MR MICHAEL LEJBACH BERTELSEN (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-4001-4581)

MR RENÉ BØRGE KORSGAARD BRUND (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-7246-4811)

Received Date : 12-Oct-2016

Revised Date : 01-Mar-2017

Accepted Date : 17-Mar-2017

Article type : Review Article

Title page

A framework for the etiology of running-related injuries.

Authors

Bertelsen, M.L.^a; Hulme, A.^c; Petersen, J.^a; Korsgaard Brund, R.^d; Sørensen, H.^a; Finch, C.F.^c; Parner, E.T.^b; Nielsen, R.O.^a

- a. Section for Sports Science, Department of Public Health, Aarhus University, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark
- b. Section of Biostatistics, Department of Public Health, Aarhus University, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark
- c. Australian Collaboration for Research into Injury in Sport and its Prevention, Federation University Australia

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/sms.12883](https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12883)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

d. Department of Health Science and Technology, Aalborg University, SMI[®], Aalborg, Denmark

Corresponding author

Michael Lejbach Bertelsen, Department of Public Health, Aarhus University, Dalgas Avenue 4, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark. E-mail michael.bertelsen@ph.au.dk Phone +45 87 16 84 92

ABSTRACT

The etiology of running-related injury is important to consider as the effectiveness of a given running-related injury prevention intervention is dependent on whether etiologic factors are readily modifiable and consistent with a biologically plausible causal mechanism. Therefore, the purpose of the present article was to present an evidence-informed conceptual framework outlining the multifactorial nature of running-related injury etiology. In the framework, four mutually exclusive parts are presented: (A) Structure-specific capacity when entering a running session; (B) Structure-specific cumulative load per running session; (C) Reduction in the structure-specific capacity during a running session; and, (D) Exceeding the structure-specific capacity. The framework can then be used to inform the design of future running-related injury prevention studies, including the formation of research questions and hypotheses, as well as the monitoring of participation-related and non-participation-related exposures. In addition, future research applications should focus on addressing how changes in one or more exposures influence the risk of running-related injury. This necessitates the investigation of how different factors affect the structure-specific load and/or the load capacity, and the dose-response relationship between running participation and injury risk. Ultimately, this direction allows researchers to move beyond traditional risk factor identification to produce research findings

that are not only reliably reported in terms of the observed cause-effect association, but also translatable in practice.

Keywords: Sports injury; injury prevention; biomechanics **INTRODUCTION**

Running is performed by many able-bodied individuals worldwide and is highly effective at promoting a range of health-related benefits (Hespanhol Junior et al., 2015a). Notwithstanding the plethora of health-related benefits that distance running offers to its adherents, musculoskeletal injury is a major barrier to continued participation (Koplan et al., 1995; Nielsen et al., 2014c; Videbaek et al., 2015).

A recent meta-analysis has highlighted that, depending on the type of runner, injury definition, and length of follow-up, the reported running-related injury incidence rate ranges from 2.5 to 33.0 injuries per 1000 hours of running (Videbaek et al., 2015). Owing to the potentially high risk of sustaining injury and its consequences on time-to-recovery and socioeconomic costs (Hespanhol Junior et al., 2015a; Hespanhol Junior et al., 2016; Nielsen et al., 2014c; Smits et al., 2016; Videbaek et al., 2015), running-related injury arguably characterises an important public health issue. For this reason, injury prevention research approaches and strategies should be prioritised. However, in order to directly reduce the risk of injury at the population-level, it is important to firstly gain understanding about causal factors and mechanisms of its etiology (Finch, 2006).

The nature of running-related injury is known to have a complex multifactorial origin (Hreljac, 2005; Malisoux et al., 2015a). Considerable research efforts have been made on behalf of the sports medicine research community to shed light on its etiology. According to a recent systematic review, in excess of 70 studies have examined non-biomechanical, modifiable and non-modifiable, middle- and long-distance running-related injury risk and protective factors (Hulme et al., 2016). Across these studies, risk factors for running-related injury have represented a range of exposures, from footwear properties, training-related parameters, anthropometric characteristics, and demographic indications (Hulme et al., 2016). The identification of risk factors for injury can help to detect certain runners who might be at an increased or decreased risk of developing injury (Bittencourt et al., 2016). Irrespective of statistical significance, however, not every exposure will be causally related to running-related injury (Shrier & Platt, 2008). In other words, potentially effective injury prevention intervention strategies will have a better chance of working if the identified etiologic

factors are readily modifiable and consistent with a biologically plausible mechanism (Finch, 2006). In a recent consensus-based statement on training load in sport (Soligard et al., 2016), the important role of training errors in relation to injury development was promoted, since all sports-related injuries occur as a direct result of participating in a given training regimen. As with other sports (Drew & Finch, 2016), training errors have also been acknowledged as a major contributor to overuse injury in distance runners (Malisoux et al., 2015a; Nielsen et al., 2012).

Even though the evidence about risk factors as generated via traditional epidemiological inquiry is useful, knowledge about how to reduce running-related injury risk has to be used in a practical way by runners and/or their immediate supporting staff (e.g., coaches and healthcare professionals). Accordingly, the design and analyses associated with a given running-related injury study has to produce research findings that are not only reliably reported in terms of the observed cause-effect association, but also translatable under a real-world scenario. For instance, a study found that runners with a body mass index (BMI) ≥ 26 kg/m² had a reduced risk of sustaining a running-related injury when compared to runners with a lower BMI (Taunton et al., 2003). In the absence of a training load exposure in the analyses, it would be misleading to interpret this finding as ‘runners with a BMI ≥ 26 kg/m² can participate in running to a greater extent than their peers who have a lower BMI’. Contrastingly, in a study by Nielsen et al. (2014a), stratified analyses were used to investigate if runners with a higher BMI were able to tolerate less running than those with a lower BMI. The results from that study revealed BMI to modify the association between running distance and injury in the sense that those with a higher BMI were more susceptible to injury than those with a lower BMI if they ran a similar distance (Nielsen et al., 2014a).

