

**MANUSCRIPT TYPE:**

Original Research

**MANUSCRIPT TITLE:**

Comparison of Drop Jump and Tuck Jump Knee Joint Kinematics in Elite Male Youth Soccer Players: Implications for Injury Risk Screening

**AUTHORS:**

Rhodri S. Lloyd, PhD<sup>1,2,3</sup>

Jon L. Oliver, PhD<sup>1,2</sup>

Gregory D. Myer, PhD<sup>4,5,6</sup>

Mark De Ste Croix, PhD<sup>7</sup>

Josh Wass, MSc<sup>8</sup>

Paul J. Read, PhD<sup>1,9</sup>

**AFFILIATIONS:**

1. School of Sport and Health Sciences, Cardiff Metropolitan University, Cardiff, UK
2. Sport Performance Research Institute, New Zealand (SPRINZ), AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand
3. Centre for Sport Science and Human Performance, Waikato Institute of Technology, Hamilton, New Zealand
4. Division of Sports Medicine, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA
5. Department of Pediatrics and Orthopaedic Surgery, College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA
6. The Micheli Center for Sports Injury Prevention, Boston, MA, USA
7. School of Sport and Exercise, University of Gloucestershire, Gloucester, UK
8. English Institute of Sport, Manchester Institute of Health and Performance, Manchester, UK
9. Athlete Health and Performance Research Centre, Aspetar Orthopaedic and Sports Medicine Hospital, Doha, Qatar

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Name: Rhodri S. Lloyd, PhD

Address: School of Sport, Cardiff Metropolitan University  
Cyncoed Campus, Cyncoed Road, Cardiff, CF23 6XD, United Kingdom

Telephone: 02920 417062

Fax: 02920 416768

Email: rlloyd@cardiffmet.ac.uk

**Abstract word count:** 249

**Main manuscript word count:** 3,000

1 **Comparison of Drop Jump and Tuck Jump Knee Joint Kinematics in Elite Male Youth**  
2 **Soccer Players: Implications for Injury Risk Screening**

3

4 ABSTRACT

5 **Context:** Despite the popularity of jump-landing tasks being used to identify injury risk factors,  
6 minimal data currently exist examining differences in knee kinematics during commonly used  
7 bilateral jumping tasks. This is especially the case for rebounding-based protocols involving  
8 young athletes. **Objective:** The purpose of this study was to compare the frontal plane  
9 projection angle (FPPA) during the drop vertical jump (DVJ) and tuck jump assessment (TJA)  
10 in a cohort of elite male youth soccer players of varying maturity status. **Methods:** A total of  
11 57 male youth soccer players from an English championship soccer club participated in the  
12 study. Participants performed three trials of the DVJ and TJA, during which movement was  
13 recorded with two-dimensional video cameras. FPPA for both right (FPPA-*r*) and left (FPPA-  
14 *l*) legs, with values <180° indicative of medial knee displacement. **Results:** On a whole-group  
15 level, FPPA-*r* ( $172.7 \pm 7.4^\circ$  versus  $177.2 \pm 11.7^\circ$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $ES = 0.46$ ) and FPPA-*l* ( $173.4 \pm$   
16  $7.3^\circ$  versus  $179.2 \pm 11.0^\circ$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $ES = 0.62$ ) was significantly greater for both limbs in the  
17 TJA compared to the DVJ; however, these differences were less consistent when grouped by  
18 maturity status. FPPA-*r* during the TJA was significantly and moderately greater in the circa-  
19 PHV group compared to the post-PHV cohorts ( $169.4 \pm 6.4^\circ$  versus  $175.3 \pm 7.8^\circ$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  
20  $ES = 0.49$ ). Whole group data showed moderate relationships for FPPA-*r* and FPPA-*l* between  
21 the TJA and DVJ; however, stronger relationships were shown in circa and post-PHV players  
22 compared to the pre-PHV cohort. **Conclusions:** Considering that the TJA exposed players to a  
23 larger FPPA and was sensitive to between-group differences in FPPA-*r*, the TJA could be  
24 viewed as a more suitable screen for identifying FPPA in young male soccer players.

