

# London International Consensus and Delphi study on Hamstring Injuries

## Part 3: Rehabilitation, Running and Return to Sport

### Authors

Bruce Paton<sup>ab</sup>, Paul Read<sup>ao</sup>, Nicol Van Dyk<sup>mn</sup>, Mathew Wilson<sup>ao</sup>, Noel Pollock<sup>da</sup>, Nick Court<sup>c</sup>, Michael Giakoumis<sup>d</sup>, Paul Head<sup>ei</sup>, Babar Kayani<sup>b</sup>, Sam Kelly<sup>f</sup>, Gino Kerkhoffs<sup>gh</sup>, James Moore<sup>i</sup>, Peter Moriarty<sup>bo</sup>, Simon Murphy<sup>j</sup>, Ricci Plaistow<sup>b</sup>, Ben Stirling<sup>k</sup>, Laura Tulloch<sup>l</sup>, David Wood<sup>p</sup>, Fares Haddad<sup>abo</sup>

### Affiliation

a Institute of Sport Exercise and Health, Division Surgery Intervention Science, University College London, UK

b Orthopaedic dept University College London Hospitals NHS foundation trust, London UK

c AFC Bournemouth, UK

d British Athletics, Lee Valley, UK

e BFR Physio, Caterham, UK

f Blackburn Rovers FC / Rochdale AFC, UK

g Orthopaedic dept Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Amsterdam, NL

h Academic Centre for Evidence Based Sports Medicine, Amsterdam, NL

i Centre for Human Health and Performance, London, UK

j Leicester city FC / Arsenal FC, UK

k Welsh Rugby Union, Cardiff, Wales, UK

l Saracens Rugby, London UK

m High Performance Unit, Irish Rugby Football Union, Dublin, Ireland

n Section Sports Medicine, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

o Princess Grace Hospital HCA Healthcare, London, UK

p North Sydney Orthopaedic and Sports Medicine Centre, Sydney, Australia

### Corresponding Author

Bruce Paton – ISEH UCLH / UCL [b.paton@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:b.paton@ucl.ac.uk)

Orcid ID - 0000-0002-2581-599X

Institute sport Exercise and Health, University College London,

170 Tottenham Court Road London, UK. W1T 7HA

### Key words

Hamstring, classification, muscle, injury, consensus, Delphi, imaging

### **Data availability statement**

The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the large number of hamstring experts who contributed their valuable time, effort and expertise in completing our surveys,

The consensus process and meeting were co-created and funded by the Institute of Sport Exercise and Health, London, UK and the Academic Centre for Evidence Based Sports Medicine, Amsterdam, NL

The consensus and the launch of PHAROS were partly made possible by a grant from the International Olympic Committee (IOC).

Thanks also to Naomi Shah PT (India) and Magnus Hilmansson PT (Iceland) who assisted with meeting days.

### **Competing interests**

No member of the group reported competing interests in this study. No group member or participant received financial remuneration, and study was carried out independent of funding bodies and they did not influence the design, conduct, or results of the study

### **Contributorship**

This manuscript is the combined effort of the attached Authors. Bruce Paton drafted the initial manuscript.

Paul Read, Matthew Wilson, Nicol VanDyk, Noel Pollock and James Moore contributed significant drafting comments and edits. Other authors were all responsible for minor edits.

BP, FSH, JM were responsible for research and survey design and facilitating the consensus meeting days (MG facilitated for Running and RTS).

### **Ethical approval information**

UCL Research Ethics Committee Office for The Vice Provost Research-

Approved Project ID: 5938/002 - Title: Decision-Making in the Assessment and treatment of Hamstring Injury

Tel: +44 (0)20 7679 8717 Email: [ethics@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:ethics@ucl.ac.uk) <http://ethics.grad.ucl.ac.uk>

### **Patient involvement**

This study did not involve patients but sought expert opinion regarding best practice in management of hamstring Injury

### **Word Count**

6544 Words (Excluding title page, abstract, tables, figures, references) References 213

## Key findings

1. Differences in hamstring musculotendinous tissue, muscle anatomy and functional roles should direct the rehabilitation prescription for different muscles and myotendinous tissues after hamstring injury (HSI).
2. In early-stage rehab, most experts advocate protection of injured tissue from loading at length and elastic loads (i.e., high strain and strain rate loads).
3. In early loading, the types of load / contraction considered appropriate, and the order of their application varied greatly between experts. While experts initially prescribe isometric exercises, there is evidence of less force development with concentric exercise compared to isometric exercise and consequently less connective tissue strain.
4. Experts considered the key kinetic chain deficits as possible contributing factors to (re)injury.
5. Adjuncts such as strength training with blood flow restriction are increasingly used to allow earlier strength adaptation but did not achieve global consensus agreement.
6. Experts use an integrated assessment of symptoms, strength, and response to previous loading as criteria for progressing and dosing exercise and deciding on safety to return to running and sport. Other criteria such as flexibility and special return to sport (RTS) tests are used less widely.
7. On criteria related to pain, experts suggest some activities should be pain-free through rehabilitation (i.e., sprinting) but with other exercise activities a pain threshold approach can be permitted.
8. In later loading, experts aim to achieve full outer length strength and eccentric strength as key criteria for return to running and sport.
9. In later stage rehab, experts advocate prescription of running and sprinting as key components of HSI rehabilitation and as key progression criteria for return to sport.
10. Experts focus on the demands and capacity required for competition when deciding the rehabilitation end goal and timing of RTS. Experts monitor and test athletes through rehabilitation and use modalities such as global positioning system (GPS) to give sports-specific information on loading/running dosages, speed, and RTS readiness.

## **Abstract**

**Background:** Hamstring injuries (HSI) are the most common athletic injury in running and pivoting sports, but despite large amounts of research, injury rates have not declined in the last 2 decades. HSI often recur and many areas are lacking evidence and guidance for optimal rehabilitation. This study aimed to develop an international expert consensus for the management of HSI.

**Methods:** A modified Delphi methodology and consensus process was used with an international expert panel, involving 2 rounds of online questionnaires and an intermediate round involving a consensus meeting. The initial information gathering round questionnaire, was sent to 46 international experts, which comprised open-ended questions covering decision-making domains in HSI. Thematic analysis of responses outlined key domains which were evaluated by a smaller international subgroup (n=15) comprising clinical academic sports medicine physicians, physiotherapists, and orthopaedic surgeons in a consensus meeting. After group discussion around each domain, a series of consensus statements were prepared, debated, and refined. A round 2 questionnaire was sent to 112 international hamstring experts to vote on these statements and determine level of agreement. Consensus threshold was set a priori at 70%.

**Results** Expert response rates were 35/46 (76%) (first round), 15/35 (attendees /invitees to meeting day) and 99/112 (88.2%) for final survey round. Statements on rehabilitation reaching consensus centred around: exercise selection and dosage (78.8-96.3% agreement), impact of the kinetic chain (95%), criteria to progress exercise (73-92.7%), running and sprinting (83-100%) in rehabilitation, and criteria for return to sport (78.3-98.3%). Benchmarks for flexibility (40%) and Strength (66.1%) and adjuncts to rehabilitation (68.9%) did not reach agreement. This consensus panel recommends individualised rehabilitation based on the athlete, sporting demands, involved muscle(s) and injury type and severity(89.8%). Early-stage rehab should avoid high strain loads and rates. Loading is important but with less consensus on optimum progression and dosage. This panel recommends rehabilitation progress based on capacity and symptoms, with pain thresholds dependent on activity, except pain-free criteria supported for sprinting (85.5%). Experts focus on the demands and capacity required for match-play when deciding the rehabilitation end goal and timing of return to sport (89.8%).

Conclusions: The expert panellists in this study followed evidence on aspects of rehabilitation after HSI, suggesting rehabilitation prescription should be individualised, but clarified areas where evidence was lacking. Additional research is required to determine the optimal load dose, timing and criteria for HSI rehabilitation and the monitoring and testing metrics to determine safe rapid progression in rehabilitation and safe return to sport. Further research would benefit optimizing :- prescription of running and sprinting ;the application of adjuncts in rehabilitation ;and treatment of kinetic chain HSI factors.

## **Introduction**

Hamstring injuries remain the most significant time loss injury in football and high intensity running sports<sup>1 2</sup>, with large financial, physical and emotional costs. Research on prevention strategies has not been effective in reducing injury incidence and recurrences have remained constant in elite soccer.<sup>3 4</sup> whereas the incidence of other injuries has reduced.<sup>5</sup>

Rehabilitation of hamstring injury has evolved to address inflammation, promote biological healing and emphasise optimal loading throughout the rehabilitation.<sup>6</sup> The individual hamstring muscles have often been treated uniformly as they work in conjunction, but evidence has emerged, demonstrating that they have different functional roles, capabilities and injury mechanisms<sup>7</sup>, based on their anatomy and nerve supply<sup>8</sup>, fibre type composition<sup>9 10</sup>and connective tissue architecture.<sup>8 11 12</sup> Each muscle may therefore require a different rehabilitation approach<sup>11 13 14</sup>, influencing exercise selection in rehabilitation.<sup>15 16</sup> Evidence has emerged to inform exercise prescription in hamstring injury prevention<sup>17 18</sup>, but exercise selection to inform rehabilitation remains unclear and some consensus reviews ignore exercise completely.<sup>19</sup>

The effects of rehabilitation approaches investigating single exercises are common<sup>20-22</sup> but few studies have examined combined programmes. These exist in football, sprinting<sup>23-26</sup>, general sports<sup>27</sup>, and Australian rules football<sup>28</sup>; however, they differ significantly, and few rehabilitation protocols investigate higher grade tendon hamstring injuries requiring longer rehabilitation and time to return to

sport.<sup>29</sup> A 2015 review of rehabilitation studies was unable to pool the rehabilitation literature due to heterogeneity.<sup>30</sup> Interventions included:- strength exercises (lengthened vs shortened)<sup>24 31</sup>; progressive agility and trunk stabilisation<sup>32</sup>; progressive running and stretching<sup>33</sup>; static stretching<sup>34</sup> and sacroiliac manipulation.<sup>35</sup> Separated meta-analyses of these studies found that lengthening exercises reduce time to RTS but none of the other types provided superior results. Reinjury rates, when reported, were not significantly different between programmes. These interventions did not follow a clinically reasoned rehabilitation approach. Given this heterogeneous small sample (6 studies with around 386 hamstring injury athletes) there is a need for more robust evidence to inform rehabilitation after hamstring injury. There are guidelines and reviews published on criteria for RTS after hamstring injury<sup>28 36-41</sup>, but these are in lower grade injuries. Criteria tests often don't mimic specific sporting loads or functional demands<sup>39 40</sup>, and do not quantify subsequent reinjury risk.<sup>40</sup> There is a need to determine if and how current criteria are used in practice and if this aligns with the available evidence. There may be a need to develop more specific criteria for RTS that link more closely with hamstring function in specific sports.

The volume of literature on HSI rehabilitation is increasing, but current rehabilitation practice does not always follow research.<sup>42</sup> Less evidence is available in elite sport athletes. Research contains small sample sizes, and decision-making draws on clinical expertise. While there are significant drivers to achieve a faster more robust RTS, multiple stakeholder interests frequently result in athletes RTS while still vulnerable to reinjury.<sup>43</sup> To more clearly understand current practice, innovation and level of expertise pertaining to HSI rehabilitation in elite sport settings, a qualitative research approach is required to outline assessment and treatment decision-making of global experts whose aim is to achieve best outcome for their athletes.

The London International Hamstring Injury consensus group was convened in 2020. Our aim was to determine, based on expert consensus, the key aspects in rehabilitation and RTS decision-making in the assessment and treatment of hamstring injuries.

## **Methods**

### **Study Design**

We used a modified Delphi research design, including an international panel of experts, with the aim of reaching a consensus on best practice for decision-making in rehabilitation and RTS after HSI. The Delphi process is a scientific, iterative, multistage process used to achieve expert consensus in a given subject, particularly, where limited literature is available to guide decision-making.<sup>44 45</sup> It takes into account expert opinion and expert clinical practice<sup>46</sup>. There have been previous Delphi studies in prevention<sup>47</sup> and RTS after HSI<sup>48 49</sup>, but the group sought to obtain expert consensus on best-practice rehabilitation, given current disparate and conflicting approaches.

The methodology followed guidance on Delphi studies<sup>44 50</sup> web survey design<sup>51</sup> (the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES)<sup>51</sup> and the reporting standard for conducting and reporting Delphi studies (CREDES)<sup>50</sup>) to avoid bias and is described below and in supplementary file 1 and methodology in paper 1 in this series. Ethical approval for the study was sought and obtained from the institutional ethical review board (Project ID 5938/002). Participants were informed prior to commencing the surveys, with completion implying consent.

### **Expert Panel**

An international representative group of multidisciplinary clinicians and researchers were invited to participate, based on their expertise in assessment and management (including rehabilitation and RTS) of HSI. A purposive, heterogeneous representative sample of experts was chosen with a mix of:- professional discipline (sport and exercise medicine physicians, physiotherapists, surgeons, sport and exercise scientists/researchers and athletic trainers), international location (or work schedule), gender and sporting discipline, in line with Delphi methodology.<sup>52</sup>

The criteria for expert inclusion were: - a high level of expertise assessing, managing, rehabilitating and/or researching hamstring injuries, based on: - the number and type of HSI seen per year; years worked with athletes who sustain HSI; willingness to complete the digital survey and or attend the consensus meeting ;sufficient level of written and spoken English; and/or peer reviewed publication



(authorship) in hamstring research. Possible experts were excluded if they had 1) insufficient experience of assessment or management of hamstring injury, 2) insufficient time to fully complete the online survey. Clinicians and non-clinicians were included but asked to answer only those survey questions related to their fields of expertise. (see methodology supplement 1) Domains of surgery, post-surgical recovery, diagnosis and classification were also identified and experts were chosen , with sufficient expertise in these combined areas, as well as rehabilitation.

Coaches and trainers comprised 6% of the experts for the final survey. While they did not all have experience in diagnosis or surgery domains, or early rehabilitation their expertise in late-stage rehabilitation, running and return to sport was sought. Athletes were not included; however, we would acknowledge their voices as vital. Many of our experts have also been athletes and 38% of the final survey expert respondents reported a personal history of hamstring injury, being patients themselves

### **Modified Delphi process**

The study was undertaken after a review of decision-making aspects of the assessment and management and rehabilitation of HSI. The literature was searched, the evidence discussed, and the author team led a review of the evidence presented as a narrative summary to inform the consensus rationale and knowledge gaps. The study comprised two rounds of a purposive digital survey interspersed with a face-to-face meeting round. Each round was modified, based on feedback to achieve a consensus among the international panel of experts. Each Delphi round comprised a digital questionnaire, an analysis, and a feedback report.

Round one involved a digital survey, with open ended questions to a global group of clinicians with expertise in treating HSI. The round one survey (see appendix 1 in methods Supplement) aimed to gather information, and understand, from the experts' viewpoint, where are the gaps in the literature evidence and clinical practice in hamstring injury rehabilitation, return to running, sprinting and RTS. The initial round 1 survey comprised open ended qualitative

information gathering questions. The survey used a digital institution-based software package – Opinio 7.12 (copyright 1998-2020 ObjectPlanet, Oslo Norway).

