Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Qipeng Song, Shandong Sport University, China

REVIEWED BY Luca Russo, University of eCampus, Italy Jia Han, Shanghai University of Medicine and Health Sciences, China

*CORRESPONDENCE Ronghua Liu, ⊠ Z2008266@shufe-zj.edu.cn

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work

RECEIVED 07 May 2024 ACCEPTED 16 August 2024 PUBLISHED 29 August 2024

CITATION

He Z, Zhu H, Ye B, Zheng Z, Liu G, Pan H and Liu R (2024) Does chronic ankle instability patients lead to changes in biomechanical parameters associated with anterior cruciate ligament injury during landing? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Physiol.* 15:1428879. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2024.1428879

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 He, Zhu, Ye, Zheng, Liu, Pan and Liu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms. Does chronic ankle instability patients lead to changes in biomechanical parameters associated with anterior cruciate ligament injury during landing? A systematic review and meta-analysis

Zhanyang He^{1†}, Houwei Zhu^{1†}, Binyong Ye¹, Zhe Zheng¹, Gongju Liu², Huiju Pan¹ and Ronghua Liu³*

¹College of Physical Education and Health Sciences, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, China, ²Scientific Research Center and Laboratory of Aquatic Sports Science of General Administration of Sports China, Zhejiang College of Sports, Hangzhou, China, ³Shanghai University of Finance and Economics Zhejiang College, Jinhua, China

Objective: This study aimed to determine if patients with chronic ankle instability (CAI) exhibit biomechanical changes associated with the increased risk of anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury during landing tasks.

Study Design: This study was conducted through systematic review and meta-analysis.

Data Sources: Searches were conducted in May 2024 across five electronic databases, including Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed, SPORTDiscus, and Cochrane Library.

Eligibility Criteria: Studies were included if they (1) involved subjects with CAI and healthy controls and (2) assessed biomechanical variables such as ground reaction forces, joint angles, and joint torques.

Results: Of the 675 identified studies, 171 were included in the review, and 13 were eligible for meta-analysis. The reviewed studies clearly defined research objectives, study populations, consistent participant recruitment, and exposures, and they used valid and reliable measures for outcomes. However, areas such as sample size calculation, study sample justification, blinding in assessments, and addressing confounders were not robust. This meta-analysis involved 542 participants (healthy group: n = 251; CAI group: n = 291). Compared with healthy individuals, patients with CAI exhibited a greater peak vertical ground reaction force (peak VGRF; SMD = 0.30, 95% CI: 0.07–0.53, p = 0.009), reduced hip flexion angles (SMD = -0.30, 95% CI: -0.51 to -0.17, p < 0.0001), increased trunk lateral flexion (SMD = 0.47, 95% CI: 0.09-0.84, p = 0.02), and increased knee extension moments (SMD = 0.39, 95% CI: 0.02-0.77, p = 0.04).

Conclusion: During landing tasks, patients with CAI demonstrate increased hip extension moments and knee extension moments, decreased hip flexion angles, increased peak VGRF, and increased trunk lateral flexion angles. These biomechanical variables are associated with an elevated risk of ACL injuries.

Systematic Review Registration: Identifier CRD42024529349.

KEYWORDS

chronic ankle instability, proximal, joint biomechanics, landing, anterior cruciate ligament

1 Introduction

Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries are among the most severe injuries in sports, which remarkably affect athletic performance (Davey et al., 2019). The incidence and cost of recovery from ACL injuries are high, with approximately 100,000 to 2,50,000 cases occurring annually in the United States alone (Hewett et al., 1999; Mancino et al., 2023). The estimated cost per injury is about \$17,000, with an annual cost of approximately \$646 million for surgeries and rehabilitation among females with ACL injuries (Hewett et al., 1999). Moreover, pain, functional limitations, and radiographic signs of osteoarthritis in the knee are evident 12-20 years post-injury (Lohmander et al., 2004; Myklebust and Bahr, 2005). The current paradigms for ACL injury mechanisms during landing include four main theories: Ligament dominance, Quadriceps dominance, Trunk dominance, and Leg dominance (Hewett et al., 2010). Based on these theories, previous scholars have identified eight biomechanical variables associated with ACL injury risk during landing (dynamics and kinematics in the horizontal, frontal, and sagittal planes, impact loads, and trunk movements) (Chou et al., 2023; Hewett et al., 2010). For instance, small knee and hip flexion angles in sagittal plane kinematics have been previously reported to correlate with a great risk of ACL injuries (Devita and Skelly, 1992; Lin et al., 2012; Padua et al., 2009; Trigsted et al., 2017) (Table 1). Identifying the biomechanical changes and influencing factors of individual ACL injury patterns is crucial for assessing functional capabilities and predicting subsequent injury risks post-return to sports.

Existing research suggests that chronic ankle instability (CAI) may be important predisposing factor for ACL injuries. Epidemiological surveys indicate that 52%-60% of patients with ACL injuries have a history of ankle sprains (Kramer et al., 2007; Söderman et al., 2001), and most ankle sprains develop into CAI (Theisen and Day, 2019). Studies by Theisen and Day also suggest that the altered lower limb biomechanics associated with CAI may increase the susceptibility to non-contact ACL injuries (Theisen and Day, 2019). The etiology of CAI is often attributed to injuries of the lateral ankle ligaments, primarily the anterior talofibular ligament, resulting from sprains, with or without damage to the calcaneofibular ligament (van Putte-Katier et al., 2015). In addition, CAI is a common sequela of recurrent ankle sprains (Gribble et al., 2016). About 73% of individuals with ankle sprains develop CAI (Theisen and Day, 2019). Patients with CAI often experience persistent symptoms of pain or weakness in the ankle (Gribble et al., 2013), which affects their quality of life and participation in physical activities (Arnold et al., 2011; Hubbard-Turner and Turner, 2015), as well as increases the risk of recurrent sprains and post-traumatic ankle osteoarthritis (Gribble et al., 2016; Moisan et al., 2017).

In recent years, CAI has received attention as a risk factor for ACL injuries during landing motions (Kikumoto et al., 2024). Current literature proposes that the mechanism of ACL injuries in patients with CAI is due to distal responses in the kinematic chain triggered by the ankle during landing tasks, which result in alterations in the proximal movement chain (knee joint, hip joint, and trunk) (Hertel and Corbett, 2019; Sueki et al., 2013). Munn et al. have shown that several somatosensory domains are impaired in patients with CAI, possibly due to ligament and joint proprioceptor damage during injury and potential neural damage post-ligament injury (Munn et al., 2010). Impairments in proprioceptors can lead to altered feedforward motor control

Sagittal Plane Kinematics	Hip flexion angle↓(Devita and Skelly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)	Knee flexion angle↓(Devita and Skelly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)	Ankle dorsiflexion angle](Boden et al., 2009; Padua et al., 2009)				
Sagittal Plane Kinetics	Hip extension moment ^{(Devita and Skelly, 1992;} Trigsted et al., 2017)	Knee extension moment ^{(Devita} and Skelly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)					
Frontal plane kinematics	Hip abduction angle↓(Hewett et al., 2005)	Knee abduction angleî(Hewett et al., 2005)					
Frontal plane Kinetics	knee adduction moment ^{(Lin} et al., 2012)						
Horizontal plane kinematics	Hip Internal rotation angleî(Devita and Skelly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)	Knee Internal rotation angle [↑] (Devita and Skel	ly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)				
Horizontal plane Kinetics	Hip Internal rotation Moment↑(Devita and Skelly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)	Knee Internal rotation Moment ^(Devita and S)	skelly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)				
Impact loading	Peak VGRF↑(Devita and Skelly, 1992)	Loading rate ⁽ Paterno et al., 2007)					
Trunk mechanism	Trunk flexion↓(Paterno et al., 2007)	Trunk lateral flexion ^{(Kristianslund} et al., 201	2)				

TABLE 1 Grouping of biomechanical variables.

TABLE 2 Search strategy for each database.

Database	Web of Science	Scopus	PubMed	SPORTDiscus	Cochrane Library					
Applied database fields used During The search	Topic (Title, abstract, author, keywords, and Keywords Plus)	Title Abstract, keyword	Title, Abstract	Title, Abstract	Title Abstract, keyword					
Restrictions for the search	None									
Examples of the strategy Web of Science	(((TS=(chronic ankle instability OR ankle instability OR functional ankle instability OR mechanical ankle instability OR CAI OR FAI OR MAI)) AND TS=(lower limb OR lower extremity OR hip OR knee OR ankle OR trunk)) AND TS=(kinematic OR kinetics OR biomechanics OR Moment OR Torque OR dynamic OR angles OR moments OR forces OR ground reaction force OR GRF OR displacement)) AND TS=(stop jump OR stop-jump OR stop jumping OR stop-jumping OR land OR landing OR jump land OR jump landing OR jump-land OR jump-landing OR drop-vertical jump OR single-leg landing OR single-leg land OR jump OR jumping)									
Examples of the strategy Scopus	(TITLE-ABS-KEY ("chronic ankle instability" OR "ankle instability" OR "functional ankle instability" OR "mechanical ankle instability" OR "CAI" OR "FAI" OR "MAI") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ("lower limb" OR "lower extremity" OR "hip" OR "knee" OR "ankle" OR "trunk") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ("kinematic" OR "kinetics" OR "biomechanics" OR "Moment" OR "Torque" OR "dynamic" OR "angles" OR "moments" OR "forces" OR "ground reaction force" OR "GRF" OR "displacement") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ("stop jump" OR "stop-jumping" OR "stop-jumping" OR "landing" OR "landing" OR "jump landing" OR "jump-land" OR "jump-land" OR "jump-land"))									
Examples of the strategy PubMed	(((chronic ankle instability [Title/Abstract] OR at mechanical ankle instability [Title/Abstract] OR 0 limb [Title/Abstract] OR lower extremity [Title/Ab trunk [Title/Abstract]) AND (kinematic [Title/A [Title/Abstract] OR Torque [Title/Abstract] OR d forces [Title/Abstract] OR ground reaction force [T jump [Title/Abstract] OR stop-jump [Title/Abstract] Abstract] OR landing [Title/Abstract] OR jump la OR jump-landing [Title/Abstract] OR drop-vertica Abstract] OR jump [Title/Abstract] OR jumping	nkle instability [Titl CAI [Title/Abstract] sstract] OR hip [Titl bstract] OR kinetic lynamic [Title/Abstract] OR stop jumping and [Title/Abstract] l jump [Title/Abstract] [Title/Abstract])	e/Abstract] OR ff OR FAI [Title// e/Abstract] OR ki s [Title/Abstract] act] OR angles [7 RF [Title/Abstract] OR jump landing ct] OR single-leg	unctional ankle instabili Abstract] OR MAI [Titl nee [Title/Abstract] OR OR biomechanics [Titl Title/Abstract] OR mon tt] OR displacement [Titl OR stop-jumping [Title/ g [Title/Abstract] OR ju landing [Title/Abstract]	ity [Title/Abstract] OR e/Abstract]) AND (lower ankle [Title/Abstract] OR le/Abstract] OR Moment tents [Title/Abstract] OR de/Abstract])) AND (stop 'Abstract] OR land [Title/ ump-land [Title/Abstract] OR single-leg land [Title/					
Examples of the strategy SPORTDiscus	TI (chronic ankle instability OR ankle instability OR functional ankle instability OR mechanical ankle instability OR CAI OR FAI OR MAI) AND TI (lower limb OR lower extremity OR hip OR knee OR ankle OR trunk) AND TI (kinematic OR kinetics OR biomechanics OR Moment OR Torque OR dynamic OR angles OR moments OR forces OR ground reaction force OR GRF OR displacement) AND TI (stop jump OR stop-jump OR stop jumping OR stop-jumping OR land OR landing OR jump land OR jump landing OR jump-land OR jump-landing OR drop-vertical jump OR single-leg landing OR single-leg land OR jump OR jumping)									
	AB (chronic ankle instability OR ankle instability MAI) AND AB (lower limb OR lower extremity OF OR Moment OR Torque OR dynamic) AND AB (jump land OR jump landing OR jump-land OR ju OR jumping)	OR functional ankl R hip OR knee OR a stop jump OR stop-, mp-landing OR dro	e instability OR r nkle OR trunk) A jump OR stop jur p-vertical jump C	nechanical ankle instabi ND AB (kinematic OR ł nping OR stop-jumping R single-leg landing OR	lity OR CAI OR FAI OR cinetics OR biomechanics OR land OR landing OR t single-leg land OR jump					
Examples of the strategy Cochrane Library	chronic ankle instability OR ankle instability OR fr Title Abstract Keyword AND lower limb OR low kinematic OR kinetics OR biomechanics OR Mon force OR GRF OR displacement in Title Abstract OR landing OR jump land OR jump landing OR ju land OR jump OR jumping in Title Abstract Key	inctional ankle insta ver extremity OR hi nent OR Torque OR Keyword AND stop imp-land OR jump-l word - (Word varia	bility OR mechan p OR knee OR a dynamic OR ang jump OR stop-ju anding OR drop- ations have been	ical ankle instability OR nkle OR trunk in Title gles OR moments OR fc Imp OR stop jumping C vertical jump OR single- searched)	CAI OR FAI OR MAI in Abstract Keyword AND orces OR ground reaction IR stop-jumping OR land leg landing OR single-leg					

mediated by spinal or supraspinal mechanisms, affecting centrally mediated motor control strategies (Brown et al., 2004; Caulfield and Garrett, 2002; Hass et al., 2010). These outcomes may lead to changes in the proximal movement chain to compensate for ankle instability and functional impairment (Bullock-Saxton, 1994; Koshino et al., 2013). Such compensatory phenomena in proximal joints could cause ACL injuries (Jeon et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2022). For example, Terada et al. found reduced knee flexion at the peak of the anterior tibial shear force in patients with CAI (Terada et al., 2014), and Jeon et al.'s meta-analysis identified greater vertical ground reaction forces (VGRF) upon landing in patients with CAI (Jeon et al., 2021), both results were associated with ACL injury risk. However, the aforementioned studies identified only a single biomechanical variable difference associated with ACL injuries, probably due to the limited outcome indicators set in previous research, which failed to report more biomechanical differences related to ACL injuries. Consequently, many studies based on similar measurements have produced inconsistent results, and the adoption of a single variable alone is insufficient to objectively describe the ACL injury mechanisms in CAI patients. The lack of combined analyses of variables related to ACL injuries, which limits the effective examination of how proximal adaptations caused by CAI lead to ACL injuries.

A 13-year epidemiological study revealed that landing maneuvers are a common cause of ACL injuries in sports with frequent jumping activities, such as basketball and volleyball (Agel et al., 2005). Krosshaug et al. (2006) analyzed videos of 39 ACL injuries during basketball games and found that most injuries occurred during non-contact landing maneuvers. The landing action, given its high impact and frequent occurrence, warrants particular attention (Kim et al., 2017; Konradsen and Voigt, 2002). Moreover, landing provides a controlled and easily standardizable experimental condition, facilitating accurate assessment and analysis of biomechanical parameters. Considering the commonality, representativeness, high impact, and robustness of landing measurements in ACL injury studies, this research focuses on the landing maneuvers of patients with CAI.