25 **KEY WORDS:** tuck jump assessment, maturation, frontal plane projection angle, knee valgus

26 INTRODUCTION

27 The demands of soccer predispose male youth athletes to a heightened risk of injury; thus, these  
28 players should be considered a target group for the implementation of screening protocols to  
29 identify ‘at risk’ individuals <sup>1</sup>. Epidemiological data indicate that rapid decelerations are a  
30 frequent mechanism of injury, with the knee being the anatomical location at the greatest risk  
31 of severe injury <sup>2</sup>. Aberrant motor control strategies characterized by reduced abilities to  
32 effectively control limb motion during athletic movements are a proposed risk factor <sup>3</sup>.  
33 Quantifying movement competency in sport-relevant tasks should be considered an important  
34 component for injury risk reduction. Jump-landing assessments are frequently used within pre-  
35 participation screens to aid in the identification of injury risk <sup>4-6</sup>; however, research has  
36 indicated that there is a diverse range of assessment tools used within sports such as soccer,  
37 with a lack of consistency amongst practitioners <sup>7</sup>. The drop vertical jump (DVJ) is one of the  
38 most commonly used screening tools within the literature <sup>4,8,9</sup>, and dynamic knee valgus  
39 measured during this test has previously been associated with a greater risk of anterior cruciate  
40 ligament (ACL) <sup>8</sup> and patellofemoral joint <sup>10</sup> injury. Abnormal landing kinematics during the  
41 DVJ have also been reported by elite male youth soccer players who subsequently sustained  
42 an ACL injury <sup>5</sup>.

43

44 The validity of the DVJ as a screening tool for predicting ACL injury risk has recently been  
45 examined in elite female soccer players <sup>11</sup>. Medial knee displacement was associated with an  
46 increased risk of ACL injury; however, poor sensitivity and specificity of this measure was  
47 reported with the authors indicating that this test cannot predict ACL injuries <sup>11</sup>. It is plausible  
48 that constraining the task, whereby all participants drop from the same height, reduces the  
49 sensitivity when identifying individuals who display aberrant kinematics that are indicative of  
50 a greater injury risk. Jump heights exceeding 30 cm are likely to be achieved during

51 competitive soccer practice and match play where the mechanism of injury occurs. Thus,  
52 protocols that quantify landing kinematics during movements that are representative of those  
53 performed relative to the individual (i.e. matched to their jump height) may be more sensitive  
54 in establishing the movement deficits such as reduced frontal plane knee control that may be  
55 associated with injury risk.

56

57 Screening assessments that involve repeated jumping tasks also require athletes to respond to  
58 movement perturbations and forces <sup>12</sup>. The tuck jump assessment (TJA) is a practical field-  
59 based test that utilizes this approach and has been developed to identify errors in plyometric  
60 technique that are associated with ACL injury risk factors <sup>13,14</sup>. More recently, it was shown in  
61 a sample of elite male youth soccer players that of the 10-criteria included in the original TJA  
62 <sup>13</sup>, knee valgus was the only measure to display acceptable test re-test reliability <sup>12</sup>. The  
63 presence of knee valgus within the TJA is currently subjectively scored using either a  
64 dichotomous approach, “yes/no” <sup>13</sup> or an ordinal scale to more objectively rate the quality of  
65 the movement <sup>12</sup>. Limited data are currently available on frontal plane projection angles (FPPA)  
66 during the TJA in youth populations, measured quantitatively with practically viable methods.  
67

68 While research has examined biomechanical differences in a range of jump-landing screening  
69 tests, invariably these have involved bilateral versus unilateral comparisons and primarily  
70 included adults <sup>15,16</sup>. Minimal data currently exist examining differences in knee kinematics  
71 during commonly used bilateral jumping tasks, especially rebounding-based protocols, and in  
72 particular involving young athletes. The DVJ and TJA challenge movement capabilities of  
73 individuals in contrasting jump-landing conditions; while the DVJ regulates drop height (e.g.  
74 30 cm) and likely offers greater consistency across repeated measurements, the TJA reflects a  
75 more dynamic, reactive protocol that arguably possesses greater external validity but also

76 heightened movement variability. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine knee  
77 valgus kinematics during the DVJ from a 30 cm box height and a repeated TJA in a cohort of  
78 elite male youth soccer players of varying maturity status.

79

## 80 METHODS

### 81 **Design**

82 This cross-sectional, observational study was designed to compare the peak FPPA obtained in  
83 both right and left legs during a DVJ and TJA among young male soccer players.

84

### 85 **Participants**

86 Fifty-seven elite male youth soccer players, aged 10-18 years, from the academy of an English  
87 championship professional soccer club volunteered to take part in this study. Body mass (kg)  
88 was measured on a calibrated physician scale (Seca 786 Culta, Milan, Italy). Standing and  
89 seated height (cm) were both recorded on a measurement platform (Seca 274, Milan, Italy) to  
90 the nearest 0.1 cm. Seated height was measured with participants sat on top of a standardized  
91 1 m box, with height measured as the distance from the sitting surface to the top of the head <sup>17</sup>.  
92 Descriptive statistics for anthropometric variables are displayed in *table 1*. Biological  
93 maturation was estimated as years from peak height velocity (PHV) using a validated and non-  
94 invasive regression equation, which has a reported error of approximately six months <sup>18</sup>.  
95 Participants were allocated to one of three maturity groups: pre-PHV (n = 17), circa-PHV (n =  
96 15), or post-PHV (n = 25). None of the players reported injuries at the time of testing and all  
97 were participating regularly in football training and competitions in accordance with the  
98 regulations set out by the Premier League Elite Player Performance Plan. Parental consent,  
99 participant assent and physical activity readiness questionnaires were collected prior to the

100 commencement of testing. Ethical approval was granted by the institutional ethics committee  
101 in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki.