The responses from the initial survey were collated and analysed with a thematic and factor analysis<sup>53</sup> (see table 1 in methodology supplement 1). The expert panel identified four key domains which included rehabilitation and return to running and sport. This paper deals with results of rehabilitation and RTS, with previous papers covering classification and surgery. The questions were presented for discussion. All the panel members who completed the survey were invited to the discussion meeting, which comprised a two-day meeting, alongside an international conference, to allow as many of the participants to join as possible. A nominal group consensus model was followed with a facilitated, structured approach to gather qualitative information, from this group.<sup>54</sup> This approach has been followed in other consensus projects.<sup>55 56</sup> In discussions, facilitators maintained impartiality and ensured balanced discussion to avoid discussions being dominated by the most eminent clinicians/ academics (“eminence” bias). They aimed to work toward agreement but not force consensus. Dissenting and outlier views were considered important, representing differences in practice. This approach aimed to avoid “herding” bias.<sup>57</sup> The key consensus statements were synthesised and refined. The rehabilitation sessions were chaired by the steering committee author related to their area of specialisation –Rehabilitation (BP), Return to running/sport (MG). Statements were gradually refined through a process of facilitated debate until the entire panel were satisfied and on day 2 were put to the group for anonymous electronic voting. (See supplement 2- Appendix 4 for the complete list of statements – rehabilitation, RTS/RTR, classification and surgery)

The consensus steering committee established an a priori criterion threshold of 70%, with  $\geq 70\%$  agreed/yes responses constituting statement acceptance. 70% has been used successfully

by other Delphi studies.<sup>58-60</sup> Statements reaching group consensus were retained, with rehabilitation (11), return to running (8) and RTS(12).

The final Delphi round involved a further online survey to test these statements with this survey to a wider international group of experts who met the previous inclusion /exclusion criteria. The participants voted on the statements with yes, no, uncertain (“forced choice”) responses. This made the final survey shorter and less onerous for participants but some further Likert or factor ranking questions determined level of agreement. (See Examples methodology supplement).

These experts voted on statements and ranked their key decision-making factors or justifications related to the domain areas found in the round 1 Survey. See tables 5-7 for consensus statements, voting results and typical discussion points or areas of disagreement (open ended questions).

### **Expert panel for final round**

The final survey with voting on the consensus statements, was split into domain sections – classification, surgery, rehabilitation, return to running /sport. The expert panel in this survey were asked to complete only the domains (sections of the survey) that were within their field and scope of expertise. The survey responses were evaluated for completeness. Survey responses in each domain were evaluated by 2 steering group members and any incomplete responses from non-experts in that particular domain were removed from the analysis. Within their expertise areas, panel members were asked to complete sections as carefully as possible and provided with response options such as “uncertain”. Open ended boxes after each consensus statement also allowed them to comment, and comments and areas of disagreement were collated and analysed and grouped by theme.

## **Steering committee**

The surveys were designed by 2 experienced clinical academic physiotherapists, and a professor of orthopaedic surgery, who each have greater than 20 years clinical experience treating HSI and research expertise in HSI, as well as previous experience with Delphi research. A structured, iterative process was undertaken to develop the survey and it was piloted by a mixed group of 5 sports medicine physicians, 5 physiotherapists and 5 orthopaedic surgeons, and the survey was further refined based on their feedback. The expert panel were approached by email located from publicly available correspondence information on organisational web sites or peer reviewed journal articles. Information was provided prior to participation but actively completing the survey was implied (and stated) as the consent to participate. Any participant who withdrew had data removed.

## **Results**

The response rate and participant characteristics for those who participated in each round of the survey are reported in figure 1 and table 1 below.

**Table 1 Participant characteristics of the Expert Panels**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Categories</b>	<b>Survey Round</b>	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Survey Final Round</b>
<b>Sex</b>	<b>(M: F)</b>	<b>33:2</b>	<b>14:1</b>	<b>81:18</b>
<b>Age (years)</b>	27 - 36	11 (31.4 %)	6	32 (31.6%)
	37 - 46	13 (37.1%)	4	33(33.7%)
	47 - 56	9 (25.7%)	4	20 (20.4%)
	57 - 70	2( 5.7%)	1	14 (14.3%)
<b>Role clinician</b>	clinician only	3 (5.7%)		26 (25%)
	researcher/scientist only	2 (8.6%)		11 (11 %)
	clinician + researcher	30 (85.7%)	15 (100%)	62 (63%)
	Neither clinician nor researcher	0		1 (1%)
<b>Hamstring cases / year</b>	none	0		5 (5%)
	0-5	1(2.9%)		6 (6%)
	5-10	6 (17.1%)		25 (24%)
	10-15	7 (20%)		12 (12%)
	15-20	10 (28.6%)		13 (13%)
	20 or more	11 (31.4%)		38 (38%)
<b>Health care profession</b>	Sports medicine Physician	4 (10%)	1 (7%)	21 (18 %)
	Orthopaedic surgeon	8 (21%)	5 (35%)	18 (17 %)
	Physical Therapist	22 (55%)	10 (64%)	43 (40 %)
	Sports scientist	1 (3%)		25 (24 %)
	Athletic trainer / Strength & Conditioning coach	2 (5%)		7 (6 %)
	Other	2 (5%)		2 (2%)
<b>Country of practice</b>	North America	4 (11%)		10 (10%)
	Europe	26 (66%)	12 (80%) (UK, Neth, Ir)	65 (64%)
	Middle East/Africa	4 (11%)	1 (7%) Saf	12 (12%)
	Southeast Asia			1 (1%)
	South America			1 (1%)
	Australasia / pacific	5 (13%)	2(13%) (Aust)	10 (10%)
<b>Sports</b>	football	31 (29%)	4 (27%)	79 (80%)

	<b>athletics</b>	<b>19 (19%)</b>	<b>2 (13%)</b>	<b>59 (60%)</b>
	<b>Rugby codes</b>	<b>13(12%)</b>	<b>4 (27%)</b>	<b>40 (40%)</b>
	<b>NFL</b>	<b>5 (5%)</b>		<b>9 (9%)</b>
	<b>AFL</b>	<b>3 (3%)</b>		<b>9 (9%)</b>
	<b>basketball</b>	<b>9 (9%)</b>		<b>30 (30%)</b>
	<b>volleyball</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>		<b>1 (1%)</b>
	<b>Skiing and winter sports</b>	<b>9(9%)</b>		<b>21 (21%)</b>
	<b>hockey</b>	<b>3 (3%)</b>	<b>1 (7%)</b>	<b>22 (21%)</b>
	<b>judo/ martial arts/wrestling</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>		<b>24 (24%)</b>
	<b>cricket</b>			<b>15 (15%)</b>
	<b>Ice hockey</b>			<b>12 (12%)</b>
	<b>Acrobatics/ gymnastics / dance</b>			<b>17 (17%)</b>
	<b>Gaelic football</b>			<b>7 (7%)</b>
	<b>Racquet sports</b>			<b>17 (17%)</b>
	<b>handball</b>			<b>20 (20%)</b>
	<b>Other</b>	<b>9 (8%)</b>	<b>4 (27%)</b>	<b>6 (6%)</b>
<b>Years working with HSI</b>	<b>0-4</b>	<b>5 (14.3%)</b>		<b>17 (17%)</b>
	<b>11-14</b>	<b>8 (22.9%)</b>		<b>13 (13%)</b>
	<b>5-10</b>	<b>9 (25.7%)</b>		<b>22 (21%)</b>
	<b>15-20</b>	<b>4 (11.4%)</b>		<b>23 (23%)</b>
	<b>more than 20</b>	<b>9 (25.7%)</b>		<b>24 (24%)</b>
<b>Highest academic</b>	<b>Bachelor/Diploma</b>			<b>14 (14%)</b>
	<b>Masters</b>			<b>35(35%)</b>
	<b>PhD</b>			<b>34 (35%)</b>
	<b>Clinical Doctorate</b>			<b>15 (15%)</b>
<b>Had hamstring injury</b>	<b>hamstring problem</b>			<b>38 (38%)</b>
	<b>not applicable</b>			<b>61 (62%)</b>

UK-United Kingdom, Neth-Netherlands, IR-ireland, Aust-Australia , SAF- South Africa

Round 1 of the survey obtained baseline information from our experts on which areas of rehabilitation and RTS required more research. The open-ended responses were grouped and analysed thematically (see tables 2-4).

**Table 2 Round 1 Survey - What are the key questions that you would like answered regarding the early phase of rehabilitation after HSI?**

<i>Domain Area (Theme)</i>	<i>responses</i>	<i>Typical Responses</i>
<b>Early interventions (STM / neural mob/ + adjuncts BFR / EM stim)</b>	<b>9</b>	Is there a role for adjunct treatment modalities? At what time point are they safe and to what level of intensity?
<b>Progression criteria (including pain)</b>	<b>6</b>	What outcomes should we be aiming to achieve for criteria-based progression along stages
<b>Optimum exercise/ load types</b>	<b>6</b>	What are the optimal exercises to use in this phase? How early can we safely prescribe eccentric / long length exercises?
<b>Pain importance</b>	<b>5</b>	What are the outcomes of pain monitored/threshold approach to rehabilitation?
<b>Modalities for inflammation / healing (RICE, Meds)</b>	<b>5</b>	Does prolonged use of Ice, Compression or medication positively or negatively affect hamstring healing rates?
<b>Timescales (start and progress load)</b>	<b>4</b>	How early can we safely prescribe eccentric / long length exercises?
<b>Flexibility/ ROM</b>	<b>3</b>	Is there a role for Knee flexibility work?
<b>Immobilisation &amp; Bracing (optimum, effects)</b>	<b>3</b>	Does initial immobilisation positively or negatively affect hamstring healing rates?
<b>Neural factors, inhibition &amp; activation</b>	<b>3</b>	What are the outcomes of return to run process, early vs delayed vs criteria based, vs early introduction of eccentrics - any effect on neuromuscular inhibition?
<b>Optimum dosing (Frequency, Intensity, Duration)</b>	<b>2</b>	What exercise dosages are optimal for loading early phase after HSI?
<b>Safety of early loading</b>	<b>1</b>	Does early mobilization / rehab including stretching and activation of the hamstring speed or limit recovery.
<b>Tissue strain load /exercise</b>	<b>1</b>	What is the strain placed on muscle/tendon by different rehab exercises?
<b>Weight bearing</b>	<b>1</b>	When does initial reduction in weightbearing help or hinder healing?
<b>Early strength</b>	<b>1</b>	What are the outcomes of early introduction of eccentric exercises?
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	

**Table 3 What questions would you most like answered on exercise prescription in HSI rehabilitation?**

<i>Domain Area (Theme)</i>	<i>responses</i>	<i>Typical Responses</i>
<i>Progression of exercise</i>	<i>8</i>	What is optimum order of progression of exercise? inner to outer? short length to long concentric to eccentric to isometric? OKC vs CKC? knee to hip based?
<i>Dosage</i>	<i>5</i>	What is the optimum dosage of strength exercise?
<i>Contraction types</i>	<i>5</i>	What type of contraction should be emphasised during hamstring injury rehabilitation?
<i>Running /sprinting</i>	<i>4</i>	What is a safe but stimulating dosage of pitch-based running?
<i>Exercise choice</i>	<i>4</i>	what are the optimal exercises for hamstring injury prevention?
<i>Importance of symptoms</i>	<i>3</i>	How effective is early introduction of eccentrics and pain threshold training?
<i>Safety vs effectiveness balance</i>	<i>3</i>	What is a safe but stimulating dosage of strength exercise?
<i>Tissue healing stage</i>	<i>2</i>	What modes of exercise should be carried out at certain healing stages?
<i>Timing</i>	<i>2</i>	When should certain exercise types, isometric, concentric, eccentric, SSC be implemented throughout rehabilitation
<i>Insufficient evidence</i>	<i>2</i>	Can we get more insights to the specific mechanisms of HSI at a contraction mode, neural and structural level to aid prevention and rehabilitation exercise choices?
<i>Flexibility</i>	<i>1</i>	What are the effects of flexibility exercises?
<i>Strength</i>	<i>1</i>	What types of strength are crucial?
<i>Which Muscles</i>	<i>1</i>	How best do we target loading the Biceps femoris long or short head and do we need to?
<i>Functional exercise</i>	<i>1</i>	More RCTs (analogous to those employing the Nordic) exploring the functional effectiveness of different exercises
<i>Neural factors</i>	<i>1</i>	Which exercises promote optimal hamstring activation?
<i>Total</i>	<i>43</i>	



**Table 4 What are the questions you would like answered on return to running and sport after HSI?**

<i>Domain Area (Theme)</i>	<i>responses</i>	<i>Typical responses</i>
<i>running mechanics</i>	<i>8</i>	Does early return to running effect rehab outcomes?
<i>optimum monitoring</i>	<i>7</i>	What key benchmarks should we be considering before each stage and research about
<i>recovery</i>	<i>2</i>	How long to leave it between bouts of HSR?
<i>sport specifics</i>	<i>3</i>	What are the sport-specific match demands that we can replicate towards the end of rehabilitation?
<i>load tolerance</i>	<i>1</i>	Does early return to running effect rehab outcomes?
<i>strength</i>	<i>3</i>	What are key strength components and levels to enable safe return
<i>dosage</i>	<i>2</i>	What dosage of running should be permitted before sprinting is safe
<i>timing</i>	<i>4</i>	How early is it safe to sprint?
<i>Total</i>	<i>30</i>	

Consensus statements were constructed, refined and agreed after facilitated debate at the face-to-face meeting days. Statements were sent in round 2 of the survey to a wider body of global experts and the level of agreement (LOA) with statements are represented in tables 4-6. Those statements reaching 70% agreement or above are highlighted. Typical discussion points are also shown to display common responses and disagreement from open-ended questions. The order of the statements is based around the decision-making stages of rehabilitation – early / middle / late / and return to running / RTS stages.

