

Evidence Summary: Running

Christian A. Clermont, MSc Version 1 February 2018

BC INJURY research and prevention unit

The British Columbia Injury Research and Prevention Unit (BCIRPU) was established by the Ministry of Health and the Minister's Injury Prevention Advisory Committee in August 1997. BCIRPU is housed within the Evidence to Innovation research theme at BC Children's Hospital (BCCH) and supported by the Provincial Health Services Authority (PHSA) and the University of British Columbia (UBC). BCIRPU's vision is to be a leader in the production and transfer of injury prevention knowledge and the integration of evidence-based injury prevention practices into the daily lives of those at risk, those who care for them, and those with a mandate for public health and safety in British Columbia.

Author: Christian Clermont

Editors: Sarah A Richmond, Amanda Black

Reproduction, in its original form, is permitted for background use for private study, education instruction and research, provided appropriate credit is given to the BC Injury Research and Prevention Unit. Citation in editorial copy, for newsprint, radio and television is permitted. The material may not be reproduced for commercial use or profit, promotion, resale, or publication in whole or in part without written permission from the BC Injury Research and Prevention Unit.

For any questions regarding this report, contact:

BC Injury Research and Prevention Unit F508 – 4480 Oak Street Vancouver, BC V6H 3V4 Email: <u>bcinjury1@cw.bc.ca</u> Phone: (604) 875-3776 Fax: (604) 875-3569 Website: <u>www.injuryresearch.bc.ca</u>

Suggested Citation:

Clermont C, Black A, Richmond SA, Pike I, Babul S. *Evidence Summary: Running*. Active & Safe Central. BC Injury Research and Prevention Unit: Vancouver, BC; 2018. Available at <u>http://activesafe.ca/</u>.





Evidence synthesis tool

SPORT:	Runnin	Target Group:		Target Group:		Adults, Adolescents, & Children	
Injury Mechanisms:		Lower-limb musculoskeletal running-rela	ated injurie	25			
Incidence/Prevalence		Risk/Protective Factors	Intervent		Imp	plementation/Evaluation	Resources
Adults (Overall Injurie Based on a systematic from van Gent et al. (2 the incidence of lower extremity running-rela injuries has been repor- be between 19.4 and 7 of all runners, dependi which study and how a running-related injury specifically defined. In retrospective case-com analysis of 2002 runnir injuries by Taunton et (2002), the most com site of running-related injuries are the knee (4 of all injuries), foot/an (16.9%), lower leg (12. hip/pelvis (10.9%), achilles/calf (6.4%), up (5.2%), and lower back (Taunton et al., 2002). specifically, the top fiv common overuse runn related injuries are patellofemoral pain syndrome, iliotibial bai syndrome, plantar fasc	review 007), ted rted to 79.3% ing on a is a trol ng al. mon 42.1% kle 8%), per leg c (3.4%) More e most ing- nd	Overall Injuries Risk Factors Gender differences: Prospective research by Ryan, Elashi, Taunton, and Koehl (2014) demonstrates females have a lower normalized injury rate than male runners (4.46 vs. 6.86 RRIs/1000 training sessions) resulting in a relative risk of 0.67 [95% CI: 0.32-1.40] compared to men. The most significant risk factor was previous lower limb injury and incomplete rehabilitation, where half of runners reporting a running-related injury had previously sustained an injury to the same anatomical area, and 42% of runners who had a previous injury and sustained another injury declared themselves as not 100% rehabilitated. A prospective cohort study by Buist, Bredeweg, Lemmink, van Mechelen, and Diercks (2010) found higher BMI, especially in male novice runners to have a hazard risk ratio of MSK injury= 1.15 [95% CI 1.05 – 1.26]. A clinical review by Vincent and Vincent (2013) also discuss higher BMI being a	long-term strategies injuries (E Neverthe risk facto running-r researche develope informed or minimi injuries, p novice ru General A Appropria Programs For new r those wh obese, Vi (2013) re- transition other low incline wa minimize musculos walk-to-r for obese person w increasing	a lack of effective a prevention a for running-related Barton et al., 2016). less, based on the rs associated with elated injuries, ers and clinicians have d some evidence- strategies to prevent ize the risk of running particularly for new or nners. Advice for ate Start-to-Run 5 for Novice Runners runners, especially o are overweight and ncent and Vincent commend a gradual into running from /-impact activity (e.g., alking) would the risk for keletal injury. Also, un transition speed individuals (have the alk on a treadmill at g speeds until a lis reached at which	(20 run ear incl as v cap ske In a rev aug Agr pre son ove the eva stra the cos run dep run rev son ove the exa stra stra stra son ove the cos son ove the the son the the son ove the son ove the son ove the son ove the son ove the the the the son ove the son ove the son ove the the son ove the the the the the son the the the the the the the the the the	cording to Barton et al. 016), some barriers for nning retraining in the rly stages of rehabilitation clude: pain and irritability well as muscle function bacity, joint flexibility, and eletal structure. a systematic literature view of gait retraining with gmented feedback, resta and Brown (2015) esent other barriers with me potential strategies to ercome these barriers for e implementation and aluation of gait retraining ategies. For example, ere are high associated sts of long-term gradual nning retraining, pending on the individual nner. Undertaking running training on a treadmill is sier than on ground. 3D otion analysis systems are pensive, but 2D video meras and mirror-based stems seem feasible for hical environments	

meniscal injuries, and tibial	significant risk factor for running-	running is more comfortable;		
stress syndrome	related injuries.	30-60 mins 3X/week with 1	In the review by Napier et al.	
-		day rest in between). Avoid	(2015), the authors	
	In a systematic review by van Der	rapid increases in running	recommend future studies	
Novice Runners	Worp et al. (2015), some of the main, consistent risk factors included:	intensity or mileage. General	should include longer follow-	
A systematic review and		runner stepwise increase of	up measurements to assess	
meta-analysis from Videbaek,	advanced age, navicular drop (>10mm), and leg length difference.	~10%; and 5-10% stepwise	the long-term retention of biomechanical changes due	
Bueno, Nielsen, and		increased for obese individual.	to running re-training, and	
Rasmussen (2015)	In a different systematic review	This permits the bone tissues	see whether they have an	
demonstrated that novice	exploring the risk factors for lower-	to rest and avoid mechanical	effect on the reduction of	
runners are at the highest	extremity running injuries, Gijon-	failure. Runners can use the	injury.	
risk of injury with 17.8	nogueron & Fernandez-villarejo (2015)	onset of pain or symptoms as	injury.	
injuries per 1,000 hours of	found a number of risk factors,	guides for participation in		
running [95% CI: 16.7, 19.1].	including: genu varum alignment,	running. Muscle soreness is		
	male height >1.70m, alcohol intake,	expected with a big change in		
In a different systematic	increasing weekly distance >10%, shoe	running duration or decline		
review and meta-analysis,	inserts and orthotics, running >= 6	grade. Pain that increases		
Kluitenberg, van Middelkoop,	times a week, increased pronation	during running or walking		
Diercks, & van der Worp	excursion, increased reinversion	sessions should be avoided,		
(2015) presented injury rates	velocity, inadequate muscle	and if pain increases, the		
and anatomical locations for	stabilization, wide internal rotation	activity should be reduced or		
different types of runners.	range and peak tibial acceleration,	stopped. Joint pain should not		
For novice runners, the pooled injury proportion (%	muscle fatigue, and running on a Hard surface.	persist or increased 24 hours after exercise, which indicates		
[95% CI]) for a short follow-	surface.	that the MSK system is not		
up period (6-15 weeks) is	When exploring foot function as a risk	prepared for that running		
26.4% [14.2, 43.7], during a	factor for lower limb overuse injury, a	volume. In the initial phase of		
one-year follow up is 27.3%	systematic review by Dowling et al.	a running program, exercising		
[24.5, 30.3], and long-term	(2014) found greater lateral and	on non-consecutive days		
follow-up (greater than 1	medial directed centre of pressure	permits the individual a self-		
year) is 84.9% [74.8,91.5].	during running as well as increased or	assessment of his or her		
The most common injury site	decreased pressure-related outcomes	exercise response.		
for novice runners is the	in the 5 th metatarsal region to			
lower leg (34.7% of injuries),	significant risk factors.	According to a 22-week		
followed by the knee	A prospective randomized clinical trial	prospective research study by		
, (30.6%), hip/pelvis (10.2%),	by Ryan, Elashi, Newsham-West, and	Malisoux et al. (2015), runners		
ankle (8.2%), upper leg	Taunton (2014) found more injuries in	using different pairs of running		
	two minimalist groups (partial and	shoes concomitantly have a		
		39% lower risk of running-		

(Γ, Γ_{0}^{0}) and fact (2, Γ_{0}^{0})	full) then the neutral group	related injuries compared to	
(5.5%) and foot (3.5%)	full) than the neutral group	related injuries compared to	
(Kluitenberg et al., 2015).	contributing to a 160% and 310%	runners using only one pair of	
	relative risk of injury in the full	shoes during their training	
Constant Deserves	minimalist and partial minimalist	period.	
Cross-Country Runners	group, respectively.	Strength Training	
In the meta-analysis by Videbaek et al. (2015), cross- country runners had a risk of injury at 16.3 injuries per 1,000 hours of running [12.2, 31.3]. Kluitenberg et al. (2015) demonstrated that 19.7% [10.9, 33.1] of cross- country runners (i.e., runners competing in cross-country races) experienced a time- loss injury within a short follow-up period, and 77.4% [60.6, 88.4] of these runners experienced a time-loss injury within a long follow-up period. The most common injury site for cross-country runners was the lower leg (30.3% of injuries), knee (22.5%), ankle (16.2%), upper leg (9.0%), foot (8.1%), and hip/pelvis (5.7%).	 group, respectively. A clinical review by Ferber, Hreljac, and Kendall (2009) found that a large, gorwing body of literature suggests inadequate hip stabilization from hip muscle weakness leads to atypical lower extremity mechanics and increased forces while running, which are considered risk factors for running-related injuries. Protective Factors A systematic review by Nielsen, Buist, Sørensen, Lind, and Rasmussen (2012) found increased running experience to be a protective factor against overuse running-related injuries. A systematic review by Gijon- nogueron and Fernandez-villarejo (2015) found the following protective factors for running-related injuries: (i) strengthening of gluteus medius and maximus muscles; (ii) maintenance of stress level in running; (iii) shoe sole modification to improve ankle internal 	Strength Training According to multiple studies, hip and knee exercises related to strength and flexibility may be used as a preventative measure for running-related injuries since these exercises have been shown to reduce pain for those with patellofemoral pain (Ferber, Bolgla, Earl-Boehm, Emery, & Hamstra-Wright, 2015; Neal et al., 2016; van der Heijden, Lankhorst, van Linschoten, Bierma-Zeinstra, & van Middelkoop, 2015) Running Re-Training Limited evidence suggests transitioning from a rearfoot to forefoot or midfoot strike pattern, combined with increasing step rate or altering proximal mechanics to facilitate hip flexion can help	
Recreational Runners	plantarflexion moment; (iv) muscle tuning; (v) eccentric training program;	manage anterior exertional lower leg pain (Barton et al.,	
The Videbaek et al. (2015)	and (vi) elastic running surface.	2016). Nevertheless, there is	
study also revealed	A prospective 22-week follow-up	substantial evidence for the	
recreational runners		immediate biomechanical	
experience 7.7 injuries per	study by Malisoux et al. (2015) found	effects of running retraining	
1,000 hours of running [6.9,	that the parralel use of different	interventions in uninjured	
8.7], and Kluitenberg et al.	running shoes was a protective factor	populations. For example,	
	[hazard ratio (HR) = 0.614; 95% con-		