102

103 \*\*\*Table 1 near here\*\*\*

104

## 105 **Procedures**

106 Participants were required to attend their respective club training grounds on two occasions  
107 separated by a period of seven days, during the preseason. The first session was used to  
108 familiarize participants with the test equipment and assessment protocols. During this session,  
109 participants were questioned to identify their preferred kicking leg (i.e. were they either “right-  
110 footed” or “left-footed”). In the second session, data were collected for the DVJ and TJA in a  
111 randomized, counterbalanced order. A 10-minute standardized dynamic warm up was  
112 completed prior to each test session, which included approximately 3-minutes of sub-maximal  
113 multidirectional running and roughly 7-minutes of dynamic mobilisation and activation  
114 exercises, which targeted the main muscle groups of the lower and upper extremities and  
115 gradually increased in terms of their speed of movement. Participants were asked to refrain  
116 from strenuous exercise at least 48 hours prior to testing and eat according to their normal diet,  
117 avoiding eating and drinking substances other than water one hour prior to each test session.  
118 To allow visible tracking of the knees, participants were instructed to wear shorts that covered  
119 down to approximately mid-thigh.

120

### 121 *Drop vertical jump (DVJ)*

122 Participants stood on top of a box at a height of 30 cm with their feet 35 cm apart. Instructions  
123 were to drop directly down and contact the floor ensuring no vertical elevation or sinking as  
124 they stepped from the box. Upon ground contact, players were instructed to minimize ground

125 contact time and immediately perform a maximum vertical jump and then land on the floor and  
126 stick the landing in line with previous recommendations <sup>19</sup>. Participant's hands were freely  
127 available during the test in order to replicate a natural jump-landing position <sup>20</sup>. Three trials  
128 were performed, separated by one-minute recovery intervals.

129

### 130 *Tuck jump assessment (TJA)*

131 Participants stood on two vertical strips of tape which were 35 cm apart and connected by a  
132 horizontal line forming a H-Shape <sup>13</sup>. The test began by performing a countermovement  
133 followed by a jump in a vertical direction as high as possible while simultaneously pulling their  
134 knees up towards their chest. Tuck jumps were then repeatedly performed in place for a period  
135 of 10 seconds. Three trials of the TJA protocol were performed, separated by one-minute  
136 recovery intervals. Instructions were to jump as high as possible, land in the same footprint  
137 with each jump and to minimize ground contact time, utilizing a toe to mid-foot rocking landing  
138 strategy <sup>13</sup>. The H-Shape taped lines served as a visual guide to help the rater determine foot  
139 positioning faults during landing (e.g. feet not shoulder width apart, or not parallel).

140

### 141 *Kinematic analysis*

142 Two-dimensional (2D) video cameras were used to capture the test and the data were analyzed  
143 retrospectively using freely available software (Kinovea 0.8.23; Free Software Foundation,  
144 Boston, USA). Peak frontal plane projection angle (FPPA) was calculated by measuring the  
145 angle created by lines drawn between the hip, knee and ankle joint centres at the point of  
146 maximum knee flexion <sup>19</sup> and calculated for both the right (FPPA-*r*) and left (FPPA-*l*) legs.  
147 Maximum knee flexion angle was determined from the frame which indicated the lowest point  
148 of the landing task as observed on the video using the analysis software; an approach that is in  
149 accordance with previous research <sup>16,27</sup>. The FPPA was measured once for each DVJ trial. For

150 the TJA, peak FPPA was calculated for each ground contact experienced during the protocol,  
151 with an average peak FPPA compiled across all ground contacts of each trial. The mean peak  
152 FPPA was then averaged across the three trials of the TJA and used for analysis. This approach  
153 has been shown to be valid and reliable for the quantification of knee valgus motion during a  
154 range of jump-landing tasks<sup>21,22</sup>. Values  $<180^\circ$  were indicative of medial knee displacement.  
155 Kinematic data were collected at 50 Hz using a high-definition video camera (Samsung, New  
156 Jersey, USA) positioned in the frontal plane at a height 0.70 m, and a triangulated distance of  
157 five meters from the center of the capture area. To allow visible tracking of the knees, subjects  
158 were required to wear shorts with a line at approximately mid-thigh. The same rater marked  
159 and recorded each trial to maximize inter-rater consistency.