## Stage 2 Consensus statements Tables –

Table 5 Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey – Global expert Panel - **Rehabilitation**

Statements related to General Rehabilitation	TRUE	FALSE	Undecided	Samples of typical responses - discussion points or areas of disagreement	
<i>Initial and progressive loading of injured hamstring muscles should include exercise with different: - contraction types, muscle lengths, functional movements, body positions, but the type of exercise will depend on the sports specific adaptation required, symptoms and risks of reinjury</i>	89.8%	8.5%	1.7%	Initial loading about neuromuscular stimulation and improving healing / Muscle tension at length not ideal/ initial loading isometric to minimise stress or shearing on tendon / eccentric contractions should be the focus.	
<i>The ORDER and SPEED of PROGRESSION of exercises - (concentric / isometric / eccentric exercises), hip and knee-based exercises, inner and outer length exercises and open and closed kinetic chain exercises) - will depend on: -</i>	<i>adaptation required</i>	96.2%	0.0%	3.8%	Level of agreement reflects the importance of the target adaptations required as a criterion for prescription.
	<i>symptoms</i>	88.9%	7.4%	3.7%	Symptoms were the main criterion used by rehabilitation clinicians to make decisions.
	<i>type of injury</i>	75.0%	15.4%	9.6%	Overall, the injury and tissue type were major considerations for clinicians in deciding on exercise.
	<i>risk of recurrence</i>	60.4%	26.4%	13.2%	No comments made -? Possibly reflecting the little literature available on this.
	<i>stage of tissue healing</i>	90.7%	5.6%	3.7%	Tissue and stage of healing showed strong agreement - discussions suggested that it was harder to know at tissue level how healing was progressing, and symptoms were used as a surrogate to this.
	<i>symptoms pain</i>	90.7%	1.9%	7.4%	Symptoms were the main criterion used by rehabilitation clinicians to make decisions.
	<i>strength</i>	92.7%	3.6%	3.6%	While strength overall showed good agreement - there was less agreement on which components of strength were thought to be most important.
<i>The CRITERIA FOR PROGRESSION of exercise should include: -</i>	<i>Special tests</i>	62.7%	13.7%	23.5%	Lack of agreement on specific tests - but a combination of factors was thought to be more important
	<i>Functional milestones</i>	87.3%	5.5%	7.3%	Function was agreed to be important - but panel could not agree on which functional milestones are most important.
	<i>Flexibility</i>	67.9%	17.0%	15.1%	Flexibility and ROM were thought by the panel to be less important as a criterion- and comments were that strength exercises at longer length were sometimes used to build flexibility concurrently with strength.
	<i>The severity of the injury</i>	73.1%	15.4%	11.5%	After the initial diagnosis and early treatment stage the progressions were led more by the above criteria than the severity of the injury - although many issued cautions with tendon injuries and higher-grade tendon injuries due to risk of re rupture.
<i>The Dosage of exercise (frequency, intensity, duration) should be based on: -</i>	<i>The response to previous loading</i>	96.3%	1.9%	1.9%	Graded process of loading and assessing response - both during and after exercise - especially in terms of pain - it was felt this gave the optimum speed of rehab
	<i>Examination findings</i>	88.2%	9.8%	2.0%	High agreement that examination was vital prior to progressions in dosage.
	<i>Stage of Healing</i>	86.5%	7.7%	5.8%	Appropriate healing level to tolerate applied loads.
	<i>Periodisation factors</i>	88.2%	3.9%	7.8%	Weekly and seasonal factors affect decisions on dosage and are key considerations in elite sport environments.
	<i>Sporting level</i>	82.7%	15.4%	1.9%	
	<i>Current and previous capacity</i>	88.7%	7.5%	3.8%	These 3 questions related to knowing the end goal in load capacity for match fitness, which will depend on type and level of sport.
	<i>The target adaptations related to the patient's goals and or sport</i>	92.3%	3.8%	3.8%	
	<i>Strength</i>	92.6%	3.7%	3.7%	Training principles of overload - ensuring strength loads are progressed to enable muscle to keep adapting - i.e., avoid accommodation to the equivalent applied loads.

<i>Fitness</i>	78.8%	13.5%	7.7%	Cardiovascular fitness may not affect dosage in gym-based work but will affect running work.
<i>Severity of the injury</i>	84.6%	11.5%	3.8%	It may not be appropriate to load some injuries too heavily - as they may not have symptoms but still be at risk of re-tear - it biceps femoris and central tendon involvement.
<i>The whole rehabilitation process should be agreed within the MDT and have athlete engagement</i>	96.8%	1.6%	1.6%	MDT and athlete engagement were key - the discussions were around all the stakeholders' potentially conflicting goals and timeframes.
<i>The patient's sport and previous level of participation will impact the progression of exercise selection and ultimate return to activity</i>	95.2%	3.2%	1.6%	The discussions were like the 3 questions above.
<i>It is important to consider the possibility of sciatic nerve / neural symptoms when considering a patient's progression through rehabilitation. Neural mobility could be considered in treatment but the protection of the repaired or vulnerable tissue should be maintained.</i>	90.5%	0.0%	9.5%	Strong agreement.
<i>ADJUNCTS to REHABILITATION, such as blood flow restriction, electrical stimulation and hydrotherapy should be considered in the early stages to enhance tissue healing and recovery (Caution should be used with cuff pressures over repairing tissues when using blood flow restriction (BFR) training)</i>	68.9%	6.6%	24.6%	There was less uniform global practice when relating to use of adjuncts such as BFR- this reflects small evidence base only in HIS.
<i>Rehabilitation should be MONITORED with appropriate markers that are progressive with recovery</i>	98.4%	0.0%	1.6%	Monitoring was agreed but the most common form of monitoring was very varied!! - most panellists mentioned monitoring with GPS data allowing on field training / match play load data.
<i>Final stage strengthening should aim to achieve adequate symptom free, outer range, eccentric and isometric strength in injured and uninjured limb.</i>	95.2%	1.6%	3.2%	Panel had agreement on the types of strength to be achieved by final stage rehab - with outer length eccentric and isometric strength - in line with evidence on strength.
<i>It is key during a hamstring rehabilitation to assess, treat and prescribe exercises addressing the whole kinetic chain.</i>	90.5%	3.2%	6.3%	Panel agreed that biomechanical kinetic chain was important but there was less agreement on which were the most important components - many panellists suggested that it should be individualised and decided based on thorough subject and objective examination.

Table 6 Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey – Global expert Panel - **Return to Running**

Statements related to return to running	TRUE	FALSE	Undecided	Samples of typical responses - discussion points or areas of disagreement
<i>On pitch/track/field (sport specific) running is a significant part of hamstring rehabilitation.</i>	98.4%	1.6%	0.0%	Levels of agreement for these 2 questions reflects the importance of running as part of HSI rehabilitation.
<i>Running dosages should be gradually increased to ensure return to full sprinting.</i>	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Hamstring muscle function discussed and difference in function at speed was acknowledged.
<i>Sprinting dosage loads should approach game level intensities and volumes to reduce risk of recurrence on return to sport</i>	95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	Sprinting in games presents injury risk and sprint work is a key component in final phase rehabilitation.
<i>Further research should investigate the specific actions, bias, roles of individual muscles in function of running and sprinting to aid rehab exercise prescription.</i>	84.7%	0.0%	15.3%	Differences in muscle roles were discussed and the panel expressed need for more research into how the differences in muscle function will then impact rehabilitation.
<i>Further research should investigate types (styles) and dosages of running (quantity, speed) that promote adaptations but reduce risk of recurrence</i>	90.3%	1.6%	8.1%	Discussions suggested that running had not been prioritised sufficiently in literature and identified a research need.
<i>Further research should investigate safe time frames to commence running post Hamstring injury or surgery</i>	90.3%	1.6%	8.1%	Risk of reinjury is high when reexposing HSI athletes to running - and the panel wanted safer time frames for return - and more research onto timeframes.
<i>Mild pain with running is permissible in rehabilitating certain HSI, but we need to consider the function of the individual, the anatomy, injury, classification and the 24-hour pain pattern (subjective and objective)</i>	83.9%	9.7%	6.5%	The panel acknowledged many athletes have pain when restarting running - there was less agreement on how much pain was permissible / deleterious - the stated consideration factors reached agreement but other factors did not.
<i>In HSI Pain free running is a criterion for return to sprinting.</i>	85.5%	8.1%	6.5%	The panel agreed that pain levels should be reduced prior to permitting sprinting - the panel acknowledged that the initial commencement of full sprinting - was a high-risk period for reinjury.

Table 7 Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey – Global expert Panel - **Return to Sport**

<b>Statements related to Return to Sport</b>	<b>TRUE</b>	<b>FALSE</b>	<b>Undecided</b>	<b>Samples of typical responses - discussion points or areas of disagreement</b>
<i>In HSI, Range of motion is a consideration for RTS. If previous data is available, then within 10% of previous scores should be used otherwise within 20% of the other limb</i>	45.0%	23.3%	31.7%	Flexibility was not considered a key factor by many clinicians - stretching did not always produce improvements in function or performance and less agreement over acceptable levels.
<i>Kinetic chain strength/function is a consideration criterion for RTS.</i>	78.3%	6.7%	15.0%	All agreed Kinetic chain was important - but panel did not agree on key kinetic chain factors. A clinical reasoning approach was advocated to assess each athlete based on the required sporting demand and key injury risk activities.
<i>Progression to Peak isometric force in mid and outer range, isotonic strength (eccentric only/eccentric &amp; concentric) are all considerations for RTS</i>	83.3%	1.7%	15.0%	Optimal types of exercise were controversial but consistent with literature - eccentric or isometric exercises at length were considered important and reached agreement.
<i>Benchmarks for strength should reflect the end goal demands of the athlete but should be within 10% of previous data or population means</i>	66.1%	10.2%	23.7%	The low agreement for this question reflected differences in opinion on strength benchmarks.
<i>Athlete subjective apprehension is a consideration for RTS criteria.</i>	98.3%	0.0%	1.7%	The strong agreement reflects the importance the panel placed on the athletes leading the RTS / RTR process - and ensuring their opinion was prioritised.
<i>Athlete self-assessment of their readiness to RTS is a key factor in the return to sport decision making process.</i>	86.7%	5.0%	8.3%	
<i>Asking H-Test is a useful test in the return to sprinting decision process</i>	57.6%	18.6%	23.7%	The respondents were divided on use of pain provocation tests. Their usefulness was acknowledged but it was felt that no one specific test could assess readiness to return to sprinting - and the tests should form part of an ongoing assessment and clinical reasoning process.
<i>Endurance Capacity testing of the hamstrings should be a consideration for RTS</i>	78.3%	6.7%	15.0%	Endurance was felt to be important, but it was harder to get agreement on which endurance tests were most important - running endurance was felt to be important but the panel suggested that the level of endurance related to the specific sporting demands.
<i>Pain free sprinting is a criterion for return to play</i>	96.7%	1.7%	1.7%	The importance of sprinting in match play / competition was acknowledged, with high agreement. There was less agreement on the dosage of full sprinting. While some pain was permitted in running, sprinting in RTS - was expected to be pain-free.
<i>Completing full unrestricted training session should be a criterion for Return to Sport</i>	93.3%	6.7%	0.0%	Training sessions reached agreement - particularly as this assessed the athlete with sports specific demands and endurance requirements.
<i>The use of previous GPS metrics can guide the required dosage of appropriate metrics i.e., volume, sprints, speed, HSR</i>	83.3%	3.3%	13.3%	Many in the panel were using GPS to measure running dosage - and their usefulness was thought to be key - with practice expertise moving faster than research evidence base - this was thought to be an area requiring greater research.
<i>Return to sport should be a multidisciplinary process that involves all stakeholders ideally</i>	98.3%	0.0%	1.7%	The importance of a whole MDT and coaching athlete stakeholder involvement reached high LOA - but many clinicians acknowledged significant pressure from stakeholder groups to modify their clinical decision-making.

## **Discussion**

This modified Delphi aimed to reach expert consensus on the rehabilitation of HSI over three rounds, comprising two online surveys separated by a consensus group meeting which established consensus statements around: - rehabilitation (11), return to running (8) and return to sport (12). Further expert voting in the final round online survey further refined these statements, with key statements reaching the a priori agreed 70% agreement (rehabilitation (11), return to running (8) and return to sport (9)). The discussion is ordered around the consensus statements relevant for the stages of rehabilitation – early / middle / late stages.

### **Initial and progressive loading – type and dosage of exercise**

Exercise prescription should aim to prepare the injured hamstring for the sports-specific capacity required (LOA 89.5%). Multiple types of exercise were agreed to be important but there was no agreement on which exercises were best at each rehabilitation stage. When deciding on initial loading, pain, athlete confidence and classification of injury were important, but flexibility, gait and strength were ranked low. This is not aligned with evidence, suggesting that strength in outer lengths and flexibility are both associated with early rehabilitation progression<sup>61</sup>, but other reviews suggest range of movement (ROM) and flexibility are less important.<sup>62 63</sup> Motor control and recruitment were not prioritised by as many experts, possibly reflecting lower volumes of evidence, and difficulties with measurement. Clinical reasoning to inform load prescription using assessment and specific criteria, rather than time associated prescription was preferred. Outer length eccentric and isometric strength capacity was required by the end stage of rehabilitation, in alignment with review evidence on prevention of injury<sup>17 18 64</sup> and prevention of recurrence.<sup>65 66</sup> The response to previous loading and strength (92.3% LOA) should be prioritised to decide the dosage of exercise/ load (LOA 96.2%).

### **Influence of tissue healing**

The stage of healing was important in deciding dosage of loading (LOA 86%). Components of muscle tissue (fascia, muscle cells and tendon) heal and adapt to loading at different rates after injury<sup>67</sup> and

this has implications for time frames of healing, loading and recovery.<sup>68 69</sup> Rehabilitation should be clinically reasoned and individualised, based on the type of injured tissue, and its speed of healing and adaptation.<sup>70-74</sup> Optimising progressive dosage of loading (volume, frequency, intensity, and duration) should encompass sufficient overload to promote adaptations but not cause tissue reinjury<sup>75</sup>, which may vary for each myotendinous structure (fascia/ muscle/ MTJ / tendon). This follows evidence of faster time frames for healing of myofascial (type a)<sup>76</sup>, versus MTJ (b), which heals via satellite cell induced myogenesis and tendon (type c) injuries<sup>77 78</sup> which depend on collagen synthesis and replacement and remodelling.<sup>79 80</sup> The type of tissue may influence the amount of early protection required<sup>80</sup> and the risk of recurrence, with more protection required and greater risk in c or tendon type injuries.<sup>81</sup> Hamstrings have complex intramuscular tendon architecture and injuries to these structures are often poorly recognised<sup>82</sup>, with poor rehabilitation outcomes<sup>83</sup>, and may require further protection, although this remains controversial.<sup>84</sup> Repaired tendon tissue may not regain pre-injury biomechanical properties, even at 12 months.<sup>85</sup> Longer protection may be required, particularly from elastic or strain loads like running, sprinting, jumping and other sports-specific movements requiring tissue elasticity<sup>6</sup> (LOA 92.3%). For hamstring injury, our panel suggested early protection may be required from activities such as weight bearing (high grade injury), stairs and high force contractions, contraction at long lengths, eccentric contractions, and stretch shortening cycle (SSC) contractions (jumping, plyometrics and running). They disagreed however on the time frames for protection, with most suggesting that timing or protection should relate to presence or level of symptoms. Symptoms, however, were thought to provide only a surrogate measure of healing, and in some types of injury, adequate fixed tissue healing time may be required (i.e. tendon and connective tissue injuries). Symptoms may resolve while the healing tissue is still vulnerable. This represents a conflict between symptom-based and time-based rehabilitation approaches, and both may be required.

