison of knee joint kinematics during a countermovement jump among different sports surfaces in male soccer players. *Science and Medicine in Football.* Jan 2;1(1):74-9.
- Avedesian JM, Judge LW, Wang H, Dickin DC. 2018. The biomechanical effect of warm-up stretching strategies on landing mechanics in female volleyball athletes. *Sports Biomechanics,* 19(5):587–600.
- Bates NA, Myer GD, Hale RF, Schilaty ND, Hewett TE. 2020. Prospective frontal plane angles used to predict ACL strain and identify those at high risk for sports-related ACL injury. *Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine.* Oct 13;8(10):2325967120957646.

633 Bates NA, Schilaty ND, Krych AJ, Hewett TE. 2019a. Influence of relative injury risk profiles  
634 on ACL and MCL strain during simulated landing leading to a noncontact ACL injury event.  
635 *Clin Biomech.* 69: 44-51.

636 Bates NA, Schilaty ND, Nagelli CV, Krych AJ, Hewett TE. 2019b. Multiplanar loading of the  
637 knee and its influence on ACL and MCL strain during simulated landings and noncontact tears.  
638 *Am J Sports Med.* 47(8):1844-1853.

639 Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using  
640 lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software.* 67(1), 1-48.

641 Binnie MJ, Dawson B, Pinnington H, Landers G, Peeling P. 2013. Effect of training surface on  
642 acute physiological responses after interval training. *J Strength Cond Res.* Apr 1;27(4):1047-  
643 56.

644 Binnie, MJ, Dawson, B, Arnot, MA, Pinnington, H, Landers, G, and Peeling, P. 2014. Effect  
645 of sand versus grass training surfaces during an 8- week pre-season conditioning programme  
646 in team sports athletes. *J Sports Sci.* 32: 1001–1012.

647 Bisciotti GN, Chamari K, Cena E, Bisciotti A, Corsini A, Volpi P. 2019. Anterior cruciate  
648 ligament injury risk factors in football. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness.* Apr 30;59(10):1724-38.

649 Boden, BP, Dean, GS, Feagin, JA, and Garrett, WE. 2000 Mechanisms of anterior cruciate  
650 ligament injury. *Orthopaedics.* 23: 573–578.

651 Brown SR, Wang H, Dickin DC, Weiss KJ. 2014. The relationship between leg preference and  
652 knee mechanics during sidestepping in collegiate female footballers. *Sports*  
653 *Biomechanics*, 13(4): 351-361.

654 Chijimatsu M, Ishida T, Yamanaka M, Taniguchi S, Ueno R, Ikuta R, Samukawa M, Ino T,  
655 Kasahara S, Tohyama H. 2020. Landing instructions focused on pelvic and trunk lateral tilt

656 decrease the knee abduction moment during a single-leg drop vertical jump. *Phys Ther in Sport*.  
657 Nov 1; 46:226-33.

658 Cronin NJ, Kumpulainen S, Joutjärvi T, Finni T, Piitulainen H. 2015. Spatial variability of  
659 muscle activity during human walking: the effects of different EMG normalization approaches.  
660 *Neuroscience*. Aug 6; 300:19-28.

661 Decker MJ, Torry MR, Wyland DJ, Sterett WI, Steadman JR. 2003. Gender differences in  
662 lower extremity kinematics, kinetics and energy absorption during landing. *Clin Biomech*. 18:  
663 662–669.

664 DeMorat G, Weinhold P, Blackburn T, Chudik S, Garrett W. 2004. Aggressive quadriceps  
665 loading can induce noncontact anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Am J Sports Med* 32: 477–  
666 483.

667 Dempsey AR, Elliott BC, Munro BJ, Steele JR, Lloyd DG. 2012. Whole body kinematics and  
668 knee moments that occur during an overhead catch and landing task in sport. *Clin Biomech*.  
669 Jun 1;27(5):466-74.

670 Dix J, Marsh S, Dingenen B, Malliaras P. 2019. The relationship between hip muscle strength  
671 and dynamic knee valgus in asymptomatic females: A systematic review. *Phys Ther in Sport*.  
672 May 1; 37:197-209.