Therefore, a systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted to investigate whether biomechanical changes related to ACL injury risk are present in patients with CAI during landing tasks. Previous studies have found that patients with CAI often fail to effectively utilize the lower limb buffering mechanisms during landing owing to ankle instability (Jeon et al., 2021). Additionally, changes have been observed in the proximal movement chain of the lower limbs in CAI patients (Bullock-Saxton, 1994; Koshino et al., 2013). We hypothesized that compared with healthy individuals, those with CAI will exhibit a greater peak VGRF and an upright body posture (i.e., reduced knee and hip flexion), leading to an increased risk of ACL injury.

2 Methods

This review was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-analyses. It was prospectively registered in the international database for systematic reviews. (PROSPERO registration number: CRD42024529349).

2.1 Identification of ACL injuryrelated variables

Four theories based on the mechanism of landing ACL injury (Ligament dominance; Quadriceps dominance; Trunk dominance; leg dominance) (Hewett et al., 2010), and previous prospective and case-control studies identified eight biomechanical variables associated with ACL injury risk (Chou et al., 2023; Hewett et al., 2010). These variables have been adopted in several high-quality studies (Chou et al., 2023), thereby proving their reliability. Table 1 illustrates the detrimental directionality of biomechanical variables in each construct (high injury risk). Following data extraction, clarifying which outcome indicators are used for correlation analysis is crucial, serving as the bridge to determine whether CAI is associated with ACL injuries.

2.2 Data sources and search strategy

In May 2024, a systematic search was conducted across five electronic databases: Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed, SPORTDiscus, and Cochrane Library. Keywords related to CAI and biomechanical variables were used to identify relevant articles. Keywords for each category were combined using the Boolean operator "OR" and then combined across categories using "AND" for each database search. There was no restriction on publication date. Boolean logic was utilized for all database searches: (chronic ankle instability OR ankle instability OR functional ankle instability OR mechanical ankle instability OR CAI OR FAI OR MAI) AND (lower limb OR lower extremity OR hip OR knee OR ankle OR trunk) AND (kinematic OR kinetics OR biomechanics OR Moment OR Torque OR dynamic) AND [1) stop jump: (stop jump OR stop-jump OR stop jumping OR stop-jumping), 2) landing: (land OR landing OR jump land OR jump landing OR jump-landing OR drop-vertical jump OR single-leg landing OR single-leg land OR jump OR jumping)]. The detailed search strategy is presented in Table 2.

2.3 Inclusion criteria

The search results were independently screened by two reviewers (Z.H., B.Y.) on the basis of the predetermined inclusion and exclusion criteria, with disputes resolved by the corresponding author (H.Z.) if necessary. Studies were included if they met the following criteria: In accordance with the PICOS guidelines, studies meeting the following criteria were included: P: The study population consists of individuals with CAI and healthy control subjects. I: Participants perform landing tasks as an intervention measure. C: CAI patients are compared with a healthy control group. O: The reported outcomes are biomechanical variables, such as ground reaction forces, joint angles, and joint torques. S: Cross-sectional studies are included. Exclusion criteria included the following: 1) variables unrelated to ACL injury outcome indicators (Table 1); 2) task location is not on a flat surface (differences in biomechanics of landing on flat and sloped surfaces may affect the robustness of study results. Additionally, sloped landings are uncommon in real-life activities.); 3) studies employing one-dimensional statistical parametric mapping analysis (Data cannot be pooled for meta-analysis); 4) review articles, editorials, speeches, commentaries, abstracts, case studies, surgical procedures, and non-peer-reviewed articles.

2.4 Study selection

Titles and abstracts were screened by two independent reviewers, with any discrepancies resolved through consultation with a third author. If eligibility could not be determined from the title and abstract, then full texts were obtained and reviewed. Cohen's kappa coefficient (κ) and percentage agreement were used to assess inter-reviewer consistency. κ was interpreted on the basis of Landis and Koch's standards: Values less than 0 indicated no agreement, 0–0.20 indicated slight agreement; 0.21–0.40 indicated fair agreement; 0.41–0.60 indicated moderate agreement; 0.61–0.80 indicated substantial agreement; and 0.81–1 indicated almost perfect agreement (Landis and Koch, 1977). Full texts of all eligible studies were retrieved, and data such as demographics (e.g., gender and age), sample size, and biomechanical variable results (e.g., standardized ground reaction forces, joint angles, and standardized joint torques) were extracted.

2.5 Quality assessment and analysis

The quality of included studies was assessed using the NIH quality assessment tool for observational cohort and cross-sectional studies. Two researchers (Z.H. and B.Y.) independently evaluated the quality of each study, with any disagreements resolved through discussion until consensus was reached.



2.6 Publication bias

Publication bias was assessed using funnel plots and Egger's regression test. Visual inspection of funnel plot symmetry indicated an unbiased range of effect sizes among the included studies. Asymmetry in the funnel plot suggested bias toward specific effect sizes or sample sizes. Egger's regression test quantified bias using the effect size of each included study, with a *p*-value less than 0.05 indicating significant publication bias (Borenstein et al., 2021).

2.7 Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analyses were conducted on studies included in the meta-analysis to determine if the exclusion of influential studies affected the overall effect results. Thus, the most influential studies were excluded from the meta-analysis and analysis was repeated.

2.8 Data extraction and statistical analysis

Data were extracted by two authors (Z.H., B.Y.) using standardized forms from each included study. The extracted data were as follows: 1)

sample description, encompassing the sample size, age, and gender; 2) information related to CAI, including the definition of CAI and scores from the Cumberland Ankle Instability Tool; 3) biomechanical variables related to outcome indicators (Table 1); 4) standardized results, including means, SDs, p-values, and standardized difference in effect sizes; 5) task conditions, specifically limited to landing tasks performed on flat surfaces. The data extracted from all included studies were then synthesized for comprehensive analysis. Statistical analysis compared biomechanical variables between patients with CAI and healthy individuals as the effect sizes for meta-analysis. To avoid errors caused by multiple biomechanical variables within each structure influencing the final outcome, we conducted separate meta-analyses for biomechanical outcome indicators within each structure (e.g., separate meta-analyses for Trunk flexion and trunk lateral flexion within the trunk mechanism structure). Additionally, to prevent reliance on effect sizes from the same study, we averaged the effect sizes based on specific task conditions (e.g., averaging the parameters of a biomechanical variable at different stages during a landing task) (Borenstein et al., 2021).

The overall effect size for each variable was calculated using sample size, means, standard deviations, mean differences, and *p*-values. Meta-analyses were performed using Review Manager V.5.3 (Copenhagen, Denmark: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014). Owing to variations in drop platform

Sagittal Plane Kinematics of the Lower Limb	Hip flexion angle↓(Devita and Skelly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)	Knee flexion angle↓(Devita and Skelly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)	Ankle dorsiflexion angle↓(Boden et al., 2009; Padua et al., 2009)
Sagittal Plane Kinetics of the Lower Limb	Hip extension moment↑(Devita and Skelly, 1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)	Knee extension moment ^{(Devita and Skelly,}	1992; Trigsted et al., 2017)
Frontal plane kinematics of the Lower Limb	Hip abduction angle↓(Hewett et al., 2005)	Knee abduction angle ⁽ Hewett et al., 2005)	
Impact loading	Peak VGRF†(Devita and Skelly, 1992)	Loading rate ^{(Paterno} et al., 2007)	
Trunk mechanism	Trunk flexion↓(Paterno et al., 2007)	Trunk lateral flexion ^{(Kristianslund} et al., 20	012)

TABLE 3 Outcome indicators determined.

heights and the differences between single and double foot landings among the included studies, ensuring complete consistency across multicenter and multiprotocol studies is challenging. Therefore, this study calculated the effect size of each biomechanical variable using the standardized mean difference (SMD) with a 95% confidence interval (CI). A random effect model was employed. Heterogeneity among the included studies was assessed using the I² statistic.

3 Results

3.1 Study selection and characteristics

An initial search across five databases yielded 1,615 articles. After duplicates were removed, 675 studies remained. Title and abstract screening by two reviewers eliminated 504 studies (consistency rate = 97.62%, κ = 0.49), and 171 studies were assessed for eligibility through full-text review. After this review, 157 studies were excluded, leaving 14 studies included in the meta-analysis (consistency rate = 100%, κ = 1). The detailed exclusion process at each stage is depicted in Figure 1. A total of 564 participants were involved in this study (healthy group: n =262; CAI group: n = 302), with detailed characteristics of the included studies provided in Table 3. For variables related to ACL injury, seven studies were included on peak VGRF (Caulfield and Garrett, 2004; De Ridder et al., 2015; Jeon and Park, 2021; Lee et al., 2017; Watabe et al., 2022; Watanabe et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2012), three studies on loading rate (De Ridder et al., 2015; Jeon and Park, 2021; Lee et al., 2017); nine and ten studies on hip flexion angle (Brown et al., 2011; Caulfield and Garrett, 2004; Gribble and Robinson, 2009; Han et al., 2023; Jeon and Park, 2021; Sagawa et al., 2024; Terada et al., 2015; Terada et al., 2014; Watabe et al., 2022; Watanabe et al., 2021) and knee flexion angle (Brown et al., 2011; Caulfield and Garrett, 2004; Gribble and Robinson, 2009; Han et al., 2023; Jeon and Park, 2021; Sagawa et al., 2024; Terada et al., 2015; Terada et al., 2014; Watabe et al., 2022; Watanabe et al., 2021), respectively. Ankle flexion angle is covered in 10 studies (Gribble and Robinson, 2009; Han et al., 2023; Jeon and Park, 2021; Kipp and Palmieri-Smith, 2012; Lee et al., 2017; Sagawa et al., 2024; Terada et al., 2015; Watabe et al., 2022; Watanabe et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2012); and two studies each on hip extension moment (Jeon and Park, 2021; Watanabe et al., 2021) and knee extension moment (Jeon and Park, 2021; Watanabe et al., 2021). Four studies on hip abduction angle (Brown et al., 2011; Jeon and Park, 2021; Sagawa et al., 2024; Terada et al., 2015) and three studies on knee abduction angle (De Ridder et al., 2015; Jeon and Park, 2021; Lee

et al., 2017); two studies on trunk flexion (Brown et al., 2011; Watabe et al., 2022) and two studies on trunk lateral flexion (Brown et al., 2011; Watabe et al., 2022). No other biomechanical variables related to ACL injuries were reviewed in this study (Table 4).

3.2 Quality assessment

The results of the quality assessment tool developed by NIH for observational cohorts and cross-sectional studies ranged from five to 9 (Table 5). The evaluation results highlight some apparent strengths and limitations of the included literature. The strengths lie in the studies having clear objectives, defined study populations, and consistent participant recruitment, and using valid and reliable methods for exposure definition and outcome measurement. These aspects are important indicators of high research quality, suggesting that the design and execution of the studies were successful in these respects. However, some shortcomings remain. Only two studies calculated the sample size and determined an appropriate study sample size, which could affect the statistical power of the results and the reliability of the conclusions. Furthermore, the lack of assessment of blinding implementation and insufficient justification for confounding variables could lead to bias and errors in the study outcomes.

3.3 Publication bias

Publication bias was detected in the trunk flexion angle (p = 0.007). No publication bias was found for the remaining variables (Supplementary Appendix S1).

3.4 Heterogeneity

Heterogeneity was present in the ankle dorsiflexion angle (Figure 2C), loading rate (Figure 3A), knee flexion angle (Figure 2B), and trunk flexion (Figure 4B).

3.5 Study findings

Our research findings indicated that patients with CAI exhibited a greater maximum (peak VGRF; SMD = 0.30, 95% CI: 0.07–0.53, p = 0.009), a reduced hip flexion angle (SMD = -0.34,95% CI:

TABLE 4 Study characteristics and participant demographics.

First Author (year)	Test method	Study type	Population (total/male/ female)	Outcome measures
Watanabe et al. (2021)	single-leg landing (0.3 m,0.4 m,0.5 m)	cross-sectional	26 Competitive collegiate athletes; Control group = $13/7/4$ Age = 20.6 ± 2.1 CAI group = $13/7/4$ Age = 21.6 ± 1.6	Kinematics Peak knee Flexion angle (0.3 m,0.4 m,0.5 m) Peak hip flexion angle (0.3 m,0.4 m,0.5 m) Kinetics Peak knee extension moment (0.3 m,0.4 m,0.5 m) Peak hip extension moment (0.3 m,0.4 m,0.5 m) Impact Loading Peak VGRF (0.3 m,0.4 m,0.5 m)
Gribble and Robinson (2009)	double-leg take-off jump with a landing on a single limb	cross-sectional	Control group = $19/10/9$ Age = 23.1 ± 3.9 CAI group = $19/10/9$ Age = 20.3 ± 2.9	<i>Kinematics</i> Peak knee flexion angle (Injured side) Peak hip flexion (Injured side)
Zhang et al. (2012)	drop landing (0.6 m)	cross-sectional	Control group = 10Age = 24.1 (5.4) CAI group = 10 Age = 24.8 (5.7)	<i>Impact loading</i> 2nd peak vertical GRF
Terada et al. (2014)	vertical stop jump (50% of Vertmax)	case-control experiment design	Thirty-eight physically active participants Control group = 19/10/9 Age = 21.32 \pm 4.04) CAI group = 19/10/9 Age = 20.11 \pm 1.63	Kinematics Knee sagittal plane angle at Peak anterior tibial shear force (ATSF) Hip sagittal plane angle at Peak ATSF
Lee et al. (2017)	single-leg drop landing	Controlled laboratory	28 competitive taekwondo athletes Control group = 14/14 Age = 21.21 \pm 2.08 CAI group = 14/14 Age = 20.07 \pm 0.27	<i>Impact loading</i> Peak VGRF Loading rate
De Ridder et al. (2015)	Vertical drop (0.4 m)	cross-sectional	Control group = $30/12/18$ Age = 25.7 \pm 1.8 CAI group = $38/19/19$ Age = 22.1 \pm 3.4	<i>Impact Loading</i> Peak vertical GRF Loading rate
Caulfield and Garrett (2004)	single leg vertical drop (0.4 m)	cross-sectional	Control group = $10/10$ Age = 22.6 ± 4.6 FAI group = $14/14$ Age = 26.6 ± 6.3	Impact loading Peak vertical GRF
Jeon and Park (2021)	Drop landing (0.3 m)	cross-sectional	Control group = 18/18 Age = 20.22 ± 2.29 CAI group = 16/16 Age = 20.19 ± 1.47	Kinematics Hip flexion joint angle; hip abduction joint angle; Knee Flexion joint angle Knee Valgus joint angle <i>Kinetics</i> Hip flexion Joint moment Knee flexion Joint moment <i>Impact loading</i> Max vGRF Loading rate
Watabe et al. (2022)	proactive condition (single-leg landings) reactive condition (side-step cutting, 60° side-step cutting, single-leg landing, and forward stepping)	cross-sectional	28 physically active individuals; Control group = 14/Age = 21.5 ± 1.3 CAI group = 14/Age = 21.4 ± 1.4	Kinematics Maximum Right lateral trunk flexion in (PRO,REA) Maximum Trunk flexionin in (PRO,REA) Maximum Hip flexion in (PRO,REA) Maximum Ankle dorsiflexion in (PRO,REA) Impact loading Vertical ground reaction force in (PRO,REA)
Brown et al. (2011)	single-leg landing in the anterior, lateral, and medial directions (50% of Vertmax)	cross-sectional	68 recreationally active participants Control group = $24/12/12$ male's Age = 19.8 ± 13 /female's Age = 20.2 ± 1.0 MAI group = $21/8/13$ male's Age = 18.6 ± 3.3 /female's Age = 19.9 ± 1.0 FAI group = $23/11/12$ male's Age = 20.5 ± 1.7 /female's Age = 20.1 ± 1.5	Kinematics Knee flexion-extension angle Knee abduction-adduction angle Hip flexion angle Hip abduction-adduction angle Trunk flexion angle Trunk lateral flexion angle

(Continued on following page)

TABLE 4 (Continued) Study characteristics and participant demographics.