Unfortunately, only very few studies in the past 40 years have examined the role of effect-measure modification on injury risk as it relates to the association between a participation-related exposure and running-related injury (Hulme et al., 2016). This problem was recently addressed in the International Olympic Committee (IOC) consensus statements on load in sports and risk of injury (Soligard et al., 2016). The IOC statement recommended that, where feasible, future research should investigate the dose-response relationship between a participation-related variable and injury risk through large scale prospective cohort study designs. In addition, particular focus should be directed towards the potential interactions with, and relative contributions from, other risk factors (Soligard et al., 2016). Therefore, in the distance running-related injury prevention research context, researchers should consider how much running is ‘too much’, as well as how factors such as BMI,

footwear, sex, and surface and terrain, influence the dose-response relationship between running participation and injury risk.

To facilitate this research direction, a framework for the complex, multifactorial etiology of running injuries will assist in future hypothesis making and study design. Such a framework can then be used to facilitate data analyses through better understanding the role of confounders, mediators, and/or effect-measure modifiers (Meeuwisse, 1994; Shrier & Platt, 2008; VanderWeele & Vansteelandt, 2009). From there, the proposed framework can assist with the identification of whether a given exposure of interest is time-fixed or time-dependent (i.e. changes status over time), and if it is modifiable (Nielsen et al., 2016). Therefore, the purpose of the present article was to present an evidence-informed conceptual framework outlining the multifactorial nature of running-related injury etiology.

A FRAMEWORK FOR THE ETIOLOGY OF RUNNING INJURIES

In the sports science context, several authors have emphasized the importance of looking beyond the immediate set of risk factors and deeper into the complex nature of causation (Bekker & Clark, 2016; Hulme & Finch, 2016; Meeuwisse et al., 2007; Shrier & Platt, 2008). While visualizing causal frameworks has been used in a number of studies on sports injury in general (Meeuwisse et al., 2007; Shrier et al., 2016; Windt & Gabbett, 2017), sports-specific frameworks are now needed. In the running-related injury thematic, a simple model has been presented (Malisoux et al., 2015a). Accordingly, more work is needed to modify and further develop this framework. In Figure 1, a conceptual framework of running-related injury development is presented with the use of four parts: (Part A) Structure-specific capacity when entering a running session; (Part B) Structure-specific cumulative load per running session; (Part C) Reduction in the structure-specific capacity during a running session; and, (Part D) Exceeding the structure-specific capacity.

PART A: STRUCTURE-SPECIFIC LOAD CAPACITY WHEN ENTERING A RUNNING SESSION

The structure-specific load capacity can be defined as the musculoskeletal system's ability to withstand load without sustaining injury (Hreljac, 2005). As all musculoskeletal structures in the human body adapt positively or negatively to applied load over time (Ni et al., 2013; Xu et al., 2016), each runner will commence a given running session with a unique load capacity for each bodily structure (Bohm et al., 2015). This adaptation can be influenced by factors such as time

between sessions or competition (Magnusson et al., 2010; Soligard et al., 2016), running experience, previous injury, history of menstrual patterns, diet, sleep (von Rosen et al., 2016), use of oral contraceptives, participation in other sporting activities, sex (van der Worp et al., 2015), and age (Kline & Williams, 2015). These factors comprise only a limited number of known risk factors that might affect the structure-specific load capacity.

PART B: STRUCTURE-SPECIFIC CUMULATIVE LOAD PER RUNNING SESSION

Seminal work which conceptualised the cyclical nature of risk and causation in the sports injury context reported, “*exposure is a combination of both possessing a risk factor and then participating (to a greater or lesser degree) with the risk factor*” (Meeuwisse et al., 2007). Based on this, it can be contended that injury development in runners requires understanding of how the risk of injury changes depending on the dose of running participation. Therefore, the quantification of running participation is needed to move from risk factor identification alone towards a better understanding of the nature of running-related injury development. However, methodological and practical considerations on what precisely constitutes ‘running participation’, and how it differs from structure-specific load, is currently required in order to move beyond the traditional approach of simply identifying statistically significant risk factors (Hulme et al., 2016).

Repetition count has recently been promoted as important when monitoring sports participation in relation to injury risk (Soligard et al., 2016). In a running context, repetition count is best expressed as the number of gait cycles (strides) (Novacheck, 1998). The stride begins when one foot contacts the ground, and ends when that same foot contacts the ground again (Novacheck, 1998). In the present paper, running participation is defined as the number of strides taken during a running session. As will soon be discussed, the number of strides per running session is theoretically superior as an alternative to running distance and time-spent running. Similarly, it is equally important to distinguish running participation (i.e. number of strides) from the load applied to the specific musculoskeletal structures in the body. To predict the latter, quantification of stride-wise load magnitude and load distribution is needed (Edwards et al., 2008; Edwards et al., 2010; Firminger & Edwards, 2016; Sobhani et al., 2017; Willy et al., 2016).

In a distance running context, structure-specific cumulative load can be viewed as the sum of stride-specific loads that a certain musculoskeletal structure is exposed to during a single running session (Lenhart et al., 2014b). Estimation of the structure-specific cumulative load per running session

involves *stride-wise* quantification of: (i) *the load distribution per stride*; and, (ii) *the load magnitude per stride*.

(i) Load distribution per stride

The term ‘load distribution’ refers to how the load per stride is distributed across individual anatomical structures (e.g., joint surfaces, muscles and ligaments). Using a few examples, load distribution is affected by: (i) *changing running shoes*, since the load may be distributed differently across lower extremities (Bergstra et al., 2015; Chambon et al., 2014; Firminger & Edwards, 2016; Fuller et al., 2016; Kong et al., 2009; Ryan et al., 2014; Sobhani et al., 2014; Sobhani et al., 2015; Sobhani et al., 2017; Warne et al., 2014; Warne et al., 2016), (ii) *applying a different running technique*, since differences in kinematic and kinetic characteristics between foot-strike patterns were found during running (Almeida et al., 2015). Other technique modifications influencing running kinematics and/or kinetics involve trunk posture (Teng & Powers, 2015), step rate (Heiderscheit et al., 2011; Lenhart et al., 2014a; Lenhart et al., 2014b), the pose-method and chi-running (Arendse et al., 2004; Goss & Gross, 2012; Goss & Gross, 2013), and step length (Willson et al., 2014); (iii) *change in terrain*, since uphill and downhill running will change certain kinematics and hence load distribution depending on the nature of the terrain (Vernillo et al., 2016); (iv) *changing between overground and treadmill*, since loads are distributed differently in the two settings (Willy et al., 2016), (v) *changing surface*, since surface hardness may influence the interplay of load distribution to the lower extremity by changing the lower leg kinematics and kinetics during running (Dixon et al., 2000; Ferris et al., 1999; Hardin et al., 2004; Stergiou et al., 1999); and, (vi) *bone morphology and physiology*, since the form and structure and special structural features of the leg impacts how the load is distributed (Popp et al., 2017; Powell et al., 2014; Powell et al., 2016; Williams et al., 2004).