### **Commencement of loading and exercise prescription**

After initial protection, the primary rehabilitation goal, is to progressively load recovering tissue to promote its optimal adaptation back to full strength, elasticity, capability and function.<sup>6</sup>

The type of muscle contraction prescribed in exercise (eccentric<sup>35</sup> ; isometric<sup>86</sup>; concentric<sup>87</sup>) produces different force outputs and loads on muscle tissues, leading to different adaptation, and requiring different periodisation and recovery times.<sup>88 89</sup> Early eccentric loading was typically avoided by our experts due to perceived reinjury risk and loading commences with isometric contraction at shortened lengths. This follows historical guidance.<sup>90</sup> Isometric contractions, however, (depending on the muscle length and effort) can produce greater tensile force loads within tendinous connective tissue than do eccentric loads.<sup>91</sup> Heavy loads may, therefore, be applied too early, but this may inadvertently allow earlier adaption within connective tissue and speed rehabilitation. However, some of our panel, and some authors suggest that it may be advantageous to safely expose tissue to paced eccentric loads.<sup>28 92</sup> Outer length, eccentric, and isometric strength work was certainly an ultimate goal (LOA 95%). Loading hamstring at longer lengths may increase fascicle length,<sup>92 93</sup> changing the length tension relationship in muscle and reducing injury risk.<sup>94</sup>

The hamstring muscle group comprises two joint muscles and muscle function differs depending on the mobile joint, but also whether the mobile segment is fixed (or in a closed kinetic chain (CKC)) or free, in an open kinetic chain (OKC). Recruitment will differ with reversal of the mobile versus fixed attachments.<sup>95 96</sup> For hamstrings, hip versus knee dominant exercises load different parts of the muscles<sup>97-100</sup>, with different training effects. Our panel advocated applying both types, but without agreement on which should be first.

Exercise speed and elastic function in rehabilitation prescription was emphasised by only small numbers in our panels (outlier view), but evidence suggests that adaptations to training are influenced by contraction speed and elastic function. Muscle connective tissue is an elastic energy store and tendon strain and elastic/spring behaviour are vital to hamstring muscle function, but involve high tensile loads on the tendon and muscle connective tissue.<sup>101</sup> This elastic/spring behaviour must be restored for activities such as running or jumping.<sup>102</sup> Elasticity also works across long fascial slings of connective tissue(CT), as well as within individual muscles<sup>103</sup>. Deciding when to allow elastic load and SSC activities has importance<sup>102</sup>, including running at low and high speeds.<sup>104</sup> Reinjury risk is high during introduction of these activities.<sup>81 105</sup> In SSC and elastic work, the speed of activity increases strain rates

on CT, placing the CT under greatest load and risk, although high strain amounts may be tolerated by recovering tissue if applied slowly, and may stimulate connect tissue cells / fibroblasts, tenocytes to adapt fastest. This raises the importance of the speed of the exercise. In hamstrings, as running speed increases, elastic strain behaviour, the amount of negative work<sup>106</sup>, and force<sup>107</sup> all increase. Typically, our experts reported not exposing injured tissue to running early, but in certain injury types, in controlled situations, this loading, may allow earlier tissue adaptation.

We did not reach consensus around neural activation and motor control, which were only highlighted by small numbers on our panel (outlier viewpoint), reflecting some evidence finding neuromuscular deficits and inhibition after hamstring injury<sup>108-110</sup>. Many clinicians include exercise for muscle activation, to address this inhibition and control<sup>111</sup>, and different hamstring exercises activate muscles very differently<sup>112-114</sup>, with implications for neural components to strength. Reinjury risk can be higher with lower levels of muscle activation in warm up.<sup>115</sup> Neural movement may be important, with neuromeningeal mechanisms to some HSI proposed<sup>116</sup>, and assessment and treatment of neurodynamics can have significant effects on symptoms and flexibility.<sup>117-119</sup>

### **Flexibility**

The commencement of flexibility work recommended after hamstring injury is varied and we did not reach consensus. Lack of hamstring flexibility is a possible risk factor for HSI and reinjury<sup>120</sup> but can be present after injury.<sup>121</sup> Some authors advocate flexibility work after HSI<sup>34 122</sup> but other evidence suggests flexibility may not be a risk factor for reinjury.<sup>63</sup>

### **Monitoring and Progression of exercise**

Progression of exercise maintains ongoing adaptation to training.<sup>123</sup> There was strong agreement for monitoring through rehabilitation (LOA 98.4%). Exercise progressions should ideally be made based on criteria. Having specific adaptation goals (LOA 96.1%), considering tissue healing (90.4%), or the type of injury (75%), and using symptoms (88.5%), such as pain, were considered important criteria for progression. There was less agreement on recurrence risk (60.4%) affected decision-making. Risk of recurrence did not reach consensus. This may reflect the lack of research into what types or speeds of progression affect reinjury risk. Strength, rather than pain was the most important criterion for



progression, indicating that some clinicians prefer to tolerate some level of pain (pain threshold), although, a high proportion of the panel wanted tissue to be pain-free prior to progression.<sup>28 92</sup>

We did not achieve consensus on the optimal order of exercise progression but did agree that this should be individualised based on the level and type of sport and required capacity (LOA 95%). Rehabilitation should be commenced and progressed with a sport-specific end target goal/capacity (LOA 96.2%), and that loading of the injured muscle(s) should follow the muscle actions, demands roles in the athlete's sport and level of play. Injury patterns in some sports relate to slow speed stretch type forces with contracting muscles.<sup>124</sup> Sports such as rugby or American football see different HSI mechanisms with high load slow stretch injury, typically involving the semimembranosus and fascia, with extremes of hip flexion and knee extension<sup>125 126</sup>. Sports involving jumping, pivoting or kicking<sup>127</sup> differ again in hamstring and lower limb kinetic chain function<sup>128</sup>. Rehabilitation exercise should, therefore, be chosen, adapted, and targeted specifically to the functional requirements of the injured muscle<sup>98 111</sup> in the sport, and its injury risk movements.

It is historically suggested that knee-based exercise be introduced prior to hip-based exercise. Hip-based protocols such as the L Protocol require the hamstrings to function at longer muscle lengths and are effective in elite sprinters<sup>23</sup> and footballers<sup>24</sup> for hamstring injury prevention. The advantage of hip over knee-based protocols, and when to commence them, is less clear in rehabilitation. Hamstring contractions in high-speed running, however, involve controlling concurrent knee and hip high speed Single leg angular motions<sup>129</sup> and it may be appropriate to consider biarticular single leg exercise.

### **Subjective and objective longitudinal monitoring throughout rehabilitation**

Progression of rehabilitation should be reasoned and based on ongoing assessment including both subjective and objective measures,<sup>130</sup> as well as evidenced-based criteria. Many of the criteria that clinicians use to progress load, are investigated only in subsets of the hamstring injury population<sup>61</sup>, or not at all.<sup>28</sup>

## **Imaging**

None of our expert panel recommended using imaging findings as criteria for progression, and this was not added as a consensus statement. MRI findings show poor significance at RTP<sup>131 132</sup> and our outcomes align with another consensus statement in football, where medical imaging was not recommended to inform RTP decisions.<sup>49</sup> While imaging is used for classification and grading of injury, which assists rehabilitation prescription in practice<sup>16 29</sup>, imaging could not be used to determine restoration of muscle and connective tissue architecture and load capacity.

## **Clinical examination findings/ assessment**

Many studies use clinical examination components as the main decision-makers for progressions as they show greater predictive value than imaging modalities such as MRI.<sup>133 134</sup> Several studies have investigated the most important examination findings.<sup>135-138</sup>

Pain was the most important criterion for rehabilitation progression (LOA 90.4%). Traditionally the absence of pain was the criterion for progression<sup>40</sup>, although some pain is acceptable<sup>28 49</sup>, and rehabilitation with a permitted pain-threshold has been found to be beneficial.<sup>65 139 140</sup> Slower pain free progression is advocated in high grade or tendinous hamstring injuries.<sup>141 142 16</sup> Pain threshold rehabilitation may not accelerate time to RTS, but may accelerate restoration of isometric knee flexor strength and maintain Biceps Femoris long head fascicle length, compared to pain-free rehabilitation.<sup>92</sup>

Range of movement/ muscle flexibility scored highly with our experts as progression criteria (LOA 67.9%) but did not quite reach consensus threshold. Some evidence suggests that Flexibility and ROM tests, however, may correlate with TRTS.<sup>61</sup> Tests such as Maximal Hip Flexion Active Knee Extension (MHFAKE)<sup>143</sup> and Straight leg raise (SLR)<sup>120</sup> may be useful. Clinicians may also consider the use of modified Thomas Test<sup>144</sup> or a slump test for neurodynamic assessment.<sup>118 119</sup>

Muscle strength was scored highly by our panel as a key examination progression criterion (LOA 92.5%), following evidence of strength tests correlating closely with clinical progression and running effort.<sup>61 133</sup> We did not have consensus on the most important types of strength or optimum measurement

methods but agreed that outer length and eccentric strength were key (LOA 95%). This follows evidence that outer length tests correlated more with progression than mid or inner range strength tests<sup>61 133</sup>. Quick convenient tests, such as manual muscle tests show low validity and reliability<sup>145 146</sup>. Instrumented tests such as handheld dynamometry (HHD) are more reliable, but still show questionable validity and reliability<sup>147</sup>. Tests such as prone knee bend (PKB) testing at 15° with HHD<sup>26</sup> or knee flexion in supine with hip flexed, which test outer length hamstring function, can better mimic sporting or injury risk situations. Other measurement devices such as the Nordbord<sup>148</sup> have been used as a criterion for RTS and progression, citing evidence of Nordic hamstring exercise (NHE) to prevent HSI<sup>149</sup> but a recent meta-analysis reported inconclusive evidence of NHE preventing hamstring injury.<sup>150</sup>

Other muscle strength tests, such as hand held dynamometry and isokinetic dynamometry<sup>151</sup>, and the derived hamstring to quadriceps<sup>152</sup> or concentric to eccentric<sup>121 153 154</sup> ratios may be beneficial<sup>28</sup>, although other evidence suggest less utility to predict risk of reinjury<sup>155 156</sup> or RTS<sup>157</sup>. Tests however, cannot isolate/quantify individual hamstring or posterior chain muscle contribution<sup>158</sup> and other knee and hip muscles, such as gastrocnemius or adductor magnus, may compensate for hamstring muscle deficits. The different sport-specific body positions, functional roles and speeds of the individual hamstring muscles in sporting tasks (i.e. sprinting) are difficult to assess with these tests and our experts reported combining these tests to measure multiple parameters of strength.<sup>159</sup> More valid / sports-specific tests to aid progression in strength prescription in rehabilitation are needed.

Some of our experts used surface electromyography (sEMG), measuring the contribution of each posterior chain (hamstring) muscle in exercises and detect neuromuscular inhibition.<sup>108</sup> however, other authors highlight poor validity and reliability of sEMG.<sup>160</sup> Further research is warranted, as some central nervous system changes are present after hamstring injury<sup>110</sup>, and may be implicated in recurrence.

## **Adjuncts**

Adjuncts to strengthening which enhance muscle adaptation, but with lower tissue joint loads are frequently used in early rehabilitation. Examples include muscle stimulation and strength training with blood flow restriction (BFR), which allow earlier commencement of strength training, at lower levels of load. Their utility did not reach consensus in final round (LOA 67.8%), although BFR was used by

all the rehab clinicians in our consensus meeting panel, reflecting differences in global clinical practice. Few studies have examined their use after HSI. There is growing evidence for effectiveness in other conditions such as anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction<sup>161</sup>, and our panel reported adapting protocols for HSI.

The use of EMS and hydrotherapy were identified as being part of current practice<sup>162 163</sup>, particularly in the early phase of rehabilitation<sup>26</sup>, although the optimal use of these modalities remain unknown.

### **Contribution of the kinetic chain**

During hamstring rehabilitation, it is important to assess the kinetic chain (LOA 90.2%), but there was less agreement on which structures to prioritise. Several clinicians commented on posterior chain muscle sling function, suggesting that treatment should be individualised, based on assessment and clinical reasoning, with correction of dysfunctions as a criterion for RTS (LOA 77.6%). The statement around sciatic nerve showed strong agreement (90.5%), reflecting its proximity and frequent involvement in high grade hamstring injury, where the nerve can be tractioned or tethered. Associated symptoms warrant investigation and possible surgical consideration.

Some of our experts suggested hip and pelvis biomechanics influence hamstring injury risk. Sacroiliac joint mobility and force closure<sup>164 165</sup> and ilial asymmetry both affect the pelvis and ischial tuberosity position, altering length tension relationships in the hamstrings. Pelvic control and gluteal muscle activation associates with hamstring injury in running.<sup>166</sup> Gluteal versus Hamstring contribution in hip extension<sup>167</sup>; Femoroacetabular impingement (FAI)<sup>168 169</sup>; lack of hip Flexion<sup>170</sup>; lumbar spine L5/S1 nerve root pathology<sup>171</sup>, and trunk strength with altered EMG activity<sup>172</sup> have all been implicated in HSI risk. Other studies, however, do not implicate proximal kinetic chain muscles after HSI and the picture may be more complicated.<sup>173</sup> Our panel advocated for a kinetic chain approach that individualises assessment and clinical reasoning for each athlete.

### **Return To Running**

Running and sprinting were identified as a key components of rehabilitation after hamstring injury (LOA98.4%) (table 3). This reflected literature suggesting high speed running (HSR) exposure<sup>174 175</sup>,

and poor prescription of running<sup>64</sup> are risk factors for hamstring injury and reinjury. The hamstrings are integral to running and sprinting<sup>176 177</sup>, particularly in end swing and early stance phases<sup>178</sup> when large forces and rates/ amounts of strain<sup>179</sup> are present within the hamstring connective tissue.<sup>101 104 180</sup> In running, the three hamstring muscles show different activation, at different lengths<sup>179</sup> and velocities<sup>12 181</sup>, and with different force outputs.<sup>98 111 176</sup> In sprinting, semitendinosus undergoes the largest lengthening velocity, with semimembranosus, functioning with greatest force production and biceps femoris undergoing the largest strain<sup>11 176</sup>, with some studies suggesting BF LH can reach 112% of its resting length<sup>180 182</sup> (possibly the reason why this muscle is more frequently injured in HSR mechanism<sup>31 183 184</sup>). The muscles may also function differently based on the levels of acceleration.<sup>185</sup> This may mean each muscle requires a different rehabilitation prescription for return to running (RTR).

Strong agreement between our experts highlighted that different hamstring muscles play different roles in running which affects rehabilitation prescription (LOA 84.2%) and safe time frames to progress running (LOA 90%).

### **Criteria for return to running**

Consensus was reached on a criteria-based approach rather than time frames for RTR but differed on their preferred criteria. Clinicians indicated their use of criteria related to pain, strength and flexibility, but assessed running specific muscle functions and capacities.<sup>17</sup>

Pain level was the main criterion chosen by the panel for RTR, either on examination (palpation)<sup>65</sup> or with a specific test or activity.<sup>186</sup> Some pain is expected, and they agreed mild pain may be acceptable (LOA 83.1%) but did not agree on a tolerated pain threshold. They suggested a tolerated threshold level of pain was preferred, decided between the athlete and rehabilitation team.<sup>92</sup> Further research was recommended on the relationship between pain, recovery time and reinjury risk during or after running (table 3).