First Author (year)	Test method	Study type	Population (total/male/ female)	Outcome measures
Han et al. (2023)	single-leg drop-landing	cross-sectional	44 physically active individuals Control group = $22/11/11$ Age = 23.4 ± 2.6) CAI group = $22/11/11$ Age = 23.4 ± 2.4	Kinematics Knee flexion angle at initial contact in (Anticipated,Unanticipated) Maximum knee flexion angle in (Anticipated,Unanticipated) Knee displacement in (Anticipated,Unanticipated) Hip flexion angle at initial contact in (Anticipated,Unanticipated) Maximum hip flexion angle in (Anticipated,Unanticipated) Hip displacement in (Anticipated,Unanticipated)
Terada et al. (2015)	single-leg drop landing (0.3 m) conditions: (1) looking-down and (2) looking-up	Controlled laboratory	Thirty-eight physically active participants Control group = $19/6/13$ Age = 20.58 ± 2.32 CAI group = $19/11/8$ Age = 21.68 ± 4.82	Kinematics Hip sagittal plane angle at initial contact (looking-up,looking-down) Hip frontal plane at initial contact (looking- up,looking-down) Knee sagittal plane at initial contact (looking-up,looking-down) Knee frontal plane at initial contact (looking-up,looking-down)
Sagawa et al. (2024)	Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing (0.2 m)	cross-sectional	Control group = 19/19/0 Age = 23.9 ± 2.8 CAI group = 19/19/0 Age = 25.3 ± 2.9	Kinematics Hip Flexion maximum angle during 200 m interval post-landing Hip Abduction maximum angle during 200 m interval post-landing Knee Flexion maximum angle during 200 m interval post-landing

-0.53 to -0.19, p < 0.0001), (Figure 4A) and an increased trunk lateral flexion angle (SMD = 0.47,95% CI: 0.05-0.9, p = 0.03) during landing tasks. In Addition, these patients showed increased hip extension moments (SMD = 0.47,95% CI: 0.09-0.84, p = 0.02) and greater knee extension moments (SMD = 0.39,95% CI: 0.02-0.77, p = 0.04) (Figures 2C, D) compared with healthy controls. By contrast, no significant differences in the loading rate, knee flexion angle, trunk flexion angle, knee abduction angle (Figure 3B), ankle dorsiflexion angle (Figure 2E) and hip abduction angle were found between patients with CAI and healthy individuals. The sensitivity analysis results reveal that the outcomes for Knee extension moment and Loading rate are significantly influenced by individual studies (Supplementary Appendix S4). Specifically, removing the study by Jeon and Park (2021) led to a significant change in the *p*-value for Knee extension moment (p < 0.05), and removing Lee et al. (2017) similarly affected the *p*-value for Loading rate (p < 0.05). Due to the limited number of studies included, further subgroup analysis to explore these differences was not feasible. This limitation highlights the need for cautious interpretation of our conclusions. Additionally, the results for other variables remained consistent and unchanged in the sensitivity analysis.

4 Discussion

This systematic review aimed to determine whether changes in lower limb biomechanics during landing tasks in the CAI population increase the risk of ACL injury compared with that in a healthy population. This meta-analysis included data from 14 studies (Brown et al., 2011; Caulfield and Garrett, 2004; De Ridder et al., 2015; Gribble and Robinson, 2009; Han et al., 2023; Jeon and Park, 2021; Kipp and Palmieri-Smith, 2012; Lee et al., 2017; Sagawa et al., 2024; Terada et al., 2015; Terada et al., 2014; Watabe et al., 2022; Watanabe et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2012), which compared the landing biomechanics between patients with CAI and healthy individuals. Our findings indicated that patients with CAI exhibited a greater peak VGRF during landing compared with healthy individuals, which was consistent with our initial hypothesis. A decreased hip flexion angle was also observed, partially supporting our hypothesis that the body was upright, although no significant difference was found in knee flexion angles. Additionally, an increased trunk lateral flexion, an increased hip extension moment, and an increased knee extension moment were observed in patients with CAI.

4.1 Sagittal plane kinematics and kinetics of the lower limb

Our study revealed that individuals with CAI landed with decreased hip flexion angles and increased knee and hip extension moments. However, contrary to our expectations, patients with CAI did not exhibit reduced knee flexion angles or dorsiflexion angles. This finding is also in contrast to the findings of Chan et al. (2022) and Aaron and James (Theisen and Day, 2019), who reported reduced knee flexion and ankle dorsiflexion in similar contexts (Chan et al., 2022). This inconsistency may stem from our meta-analysis incorporating anticipated and unanticipated landing conditions (Han et al., 2023; Watabe et al., 2022) and

First Author (year)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Total (Yes)
Watanabe et al. (2021)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	Yes	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	6
Kipp and Palmieri-Smith (2012)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Gribble and Robinson (2009)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Zhang et al. (2012)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Terada et al. (2014)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Lee et al. (2017)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
De Ridder et al. (2015)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Caulfield and Garrett (2004)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Jeon and Park (2021)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Watabe et al. (2022)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Han et al. (2023)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Terada et al. (2015)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Brown et al. (2011)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	No	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	5
Sagawa et al. (2024)	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	Yes	No	No	NA	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	6

TABLE 5 Methodological quality score using the NIH quality assessment tool of relevant studies.

Q1: was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?, Q2: was the study population clearly specified and defined?, Q3: was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?, Q4: were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?, Q5: was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?, Q6: for the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?, Q7: was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?, Q8: for exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?, Q9: were the exposure (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?, Q12: were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?, Q13: was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?, Q14: were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)? CD: cannot determine, NA: notapplicable.

changes in visual focus during landing (Terada et al., 2015). Analyzing multiple states together led to high heterogeneity, but this result was considered acceptable because it reflected the different dynamic states encountered during athletic activities. Moreover, our findings suggested that patients with CAI developed neuromuscular feedforward mechanisms that resulted in upright postures and increased hip extension moments during landing, thereby supporting our study outcomes (Figure 2) (Beckman and Buchanan, 1995; Kim et al., 2017).

High knee extension moments during landing are associated with increased risk of ACL injuries (Alentorn-Geli et al., 2009). This injury mechanism is prevalent among female athletes (Karita et al., 2017). The primary reason is that women typically have wider hips, which leads to a larger Q-angle (the angle between the lateral femoral axis and the tibial axis) compared with men (Mizuno et al., 2001). An increased Q-angle enhances the lateral pulling force of the quadriceps, resulting in greater knee extension torque (Heiderscheit et al., 2000). Additionally, women's weaker muscle strength and neuromuscular control may contribute to increased knee extension torque during landing (Hewett et al., 2005). Cadaver studies have shown that intense quadriceps contractions can cause ACL ruptures (DeMorat et al., 2004). Furthermore, during high-speed eccentric contractions and quadriceps activation during landing, the ACL is subjected to greater forces compared with those observed during maximum isometric contractions of the quadriceps (Griffin et al., 2000). Previous research also supported our findings, indicating that patients with CAI exhibited a higher quadriceps/hamstring coactivation ratio during inclined plane landings compared with healthy individuals (Li et al., 2017). During landing, the hamstring's force is diminished, and the quadriceps play a dominant role. Previous studies have shown that greater hamstring activation can reduce the ACL load exerted by the quadriceps and provide dynamic knee stability by resisting anterior tibial translation, lateral tibial translation, and transverse tibial rotation (Renström et al., 1986; Withrow et al., 2008). Therefore, the increased knee extension moment observed during landing in patients with CAI may be a potential mechanism leading to ACL injuries in this population.

Previous research has revealed that the contraction of the knee and hip extensors does not decrease VGRF during the landing contact phase; by contrast, the associated energy is transferred to the bones and ligaments, thereby increasing joint contact stress and the risk of ACL and meniscal injuries (Mills et al., 2009). In addition, this phenomenon has been observed in the biomechanical factors related to ACL injury and knee joint energy absorption. At the terminal phase of landing, knee joint energy absorption is inversely related to VGRF and hip extension moments and directly related to peak hip flexion angles (Norcross et al., 2010). These findings indicated that high hip extension moments and reduced hip flexion angles could lead to insufficient