(2015) demonstrated that (2015) demonstrated that experience time-loss injuries weth a short follow-up (6-15) weths), then increase to 55%if demonstrated injuries.addressing the presence of one of the most beneficial running; retratating strategies, with the importance of the foot landing closer to the contracting tasks and tasks (2015), foot rate will move the foot strike closer log (24,94,060)Sectific light sectific light(10.15%), followed by the uper log (24,94,060) (7.3%), followed by the resence 7.2 lighters per light estific light estific light estific light estific light estific light estific light estific estific light estific light estific estific light estific light estific estific light estific light estific estific light estific <br< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>l .</th></br<>				l .
experience time-loss injuiry with a short followup (6-15 (48.1, 61.8] at a one yeer follow up. The most common injuiry site for recreational runners its the red 26.3 % of injuires), followed by the lower leg (22.4%), foot (10.1%), hij/polyevis (8.4%), foot for a systematic review by and Hassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and Hassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and Hassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and fassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and fassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and fassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and fassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and fassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and fassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and fassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and fassen (2012), the indigitance runners. In a systematic review by van der minegez (ii) sudden increase in minegez (ii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) sudden increase in the s		. , -		
with a short follow-up (a -15) weeks), then increase to 55% (43., 6.13) at a one year follow up. The most common injury site for cerreational runners is the knee (25.3% of injure)s, followed by the one due weeks), then increase in clock), hip abductor in a systematic review by ranke (7.3%).runners is the knee (22.4%), foot ind Hassen (2016), hip abductor in a systematic review by van der weakness is may be considered a risk factor for illoitbial band syndrome in long distance runners.runners is the centre of mass. increasing step rate should be graduate (5.10%) to ensure manageable changes and anageable changes and anageable changes and anicrease review by van der Worp, van der Horst, de Wijer, Back, Ning factors are associated with a increased risk of TBS: (1) excessive following factors are associated with a increased risk of TBS: (1) excessive mileage; (ii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) sudden increase i		running-related injuries.	-	
With a soft follow-up (e-15)Fundamentation(48.1, 61.8) at a one year follow up. The most common injury site for recreational injurys is the need (26.3% of injurdes), followed by the lower leg (22.4%), foot (10.1%), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and Hassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk and (21.3%), hip/oblical band synthme in long distance runners.increasing step rate should be graduate (5.10%) to ensure manageable changes and avoid excessive fatigue. Concurrently addressing muscle function and flexibility deficits is also important. For injourse interaction and flexibility deficits is also important. For injourse interaction and flexibility.Ultramarathon runners experience 7.2 injuries per and recease runners. (V) debaek et al., 2015), indicated that 64.6% (61.9, 67.2) of ultramarathon runner sectional experimental study by Ferber, Noehren, Hamili, and David varum; (w) high arches; (wi) hip infexibility.increasing step rate, reducing ovarum; (v) adden increase in 		Specific Injuries:		
[48.1, 61.8] at a one year follow up. The most common injury site for recreational runners is the knee (23.3% of injurise), followed by the lower leg (22.4%), foot (20.1%), hip/pelvis (8.4%), and Hassen (2016), hip abductor weakness is may be considered a risk factor for illicitibial bad syndrome in long distance runners.foot landing closer to the centre of mass. Increasing step rate should be graduate (5-10%) to ensure manageable changes and analde (27.3%).Ultramarathon Runners experience 7.2 injuries per sperience 7.2 injuries per lono outs of running [5.5, RJ (10.1%), hip/pelvis (8.19, of running [5.5, RJ (10.1%), hip/pelvis (8.19, running retraining may pilve pelvis (10.1%), hip/pelvis (10.1%), hip/p				
follow up. The most commonNo. TAULUD.: According to a systematic review by muthers is the knee (26.3%)contrig to a systematic review by muthers (26.3%), foot how leg (22.4%), foot meak exists is may be considered a risk factor for illotibial band syndrome in long distance runners.control full move the foot strike closer to the centre of mass. Increasing step rate should be graduate (5.10%) to ensure manageable changes and avoid excessive fatigue.Utramarathon RunnersIn a systematic review by van der Worp, van der forander (2012), following factors are associated with an increased risk of TBS: (1) excessive mileage; (iii) little running experience, (iv) leg length discrepancy: (v) genu varum; (v) lig langth discrepancy: (v) genu varum; (v) lig length discrepancy: (v) genu varum (v) lig harches; (vii) hip infexibility.control full discrepancy: (v) genu varum; (v) lig length discrepancy: (v) genu varum; (v) diffex harches; (vii) hip infexibility.control full discrepancy: (v) genu prevention strategies in runners experience a time- loss running injury with one year. Site-specific injures history of ITBS to have greater peak reafoti invertor moment, peak knee history of ITBS to have greater peak ratofot invertor moment, peak knee adduction angle compared to head have adduction angle compared to head have adduction angle compared to head have stratofot invertor moment, peak have ratofot invertor moment, peak knee thistoruning subgroup in the kluteneberg et al. (2015)the systematic review by Barton et al. (2016)Inter-asing step variation angle, compared to head have thistoruning subgroup in the kluteneberg et al. (2015)constent with other prospective prevention strategies in runners, steperici running retraining 		Iliotibial Band Syndrome	•	
Totiow up: Ine most common injury site for cereational privates, followed by the lower leg (22.4%), foot (10.4%), hip/pelvis (8.4%), and Hasen (2015), hip boluctor weakness is may be considered a risk factor for iliotibial band syndrome in hower leg (22.4%), hip/pelvis (8.4%), and Hasen (2015), hip boluctor ing distance runners. In a systematic review by van der Worp, van der Horst, de Wijer, Backy, Rollowing factors are associated with an lincrease in faits also important. For following factors are associated with an lincrease in file solution and Hasen (51.5%) (10 excessive retraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exvists. (iv) leg length discreances; (iii) hip inflected that 64.6% (61.9, 67.21 of ultramarathon runners experience a line- loss running ling within on year. Site-specific injuries have rarely been reported in ultramarathon runners; were not further analyzefor this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.Centre or mass. increasing step rate will move the foot strike closer to the centre of mass. Increasing step rate hould be graduate (5-10%) to ensure manageable changes sand a divide excertes in mileage; (iii) suden increase in mileage; (iii) hit erunning experience; influe subgroup in the kory of TBS to have greater peak reafoot invertor moment, peak knee internal rotation angle, compared to healty adduction angle compared to healty adduction angle compared to head to is consistent with other prospective reserch.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.Concurrent this running subgroup in the further analyzefor this running subgroup in the further analyzefor this running subgroup in the <td></td> <td>Risk Factors:</td> <td></td> <td></td>		Risk Factors:		
rumers is the knee (26.3% of injuries), followed by the lower leg (22.4%), foot (10.1%), hip/pelvis (8.4%), ankle (7.8%), and upper leg (7.3%). Ultramarathon runners Ultramarathon runners experience 7.2 injuries per 1,000 hours of running (5.5) 8.8 (Videbaek et al., 2015), Kluitenberg et al. (2015), for untervention utramarathon runners; 8.8 (Videbaek et al., 2015), Kluitenberg et al. (2015), for untervention utramarathon runners; 8.8 (Videbaek et al., 2015), Kluitenberg et al. (2015), for untervention utramarathon runners; 8.8 (Videbaek et al., 2015), Kluitenberg et al. (2015), for untervention utramarathon runners; 8.8 (Videbaek et al., 2015), Kluitenberg et al. (2015), for untervention utramarathon runners; 8.8 (Videbaek et al., 2015), Kluitenberg et al. (2015), for untervention utramarathon runners; 8.8 (Videbaek et al., 2015), Kluitenberg et al. (2015), for untervention utramarathon runners; 8.8 (Videbaek et al., 2015), Kluitenberg et al. (2015), for untervention utramarathon runners; 8.8 (Videbaek et al., 2015), Kluitenberg et al. (2015), for untervention utramarathon runners; therefore, pooled statistics, were not further analyzed for have greater peak for untervention runners; therefore, pooled statistics, were not further analyzed for have greater peak for untervention runners; therefore, pooled statistics, were not further analyzed for have greater peak for untervention runners; therefore, pooled statistics, were not further analyzed for have greater peak for untervention runners; therefore, pooled statistics, were not further analyzed for have greater peak for untervention runners; therefore, pooled statistics, were not further analyzed for have greater peak for untervention runners; therefore, pooled statistics, were not further analyzed for have greater peak for untervention runners; therefore, pooled statistics, were not further analyzed for have greater peak for untervention runners; therefore, pooled statistics, were not further a	-			
injuries), followed by the lower leg (22.4%), foot (10.1%), hip/petvis (8.4%), ankle (7.8%), and upper leg (7.3%). Ultramarathon Runners Ultramarathon runners experience 7.2 injuries per 1,000 hours of running [5,5, 8.8] (videback et al., 2015). Kluitenberg et al. (2015) inficatif that 64.6% (61.9), 67.2] of ultramarathon runners experience name usanaged size for the runners. Kluitenberg et al. (2015) inficatif that 64.6% (61.9), 67.2] of ultramarathon runners experience ration wear out further analyzefs therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzefs internal rotation angle, and peak hip aduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS on is consistent with other prospecitive reserver.				
lower leg (22.4%), foot (10.1%), hip/pelvis (8.4%), ankle (7.8%), and upper leg (7.3%). Ultramarathon Runners Ultramarathon runners experience 7.2 injuries per 1,000 hours of running (5.5, R.8) (Videbaek et al. 2015). Howers of Latt 64.6% (61.9) 67.2) of ultramarathon runners; experience 1, 2015. No bear experience 3.1% Site-specific nuries biorechanics therefore, pooled statistists were not further analyzeds History of ITBS to have greater peak rear-foot invertor moment, peak knep site-specific re, no leg (11) further to have greater peak rear-foot invertor moment, peak knep site-specific re, no leg (11) further analyzeds therefore, pooled statistists were not further analyzeds History of ITBS to have greater peak rear-foot invertor moment, peak knep site-specific running is ubgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) therefore, pooled statistists were not further analyzeds therefore, pooled statistists were not further analyzeds therefore, pooled statistists mitaraathon runners; therefore, pooled statistists meta-analysis.				
(10.1%), hip/petvis (8.4%), ankle (7.8%), and upper leg (7.3%).factor for illotibial band syndrome in long distance runners.manageable changes and avoid excessive fatigue.Ultramarathon Runnersin a systematic review by van der Worp, van der Horst, de Wijer, Backx, & Nijhuis-van der Sanden (2012), the following factors are associated with an increased risk of TBS: (i) excessive mileage; (iii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) sudden increase in wratm; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip arches; (vii) hip arches; (vii) hip have rarely been reported in utramarathon runners; therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.factor for illotibial band syndrome in adduction angle compared to healthy adduction angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for TIBS and adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for TIBS and adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for TIBS and adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for TIBS and adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for TIBS and adduction angle compared to hea			o .	
ankle (7.3%), and upper leg (7.3%).long distance runners. In a systematic review by van der Worp, van der Horst, de Wijer, Backa, & Nijhuis-van der Sanden (2012), the following factors are associated with an increased risk of ITBS: (i) excessive mileage; (ii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) didte running experience; (iv) leg length discrepancy; (v) genu varum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.avoid excessive fatigue. Concurrently addressing muscle function and flexibility deficits is also important. For injury prevention, running retraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists. Increasing step rate, reducing ovarum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.avoid excessive fatigue. Concurrently addressing muscle function and flexibility deficits is also important. For injury prevention, running retraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists. Increasing step arte, reducing ovarum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.avoid excessive fatigue. Concurrently addressing moscle function and flexibility.67.2] of ultramarathon runners experience a time- loss running injury within our y Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, and Davis (2010) found females with a previous history of ITBS to have greater peak reaffoot invertor moment, peak knee internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.havoid excessive fatigue. Control currently addresses gait retraining addresses gait retraining startegies for site-specific injuries.1000field current out addron angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered bio		•	e	
(7.3%).In a systematic review by van der Worp, van der Horst, de Wijer, Backx, & Nijhuis-van der Sanden (2012), the following factors are associated with an increased risk of ITBS: (i) excessive mileage; (ii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) iltite running experience ators are the systematic review by Barton et al. (2015) were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.Concurrently addressing musical mater in proximal kinematics seem to be the most common frective prevention strategies in running (Barton et al., 2016).Concurrentive addressing musical mater in the systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.(7.3 w)internal rotation angle, and peak hip addresse fait factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.		•	u	
Ultramarathon RunnersIn a systematic review by van dermuscle function and flexibility deficts is also important. For injury prevention, running retraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists.Ultramarathon runners experience 7.2 injuries per 1,000 hours of running [5.5, 8.8] (Videbaek et al., 2015).mileage; (iii) ultite running experience; (iii) geregative, (vi) genu vient, (vi) hig arches; (vii) hip inficxibility.muscle function and flexibility deficts is also important. For injury prevention, running retraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists.67.2) of ultramarathon runners experience a time- loss running injury with on- year. Site-specific injuries have rarely been reported in this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.Female Specific Running Biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.Muscle function and flexibility deficts is also important. For injury prevention, running retraining may play a role but alack of evidence to guide implementation exists.1000 fund females with a previous history of ITBS to have greater peak therefore, pooled statistics were and further analyzed for this running subgroup in the internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy is consistent with other prospective research.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining addresses gait retraining injuries.Muter ber prospective this running subgroup in the instruming subgroup in the is consistent with other prospective research.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait r		long distance runners.	•	
Ultramarathon RunnersWorp, van der Horst, de Wijer, Back, & Nijhuis-van der Sanden (2012), the following factors are associated with an increased risk of ITBS: (i) excessive mileage; (ii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) little running experience, 8.8] (Videbaek et al., 2015). Kluitenberg et al. (2015) ext. (vi) leg length discrepancy; (v) gen varum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.muscle function and flexibility deficits is also important. For injury prevention, running retraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists. Increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increasing step width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the Female Specific Running Biomechanics:muscle function and flexibility deficits is also important. For injury prevention, running overstriding, increasing step width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in runners experision erations (2010) found females with a previous history of ITBS to have greater peak this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.Moscle Hunction and flexibility deficits is also important. For injury prevention, running retraining datoring and common stists. The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresse gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.Worp, van der Horst, de Wijer, Backw, generic eration angle, and peak hip a iddresse for site-specific injuries.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.Were nere out further analyzed for this running subgroup in the kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.Kich are considered biomechanical risk f	(7.3%).	In a systematic review by van der		
Ultramarathon Runners& Nijhuis-van der Sanden (2012), the following factors are associated with an increased risk of ITBS: (i) excessive mileage; (iii) suden increase in mileage; (iii) suden increase in mileage; (iii) suden increase in mileage; (iii) suden increase in mileage; (iii) little running experience; (iv) leg length discrepancy; (v) genu varm; (vi) high arches; (vi) hip inflexibility.deficits also important. For injury prevention, running retraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists. Increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increasing step width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).deficits also important. For injury prevention, running retraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists. Increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increasing step width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).deficits also important. For ingury prevention, running implementation exists. Increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increasing step width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).Vibration subgroup in the this running subgroup in the interain rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospectiveThe systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also atdresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.		• •	-	
Ultramaration kunnersfollowing factors are associated with an increased risk of ITBS: (i) excessive mileage; (ii) luttle running experience (iv) leg length discrepancy; (v) genu varum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.inileage; (iii) luttle running experience retraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists. Increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increase in increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increase in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).Internation exists. Increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increase in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.history of ITBS to have gre			•	
Ultramarathon runners experience 7.2 injuries per 1,000 hours of running [5.5, 8.8] (Videbaek et al., 2015)an increased risk of ITBS: (i) excessive mileage; (ii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) little running experience; (iv) leg length discrepancy; (v) genu varum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.refraining may play a role but a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists. Increasing step width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015)an increased risk of ITBS to have greater peak reafoot invertor moment, peak knee internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospectivereafoot invertor for research.reference processing running subgroup in the strategies for site-specific injuries.reafoot invertor moment, peak knee addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.reafoot invertor moment, peak knee addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.	Ultramarathon Runners			
experience 7.2 injuries per 1,000 hours of running [5.5, 8.8] (Videbaek et al., 2015).mileage; (ii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) little running experience; (iv) leg length discrepancy; (v) genu varum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists. Increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increasing step width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running runners; therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.mileage; (ii) sudden increase in mileage; (iii) little running experience; (iv) leg length discrepancy; (v) genu varum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.a lack of evidence to guide implementation exists. Increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increasing step width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).4. coss-sectional experimental study by Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, and Davis (2010) found females with a previous this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.A cross-sectional experimental study by Ferber noehren, peak knee internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.5. Exertional Leg Pain: Limited evidence indicates aExertional Leg Pain: Limited evidence indicates a <td>Ultramarathon runners</td> <td>•</td> <td>• • • •</td> <td></td>	Ultramarathon runners	•	• • • •	
1,000 hours of running [5.5, 8.8] (Videbaek et al., 2015).mileage; (iii) little running experience; (iv) leg length discrepancy; (v) genu varum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increasing step width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).indicated the 64.6% (G1.9, inflexibility.67.2] of ultramarathon runners experience a time- loss running injury within one year. Site-specific injuries have rarely been reported in ultramarathon runners; therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.A cross-sectional experimental study by Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, and Davis (2010) found females with a previous history of ITBS to have greater peak internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresse gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.		.,	-	
8.8] (Videbaek et al., 2015).(iv) leg length discrepany; (v) genu varum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hip inflexibility.Increasing step rate, reducing overstriding, increasing step rate, reduc			•	
Kluitenberg et al. (2015)varum; (vi) high arches; (vii) hipoverstriding, increasing stepindicated that 64.6% [61.9,inflexibility.width, and altering proximal67.2] of ultramarathoninflexibility.width, and altering proximalrunners experience a time- <i>Female Specific Running</i> most common, effectiveloss running injury within oneA cross-sectional experimental studyprevention strategies inhave rarely been reported inby Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, and Davisrunning retraining (Barton et(2010) found females with a previoushistory of ITBS to have greater peakThe systematic review bybarton et al. (2015)internal rotation angle, and peak hipBarton et al. (2016) alsometa-analysis.doution angle compared to healthystrategies for site-specificbiomechanical risk factors for ITBS andis consistent with other prospectivestrategies for site-specificis consistent with other prospectiveresearch. <i>Exertional Leg Pain:</i>				
indicated that 64.6% [61.9, 67.2] of ultramarathon runners experience a time- loss running injury within one year. Site-specific injuries have rarely been reported in ultramarathon runners; therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.inflexibility.width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).indicated that 64.6% [61.9, 67.2] of ultramarathon runners experience a time- loss running injury within one year. Site-specific injuries have rarely been reported in ultramarathon runners; therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.inflexibility.width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).is consistent with other prospective research.inflexibility.width, and altering proximal kinematics seem to be the most common, effective prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).is consistent with other prospective research.Exertional Leg Pain: Limited evidence indicates a				
67.2] of ultramarathon runners experience a time- loss running injury within one year. Site-specific injuries have rarely been reported in ultramarathon runners; therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015)Female Specific Running specific Running therefore, pooled statistics history of ITBS to have greater peak internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.Female Specific Running most common, effective prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).700Female Specific Running biomechanics:Female Specific Running most common, effective prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).8Female Specific Running prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).9Female Specific Running prevention strategies for strategies for site-specific injuries.9Female Specific Running prevention strategies for site-specific injuries. <td>• • • •</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	• • • •			
Provinces experience a time- loss running injury within one year. Site-specific injuries have rarely been reported in ultramarathon runners; therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015)Biomechanics: A cross-sectional experimental study by Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, and Davis (2010) found females with a previous history of ITBS to have greater peak internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.prevention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).Biomechanics: provention strategies in running retraining (Barton et al., 2016).The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.Biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.Feretional Leg Pain: Limited evidence indicates a				
loss running injury within one year. Site-specific injuriesA cross-sectional experimental study by Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, and Davis (2010) found females with a previous history of ITBS to have greater peak were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.A cross-sectional experimental study by Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, and Davis (2010) found females with a previous history of ITBS to have greater peak internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy meta-analysis.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also atdresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.adduction angle compared to healthy is consistent with other prospective research.strategies for site-specific injuries.Limited evidence indicates aLimited evidence indicates aExertional Leg Pain:	runners experience a time-			
Year. Site-specific injuriesA cross-sectional experimental study by Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, and Davis (2010) found females with a previous history of ITBS to have greater peak meta-analysis.al., 2016).ultramarathon runners; therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.history of ITBS to have greater peak internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries. <i>Exertional Leg Pain:</i> Limited evidence indicates aExertional Leg Pain:	loss running injury within one	biomechanics:		
nave rarely been reported in ultramarathon runners;by render, Noemen, namin, and Davis (2010) found females with a previous history of ITBS to have greater peak this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015)The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.Kluitenberg et al. (2015)adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.Exertional Leg Pain: Limited evidence indicates a	year. Site-specific injuries	A cross-sectional experimental study		
therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.history of ITBS to have greater peak rearfoot invertor moment, peak knee internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.The systematic review by Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries. <i>Exertional Leg Pain:</i> Limited evidence indicates aLimited evidence indicates a	have rarely been reported in	by Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, and Davis	ai., 2010).	
were not further analyzed for this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.rearfoot invertor moment, peak knee internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.Barton et al. (2016) also addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries.Exertional Leg Pain: Limited evidence indicates aExertional Leg Pain: Limited evidence indicates a	ultramarathon runners;	(2010) found females with a previous		
this running subgroup in the Kluitenberg et al. (2015) meta-analysis.internal rotation angle, and peak hip adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.addresses gait retraining strategies for site-specific injuries. <i>Exertional Leg Pain:</i> Limited evidence indicates aLimited evidence indicates a	therefore, pooled statistics		The systematic review by	
Kluitenberg et al. (2015)adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.strategies for site-specific injuries. <i>Kluitenberg et al.</i> (2015)adduction angle compared to healthy controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.strategies for site-specific injuries. <i>Limited evidence indicates a</i> trategies for site-specific injuries.	were not further analyzed for	rearfoot invertor moment, peak knee	Barton et al. (2016) also	
meta-analysis.controls, which are considered biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research.injuries.Limited evidence indicates aLimited evidence indicates a			addresses gait retraining	
biomechanical risk factors for ITBS and is consistent with other prospective research. Limited evidence indicates a	Kluitenberg et al. (2015)		strategies for site-specific	
is consistent with other prospective research. Exertional Leg Pain: Limited evidence indicates a	meta-analysis.	-	injuries.	
research. Limited evidence indicates a			Evertional Lea Pain:	
		is consistent with other prospective	LACITIONIAI LEY PUIII.	
transition from rearfoot to		research.		
			transition from rearfoot to	