Strength was chosen as a criterion for RTR, but with disagreement on what type or quantity of strength was adequate or again how to test. Many panel members identified outer length eccentric or isometric strength criteria, in line with literature on hamstring functional demands in running and rehabilitation programmes.<sup>23 24</sup>

The panel identified flexibility and ROM factors as important prior to RTR, with tests such as MHFAKE<sup>61</sup>, although literature suggests flexibility is not a risk factor for reinjury<sup>63</sup>. Large differences were present in their choice of special tests for RTR, with examination type tests or jump/hop testing was also used<sup>187</sup>, in line with evidence on reactive strength index<sup>188</sup> as a risk factor for injury but these tests also lacked agreement, reflecting conflicting evidence on evaluating HSI risk using power and plyometric testing.<sup>63</sup>

### **Criteria for sprinting**

No consensus was reached for criteria for safe return to sprinting, reflecting the lack of evidence quantifying sprint loads and risk of reinjury. There was 100% agreement that loads should be increased to full sprinting prior to RTS. This reflects their awareness of the hamstrings functional role in full sprinting and the increased tissue strain rates with elevated running speeds.<sup>189</sup> Progressing running too rapidly in rehabilitation may risk re-tear but altered running kinematics<sup>63</sup> and even insufficient running conditioning<sup>190 191</sup> may also increase risk of reinjury. More research into optimum dosages of running to prevent reinjury risk is needed (LOA 90%).

There was some difference in criteria that our panel used to permit return to sprinting, with higher speeds emphasised in strength testing. Few of our panel mentioned power or rate of force development (RFD) testing, and clinicians disagreed on the required threshold of strength, often using only the percentage of strength of the uninjured limb – the limb symmetry index (% LSI) to quantify, but with strong acknowledgement that the unaffected limb was rarely normal. Special tests as criteria for sprinting (such as the Askling H Test<sup>186</sup>) did not reach high levels of agreement (56.1%), but there was strong agreement on completion of submaximal running phases as a criterion for returning to sprinting, although the panel disagreed on threshold volumes, intensities, or speeds. This reflects the lack of evidence around the dosages of running required to reduce injury risk, and our panel showed high LOA on the need for future running research into muscle roles (84.2%)/ types of running (90%) and safe time frames (90%). Many of our panel prioritised GPS data to benchmark, grade and target running loads, and evaluated on symptom response (pain/tightness) to graded running loads. They agreed that pain-

free running was a criterion for sprinting (LOA 85.5%). In the situation of sprinting, where injury risk is higher, pain-free vs pain threshold criteria were preferred.

## **Return To Sport**

We acknowledged that the RTS phase was a reinjury risk period and safe management was vital (table 4). Many athletes demonstrate deficits in function, despite being cleared to RTS.<sup>122 148</sup> The highest risk period for reinjury after RTS is the first month<sup>192</sup>, with risks raised for the first year<sup>137</sup> and competition running levels can remain suppressed even after RTS.<sup>43</sup>

## **Criteria for Return to sport**

Several Delphi consensus studies outline RTS criteria<sup>48 49</sup>, emphasising pain (clinical examination / testing); functional performance; strength; flexibility and athlete confidence. While these components are acknowledged we also identified criteria around running and return to full training and sports specific criteria, correlating with performance. It should be noted that a decision to return to sport is a shared decision and the clinician's role may be to provide information regarding risk rather than strict criteria to RTS.<sup>193</sup> However, completion of full unrestricted training sessions was crucial (LOA- 93.3%), as well as painfree sprinting (96.7%), with volume, speed and intensity at (and preferably beyond) competition levels. This reflects evidence showing ongoing deficits in force production and power in running— even at RTS<sup>194</sup>, although appropriate prescription and progression of loads can reduce reinjury risk.<sup>190</sup> It should also be recognised that in some sports, players can RTS but adjust their exposure to high speed running loads.<sup>43</sup> Monitoring external running workload using GPS, allows more quantifiable, on-field sports-specific (position-specific) loads, speeds as part of expert rehabilitation. The clinicians also recommended using historical training and match play GPS baseline data as a benchmark (LOA 83.3%). Running load metrics include: - speed, accelerations, distance, direction changes and number of sprints efforts.<sup>49 195</sup>

We agreed that endurance was a consideration (LOA 78.3%) but there was less agreement on what type of endurance. It should be sports-specific, relating to the sport's volume of high-speed running. This follows evidence suggesting increased risk of injury with lack of fitness<sup>196</sup> and fatigue.<sup>197</sup>

Factors such as ROM and, flexibility, traditionally rated as important, failed to reach threshold agreement (45%). This may reflect evidence on flexibility and static stretching causing some detriment to elastic function and performance<sup>198</sup> and review evidence suggesting flexibility and ROM were less important as reinjury risk factors.<sup>63</sup> Few in the panel suggested imaging was useful for return to sport decision-making, in line with current evidence.<sup>63</sup>

### **Strength**

Strength as a criterion for RTS reached consensus but the group disagreed on which strength components were key. Mid and outer length isometric and eccentric strength was agreed on (LOA 83.3%) in line with evidence on types of strength deficits posing injury risk.<sup>65 66</sup> The quantity of strength required is not clear, particularly in relation to the uninjured side (including the frequent benchmark of <10% deficit) (LOA 66.1%). This reflects a movement away from %LSI as a strength measure due to loss of unaffected leg strength postinjury. Pre-season benchmark screening on variables such as strength / fitness, flexibility did not have a high LOA (64.9%) on which screening data to prioritise and what % difference was permissible. General population data were thought to be too non-specific. Sports differed in priority benchmark screening data and the %LSI considered acceptable. The panel suggested less correlation between strength components and the ability to run and more research may be required to understand if running criteria should be prioritised over strength criteria for RTS (90.3%).

### **Performance tests and sports/position specific testing**

On-field tests of performance have also been used alongside running tests for return to play. These include hop and jump tests.<sup>199</sup> However, they may not replicate the type of matchplay hamstring loads. Special criterion tests exist, such as the Prone Hip Extension<sup>200</sup> and Askling H-Test<sup>186</sup> aim to reproduce hamstring loads during sprinting, but they are not performed upright, and do not approach the speed or amount of hamstring strain in sprinting, and did not reach agreement for use by our panel (LOA 57.6%).

### **Athlete Confidence**

Athlete confidence and apprehension ranked highly in criteria for RTS (LOA 98.6%). Player self-assessment, psychological readiness and confidence were seen as vital for RTS (86.7%), with negative emotions such as anxiety and fear avoidance detrimental to performance and pain.<sup>201 202</sup> Athlete



confidence is the most significant predictor of return to full performance in some conditions like ACL reconstruction.<sup>203</sup> However, in HSI, some athletes may present with few symptoms until sprinting, or SSC activity and athletes may feel ready to RTS but are still at risk of reinjury.

Our panel reported decision-making pressure from other non-medical factors<sup>204-208</sup> and players can RTS in spite of poor test results.<sup>209</sup> They strongly agreed that decision-making should include members of the medical/rehabilitation team, the coaches, other stakeholders and especially athletes themselves<sup>193</sup><sup>210</sup>(LOA 98.3%).

## **Limitations**

There are many potential weaknesses of the Delphi and consensus research methodology. Bias is possible with inadequate stakeholder/ expert inclusion/exclusion or with inadequate design of surveys or meetings.<sup>211</sup> In spite of invitation, many international round 1 expert panel respondents were unable to attend our face-to-face meeting days, The London 2020 international Delphi and hamstring consensus meeting group comprised 15 out of 35 respondents/experts (43%) to the initial survey. This could result in inclusion bias; however, the panel attending were heterogenous, with a mix of profession, sport, age, and domain expertise in treatment of HSI. They comprised clinicians from Australia, Netherlands, Ireland, the middle east, but the majority of the meeting panel were UK based. We sought and invited experts from Asia, Africa and South America, however there were less identifiable experts (clinical or published), and they could not attend due to pandemic travel restrictions. This may mean their HSI management practices are not represented, possibly introducing a further bias. Our meeting panel all worked in elite sport in international jobs with work schedules with international patient/athlete cohorts . Many did not train professionally in the UK and their work experience and current work schedules comprised USA, Africa, Middle East, Australia and Asia. They reported that many of their athletes trained internationally, reflecting the current international nature of elite and Olympic sport. To further reinforce the integrity of the consensus, and provide more international perspective, authors were included with significant Middle East hamstring work experience.

Our group had multiple domains of expertise. These included surgery, post-surgical and conservative rehabilitation, classification, diagnosis, running and return to sport. It was harder to evaluate expertise

in rehabilitation and RTS, and the criteria chosen for expertise were harder to establish for rehabilitation. Academic criteria were thought to be important, but very few rehabilitation specialists had published. Clinical criteria were therefore deemed important. For clinical experience, the number of patients seen annually with his by the expert was chosen (ie quantity of experience), but it was difficult to determine the range of injury types or severity and gauge the quality of rehabilitation experience. Choosing criteria for expertise is difficult for any Delphi study and represents one weakness of this methodology<sup>212</sup> While we trusted the survey respondents to complete only those fields that encompassed their expertise (the reason for lack of full response rate for every section), it may be possible that some respondents completed sections that were outside their domain and level of expertise or scope of practice. Open-ended questions in the first round meant that only the information that clinicians submitted was used and adapted for the basis of subsequent rounds.

The perspectives of some groups may be underrepresented in this work , with coaches and athletes comprising a smaller proportion of our panel, and, their view is vital<sup>213</sup>, although 38% of the panel in the final survey had undergone HSI, possibly contributing to the “patient,/athlete” voice.

While we attempted to be inclusive, the representation of women is low in our panels, (2/39, 1/15, and 18/99). We found the response rates lower for the women experts we surveyed and invited to our meeting. It was found that female rates of publication are lower in HSI, with less publicly available information on expertise. This also holds for experts from low to middle income countries, and other deserving groups with lower publication rates, or fewer English language publications, and less publicly available information on expertise. This has been a weakness in other consensus research and the voices of these groups are also vital.

### **Recommendations for future research**

The consensus panel members suggested the following area of HSI rehabilitation areas of future research: - tolerability of tissue for early loading and the greatest injury risk loads or dosages; which order of progression of exercise was optimal; neuromuscular control of running; muscle tendon interaction /sling function and elasticity and optimum methods to measure and train these, and finally, the optimal and minimal effective doses of running exposure to reduce reinjury risk.

## **Conclusion And Recommendations**

Our Delphi study and expert panel suggest that rehabilitation prescription after hamstring injury should be individualised, based on the athlete's sports specific hamstring demands, the nature of the injury, and required capacities. Decision making should consider differences in hamstring musculotendinous tissue, individual muscle anatomy and functional roles. This should direct rehabilitation prescription for different muscles and myotendinous tissues after hamstring injury. In early-stage rehabilitation most experts advocate protection of injured tissue from elastic load or stretch shortening (high strain amount and rate loads), but the types of load / contraction and the order of their application varied greatly between our experts.

Experts recommend addressing dysfunctions in the whole lower limb and kinetic chain related to hamstring function. While not reaching consensus, many experts are increasingly utilising adjuncts such as blood flow restriction training to achieve early strength gains with lower tissue loads.

They recommend criteria of symptoms, strength, and response to previous loading as criteria for progressing and dosing exercise and deciding on safety to return to running and sport. Other criteria such as flexibility and special RTS tests are used less widely. On criteria related to pain – experts suggest some activities should be pain-free through rehabilitation (sprinting) but with other exercise activities a pain threshold approach can be permitted. In later loading – experts aim to achieve full outer length strength and eccentric strength as a key criterion for return to running and sport.

In later stage rehab experts advocate prescription of running and sprinting as a key component of hamstring injury rehabilitation and as a key progression criterion for return to sport. Experts focus on the demands and capacity required for matchplay when deciding the rehabilitation end goal and RTS – they continuously monitor and test athletes through rehabilitation and are using modalities such as GPS to give more sports specific on-field information on loading and running dosages and RTS readiness and would like more research into optimising these testing modalities.

## References

1. Ekstrand J, Hagglund M, Walden M. Injury incidence and injury patterns in professional football: the UEFA injury study. *Br J Sports Med* 2011;45(7):553-8. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.2009.060582 [published Online First: 2009/06/26]
2. Edouard P, Branco P, Alonso JM. Muscle injury is the principal injury type and hamstring muscle injury is the first injury diagnosis during top-level international athletics championships between 2007 and 2015. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50(10):619-30. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095559 [published Online First: 2016/02/19]
3. Ekstrand J, Waldén M, Hägglund M. Hamstring injuries have increased by 4% annually in men's professional football, since 2001: A 13-year longitudinal analysis of the UEFA Elite Club injury study. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;50(12):731-37. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095359
4. Ekstrand J, Spreco A, Bengtsson H, et al. Injury rates decreased in men's professional football: an 18-year prospective cohort study of almost 12 000 injuries sustained during 1.8 million hours of play. *Br J Sports Med* 2021;55(19):1084-91. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-103159 [published Online First: 2021/02/07]
5. Ekstrand J, Hagglund M, Kristenson K, et al. Fewer ligament injuries but no preventive effect on muscle injuries and severe injuries: an 11-year follow-up of the UEFA Champions League injury study. *Br J Sports Med* 2013;47(12):732-7. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-092394 [published Online First: 2013/07/03]
6. Bleakley CM, Glasgow P, MacAuley DC. PRICE needs updating, should we call the POLICE? *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2012;46(4):220-21. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090297
7. Afonso J, Rocha-Rodrigues S, Clemente FM, et al. The Hamstrings: Anatomic and Physiologic Variations and Their Potential Relationships With Injury Risk. *Front Physiol* 2021;12:694604. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2021.694604 [published Online First: 2021/07/27]
8. Woodley SJ, Mercer SR. Hamstring muscles: Architecture and innervation. *Cells Tissues Organs* 2005;179(3):125-41. doi: 10.1159/000085004
9. Dahmane R, Djordjević S, Smerdu V. Adaptive potential of human biceps femoris muscle demonstrated by histochemical, immunohistochemical and mechanomyographical methods. *Medical and Biological Engineering and Computing* 2006;44(11):999-1006. doi: 10.1007/s11517-006-0114-5
10. Garrett WE, Jr., Califf JC, Bassett FH, 3rd. Histochemical correlates of hamstring injuries. *Am J Sports Med* 1984;12(2):98-103. doi: 10.1177/036354658401200202 [published Online First: 1984/03/01]
11. Kellis E, Galanis N, Kapetanos G, et al. Architectural differences between the hamstring muscles. *Journal of electromyography and kinesiology : official journal of the International Society of Electrophysiological Kinesiology* 2012;22(4):520-6. doi: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2012.03.012 [published Online First: 2012/05/09]
12. Higashihara A, Nagano Y, Ono T, et al. Differences in hamstring activation characteristics between the acceleration and maximum-speed phases of sprinting. *J Sports Sci* 2018;36(12):1313-18. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2017.1375548
13. Bourne MN, Duhig SJ, Timmins RG, et al. Impact of the Nordic hamstring and hip extension exercises on hamstring architecture and morphology: implications for injury prevention. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(5):469-77. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096130 [published Online First: 2016/11/02]
14. Mendiguchia J, Garrues MA, Cronin JB, et al. Nonuniform changes in MRI measurements of the thigh muscles after two hamstring strengthening exercises. *J Strength Cond Res* 2013;27(3):574-81. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e31825c2f38 [published Online First: 2013/02/28]
15. Hamilton B. Hamstring muscle strain injuries: what can we learn from history? *Br J Sports Med* 2012;46(13):900-3. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2012-090931 [published Online First: 2012/03/31]
16. Macdonald B, McAleer S, Kelly S, et al. Hamstring rehabilitation in elite track and field athletes: applying the British Athletics Muscle Injury Classification in clinical practice. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2019;bjsports-2017-098971. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-098971
17. Guex K, Millet GP. Conceptual Framework for Strengthening Exercises to Prevent Hamstring Strains. *Sports Medicine* 2013;43(12):1207-15. doi: 10.1007/s40279-013-0097-y
18. Bourne MN, Timmins RG, Opar DA, et al. An Evidence-Based Framework for Strengthening Exercises to Prevent Hamstring Injury. *Sports Medicine* 2018;48(2):251-67. doi: 10.1007/s40279-017-0796-x
19. Hotfiel T, Seil R, Bily W, et al. Nonoperative treatment of muscle injuries-recommendations from the GOTS expert meeting. *Journal of Experimental Orthopaedics* 2018;5(1) doi: 10.1186/s40634-018-0139-3
20. Mjøltnes R, Arnason A, Østhaugen T, et al. A 10-week randomized trial comparing eccentric vs. concentric hamstring strength training in well-trained soccer players. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports* 2004;14(5):311-17. doi: 10.1046/j.1600-0838.2003.367.x
21. Macdonald B, O'Neill J, Pollock N, et al. Single-Leg Roman Chair Hold Is More Effective Than the Nordic Hamstring Curl in Improving Hamstring Strength-Endurance in Gaelic Footballers With Previous Hamstring Injury. *J Strength Cond Res* 2019;33(12):3302-08. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000002526