(ii) Load magnitude per stride

The term ‘load magnitude’ refers to the size of the load per stride applied to the body whilst engaged in running. During stance phase, the load magnitude will predominantly be determined by the ground reaction force and muscle forces contributing to joint compression forces and strain on tendons and muscles (Novacheck, 1998). Alternatively, during swing phase, the load magnitude will predominantly be determined by kinematic properties such as hip flexor range of motion (Novacheck, 1998). Thus the magnitude of the stride-specific load during stance and swing phase is influenced by factors, including but not limited to, body weight and terrain, running speed (Dorn et

al., 2012; Edwards et al., 2010; Petersen et al., 2014; Schache et al., 2011), and vertical oscillation (Kaplan et al., 2016; Wille et al., 2014; Wren et al., 2001).

PART C: REDUCTION IN THE STRUCTURE-SPECIFIC LOAD CAPACITY DURING A RUNNING SESSION

The proposed framework indicates that the structure-specific load capacity gradually decreases in response to repetitive loading associated with multiple strides and no restitution period (Figure 2a) (Hreljac, 2005; Magnusson et al., 2010; Soligard et al., 2016). The extent to which this capacity decreases after each stride is dependent on the magnitude of the load applied in each stride, and the structures sensitivity to that load (Edwards et al., 2010; Ni et al., 2013). Therefore, if the structure-specific cumulative load of a running session can be successfully estimated, the next task is to relate it to the reduction in the structure-specific load capacity in different runners cumulating the load in various ways (e.g., few strides with high load versus many strides with low load) (Dye, 2005; Kaplan et al., 2016; Ni et al., 2013). The reduction in load capacity, particularly in combination with psychological non-sport stressors and inter- and intra-individual variation, will determine if maladaptation is triggered at a given time frame for recovery (Soligard et al., 2016).

PART D: EXCEEDING THE STRUCTURE-SPECIFIC LOAD CAPACITY

The relationship between load and load capacity has been suggested to play an important role in injury development (Dye, 1996; Hreljac, 2005; Soligard et al., 2016), and the inciting event for running-related injury occurs when the structure-specific cumulative load exceeds the capacity of that structure (Hreljac, 2005). Injury may occur within one session, or over multiple running sessions given insufficient recovery between running sessions. This will contribute to the gradual reduction in the load capacity of certain structures (Figure 2a) (Magnusson et al., 2010; Meeusen et al., 2013). However, in the specific injurious running session, injury is the result of multiple load repetitions (strides) that have gradually decreased the structure-specific load capacity to a level where eventually, it has been surpassed (Figure 2b). The severity of a given injury depends on the degree to which the structure-specific load capacity has been exceeded. Soligaard et al (2016) described the relationship between load and health as a well-being continuum progressing from

homeostasis, acute fatigue, functional and non-functional over-reaching, overtraining syndrome, subclinical tissue damage, clinical symptoms, time-loss injury or illness, and ultimately death.

In summary, the number of strides a runner is able to complete without exceeding the load capacity of a specific structure in a running session is dependent on the following: (i) the structure specific load capacity when entering the running session; (ii) the amount of load applied to the structure in each stride (magnitude and distribution); and, (iii) the structure's sensitivity to that load (reduction in load capacity).

IMPLICATIONS OF THE FRAMEWORK

The concepts of combining participation-related and non-participation-related risk factors for running-related injury development have been addressed by Malisoux et al. (Malisoux et al., 2015a). However, the distinction between participation and cumulative structure-specific load, as described in the present framework, has received little attention in the context of running. This distinction has important considerations for hypothesis-making, data analysis and data collection procedures.

IMPLICATIONS FOR HYPOTHESIS-MAKING AND RESEARCH QUESTION

The proposed framework illustrates that if participation in running is omitted from an analyses, sub-groups of runners at a decreased or increased risk of injury can be identified, whereas researchers' ability to investigate the etiology behind injury occurrence is restricted. Rather than identifying discrete individual-level risk factors in isolation, it is important to consider how participation-related and non-participation-related variables interact in a dynamic and recursive manner (Bekker & Clark, 2016; Bittencourt et al., 2016). For example, a research hypothesis such as: "*runners sustain a running-related injury because they had a certain characteristic*" requires appropriate reformulation because the effect of a given variable; whether it is affecting the load per stride or the load capacity, also depends on the level of participation. For instance, a running-related injury is not sustained because of footwear type, a high or low BMI, or poor running technique (Malisoux et al., 2015a). Rather, running injuries are sustained when runners increase their participation to the point where an interaction with an existing risk factor becomes significant enough to cause injury. Causal relationships are thus better examined by including the level of participation as the exposure to injury. A more appropriate hypothesis is: "*We hypothesise the injury occurred as a result of the runner possessing multiple risk factors and then participating in running under certain*

circumstances to a degree where the structure's load capacity was exceeded". If the combined nature of the exposure and other factors is to be examined, then researchers must rephrase their research question. The common risk factor approach: "Are runners with a specific variable at an increased risk of running-related injury?" is not appropriate if we seek to move beyond prediction and towards causation and intervention. A more appropriate research question would be: "How much running participation can runners with a specific variable tolerate, compared to runners not having that variable?"

Reformulating traditional hypotheses to instead account for alternative participatory exposures will have implications for methodologies and analyses. Runners might be allocated to different conditions based on participatory criteria, and further stratified according to training-related experience or other variables under investigation (Nielsen et al., 2014a). As such, analyses require insight into the differences between confounders, effect-measure modifiers, and mediating variables (Meeuwisse, 1994; Shrier & Platt, 2008).