673 Donnell-Fink LA, Klara K, Collins JE, Yang HY, Goczalk MG, Katz JN, Losina E. 2015.  
674 Effectiveness of knee injury and anterior cruciate ligament tear prevention programs: A meta-  
675 analysis. *PLoS One*. 10: e0144063.

676 Ford KR, Myer GD, Hewett TE. 2003. Valgus knee motion during landing in high school  
677 female and male basketball players. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 35(10):1745–1750.

678 Gaudino P, Gaudino C, Alberti G, Minetti AE. 2013. Biomechanics and predicted energetics  
679 of sprinting on sand: hints for soccer training. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*. May  
680 1;16(3):271-5.

681 Giatsis G, Panoutsakopoulos V, Kollias IA. 2022. Drop jumping on sand is characterized by  
682 lower power, higher rate of force development and larger knee joint range of motion. *Journal*  
683 *of Functional Morphology and Kinesiology*. Feb 4;7(1):17.

684 Greenland S. 2019. Valid p-values behave exactly as they should: Some misleading criticisms  
685 of p-values and their resolution with s-values. *The American Statistician*, 73(sup1):106-114.

686 Greenland S. 2017. Invited commentary: the need for cognitive science in  
687 methodology. *American journal of epidemiology*, 186(6):639-645.

688 Hammami M, Bragazzi NL, Hermassi S, Gaamouri N, Aouadi R, Shephard RJ, Chelly MS.  
689 2020. The effect of a sand surface on physical performance responses of junior male handball  
690 players to plyometric training. *BMC Sports Science, Medicine and Rehabilitation*. Dec; 12:1-  
691 8.

692 Hermens HJ, Freriks B, Merletti R, Stegeman D, Blok J, Rau G, Disselhorst-Klug C, Hägg G.  
693 1999. European recommendations for surface electromyography. *Roessingh Research and*  
694 *Development*. 8(2):13-54.

695 Herrington L. 2010. The effects of 4 weeks of jump training on landing knee valgus and  
696 crossover hop performance in female basketball players. *J Strength Cond Res*. 24(12):3427–  
697 3432.

698 Hewett, TE, Myer, GD, Ford, KR, Heidt, RS, Colosimo, AJ, McLean, SG, Van Den Bogert  
699 AJ, Paterno MV, Succop, P. 2005. Biomechanical measures of neuromuscular control and



700 valgus loading of the knee predict anterior cruciate ligament injury risk in female athletes a  
 701 prospective study. *Am J Sports Med.* 33: 492–501.

702 Hollville E, Nordez A, Guilhem G, Lecompte J, Rabita G. 2020. Surface properties affect the  
 703 interplay between fascicles and tendinous tissues during landing. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* Jan;  
 704 120:203-17.

705 Hughes G, Dally N. 2015. Gender difference in lower limb muscle activity during landing and  
 706 rapid change of direction. *Science & Sports*, 30(3):163-168.

707 Impellizzeri FM, Rampinini E, Castagna C, Martino F, Fiorini S, Wisloff U. 2008. Effect of  
 708 plyometric training on sand versus grass on muscle soreness and jumping and sprinting ability  
 709 in soccer players. *Br J Sports Med.* 42: 42–46.

710 Koga H, Nakamae A, Shima Y, Iwasa J, Myklebust G, Engebretsen L, Bahr R, Krosshaug T.  
 711 2010. Mechanisms for noncontact anterior cruciate ligament injuries: knee joint kinematics in  
 712 10 injury situations from female team handball and basketball. *The American Journal of Sports*  
 713 *Medicine.* Nov;38(11):2218-25.

714 Kristianslund E, Krosshaug T, Van den Bogert AJ. 2012. Effect of low pass filtering on joint  
 715 moments from inverse dynamics: implications for injury prevention. *Journal of*  
 716 *biomechanics*, 45(4):666-671.

717 Krosshaug T, Steffen K, Kristianslund E, Nilstad A, Mok KM, Myklebust G, Bahr R. 2016.  
 718 The vertical drop jump is a poor screening test for ACL injuries in female elite soccer and  
 719 handball players: a prospective cohort study of 710 athletes. *Am J Sports Med.* 44(4):874-883.