	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% C	IV. Random, 95% CI
-	Brown et al.2012 (single-leg landing)FAI	3.98	0.61	23	4.56	1.37	24	8.3%	-0.53 [-1.12.0.05]	
	Brown et al 2012 (single-leg landing)/Al	4 07	0.57	21	4.56	1.37	24	8.0%	-0.45 [-1.04 0.15]	
	Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing)	30.83	10.64	19	29.9	13	19	7.0%	0.08 [-0.56, 0.71]	
	Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti)	22.366	8.7	22	22.53	5.866	22	8.1%	-0.02 [-0.61, 0.57]	
	Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti)	16.7	5.4	22	16.9	4.566	22	8.1%	-0.04 [-0.63, 0.55]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m)	39.39	17.88	16	47.63	18.26	18	6.1%	-0.44 [-1.13, 0.24]	
	Sagawa et al.2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing)	34.9	17.8	19	36	9.9	19	7.0%	-0.07 [-0.71, 0.56]	
	Terada et al. 2014(vertical stop jump land)	31.91	8.58	19	31.18	11.31	19	7.0%	0.07 [-0.56, 0.71]	
	Terada et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m)LD	21.66	5.64	19	27.79	10.06	19	6.5%	-0.74 [-1.40, -0.08]	,
	Terada et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m)LU	21.73	5.07	19	26.68	9.27	19	6.6%	-0.65 [-1.30, 0.01]	
	Watabe et al. 2022 (proactive condition)	21.66	5.64	19	27.79	10.06	19	6.5%	-0.74 [-1.40, -0.08]	
	Watabe et al. 2022 (reactive condition)	21.73	5.07	19	26.68	9.27	19	6.6%	-0.65 [-1.30, 0.01]	
	Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m)	27.1	3.95	13	30.26	10.52	13	4.7%	-0.39 [-1.16, 0.39]	
	Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m)	28.42	3.42	13	32.36	11.85	13	4.7%	-0.44 [-1.22, 0.34]	
	Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.5m)	33.15	3.69	13	35.78	13.16	13	4.7%	-0.26 [-1.04, 0.51]	
	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 11.26, df = 14 (P + Test for overall effect: Z = 3.96 (P < 0.0001)	= 0.67); l²	= 0%	276			282	100.0%	-0.34 [-0.51, -0.17]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 I CAI Hip flexion angle
в		CAI	aroup		Healt	h group			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random. 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
-	Brown et al.2012 (single-leg landing)FAI	3.33	0.5	23	3.48	0.77	24	7.1%	-0.23 [-0.80, 0.35]	
	Brown et al.2012 (single-leg landing)MAI	3.42	0.47	21	3.48	0.77	24	7.0%	-0.09 [-0.68, 0.50]	
	Caulfield and Garrett 2004 (single leg drop 0.4m)	50.44	7.5	19	49.96	13.14	19	6.6%	0.04 [-0.59, 0.68]	
	Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing)	50.44	7.5	19	49.96	13.14	19	6.6%	0.04 [-0.59, 0.68]	
	Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti)	31.667	6.533	22 20	6.5333	6.67	22	6.8%	0.76 [0.15, 1.38]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti)	27.467	6.033	22	27.4	6.033	22	7.0%	0.01 [-0.58, 0.60]	
	Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m)	62.27	13.14	16	65.33	15.31	18	6.2%	-0.21 [-0.88, 0.47]	
	Sagawa et al.2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing)	53.4	9.9	19	52.5	6.8	19	6.6%	0.10 [-0.53, 0.74]	
	Terada et al. 2014(vertical stop jump land)	25.37	8.1	19	32.07	9.63	19	6.4%	-0.74 [-1.40, -0.08]	
	rerada et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m)LD	5.85	3.35	19	9.91	7.71	19	6.4%	-0.67 [-1.32, -0.01]	
	Watabe et al. 2012 (proactive condition)	3.82	3.38	14	3.40	13.61	14	5 7%	-0.03 [-1.28, 0.02]	
	Watabe et al. 2022 (reactive condition)	35 71	13.57	14	39.83	16.48	14	5.7%	-0.26 [-1.01.0.48]	
	Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m)	57.89	2.81	13	52.28	8.77	13	5.3%	0.83 [0.03, 1.64]	
	Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m)	62.8	4.91	13	57.89	8.07	13	5.3%	0.71 [-0.09, 1.51]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.5m)	69.47	4.99	13	62.1	7.02	13	5.0%	1.17 [0.33, 2.01]	
	Total (95% CI)			285			291	100.0%	0.02 [-0.24, 0.27]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15; Chi ² = 34.62, df = 15 (P =	0.003); l ²	= 57%							-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
										CALKnoo flovion anglo 1 CALKnoo flovion anlo
c										CAI Knee flexion angle CAI Knee flexion anle
С	Study of Subannum	CAI gr	oup	Hea	alth gro	up	Weight	Std. Me	an Difference	CAI Knee flexion angle TCAI Knee flexion ante
C	Study or Subgroup M Gibble and Robiesce 2000/single last immundice)	CAI gro	oup SD Tota	Hea I Mean	alth gro	up Total	Weight	Std. Me	an Difference andom. 95% Cl	CAI Knee flexion angle TCAI Knee flexion anle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup	CAI gr Aean S 9.52 9.9	oup SD Tota 92 19 98 22	Hea <u>I Mean</u> 9 9.63	alth gro SD 8.82	up Total 19 22	Weight 7.5% 7.9%	Std. Me t IV. R -0.	an Difference andom, 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72]	CAI Knee flexion angle CAI Knee flexion ante Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
c	Study or Subgroup f Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Junani)	CAI gro Mean S 9.52 9.9 4.8 2 11.6 5	oup 5D Tota 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22	Hea <u>I Mean</u> 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9	up <u>Total</u> 19 22 22	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5%	Std. Me t IV. R -0.	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 00 [0 37, 162]	CAI Knee flexion angle CAI Knee flexion anie Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m)	CAI gro <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.9 4.8 2 11.6 5 -9.17 7.6	oup 5D Tota 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16	Hea <u>I Mean</u> 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 3 -11.18	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05	up Total 19 22 22 18	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 7.1%	Std. Me t IV. R -0. 5 0. 5 1	an Difference andom, <u>95% Cl</u> 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] .00 [0.37, 1.62] 23 [-0.44, 0.91]	CAI Knee flexion angle CAI Knee flexion anle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup A Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Orop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land)	CAI gn <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.9 4.8 2 11.6 5 -9.17 7.6 -18.1 5	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16 5.2 1 ⁻¹	Hea <u>I Mean</u> 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 3 -11.18 1 -17.3	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27	up 19 22 22 18 11	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 7.1% 5.7%	Std. Me t IV. R -0. -0. -0. -0. -0.	an Difference (andom, 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] .00 [0.37, 1.62] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71]	CAI Knee flexion angle CAI Knee flexion ante Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Junni) Jeon and Park 2021 (Orop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing)	CAI gro Mean S 9.52 9.9 4.8 2 11.6 5 -9.17 7.6 -18.1 5 -0.41 4.3	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16 5.2 1 ² 32 1 ⁴	Hea <u>1 Mean</u> 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 3 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 6.53	up 19 22 22 18 11 14	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 7.1% 5.7% 6.3%	Std. Me t IV. B 5 -0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 -0. 5 -0.	an Difference andom, 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 00 [0.37, 1.62] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16]	CAI Knee flexion angle CAI Knee flexion anie Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup (Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing) Sagawa et al. 2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing)	CAI gro <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.9 4.8 2 11.6 5 -9.17 7.6 -18.1 5 -0.41 4.3 16.6 4	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16 5.2 1 ⁻¹ 32 14 1.1 19	Hea Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 5 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7	up Total 19 22 22 18 11 14 14	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 5.7% 6.3% 7.5%	Std. Me t IV. R 5 -0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0.	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 20 [0.37, 1.62] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 15 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53]	CAI Knee flexion angle CAI Knee flexion anle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup N Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Linanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmeint-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing) Sagawa et al. 2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Terada et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m)LD	CAI gr <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.9 4.8 2 11.6 5 9.17 7.6 -18.1 5 -0.41 4.3 16.6 4 15.87 10.3	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16 5.2 1 ⁴ 1.1 19 57 19 57 19	Hea Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 5 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1 9 45.44	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7 12.25	up 19 22 28 18 11 14 19 19	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 5.7% 6.3% 7.5% 7.5%	Std. Me t IV. R 5 -0. 5 0. 5 1 5 0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0.	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 03 [-0.44, 0.91] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67]	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
c	Study or Subgroup Grobinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Grobble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drom) at Unanti) Joen and Park 2021 (forg landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing) Ternda et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m)LD Ternda et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m)LD	CAI gro <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.5 9.52 9.5 11.6 5 9.17 7.6 18.1 5 0.41 4.3 16.6 4 5.87 10.5 6.41 9.6 4.5.87 10.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16 5.2 1 ⁻¹ 32 14 1.1 19 57 19 62 19 47 14	Hea Hea 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 6 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1 9 45.44 9 45.77 1 25.95	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7 12.25 12.11	up 19 22 22 18 11 14 19 19 19	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 5.7% 6.3% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5%	Std. Me t IV. R -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0.	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 00 [0.37, 1.62] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 06 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 06 [-0.58, 0.66] 06 [-0.58, 0.66]	CAI Knee flexion angle CAI Knee flexion anie Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup M Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Man et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing) Sagawa et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing) Sagawa et al. 2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Terada et al. 2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m)LU Variabe et al. 2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m)LU Variabe et al. 2022 (conceive condition) Variabe et al. 2022 (conceive condition) Variabe et al. 2022 (conceive condition)	CAI gr <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.5 4.8 2 11.6 5 9.17 7.6 -18.1 5 -0.41 4.3 16.6 4 15.87 10.3 6.41 9.6 4.42 7.4 5.87 2.4 -1.65 4 -1.65 4 -1.55	oup <u>50 Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16 5.2 1 ⁻¹ 32 14 1.1 19 57 19 62 19 47 14 49 49	Hea Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 6 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1 9 45.44 9 45.77 4 25.85 1 26.77 1 26.77	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7 12.25 12.11 6.96	up 19 22 22 18 11 14 19 19 19 19	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 5.7% 6.3% 7.5% 7.5% 6.5%	Std. Me V. R -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0.	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 11 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.81] 23 [-0.44, 0.81] 23 [-0.44, 0.81] 15 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 05 [-0.50, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50]	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CL
C	Study or Subgroup N Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Linanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing) Sagawa et al.2024(Single-leg drop landing 0.3m).L 4 Vatabe et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m).L 4 Watabe et al. 2022 (practive condition) 2 Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg lace lace long 0.3m).L 4	CAI gr <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.5 11.6 5 9.17 7.6 -18.1 5 -0.41 4.3 16.6 4 15.87 10.3 16.41 9.6 4.40 7.4 25.89 3.4 8.94 2.0 25.89 3.4	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 669 16 5.2 1 ³ 14 14 15 57 19 62 19 47 14 49 14 97 1 ⁴	Hea <u>1 Mean</u> 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 6 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1 9 45.44 9 45.77 4 25.85 4 26.77 3 14.42	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7 12.25 12.11 6.96 3.7 9	up 19 22 22 18 11 14 19 19 19 14 14 13	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 5.7% 6.3% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.5%	Std. Me 1V. R -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0.	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 00 [0.37, 1.62] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-9.66, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 06 [-0.58, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50]	CAI Knee flexion and Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup It Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Itan et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Joen and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Leg at al. 2021 (Grop landing 0.3m) Lee et al. 2017 (Single-leg top landing 0.3m) Leg at al. 2015 (Single-leg atop landing 0.3m) Terada et al. 2015 (Single-leg top landing 0.3m) Leg at al. 2015 (Single-leg atop landing 0.3m) Leg at al. 2012 (Single-leg atop landing 0.3m) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m)	CAI gn <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.9 4.8 2 11.6 5 9.17 7.6 -18.1 5 -0.41 4.3 16.6 4 15.87 10.3 16.41 9.0 44.02 7.4 5.89 3.4 8.94 2.9 0.48 2.6 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 65 1 22 65 1 22 65 1 19 57 19 62 19 47 14 49 14 97 10 64 12 64 12	Hea Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 6 -11.18 1 -17.3 9 17.1 9 45.44 9 45.77 4 25.77 3 14.42 3 17.07	alth gro 50 8.82 3.5 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7 12.25 12.11 6.96 3.47 3.79 3.85	up 19 22 28 11 14 19 19 19 19 14 14 13	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.1% 5.7% 6.3% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.5% 5.8%	Std. Me t IV. R -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0.	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 00 [0.37, 1.62] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 06 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 06 [-0.58, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50]	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl
C	Study or Subgroup M Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Definition 2024(single-leg Letral) Torp Landing 0.3m) Terrada et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m).LU 4 Watabe et al. 2022 (coractive condition) 2 Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Matabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Matabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m)	CAI gn <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.9 4.8 2 11.6 5 9.17 7.6 18.1 5 0.41 4.3 16.6 4 15.87 10.3 16.41 9.0 24.02 7.4 5.89 3.4 18.94 2.5 0.48 2.6 21.47 3.4	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 5.1 22 5.1 22 5.1 22 5.1 22 5.2 19 14 5.2 19 14 14 14 97 12 14 14 97 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	Hea Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 6 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1 9 45.44 9 45.77 4 25.85 4 26.77 3 26.77 3 17.07 3 17.07 3 17.05	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7 12.25 12.11 6.96 3.47 3.79 3.85 3.63	up 19 22 18 11 14 19 19 19 19 14 14 13 13	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 5.7% 6.3% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.5% 5.8% 5.8%	Std. Me t IV. R -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0.	an Difference indom, 95% CI 10 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 24 [-0.44, 0.91] 16 [-1.58, 0.71] 40 [-1.38, 0.71] 40 [-1.58, 0.63] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50]	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup I Grbbie and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) I Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) I Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Joen and Park 2021 (forg landing 0.3m) I Stop and Palmiert-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee at al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing) I Sagawa et al. 2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Terada et al. 2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) I Watabe et al. 2022 (groactive condition) Watabe et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Yatabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Yatabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Yatabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition)	CAI gr <u>Mean S</u> 9.52 9.9 9.52 9.9 9.52 9.9 9.57 7.6 -9.17 7.	oup 5D Tota 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16 5.2 11 5.2 14 5.1 15 5.2 14 5.3 16 4.1 18 5.7 13 62 18 47 14 497 13 64 13 42 13 5.3 10	Heat Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 5 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1 9 45.77 4 25.85 4 26.77 3 14.42 3 17.95 4 26.77 3 14.42 3 17.95 9 -17	alth gro SD 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7 12.25 12.11 6.96 3.47 3.85 3.63 3.63 7.2	up Total 19 22 22 18 11 14 19 19 19 14 14 13 13 13 13 10	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 7.1% 6.3% 7.5% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8%	Std. Me IV. R 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 00 [0.37, 1.62] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 11 [-0.75, 0.63] 11 [-0.75, 0.63] 14 [-0.60, 0.67] 06 [-0.58, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.49, 0.50]	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup It Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Item and al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Manti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Terada et al.2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Terada et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) U Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg lateral Drop Landing) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg lateral Drop Landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg condition) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Yeatabee et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Yeatabee et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Yeatabee et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.5m) Yeatabee et al. 20	CAI gri Mean S 9.52 9.5 4.8 25 9.17 7.6 1.8.1 5 0.41 4.3 16.6 4 15.87 10.3 16.41 9.6 4.40 7.4 25.89 3.4 16.94 2.6 20.48 2.6 21.47 3.4 -16.6 6	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16 5.2 11 32 14 1.1 19 57 19 62 19 449 14 49 14 49 14 3.3 10 64 13 3.3 10 5.3 10 5.3 10 5.4 10 5.2 11 5.2 11	Heat Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 6 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1 9 45.44 9 45.77 4 25.85 4 25.85 4 26.77 3 14.42 3 17.07 3 17.95 0 -17	alth gro SD 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7 12.25 12.11 6.96 3.47 3.79 3.85 3.85 3.85 3.63 7.2	up Total 19 22 22 18 11 14 19 19 14 14 13 13 13 10	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 7.1% 6.3% 7.5% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.4%	Std. Me IV. R 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 03 [-0.44, 0.91] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 05 [-0.59, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.43, 2.14] 0.00 [0.18, 1.82] 1.97 [0.15, 1.79] 06 [-0.82, 0.53]	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl
C	Study or Subgroup M Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing). Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg imp-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing). Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing). Signa of Parkiner-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing). Signava et al. 2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing). Ternad et al. 2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m).LU Heratic et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabe et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Matabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Matabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Matabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Matabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Matabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Watabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). Matabae et al. 2022 (groactive condition). </td <td>CAI gr <u>Mean \$</u> 9.52 9.5 9.52 9.5 9.17 7.6 -18.1 5 -0.41 4.3 16.6 4 15.87 10.3 6.41 9.6 24.02 7.4 5.89 3.4 8.94 2.9 20.48 2.6 -14.7 3.4 -16.6 6 -16.6 6 -16.6 -16 -16.6 -</td> <td>oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 65 2 1 32 14 1.1 19 57 19 662 19 47 14 49 14 97 13 64 13 64 13 64 13 64 13 63 3 10 238 238</td> <td>Hea 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 5 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1 9 45.44 4 5.77 4 26.77 3 14.42 3 17.07 3 17.95 0 -17 3</td> <td>alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 12.25 12.11 6.96 3.47 3.79 3.85 3.63 7.2</td> <td>up Total 19 22 28 11 14 19 19 19 19 14 13 13 13 10 240</td> <td>Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 6.3% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.4% 100.0%</td> <td>Std. Me IV. B -0.5</td> <td>an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 03 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.47, 0.71] 00 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 06 [-0.58, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.92, 0.50]</td> <td>Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI</td>	CAI gr <u>Mean \$</u> 9.52 9.5 9.52 9.5 9.17 7.6 -18.1 5 -0.41 4.3 16.6 4 15.87 10.3 6.41 9.6 24.02 7.4 5.89 3.4 8.94 2.9 20.48 2.6 -14.7 3.4 -16.6 6 -16.6 6 -16.6 -16 -16.6 -	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 65 2 1 32 14 1.1 19 57 19 662 19 47 14 49 14 97 13 64 13 64 13 64 13 64 13 63 3 10 238 238	Hea 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 5 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 3 9 17.1 9 45.44 4 5.77 4 26.77 3 14.42 3 17.07 3 17.95 0 -17 3	alth gro SD 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 12.25 12.11 6.96 3.47 3.79 3.85 3.63 7.2	up Total 19 22 28 11 14 19 19 19 19 14 13 13 13 10 240	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 6.3% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.4% 100.0%	Std. Me IV. B -0.5	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 03 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.47, 0.71] 00 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 06 [-0.58, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.92, 0.50]	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
C	Study or Subgroup I Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Iman et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (forg landing 0.3m) Sign and Park 2021 (forg landing 0.3m) Sign and Park 2021 (forg landing 0.3m) Sign and Park 2021 (forg landing 0.3m) Forg and Park 2021 (forg landing 0.3m) Sagawa et al. 2024(single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Franda et al. 2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zubrab et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zubrab et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zubrab et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zubrab et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zubrab et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zubrab et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zubrab et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zubrab et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zubrab et al. 2022 (sing	CAI graveling dean S 9.52 9.9, 4.8 2 11.6 5 9.17 7.6 14.3 15.87 10.3 46.41 9.6 44.02 7.4 15.87 10.3 16.6 4 15.87 10.3 16.6 4 14.3 15.87 10.3 16.6 4 10.048 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.5 1.5 5 1.5	oup <u>5D Tota</u> 92 19 2.8 22 5.1 22 69 16 5.2 14 1.32 14 1.32 14 1.49 14 97 15 64 15 449 14 97 15 64 1	Hea Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7.7 5 -11.18 1 -17.3 4 33 9 45.44 9 45.47 4 25.85 4 25.85 4 25.85 1 26.77 3 14.42 3 17.07 3 17.95 0 -17 3	alth gro SD 3.5 3.9 9.05 7.27 6.53 4.7 12.25 12.21 1.12 3.47 3.47 3.63 3.63 7.2	up <u>Total</u> 19 22 18 11 14 19 19 14 13 13 13 10 240	Weight 7.5% 7.5% 5.7% 6.3% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.4%	Std. Me IV. B -0.	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 03 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.80, 0.67] 05 [-0.58, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.92, 0.50] 26 [-0.82, 0.93] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] -2	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Knee flexion ande IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle
C	Study or Subgroup Item of a 12022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Manti) Jean and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Lee at al. 2012 (Single-leg torop landing) Sagawa et al.2024 (Single-leg torop landing 0.3m) Lee at al. 2013 (Single-leg torop landing) Varada et al.2015 (single-leg torop landing 0.3m) Lee at al. 2013 (Single-leg torop landing 0.3m) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing 0.3m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Total (9% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; Chi ² = 28.80, df = 14 (P = 0.12) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; Chi ² = 0.12) Yeatabe et al. 2014 (Yeatabe et al. 2014)	CAI gru dean S 9.52 9.52 1.16 5 9.17 7.6 1.8.1 5 9.17 7.6 1.8.1 5 9.17 7.6 1.8.4 5 9.17 7.6 1.8.4 5 9.17 7.6 1.8.4 5 1.6.5 6 1.47 3.4 1.47 3.4 1.47 3.4 1.47 3.5 CAI grou	Outp D Total SD Total 2.9 11 2.8 22 5.1 22 14 12 5.7 15 5.7 15 5.7 15 5.7 15 5.7 14 449 14 97 12 442 12 423 12 8 9%	Heelth Heelth Heelth	alth group	up Total 19 22 22 22 18 11 14 14 13 13 13 10 240	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 6.3% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.4% 5.4%	Std. Met IV.R 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 6 0.	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 03 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 00 [-3.7, 1.62] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 06 [-0.58, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 29 [0.43, 2.14] 00 [0.16, 1.79] 06 [-0.82, 0.93] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] -2	Std. Mean Difference N. Random. 95% Cl A CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference
C	Study or Subgroup M Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeen and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kip and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Torada et al.2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Terada et al.2015(single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Torada et al.2015(single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.3m) Yeatabee et al. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.3m) Yeatabee et al. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.5m) Zhang et al. 2012 (drop Landing 0.5m) Zhang et al. 201	CAI grn Mean S 9.52 9.4 1.6 5 9.17 7.6 1.6 4 5.87 10.0 5.87 10.0 4.8.9 3.4 8.94 2.5 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.48 2.6 0.1); I ^a = 51 CAI grou an SD	oup BD Totals SD Totals 92 19 92 19 92 18 532 11 542 12 557 19 562 11 577 12 577 12 577 12 577 13 562 11 747 14 497 12 42 13 142 13 158 19%	Hee 1 Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 2 7 1.118 1.118 1.118 4.25.85 4.25.85 4.25.85 4.25.85 4.25.85 4.25.85 1.1.95 1.1.9	alth gro SD 8.823 9.05 12.25 12.25 12.25 12.25 3.85 3.63 3.85 3.63 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.27 3.85 3.63 3.72 3.85 3.63 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2	up Total 19 22 22 22 18 11 14 19 9 9 19 14 13 13 13 10 240	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.4% 100.0%	Std. Met t IV. R 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 -0. 5 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0.	an Difference andom. 95% CI 11 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 25 [-0.90, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50]	Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsifiexion angle Std. Mean Difference CAI Ankle dorsifiexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI
C D	Study or Subgroup It Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Itan et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jean and Park 2021 (forp landing 0.3m) Sign and Park 2021 (forp landing 0.3m) Sign and Park 2021 (forp landing 0.3m) Sign and Park 2021 (forp landing 0.3m) Sign and Park 2021 (forp landing 0.3m) Sagawa et al. 2024(single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Sign and et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabe et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabe et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et al. 2022 (gracitive condition) Watabae et	CAI grou 64.8 2 9.52 9.1 11.6 5 9.952 9.1 11.6 5 9.917 77.1 11.6 15 11.6 15	oup <u>D Total</u> <u>20</u> 19 2.8 22 2.8 22 10 2.2 11 10 2.2 11 10 2.2 11 10 2.2 11 10 2.2 11 10 2.2 11 10 2.2 11 10 2.2 12 10 2.2 12 10 2.3 12 10 2.2 12 10 2.3 12 10 2.2 12 10 2.3 12 10 2.2 12 10 2.3 12 10 2.2 12 10 2.3 12 10 2.3 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Heat Heat	alth gro SD Tr. a group SD Tr. a group a g	up Total 19 22 22 22 11 14 19 19 19 19 19 19 14 14 13 13 10 240	Weight 7.5% 7.5% 6.3% 7.5% 6.5% 5.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Met IV.R 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 03 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.47, 0.71] 00 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 05 [-0.89, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50]	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle
C D	Study or Subgroup It Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Itan et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Itanti Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Itanti 2024 (Single-leg Leg Land) Itanti Lee et al. 2017 (Single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Itanti 2015 (Single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Itanti 2012 (Single-leg Leg Land) Varaab et al. 2015 (Single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Itanti 2012 (Single-leg Leg Land) Itanti 2012 (Single-leg Leg Land) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Itanti 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Itanti 2012 (drop landing 0.5m) Itanti 2012 (drop landing 0.5m) Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Itanti 2012 (drop landing 0.5m) Itanti 2012 (drop landing 0.5m) Italt 95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.14; Chi² = 28.80, df = 14 (P = 0.12) Italt 95% CI) Iter for overail effect: Z = 1.56 (P = 0.12) Italt 94% OF Subgroup Me Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) 0 Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 0 Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 0 Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 0	CAI gro nfac S 9.52 9.1 4.8 2 9.952 9.1 1.6 5 9.17 7.1 1.6 5 9.16.1 5 9.17 7.1 1.6 5 9.17 7.1 1.6 4 1.6 5 9.17 7.1 1.6 6 1.5 7 1.6 6 1.5 7 1.6 6 1.5 7 1.6 6 1.6 6 1.6 6 1.6 6 1.1 1.4 1.1 1.4 1.1 1.0 1.1 0.0 1.2 0.0	oup <u>D Total</u> 2.8 22 2.8 22 2.8 22 1.1 22 1.2 1 2.2 1 1.2 1.2 1 1.2 1.2 1 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.	Health Health Health Health Health Mean 0.08 2.27 4.26.85 1.4.26.85 1.4.26.85 1.4.26.85 1.4.26.85 1.4.26 1.7.95 1.4.26 1.7.95 1.4.26 1.7.95 1.4.26	alth group 8.82 3.5 3.9 9.05 12.25 12.11 3.47 3.87 3.63 3.63 3.79 3.85 7.2 12.51 12.11 3.47 3.47 7.2 12.51 1	up Total 19 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 21 14 14 13 13 13 10 240 0 0 0 18 3(3) 13 22 240	Weight 7.5% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Met V.R 0.3 5 -0.0 5 -0.0 5 -0.0 5 -0.0 5 -0.0 5 -0.0 5 -0.0 5 -0.0 5 -0.0 5 -0.0 5 0.0 6 0.2 6 0.33 0.33 0.2	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 03 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 00 [-3.7, 1.62] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 06 [-3.68, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 29 [0.43, 2.14] 00 [0.18, 1.82] 197 [0.15, 1.79] 06 [-0.82, 0.93] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] -2 1 Difference 10 Jifference 10	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle
C D	Study or Subgroup M Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) The start 2022 (single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Manti) Jeen and Park 2021 (Orop landing 0.3m) Jeen and Park 2021 (Orop landing 0.3m) Jeen and Park 2021 (Single leg Lard) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Jeen and Park 2021 (Single-leg Lateral Orop Landing) Sagawa et al.2015(single-leg Lateral Orop Landing 0.3m) Jerada et al.2015(single-leg Lateral Orop Landing 0.3m) Vataba et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Orop Landing 0.3m) Zwatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Orop Landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Orop Landing 0.3m) Zwatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Orop Landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Orop Landing 0.3m) Zwatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.3m) Zwatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.5m) Zhang et al. 2012 (drop Landing 0.5m) Zhang et al. 2012 (single-leg Landing 0.5m) Total (95% Cl) Jeen and Park 2021 (Drop Landing 0.3m) Zeen tal. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.5m) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop Landing 0.3m) Zwatabae et al. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.3m) Zwatabae et al. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.3m) Zwatabae et al. 2022 (single-leg Landing 0.3m) Zwatabae et al.	CAI gro 48 2 116 5 9.972 48 2 116 5 9.977 74 116 5 9.917 74 116 5 116 5 116 5 116 5 116 5 116 5 116 5 117 5 116 5 117 5 1	oup <u>SD Total</u> 22 11 28 22 11 28 22 12 26 9 11 27 12 26 9 11 157 15 27 12 27	Heat 9.63 2.44.3 3.71.18 1.71.4 4.25.87 4.25.87 4.25.87 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 3.17.97 4.25.87 4.	alth gro <u>SD</u> a group <u>SD</u> 1663 3.47 3.72 5.33 4.7 5.34 3.47 3.72 5.34 5.47	up Total 19 22 22 22 28 11 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 6.3% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Met V.R 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.3 0.3 0.33 0.33 0.33 0.6	an Difference andom. 95% CI 10 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 25 [-0.73, 1.79] 06 [-0.82, 0.93] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] -2 10 Difference 10 dom. 95% CI -2 -2	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle
C D	Study or Subgroup M Grbble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Man et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Manti) Jean and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Single Anti Single	CAI grn facan S 9.52 0.48 2 11.6 5 9.52 0.41 4.3 15.87 10.41 4.3 15.89 0.41 15.89 0.41 15.89 0.41 15.89 0.41 11.00.6 6 001); P = 51 CAI grou CAI grou CAI grou 0.00 0.21 11 0.06 30 0.21 51 1.66	oup <u>5D</u> Tota 92 11 5.1 22 69 11 5.2 17 15.2 17 15	Heet Heat Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 3 -11.18 1 -17.3 3 -11.18 1 -17.3 3 -17.45 4 25.85 4 25.85 4 25.85 4 25.85 4 25.85 4 25.85 5 -17 3 -17 3 -17 3 -17 4 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17	status status s 8.82 i 3.5 i 9.05 i 7.27 i 12.11 i 6.96 i 3.79 3.85 3.63 i 3.63 j 7.2 s 7.2 s 0.57 j 0.58 0.58 0.16	up Total 19 22 22 18 11 14 19 19 19 14 13 13 240 240 240	Weight 7.5% 7.5% 6.3% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 100.0% S 8 ight 0.8% 2.8% 2.7%	Std. Mee VLR 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.03 0.62 0.62 0.62 0.62 0.62 0.62 0.62	an Difference andom. 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.66, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 05 [-0.58, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 25 [-0.90, 0.50] 26 [-0.82, 0.50] 27 [-0.05, 0.48] -2 20 10 [-0.50, 0.48] -2 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI T
C D	Study or Subgroup M Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Manti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Figs and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single leg Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Figs and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single-leg Leg Land) Lee et al. 2015 (single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Firada et al.2015 (single-leg log landing 0.3m) Vatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 2 Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 2 Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) 2	CAI grow fean S 9.52 9.52 9.16 6.4 9.17 7.1 18.1 5 9.41 4.3 18.1 5.87 18.1 5.87 18.1 5.87 18.38 12.15 18.6 4 9.41 4.3 18.38 12.15 0.41 4.3 0.41 4.3 0.41 4.3 0.42 2.1147 3.894 2.044 2.044 2.044 2.013 16.6 0.013 16 0.014 1 0.015 1 0.02 0.21 0.03 0.21 0.04 2.2 0.213 1 0.66 0.7 39 0.21 1.66 1.66	oup SD_Tota 92 11 93.8 22 93.1 12 94.1 14 95.2 11 96.3 14 97 13 97 14 42 13 9% 16 13 13 13 13 55 55	Heatt Mean 9 9.63 2 4.4 3 -11.18 1 -17.3 3 14.2 4 26.77 3 14.42 4 26.77 3 14.42 4 26.77 3 14.42 9 -17 3 14.2 17.95 9 -17 -17 9 -17 -17 9 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17 -17	alth gro 8.822 9.055 7.27 12.255 12.11 13.85	up Total 19 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 23 18 11 19 19 19 19 19 14 13 13 10 240 0 0 13 22 10 19 19 19 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 2	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 5.7% 6.3% 5.7% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Mean VR B Std. Mean Std. Mean Std. Mean V. Ram 0.33 0.63 0.63 0.33 0.63 0.64 0.44 0.53 0.65 0.44 0.53 0.65 0.45 0.	an Difference andom. 95% CI 11 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 12 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 29 [0.43, 2, 14] 00 [0.18, 1.82] -2 10 [0.18, 1.82] -2 10 [0.65, 0.48] -2 10 [0.36, 1.03] [-0.46, 1.09] [-0.71, 1.41] 2 [-0.16, 1.42] 7 [0.09, 0.84]	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsification angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsification angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsification angle
C _	Study or Subgroup M Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jean and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Signal Anti (Drop landing) Joen and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Signal Park 2021 (Drop landing) Signal Park 2021 (Drop landing) Sagawa et al. 2024(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Terada et al. 2021(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Signal Park 2021 (Drop landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (gringle-leg landing 0.3m) Watabe et al. 2022 (gringle-leg landing 0.3m) Zhang et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Quatanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zhang et	CAI group steam S 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.16 11.6 5 15.83 10.041 16.41 9.7 15.83 10.041 16.6 6 01); P = 51 51 11 0.06 36 0.71 51 1.66 90); P = 0 90; P = 0	oup <u>BD Total</u> 92 11 22 5.1 22 6.1 22 6.1 22 6.1 22 6.1 22 7.1 1 7.2 11 7.7	Heet Heen 9 9.63 2 4.4 7 3 -11.18 4 7 5 -11.18 9 45.47 4 25.85 1 4.24 2 6.77 4 25.85 1 4.24 2 6.77 3 Heatth Mean 0.08 4 2.15 (2.27 (4.43 1	alth group 8.822 3.55 12.11 6.96 3.47 12.11 6.96 3.47 12.11 3.47 1.37 3.85 7.2 12.11 1.66 1.66 1.66	up Total 19 222 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 14 13 13 10 240 240 240 57 10	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 5.7% 5.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8	Std. Mean t IV.R 5 -0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0.3 0.33 0.62 0.64 0.62	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 05 [-0.58, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] 	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle
C_	Study or Subgroup It Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Itan anti, Joze (single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Jen and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Signa at al.2024(Single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Lee et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Jerada et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Lee et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Vatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 2 Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 2 Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 2	CAI group fean 5 9.52 9.52 9.16 6 9.17 7.4 11.6 5 11.6 5.67 11.6 6.4 11.6 6.4 11.6 6.4 11.6 6.4 11.7 7.58 11.6 6.4 11.7 7.8 11.6 6.4 11.7 7.8 11.6 6.0 11.7 7.8 11.8 7.9 11.1 1.0 11.0 1.6 11.0 1.6 11.0 1.6 11.0 1.6 90); I ² = 0 1.6 90); I ² = 0 1.6 11.0 1.6 12.7 1.6 13.8 1.6 14.7 1.6 15.7 1.6 16.8 1.6 10.9 1.7	oup SD Tota 92 11 92 13 92 13 92 13 92 14 5.2 17 132 17 157 16 157 16 16 13 13 13 13 13 55 55 9% 55 9% 55	Heet Health (Health (alth group SD 3.68 3.7.27 5.7.27	up Total 19 22 22 18 11 14 13 13 10 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 24	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 6.3% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Ma <u>IV. Rand</u> Std. N. Mean IC Std. Mean IC N. Rand J. Mean IC J. Mean IC J. Mean IC J. Mean IC J. Mean IC	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-0.82, 0.63] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 29 [0.43, 2.14] 00 [0.16, 1.82] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] -2 Difference 16 (-0.81, 1.03) 20 (-0.61, 1.42] -2 Difference 0.5% CI 0.50, 0.85]	Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsification angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsification angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI
C_	Study or Subgroup M Grbble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Mnti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Mnti) Janne Dark 2021 (forp landing 0.3m) Single Single-Single Single Si	CAI group dean \$ nfan \$ 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 11.6 5.8 15.8 10.04 16.6 6 01); P = 51 51 110 0.06 36 0.7 51 1.66 90); P = 0 51 751 1.66 90); P = 0 51 76 0.05 76 0.05	oup SD Total SD Total 92 11 18 22 132 14 11 11 11 11 12 14 14 11 152 11 164 12 17 14 18 13 13 13 55 55 13 13 16 13 16 13 17 11	Heet Health (Realth (Health (alth group SD 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.7.27 6.53 4.7 12.11 3.47 3.79 3.85 3.79 3.85 3.79 3.85 3.77 2.365 3.77 3.85 3.77 2.365 3.77 3.85 3.77 3.85 3.77 3.85 3.77 3.85 3.77 3.85 3.77 3.85 3.77 3.85 3.77 3.85 3.77 3.79 3	up Total 19 22 22 22 22 11 14 14 13 13 13 13 240 240 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 6.3% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Mean L VV.R Std. Mean Std. Mean Std	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 00 [-1.36, 0.16] 11 [-0.75, 0.53] 04 [-0.60, 0.67] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] -2 1 Difference 10 [-0.51, 1.42] 10 [-0.9, 0.84] 11 [-0.05, 0.85] 25, 0.12] 21 [-0.09, 0.85] 25, 0.12] 25, 0.12] 25, 0.12] 26, 0.12] 26, 0.12] 27, 0.12] 26, 0.12] 27, 0.12] 27, 0.12] 20, 0.12] 20, 0.12] 20, 0.12] 20, 0.12] 20, 0.12] 20, 0.12] 20, 0.12] 21, 0.12	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment
C	Study or Subgroup It Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Manti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Sigma and Parliesi-Simith 2012 (Single leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (Single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Frada et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Vatabe et al. 2022 (incractive condition) Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; Chi ² = 28.80, df = 14 (P = 0.12) Study or Subgroup Me Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) 2 Vatanabe et al. 2022 (ingle-leg landing 0.4m) 2 Vatanabe et al. 2022 (ingle-leg landing 0.4m) 2 Vatabe et al. 2022 (ingle-leg landing 0.5m) 5 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.57, df = 3 (P = 0.12)<	CAI group fean 5 9.52 0.11 9.52 0.16 9.52 0.16 9.52 0.16 11.6 5 5.67 0.11 15.67 10.21 5.68 3. 16.6 6 0.11; P = 51 51 0.048 2. 0.013; P = 51 51 0.66 6 0.01; P = 51 51 1.66 6 0.01; P = 51 51 1.66 6 0.01; P = 0 51 1.66 6 0.01; P = 0 0.21	oup SD Tota 92 11 92 13 92 13 92 13 92 13 92 14 92 12 92 13 92 14 92 15 93 14 94 14 47 14 47 14 42 12 13 13 13 13 55 55 90 16 13 13 13 13	Heeith (Health	alth group 50 3.82 3.5 3.905 3.7.27 4.7 12.11 3.47 3.72 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 5.01 5.68 9.01 5.68 9.05 1.666 9.01 1.58 9.05 1.666 9.05 1.666 9.05 1.72 1.21 1.22 1.23 1.2	up Total 19 222 18 11 14 19 19 19 19 19 220 220 222 13 13 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 240	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 5.7% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Ma t <u>IV. R</u> -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0. -0.	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-0.82, 0.63] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.34, 2.14] 2 10 [-0.82, 0.53] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] 2 h Difference 10 [-0.71, 1.41] 2 [-0.16, 1.42] 7 [0.09, 0.84]	Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment
	Study or Subgroup If Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Manti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmiert-Smith 2012 (Single Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (Single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Sagawa et al. 2024(single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Ternda et al. 2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; Chi ² = 28.80, df = 14 (P = 0. Yatanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) 0 Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) 0 <	CAI group $dean$ S 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 11.6 5 11.6 5 15.7 10.04 15.87 10.04 15.87 10.04 15.87 10.04 11.87 10.04 20.41 4.3 11.75 16.6 36 0.07 11 0.6 36 0.21 151 1.66 90 12 11 0.06 36 0.21 51 1.66 90 12 11 0.19 90 12 11 0.19 90 11 10.19 0.21 10.19 0.21 10.19 0.21 10.19 0.21 10.19 0.21 10.19 0.21	oup 5D Total 92 11 8 52 12 8 53 22 14 54 25 15 57 11 15 55 5 55	Heith Health	alth group SD Tot a group SD Tot SD Tot S	up Total 19 222 18 11 14 14 13 13 13 13 10 240 240 0 13 22 13 22 57 10 57 10 57 10	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.4% 100.0% 8 8 2.7% 0.0% 8 100.0% 8 100.0%	Std. Moan L W.R Std. Moan Std. Std. Std. Std. Std. Std. Std. Std.	an Difference andom. 95% CI 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 24 [-0.44, 0.91] 25 [-0.90, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.40, 1.79] 06 [-0.82, 0.93] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] 	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI I CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI I CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI I CAI Hip extension moment Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI I CAI Hip extension moment
C_	Study or Subgroup M Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Man et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Manti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3 m) Single Antibility Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3 m) Single Antibility Single Antibility Single Antibility Lee at al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing 0.3 m) Control (Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Single Antibility Vatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3 m) Yeatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landin	CAI group fean 5 9.52 9.52 9.52 9.52 11.6 5 15.87 10.3 15.87 10.3 15.87 10.3 16.6 6 0.041 4.3 16.6 6 0.01; P = 51 50 0.04 2.4 0.04 2.4 10.06 36 0.7 10.99 9.01; P = 51 1.66 90); P = 0 90; P = 0 90); P = 0 2.4 7.4 10.19 9.021 11 10 0.21 11 0.19 9.021 10 9.021 15 9.044 5	oup SD Total 92 11 12 132 11 157 151 152 11 157 151 152 11 157 151 152 151 152 151 152 16 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	Heet Heatth Health (Health (He	alth group sport a group sport a group sport a group sport a group a group b Tot b 1 c 1 c 2 c 2 c 3 c 3 c 3 c 3 c 3 c 3 c 4 c 7 c 2 c 3 c 4 c 7 c 7 c 7 c 7 c 7 c 7 c 7 c 7	up Total 199 222 18 11 14 19 19 19 19 19 19 240 240 240 240 240 240 57 100 13 22, 57 100 13 22, 3 22, 3 22, 3 22, 3 22, 57 100 13 22, 57 100 10 2, 10 2,	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Mean (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	an Difference andom, 95% CI 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 12 [-0.44, 0.81] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 10 [-1.36, 0.16] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 10 [-1.56, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 26 [-0.82, 0.93] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] 	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment
C_	Study or Subgroup It Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Anti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Manti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Kipp and Palmieri-Smith 2012 (Single leg Lag Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Frand at al.2024(Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Terada et al.2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Frand at al.2022(single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Zingle-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Zingle-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Zingle-leg Landing 0.4m) Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) Zingle-leg Landing 0.5m) Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.14; Chl" = 28.80, df = 14 (P = 0.12) Study or Subgroup Met Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) 2 Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 2 Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.4m) 2 Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.5m) 5	CAI group fean S 9.52 9.52 9.16 6 9.17 7.1 18.1 5.2 9.17 7.1 18.1 5.2 9.17 7.1 16.6 4 5.89 3.3 18.44 9.4 2.7 7.4 16.6 6 0.41 4.3 16.6 6 0.7 17.1 16.6 6 0.7 7.4 11.0 0.6 36 0.7 39 0.21 51 1.66 90); P = 0 90; P = 0 CAI group 90; 21 5 0.44	oup SD Tota 92 11 22 51 22 12 52 11 22 57 11 22 57 11 22 13 22 12 147 14 149 147 14 149 13 13 13	Heet Health Health Health Health Health Health C.2.7 0. 1.5.0 Health	alth group SD 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.7.27 12.11 3.65 12.11 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.65 3.65 3.65 9.05 9.05 12.11 3.65 9.05 1.66 9.05 1.7 1.65 1.65 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.65 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7	up Total 19 222 18 11 14 13 13 13 10 240 0 0 18 31 10 240 0 0 18 31 10 240 0 0 18 31 10 240 0 0 0 11 11 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 6.3% 5.7% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.4% 100.0% 8 8 8 100.0% 8 8 100.0% 8 8 100.0%	Std. Maa L VL R Std. Maan L Std. Maan L	an Difference andom. 95% CI 11 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 12 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] -2 Difference 0.05, 0.48] 20 [-0.16, 1.42] 7 [0.99, 0.84] 0.55, 1.21] 0.05, 1.71] 0.05, 0.71]	Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment
C_	Study or Subgroup M Grbble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Mnti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Mnti) Janne Dark 2021 (forp landing 0.3m) Single Addition (Single-leg Leg Land) Lee et al. 2017 (single-leg drop landing) Single Addition (Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Single Addition (Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Terada et al. 2022 (single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Single Addition (Single-leg Lateral Drop Landing) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zatharg et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Zatharg et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Watanabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; Chi ² = 28.80, df = 14 (P = 0.72) Study or Subgroup Matabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Quatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Quatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Single Addition (Single Single Single Addition (Single Single Addition (Single Single Single Addition (Single Single Additin (Single Si	CAI group 9.52 9.17 7. 11.6 5 4.8 2 11.6 6 6 11.0 4.8 2 11.7 7. 11.6 6 6 11.0 4.8 2 11.0 4.8 2	oup SD Total SD Total S6 S2 11 S2 S4 23 S2 S3 11 S2 S4 12 S2 S5 S5 S5 S5 S5 S5 S5 S6	Heei Health (Health (Health (Health (Health (1.133) (1.195) (alth group solution although and a solution although and although and although al	up Total 19 22 22 22 22 11 14 15 19 19 19 19 14 13 13 13 13 240 240 240 57 100 13 22 57 100 13 22, 57 100 10 243 257 100 10 24, 10 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 24, 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Mean (1) V. R (2) -0. (3) -0. (4) -0. (5) -0. (5) -0. (5) -0. (6) -0. (6) -0. (7) -0.	an Difference an dom, 95% Cl 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.71] 20 [-0.44, 0.71] 20 [-0.5, 0.71] 20 [-0.5, 0.63] 24 [-0.60, 0.67] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 29 [-0.43, 2.14] 97 [0.15, 1.79] 00 [-0.82, 0.93] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] -2 10 Difference 10 0.95% Cl 21 [-0.07, 1.41] 3 [-0.16, 1.42] 7 [0.09, 0.84] 0.50, 0.85] 0.35, 1.20] 0.02, 0.77] 	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl CAI Ankle dorsiflexion angle Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl CAI Hip extension moment Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl CAI Hip extension moment
C_	Study or Subgroup Item Gribble and Robinson 2009(single leg jump landing) Than et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Han et al. 2022(single-leg drop-landing at Unanti) Jeon and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Single and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Joen and Park 2021 (Drop landing 0.3m) Frada et al. 2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Frada et al. 2015(single-leg drop landing 0.3m) Vatabe et al. 2012 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Vatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Vatabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Vatabae et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yatabe et al. 2022 (single-leg landing 0.3m) Yatabae et al. 202	CAI group fean 5 9.52 0.1 11.6 5 9.57 1.1 11.6 5 9.57 1.1 15.6 1.4 15.7 1.6 16.6 1.4 15.87 1.3 16.6 6 0.11 1.2 16.6 6 011; P = 51 50 021; D = 50 3.3 030 0.21 15 1.66 030 0.21 15 1.66 0.05 0.7 16 0.05 17 1.66 0.01; P = 0 0.21 16 0.05 17 1.66 0.05 1.66 0.05 1.66 0.05 0.41 0.05 0.44 10.19 0.21 10.19 0.21 10.19 0.21 <td>oup SD Tota 92 11 92 13 92 13 92 14 92 13 132 11 157 15 16 13 13 13 13 13 55 6</td> <td>Heeith Health Health Health Health Health Health Health C2.27 0.15 0.015 0.</td> <td>alth group 50 3.82 3.5 3.905 3.7.27 4.7 12.11 3.47 3.85 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 5.01 0.58 0.16 6.66 9000 10.16 10.16 10.16 10.17 10.15 10.17 10.25 10.17 10.25 10.17 10.15 10.17 10.15 10.1</td> <td>up Total 19 222 18 11 14 19 19 19 19 19 22 22 13 13 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 240</td> <td>Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 5.7% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5</td> <td>Std. Ma I VL 8 Std. Maan Std. Std. Std. Std. Std. Std. Std. Std.</td> <td>an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.32, 1.03] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] </td> <td>Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle</td>	oup SD Tota 92 11 92 13 92 13 92 14 92 13 132 11 157 15 16 13 13 13 13 13 55 6	Heeith Health Health Health Health Health Health Health C2.27 0.15 0.015 0.	alth group 50 3.82 3.5 3.905 3.7.27 4.7 12.11 3.47 3.85 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.63 5.01 0.58 0.16 6.66 9000 10.16 10.16 10.16 10.17 10.15 10.17 10.25 10.17 10.25 10.17 10.15 10.17 10.15 10.1	up Total 19 222 18 11 14 19 19 19 19 19 22 22 13 13 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 240	Weight 7.5% 7.9% 7.5% 5.7% 6.5% 6.5% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5.8% 5	Std. Ma I VL 8 Std. Maan Std. Std. Std. Std. Std. Std. Std. Std.	an Difference andom. 95% CI 01 [-0.65, 0.62] 12 [-0.47, 0.72] 23 [-0.44, 0.91] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.16] 12 [-0.96, 0.71] 60 [-1.36, 0.69] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.99, 0.50] 25 [-0.32, 1.03] 21 [-0.05, 0.48] 	Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle Std. Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment CAI Hip extension moment CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle CAI Ankle dorsilfexion angle