		form on model of studies were	
Marathon Runners	Both Sexes Running Biomechanics:	fore- or midfoot strike pattern	
Kluitophorg at al (2015)		along with increased step rate	
Kluitenberg et al. (2015)		can help manage exertional leg	
reported that 64.7% [24.6,	Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome	pain. Reducing overstriding is	
91.2] will experience a		also suggested to help anterior	
running-related time-loss	<u>Risk Factors:</u>	exertional leg pain.	
injury within a short follow- up period. With longer	A systematic review by Barton, Lack,	Patellofemoral Pain:	
follow-up periods, the rate	Malliaras, and Morrissey (2013) found	Limited evidence suggests	
decreased to 31.3% [28.8,	moderate-to-strong evidence that	visual and verbal feedback to	
33.9]. The most common	gluteus medias activity is delayed and	reduce peak hip adduction	
injury site for marathon	of shorter duration during running,	during stance for runners with	
runners was the lower leg	which may be a risk factor for PFPS.		
_	Dutton, Khadavi, and Fredericson	patellofemoral pain. Reducing	
(not including the knee or	(2016) found a number of risk factors	overstriding with increased	
ankle joints) (29.9% of	. ,	step rate is also suggested to	
injuries), followed by the	for patellofemoral pain in their	be an important treatment for	
knee (26.6%), foot (13.1%),	systematic review. These risk factors	patellofemoral pain.	
hip/pelvis (9.4%), upper leg	include: (i) increase in weekly running	Achilles Tendinopathy:	
(i.e., the thigh) (8.7%) and	distance > 30% over 2 week period; (ii)) (am, limited to limited	
ankle (7.9%).	quadriceps weakness; (iii) delayed	Very limited to limited	
	Vasti muscle activation; (iv)	evidence suggests	
	inflexibility in quadriceps and	transitioning individuals with a	
Track & Field Athletes	hamstring muscles; (v) lower hip	pronounced forefoot strike to	
According to Kluitenberg et	adduction strength; and (vi) lower hip	a rearfoot or midfoot strike is	
al. (2015), within a one-year	external rotation strength.	a proposed strategy for	
follow-up period, 63.8%	In a systematic review and meta-	Achilles tendinopathy and calf	
[56.0, 70.5], 63.9% [41.4,	analysis by Cronstrom, Creaby, Nae,	strain.	
81.6], and 31.7% [25.8, 38.2]	and Ageberg (2016), women with	Iliotibial Band Syndrome:	
of sprinters, middle-distance,	patellofemoral pain had greater peak	Very limited to limited	
and long-distance runners,	knee abduction compared to men in	evidence suggests increasing	
respectively, experience a	weight-bearing activities, such as	step width helps with cross-	
time-loss running-related	running, which may further increase	over gait (hip adduction at foot	
injury. Injury sites were only	the risk of overuse running-related	strike) and reduces iliotibial	
been reported for sprinters,	injuries.	band strain. For hamstring	
and sprinters experienced	Neal, Barton, Gallie, O'Halloran, and	injuries,	
the highest proportion of	Morrissey (2016) found in their	injunes,	
injuries in the upper leg	systematic review and meta-analysis	Hamstring Injuries:	
(32.9%), followed by the	systematic review and meta-dilarysis		