720 Krosshaug, T, Nakamae, A, Boden, BP, Engebretsen, L, Smith, G, Slauterbeck, JR, Bahr, R.  
 721 2007. Mechanisms of anterior cruciate ligament injury in basketball video analysis of 39 cases.  
 722 *Am J Sports Med.* 35: 359–367.

723

724 Landry SC, McKean KA, Hubley-Kozey CL, Stanish WD, Deluzio KJ. 2007. Neuromuscular  
725 and lower limb biomechanical differences exist between male and female elite adolescent  
726 soccer players during an unanticipated side-cut maneuver. *The American journal of sports*  
727 *medicine*, 35(11):1888-1900.

728 Lakens D. 2022. Sample size justification. *Collabra: psychology*, 8(1):33267.

729 Letafatkar A, Rajabi R, Tekamejani EE, Minoonejad H. 2015. Effects of perturbation training  
730 on knee flexion angle and quadriceps to hamstring cocontraction of female athletes with  
731 quadriceps dominance deficit: Pre–post intervention study. *The knee*. Jun 1;22(3):230-6.

732

733 Llurda-Almuzara L, Perez-Bellmunt A, Labata-Lezaun N, López-de-Celis C, Canet-Vintró M,  
734 Cadellans-Arroniz A, Moure-Romero L, Aiguadé-Aiguadé R. 2021. Relationship between  
735 lower limb EMG activity and knee frontal plane projection angle during a single-legged drop  
736 jump. *Phys Ther in Sport*. Nov 1; 52:13-20.

737 Maniar N, Schache AG, Pizzolato C, Opar DA. 2022. Muscle function during single leg  
738 landing. *Scientific Reports*. Jul 7;12(1):11486.

739 Mirzaei B, Norasteh AA, de Villarreal ES, Asadi A. 2014. Effects of six weeks of depth jump  
740 vs countermovement jump training on sand on muscle soreness and performance. *Kinesiology*.  
741 46(1):97–108.

742 Miyama M, Nosaka K. 2004. Influence of surface on muscle damage and soreness induced by  
743 consecutive drop jumps. *J Strength Cond Res*. 18: 206–211.

744 Miyamoto D, Saito A, Kimoto M, Terui Y, Okada K. 2023. Relationship between the knee  
 745 valgus moment and the hip abductor and adductor activity during single-leg landing. *Phys Ther*  
 746 *in Sport*. May 1; 61:129-34.

747 Mizner RL, Chmielewski TL, Toepke JJ, Tofte KB. 2012. Comparison of 2-dimensional  
 748 measurement techniques for predicting knee angle and moment during a drop vertical  
 749 jump. *Clinical journal of sport medicine*, 22(3):221-227.

750 Montalvo, AM, Schneider, DK, Yut, L, Webster, KE, Beynnon, B, Kocher, MS, Myer, GD.  
 751 2019. “What’s my risk of sustaining an ACL injury while playing sports?” A systematic review  
 752 with meta-analysis. *British journal of sports medicine*, 53(16):1003-1012.

753 Morgan KD, Donnelly CJ, Reinbolt JA. 2014. Elevated gastrocnemius forces compensate for  
 754 decreased hamstrings forces during the weight-acceptance phase of single-leg jump landing:  
 755 Implications for anterior cruciate ligament injury risk. *J Biomech*. 47: 3295–3302.

756 Myer GD, Ford KR, Di Stasi SL, Foss KD, Micheli LJ, Hewitt T. 2015. High knee abduction  
 757 moments are common risk factors for patellofemoral pain (PFP) and anterior cruciate ligament  
 758 (ACL) injury in girls: is PFP itself a predictor for subsequent ACL injury? *Br J Sports Med*.  
 759 49(2):118-122.

760 Myer, GD, Bates, NA, DiCesare, CA, Foss, KDB, Thomas, SM, Wordeman, SC, Sugimoto, D,  
 761 Roewer, BD, McKeon, JMM, Di Stasi, SL, Noehren, BW. 2015. Reliability of 3-dimensional  
 762 measures of single-leg drop landing across 3 institutions: implications for multicenter research  
 763 for secondary ACL-injury prevention. *Journal of sport rehabilitation*, 24(2):198-209.