IMPLICATIONS FOR DATA ANALYSIS

If overuse running-related injuries occur as a consequence of "running too much, too soon" as suggested by others (Fredericson, 1996; Galloway et al., 1992; Nielsen et al., 2012; Renstrom, 1993; Rzonca & Baylis, 1988; Wen, 2007), the role of exposures and their changes in status over time, requires further attention from running injury researchers (Nielsen et al., 2016). Much attention in the broader field of sports science has, as of late, also shifted in this same direction (Soligard et al., 2016). According to the framework presented in this article, we recommend researchers, and health-care professionals to consider if change prior to running-related injury development has occurred within one or more of the following four categories: (i) change in the amount of participation (i.e., running more than usual), and/or: (ii) change in the load distribution; (iii) change in the magnitude of the load; and, (iv) change in the load capacity (i.e., participating the same but with circumstances that changed).

(i) Change in the amount of running participation

Researchers conducting large-scale epidemiological studies have the opportunity to quantify changes in running participation. Recently, emphasis has shifted towards calculating sudden changes via the acute:chronic workload ratio (Gabbett et al., 2012; Hulin et al., 2014; Hulin et al., 2016; Windt & Gabbett, 2017). Importantly, such workload ratio does not, although

terminologically related, respond to changes in the cumulative structure-specific load as described in the present framework. Instead, the workload ratio corresponds to changes in running participation. Although new research endeavours may include sudden changes in running participation, the definition of ‘sudden change’ requires clarification and further discussion. Definition of sudden changes in participation has included differences between a 4-week-based acute:chronic workload ratio, which is commonly used in other sports than running (Gabbett, 2016; Gabbett et al., 2016; Hulin et al., 2014; Hulin et al., 2016), and the week-to-week change which has been applied to running-related injury data (Buist et al., 2008; Kluitenberg et al., 2016; Nielsen et al., 2014b). The question remains whether data on sports participation and sudden changes should be viewed as rolling averages or as non-linear relationships (Drew et al., 2016; Menaspa, 2016; Murray et al., 2016).

(ii) Change in the load distribution

Running too much following a change in distribution of load across individual anatomical structures, e.g., joint surfaces, muscles and ligaments, may, as visualized by the model, increase injury risk because the structure-specific cumulative load of a running session is dependent on the load distribution. For instance, running too much in a new shoe (Fuller et al., 2016; Histen et al., 2016; Malisoux et al., 2015b; Ryan et al., 2014), or transitioning to a new running technique, may increase the cumulative load in a specific structure to a level which does not allow for adaptive tissue repair between running sessions, thus increasing the risk of injury (Goss & Gross, 2012). Importantly, the increase in risk following change in distribution could be neglected if the amount of running participation is reduced accordingly until the tissue is accustomed to the new load. In the case of a researcher wanting to examine if a change in load distribution increases the risk of running-related injury, quantification of running participation and variables like changes in running style, running shoes, and surface, is necessary.

(i) Change in the magnitude of load per stride

Injury may occur if the magnitude of the load per stride is suddenly increased to a level where the structure-specific cumulative load of a running session overwhelms the ability for adaptive tissue repair. For instance, increasing running speed will increase the magnitude of the load per stride, and if the increase in speed is excessive and unfamiliar to the runner, an injury might occur (Nielsen et

al., 2013b). The same line of reasoning can be applied to a gradual change in body weight, or a sudden change in running surfaces and terrain (Tessutti et al., 2012). Examination of the role of a sudden change in the magnitude of load on running-related injury development requires, for instance, the quantification of running participation and changes in body weight, running speed and terrain.

(ii) Change in load capacity

Naturally, other sports activities and activities of daily living change the structures capabilities to withstand load during running, for better or worse, over time. Running-related injury may, therefore, occur if runners run too much with a reduced load capacity following other types of activities (Kaplan et al., 2016; Wren et al., 2001). Unfortunately, at the present time, load capacity is nearly impossible to quantify. Indirect markers of overtraining, such as elevated heart rate at rest or live blood analysis (e.g., hormone analysis or biochemical analysis), might be quantifiable (Halsen, 2014; Urhausen et al., 1995; Urhausen & Kindermann, 2002). However, no current methods directly address tissue-specific load capacity. In large-scale epidemiological studies, quantification of between-session changes in activity level, sleep, diet and illness, is necessary to identify the influence of changes in load capacity on the association between running participation and injury risk.

Applying statistics to analyse changes

To examine the role of change (in one or more of the four levels above) on running-related injury development, researchers should be encouraged to understand advanced statistical models, such as those based on time-to-event, since inclusion of variables that change status over time is a necessary step in the analytical approach (Mahmood et al., 2014; Nielsen et al., 2016; Ullah et al., 2014). Unfortunately, studies investigating the association between time-varying exposures and outcomes are rare in sport-injury research (Nielsen et al., 2016; Nielsen et al., 2014b; Shrier et al., 2016). Lack of interdisciplinary collaborations between researchers with different competencies may be the reason for the limited number of studies dealing with changes. This calls for a stronger collaboration between researchers with e.g. epidemiological, statistical or biomechanical backgrounds.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The framework enables researchers within the running injury thematic to carefully consider when and why to collect continuous data on exposures related to running-related injury. Here, quantification of running participation is of particular importance.

Quantifying running participation in epidemiological studies

To outline the mechanisms leading to injury, number of strides was used as a measure of running participation. Measurement of strides in epidemiological studies examining the etiology behind running-related injuries should be considered for the following reasons: (i) it takes into account repetition count (Novacheck, 1998; Soligard et al., 2016); and, (ii) each stride defines the load and load distribution and the vast majority of the load is distributed during stance (Kernozek et al., 2016). Based on this, we recommend future data collections within the running-related injury thematic to include quantification of strides. However, researchers conducting epidemiological studies have the opportunity to, at least, measure three types of participation-related variables: (i) time exposed to running, (ii) running distance (e.g., kilometres run per session or week), and/or (iii) number of strides. If it is not possible to quantify number of strides in prospective studies on runners, then, running distance and/or time exposed to running are still feasible alternatives and should be used (Malisoux et al., 2015a).