160

### 161 **Statistical analyses**

162 Descriptive statistics (mean  $\pm$  sd) were calculated for all variables. A 3 (group) x 2 (test) x 2  
163 (leg) mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to determine any between-group  
164 differences for FPPA between each maturity group for both TJA and DVJ tests. Homogeneity  
165 of variance was tested using Levene's statistic, and where violated Welch's adjustment was  
166 used to calculate the F-ratio. When equal variance was or was not assumed, Tukey's HSD and  
167 Games-Howell post hoc tests were used respectively, to establish the origin of any between-  
168 group differences. Cohen's *d* effect sizes (ES) were calculated to interpret the magnitude of  
169 between group differences using the following classifications: standardized mean differences  
170 of 0.2, 0.5 and 0.8 for small, moderate, and large effect sizes respectively<sup>23</sup>. Pearson's  
171 correlation coefficients were used to determine the strength of relationship between measures  
172 of FPPA in both the TJA and DVJ. The magnitude of relationships in correlation analyses were  
173 classified as either; almost perfect ( $r = >0.9$ ), very large ( $r = 0.7-0.9$ ), large ( $r = 0.5-0.7$ ),  
174 moderate ( $r = 0.3-0.5$ ), small ( $r = 0.1-0.3$ ) or trivial ( $r = <0.1$ )<sup>24</sup>. The level of significance was



175 set at alpha level  $p < 0.05$ . Intra-rater reliability for FPPA was assessed using a two-way  
176 random intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) with absolute agreement on a sub-section of  
177 participants ( $n = 20$ ). To conduct the analysis, the rater viewed the same videos in a randomized  
178 order on two separate occasions, separated by a period of 7 days. All statistical tests were  
179 computed using SPSS® v.23 for Mac.

180

## 181 RESULTS

182 Data showed that 78% of participants preferred kicking with their right leg. Very large ICC  
183 (0.90; 0.86 – 0.93 (95% CI)) indicated that intra-rater reliability was strong. Results from the  
184 mixed ANOVA showed no main effect for “group” but a main effect for “test”, with FPPA  
185 significantly greater (indicating more medial displacement) in the TJA compared to the the  
186 DVJ in the right leg ( $172.7 \pm 7.4^\circ$  versus  $177.2 \pm 11.7^\circ$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $ES = 0.46$ ) and left leg ( $173.4$   
187  $\pm 7.3^\circ$  versus  $179.2 \pm 11.0^\circ$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $ES = 0.62$ ) respectively. Table 2 shows that when grouped  
188 by maturity status, FPPA-*r* was significantly greater during the TJA in the circa-PHV compared  
189 to post-PHV participants ( $169.4 \pm 6.4^\circ$  versus  $175.3 \pm 7.8^\circ$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $ES = 0.49$ ). Apart from a  
190 significant difference between FPPA-*r* in the TJA and the FPPA-*l* during the DVJ for the circa-  
191 PHV group ( $p < 0.001$ ;  $ES = 1.13$ ), there were no other meaningful significant interaction  
192 effects ( $p > 0.05$ ).

193

194 \*\*\*Table 2 near here\*\*\*

195

196 Whole-group analysis revealed moderate, significant relationships between FPPA in the DVJ  
197 and TJA for both right and left legs. When grouped by maturity, the strength of relationships  
198 varied for FPPA-*r* and FPPA-*l* between both screening assessments. Specifically, there were  
199 nonsignificant weak correlations for both FPPA-*r* and FPPA-*l* in the pre-PHV group, a

200 significant large correlation for the FPPA-*l* in the circa-PHV group, while in the post-PHV  
201 cohort there were significant large and moderate correlations for FPPA-*l* and FPPA-*r*,  
202 respectively.

203

204 \*\*\*Table 3 near here\*\*\*

205

## 206 DISCUSSION

207 The current study examined the differences in peak FPPA in both limbs during the TJA and  
208 DVJ screening protocols in male youth soccer players of different maturity status. The main  
209 findings were that on a whole-group level, FPPA was significantly greater for both limbs in  
210 the TJA when compared to the DVJ; however, when grouped by maturity status, these  
211 differences were eliminated. There was also a significant and moderate difference in FPPA-*r*  
212 during the TJA between the circa-PHV and post-PHV cohorts. Correlation analysis revealed  
213 only moderate relationships for FPPA-*r* and FPPA-*l* between the TJA and DVJ; however, when  
214 grouped by maturity status, the strength of correlations was more varied with stronger  
215 relationships shown in circa and post-PHV players.