22. Oliver GD, Dougherty CP. The razor curl: A functional approach to hamstring training. *J Strength Cond Res* 2009;23(2):401-05. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e31818f08d0
23. Askling CM, Tengvar M, Tarassova O, et al. Acute hamstring injuries in Swedish elite sprinters and jumpers: a prospective randomised controlled clinical trial comparing two rehabilitation protocols. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48(7):532-9. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-093214 [published Online First: 2014/03/13]
24. Askling CM, Tengvar M, Thorstensson A. Acute hamstring injuries in Swedish elite football: a prospective randomised controlled clinical trial comparing two rehabilitation protocols. *Br J Sports Med* 2013;47(15):953-9. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-092165 [published Online First: 2013/03/29]
25. Mendiguchia J, Martinez-Ruiz E, Edouard P, et al. A Multifactorial, Criteria-based Progressive Algorithm for Hamstring Injury Treatment. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2017;49(7):1482-92. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000001241 [published Online First: 2017/03/10]
26. Mendiguchia J, Brughelli M. A return-to-sport algorithm for acute hamstring injuries. *Phys Ther Sport* 2011;12(1):2-14. doi: 10.1016/j.ptsp.2010.07.003 [published Online First: 2011/01/25]
27. Sherry MA, Johnston TS, Heiderscheid BC. Rehabilitation of acute hamstring strain injuries. *Clinics in Sports Medicine* 2015;34(2):263-84. doi: 10.1016/j.csm.2014.12.009
28. Hickey JT, Timmins RG, Maniar N, et al. Criteria for Progressing Rehabilitation and Determining Return-to-Play Clearance Following Hamstring Strain Injury: A Systematic Review. *Sports Medicine* 2017;47(7):1375-87. doi: 10.1007/s40279-016-0667-x
29. Pollock N, Kelly S, Lee J, et al. A 4-year study of hamstring injury outcomes in elite track and field using the British Athletics rehabilitation approach. *Br J Sports Med* 2022;56(5):257-63. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-103791 [published Online First: 2021/04/16]
30. Pas HIMFL, Reurink G, Tol JL, et al. Efficacy of rehabilitation (lengthening) exercises, platelet-rich plasma injections, and other conservative interventions in acute hamstring injuries: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2015;49(18):1197-205. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-094879
31. Askling CM, Tengvar M, Saartok T, et al. Acute first-time hamstring strains during high-speed running: a longitudinal study including clinical and magnetic resonance imaging findings. *Am J Sports Med* 2007;35(2):197-206. doi: 10.1177/0363546506294679 [published Online First: 2006/12/16]
32. Sherry MA, Best TM. A Comparison of 2 Rehabilitation Programs in the Treatment of Acute Hamstring Strains. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 2004;34(3):116-25. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2004.34.3.116
33. Silder A, Sherry MA, Sanfilippo J, et al. Clinical and morphological changes following 2 rehabilitation programs for acute hamstring strain injuries: A randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy* 2013;43(5):284-99. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2013.4452
34. Malliaropoulos N, Papalexandris S, Papalada A, et al. The Role of Stretching in Rehabilitation of Hamstring Injuries: 80 Athletes Follow-Up. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 2004;36(5):756-59. doi: 10.1249/01.MSS.0000126393.20025.5E
35. Cibulka MT, Rose SJ, Delitto A, et al. Hamstring muscle strain treated by mobilizing the sacroiliac joint. *Physical Therapy* 1986;66(8):1220-23. doi: 10.1093/ptj/66.8.1220
36. Maffulli N, Oliva F, Frizziero A, et al. ISMuLT Guidelines for muscle injuries. *Muscles Ligaments Tendons J* 2013;3(4):241-9. doi: 10.11138/mltj/2013.3.4.241 [published Online First: 2014/03/07]
37. Fournier-Farley C, Lamontagne M, Gendron P, et al. Determinants of Return to Play After the Nonoperative Management of Hamstring Injuries in Athletes: A Systematic Review. *Am J Sports Med* 2016;44(8):2166-72. doi: 10.1177/0363546515617472 [published Online First: 2015/12/17]
38. Orchard J, Best TM, Verrall GM. Return to play following muscle strains. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine* 2005;15(6):436-41. doi: 10.1097/01.jsm.0000188206.54984.65
39. Arden CL, Glasgow P, Schneiders A, et al. 2016 Consensus statement on return to sport from the First World Congress in Sports Physical Therapy, Bern. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50(14):853-64. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096278 [published Online First: 2016/05/27]
40. van der Horst N, van de Hoef S, Reurink G, et al. Return to Play After Hamstring Injuries: A Qualitative Systematic Review of Definitions and Criteria. *Sports Medicine* 2016;46(6):899-912. doi: 10.1007/s40279-015-0468-7
41. Belk JW, Kraeutler MJ, Mei-Dan O, et al. Return to Sport After Proximal Hamstring Tendon Repair: A Systematic Review. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2019;7(6):2325967119853218. doi: 10.1177/2325967119853218 [published Online First: 2019/07/02]
42. Delvaux F, Rochcongar P, Bruyère O, et al. Return-to-play criteria after hamstring injury: Actual medicine practice in professional soccer teams. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine* 2014;13(3):721-23.
43. Whiteley R, Massey A, Gabbett T, et al. Match High-Speed Running Distances Are Often Suppressed After Return From Hamstring Strain Injury in Professional Footballers. *Sports Health* 2021;13(3):290-95. doi: 10.1177/1941738120964456 [published Online First: 2020/11/06]

44. Hasson F, Keeney S, McKenna H. Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2000;32(4):1008-15.
45. Powell C. The Delphi technique: Myths and realities. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2003;41(4):376-82. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02537.x
46. Negrini S. Why evidence-based medicine is a good approach in physical and rehabilitation medicine. Thesis. *European Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine* 2014;50(5):585-91.
47. McCall A, Pruna R, Van der Horst N, et al. Exercise-Based Strategies to Prevent Muscle Injury in Male Elite Footballers: An Expert-Led Delphi Survey of 21 Practitioners Belonging to 18 Teams from the Big-5 European Leagues. *Sports Medicine* 2020;50(9):1667-81. doi: 10.1007/s40279-020-01315-7
48. van der Horst N, Backx F, Goedhart EA, et al. Return to play after hamstring injuries in football (soccer): a worldwide Delphi procedure regarding definition, medical criteria and decision-making. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2017;51(22):1583-91. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-097206
49. Zambaldi M, Beasley I, Rushton A. Return to play criteria after hamstring muscle injury in professional football: A Delphi consensus study. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2017;51(16):1221-26. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-097131
50. Jünger S, Payne SA, Brine J, et al. Guidance on Conducting and REporting DELphi Studies (CREDES) in palliative care: Recommendations based on a methodological systematic review. *Palliat Med* 2017;31(8):684-706. doi: 10.1177/0269216317690685 [published Online First: 2017/02/14]
51. Eysenbach G. Improving the quality of Web surveys: the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES). *Journal of medical Internet research* 2004;6(3):e34-e34. doi: 10.2196/jmir.6.3.e34
52. Hsu CC, Sandford BA. The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation* 2007;12(10):1-8.
53. Harper D, Thompson AR. *Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy: A Guide for Students and Practitioners* 2011.
54. Fink A, Koscoff J, Chassin M, et al. Consensus methods: characteristics and guidelines for use. *American journal of public health* 1984;74(9):979-83. doi: 10.2105/ajph.74.9.979
55. Fuller CW, Ekstrand J, Junge A, et al. Consensus statement on injury definitions and data collection procedures in studies of football (soccer) injuries. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine* 2006;16(2):97-106. doi: 10.1097/00042752-200603000-00003
56. Schwank A, Blazey P, Asker M, et al. 2022 Bern Consensus Statement on Shoulder Injury Prevention, Rehabilitation, and Return to Sport for Athletes at All Participation Levels. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 2022;52(1):11-28. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2022.10952
57. Shrier I. Consensus statements that fail to recognise dissent are flawed by design: a narrative review with 10 suggested improvements. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2020;bjsports-2020-102545. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-102545
58. Verhagen AP, De Vet HCW, De Bie RA, et al. The Delphi list: A criteria list for quality assessment of randomized clinical trials for conducting systematic reviews developed by Delphi consensus. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998;51(12):1235-41. doi: 10.1016/S0895-4356(98)00131-0
59. Huisstede BMA, Hoogvliet P, Henk Coert J, et al. Multidisciplinary consensus guideline for managing trigger finger: Results from the European HANDGUIDE study. *Physical Therapy* 2014;94(10):1421-33. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20130135
60. Kleynen M, Braun SM, Bleijlevens MH, et al. Using a Delphi technique to seek consensus regarding definitions, descriptions and classification of terms related to implicit and explicit forms of motor learning. *PLoS ONE* 2014;9(6) doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0100227
61. Whiteley R, van Dyk N, Wangenstein A, et al. Clinical implications from daily physiotherapy examination of 131 acute hamstring injuries and their association with running speed and rehabilitation progression. *British journal of sports medicine* 2018;52(5):303-10. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-097616
62. Freckleton G, Pizzari T. Risk factors for hamstring muscle strain injury in sport: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2013;47(6):351-8. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090664 [published Online First: 2012/07/06]
63. Green B, Bourne MN, van Dyk N, et al. Recalibrating the risk of hamstring strain injury (HSI): A 2020 systematic review and meta-analysis of risk factors for index and recurrent hamstring strain injury in sport. *Br J Sports Med* 2020;54(18):1081-88. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-100983 [published Online First: 2020/04/18]
64. Opar DA, Williams MD, Shield AJ. Hamstring strain injuries: Factors that Lead to injury and re-Injury. *Sports Medicine* 2012;42(3):209-26. doi: 10.2165/11594800-000000000-00000
65. De Vos RJ, Reurink G, Goudswaard GJ, et al. Clinical findings just after return to play predict hamstring re-injury, but baseline MRI findings do not. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48(18):1377-84. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2014-093737 [published Online First: 2014/07/20]

66. Goossens L, Witvrouw E, Vanden Bossche L, et al. Lower eccentric hamstring strength and single leg hop for distance predict hamstring injury in PETE students. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2015;15(5):436-42. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2014.955127 [published Online First: 2014/09/06]
67. Khan KM, Scott A. Mechanotherapy: How physical therapists' prescription of exercise promotes tissue repair. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2009;43(4):247-52. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.2008.054239
68. Charge SB, Rudnicki MA. Cellular and molecular regulation of muscle regeneration. *Physiol Rev* 2004;84(1):209-38. doi: 10.1152/physrev.00019.2003 [published Online First: 2004/01/13]
69. Connell DA, Schneider-Kolsky ME, Hoving JL, et al. Longitudinal study comparing sonographic and MRI assessments of acute and healing hamstring injuries. *American Journal of Roentgenology* 2004;183(4):975-84. doi: 10.2214/ajr.183.4.1830975
70. Westerterp KR, Verstappen FTJ. Effect of body build on weight-training-induced adaptations in body composition and muscular strength. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 1994;26(4):515-21.
71. Hubal MJ, Gordish-Dressman H, Thompson PD, et al. Variability in muscle size and strength gain after unilateral resistance training. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 2005;37(6):964-72. doi: 10.1249/01.mss.0000170469.90461.5f
72. Timmons JA. Variability in training-induced skeletal muscle adaptation. *J Appl Physiol* 2011;110(3):846-53. doi: 10.1152/jappphysiol.00934.2010
73. Beaven CM, Cook CJ, Gill ND. Significant strength gains observed in rugby players after specific resistance exercise protocols based on individual salivary testosterone responses. *J Strength Cond Res* 2008;22(2):419-25. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e31816357d4 [published Online First: 2008/06/14]
74. Ahtiainen JP, Walker S, Peltonen H, et al. Heterogeneity in resistance training-induced muscle strength and mass responses in men and women of different ages. *Age (Dordr)* 2016;38(1):10. doi: 10.1007/s11357-015-9870-1 [published Online First: 2016/01/16]
75. Magnusson SP, Langberg H, Kjaer M. The pathogenesis of tendinopathy: Balancing the response to loading. *Nature Reviews Rheumatology* 2010;6(5):262-68. doi: 10.1038/nrrheum.2010.43
76. Lau FH, Pomahac B. Wound healing in acutely injured fascia. *Wound Repair Regen* 2014;22:14-17. doi: 10.1111/wrr.12165
77. Jakobsen JR, Jakobsen NR, Mackey AL, et al. Remodeling of muscle fibers approaching the human myotendinous junction. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports* 2018;28(8):1859-65. doi: 10.1111/sms.13196
78. Yang G, Rothrauff BB, Tuan RS. Tendon and ligament regeneration and repair: Clinical relevance and developmental paradigm. *Birth Defects Res Part C Embryo Today Rev* 2013;99(3):203-22. doi: 10.1002/bdrc.21041
79. Nourissat G, Berenbaum F, Duprez D. Tendon injury: From biology to tendon repair. *Nature Reviews Rheumatology* 2015;11(4):223-33. doi: 10.1038/nrrheum.2015.26
80. James R, Kesturu G, Balian G, et al. Tendon: Biology, Biomechanics, Repair, Growth Factors, and Evolving Treatment Options. *J Hand Surg (USA)* 2008;33(1):102-12. doi: 10.1016/j.jhsa.2007.09.007
81. Pollock N, Patel A, Chakraverty J, et al. Time to return to full training is delayed and recurrence rate is higher in intratendinous ('c') acute hamstring injury in elite track and field athletes: clinical application of the British Athletics Muscle Injury Classification. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50(5):305-10. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-094657 [published Online First: 2016/02/19]
82. Van Der Made AD, Tol JL, Reurink G, et al. Potential hamstring injury blind spot: We need to raise awareness of proximal hamstring tendon avulsion injuries. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2019;53(7):390-92. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2018-100063
83. Entwisle T, Ling Y, Splatt A, et al. Distal Musculotendinous T Junction Injuries of the Biceps Femoris: An MRI Case Review. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2017;5(7):2325967117714998. doi: 10.1177/2325967117714998 [published Online First: 2017/08/11]
84. Van Der Made AD, Almusa E, Reurink G, et al. Intramuscular tendon injury is not associated with an increased hamstring reinjury rate within 12 months after return to play. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2018;52(19):1261-66. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-098725
85. Miyashita H, Ochi M, Ikuta Y. Histological and biomechanical observations of the rabbit patellar tendon after removal of its central one-third. *Archives of orthopaedic and trauma surgery* 1997;116(8):454-62. doi: 10.1007/BF00387577
86. Van Hooren B, Bosch F. Is there really an eccentric action of the hamstrings during the swing phase of high-speed running? part I: A critical review of the literature. *J Sports Sci* 2017;35(23):2313-21. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2016.1266018
87. Kay D, St Clair Gibson A, Mitchell MJ, et al. Different neuromuscular recruitment patterns during eccentric, concentric and isometric contractions. *J Electromyogr Kinesiology* 2000;10(6):425-31. doi: 10.1016/S1050-6411(00)00031-6