In situations where traditional participation-related variables have to be used, researchers should strive to collect objective data, particularly when it has been shown runners are unable to validly self-report running distance (Dideriksen et al., 2016). For decades, wearable technologies such as sports watches and fitness trackers have allowed runners to quantify time exposed to running. The recent development of these commercially available devices (Adams et al., 2016; Nielsen et al., 2013a), including insoles (Mann et al., 2014), pedometers (Moran et al., 2013) and accelerometers (Tudor-Locke et al., 2015; Watari et al., 2016), as well as electronic health platforms (Malisoux et al., 2013), now afford research teams the possibility of using new ways to collect data. This potentially opens up a new era of data collection and data analyses possibilities, especially given that no large-scale field-based epidemiological studies have yet examined the association between number of strides during running, as a measure of running participation, and the risk of developing running-related injury.

Future data collection challenges

Quantification of sudden changes in structure-specific cumulative load is appealing but presents a number of challenges from a biomechanical perspective. Firstly, quantifying structure-specific load per stride is complex, but can be achieved with contemporary laboratory-based methods and computer-modelling (Dorn et al., 2012; Edwards et al., 2008). Such approaches allow for approximation of forces applied to individual anatomical structures. However, the calculation of stress (i.e., force/area, which is the load-variable most closely related to tissue damage) per stride, also requires knowledge of the areas over which the forces are applied (e.g., contact areas between joint surfaces subjected to compression “bone-on-bone” forces or cross sectional areas of muscles, tendons and ligaments subjected to traction forces). Valid biomechanical measures of these areas are hard to obtain, not least because they vary considerably during the step cycle. Moreover, methods for estimating forces applied to individual structures all involve some form of mathematical optimization, which requires fairly speculative assumptions about how the central nervous system coordinates activation of individual muscles (Al-Munajjed et al., 2016; Kernozek et al., 2016; Miller & Hamill, 2009). Despite these limitations, the model proposed in the present article is appealing given that it provides a conceptual framework that, if used in practice, would lead to more accurate quantification of running exposure compared with traditional measures. This makes sudden changes in cumulative structure-specific load an interesting area of study because it permits an in-depth examination of the association between changes in training-related variables (e.g., pace, distance, surface and technique) and runner characteristics (e.g., equipment usage, weight) in relation to injury development in specific structures. Stride-specific loads vary from stride to stride. Therefore, information on a stride-wise level must be added in order to calculate an estimate of the structure-specific cumulative load per running session. Such data may be gathered in biomechanical laboratories. Still, the future challenge is to be able to calculate approximate values of these structure-specific loads from field-based data.

PERSPECTIVES

Running-related injury occurs from a combination of the runner possessing multiple risk factors and then participating in running under certain circumstances to a degree where the structure’s load capacity is exceeded. The number of strides, magnitude of load, distribution of load and load capacity are all necessary ingredients for understanding the cause of running-related injury. Based on the proposed framework, we recommend future running-related injury research to carefully consider its research question, hypotheses and the adopted statistical approach, to ensure that advances can be made in understanding how and why running-related injury occurs. Knowledge on

how factors influence the dose-response relationship between running participation and injury will bring significant advances towards understanding the etiology of running-related injury.

Acknowledgements

Ellen Aagaard Nøhr, University of Southern Denmark, for providing valuable comments in the initial part of the development of the framework.

Funding

Michael Bertelsen and Rasmus Nielsen are funded by Aarhus University Research Fund. Adam Hulme is funded via the Australian Research Training Scheme (RTS) program at Federation University Australia. Caroline Finch is funded by a National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Principal Research Fellowship (ID1058737). ACRISP is one of the International Research Centres for the Prevention of Injury and Protection of Athlete Health supported by the International Olympic Committee (IOC).

References

Adams D, Pozzi F, Carroll A, Rombach A, Zeni J, Jr. Validity and Reliability of a Commercial Fitness Watch for Measuring Running Dynamics. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther 2016; 46: 471-476.

Al-Munajjed AA, Bischoff JE, Dharia MA, Telfer S, Woodburn J, Carbes S. Metatarsal Loading during Gait-A Musculoskeletal Analysis. *J Biomech Eng* 2016; 138: 4032413.

Almeida MO, Davis IS, Lopes AD. Biomechanical Differences of Foot-Strike Patterns during Running: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2015; 45: 738-755.

Arendse RE, Noakes TD, Azevedo LB, Romanov N, Schwellnus MP, Fletcher G. Reduced Eccentric Loading of the Knee with the Pose Running Method. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2004; 36: 272-277.

Bekker S, Clark AM. Bringing Complexity to Sports Injury Prevention Research: From Simplification to Explanation. *Br J Sports Med* 2016; 50: 1489-1490.

Bergstra SA, Kluitenberg B, Dekker R, Bredeweg SW, Postema K, Van den Heuvel ER, Hijmans JM, Sobhani S. Running with a Minimalist Shoe Increases Plantar Pressure in the Forefoot Region of Healthy Female Runners. *J Sci Med Sport* 2015; 18: 463-468.

Bittencourt NF, Meeuwisse WH, Mendonca LD, Nettel-Aguirre A, Ocarino JM, Fonseca ST. Complex Systems Approach for Sports Injuries: Moving from Risk Factor Identification to Injury Pattern Recognition-Narrative Review and New Concept. *Br J Sports Med* 2016; doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095850.

Bohm S, Mersmann F, Arampatzis A. Human Tendon Adaptation in Response to Mechanical Loading: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Exercise Intervention Studies on Healthy Adults. *Sports Med Open* 2015; 1: 7.

Buist I, Bredeweg SW, van Mechelen W, Lemmink KA, Pepping GJ, Diercks RL. No Effect of a Graded Training Program on the Number of Running-Related Injuries in Novice Runners: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Sports Med* 2008; 36: 33-39.

Chambon N, Sevrez V, Ly QH, Gueguen N, Berton E, Rao G. Aging of Running Shoes and its Effect on Mechanical and Biomechanical Variables: Implications for Runners. *J Sports Sci* 2014; 32: 1013-1022.

Dideriksen M, Soegaard C, Nielsen RO. Validity of Self-Reported Running Distance. *J Strength Cond Res* 2016; 30: 1592-1596.