knee (30.6%), hip/pelvis	that runners with patellofemoral pain	General support for anterior	
(10.5%), foot (4.0%), and	have lower extremity malalignment	pelvic tilt, reduce overstriding	
lower leg (3.4%).	and increased peak hip internal		
	rotation and contralateral drop, which	with increased step rate, and	
	targeted interventions can modify.	greater hip and knee flexion	
Children & Adolescents		during swing.	
children & Adolestents	Lower Leg Injuries (e.g., MTSS)		
Based on Nelson, Alhajj, Yard,	A systematic review and mate analysis	According to a systematic	
Comstock, and McKenzie	A systematic review and meta-analysis	According to a systematic	
(2009) as cited in a clinical	by Hamstra-Wright, Bliven, and Bay	literature review from Napier,	
review by Krabak, Snitily, and	(2015) found consistent evidence for	Cochrane, Taunton, and Hunt	
Milani (2016), 25.1% of	individuals with MTSS having a	(2015), there are a number of	
sport-related injuries in	significantly greater BMI, navicular	kinematic Alterations	
-	drop, ankle plantarflexion range of	associated with manipulation	
children are due to running.	motion, and hip external rotation	of step rate and stride length	
A prospective study by Rauh,	range of motion than healthy controls.	that may ultimately protect	
Koepsell, Rivara, Margherita,		against overuse running	
and Rice (2006) of 421	Bone Stress Injuries	related injureis. For example,	
adolescent cross-country	In a clinical review by Warden, Burr,	an increase in step frequency	
runners over one season	and Brukner (2006), female sex and	increases knee flexion at initial	
found that 38.5% sustained	intense changes in physical activity	contact and decreases peak	
at least one injury. Girls	were considered risk factors with	knee flexion during stance.	
sustained a significantly	bone stress fractures.	The ankle is more	
higher overall injury rate	A clinical review by Tenforde, Kraus, &	plantarflexed at heel strike	
(19.6 RRI / 1,000 athletic	Fredericson (2016) identified the	with increased step rate. Less	
events) than boys (15.0 RRI /	. ,	peak hip flexion and adduction	
1,000 athletic events).	following risk factors for bone stress	during loading with increased	
	injuries: (i) running volumes > 32km;	step rate. An inverse	
	(ii) genetics; (iii) medications	relationship between step rate	
	(anticonvulsants, steroids,	and horizontal distance	
	antidepressants, antacids); (iv) female	between centre of mass and	
	athlete triad; (v) insufficient calcium		
	and vitamin D; (vi) prior fracture; and	heel at initial contact	
	(vii) lower bone mass density.	(overstriding). There is also an	
		inverse relationship between	
	Achilles Tendon Injuries	step rate and vertical centre of	
	A cross-sectional experiment by	mass vertical excursion, and a	
		positive relationship between	
	Michael Ryan et al. (2009) found	step rate and leg stiffness.	
	runners exhibiting Achilles	· · · · ·	
	tendinopathy to have greater ankle		

evente a disclass and doute a U	Current and a star law attained	
eversion displacement during the	Greater step length and	
stance phase of running.	ground contact time has been	
In two systematic reviews by Lorimer	associated with novice runners	
and Hume (2014, 2016), the following	and potentially a higher	
running-related factors were	incidence of injury; therefore,	
associated with an increased risk of	reducing these parameters	
Achilles tendon injury: (i) greater peak	may prevent injury. Peak tibial	
breaking force; (ii) neglecting active	acceleration and impact	
recovery measures with slower	attenuation increases with an	
training runs; (iii) more compliant	increased stride length.	
surfaces such as sand and track; (iv)		
natural forefoot strikers have more	Napier et al. (2015) also	
plantarflexed foot at contact resulting	discusses the use of	
in higher risk; and (v) older age.	biofeedback in populations of	
	healthy runners and	
Based on the same two reviews,	demonstrates the clinical	
Lorimer and Hume (2014, 2016) also	feasibility of this intervention,	
outline some protective factors for	potentially for prevention	
Achilles tendon injuries: (i) high peak	purposes. However, there is	
vertical ground reaction force; (ii)	no evidence to support long-	
greater arch height; and (iii) running	term injury rates in runners	
on stiffer surfaces.	receiving feedback/retraining.	
Plantar Fasciitis	There is also limited evidence	
	to support hip adduction angle	
A systematic review and with a	retraining to reduce vertical	
detailed literature review from Beeson	impact peak. Augmented	
(2014) found runners were at an	feedback is effective in	
increased risk of plantar fasciitis with	reducing the magnitude of	
increased body weight & BMI (>30	GRFS, vertical instantaneous	
kg/m ² = an odds ratio of 5.6 [1.9-16.6]	rate, vertical average loading	
compared to a BMI < 25 kg/m ²),	rage, and vertical impact peak,	
reduced dorsiflexion flexibility,	which have been associated	
hamstring tightness, inappropriate	with tibial stress fractures,	
footwear, improper training (rapid	plantar fasciitis, and MTSS.	
increases in training load), and greater		
peak rearfoot eversion during stance	A systematic review by	
phase of running.	Schubert, Kempf, and	
	Heiderscheit (2014)	

		demonstrated the minimum change in step frequency to observe biomechanical changes was 10% in most cases, but some changes were noted at 5% increased. None of the studies above addressed injury prevention or recovery. (Schubert et al., 2014).		
Works Cited:	Works Cited:	Works Cited:	Works Cited:	
Kluitenberg, B., van Middelkoop, M., Diercks, R., & van der Worp, H. (2015). What are the differences in injury proportions between different populations of runners? A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Sports</i> <i>Medicine, 45</i> (8), 1143-1161. Krabak, B. J., Snitily, B., & Milani, C. J. (2016). Running injuries during adolescence and childhood. <i>Physical</i> <i>Medicine and Rehabilitation</i> <i>Clinics, 27</i> (1), 179-202. Nelson, N. G., Alhajj, M., Yard, E., Comstock, D., & McKenzie, L. B. (2009). Physical education class injuries treated in emergency departments in the US in	 Barton, C. J., Lack, S., Malliaras, P., & Morrissey, D. (2012). Gluteal muscle activity and patellofemoral pain syndrome: A systematic review. <i>British Journal of Sports</i> <i>Medicine</i>, bjsports-2012. Beeson, P. (2014). Plantar fasciopathy: Revisiting the risk factors. <i>Foot and</i> <i>Ankle Surgery</i>, <i>20</i>(3), 160-165. Buist, I., Bredeweg, S. W., Lemmink, K. A., Van Mechelen, W., & Diercks, R. L. (2010). Predictors of running-related injuries in novice runners enrolled in a systematic training program: A prospective cohort study. <i>American</i> <i>Journal of Sports Medicine</i>, <i>38</i>(2), 273- 280. Cronström, A., Creaby, M. W., Nae, J., & Ageberg, E. (2016). Gender differences in knee abduction during 	Barton, C. J., Bonanno, D. R., Carr, J., Neal, B. S., Malliaras, P., Franklyn-Miller, A., & Menz, H. B. (2016). Running retraining to treat lower limb injuries: a mixed-methods study of current evidence synthesised with expert opinion. <i>British Journal of</i> <i>Sports Medicine, 50</i> (9), 513- 526. Ferber, R., Bolgla, L., Earl- Boehm, J. E., Emery, C., & Hamstra-Wright, K. (2015). Strengthening of the hip and core versus knee muscles for the treatment of patellofemoral pain: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. <i>Journal of</i>	Agresta, C., & Brown, A. (2015). Gait retraining for injured and healthy runners using augmented feedback: A systematic literature review. Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy, 45(8), 576- 584. Barton, C. J., Bonanno, D. R., Carr, J., Neal, B. S., Malliaras, P., Franklyn-Miller, A., & Menz, H. B. (2016). Running retraining to treat lower limb injuries: a mixed-methods study of current evidence synthesised with expert opinion. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 50(9), 513- 526.	

 1997– 2007. Pediatrics, 124(3), 918- 925. Rauh, M. J., Koepsell, T. D., Rivara, F. P., Margherita, A. J., & Rice, S. G. (2005). Epidemiology of musculoskeletal injuries among high school cross- country runners. American Journal of Epidemiology, 163(2), 151- 159. Taunton, J. E., Ryan, M. B., Clement, D. B., McKenzie, D. C., Lloyd-Smith, D. R., & Zumbo, B. D. (2002). A retrospective case-control analysis of 2002 running injuries. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 36(2), 95- 101. 	 weight-bearing activities: A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Gait &</i> <i>Posture</i>, <i>49</i>, 315-328. Dowling, G. J., Murley, G. S., Munteanu, S. E., Smith, M. M. F., Neal, B. S., Griffiths, I. B., & Collins, N. J. (2014). Dynamic foot function as a risk factor for lower limb overuse injury: A systematic review. <i>Journal of Foot and</i> <i>Ankle Research</i>, <i>7</i>(1), 53. Dutton, R. A., Khadavi, M. J., & Fredericson, M. (2016). Patellofemoral pain. <i>Physical Medicine and</i> <i>Rehabilitation Clinics of North</i> <i>America</i>, <i>27</i>(1), 31–52. Ferber, R., Hreljac, A., & Kendall, K. D. (2009). Suspected mechanisms in the cause of overuse running injuries: A clinical review. <i>Sports Health</i>, <i>1</i>(3), 242-246. Ferber, R., Noehren, B., Hamill, J., & Davis, I. (2010). Competitive female runners with a history of iliotibial band syndrome demonstrate atypical hip and knee kinematics. <i>Journal of</i> <i>Orthopaedic & Sports Physical</i> <i>Therapy</i>, <i>40</i>(2), 52-58. Gijon-Nogueron, G., & Fernandez- Villarejo, M. (2015). Risk factors and protective factors for lower-extremity running injuries: A systematic review. <i>Journal of the American</i> <i>Podiatric Medical Association</i>, <i>105</i>(6), 	Athletic Training, 50(4), 366- 377. Malisoux, L., Ramesh, J., Mann, R., Seil, R., Urhausen, A., & Theisen, D. (2015). Can parallel use of different running shoes decrease running-related injury risk? <i>Scandinavian Journal of</i> <i>Medicine & Science in</i> <i>Sports, 25</i> (1), 110-115. Napier, C., Cochrane, C. K., Taunton, J. E., & Hunt, M. A. (2015). Gait modifications to change lower extremity gait biomechanics in runners: a systematic review <i>British</i> <i>Journal of Sports</i> <i>Medicine, 49</i> (21), 1382-1388. Neal, B. S., Barton, C. J., Gallie, R., O'Halloran, P., & Morrissey, D. (2016). Runners with patellofemoral pain have altered biomechanics which targeted interventions can modify: a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Gait &</i> <i>Posture, 45,</i> 69-82. Schubert, A. G., Kempf, J., & Heiderscheit, B. C. (2014). Influence of stride frequency and length on running mechanics: A systematic review. <i>Sports Health 6</i> (3)	Napier, C., Cochrane, C. K., Taunton, J. E., & Hunt, M. A. (2015). Gait modifications to change lower extremity gait biomechanics in runners: a systematic review. <i>British</i> <i>Journal of Sports Medicine</i> , <i>49</i> (21), 1382-1388.	
	-	u		