216

217 Previous research has shown differences in frontal plane knee motion between different lower  
218 limb screening tests <sup>25</sup>. Similarly, the current study revealed FPPA was significantly and  
219 moderately greater in both limbs during the TJA in comparison to the DVJ protocol. Both the  
220 TJA <sup>13,14</sup> and DVJ protocol <sup>9</sup> have been proposed as screening tools to assess ACL injury risk  
221 factors, with the DVJ being used more extensively within the literature. The results of the  
222 current study suggest that the TJA may offer a screening protocol that is more likely to expose  
223 aberrant frontal plane knee control during ground contact. Intuitively, this is due to the more  
224 reactive and repeated nature of the test when compared to the DVJ protocol that utilizes a single

225 repetition from a standardized drop height. The DVJ may artificially induce feed-forward  
226 stabilization mechanisms, which have been shown to develop as a result of advancing age and  
227 maturation <sup>20</sup>. Conversely, the TJA is likely to better represent the ability of the neuromuscular  
228 system to provide adequate stabilization and force attenuation in response to each individual's  
229 jumping capabilities.

230

231 When grouped by maturity status, FPPA-*r* and FPPA-*l* were greater in the TJA compared to  
232 the DVJ; however, these differences did not reach significance. This indicates that when testing  
233 more homogenous maturity groups, the ability to discriminate between frontal plane knee  
234 motion during both screening protocols is reduced, albeit by sub-dividing into smaller maturity  
235 groups, the ability to detect significant between-group differences becomes more challenging.  
236 While no significant within-group differences in FPPA were shown across both screening  
237 tools, between-group analysis did reveal that FPPA-*r* during the TJA was moderately  
238 significantly greater in the circa-PHV group compared to the post-PHV cohort. This could be  
239 explained by the rapid growth in limb length that adolescents experience during and  
240 immediately after peak height velocity, which can lead to temporary decrements in motor  
241 control and neuromuscular function. This finding is commensurate with previous research  
242 examining jumping and landing performance in junior male soccer players <sup>26-28</sup> and heightened  
243 injury incidence data associated with the growth spurt <sup>29</sup>.

244

245 Research examining frontal plane knee motion in female athletes has revealed strong  
246 agreement ( $r = 0.93$ ) in knee valgus during vertical jump and drop vertical jump tests <sup>30</sup>. Owing  
247 to this similarity, the authors proposed that the vertical jump could be utilized as a practice  
248 measure of ACL injury risk; however, knee kinematics were analyzed during the pre-flight  
249 phase of the vertical jump and not during landing, meaning the results should be interpreted

250 with caution. Conversely in the current study, on a whole group level the strength of  
251 relationships in FPPA between limbs (i.e. FPPA-*l* versus FPPA-*r*) in the DVJ and also in the  
252 TJA protocol, while significant, were only moderate which indicates that the magnitude of  
253 FPPA is likely to differ depending on which screening protocol is used.

254

255 The strength of correlation in FPPA between limbs in both DVJ and TJA tests appeared to vary  
256 according to the stage of maturity. Notably, the pre-PHV group failed to show any meaningful  
257 relationships in FPPA in either leg between the two tests; the circa-PHV revealed a significant  
258 large correlation for the FPPA-*l*, while significant large and moderate correlations for FPPA-*l*  
259 and FPPA-*r* were reported in the post-PHV cohort. Cumulatively, this suggests that increases  
260 in maturity will result in young males displaying more consistent FPPA during rebound-type  
261 activities. The weaker correlations in FPPA across the two screening tests displayed in the less  
262 mature cohort may reflect the more variable movement typically displayed by this population  
263 <sup>31</sup>, which has been attributed to immature pre-frontal motor cortex activation negatively  
264 affecting coordinative abilities of younger children. Conversely, older and more experienced  
265 individuals will likely have developed more consistent and robust motor control strategies, and  
266 thus utilize similar degrees of frontal plane knee motion across the different test protocols.  
267 Practically, this may result in more mature individuals displaying similar risk profiles across  
268 different screening tests.

269

270 A final point of consideration is the fact that significant between-group differences in FPPA  
271 were noted in the right leg only, which means that the FPPA in the left leg did not differ  
272 between groups. Due to the high proportion of right-footed kickers in the study, this would  
273 infer that any growth-related discrepancies in frontal plane knee motion were most likely  
274 present in the kicking leg, while the FPPA in the stance leg was more consistent across the

275 groups. Notably, significant large correlations in FPPA-*l* across both testing protocols were  
276 shown in both the circa- and post-PHV cohorts, while FPPA-*r* was only moderately correlated  
277 in the post-PHV cohort. Tentatively, this would support the notion of greater stability and  
278 consistency of movement in the stance leg, in particular as players become more mature and  
279 experienced. Speculatively, this trend may be due to the development of asymmetries in  
280 functional properties (e.g. muscular strength), which have been identified previously in  
281 Australian Football League athletes <sup>32</sup>.