88. Byrne C, Twist C, Eston R. Neuromuscular function after exercise-induced muscle damage: theoretical and applied implications. *Sports Med* 2004;34(1):49-69. doi: 10.2165/00007256-200434010-00005 [published Online First: 2004/01/13]
89. Johnston MJ, Cook CJ, Drake D, et al. The Neuromuscular, Biochemical, and Endocrine Responses to a Single-Session Vs. Double-Session Training Day in Elite Athletes. *J Strength Cond Res* 2016;30(11):3098-106. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001423
90. Kujala UM, Orava S, Järvinen M. Hamstring injuries. Current trends in treatment and prevention. *Sports Medicine* 1997;23(6):397-404. doi: 10.2165/00007256-199723060-00005
91. Westing SH, Seger JY, Karlson E, et al. Eccentric and concentric torque-velocity characteristics of the quadriceps femoris in man. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 1988;58(1-2):100-04. doi: 10.1007/BF00636611
92. Hickey JT, Timmins RG, Maniar N, et al. Pain-Free Versus Pain-Threshold Rehabilitation Following Acute Hamstring Strain Injury: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy* 2020;50(2):91-103. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2020.8895 [published Online First: 2020/02/02]
93. Timmins RG, Ruddy JD, Presland J, et al. Architectural Changes of the Biceps Femoris Long Head after Concentric or Eccentric Training. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 2016;48(3):499-508. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000795
94. Timmins RG, Bourne MN, Shield AJ, et al. Short biceps femoris fascicles and eccentric knee flexor weakness increase the risk of hamstring injury in elite football (soccer): a prospective cohort study. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50(24):1524-35. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095362 [published Online First: 2015/12/18]
95. Lutz GF, Palmitier RA, An KN, et al. Comparison of tibiofemoral joint forces during open-kinetic-chain and closed-kinetic-chain exercises. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery - Series A* 1993;75(5):732-39. doi: 10.2106/00004623-199305000-00014
96. Stien N, Saeterbakken AH, Andersen V. Electromyographic comparison of five lower-limb muscles between single and multi-joint exercises among trained men. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine* 2021;20(1):56-61.
97. Malliaropoulos N, Mendiguchia J, Pehlivanidis H, et al. Hamstring exercises for track and field athletes: Injury and exercise biomechanics, and possible implications for exercise selection and primary prevention. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2012;46(12):846-51. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090474
98. Schoenfeld BJ, Contreras B, Tiryaki-Sonmez G, et al. Regional differences in muscle activation during hamstrings exercise. *J Strength Cond Res* 2015;29(1):159-64. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000000598
99. Fernandez-Gonzalo R, Tesch PA, Linnehan RM, et al. Individual Muscle use in Hamstring Exercises by Soccer Players Assessed using Functional MRI. *International Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;37(7):559-64. doi: 10.1055/s-0042-100290
100. Feyzioğlu Ö, Öztürk Ö, Sirmen B, et al. Does an accelerated program give equivalent results in both elite athletes and nonathletes? *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation* 2020;29(5):572-77. doi: 10.1123/JSR.2018-0346
101. Thelen DG, Chumanov ES, Best TM, et al. Simulation of biceps femoris musculotendon mechanics during the swing phase of sprinting. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 2005;37(11):1931-38. doi: 10.1249/01.mss.0000176674.42929.de
102. Fukashiro S, Hay DC, Nagano A. Biomechanical behavior of muscle-tendon complex during dynamic human movements. *J Appl Biomech* 2006;22(2):131-47. doi: 10.1123/jab.22.2.131
103. Roberts TJ. Contribution of elastic tissues to the mechanics and energetics of muscle function during movement. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 2016;219(2):266-75. doi: 10.1242/jeb.124446
104. Schache AG, Dorn TW, Wrigley TV, et al. Stretch and activation of the human biarticular hamstrings across a range of running speeds. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2013;113(11):2813-28. doi: 10.1007/s00421-013-2713-9 [published Online First: 2013/09/10]
105. Brukner P, Connell D. Serious thigh muscle strains: Beware the intramuscular tendon which plays an important role in difficult hamstring and quadriceps muscle strains. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;50(4):205-08. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095136
106. Thelen DG, Chumanov ES, Sherry MA, et al. Neuromusculoskeletal models provide insights into the mechanisms and rehabilitation of hamstring strains. *Exercise Sport Sci Rev* 2006;34(3):135-41. doi: 10.1249/00003677-200607000-00008
107. Chumanov ES, Heiderscheid BC, Thelen DG. The effect of speed and influence of individual muscles on hamstring mechanics during the swing phase of sprinting. *J Biomech* 2007;40(16):3555-62. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2007.05.026 [published Online First: 2007/07/31]
108. Sole G, Milosavljevic S, Nicholson H, et al. Altered muscle activation following hamstring injuries. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2012;46(2):118-23. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2010.079343



109. Opar DA, Williams MD, Timmins RG, et al. Rate of torque and electromyographic development during anticipated eccentric contraction is lower in previously strained hamstrings. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2013;41(1):116-25. doi: 10.1177/0363546512462809
110. Summers SJ, Chalmers KJ, Wallwork SB, et al. Interrogating cortical representations in elite athletes with persistent posterior thigh pain – New targets for intervention? *J Sci Med Sport* 2021;24(2):135-40. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2020.07.003
111. Bourne MN, Williams MD, Opar DA, et al. Impact of exercise selection on hamstring muscle activation. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2017;51(13):1021-28. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095739
112. Guruhan S, Kafa N, Ecemis ZB, et al. Muscle Activation Differences During Eccentric Hamstring Exercises. *Sports Health* 2021;13(2):181-86. doi: 10.1177/1941738120938649
113. Keerasomboon T, Mineta S, Hirose N. Influence of altered knee angle and muscular contraction type on electromyographic activity of hamstring muscles during 45° hip extension exercise. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine* 2020;19(4):630-36.
114. Hegyi A, Csala D, Péter A, et al. High-density electromyography activity in various hamstring exercises. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports* 2019;29(1):34-43. doi: 10.1111/sms.13303
115. Garrett Jr WE, Safran MR, Seaber AV, et al. Biomechanical comparison of stimulated and nonstimulated skeletal muscle pulled to failure. *The American journal of sports medicine* 1987;15(5):448-54. doi: 10.1177/036354658701500504
116. Verrall GM, Slavotinek JP, Barnes PG, et al. Clinical risk factors for hamstring muscle strain injury: A prospective study with correlation of injury by magnetic resonance imaging. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2001;35(6):435-39. doi: 10.1136/bjism.35.6.435
117. Pietrzak M, Vollaard NBJ. Effects of a novel neurodynamic tension technique on muscle extensibility and stretch tolerance: A counterbalanced crossover study. *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation* 2018;27(1):55-65. doi: 10.1123/jsr.2016-0171
118. López López L, Torres JR, Rubio AO, et al. Effects of neurodynamic treatment on hamstrings flexibility: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Phys Ther Sport* 2019;40:244-50. doi: 10.1016/j.ptsp.2019.10.005
119. Kaneda H, Takahira N, Tsuda K, et al. Effects of tissue flossing and dynamic stretching on hamstring muscles function. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine* 2020;19(4):681-89.
120. Witvrouw E, Danneels L, Asselman P, et al. Muscle flexibility as a risk factor for developing muscle injuries in male professional soccer players: A prospective study. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2003;31(1):41-46. doi: 10.1177/03635465030310011801
121. Jönhagen S, Nemeth G, Eriksson E. Hamstring Injuries in Sprinters: The Role of Concentric and Eccentric Hamstring Muscle Strength and Flexibility. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 1994;22(2):262-66. doi: 10.1177/036354659402200218
122. Maniar N, Shield AJ, Williams MD, et al. Hamstring strength and flexibility after hamstring strain injury: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;50(15):909-20. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095311
123. Pollard CW, Opar DA, Williams MD, et al. Razor hamstring curl and Nordic hamstring exercise architectural adaptations: Impact of exercise selection and intensity. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports* 2019;29(5):706-15. doi: 10.1111/sms.13381
124. Askling CM, Tengvar M, Saartok T, et al. Acute first-time hamstring strains during slow-speed stretching: clinical, magnetic resonance imaging, and recovery characteristics. *Am J Sports Med* 2007;35(10):1716-24. doi: 10.1177/0363546507303563 [published Online First: 2007/06/15]
125. Askling CM, Tengvar M, Saartok T, et al. Acute first-time hamstring strains during slow-speed stretching: Clinical, magnetic resonance imaging, and recovery characteristics. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2007;35(10):1716-24. doi: 10.1177/0363546507303563
126. Askling CM, Tengvar M, Saartok T, et al. Proximal hamstring strains of stretching type in different sports: Injury situations, clinical and magnetic resonance imaging characteristics, and return to sport. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2008;36(9):1799-804. doi: 10.1177/0363546508315892
127. Orchard J, Walt S, McIntosh A, et al. Muscle activity during the drop punt kick. *J Sports Sci* 1999;17(10):837-38.
128. Samaan MA, Hoch MC, Ringleb SI, et al. Isolated hamstrings fatigue alters hip and knee joint coordination during a cutting maneuver. *J Appl Biomech* 2015;31(2):102-10. doi: 10.1123/JAB.2013-0300
129. Thelen DG, Chumanov ES, Hoerth DM, et al. Hamstring muscle kinematics during treadmill sprinting. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 2005;37(1):108-14. doi: 10.1249/01.MSS.0000150078.79120.C8
130. Jones M, Edwards I, Gifford L. Conceptual models for implementing biopsychosocial theory in clinical practice. *Man Ther* 2002;7(1):2-9. doi: 10.1054/math.2001.0426
131. Reurink G, Goudswaard GJ, Tol JL, et al. MRI observations at return to play of clinically recovered hamstring injuries. *British journal of sports medicine* 2014;48(18):1370-76. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-092450

132. Reurink G, Almusa E, Goudswaard GJ, et al. No association between fibrosis on magnetic resonance imaging at return to play and hamstring reinjury risk. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2015;43(5):1228-34. doi: 10.1177/0363546515572603
133. Jacobsen P, Witvrouw E, Muxart P, et al. A combination of initial and follow-up physiotherapist examination predicts physician-determined time to return to play after hamstring injury, with no added value of MRI. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;50(7):431-39. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095073
134. Verrall GM, Slavotinek JP, Barnes PG, et al. Assessment of physical examination and magnetic resonance imaging findings of hamstring injury as predictors for recurrent injury. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy* 2006;36(4):215-24. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2006.36.4.215 [published Online First: 2006/05/09]
135. Moen MH, Reurink G, Weir A, et al. Predicting return to play after hamstring injuries. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48(18):1358-63. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2014-093860 [published Online First: 2014/07/20]
136. Schneider-Kolsky ME, Hoving JL, Warren P, et al. A comparison between clinical assessment and magnetic resonance imaging of acute hamstring injuries. *Am J Sports Med* 2006;34(6):1008-15. doi: 10.1177/0363546505283835 [published Online First: 2006/02/16]
137. Warren P, Gabbe BJ, Schneider-Kolsky M, et al. Clinical predictors of time to return to competition and of recurrence following hamstring strain in elite Australian footballers. *British journal of sports medicine* 2010;44(6):415-19.
138. Askling C, Saartok T, Thorstensson A. Type of acute hamstring strain affects flexibility, strength, and time to return to pre-injury level. *Br J Sports Med* 2006;40(1):40-4. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2005.018879 [published Online First: 2005/12/24]
139. Smith BE, Hendrick P, Smith TO, et al. Should exercises be painful in the management of chronic musculoskeletal pain? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2017;51(23):1679-87.
140. Hickey JT, Timmins RG, Maniar N, et al. Pain-free versus pain-threshold rehabilitation following acute hamstring strain injury: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy* 2020;50(2):91-103. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2020.8895
141. Järvinen TAH, Järvinen TLN, Kääriäinen M, et al. Muscle injuries: optimising recovery. *Best Practice and Research: Clinical Rheumatology* 2007;21(2):317-31. doi: 10.1016/j.berh.2006.12.004
142. Järvinen TAH, Järvinen TLN, Kääriäinen M, et al. Muscle injuries: Biology and treatment. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2005;33(5):745-64. doi: 10.1177/0363546505274714
143. Reurink G, Goudswaard GJ, Oomen HG, et al. Reliability of the active and passive knee extension test in acute hamstring injuries. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2013;41(8):1757-61. doi: 10.1177/0363546513490650
144. Harvey D. Assessment of the flexibility of elite athletes using the modified Thomas test. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 1998;32(1):68-70. doi: 10.1136/bjism.32.1.68
145. Bohannon RW. Manual muscle testing: Does it meet the standards of an adequate screening test? *Clinical Rehabilitation* 2005;19(6):662-67. doi: 10.1191/0269215505cr873oa
146. Wadsworth CT, Krishnan R, Sear M, et al. Intrarater reliability of manual muscle testing and hand-held dynamometric muscle testing. *Physical Therapy* 1987;67(9):1342-47. doi: 10.1093/ptj/67.9.1342
147. Kelln BM, McKeon PO, Gontkof LM, et al. Hand-held dynamometry: Reliability of lower extremity muscle testing in healthy, physically active, young adults. *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation* 2008;17(2):160-70. doi: 10.1123/jsr.17.2.160
148. Opar DA, Piatkowski T, Williams MD, et al. A novel device using the nordic hamstring exercise to assess eccentric knee flexor strength: A reliability and retrospective injury study. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy* 2013;43(9):636-40. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2013.4837
149. van Dyk N, Behan FP, Whiteley R. Including the Nordic hamstring exercise in injury prevention programmes halves the rate of hamstring injuries: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 8459 athletes. *Br J Sports Med* 2019;53(21):1362-70. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2018-100045 [published Online First: 2019/02/28]
150. Impellizzeri FM, McCall A, van Smeden M. Why methods matter in a meta-analysis: a reappraisal showed inconclusive injury preventive effect of Nordic hamstring exercise. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2021;140:111-24. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.09.007>
151. Drouin JM, Valovich-mcLeod TC, Shultz SJ, et al. Reliability and validity of the Biodex system 3 pro isokinetic dynamometer velocity, torque and position measurements. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2004;91(1):22-9. doi: 10.1007/s00421-003-0933-0 [published Online First: 2003/09/26]
152. Croisier JL, Ganteaume S, Binet J, et al. Strength imbalances and prevention of hamstring injury in professional soccer players: A prospective study. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2008;36(8):1469-75. doi: 10.1177/0363546508316764