1			
	Hamstra-Wright, K. L., Bliven, K. C. H., & Bay, C. (2015). Risk factors for medial tibial stress syndrome in physically active individuals such as runners and military personnel: A systematic review and meta- analysis. <i>British Journal of Sports</i> <i>Medicine, 49</i> (6), 362-369.	van der Heijden, R. A., Lankhorst, N., Van Linschoten, R., Bierma-Zeinstra, S. M., & van Middelkoop, M. (2013). Exercise for treating patellofemoral pain syndrome. <i>Cochrane Database</i> <i>of Systematic Reviews, 2</i> .	
	Lorimer, A. V., & Hume, P. A. (2014). Achilles tendon injury risk factors associated with running. <i>Sports</i> <i>Medicine</i> , <i>44</i> (10), 1459-1472. Lorimer, A. V., & Hume, P. A. (2016). Stiffness as a risk factor for Achilles tendon injury in running athletes. <i>Sports Medicine</i> , <i>46</i> (12), 1921-1938.	Vincent, H. K., & Vincent, K. R. (2013). Considerations for initiating and progressing running programs in obese individuals. <i>Journal of the</i> <i>American Academy of Physical</i> <i>Medicine and</i> <i>Rehabilitation</i> , 5(6), 513-519.	
	Malisoux, L., Ramesh, J., Mann, R., Seil, R., Urhausen, A., & Theisen, D. (2015). Can parallel use of different running shoes decrease running- related injury risk? <i>Scandinavian</i> <i>Journal of Medicine & Science in</i> <i>Sports, 25</i> (1), 110-115.		
	Mucha, M. D., Caldwell, W., Schlueter, E. L., Walters, C., & Hassen, A. (2017). Hip abductor strength and lower extremity running related injury in distance runners: A systematic review. <i>Journal of Science and</i> <i>Medicine in Sport, 20</i> (4), 349-355.		
	Neal, B. S., Barton, C. J., Gallie, R., O'Halloran, P., & Morrissey, D. (2016). Runners with patellofemoral pain have altered biomechanics which		

		1
targeted interventions can modif	: A	
systematic review and meta- analysis. <i>Gait & Posture, 45,</i> 69-8.		
analysis. Guit & Posture, 45, 69-6.		
Nielsen, R. O., Buist, I., Sørensen,	ł. <i>,</i>	
Lind, M., & Rasmussen, S. (2012).		
Training errors and running relate		
injuries: a systematic review. <i>International Journal of S</i>	orts	
Physical Therapy, 7(1), 58.		
Ryan, M., Elashi, M., Newsham-W		
R., & Taunton, J. (2013). Examinir injury risk and pain perception in		
runners using minimalist		
footwear. British Journal of Sport		
Medicine, bjsports-2012.		
Ryan, M., Elashi, M., Taunton, J.,		
Koehl, M. (2014). Is gender a risk		
factor for injury in runners? The f	st	
of a three part series to develop a		
gender targeted injury prevention		
strategy. Journal of Science and		
Medicine in Sport, 18, e72-e73.		
Ryan, M., Grau, S., Krauss, I., Mai	vald,	
C., Taunton, J., & Horstmann, T.		
(2009). Kinematic analysis of run	ers	
with achilles mid-portion tendinopathy. <i>Foot & Ankle</i>		
International, 30(12), 1190-1195.		
Tenforde, A. S., Kraus, E., & Erodoriscon, M. (2016), Pono stro		
Fredericson, M. (2016). Bone stre injuries in runners. <i>Physical Medi</i>		
and Rehabilitation Clinics, 27(1),		
149.		
van der Worp, M. P., Ten Haaf, D.	s	
van Cingel, R., de Wijer, A., Nijhui		
van einger, n., de vrijer, A., Nijha		

() S S	der Sanden, M. W., & Staal, J. B. (2015). Injuries in runners: A systematic review on risk factors and sex differences. <i>PLoS One, 10</i> (2), e0114937.		
N V II r	Van der Worp, M. P., van der Horst, N., de Wijer, A., Backx, F. J., & Nijhuis- van der Sanden, M. W. (2012). liotibial band syndrome in runners. <i>Sports Medicine, 42</i> (11), 969- 992.		
С р о	Vincent, H. K., & Vincent, K. R. (2013). Considerations for initiating and progressing running programs in obese individuals. <i>PM&R, 5</i> (6), 513- 519.		
Γ p r	Warden, S. J., Burr, D. B., & Brukner, P. D. (2006). Stress fractures: bathophysiology, epidemiology, and risk factors. <i>Current Osteoporosis</i> <i>Reports</i> , <i>4</i> (3), 103-109.		

Review of Sport Injury Burden, Risk Factors and Prevention

Running

Incidence and Prevalence

The incidence of lower extremity running-related injuries has been reported to be between 19.4 and 79.3% of all runners (van Gent et al., 2007), and the most common site of running-related injuries are the knee (42.1% of all injuries), foot/ankle (16.9%), lower leg (12.8%), hip/pelvis (10.9%), achilles/calf (6.4%), upper leg (5.2%), and lower back (3.4%) (Taunton et al., 2002). More specifically, the top five most common overuse running-related injuries are patellofemoral pain syndrome, iliotibial band syndrome, plantar fasciitis, meniscal injuries, and tibial stress syndrome (Taunton et al., 2002). The aforementioned large range of incidence for running-related injuries in the general running population likely depends on how a runningrelated injury is defined and which population of runners is explored.

When comparing the number of running-related injuries between different types of runners, it is important to standardize the amount of time spent running. Specifically, running-related injuries per 1,000 hours of running is a common way to standardize the risk of injury for different types of runners. Based on this measurement, novice runners are at the highest risk of injury with 17.8 injuries per 1,000 hours of running [95% CI: 16.7, 19.1], followed by cross-country runners at 16.3 injuries per 1,000 hours of running [12.2, 31.3], recreational runners with 7.7 injuries per 1,000 hours of running [6.9, 8.7], and ultramarathon runners with 7.2 injuries per 1,000 hours of running [5.5, 8.8] (Videbaek, Bueno, Nielsen, & Rasmussen, 2015).

Although a consensus definition for running-related injuries has only been recently developed by Yamato, Saragiotto, and Lopes (2015) to help increase the consistency in running injury research, pooled injury proportions from previous studies have also been found for different, homogeneous populations of runners with different lengths of follow-up.

For novice runners (i.e., runners with no regular running experience within the previous year), the pooled injury proportion (% [95% CI]) for a short follow-up period (6-15 weeks) is 26.4% [14.2, 43.7], during a one-year follow up is 27.3% [24.5, 30.3], and long-term follow-up (greater than 1 year) is 84.9% [74.8,91.5]. The most common injury site for novice runners is the lower leg (34.7% of injuries), followed by the knee (30.6%), hip/pelvis (10.2%), ankle (8.2%), upper leg (5.5%) and foot (3.5%) (Kluitenberg et al., 2015).

For recreational runners (i.e., non-competitive runners or runners participating in road races shorter than 10km), a similar trend shows that 28% [23.1, 33.5] of runners will experience time-loss injuries (i.e., injury that hampered training for at least one day) with a short follow-up (6-15 weeks), then increase to 55% [48.1, 61.8] at a one year follow up. The most common injury site for recreational runners is the knee (26.3% of injuries), followed by the lower leg (22.4%), foot (10.1%), hip/pelvis (8.4%), ankle (7.8%), and upper leg (7.3%) (Kluitenberg et al., 2015)

A reported 19.7% [10.9, 33.1] of cross-country runners (i.e., runners competing in crosscountry races) will experience a time-loss injury within a short follow-up period, and 77.4% [60.6, 88.4] of these runners will experience a time-loss injury within a long follow-up period. The most common injury site for cross-country runners is the lower leg (30.3% of injuries), knee (22.5%), ankle (16.2%), upper leg (9.0%), foot (8.1%), and hip/pelvis (5.7%) (Kluitenberg et al., 2015).

For marathon runners (i.e., runners competing in a marathon), it is reported that 64.7% [24.6, 91.2] will experience a running-related time-loss injury within a short follow-up period. With longer follow-up periods, the rate decreases to 31.3% [28.8, 33.9]. The most common injury site for marathon runners is the lower leg (not including the knee or ankle joints) (29.9% of injuries), followed by the knee (26.6%), foot (13.1%), hip/pelvis (9.4%), upper leg (i.e., the thigh) (8.7%) and ankle (7.9%) (Kluitenberg et al., 2015).

When exploring specific types of track athletes with a one-year follow-up period, 63.8% [56.0, 70.5], 63.9% [41.4, 81.6], and 31.7% [25.8, 38.2] of sprinters, middle-distance, and long-distance runners, respectively, will experience a time-loss running-related injury. Injury sites have only been reported for sprinters, and the data suggest sprinters experience the highest proportion of injuries in the upper leg (32.9%), followed by the knee (30.6%), hip/pelvis (10.5%), foot (4.0%), and lower leg (3.4%) (Kluitenberg et al., 2015).

Finally, 64.6% [61.9, 67.2] of ultramarathon runners (i.e., runners competing in races longer than a marathon) will experience a time-loss running injury within one year (Kluitenberg et al., 2015). Site-specific injuries have rarely been reported in ultramarathon runners; therefore, pooled statistics were not further analyzed for this running subgroup.

Risk and Protective Factors

The etiology of running-related injuries is multifactorial, with both modifiable and nonmodifiable risk and protective factors that may increase or decrease the risk of running-related injuries. These risk and protective factors can be clustered into four main domains: (1) personal factors, (2) running biomechanics, (3) training factors, and (4) health and lifestyle related factors, which can be understood for running-related injuries in general or site-specific injuries (Gijonnogueron & Fernandez-villarejo, 2015; van Der Worp et al., 2015).

General Running-Related Injuries

Personal Factors. Personal risk factors are considered non-modifiable, and for general running-related injuries, the personal risk factors include: advanced age, leg length difference, male height greater than 1.70m, and a genu varum alignment (Gijon-nogueron & Fernandez-villarejo, 2015; van Der Worp et al., 2015). Although the incidence rate between males and females for running-related injuries (RRIs) is not significantly different, prospective research has shown that females have a lower injury rate than males (4.46 vs 6.86 RRIs/1000 training session, respectively), resulting in a relative risk ratio of 0.67 [95% CI: 0.32-1.40] (M Ryan et al., 2014).