282

283 Certain limitations should be noted in this study. *Firstly*, kinematic data were collected using  
284 2D video footage, which in comparison to “gold standard” 3D motion capture, does not account  
285 for movement in all planes of motion and segmental and joint rotations. However, research has  
286 shown acceptable agreement between 2D and 3D analysis methods <sup>33,34</sup>, and many of the injury  
287 risk factors associated with the knee occur in the sagittal and frontal planes. Additionally, due  
288 to financial costs and time-consuming nature of testing, many 3D motion capture systems are  
289 impractical for applied settings, especially when attempting to screen large groups of young  
290 players in the setting of a soccer academy. *Secondly*, the point of maximum knee flexion was  
291 not quantified using a sagittal plane camera; however, the chosen method of determining the  
292 lowest point of the landing task has been validated in previous research <sup>16,27</sup>. *Finally*,  
293 correlation does not imply causation, and further research is required to better understand the  
294 reason for the variability in strength of relationships across the different maturity groups.  
295 Despite these limitations, the current study makes an original and significant contribution to  
296 the literature, indicating that practitioners should consider the maturational stage of young  
297 players when selecting screening tools and also when interpreting the kinematic data.

298

299 CONCLUSIONS

300 Practitioners should consider the findings of the current study when using jump-landing tasks  
301 to screen young male soccer players for aberrant lower limb movement patterns. The data  
302 indicate that the TJA was more likely to expose individuals who demonstrate greater FPPA-*r*  
303 and FPPA-*l* than the DVJ when analyzed on a whole-group level, and was able to detect  
304 differences in FPPA-*r* between the circa-PHV and post-PHV groups. Thus, in instances where  
305 available testing time is limited, the TJA may be viewed as a preferred screening tool.  
306 However, while the TJA may better reflect the dynamic nature of competitive soccer, thereby  
307 possessing greater external validity, the DVJ more stringently regulates drop height and  
308 therefore may be more reliable for serial repeated measurements of FPPA. Additionally, the  
309 agreement in FPPA between the TJA and DVJ appeared to increase with maturity status, and  
310 thus; given the short duration of the tests it may be prudent to use both protocols for injury risk  
311 screening until prospective data become available examining the predictive ability of both tests  
312 to identify “at risk” athletes.

313

#### 314 REFERENCES

- 315 1. Schmikli SL, de Vries WR, Inklaar H, Backx FJ. Injury prevention target groups in  
316 soccer: injury characteristics and incidence rates in male junior and senior players. *J*  
317 *Sci Med Sport*. 2011;14(3):199-203.
  
- 318 2. Read PJ, Oliver JL, De Ste Croix MBA, Myer GD, Lloyd RS. An audit of injuries in  
319 six english professional soccer academies. *J Sports Sci*. 2018;36(13):1542-1548.
  
- 320 3. Read PJ, Oliver JL, De Ste Croix M, Myer GD, Lloyd RS. Neuromuscular injury risk  
321 factors for knee and ankle injuries in male youth soccer players. *Sports Med*.  
322 2016;46(8):1059-1066.

- 323 4. Hewett TE, Myer GD, Ford KR, Slauterbeck JR. Preparticipation physical  
324 examination using a box drop vertical jump test in young athletes: the effects of  
325 puberty and sex. *Clin J Sport Med.* 2006;16(4):298-304.
- 326 5. Padua DA, DiStefano LJ, Beutler AI, de la Motte SJ, DiStefano MJ, Marshall SW.  
327 The Landing Error Scoring System as a Screening Tool for an Anterior Cruciate  
328 Ligament Injury-Prevention Program in Elite-Youth Soccer Athletes. *J Athl Train.*  
329 2015;50(6):589-595.
- 330 6. Myer GD, Ford KR, Brent JL, Hewett TE. Differential neuromuscular training effects  
331 on ACL injury risk factors in "high-risk" versus "low-risk" athletes. *BMC*  
332 *Musculoskelet Disord.* 2007;8:39.
- 333 7. Read PJ, Jimenez P, Oliver JL, Lloyd RS. Injury prevention in male youth soccer:  
334 Current practices and perceptions of practitioners working at elite English academies.  
335 *J Sports Sci.* 2018;36(12):1423-1431.
- 336 8. Hewett TE, Myer GD, Ford KR, et al. Biomechanical measures of neuromuscular  
337 control and valgus loading of the knee predict anterior cruciate ligament injury risk in  
338 female athletes: a prospective study. *Am J Sports Med.* 2005;33(4):492-501.
- 339 9. Leppanen M, Pasanen K, Kujala UM, et al. Stiff Landings Are Associated With  
340 Increased ACL Injury Risk in Young Female Basketball and Floorball Players. *Am J*  
341 *Sports Med.* 2017;45(2):386-393.
- 342 10. Souza RB, Powers CM. Differences in hip kinematics, muscle strength, and muscle  
343 activation between subjects with and without patellofemoral pain. *J Orthop Sports*  
344 *Phys Ther.* 2009;39(1):12-19.
- 345 11. Krosshaug T, Steffen K, Kristianslund E, et al. The Vertical Drop Jump Is a Poor  
346 Screening Test for ACL Injuries in Female Elite Soccer and Handball Players: A  
347 Prospective Cohort Study of 710 Athletes. *Am J Sports Med.* 2016;44(4):874-883.