Sagittal Plane biomechan Knee extension moment.

knee joint energy dissipation capacity, producing high ACL loads and increasing ACL injury risks (Alentorn-Geli et al., 2009; Norcross et al., 2010). Overall, the biomechanical pattern of sagittal plane landings in the CAI group, characterized by increased knee and hip extension torques and reduced hip flexion angles, may provide a potential



ean Dimerence
Indom. 95% Cl
_ <u>-</u>
•
KF CAI Vertical GKF
an Difference
1dom. 95% Cl
-
0 0.5 1

mechanism for the heightened risk of individual ACL injuries following CAI.

4.2 Frontal plane kinematics of the lower limb

Contrary to our expectations, no significant differences in hip abduction angles and knee abduction angles were observed between patients with CAI and the healthy group. Our review included four studies on hip abduction angles (Brown et al., 2011; Jeon and Park, 2021; Sagawa et al., 2024; Terada et al., 2015) and three on knee abduction angles (De Ridder et al., 2015; Jeon and Park, 2021; Lee et al., 2017). The collected data generally showed similar knee and hip abduction angles between patients with CAI and healthy individuals during jump-landing tasks, with only one study reporting a reduced knee abduction angle (Jeon and Park, 2021) (Figure 3). Therefore, our meta-analysis found no significant differences between the two groups. During landing tasks, patients with CAI and healthy individuals experienced similar frontal plane kinematics.