Running Biomechanics. Modifiable risk factors associated with running biomechanics include: a navicular drop greater than 10mm during the stance phase of running, increased pronation excursion, increased reinversion velocity, wide internal rotation range and peak tibial acceleration, greater lateral or medial directed centre of pressure during running, and increased or decreased pressure-related outcomes in the fifth metatarsal region (Dowling et al., 2014; Gijon-nogueron & Fernandez-villarejo, 2015; van Der Worp et al., 2015). Since gait modification for running retraining has demonstrated positive outcomes for biomechanical risk factors associated with running-related injuries (Barton et al., 2016), all running biomechanics-related risk factors can be considered modifiable.

Training Factors. With respect to training factors, runners are generally at an increased risk of injury with a progressive increase in weekly running mileage greater than 10% per week, running six or more times per week, consistently running on a hard surface, experiencing high levels of muscle fatigue and improper recovery regimens, and wearing shoe inserts or orthotics (van Der Worp et al., 2015). Also, the use of minimalist footwear may increase the risk of experiencing a running-related injury, as compared with more neutral footwear (Ryan, Elashi, Newsham-West, & Taunton, 2014). Finally, hip muscle weakness can lead to significantly lower hip stabilization during running, which can increase the likelihood of overuse running-related injuries (Ferber, Hreljac, & Kendall, 2009)

Health and Lifestyle. Previous lower limb injury has been suggested to be a strong nonmodifiable risk factor for lower-limb running-related injuries (Hulme, Nielsen, Timpka, Verhagen, & Finch, 2017; Saragiotto et al., 2014b; Taunton et al., 2003; van Der Worp et al., 2015), where research demonstrates half of runners reporting a running-related injury had previously sustained an injury to the same anatomical area (Taunton et al., 2003). Modifiable health and lifestyle related factors associated with running-related injuries include: incomplete rehabilitation from a prior injury (42% of runners who had a previous injury and sustained another injury declared themselves as not 100% rehabilitated) (Taunton et al., 2003), higher body mass index, tobacco use, and increased alcohol intake (Hulme et al., 2017; Saragiotto et al., 2014b; Taunton et al., 2003; van Der Worp et al., 2015).

Protective Factors. The alternatives to the aforementioned modifiable risk factors may be considered protective factors within their respective domain. Nevertheless, research suggests some specific protective factors that a runner may consider during their training. These include increasing and improving experience level in running, improvements in strength (concentric and eccentric) and muscle tuning of the gluteal and quadriceps muscles, modifying the sole of the shoe to improve ankle internal plantarflexion moment, and running on a more elastic running surface (Gijon-nogueron & Fernandez-villarejo, 2015). Furthermore, it has been suggested that the concomitant use of multiple pairs of running shoes during a training program can help protect against running-related injuries (Malisoux et al., 2015).

Site-Specific Injuries

Considering site-specific time-loss injuries vary between different types of runners based on training history, running experience, and distance, it is important to understand modifiable and non-modifiable risk and protective factors for site-specific injuries to educate those more prone to specific running-related injuries.

Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome

Patellofemoral pain syndrome is the most common running-related injury at the knee joint, especially in recreational runners. There are various modifiable risk factors associated with patellofemoral pain syndrome for running biomechanics and training.

Training Factors. Modifiable risk factors associated with training include an increase in weekly running distance greater than 30% over a two-week period, quadriceps weakness, delayed quadriceps and gluteus medius muscle activation, inflexibility in the quadriceps and hamstring muscles, hip abduction weakness, and lower hip external rotation weakness (Barton, Lack, Malliaras, & Morrissey, 2013; Dutton, Khadavi, & Fredericson, 2016; Lankhorst, A Bierma-Zeinstra, & Middelkoop, 2013; Oser, Oser, & Silvis, 2013).

Running Biomechanics. With respect to running biomechanics, studies suggest greater knee abduction in women and greater peak force in the second and third metatarsal region during the stance phase of running to be modifiable risk factors (Cronstrom et al., 2016; Dowling et al., 2014).

Iliotibial Band Syndrome

Personal Factors. For iliotibial band syndrome, non-modifiable personal risk factors include leg length discrepancy, genu varum, and high arched feet (van der Worp et al., 2012).

Training Factors. Other modifiable risk factors associated with iliotibial band syndrome include hip abductor weakness, excessive running mileage, a sudden increase in running mileage, minimal running experience, and hip inflexibility (Mucha et al., 2016; Oser et al., 2013; van der Worp et al., 2012). Consequently, some modifiable protective factors would include improved hip abductor strength, proper training, and greater hip flexibility (van der Worp et al., 2012).

Running Biomechanics. Some modifiable risk factors associated with running biomechanics may include an increased peak knee internal rotation during stance (mean difference range of 0.70-3.88 degrees greater than control), increased peak trunk ipsilateral flexion during stance (mean difference range of 0.3-2.30 degrees greater than control), increased peak hip adduction during stance (mean difference range of 2.47-3.50 degrees greater than control), and increased peak knee internal rotation during stance (mean difference range of 2.89-3.88 degrees greater than control) (Aderem & Louw, 2015; Ferber, Cat, Noehren, Hamill, & Davis, 2010). To prevent iliotibial band syndrome, one protective factor includes a mid- to fore-foot strike pattern during running to improve form and running biomechanics. This will result in

greater knee flexion at contact and shorter stride lengths, which reduces the load at the hip and knee (Almeida et al., 2015; Hall et al., 2013).

Lower Leg Injuries (e.g., Medial Tibial Stress Syndrome):

Personal Factors. A greater Q-angle and previous injury is a non-modifiable personal risk factor that has been related to lower leg injuries in running (Hamstra-Wright et al., 2015; Oser et al., 2013; Reinking, Austin, Richter, & Krieger, 2016).

Training Factors. Modifiable risk factors associated with training can include running greater than 40-64 km per week, running barefoot, and running on uneven surfaces (Hamstra-Wright et al., 2015; Reinking et al., 2016).

Running Biomechanics. Modifiable factors associated with running biomechanics include an imbalance of foot pressure, excessive foot pronation, a significantly greater navicular drop by 1.19 degrees [95% CI 0.54 to 1.84], greater plantarflexion range of motion by 5.94 degrees [95% CI 3.65 to 8.24], and greater hip external rotation range of motion of 3.95 degrees [95% CI 1.78 to 6.13]) compared to healthy controls (Hamstra-Wright et al., 2015)

Health and Lifestyle Factors. Modifiable health and lifestyle factors for lower leg injuries can include a significantly greater body mass index (Oser et al., 2013).

Achilles Tendon Injuries

Personal Factors. Older age is a non-modifiable personal risk factor associated with Achilles tendinopathy (van Der Worp et al., 2015).

Training Factors. Finally, more compliant surfaces – sand or track – are considered modifiable risk factors for Achilles tendinopathy, which means running on stiffer surfaces is considered a protective risk factor (Lorimer & Hume, 2014, 2016; Tenforde & Hunt, 2016).

Running Biomechanics. Some biomechanical modifiable risk factors include greater ankle eversion displacement during stance, a greater peak breaking force in running and a more plantarflexed foot at initial contact (Lorimer & Hume, 2014, 2016; Ryan et al., 2009).

Plantar Fasciitis

Plantar fasciitis is also a very common running-related injury, and some of the most common modifiable risk factors reported in the literature are an increased BMI (>30 kg/m² = an odds ratio of 5.6 [1.9-16.6] compared to a BMI < 25 kg/m²), limited dorsiflexion flexibility, hamstring tightness, inappropriate footwear, and rapid increases in training load (Beeson, 2014). These risk factors, combined with poor running biomechanics (e.g., greater peak rearfoot eversion during stance), will generate an unhealthy mechanical overload that results in a degenerative process of microtears in the plantar fascia (Beeson, 2014).

Bone Stress Injuries

Personal Factors. For bone stress injuries, non-modifiable personal risk factors include being of the female sex, genetics, female athlete triad, and leg length discrepancy (Tenforde et al., 2016).

Training Factors. The modifiable risk factors for training include weekly running in excess of 32km and using the same running shoes for more than 6 months (Tenforde et al., 2016).

Running Biomechanics. Modifiable running biomechanics risk factors associated with bone stress injuries include higher peak hip adduction, greater knee internal rotation, greater knee abduction, greater tibial rotation, and greater rearfoot eversion (Warden, Davis, & Fredericson, 2014).

Health and Lifestyle Factors. Finally, the modifiable health and lifestyle related factors include using certain medications (i.e., anticonvulsants, steroids, antidepressants, and antacids), insufficient calcium and vitamin D intake, prior fracture, and low bone mass density (Oser et al., 2013; Tenforde et al., 2016).

Although there has been extensive research on the risk and protective factors of runningrelated injuries, these studies have often been cross-sectional in nature. Specifically, the majority of these studies have studied runners who have already experienced a running-related injury, and researchers have made evidence informed decisions about which characteristics these individuals may have or have had that increased their likelihood of injury. Studies are beginning to explore running-related injuries in prospective longitudinal studies to fully understand the risk factors leading up to certain types of injuries as well as protective factors that may prevent running-related injuries.

Opportunities for Prevention: Effective Interventions, Cost-Effectiveness, Implementation and Evaluation

Despite extensive research in understanding the incidence, prevalence, and risk factors with running-related injuries, there is a lack of effective long-term prevention strategies (Barton et al., 2016).

Nevertheless, based on the risk factors associated with running-related injuries, researchers and clinicians have developed some evidence-informed strategies to prevent or minimize the risk of running injuries, particularly for new or novice runners. Considering novice runners are at an increased risk of injury compared with other running subgroups, this is likely due to inappropriate preparation and training for a new running program. Novice runners need appropriate strategies for start-to-run programs, and this has been discussed in the literature. Training is a modifiable factor, so implementing evidence-informed training methods at the beginning of the running program is not only important to prevent running-related injuries at the beginning of a program, but early implementation will help the novice runner get in a healthy routine as they progressively continue their training over longer periods of time. There are various ways in which a running program can be developed, and it should very much be individualized for the runner. There are some general guidelines, however, to help novice runners begin their program and avoid injury.

'Start to Run' Training Program

First, a gradual transition into running from other low-impact activity would minimize the risk for musculoskeletal injury (Vincent & Vincent, 2013). For example, a new runner can gradually transition from incline walking to a slow jog, or gradually increase the walking speed for each training session (treadmill or overground) until a threshold is reached at which running is more comfortable (Vincent & Vincent, 2013). Also, strength and flexibility exercises are important for the musculoskeletal system to positively adapt to the increased physical load of running. Specifically, hip and knee exercises related to strength and flexibility may be used as a preventative measure for running-related injuries since these exercises have been shown to reduce pain for those with patellofemoral pain (Bolgla, Earl-Boehm, Emery, Hamstra-Wright, & Ferber, 2016; Reed Ferber et al., 2015; Neal et al., 2016; van der Heijden et al., 2015).

Secondly, rapid increases in running intensity and/or mileage is considered a significant risk factor for running-related injuries (Gijon-nogueron & Fernandez-villarejo, 2015; van Der Worp et al., 2015). Therefore, regardless of running experience, a runner should increase the mileage or intensity in a stepwise fashion between 5-10% at each training session (Vincent & Vincent, 2013). This relative increase will permit the musculoskeletal tissues to rest and avoid mechanical failure while still allowing the runner to improve their health status with increased intensity and volume.

Thirdly, it has been suggested that runners using more than one pair of running shoes concomitantly during their training programs have a significantly lower risk of running-related injuries (Malisoux et al., 2015). Wearing more than one pair of running shoes will increase the amount of variability in physical load on the musculoskeletal system and minimizes excessive force to one anatomical landmark, thus reducing the likelihood of injury (Malisoux et al., 2015). There is not enough evidence to make clinically relevant conclusions for barefoot vs. shod running. However, certain biomechanical differences are observed with running barefoot, such as less vertical ground reaction forces, less knee extension moment, less dorsiflexion at ground contact, less ground contact time, shorter stride length, increased stride frequency, and increased knee flexion at contact (Perkins et al., 2014), which have been considered protective factors for running-related injuries. These biomechanical adaptations may also indicate that that certain injury patterns (iliotibial band syndrome, patellofemoral pain, gluteal/hamstring strain and tendinitis, and plantar fasciitis) may benefit from barefoot running, whereas Achilles tendinitis and calf injuries may benefit from shod running (Hollander et al., 2016). In sum, it appears that runners should alternate between different types of running shoes during their running program.