Dixon SJ, Collop AC, Batt ME. Surface Effects on Ground Reaction Forces and Lower Extremity Kinematics in Running. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2000; 32: 1919-1926.

Dorn TW, Schache AG, Pandy MG. Muscular Strategy Shift in Human Running: Dependence of Running Speed on Hip and Ankle Muscle Performance. *J Exp Biol* 2012; 215: 1944-1956.

Drew MK, Blanch P, Purdam C, Gabbett TJ. Yes, Rolling Averages are a Good Way to Assess Training Load for Injury Prevention. is there a Better Way? Probably, but we have Not seen the Evidence. *Br J Sports Med* 2016: in press

Drew MK, Finch CF. The Relationship between Training Load and Injury, Illness and Soreness: A Systematic and Literature Review. *Sports Med* 2016: in press

Dye SF. The Knee as a Biologic Transmission with an Envelope of Function: A Theory. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1996; (325): 10-18.

Dye SF. The Pathophysiology of Patellofemoral Pain: A Tissue Homeostasis Perspective. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2005; (436): 100-110.

Edwards WB, Gillette JC, Thomas JM, Derrick TR. Internal Femoral Forces and Moments during Running: Implications for Stress Fracture Development. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* 2008; 23: 1269-1278.

Edwards WB, Taylor D, Rudolphi TJ, Gillette JC, Derrick TR. Effects of Running Speed on a Probabilistic Stress Fracture Model. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* 2010; 25: 372-377.

Ferris DP, Liang K, Farley CT. Runners Adjust Leg Stiffness for their First Step on a New Running Surface. *J Biomech* 1999; 32: 787-794.

Finch C. A New Framework for Research Leading to Sports Injury Prevention. *J Sci Med Sport* 2006; 9: 3-9.

Firminger CR, Edwards WB. The Influence of Minimalist Footwear and Stride Length Reduction on Lower-Extremity Running Mechanics and Cumulative Loading. *J Sci Med Sport* 2016; 19: 975-979.

Fredericson M. Common Injuries in Runners. Diagnosis, Rehabilitation and Prevention. *Sports Med* 1996; 21: 49-72.

Fuller JT, Buckley JD, Tsiros MD, Brown NA, Thewlis D. Redistribution of Mechanical Work at the Knee and Ankle Joints during Fast Running in Minimalist Shoes. *J Athl Train* 2016: in press

Gabbett TJ. The Training-Injury Prevention Paradox: Should Athletes be Training Smarter and Harder? Br J Sports Med 2016; 50: 273-280.

Gabbett TJ, Hulin BT, Blanch P, Whiteley R. High Training Workloads Alone do Not Cause Sports Injuries: How You Get there is the Real Issue. Br J Sports Med 2016; 50: 444-445.

Gabbett TJ, Ullah S, Finch CF. Identifying Risk Factors for Contact Injury in Professional Rugby League Players--Application of a Frailty Model for Recurrent Injury. J Sci Med Sport 2012; 15: 496-504.

Galloway MT, Jokl P, Dayton OW. Achilles Tendon Overuse Injuries. Clin Sports Med 1992; 11: 771-782.

Goss DL, Gross MT. A Review of Mechanics and Injury Trends among various Running Styles. US Army Med Dep J 2012; 62-71.

Goss DL, Gross MT. A Comparison of Negative Joint Work and Vertical Ground Reaction Force Loading Rates in Chi Runners and Rearfoot-Striking Runners. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther 2013; 43: 685-692.

Halsen SL. Monitoring Training Load to Understand Fatigue in Athletes. Sports Med 2014; 44 Suppl 2: S139-47.

Hardin EC, van den Bogert AJ, Hamill J. Kinematic Adaptations during Running: Effects of Footwear, Surface, and Duration. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2004; 36: 838-844.

Heiderscheit BC, Chumanov ES, Michalski MP, Wille CM, Ryan MB. Effects of Step Rate Manipulation on Joint Mechanics during Running. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2011; 43: 296-302.

Hespanhol Junior LC, Pillay JD, van Mechelen W, Verhagen E. Meta-Analyses of the Effects of Habitual Running on Indices of Health in Physically Inactive Adults. Sports Med 2015a; 45: 1455-1468.

Hespanhol Junior LC, van Mechelen W, Postuma E, Verhagen E. Health and Economic Burden of Running-Related Injuries in Runners Training for an Event: A Prospective Cohort Study. Scand J Med Sci Sports 2016; 26:1091-9.

Histen K, Arntsen J, L'Hereux L, Heeren J, Wicki B, Saint S, Aerni G, Denegar CR, Joseph MF. Achilles Tendon Properties in Minimalist and Traditionally Shod Runners. J Sport Rehabil 2016; 1-16.

Hreljac A. Etiology, Prevention, and Early Intervention of Overuse Injuries in Runners: A Biomechanical Perspective. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am* 2005; 16: 651-67, vi.

Hulin BT, Gabbett TJ, Blanch P, Chapman P, Bailey D, Orchard JW. Spikes in Acute Workload are Associated with Increased Injury Risk in Elite Cricket Fast Bowlers. *Br J Sports Med* 2014; 48: 708-712.

Hulin BT, Gabbett TJ, Lawson DW, Caputi P, Sampson JA. The Acute:Chronic Workload Ratio Predicts Injury: High Chronic Workload may Decrease Injury Risk in Elite Rugby League Players. *Br J Sports Med* 2016; 50: 231-236.

Hulme A, Finch C. The Epistemic Basis of Distance Running Injury Research: A Historical Perspective. *Journal of Sport and Health Science* 2016; 5: 172-175.

Hulme A, Nielsen RO, Timpka T, Verhagen E, Finch C. Risk and Protective Factors for Middle- and Long-Distance Running-Related Injury: A Systematic Review. *Sports Medicine* 2016: In press (doi:10.1007/s40279-016-0636-4).

Kaplan JT, Neu CP, Drissi H, Emery NC, Pierce DM. Cyclic Loading of Human Articular Cartilage: The Transition from Compaction to Fatigue. *J Mech Behav Biomed Mater* 2016; 65: 734-742.

Kernozek T, Gheidi N, Ragan R. Comparison of Estimates of Achilles Tendon Loading from Inverse Dynamics and Inverse Dynamics-Based Static Optimisation during Running. *J Sports Sci* 2016: 1-7.