Excessive knee abduction angles and knee abduction torques during jump landing are known critical factors influencing ACL injuries (Hewett et al., 2005; Olsen et al., 2004; Quatman and Hewett, 2009). A prospective cohort study of 205 female athletes found that those who suffered ACL injuries had previously exhibited larger knee abduction angles, smaller hip abduction angles, and greater knee abduction torques than their counterparts, These variables were considered predictive of ACL injuries (Hewett et al., 2005). Therefore, avoiding large knee abduction angles and torques and small hip abduction angles during landing may help reduce ACL injury risks in patients with CAI. Given the limited research on related frontal plane dynamics, our study did not include metrics of knee abduction/adduction torques linked to ACL injuries. Future research should incorporate outcomes related to frontal plane biomechanics to elucidate the relationship between the landing frontal plane biomechanics of patents with CAI and ACL injury risks.

4.3 Impact loading

Our review included seven studies on peak VGRF (Caulfield and Garrett, 2004; De Ridder et al., 2015; Jeon and Park, 2021; Lee et al., 2017; Watabe et al., 2022; Watanabe et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2012) and three on vertical loading rates (De Ridder et al., 2015; Jeon and Park, 2021; Lee et al., 2017) as measures of VGRF and loading rates. The results indicated that patients with CAI exhibited a comparable loading rate with healthy individuals, with an increased peak VGRF (Figure 4).

Previous reviews were consistent with our findings that is, patients with CAI have a high peak VGRF during landing (Jeon et al., 2021; Simpson et al., 2018), which has been identified as a non-contact ACL injury risk (Lin et al., 2012). A prospective study found that female athletes with knee injuries who later experienced ACL ruptures had a 20% higher peak VGRF than those without knee injuries and ACL damage (Hewett et al., 2005; Paterno et al., 2007). The maximum ACL load during landing tasks occurs at the moment of impact peak VGRF (Paterno et al., 2007; Watabe et al., 2022), with an increase in peak VGRF in patients with CAI leading to high ACL loading and great ACL injury risks. Therefore, minimizing the peak VGRF during landing may reduce ACL injury risks in patients with CAI.

The loading rate, as a factor contributing to ACL injuries during landing, has been noted in previous studies to be elevated in patients with CAI (Paterno et al., 2007; Simpson et al., 2018), Although this finding contradicted our results, no significant differences in loading rates were observed. This discrepancy may stem from our dataset, which included only a few studies on loading rates, highlighting the need for further research on this phenomenon.

Other impact loading–related metrics could be used to distinguish between abnormal lower limb impact loads in patients with CAI and healthy individuals. Frontal plane ground reaction forces (Hewett et al., 2009), sagittal plane ground reaction forces (Lin et al., 2012), and symmetry of landing forces are all associated with increased risks of ACL injuries (Paterno et al., 2007; Paterno et al., 2010; Paterno et al., 2011). However, these metrics were not included in this study. In the future, we will to incorporate more indicators of impact loading to clarify the relationship between impact loading during landing in patients with CAI and ACL injury risks.

4.4 Trunk mechanics

Low trunk flexion is associated with ACL injuries (Griffin et al., 2000). A cross-sectional cohort study found that female subjects

with ACL injuries exhibited less trunk flexion compared with a control group of women, aligning their trunk with their legs in a way that increases valgus and axial forces (Hewett et al., 2009). High trunk flexion angles can prolong the time to reach peak VGRF, reduce landing impulse, and effectively absorb VGRF, decreasing the load on the ACL (Paterno et al., 2007; Watabe et al., 2022). However, this phenomenon not observed in patients with CAI. This review included two studies on this topic (Brown et al., 2011; Watabe et al., 2022). Watabe et al. (2022) studied the differences in lower limb and trunk biomechanics during active and passive single-leg landings between patients with CAI and healthy individuals, demonstrating that patients with CAI exhibit high trunk flexion angles in active and passive settings. Brown et al. (2011) examined the variability in movements during single-leg landing tasks among FAI, MAI, and healthy groups, and they found no significant differences in trunk flexion angles between patients with FAI/MAI and healthy individuals. Our review included these two studies (Brown et al., 2011; Watabe et al., 2022), and publication bias was statistically tested using Egger's test (p = 0.007), indicating that the likelihood of publishing significant results may be higher than that for nonsignificant results. The presence of this bias necessitates a cautious approach in understanding and interpreting the relationship between trunk flexion and ACL injuries. Future research should utilize a broader range of data sources to ensure the comprehensiveness and balance of the findings. Hence, the clinical significance of the current findings remains uncertain.

Furthermore, our review revealed that patients with CAI exhibited greater trunk lateral flexion than healthy controls (Figure 5). A prospective study of over 900 athletes supported this finding, showing that female athletes with ankle injuries (such as CAI and lateral ankle sprains) demonstrate greater trunk sway compared with uninjured athletes (Beynnon et al., 2006). Insufficient neuromuscular control of the body's core and decreased dynamic postural stability may contribute to increased trunk lateral flexion angles during landing (Kibler et al., 2006). The limitations associated with CAI have been shown to impair dynamic postural stability and neuromuscular control during unilateral jump landings, leading to sensorimotor function impairment (Caulfield et al., 2004; Caulfield and Garrett, 2002; Gribble and Robinson, 2009). Impaired neuromuscular control, especially in the hip muscles, is often observed in patients with CAI, who typically exhibit symptoms of deficient neuromuscular control (Bullock-Saxton et al., 1994; McCann et al., 2017; Terada et al., 2016). Therefore, the increased trunk lateral flexion observed in patients with CAI was due to decreased dynamic postural stability and inadequate neuromuscular control of the hip. Zazulak et al. (2007) suggested that trunk lateral displacement is a strong predictor of knee ligament injury, including ACL injuries. Their study of athletes over 3 years found that those with knee, ligament, or ACL injuries exhibit greater trunk displacement in all planes compared with uninjured athletes, identifying lateral displacement as the strongest predictor of ligament injuries. Trunk lateral flexion causes the lateral ground reaction force vector to shift sideways and, having a longer lever arm relative to the knee joint center, directly increases the likelihood of knee abduction motion and torque, thereby elevating the risk of ACL injuries (Hewett et al., 2009). Therefore, the landing mechanics of patients with CAI characterized



by pronounced trunk lateral flexion could be factor contributing to the increased risk of ACL injuries in this population.

4.5 Limitation

Our study has the following limitations and weaknesses. First, the current research includes young athletes (under 27 years old) from various sports and regularly exercising individuals. Therefore, our results may not be applicable to other populations with different ages and levels of physical activity. Second, given limited previous research on horizontal biomechanical variables related to ACL injuries and knee coronal plane torque as outcome measures, we were unable to perform meta-analyses on these aspects. Third, many risky movements, such as cutting and sudden stopping, can lead to ACL injuries; considering the heterogeneity and representativeness of injury movements, we selected only landing actions for analysis. Fourth, our results only indicate the differences in landing biomechanics between individuals with CAI and healthy controls during landing tasks. We cannot ascertain whether these differences would vary with different experimental protocols. Even for the same type of jump-landing tasks, the implementation protocols were not uniform. We also observed variations in platform height and single versus double foot landings, which led to high heterogeneity in some outcome indicator analyses. Lastly, each meta-analysis included only a small number of studies; Thus, the results of this systematic review should be interpreted with caution.

5 Conclusion

This study confirmed the association between CAI and increased sagittal plane kinetics, reduced hip flexion angles, increased peak VGRF, and increased trunk lateral flexion, all of which are related to a heightened risk of ACL injuries during landing tasks. These findings provide a basis for improving the understanding of ACL injury risks during landing tasks in individuals with CAI. This knowledge can guide future preventative measures and rehabilitation strategies to mitigate ACL injury risks in this population.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Author contributions

ZH: Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing-original draft, Writing-review and editing. HZ: Funding acquisition, Project administration, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing-review and editing. BY: Investigation, Writing-original Methodology, draft. Writing-review and editing. ZZ: Data curation, Validation, Writing-review and editing. GL: Data curation, Validation, Writing-review and editing. HP: Supervision, Writing-review Supervision, Validation, and editing. RL: Visualization. Writing-review and editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. The present study was funded by the Ministry of Education Humanities and Social Science Research Youth Fund Project (No. 22YJC890056), the Department of Science and Technology of Zhejiang Province (No. 2023C03197) and the National Undergraduate Training Program on Innovation and Entrepreneurship (No.202410345009).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

References

Agel, J., Arendt, E. A., and Bershadsky, B. (2005). Anterior cruciate ligament injury in national collegiate athletic association basketball and soccer: a 13-year review. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 33, 524–530. doi:10.1177/0363546504269937

Alentorn-Geli, E., Myer, G. D., Silvers, H. J., Samitier, G., Romero, D., Lázaro-Haro, C., et al. (2009). Prevention of non-contact anterior cruciate ligament injuries in soccer players. Part 1: mechanisms of injury and underlying risk factors. *Knee Surg. Sports Traumatol. Arthrosc.* 17, 705–729. doi:10.1007/s00167-009-0813-1

Arnold, B. L., Wright, C. J., and Ross, S. E. (2011). Functional ankle instability and health-related quality of life. J. Athl. Train. 46, 634-641. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-46.6.634

Beckman, S. M., and Buchanan, T. S. (1995). Ankle inversion injury and hypermobility: effect on hip and ankle muscle electromyography onset latency. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehab* 76, 1138–1143. doi:10.1016/s0003-9993(95)80123-5

Beynnon, B., Vacek, P. M., Abate III, J. A., Murphy, D., and Paller, D. (2006). A prospective study of risk factors for first time ankle inversion ankle ligament trauma.

Boden, B. P., Torg, J. S., Knowles, S. B., and Hewett, T. E. (2009). Video analysis of anterior cruciate ligament injury: abnormalities in hip and ankle kinematics. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 37, 252–259. doi:10.1177/0363546508328107

Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P., and Rothstein, H. R. (2021). Introduction to meta-analysis. John Wiley and Sons.

Brown, C., Bowser, B., and Simpson, K. J. (2011). Movement variability during single leg jump landings in individuals with and without chronic ankle instability. *Clin. Biomech.* 27, 52–63. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2011.07.012

Brown, C., Ross, S., Mynark, R., and Guskiewicz, K. (2004). Assessing functional ankle instability with joint position sense, time to stabilization, and electromyography. *J. Sport Rehabil.* 13, 122–134. doi:10.1123/jsr.13.2.122

Bullock-Saxton, J. E. (1994). Local sensation changes and altered hip muscle function following severe ankle sprain. *Phys. Ther.* 74, 17–28. doi:10.1093/ptj/74.1.17

Bullock-Saxton, J. E., Janda, V., and Bullock, M. I. (1994). The influence of ankle sprain injury on muscle activation during hip extension. *Int. J. Sports Med.* 15, 330–334. doi:10.1055/s-2007-1021069

Caulfield, B., Crammond, T., O Sullivan, A., Reynolds, S., and Ward, T. (2004). Altered ankle-muscle activation during jump landing in participants with functional instability of the ankle joint. *J. Sport Rehabil.* 13, 189–200. doi:10.1123/jsr.13.3.189

Caulfield, B., and Garrett, M. (2004). Changes in ground reaction force during jump landing in subjects with functional instability of the ankle joint. *Clin. Biomech.* 19, 617–621. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2004.03.001

Caulfield, B. M., and Garrett, M. (2002). Functional instability of the ankle: differences in patterns of ankle and knee movement prior to and post landing in a single leg jump. *Int. J. Sports Med.* 23, 64–68. doi:10.1055/s-2002-19272

Chan, L. Y. T., Sim, Y. T. N., Gan, F. K., and Bin Abd Razak, H. R. (2022). Effect of chronic ankle instability on lower extremity kinematics, dynamic postural stability, and muscle activity during unilateral jump-landing tasks: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *Phys. Ther. Sport* 55, 176–188. doi:10.1016/j.ptsp.2022.04.005

Chou, T., Huang, Y., Leung, W., Brown, C. N., Kaminski, T. W., and Norcross, M. F. (2023). Does prior concussion lead to biomechanical alterations associated with lateral ankle sprain and anterior cruciate ligament injury? A systematic review and metaanalysis. *Brit J. Sport Med.* 57, 1509–1515. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2023-106980

Davey, A. P., Vacek, P. M., Caldwell, R. A., Slauterbeck, J. R., Gardner-Morse, M. G., Tourville, T. W., et al. (2019). Risk factors associated with a noncontact anterior cruciate ligament injury to the contralateral knee after unilateral anterior cruciate ligament injury in high school and college female athletes: a prospective study. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 47, 3347–3355. doi:10.1177/0363546519886260

DeMorat, G., Weinhold, P., Blackburn, T., Chudik, S., and Garrett, W. (2004). Aggressive quadriceps loading can induce noncontact anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 32, 477–483. doi:10.1177/0363546503258928 organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphys.2024.1428879/ full#supplementary-material

De Ridder, R., Willems, T., Vanrenterghem, J., Robinson, M. A., Palmans, T., and Roosen, P. (2015). Multi-segment foot landing kinematics in subjects with chronic ankle instability. *Clin. Biomech.* 30, 585–592. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2015.04.001

Devita, P., and Skelly, W. A. (1992). Effect of landing stiffness on joint kinetics and energetics in the lower extremity. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc* 24, 108–115. doi:10.1249/00005768-199201000-00018

Gribble, P., and Robinson, R. (2009). Differences in spatiotemporal landing variables during a dynamic stability task in subjects with cai. *Scand. J. Med. Sci. Spor* 20, e63–e71. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2009.00899.x

Gribble, P. A., Bleakley, C. M., Caulfield, B. M., Docherty, C. L., Fourchet, F., Fong, D. T., et al. (2016). Evidence review for the 2016 international ankle consortium consensus statement on the prevalence, impact and long-term consequences of lateral ankle sprains. *Brit J. Sport Med.* 50, 1496–1505. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2016-096189

Gribble, P. A., Delahunt, E., Bleakley, C., Caulfield, B., Docherty, C., Fourchet, F., et al. (2013). Selection criteria for patients with chronic ankle instability in controlled research: a position statement of the International Ankle Consortium. *Brit J. Sport Med.* 48, 1014–1018. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2013-093175

Gribble, P. A., and Robinson, R. H. (2009). Alterations in knee kinematics and dynamic stability associated with chronic ankle instability. *J. Athl. Train.* 44, 350–355. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-44.4.350

Griffin, L. Y., Agel, J., Albohm, M. J., Arendt, E. A., Dick, R. W., Garrett, W. E., et al. (2000). Noncontact anterior cruciate ligament injuries: risk factors and prevention strategies. J. Am. Acad. Orthop. Sur 8, 141–150. doi:10.5435/00124635-200005000-00001

Han, S., Lee, H., and Hopkins, J. T. (2023). Effects of anticipation on joint kinematics during inversion perturbation in individuals with chronic ankle instability. *Scand. J. Med. Sci. Spor* 33, 1116–1124. doi:10.1111/sms.14342

Hass, C. J., Bishop, M. D., Doidge, D., and Wikstrom, E. A. (2010). Chronic ankle instability alters central organization of movement. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 38, 829–834. doi:10.1177/0363546509351562

Heiderscheit, B. C., Hamill, J., and Caldwell, G. E. (2000). Influence of q-angle on lower-extremity running kinematics. J. Orthop. Sport Phys. 30, 271–278. doi:10.2519/jospt.2000.30.5.271

Hertel, J., and Corbett, R. O. (2019). An updated model of chronic ankle instability. J. Athl. Train. 54, 572–588. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-344-18

Hewett, T. E., Ford, K. R., Hoogenboom, B. J., and Myer, G. D. (2010). Understanding and preventing acl injuries: current biomechanical and epidemiologic considerations - update 2010. North Am. J. Sports Phys. Ther. Najspt 5, 234–251.