Finally, listening to the body with biofeedback is important for runners to understand their body's reaction to the running programs. Runners can use the onset of pain or symptoms as a guide for participating in or restraining from running and engaging in the next training session. Although muscle soreness is expected with a big change in running duration or intensity, pain that increases during running or walking sessions should be avoided. If the pain increases during the activity, then the activity should be reduced or stopped (Vincent & Vincent, 2013). Any joint pain should not persist or increase 24 hours after exercise, and if it does, this indicates that the musculoskeletal system is not prepared for the previous chosen running volume. In the beginning stages of the running program, running on non-consecutive days permits the musculoskeletal system to recover appropriately and allows the runner to complete a self-assessment of his or her exercise response to the current training load (Vincent & Vincent, 2013).

Gait Manipulation and Running Retraining

Evidence exists to support running retraining for the treatment of exertional lower leg pain and patellofemoral pain. Specifically, this running retraining consists of transitioning from a rearfoot to forefoot or midfoot strike pattern, combined with an increased step rate and alterations in proximal mechanics to facilitate hip flexion (Barton et al., 2016). However, there is little prospective research on how gait training/retraining can prevent injuries longitudinally (Barton et al., 2016). Running retraining may play a role in injury prevention, but minimal evidence to guide implementation exists. Nevertheless, there is substantial evidence for the immediate biomechanical effects of running retraining interventions in uninjured populations, and this delivers some evidence to suggest the positive effects of running training and retraining. Running training and retraining are based on evidence-informed decisions to place the body in a better position during running in order to reduce the physical load on the musculoskeletal system. For example, greater step length and ground contact time have been associated with novice runners, and may be associated with the increase in incidence of running-related injuries in this running subgroup (Edwards, Taylor, Rudolphi, Gillette, & Derrick, 2009; Napier et al., 2015). Therefore, addressing these factors may help minimize the risk of injury.

For reducing the risk of general running injuries, addressing the presence of 'overstriding' is considered one of the most beneficial biomechanical strategies for running. The term 'overstriding' refers to the distance between the leading foot at initial contact and the centre of mass. Improving 'overstriding' is important for decreasing the incidence of running-related injuries, as it will decrease peak tibial acceleration and impact attenuation (Schubert et al., 2014), and this can be achieved from a few different strategies. An increase in step rate or cadence will increase knee flexion at initial contact and move the foot strike closer to the centre of mass, thus reducing 'overstriding' (Napier et al., 2015). Similar to any training intervention associated with running, a gradual increase in step rate over time is suggested to ensure manageable changes and avoid excessive fatigue and strain on the musculoskeletal system. A 5-10% gradual stepwise increase in cadence has been suggested to be a healthy intervention strategy to reduce 'overstriding'.

The effects of increased cadence also impact the biomechanics of other areas of the body, which can minimize physical load in certain areas. For example, an increased step frequency increases peak knee flexion during stance, which increases leg stiffness and reduces the risk of overuse running-related injuries (Napier et al., 2015). Additionally, an increased step rate can increase gluteus maximus and gluteus medius activity, which may help anterior knee pain (Hall et al., 2013). Also, less peak hip flexion and adduction during loading has been associated with an increase in step rate (Napier et al., 2015). Step rate is also associated with a decrease in ground contact time, leg length compression, braking impulse, and vertical centre of mass excursion, or vertical oscillation (Heiderscheit, Chumanov, Michalski, Wille, & Ryan, 2012; Lieberman, Warrener, Wang, & Castillo, 2015; Morin, Samozino, Zameziati, & Belli, 2007), and can lead to a "smoother" and "safer" running style during prolonged running(Morin, Samozino, & Millet, 2011).

The use of augmented feedback for healthy populations demonstrates the clinical feasibility of gait training and retraining. With step rate manipulation, the runner can monitor their changes using commercial-based wearable technology. Other strategies and tools that may be important for gait manipulation to help reduce the risk of injury are more feasible in the clinic. For example, 2D video analysis, 3D motion capture, and mirror-based systems with augmented feedback enable the runner to position their body in a more correct position in real-time to reduce the physical load during running (Agresta & Brown, 2015). Although there are many biomechanical risk factors associated with various running-related injuries, increased hip adduction seems to be a common risk factor for multiple running-related injuries. Therefore, researchers and clinicians have suggested that direct manipulation of the hip adduction angle or an increase in step width with augmented feedback is an effective intervention to re-position the thigh and hip angle during running. Specifically, there is evidence to support a decrease in hip adduction angle with gait retraining reduces the vertical impact peak while running, which may reduce the risk of running-related injuries (Agresta & Brown, 2015; Napier et al., 2015). Although there is no evidence to support long-term injury rates in runners that have changed their running patterns to alter their running biomechanics, studies indicate augmented feedback is effective in reducing the magnitude of ground reaction forces, vertical instantaneous rate, vertical average loading rate, and vertical impact peak (Napier et al., 2015) – all of which have been associated with injuries including tibial stress fractures, plantar fasciitis, and medial tibial stress syndrome.

Since there are risk and protective factors for site-specific injuries, researchers have also suggested certain strategies for gait manipulation (i.e., running gait training and retraining) to reduce the risk of specific running-related injuries. For example, limited evidence suggests visual and verbal feedback to reduce peak hip adduction angle during stance is an effective strategy to minimize patellofemoral pain (Neal et al., 2016). Reducing 'overstriding' with an increase in step rate is also suggested help with patellofemoral pain syndrome (Neal et al., 2016). Very limited to limited evidence suggests an increase in step width helps with cross-over gait (i.e., increased hip adduction at foot strike), which also reduces the strain and strain rate on the iliotibial bad and helps reduce the risk of iliotibial band syndrome. There is general support in the research community that hamstring injuries can be reduced or possibly prevented with a greater anterior

pelvic tilt, greater hip and knee flexion during swing, and, once again, increase in step rate and reduced 'overstriding'.

Limited evidence suggests a mid- to fore-foot strike pattern along with an increase in step rate can help manage anterior exertional lower leg pain (Almeida et al., 2015; Hall et al., 2013). Therefore, these same biomechanical strategies can potentially decrease the risk or prevent anterior exertional leg pain. On the contrary, a more mid- to fore-foot strike pattern is considered a risk factor for Achilles tendinopathy and calf strains. Therefore, transitioning into a different foot strike may alleviate pain for one area, but increase the risk of running-related injuries in another anatomical location. Perhaps a mid-foot strike, as opposed to extreme rearand fore-foot strike patterns, may help decrease the risk of general injuries. However, the literature suggests that changing foot strike patterns does not eliminate impact at the footground contact and does not reduce the risk of running-related injuries (Hamill & Gruber, 2017). More prospective, longitudinal research is evidently needed to study the effects of different foot strikes on site-specific running-related injuries.

Gait training- and retraining appears to be a positive intervention for running injury prevention, but there are some barriers that may limit the runner's investment in the intervention. For example, in the early stages of gait retraining, runners may experience some pain and irritability with the changes. Depending on the individual, the runner's muscle function capacity, joint flexibility, and skeletal structure may limit the amount of change he or she can do. Consequently, the more barriers to overcome for running gait training, the higher the associated costs of long-term, gradual gait retraining. Undertaking gait retraining on a treadmill is practically easier than overground running since the set-up is more controlled and the runner can take significantly more steps in a small space with an observer helping with augmented feedback. However, applying the new gait strategies to overground running surfaces may be an additional barrier if all the training was done on a treadmill. Also, treadmills can be quite expensive, which are often bound to a gym, clinic, or laboratory.

For augmented feedback using 3D motion capture systems, the cost of equipment is also very expensive. Nevertheless, 2D video camera systems and mirror-based equipment set-up are feasible for clinical environments to implement augmented feedback in running gait training and retraining. Also, wearable technology is relatively inexpensive, and provides the runner with feedback on certain metrics (e.g., step rate and vertical oscillation) that may help the runner monitor their changes in running patterns over time. For example, the Lumo Run[®] is a thumb-sized sensor that clips onto the lower body garments and measures movement near the centre of mass. The device provides metrics related to running form – cadence, bounce (vertical oscillation), braking, pelvic drop, and pelvic rotation – based on scientific literature to better quantify a runner's gait pattern that may help with performance and injury (Heiderscheit et al., 2012; Moore, 2016; Morin et al., 2007; Schache, Bennell, Blanch, & Wrigley, 1999; Willy, Scholz, & Davis, 2012). The Lumo Run[®] app also delivers a coaching process that recommends pre- and post-run exercises based on the output to help improve running form.

There is a lack of evidence-based, longitudinal and prospective evidence to support the implementation of these intervention strategies to actually prevent running-related injuries. Future studies should include longer follow-up measurements to assess the long-term retention of biomechanical changes associated with running gait training and retraining, and see whether this has an effect on the reduction and/or prevention of injury (Napier et al., 2015). Until a high quality randomized controlled trial is done to quantify the outcomes of these interventions on injury risk, these guides for implementation are all evidence-informed strategies. Therefore, future studies need to explore how these intervention strategies affect injury risk, as well as determine the proper prescription for these intervention strategies in the clinic (i.e., number and duration of intervention sessions) and/or at home for the runner with proper equipment (Agresta & Brown, 2015).

References

- Aderem, J., & Louw, Q. A. (2015). Biomechanical risk factors associated with iliotibial band syndrome in runners: a systematic review. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*, 16, 356. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12891-015-0808-7
- Agresta, C., & Brown, A. (2015). Gait retraining for injured and healthy runners using augmented feedback: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*, 45(8), 576–584. https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2015.5823
- Almeida, M. O., Davis, I. S., & Lopes, A. D. (2015). Biomechanical differences of foot strike patterns during running: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *The Journal of Orthopaedic* and Sports Physical Therapy, 45(10), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2015.6019
- Barton, C., Bonanno, D., Carr, J., Neal, B. S., Malliaras, P., Franklyn-Miller, A., & Menz, H. B. (2016). Running retraining to treat lower limb injuries: A mixed-methods study of current evidence synthesised with expert opinion. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *50*(9), 513–526. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-095278
- Barton, C. J., Lack, S., Malliaras, P., & Morrissey, D. (2013). Gluteal muscle activity and patellofemoral pain syndrome: A systematic review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 47(4), 207–214. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2012-090953
- Beeson, P. (2014). Plantar fasciopathy: Revisiting the risk factors. *Foot and Ankle Surgery*, *20*(3), 160–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fas.2014.03.003
- Bolgla, L. A., Earl-Boehm, J., Emery, C., Hamstra-Wright, K., & Ferber, R. (2016). Pain, function, and strength outcomes for males and females with patellofemoral pain who participate in either a hip/core- or knee-based rehabilitation program. *International Journal of Sports Physical Therapy*, 11(6), 926–935. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27904794%5Cnhttp://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/ articlerender.fcgi?artid=PMC5095944
- Buist, I., Bredeweg, S. W., Lemmink, K. A. P. M., van Mechelen, W., & Diercks, R. L. (2010).
 Predictors of Running-Related Injuries in Novice Runners Enrolled in a Systematic Training
 Program: A Prospective Cohort Study. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, *38*(2), 273–280. https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546509347985
- Cronstrom, A., Creaby, M. W., Nae, J., & Ageberg, E. (2016). Gender differences in knee abduction during weight-bearing activities: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gait and Posture*, 49, 315–328. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2016.07.107
- Dowling, G., Murley, G. S., Munteanu, S. E., Franettovich Smith, M. M., Neal, B. S., Griffiths, I. B., ... Collins, N. J. (2014). Dynamic foot function as a risk factor for lower limb overuse injury: A systematic review. *Journal of Foot and Ankle Research*, 7(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13047-014-0053-6