Kline PW, Williams DS, 3rd. Effects of Normal Aging on Lower Extremity Loading and Coordination during Running in Males and Females. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* 2015; 10: 901-909.

Kluitenberg B, van der Worp H, Huisstede BM, Hartgens F, Diercks R, Verhagen E, van Middelkoop M. The NLstart2run Study: Training-Related Factors Associated with Running-Related Injuries in Novice Runners. *J Sci Med Sport* 2016; 19: 642-646.

Kong PW, Candelaria NG, Smith DR. Running in New and Worn Shoes: A Comparison of Three Types of Cushioning Footwear. *Br J Sports Med* 2009; 43: 745-749.

Koplan JP, Rothenberg RB, Jones EL. The Natural History of Exercise: A 10-Yr Follow-Up of a Cohort of Runners. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1995; 27: 1180-1184.

Lenhart R, Thelen D, Heiderscheit B. Hip Muscle Loads during Running at various Step Rates. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2014a: 44: 766-74, A1-4.

Lenhart RL, Thelen DG, Wille CM, Chumanov ES, Heiderscheit BC. Increasing Running Step Rate Reduces Patellofemoral Joint Forces. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2014b: 46: 557-564.

Magnusson SP, Langberg H, Kjaer M. The Pathogenesis of Tendinopathy: Balancing the Response to Loading. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2010: 6: 262-268.

Mahmood A, Ullah S, Finch CF. Application of Survival Models in Sports Injury Prevention Research: A Systematic Review. *Br J Sports Med* 2014: 48: 630.

Malisoux L, Frisch A, Urhausen A, Seil R, Theisen D. Monitoring of Sport Participation and Injury Risk in Young Athletes. *J Sci Med Sport* 2013: 16: 504-508.

Malisoux L, Nielsen RO, Urhausen A, Theisen D. A Step Towards Understanding the Mechanisms of Running-Related Injuries. *J Sci Med Sport* 2015a: 18: 523-528.

Malisoux L, Ramesh J, Mann R, Seil R, Urhausen A, Theisen D. Can Parallel use of Different Running Shoes Decrease Running-Related Injury Risk? *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2015b: 25: 110-115.

Mann R, Malisoux L, Brunner R, Gette P, Urhausen A, Statham A, Meijer K, Theisen D. Reliability and Validity of Pressure and Temporal Parameters Recorded using a Pressure-Sensitive Insole during Running. *Gait Posture* 2014: 39: 455-9.

Meeusen R, Duclos M, Foster C, Fry A, Gleeson M, Nieman D, Raglin J, Rietjens G, Steinacker J, Urhausen A, European College of Sport Science, American College of Sports Medicine. Prevention, Diagnosis, and Treatment of the Overtraining Syndrome: Joint Consensus Statement of the European College of Sport Science and the American College of Sports Medicine. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2013: 45: 186-205.

Meeuwisse WH. Athletic Injury Etiology: Distinguishing between Interaction and Confounding. *Clin J Sport Med* 1994: 4: 171-175.

Meeuwisse WH, Tyreman H, Hagel B, Emery C. A Dynamic Model of Etiology in Sport Injury: The Recursive Nature of Risk and Causation. *Clin J Sport Med* 2007: 17: 215-219.

Menaspa P. Are Rolling Averages a Good Way to Assess Training Load for Injury Prevention? Br J Sports Med 2016.

Miller RH, Hamill J. Computer Simulation of the Effects of Shoe Cushioning on Internal and External Loading during Running Impacts. Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin 2009; 12: 481-490.

Moran DS, Evans R, Arbel Y, Luria O, Hadid A, Yanovich R, Milgrom C, Finestone AS. Physical and Psychological Stressors Linked with Stress Fractures in Recruit Training. Scand J Med Sci Sports 2013; 23: 443-450.

Murray NB, Gabbett TJ, Townshend AD, Blanch P. Calculating Acute:Chronic Workload Ratios using Exponentially Weighted Moving Averages Provides a More Sensitive Indicator of Injury Likelihood than Rolling Averages. Br J Sports Med 2016: in press.

Ni GX, Liu SY, Lei L, Li Z, Zhou YZ, Zhan LQ. Intensity-Dependent Effect of Treadmill Running on Knee Articular Cartilage in a Rat Model. Biomed Res Int 2013; 2013: 172392.

Nielsen RO, Malisoux L, Møller M, Theisen D, Parner ET. Shedding Light on the Etiology of Sports Injuries: A Look Behind the Scenes of Time-to-Event Analyses. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther 2016; 46: 300-311.

Nielsen RO, Bertelsen ML, Parner ET, Sorensen H, Lind M, Rasmussen S. Running More than Three Kilometers during the First Week of a Running Regimen may be Associated with Increased Risk of Injury in Obese Novice Runners. Int J Sports Phys Ther 2014a; 9: 338-345.

Nielsen RO, Buist I, Sorensen H, Lind M, Rasmussen S. Training Errors and Running Related Injuries: A Systematic Review. Int J Sports Phys Ther 2012; 7: 58-75.

Nielsen RO, Cederholm P, Buist I, Sorensen H, Lind M, Rasmussen S. Can GPS be used to Detect Deleterious Progression in Training Volume among Runners? J Strength Cond Res 2013a; 27: 1471-1478.

Nielsen RO, Nohr EA, Rasmussen S, Sorensen H. Classifying Running-Related Injuries Based upon Etiology, with Emphasis on Volume and Pace. Int J Sports Phys Ther 2013b; 8: 172-179.

Nielsen RO, Parner ET, Nohr EA, Sorensen H, Lind M, Rasmussen S. Excessive Progression in Weekly Running Distance and Risk of Running-Related Injuries: An Association which Varies According to Type of Injury. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther 2014b; 44: 739-747.

Nielsen RO, Ronnow L, Rasmussen S, Lind M. A Prospective Study on Time to Recovery in 254 Injured Novice Runners. PLoS One 2014c: 9: e99877.

Novacheck TF. The Biomechanics of Running. Gait Posture 1998: 7: 77-95.