- 348 12. Read PJ, Oliver JL, De Ste Croix M, Myer GD, Lloyd RS. Reliability of the tuck  
349 jump injury risk screening assessment in elite male youth soccer players. *J Strength*  
350 *Cond Res.* 2016;30(6):1510-1516.
- 351 13. Myer GD, Ford KR, Hewett TE. Tuck Jump Assessment for Reducing Anterior  
352 Cruciate Ligament Injury Risk. *Athl Ther Today.* 2008;13(5):39-44.
- 353 14. Stroube BW, Myer GD, Brent JL, Ford KR, Heidt RS, Jr., Hewett TE. Effects of task-  
354 specific augmented feedback on deficit modification during performance of the tuck-  
355 jump exercise. *J Sport Rehabil.* 2013;22(1):7-18.
- 356 15. Earl JE, Monteiro SK, Snyder KR. Differences in lower extremity kinematics  
357 between a bilateral drop-vertical jump and a single-leg step-down. *J Orthop Sports*  
358 *Phys Ther.* 2007;37(5):245-252.
- 359 16. Munro A, Herrington L, Comfort P. The Relationship Between 2-Dimensional Knee-  
360 Valgus Angles During Single-Leg Squat, Single-Leg-Land, and Drop-Jump Screening  
361 Tests. *J Sport Rehabil.* 2017;26(1):72-77.
- 362 17. Malina R, Bouchard C, Bar-Or O. *Growth, Maturation and Physical Activity.* 2nd ed.  
363 Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics; 2004.
- 364 18. Mirwald RL, Baxter-Jones AD, Bailey DA, Beunen GP. An assessment of maturity  
365 from anthropometric measurements. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2002;34(4):689-694.
- 366 19. Noyes FR, Barber-Westin SD, Fleckenstein C, Walsh C, West J. The drop-jump  
367 screening test: difference in lower limb control by gender and effect of neuromuscular  
368 training in female athletes. *Am J Sports Med.* 2005;33(2):197-207.
- 369 20. Quatman CE, Ford KR, Myer GD, Hewett TE. Maturation leads to gender differences  
370 in landing force and vertical jump performance: a longitudinal study. *Am J Sports*  
371 *Med.* 2006;34(5):806-813.



- 372 21. Munro A, Herrington L, Carolan M. Reliability of 2-dimensional video assessment of  
373 frontal-plane dynamic knee valgus during common athletic screening tasks. *J Sport*  
374 *Rehabil.* 2012;21(1):7-11.
- 375 22. McLean SG, Walker K, Ford KR, Myer GD, Hewett TE, van den Bogert AJ.  
376 Evaluation of a two dimensional analysis method as a screening and evaluation tool  
377 for anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Br J Sports Med.* 2005;39(6):355-362.
- 378 23. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences.* 2nd ed. Hillsdale,  
379 NJ: Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
- 380 24. Hopkins WG. A new view of statistics: a scale of magnitudes for effect statistics.  
381 <http://www.sportsci.org/resource/stats/effectmag.html>. 2002:[Accessed Sept 4th, 2018].
- 382 25. Paz GA, de Freitas Maia M, Santana HG, Miranda H, Lima V, Willson JD. Knee  
383 Frontal Plane Projection Angle: A Comparison Study Between Drop Vertical Jump  
384 and Step-Down Tests With Young Volleyball Athletes. *J Sport Rehabil.* 2017:1-21.
- 385 26. Read PJ, Oliver JL, De Ste Croix MBA, Myer GD, Lloyd RS. Hopping and Landing  
386 Performance in Male Youth Soccer Players: Effects of Age and Maturation. *Int J*  
387 *Sports Med.* 2017;38(12):902-908.
- 388 27. Read PJ, Oliver JL, Myer GD, De Ste Croix MBA, Belshaw A, Lloyd RS. Altered  
389 landing mechanics are shown by male youth soccer players at different stages of  
390 maturation. *Phys Ther Sport.* 2018;33:48-53.
- 391 28. Philippaerts RM, Vaeyens R, Janssens M, et al. The relationship between peak height  
392 velocity and physical performance in youth soccer players. *J Sports Sci.*  
393 2006;24(3):221-230.