Dutton, R. A., Khadavi, M. J., & Fredericson, M. (2016). Patellofemoral Pain. Physical Medicine

and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America, 27(1), 31–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmr.2015.08.002

- Edwards, B. W., Taylor, D., Rudolphi, T. J., Gillette, J. C., & Derrick, T. R. (2009). Effects of stride Length and Running Mileage on a Probabilistic Stress Fracture Model. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 41(12), 2177–2184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2010.01.001
- Ferber, R., Bolgla, L., Earl-Boehm, J. E., Emery, C., & Hamstra-Wright, K. (2015). Strengthening of the hip and core versus knee muscles for the treatment of patellofemoral pain: A multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Athletic Training*, *50*(4), 366–377. https://doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-49.3.70
- Ferber, R., Hreljac, a., & Kendall, K. D. (2009). Suspected mechanisms in the cause of overuse running injuries: A clinical review. *Sports Health: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, 1(3), 242– 246. https://doi.org/10.1177/1941738109334272
- Ferber, R., Noehren, A. T. C. B., Hamill, J., & Davis, P. I. (2010). Competitive female runners with a history of iliotibial band syndrome demonstrate atypical hip and knee kinematics, 40(2). https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2010.3028
- Gijon-nogueron, G., & Fernandez-villarejo, M. (2015). Risk factors and protective factors for lower-extremity running injuries: A systematic review. *Journal of the American Podiatric Medical Association*, *105*(6), 532–540.
- Hall, J. P. L., Barton, C., Jones, P. R., & Morrissey, D. (2013). The biomechanical differences between barefoot and shod distance running: A systematic review and preliminary metaanalysis. *Sports Medicine*, *43*(12), 1335–1353. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-013-0084-3
- Hamill, J., & Gruber, A. H. (2017). Is changing footstrike pattern beneficial to runners? *Journal of Sport and Health Science*, (May). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2017.02.004
- Hamstra-Wright, K. L., Bliven, K. C. H., & Bay, C. (2015). Risk factors for medial tibial stress syndrome in physically active individuals such as runners and military personnel: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 49, 362–369. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2014-093462
- Heiderscheit, B. C., Chumanov, E. S., Michalski, M. P., Wille, C. M., & Ryan, M. B. (2012). Effects of step rate manipulation on joint mechanics during running. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 43(2), 296–302. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181ebedf4.Effects
- Hollander, K., Heidt, C., van der Zwaard, B., Braumann, K. M., & Zech, A. (2016). Long-term effects of habitual barefoot running and walking: A systematic review. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.00000000001141
- Hulme, A., Nielsen, R. O., Timpka, T., Verhagen, E., & Finch, C. (2017). Risk and protective factors for middle- and long-distance running-related injury. *Sports Medicine*, 47(5), 869–886. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-016-0636-4

- Kluitenberg, B., van Middelkoop, M., Diercks, R., & van der Worp, H. (2015). What are the differences in injury proportions between different populations of runners? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Medicine*, 1143–1161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0331-x
- Krabak, B. J., Snitily, B., & Milani, C. J. E. (2016). Running injuries during adolescence and childhood. *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America*, 27(1), 179–202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmr.2015.08.010
- Lankhorst, N. E., A Bierma-Zeinstra, S. M., & Middelkoop, M. van. (2013). Factors associated with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med*, *47*, 193–206. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2011-090369
- Lieberman, D. E., Warrener, A. G., Wang, J., & Castillo, E. R. (2015). Effects of stride frequency and foot position at landing on braking force, hip torque, impact peak force and the metabolic cost of running in humans. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 218, 3406–14. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.125500
- Lorimer, A. V., & Hume, P. A. (2014). Achilles tendon injury risk factors associated with running. *Sports Medicine*, 44(10), 1459–1472. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-014-0209-3
- Lorimer, A. V., & Hume, P. A. (2016). Stiffness as a risk factor for Achilles tendon injury in running athletes. *Sports Medicine*, *46*(12), 1921–1938. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-016-0526-9
- Malisoux, L., Ramesh, J., Mann, R., Seil, R., Urhausen, A., & Theisen, D. (2015). Can parallel use of different running shoes decrease running-related injury risk? *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, *25*(1), 110–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12154
- Moore, I. S. (2016). Is there an economical running technique? A review of modifiable biomechanical factors affecting running economy. *Sports Medicine*, *46*(6), 793–807. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-016-0474-4
- Morin, J. B., Samozino, P., & Millet, G. Y. (2011). Changes in running kinematics, kinetics, and spring-mass behavior over a 24-h run. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 43(5), 829–836. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181fec518
- Morin, J. B., Samozino, P., Zameziati, K., & Belli, A. (2007). Effects of altered stride frequency and contact time on leg-spring behavior in human running. *Journal of Biomechanics*, *40*(15), 3341–3348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2007.05.001
- Mucha, M. D., Caldwell, W., Schlueter, E. L., Walters, C., & Hassen, A. (2016). Hip abductor strength and lower extremity running related injury in distance runners: A systematic review. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 20(4), 349–355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2016.09.002
- Napier, C., Cochrane, C. K., Taunton, J. E., & Hunt, M. A. (2015). Gait modifications to change lower extremity gait biomechanics in runners: a systematic review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 49(1), 1382–1388. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2014-094393

- Neal, B. S., Barton, C. J., Gallie, R., O'Halloran, P., & Morrissey, D. (2016). Runners with patellofemoral pain have altered biomechanics which targeted interventions can modify: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gait and Posture*, 45, 69–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.11.018
- Nelson, N. G., Alhajj, M., Yard, E., Comstock, D., & McKenzie, L. B. (2009). Physical education class injuries treated in emergency departments in the US in 1997-2007. *Pediatrics*, 124(3), 918– 25. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2008-3843
- Nielsen, R. O., Buist, I., Sørensen, H., Lind, M., & Rasmussen, S. (2012). Training errors and running related injuries: A systematic review. *The International Journal of Sports Physical Therapy*, 7(1), 58–75.
- Oser, S. M., Oser, T. K., & Silvis, M. L. (2013). Evaluation and treatment of biking and running injuries. *Primary Care Clinics in Office Practice*, *40*(4), 969–986. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pop.2013.08.011
- Perkins, K. P., Hanney, W. J., & Rothschild, C. E. (2014). The risks and benefits of running barefoot or in minimalist shoes: A systematic review. *Sports Health: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, 6(6), 475–480. https://doi.org/10.1177/1941738114546846
- Rauh, M. J., Koepsell, T. D., Rivara, F. P., Margherita, A. J., & Rice, S. G. (2006). Epidemiology of musculoskeletal injuries among high school cross-country runners. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 163(2), 151–159. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwj022
- Reinking, M. F., Austin, T. M., Richter, R. R., & Krieger, M. M. (2016). Medial tibial stress syndrome in active individuals: A systematic review and meta-analysis of risk factors. *Sports Health: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, 9(3), 252-261. https://doi.org/10.1177/1941738116673299
- Ryan, M., Elashi, M., Newsham-West, R., & Taunton, J. (2014). Examining injury risk and pain perception in runners using minimalist footwear. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 48(16), 1257–1262. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2012-092061
- Ryan, M., Elashi, M., Taunton, J., & Koehl, M. (2014). Is gender a risk factor for injury in runners? The first of a three part series to develop a gender targeted injury prevention strategy. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 18*, e72–e73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2014.11.308
- Ryan, M., Grau, S., Krauss, I., Maiwald, C., Taunton, J., & Horstmann, T. (2009). Kinematic analysis of runners with achilles mid-portion tendinopathy. *Foot & Ankle International / American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society [and] Swiss Foot and Ankle Society*, 30(12), 1190–1195. https://doi.org/10.3113/FAI.2009.1190
- Saragiotto, B. T., Yamato, T. P., Hespanhol Junior, L. C., Rainbow, M. J., Davis, I. S., & Lopes, A. D. (2014a). What are the main risk factors for running-related injuries? *Sports Medicine*, 44(8), 1153–1163. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-014-0194-6

- Saragiotto, B. T., Yamato, T. P., Hespanhol Junior, L. C., Rainbow, M. J., Davis, I. S., & Lopes, A. D. (2014b). What are the main risk factors for running-related injuries? *Sports Medicine*, 44(8), 1153–1163. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-014-0194-6
- Schache, A. G., Bennell, K. L., Blanch, P. D., & Wrigley, T. V. (1999). The coordinated movement of the lumbo – pelvic – hip complex during running : A literature review. *Gait & Posture*, 10, 30–47.
- Schubert, A. G., Kempf, J., & Heiderscheit, B. C. (2014). Influence of stride frequency and length on running mechanics: A systematic review. *Sports Health*, 6(3), 210–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/1941738113508544
- Taunton, J. E., Ryan, M. B., Clement, D. B., McKenzie, D. C., Lloyd-Smith, D. R., & Zumbo, B. D. (2002). A retrospective case-control analysis of 2002 running injuries. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *36*, 95–101.
- Taunton, J. E., Ryan, M. B., Clement, D. B., McKenzie, D. C., Lloyd-Smith, D. R., & Zumbo, B. D.
 (2003). A prospective study of running injuries: the Vancouver Sun Run " In Training " clinics.
 British Journal of Sports Medicine, 37, 239–244. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.37.3.239
- Tenforde, A. S., & Hunt, K. J. (2016). Foot and ankle injuries in runners. *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America*, *27*(1), 121–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmr.2015.08.007
- Tenforde, A. S., Kraus, E., & Fredericson, M. (2016). Bone stress injuries in runners. *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America*, 27(1), 139–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmr.2015.08.008
- van der Heijden, R., Lankhorst, N., van Linschoten, R., Bierma-Zeinstra, S., & van Middelkoop, M. (2015). Exercise for treating patellofemoral pain syndrome (Protocol). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (1). https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD010387.pub2
- van Der Worp, M. P., ten Haaf, D. S. M., van Cingel, R., de Wijer, A., Nijhuis-Van Der Sanden, M. W. G., & Bart Staal, J. (2015). Injuries in runners: A systematic review on risk factors and sex differences. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(2), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0114937
- van der Worp, M. P., van der Horst, N., de Wijer, A., Backx, F. J. G., & Nijhuis-van der Sanden, M. W. G. (2012). Iliotibial band syndrome in runners. *Sports Medicine*, 42(11), 969–992. https://doi.org/10.2165/11635400-00000000-00000
- van Gent, B. R., Siem, D. D., van Middelkoop, M., van Os, T. A., Bierma-zeinstra, S. S. M. A., & Koes, B. B. W. (2007). Incidence and determinants of lower extremity running injuries in long distance runners: A systematic review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2006.033548
- Videbaek, S., Bueno, A. M., Nielsen, R. O., & Rasmussen, S. (2015). Incidence of running-related injuries per 1000 h of running in different types of runners: A systematic review and metaanalysis. *Sports Medicine*, 45(7), 1017–1026. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0333-8

- Vincent, H. K., & Vincent, K. R. (2013). Considerations for initiating and progressing running programs in obese individuals. *Journal of the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, *5*(6), 513–519. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmrj.2013.03.008
- Warden, S. J., Burr, D. B., & Brukner, P. D. (2006). Stress fractures : Pathophysiology, epidemiology, and risk factors. *Current Osteoporosis Reports*, *4*, 103–109. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11914-996-0029-y
- Warden, S. J., Davis, I. S., & Fredericson, M. (2014). Management and prevention of bone stress injuries in long-distance runners. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*, 44(10), 749–765. https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2014.5334
- Willy, R. W., Scholz, J. P., & Davis, I. S. (2012). Mirror gait retraining frot he treatment of patellofemoral pain in female runners. *Clinical Biomedical Journal*, 27(10), 1045–1051. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2012.07.011.Mirror
- Yamato, T. P., Saragiotto, B. T., & Lopes, A. D. (2015). A consensus definition of running-related injury in recreational runners: A modified Delphi approach. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*, 45(5), 375–380. https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2015.5741