Hewett, T. E., Lindenfeld, T. N., Riccobene, J. V., and Noyes, F. R. (1999). The effect of neuromuscular training on the incidence of knee injury in female athletes. A prospective study. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 27, 699–706. doi:10.1177/03635465990270060301

Hewett, T. E., Myer, G. D., Ford, K. R., Heidt, R. S., Colosimo, A. J., McLean, S. G., et al. (2005). Biomechanical measures of neuromuscular control and valgus loading of the knee predict anterior cruciate ligament injury risk in female athletes: a prospective study. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 33, 492–501. doi:10.1177/0363546504269591

Hewett, T. E., Torg, J. S., and Boden, B. P. (2009). Video analysis of trunk and knee motion during non-contact anterior cruciate ligament injury in female athletes: lateral trunk and knee abduction motion are combined components of the injury mechanism. *Brit J. Sport Med.* 43, 417–422. doi:10.1136/bjsm.2009.059162

Hubbard-Turner, T., and Turner, M. J. (2015). Physical activity levels in college students with chronic ankle instability. J. Athl. Train. 50, 742–747. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-50.3.05

Jeon, H. G., Lee, S. Y., Park, S. E., and Ha, S. (2021). Ankle instability patients exhibit altered muscle activation of lower extremity and ground reaction force during landing: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Sport Sci. Med.* 20, 373–390. doi:10.52082/jssm. 2021.373

Jeon, K., and Park, J. (2021). Biomechanical characteristic on lower extremity with or without chronic ankle instability during double leg drop landing. *Korean J. Sport Biomechanics* 31, 113–118. doi:10.5103/KJSB.2021.31.2.113

Karita, Y., Kimura, Y., Yamamoto, Y., Naraoka, T., Sasaki, S., Miura, K., et al. (2017). Mechanisms of anterior cruciate ligament injuries in volleyball. *Brit J. Sport Med.* 51, 338–339. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2016-097372.140

Kibler, W. B., Press, J., and Sciascia, A. (2006). The role of core stability in athletic function. *Sports Med.* 36, 189–198. doi:10.2165/00007256-200636030-00001

Kikumoto, T., Kobayashi, M., Omori, G., and Kubo, M. (2024). Single-legged landing behavior of high school basketball players with chronic ankle instability. *J. Bodyw. Mov. Ther.* 39, 454–462. doi:10.1016/j.jbmt.2024.03.054

Kim, H., Son, S. J., Seeley, M. K., and Hopkins, J. T. (2017). Kinetic compensations due to chronic ankle instability during landing and jumping. *Med. and Sci. Sports and Exerc.* 50, 308–317. doi:10.1249/mss.00000000001442

Kipp, K., and Palmieri-Smith, R. M. (2012). Principal component based analysis of biomechanical inter-trial variability in individuals with chronic ankle instability. *Clin. Biomech.* 27, 706–710. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2012.02.005

Konradsen, L., and Voigt, M. (2002). Inversion injury biomechanics in functional ankle instability: a cadaver study of simulated gait. *Scand. J. Med. Sci. Spor* 12, 329–336. doi:10.1034/j.1600-0838.2002.00108.x

Koshino, Y., Yamanaka, M., Ezawa, Y., Ishida, T., Kobayashi, T., Samukawa, M., et al. (2013). Lower limb joint motion during a cross cutting movement differs in individuals with and without chronic ankle instability. *Phys. Ther. Sport* 15, 242–248. doi:10.1016/j.ptsp.2013.12.001

Kramer, L. C., Denegar, C. R., Buckley, W. E., and Hertel, J. (2007). Factors associated with anterior cruciate ligament injury: history in female athletes. J. Sports Med. Phys. Fit. 47, 446–454.

Kristianslund, E., Faul, O., Bahr, R., Myklebust, G., and Krosshaug, T. (2012). Sidestep cutting technique and knee abduction loading: implications for acl prevention exercises. *Brit J. Sport Med.* 48, 779–783. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2012-091370

Krosshaug, T., Nakamae, A., Boden, B. P., Engebretsen, L., Smith, G., Slauterbeck, J. R., et al. (2006). Mechanisms of anterior cruciate ligament injury in basketball: video analysis of 39 cases. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 35, 359–367. doi:10.1177/0363546506293899

Landis, J. R., and Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics* 33, 159–174. doi:10.2307/2529310

Lee, M., Youm, C., Son, M., Kim, J., and Kim, Y. (2017). Effects of chronic ankle instability and induced mediolateral muscular fatigue of the ankle on competitive taekwondo athletes. J. Phys. Ther. Sci. 29, 1329–1335. doi:10.1589/jpts.29.1329

Li, Y., Ko, J., Walker, M. A., Brown, C. N., Schmidt, J. D., Kim, S., et al. (2017). Does chronic ankle instability influence lower extremity muscle activation of females during landing? *J. Electromyogr. Kines* 38, 81–87. doi:10.1016/j.jelekin.2017.11.009

Lin, C., Liu, H., Gros, M. T., Weinhold, P., Garrett, W. E., and Yu, B. (2012). Biomechanical risk factors of non-contact acl injuries: a stochastic biomechanical modeling study. *J. Sport Health Sci.* 1, 36–42. doi:10.1016/j.jshs.2012.01.001

Lohmander, L. S., Ostenberg, A., Englund, M., and Roos, H. (2004). High prevalence of knee osteoarthritis, pain, and functional limitations in female soccer players twelve years after anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 50, 3145–3152. doi:10.1002/art.20589

Mancino, F., Gabr, A., Plastow, R., and Haddad, F. S. (2023). Anterior cruciate ligament injuries in female athletes. *Bone and Jt. J.* 105-B, 1033–1037. doi:10.1302/0301-620x.105b10.bjj-2023-0881.r1

McCann, R. S., Crossett, I. D., Terada, M., Kosik, K. B., Bolding, B. A., and Gribble, P. A. (2017). Hip strength and star excursion balance test deficits of patients with chronic ankle instability. *J. Sci. Med. Sport* 20, 992–996. doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2017.05.005

Mills, C., Pain, M. T. G., and Yeadon, M. R. (2009). Reducing ground reaction forces in gymnastics' landings may increase internal loading. *J. Biomech.* 42, 671–678. doi:10. 1016/j.jbiomech.2009.01.019

Mizuno, Y., Kumagai, M., Mattessich, S. M., Elias, J. J., Ramrattan, N., Cosgarea, A. J., et al. (2001). Q-angle influences tibiofemoral and patellofemoral kinematics. *J. Orthop. Res.* 19, 834–840. doi:10.1016/s0736-0266(01)00008-0

Moisan, G., Descarreaux, M., and Cantin, V. (2017). Effects of chronic ankle instability on kinetics, kinematics and muscle activity during walking and running: a systematic review. *Gait Posture* 52, 381–399. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2016.11.037

Munn, J., Sullivan, S. J., and Schneiders, A. G. (2010). Evidence of sensorimotor deficits in functional ankle instability: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *J. Sci. Med. Sport* 13, 2–12. doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2009.03.004

Myklebust, G., and Bahr, R. (2005). Return to play guidelines after anterior cruciate ligament surgery. *Brit J. Sport Med.* 39, 127-131. doi:10.1136/bjsm.2004.010900

Norcross, M. F., Blackburn, J. T., Goerger, B. M., and Padua, D. A. (2010). The association between lower extremity energy absorption and biomechanical factors related to anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Clin. Biomech.* 25, 1031–1036. doi:10. 1016/j.clinbiomech.2010.07.013

Olsen, O., Myklebust, G., Engebretsen, L., and Bahr, R. (2004). Injury mechanisms for anterior cruciate ligament injuries in team handball: a systematic video analysis. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 32, 1002–1012. doi:10.1177/0363546503261724

Padua, D. A., Marshall, S. W., Boling, M. C., Thigpen, C. A., Garrett Jr, W. E., and Beutler, A. I. (2009). The landing error scoring system (less) is a valid and reliable clinical assessment tool of jump-landing biomechanics: the jump-acl study. Am. J. Sports Med. 37, 1996–2002. doi:10.1177/0363546509343200

Paterno, M. V., Ford, K. R., Myer, G. D., Heyl, R., and Hewett, T. E. (2007). Limb asymmetries in landing and jumping 2 years following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Clin. J. Sport Med.* 17, 258–262. doi:10.1097/jsm.0b013e31804c77ea

Paterno, M. V., Schmitt, L. C., Ford, K. R., Rauh, M. J., Myer, G. D., and Hewett, T. E. (2011). Effects of sex on compensatory landing strategies upon return to sport after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *J. Orthop. Sport Phys.* 41, 553–559. doi:10.2519/jospt.2011.3591

Paterno, M. V., Schmitt, L. C., Ford, K. R., Rauh, M. J., Myer, G. D., Huang, B., et al. (2010). Biomechanical measures during landing and postural stability predict second anterior cruciate ligament injury after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction and return to sport. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 38, 1968–1978. doi:10.1177/0363546510376053

Quatman, C. E., and Hewett, T. E. (2009). The anterior cruciate ligament injury controversy: is "valgus collapse" a sex-specific mechanism? *Brit J. Sport Med.* 43, 328–335. doi:10.1136/bjsm.2009.059139

Renström, P., Arms, S. W., Stanwyck, T. S., Johnson, R. J., and Pope, M. H. (1986). Strain within the anterior cruciate ligament during hamstring and quadriceps activity. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 14, 83–87. doi:10.1177/036354658601400114

Sagawa, Y., Yamada, T., Ohmi, T., Moriyama, Y., and Kato, J. (2024). Differences in lower extremity kinematics during single-leg lateral drop landing of healthy individuals, injured but asymptomatic patients, and patients with chronic ankle instability-a crosssectional observational study. *Plos One* 19, e0297660. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0297660

Simpson, J. D., Stewart, E. M., Macias, D. M., Chander, H., and Knight, A. C. (2018). Individuals with chronic ankle instability exhibit dynamic postural stability deficits and altered unilateral landing biomechanics: a systematic review. *Phys. Ther. Sport* 37, 210–219. doi:10.1016/j.ptsp.2018.06.003

Söderman, K., Alfredson, H., Pietilä, T., and Werner, S. (2001). Risk factors for leg injuries in female soccer players: a prospective investigation during one out-door season. *Knee Surg. Sports Traumatol. Arthrosc.* 9, 313–321. doi:10.1007/s001670100228

Sueki, D. G., Cleland, J. A., and Wainner, R. S. (2013). A regional interdependence model of musculoskeletal dysfunction: research, mechanisms, and clinical implications. *J. Man. and Manip. Ther.* 21, 90–102. doi:10.1179/2042618612y.000000027

Terada, M., Ball, L. M., Pietrosimone, B. G., and Gribble, P. A. (2015). Altered visual focus on sensorimotor control in people with chronic ankle instability. *J. Sport Sci.* 34, 171–180. doi:10.1080/02640414.2015.1043324

Terada, M., Kosik, K. B., McCann, R. S., and Gribble, P. A. (2016). Diaphragm contractility in individuals with chronic ankle instability. *Med. and Sci. Sports and Exerc.* 48, 2040–2045. doi:10.1249/mss.00000000000994

Terada, M., Pietrosimone, B., and Gribble, P. A. (2014). Individuals with chronic ankle instability exhibit altered landing knee kinematics: potential link with the mechanism of loading for the anterior cruciate ligament. *Clin. Biomech.* 29, 1125–1130. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2014.09.014

Theisen, A., and Day, J. (2019). Chronic ankle instability leads to lower extremity kinematic changes during landing tasks: a systematic review. Texas, United States: International Journal of Exercise Science.

Trigsted, S. M., Post, E. G., and Bell, D. R. (2017). Landing mechanics during single hop for distance in females following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction compared to healthy controls. *Knee Surg. Sports Traumatol. Arthrosc.* 25, 1395–1402. doi:10.1007/s00167-015-3658-9

van Putte-Katier, N., van Ochten, J. M., van Middelkoop, M., Bierma-Zeinstra, S. M. A., and Oei, E. H. G. (2015). Magnetic resonance imaging abnormalities after lateral ankle trauma in injured and contralateral ankles. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 84, 2586–2592. doi:10.1016/j.eirad.2015.09.028

Watabe, T., Takabayashi, T., Tokunaga, Y., Watanabe, T., and Kubo, M. (2022). Copers exhibit altered ankle and trunk kinematics compared to the individuals with chronic ankle instability during single-leg landing. *Sport Biomech.*, 1–13. doi:10.1080/14763141.2022.2058989

Watanabe, K., Koshino, Y., Ishida, T., Samukawa, M., and Tohyama, H. (2021). Energy dissipation during single-leg landing from three heights in individuals with and without chronic ankle instability. *Sport Biomech.* 21, 408–427. doi:10.1080/14763141. 2021.2009549

Withrow, T. J., Huston, L. J., Wojtys, E. M., and Ashton-Miller, J. A. (2008). Effect of varying hamstring tension on anterior cruciate ligament strain during *in vitro* impulsive knee flexion and compression loading. *J. Bone and Jt. Surg.* 90, 815–823. doi:10.2106/jbjs.f.01352

Xu, Y., Song, B., Ming, A., Zhang, C., and Ni, G. (2022). Chronic ankle instability modifies proximal lower extremity biomechanics during sports maneuvers that may increase the risk of acl injury: a systematic review. *Front. Physiol.* 13, 1036267. doi:10. 3389/fphys.2022.1036267

Zazulak, B. T., Hewett, T. E., Reeves, N. P., Goldberg, B., and Cholewicki, J. (2007). Deficits in neuromuscular control of the trunk predict knee injury risk: a prospective biomechanical-epidemiologic study. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 35, 1123–1130. doi:10.1177/ 0363546507301585

Zhang, S., Wortley, M., Silvernail, J. F., Carson, D., and Paquette, M. R. (2012). Do ankle braces provide similar effects on ankle biomechanical variables in subjects with and without chronic ankle instability during landing? *J. Sport Health Sci.* 1, 114–120. doi:10.1016/j.jshs.2012.07.002