764 Myer, GD, Ford, KR, Khoury, J, Succop, P, and Hewett, TE. 2011. Biomechanics laboratory-  
 765 based prediction algorithm to identify female athletes with high knee loads that increase risk  
 766 of ACL injury. *Br J Sports Med*. 45: 245–252.

767 Neamatallah Z, Herrington L, Jones R. 2020. An investigation into the role of gluteal muscle  
768 strength and EMG activity in controlling HIP and knee motion during landing tasks. *Phys Ther*  
769 *in Sport*. May 1; 43:230-5.

770 Nyland J, Klein S, Caborn DN. 2010. Lower extremity compensatory neuromuscular and  
771 biomechanical adaptations 2 to 11 years after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction.  
772 *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery*, 26(9):1212-1225.

773 Olsen OE, Myklebust G, Engebretsen L, Bahr R. 2004. Injury mechanisms for anterior cruciate  
774 ligament injuries in team handball: a systematic video analysis. *The American Journal of Sports*  
775 *Medicine*. Jun;32(4):1002-12.

776 Ozen G, Atar O, Koc H. 2020. The effects of a 6-week plyometric training programme on sand  
777 versus wooden parquet surfaces on the physical performance parameters of well-trained young  
778 basketball players. *Montenegrin Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*. Mar 1;9(1):27.

779 Panebianco GP, Bisi MC, Mangia AL, Fantozzi S, Stagni R. 2021. Quantitative  
780 characterization of walking on sand in ecological conditions: Speed, temporal segmentation,  
781 and variability. *Gait & Posture*. May 1; 86:211-6.

782 Palmieri-Smith RM, McLean SG, Ashton-Miller JA, Wojtys EM. 2009. Association of  
783 quadriceps and hamstrings cocontraction patterns with knee joint loading. *Journal of athletic*  
784 *training*. May;44(3):256-63.

785 Peng HT, Chang HK, Chen HW, Huang TI, Chen H. 2023. Neuromuscular Changes in Drop  
786 Jumps on Different Common Material Surfaces with Incremental Drop Heights. *Applied*  
787 *Sciences*, 13(8), p.5123.

788 Pereira LA, Freitas TT, Marín-Cascales E, Bishop C, McGuigan MR, Loturco I. 2021. Effects  
789 of training on sand or hard surfaces on sprint and jump performance of team-sport players: A  
790 systematic review with meta-analysis. *Strength & Conditioning Journal*. Jun 1;43(3):56-66.

791 Petushek EJ, Sugimoto D, Stoolmiller M, Smith G, Myer GD. 2019. Evidence-based best-  
792 practice guidelines for preventing anterior cruciate ligament injuries in young female athletes:  
793 a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*.  
794 Jun;47(7):1744-53.

795 Pinnington HC, Dawson B. 2001. The energy cost of running on grass compared to soft dry  
796 beach sand. *J Sci Med Sport*, 4: 416–430.

797 Pinnington HC, Lloyd DG, Besier TF, Dawson B. 2005. Kinematic and electromyography  
798 analysis of submaximal differences running on a firm surface compared with soft, dry sand.  
799 *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 94: 242–253.

800 Pollard CD, Sigward SM, Powers CM. 2010. Limited hip and knee flexion during landing is  
801 associated with increased frontal plane knee motion and moments. *Clin Biomech*. Feb  
802 1;25(2):142-6.

803 Rago V, Silva JR, Brito J, Barreira D, Mohr M, Krstrup P, Rebelo AN. 2018. Switching  
804 between pitch surfaces: practical applications and future perspectives for soccer training. *The*  
805 *Journal of sports medicine and physical fitness*, 59(3):510-519.

806 Rafi Z, Greenland S. 2020. Semantic and cognitive tools to aid statistical science: replace  
807 confidence and significance by compatibility and surprise. *BMC Med Res Methodol*, 20.

808 Rafi Z, Vigotsky A. 2020. \_concurve: Computes and Plots Compatibility (Confidence)  
809 Intervals, P-Values, S-Values, & Likelihood Intervals to Form Consonance, Surprisal, &  
810 Likelihood Functions\_. *R package version*. 2(7).

811 Rafols Parellada L, Linde X, Solà J, Fort A, Brau J. 2020. Muscle activation during  
812 rehabilitation on artificial turf vs. sand after cruciate ligament surgery: A case series. *Apunts*  
813 *Sports Medicine*. Jul 1;55(207):111-4.