- 394 29. van der Sluis A, Elferink-Gemser MT, Coelho-e-Silva MJ, Nijboer JA, Brink MS,  
395 Visscher C. Sport injuries aligned to peak height velocity in talented pubertal soccer  
396 players. *Int J Sports Med.* 2014;35(4):351-355.
- 397 30. Cesar GM, Tomasevicz CL, Burnfield JM. Frontal plane comparison between drop  
398 jump and vertical jump: implications for the assessment of ACL risk of injury. *Sports*  
399 *Biomech.* 2016;15(4):440-449.
- 400 31. Focke A, Strutzenberger G, Jekauc D, Worth A, Woll A, Schwameder H. Effects of  
401 age, sex and activity level on counter-movement jump performance in children and  
402 adolescents. *Eur J Sport Sci.* 2013;13(5):518-526.
- 403 32. Hart NH, Nimphius S, Weber J, et al. Musculoskeletal Asymmetry in Football  
404 Athletes: A Product of Limb Function over Time. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*  
405 2016;48(7):1379-1387.
- 406 33. Schurr SA, Marshall AN, Resch JE, Saliba SA. Two-Dimensional Video Analysis Is  
407 Comparable to 3d Motion Capture in Lower Extremity Movement Assessment. *Int J*  
408 *Sports Phys Ther.* 2017;12(2):163-172.
- 409 34. Herrington L, Alenezi F, Alzhrani M, Alrayani H, Jones R. The reliability and  
410 criterion validity of 2D video assessment of single leg squat and hop landing. *J*  
411 *Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2017;34:80-85.

412

**Table 1. Participant characteristics per maturity group (mean  $\pm$  *sd*)**

Group	N	Age (yrs)	Standing height (cm)	Seated height (cm)	Body mass (kg)	Maturity offset (yrs)
Pre-PHV	17	11.9 $\pm$ 0.6	150.8 $\pm$ 10.2	75.8 $\pm$ 3.5	40.8 $\pm$ 8.8	-1.9 $\pm$ 0.7
Circa-PHV	15	13.8 $\pm$ 0.4	164.8 $\pm$ 8.5	82.4 $\pm$ 3.6	51.1 $\pm$ 8.2	0.0 $\pm$ 0.8
Post-PHV	25	16.7 $\pm$ 1.1	178.4 $\pm$ 5.0	89.7 $\pm$ 4.7	68.9 $\pm$ 7.6	2.7 $\pm$ 0.8

*PHV = peak height velocity*

**Table 2. Mean ( $\pm$  *sd*) FPPA, where values  $<180^\circ$  are indicative of medial knee displacement.**

Group	TJA		DVJ	
	Left	Right	Left	Right
Whole group	173.4 $\pm$ 7.3 <sup>a</sup>	172.7 $\pm$ 7.4 <sup>a</sup>	179.2 $\pm$ 11.0	177.2 $\pm$ 11.7
Pre	172.3 $\pm$ 7.2	171.7 $\pm$ 6.8	178.1 $\pm$ 12.6	173.8 $\pm$ 12.3
Circa	172.5 $\pm$ 7.1	169.4 $\pm$ 6.4 <sup>b</sup>	179.3 $\pm$ 10.6 <sup>c</sup>	175.3 $\pm$ 10.4
Post	174.8 $\pm$ 7.5	175.3 $\pm$ 7.8	180.0 $\pm$ 10.5	180.7 $\pm$ 11.6

<sup>a</sup> significantly different FPPA compared to the DVJ

<sup>b</sup> significantly different to FPPA-r in the TJA compared to the post-PHV group

<sup>c</sup> significantly different to FPPA-r in the TJA within the circa-PHV group

DVJ = drop vertical jump

TJA = tuck jump assessment

**Table 3. Correlation coefficients (r) for FPPA for each leg across both DVJ and TJA screening protocols**

Group	DVJ-TJA (FPPA-r)	DVJ-TJA (FPPA-l)
Whole group	0.38 <sup>a</sup>	0.38 <sup>a</sup>
Pre-PHV	0.13	-0.21
Circa-PHV	0.44	0.68 <sup>a</sup>
Post-PHV	0.43 <sup>a</sup>	0.66 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> significant relationship ( $p < 0.05$ )

<sup>b</sup> significant relationship ( $p < 0.01$ )

*DVJ = drop vertical jump*

*TJA = tuck jump assessment*

*FPPA-r = Frontal plane projection angle right leg*

*FPPA-l = Frontal plane projection angle left leg*