153. Opar DA, Williams MD, Timmins RG, et al. Eccentric hamstring strength and hamstring injury risk in Australian footballers. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 2015;47(4):857-65. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000465
154. Van Dyk N, Bahr R, Whiteley R, et al. Hamstring and Quadriceps Isokinetic Strength Deficits Are Weak Risk Factors for Hamstring Strain Injuries. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;44(7):1789-95. doi: 10.1177/0363546516632526
155. Bennell K. Isokinetic strength testing does not predict hamstring injury in Australian Rules footballers. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 1998;32(4):309-14. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.32.4.309
156. Zvijac JE, Toriscelli TA, Merrick S, et al. Isokinetic concentric quadriceps and hamstring strength variables from the NFL scouting combine are not predictive of hamstring injury in first-year professional football players. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2013;41(7):1511-18. doi: 10.1177/0363546513487983
157. Green B, Bourne MN, Pizzari T. Isokinetic strength assessment offers limited predictive validity for detecting risk of future hamstring strain in sport: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2018;52(5):329-36. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-098101 [published Online First: 2017/12/01]
158. Freckleton G, Cook J, Pizzari T. The predictive validity of a single leg bridge test for hamstring injuries in Australian Rules Football Players. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48(8):713-7. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-092356 [published Online First: 2013/08/07]
159. Wiesinger HP, Gressenbauer C, Kösters A, et al. Device and method matter: A critical evaluation of eccentric hamstring muscle strength assessments. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports* 2020;30(2):217-26. doi: 10.1111/sms.13569
160. Devaprakash D, Weir GJ, Dunne JJ, et al. The influence of digital filter type, amplitude normalisation method, and co-contraction algorithm on clinically relevant surface electromyography data during clinical movement assessments. *J Electromyogr Kinesiology* 2016;31:126-35. doi: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2016.10.001
161. Hughes L, Rosenblatt B, Haddad F, et al. Comparing the Effectiveness of Blood Flow Restriction and Traditional Heavy Load Resistance Training in the Post-Surgery Rehabilitation of Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Patients: A UK National Health Service Randomised Controlled Trial. *Sports Medicine* 2019;49(11):1787-805. doi: 10.1007/s40279-019-01137-2
162. Cohen S, Bradley J. Acute proximal hamstring rupture. *Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons* 2007;15(6):350-55. doi: 10.5435/00124635-200706000-00004
163. Sarimo J, Lempainen L, Mattila K, et al. Complete proximal hamstring avulsions: A series of 41 patients with operative treatment. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2008;36(6):1110-15. doi: 10.1177/0363546508314427
164. Sato K, Nimura A, Yamaguchi K, et al. Anatomical study of the proximal origin of hamstring muscles. *J Orthop Sci* 2012;17(5):614-8. doi: 10.1007/s00776-012-0243-7 [published Online First: 2012/06/07]
165. Macdonald B. An investigation into the immediate effects of pelvic taping on hamstring eccentric force in an elite male sprinter – A case report. *Phys Ther Sport* 2017;28:15-22. doi: 10.1016/j.ptsp.2017.08.001
166. Franetovich Smith MM, Bonacci J, Mendis MD, et al. Gluteus medius activation during running is a risk factor for season hamstring injuries in elite footballers. *J Sci Med Sport* 2017;20(2):159-63. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2016.07.004 [published Online First: 2016/08/17]
167. Schuermans J, Van Tiggelen D, Witvrouw E. Prone Hip Extension Muscle Recruitment is Associated with Hamstring Injury Risk in Amateur Soccer. *International Journal of Sports Medicine* 2017;38(9):696-706. doi: 10.1055/s-0043-103016
168. Kennedy MJ, Lamontagne M, Beaulé PE. Femoroacetabular impingement alters hip and pelvic biomechanics during gait. Walking biomechanics of FAI. *Gait Posture* 2009;30(1):41-44. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2009.02.008
169. Bedi A, Dolan M, Hetsroni I, et al. Surgical treatment of femoroacetabular impingement improves hip kinematics: a computer-assisted model. *Am J Sports Med* 2011;39 Suppl(1\_suppl):43S-9S. doi: 10.1177/0363546511414635 [published Online First: 2011/07/08]
170. Van Houcke J, Pattyn C, Vanden Bossche L, et al. The pelvifemoral rhythm in cam-type femoroacetabular impingement. *Clin Biomech* 2014;29(1):63-67. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2013.10.019
171. Shield AJ, Bourne MN. Hamstring Injury Prevention Practices in Elite Sport: Evidence for Eccentric Strength vs. Lumbo-Pelvic Training. *Sports Medicine* 2018;48(3):513-24. doi: 10.1007/s40279-017-0819-7
172. Schuermans J, Danneels L, Van Tiggelen D, et al. Proximal neuromuscular control protects against hamstring injuries in male soccer players: a prospective study with electromyography time-series analysis during maximal sprinting. *The American journal of sports medicine* 2017;45(6):1315-25.
173. Bourne MN, Pollard C, Messer D, et al. Hamstring and gluteal activation during high-speed overground running: Impact of prior strain injury. *J Sports Sci* 2021 doi: 10.1080/02640414.2021.1917839
174. Duhig S, Shield AJ, Opar D, et al. Effect of high-speed running on hamstring strain injury risk. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50(24):1536-40. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095679 [published Online First: 2016/06/12]

175. Ruddy JD, Pollard CW, Timmins RG, et al. Running exposure is associated with the risk of hamstring strain injury in elite Australian footballers. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2018;52(14):919-28.
176. Schache AG, Dorn TW, Blanch PD, et al. Mechanics of the human hamstring muscles during sprinting. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2012;44(4):647-58. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e318236a3d2 [published Online First: 2011/09/14]
177. Higashihara A, Ono T, Kubota J, et al. Functional differences in the activity of the hamstring muscles with increasing running speed. *J Sports Sci* 2010;28(10):1085-92. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2010.494308 [published Online First: 2010/07/31]
178. Chumanov ES, Heiderscheidt BC, Thelen DG. Hamstring musculotendon dynamics during stance and swing phases of high-speed running. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2011;43(3):525-32. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181f23fe8 [published Online First: 2010/08/07]
179. Higashihara A, Nagano Y, Ono T, et al. Relationship between the peak time of hamstring stretch and activation during sprinting. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2016;16(1):36-41. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2014.973913
180. Nagano Y, Higashihara A, Takahashi K, et al. Mechanics of the muscles crossing the hip joint during sprint running. *J Sports Sci* 2014;32(18):1722-28. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2014.915423
181. Schache AG, Dorn TW, Wrigley TV, et al. Stretch and activation of the human biarticular hamstrings across a range of running speeds. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2013;113(11):2813-28. doi: 10.1007/s00421-013-2713-9
182. Wan X, Qu F, Garrett WE, et al. The effect of hamstring flexibility on peak hamstring muscle strain in sprinting. *J Sport Health Sci* 2017;6(3):283-89. doi: 10.1016/j.jshs.2017.03.012
183. Malliaropoulos N, Isinkaye T, Tsitas K, et al. Reinjury after acute posterior thigh muscle injuries in elite track and field athletes. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2011;39(2):304-10. doi: 10.1177/0363546510382857
184. Chumanov ES, Schache AG, Heiderscheidt BC, et al. Hamstrings are most susceptible to injury during the late swing phase of sprinting. *Br J Sports Med* 2012;46(2):90. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090176 [published Online First: 2011/07/06]
185. Morin JB, Gimenez P, Edouard P, et al. Sprint acceleration mechanics: The major role of hamstrings in horizontal force production. *Frontiers in Physiology* 2015;6(DEC) doi: 10.3389/fphys.2015.00404
186. Askling CM, Nilsson J, Thorstensson A. A new hamstring test to complement the common clinical examination before return to sport after injury. *Knee surgery, sports traumatology, arthroscopy : official journal of the ESSKA* 2010;18(12):1798-803. doi: 10.1007/s00167-010-1265-3 [published Online First: 2010/09/21]
187. Goossens L, Witvrouw E, Vanden Bossche L, et al. Lower eccentric hamstring strength and single leg hop for distance predict hamstring injury in PETE students. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2015;15(5):436-42. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2014.955127
188. Venturelli M, Schena F, Zanolla L, et al. Injury risk factors in young soccer players detected by a multivariate survival model. *J Sci Med Sport* 2011;14(4):293-98. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2011.02.013
189. Edouard P, Hollander K, Navarro L, et al. Lower limb muscle injury location shift from posterior lower leg to hamstring muscles with increasing discipline-related running velocity in international athletics championships. *J Sci Med Sport* 2021;24(7):653-59. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2021.02.006 [published Online First: 2021/02/27]
190. Blanch P, Gabbett TJ. Has the athlete trained enough to return to play safely? The acute:chronic workload ratio permits clinicians to quantify a player's risk of subsequent injury. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;50(8):471-75. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095445
191. Moreno-Perez V, Paredes V, Pastor D, et al. Under-exposure to official matches is associated with muscle injury incidence in professional footballers. *Biol Sport* 2021;38(4):563-71. doi: 10.5114/biolSport.2021.100360
192. Brooks JHM, Fuller CW, Kemp SPT, et al. Incidence, risk, and prevention of hamstring muscle injuries in professional rugby union. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2006;34(8):1297-306. doi: 10.1177/0363546505286022
193. Dijkstra HP, Pollock N, Chakraverty R, et al. Return to play in elite sport: A shared decision-making process. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2017;51(5):419-20. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096209
194. Mendiguchia J, Samozino P, Martinez-Ruiz E, et al. Progression of mechanical properties during on-field sprint running after returning to sports from a hamstring muscle injury in soccer players. *INT J SPORTS MED* 2014;35(8):690-5. doi: 10.1055/s-0033-1363192 [published Online First: 2014/01/16]
195. Cummins C, Orr R, O'Connor H, et al. Global positioning systems (GPS) and microtechnology sensors in team sports: a systematic review. *Sports Med* 2013;43(10):1025-42. doi: 10.1007/s40279-013-0069-2 [published Online First: 2013/07/03]
196. McCall A, Carling C, Nedelec M, et al. Risk factors, testing and preventative strategies for non-contact injuries in professional football: current perceptions and practices of 44 teams from various premier leagues. *British journal of sports medicine* 2014;48(18):1352-57. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2014-093439

197. Woods C, Hawkins RD, Maltby S, et al. The Football Association Medical Research Programme: An audit of injuries in professional football - Analysis of hamstring injuries. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2004;38(1):36-41. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2002.002352
198. Magnusson P, Renström P. The European College of Sports Sciences Position statement: The role of stretching exercises in sports. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2006;6(2):87-91. doi: 10.1080/17461390600617865
199. Hamilton RT, Shultz SJ, Schmitz RJ, et al. Triple-hop distance as a valid predictor of lower limb strength and power. *J Athl Train* 2008;43(2):144-51. doi: 10.4085/1062-6050-43.2.144 [published Online First: 2008/03/18]
200. Thorborg K, Roos EM, Bartels EM, et al. Validity, reliability and responsiveness of patient-reported outcome questionnaires when assessing hip and groin disability: A systematic review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2010;44(16):1186-96. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2009.060889
201. Glazer DD. Development and preliminary validation of the injury-psychological readiness to return to sport (I-PRRS) scale. *Journal of Athletic Training* 2009;44(2):185-89. doi: 10.4085/1062-6050-44.2.185
202. Conti C, di Fronso S, Pivetti M, et al. Well-come back! Professional basketball players perceptions of psychosocial and behavioral factors influencing a return to pre-injury levels. *Frontiers in Psychology* 2019;10(FEB) doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00222
203. Webster KE, McPherson AL, Hewett TE, et al. Factors Associated With a Return to Preinjury Level of Sport Performance After Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Surgery. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2019;47(11):2557-62. doi: 10.1177/0363546519865537
204. Creighton DW, Shrier I, Shultz R, et al. Return-to-play in sport: A decision-based model. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine* 2010;20(5):379-85. doi: 10.1097/JSM.0b013e3181f3c0fe
205. Hägglund M, Waldén M, Magnusson H, et al. Injuries affect team performance negatively in professional football: An 11-year follow-up of the UEFA Champions League injury study. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2013;47(12):738-42. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-092215
206. Hickey J, Shield AJ, Williams MD, et al. The financial cost of hamstring strain injuries in the Australian Football League. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2014;48(8):729-30. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-092884
207. Orchard J, Best TM. The management of muscle strain injuries: An early return versus the risk of recurrence. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine* 2002;12(1):3-5. doi: 10.1097/00042752-200201000-00004
208. Shrier I. Strategic Assessment of Risk and Risk Tolerance (StARRT) framework for return-to-play decision-making. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2015;49(20):1311-15. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2014-094569
209. Tol JL, Hamilton B, Eirale C, et al. At return to play following hamstring injury the majority of professional football players have residual isokinetic deficits. *British journal of sports medicine* 2014;48(18):1364-69. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-093016
210. Dijkstra HP, Pollock N, Chakraverty R, et al. Managing the health of the elite athlete: A new integrated performance health management and coaching model. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2014;48(7):523-31. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-093222
211. Murphy M, Black NL, D McKee C, et al. Consensus development methods, and their use in clinical guideline development (Health Technology Assessment 2: 15). Cited in McColl, E, Jacoby, A, Thomas, L, Soutter, J, Bamford, C, Steen, N, Thomas, R, Harvey, E, Garratt, A and Bond, J(2001) *Design and use of questionnaires: A review of best practice applicable to surveys of health service staff and patients* 1998
212. Blazey P, Crossley KM, Ardern CL, et al. It is time for consensus on 'consensus statements'. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2022;56(6):306. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-104578
213. Belton J, Hoens A, Scott A, et al. Patients as partners in research: It's the right thing to do. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy* 2019;49(9):623-26. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2019.0106