814 Richardson MC, English B, Chesterton P. 2022. The use of sand as an alternative surface for  
815 training, injury prevention and rehabilitation in English professional football and barriers to  
816 implementation: a cross-sectional survey of medical staff. *Science and Medicine in Football*.  
817 Sep 21:1-9.

818 Richardson MC, Murphy S, Macpherson T, English B, Spears I, Chesterton P. 2020a. Effect  
819 of sand on knee load during a single-leg jump task: Implications for injury prevention and  
820 rehabilitation programs. *J Strength Cond Res*. Nov 1;34(11):3164-72.

821 Richardson MC, Wilkinson A, Chesterton P, Evans W. 2020b. Effect of sand on landing knee  
822 valgus during single-leg land and drop jump tasks: Possible implications for ACL injury  
823 prevention and rehabilitation. *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation*. Mar 31;30(1):97-104.

824 Sebastia-Amat S, Ardigò LP, Jimenez-Olmedo JM, Pueo B, Penichet-Tomas A. 2020. The  
825 effect of balance and sand training on postural control in elite beach volleyball players.  
826 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. Dec;17(23):8981.

827 Sharma R, Chaubey D. 2013. Effect of sand training on jumping abilities of junior volleyball  
828 players. *J. Educ. Pract.* May 29; 4:101-6.

829 Shimokochi Y, Ambegaonkar JP, Meyer EG, Lee SY, Shultz SJ. 2013. Changing sagittal plane  
830 body position during single-leg landings influences the risk of non-contact anterior cruciate  
831 ligament injury. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 21:888–97.

832 Sigurðsson HB, Karlsson J, Snyder-Mackler L, Briem K. 2021. Kinematics observed during  
833 ACL injury are associated with large early peak knee abduction moments during a change of  
834 direction task in healthy adolescents. *J Orthop Res.* Oct;39(10):2281-90.

835 Singh A, Sakshi G, Singh SJ. 2014. Effect of plyometric training on sand versus grass on  
836 muscle soreness and selected sport-specific performance variables in hockey players. *Journal*  
837 *of Human Sport and Exercise.* 9(1):59-67.

838 Smith R. 2006. Movement in the sand: Training implications for beach volleyball. *Strength &*  
839 *Conditioning Journal.* Oct 1;28(5):19-21.

840 Sugimoto D, Myer GD, Foss KDB, Hewett, TE. 2015. Specific exercise effects of preventive  
841 neuromuscular training intervention on anterior cruciate ligament injury risk reduction in  
842 young females: meta-analysis and subgroup analysis. *British journal of sports medicine,*  
843 49(5):282-289.

844 Tait DB, Newman P, Ball NB, Spratford W. 2022. What did the ankle say to the knee?  
845 Estimating knee dynamics during landing—A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of*  
846 *Science and Medicine in Sport.* Feb 1;25(2):183-91.

847 Taniguchi S, Ishida T, Yamanaka M, Ueno R, Ikuta R, Chijimatsu M, Samukawa M, Koshino  
848 Y, Kasahara S, Tohyama H. 2022. Sex difference in frontal plane hip moment in response to  
849 lateral trunk obliquity during single-leg landing. *BMC Sports Science, Medicine and*  
850 *Rehabilitation.* Dec;14(1):1-0.

851 Teng PS, Kong PW, Leong KF. 2017. Effects of foot rotation positions on knee valgus during  
852 single-leg drop landing: Implications for ACL injury risk reduction. *The Knee.* Jun  
853 1;24(3):547-54.

854 Walsh M, Boling MC, McGrath M, Blackburn JT, Padua DA. 2012. Lower extremity muscle  
 855 activation and knee flexion during a jump-landing task. *Journal of Athletic Training*.  
 856 Jul;47(4):406-13.

857 Winter DA. 2009. *Biomechanics and motor control of human movement*. John wiley & sons.

858 Wojtys EM, Huston LJ, Boynton MD, Spindler KP, Lindenfeld TN. 2002. The effect of the  
 859 menstrual cycle on anterior cruciate ligament injuries in women as determined by hormone  
 860 levels. *Am J Sports Med*. 30(2):182–188.