Petersen J, Nielsen RO, Rasmussen S, Sorensen H. Comparisons of Increases in Knee and Ankle Joint Moments Following an Increase in Running Speed from 8 to 12 to 16km.H. Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon) 2014: 29: 959-64.

Popp KL, McDermott W, Hughes JM, Baxter SA, Stovitz SD, Petit MA. Bone Strength Estimates Relative to Vertical Ground Reaction Force Discriminates Women Runners with Stress Fracture History. Bone 2017: 94: 22-28.

Powell DW, Andrews S, Stickley C, Williams DS. High- Compared to Low-Arched Athletes Exhibit Smaller Knee Abduction Moments in Walking and Running. Hum Mov Sci 2016: 50: 47-53.

Powell DW, Williams DS, 3rd, Windsor B, Butler RJ, Zhang S. Ankle Work and Dynamic Joint Stiffness in High- Compared to Low-Arched Athletes during a Barefoot Running Task. Hum Mov Sci 2014: 34: 147-156.

Renstrom AF. Mechanism, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Running Injuries. Instr Course Lect 1993: 42: 225-234.

Ryan M, Elashi M, Newsham-West R, Taunton J. Examining Injury Risk and Pain Perception in Runners using Minimalist Footwear. Br J Sports Med 2014: 48: 1257-1262.

Rzonca EC, Baylis WJ. Common Sports Injuries to the Foot and Leg. Clin Podiatr Med Surg 1988: 5: 591-612.

Schache AG, Blanch PD, Dorn TW, Brown NA, Rosemond D, Pandy MG. Effect of Running Speed on Lower Limb Joint Kinetics. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2011: 43: 1260-1271.

Shrier I, Platt RW. Reducing Bias through Directed Acyclic Graphs. BMC Med Res Methodol 2008: 8: 70-2288-8-70.

Shrier I, Steele RJ, Zhao M, Naimi A, Verhagen E, Stovitz SD, Rauh MJ, Hewett TE. A Multistate Framework for the Analysis of Subsequent Injury in Sport (M-FASIS). Scand J Med Sci Sports 2016: 26: 128-139.

Smits DW, Huisstede B, Verhagen E, van der Worp H, Kluitenberg B, van Middelkoop M, Hartgens F, Backx F. Short-Term Absenteeism and Health Care Utilization due to Lower Extremity Injuries among Novice Runners: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Clin J Sport Med* 2016; 26: 502-509.

Sobhani S, van den Heuvel E, Bredeweg S, Kluitenberg B, Postema K, Hijmans JM, Dekker R. Effect of Rocker Shoes on Plantar Pressure Pattern in Healthy Female Runners. *Gait Posture* 2014; 39: 920-925.

Sobhani S, van den Heuvel ER, Dekker R, Postema K, Kluitenberg B, Bredeweg SW, Hijmans JM. Biomechanics of Running with Rocker Shoes. *J Sci Med Sport* 2017; 20: 38-44.

Sobhani S, Zwerver J, van den Heuvel E, Postema K, Dekker R, Hijmans JM. Rocker Shoes Reduce Achilles Tendon Load in Running and Walking in Patients with Chronic Achilles Tendinopathy. *J Sci Med Sport* 2015; 18: 133-138.

Soligard T, Schweltnus M, Alonso JM, Bahr R, Clarsen B, Dijkstra HP, Gabbett T, Gleeson M, Hagglund M, Hutchinson MR, Janse van Rensburg C, Khan KM, Meeusen R, Orchard JW, Pluim BM, Raftery M, Budgett R, Engebretsen L. How Much is Too Much? (Part 1) International Olympic Committee Consensus Statement on Load in Sport and Risk of Injury. *Br J Sports Med* 2016; 50: 1030-1041.

Stergiou N, Bates BT, James SL. Asynchrony between Subtalar and Knee Joint Function during Running. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1999; 31: 1645-1655.

Taunton JE, Ryan MB, Clement DB, McKenzie DC, Lloyd-Smith DR, Zumbo BD. A Prospective Study of Running Injuries: The Vancouver Sun Run "in Training" Clinics. *Br J Sports Med* 2003; 37: 239-244.

Teng HL, Powers CM. Influence of Trunk Posture on Lower Extremity Energetics during Running. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2015; 47: 625-630.

Tessutti V, Ribeiro AP, Trombini-Souza F, Sacco IC. Attenuation of Foot Pressure during Running on Four Different Surfaces: Asphalt, Concrete, Rubber, and Natural Grass. *J Sports Sci* 2012; 30: 1545-1550.

Tudor-Locke C, Barreira TV, Schuna JM, Jr. Comparison of Step Outputs for Waist and Wrist Accelerometer Attachment Sites. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2015; 47: 839-842.

Ullah S, Gabbett TJ, Finch CF. Statistical Modelling for Recurrent Events: An Application to Sports Injuries. *Br J Sports Med* 2014; 48: 1287-1293.

Urhausen A, Gabriel H, Kindermann W. Blood Hormones as Markers of Training Stress and Overtraining. *Sports Med* 1995; 20: 251-276.

Urhausen A, Kindermann W. Diagnosis of Overtraining: What Tools do we have? *Sports Med* 2002; 32: 95-102.

van der Worp MP, ten Haaf DS, van Cingel R, de Wijer A, Nijhuis-van der Sanden MW, Staal JB. Injuries in Runners; a Systematic Review on Risk Factors and Sex Differences. *PLoS One* 2015; 10: e0114937.

VanderWeele TJ, Vansteelandt S. Conceptual Issues Concerning Mediation, Interventions and Composition. *Statistics and its Inference* 2009; 2: 457-468.

Vernillo G, Giandolini M, Edwards WB, Morin JB, Samozino P, Horvais N, Millet GY. Biomechanics and Physiology of Uphill and Downhill Running. *Sports Med* 2016: in press.

Videbaek S, Bueno AM, Nielsen RO, Rasmussen S. Incidence of Running-Related Injuries Per 1000 H of Running in Different Types of Runners: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med* 2015; 45: 1017-1026.

von Rosen P, Frohm A, Kottorp A, Friden C, Heijne A. Too Little Sleep and an Unhealthy Diet could Increase the Risk of Sustaining a New Injury in Adolescent Elite Athletes. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2016.

Warne JP, Kilduff SM, Gegan BC, Nevill AM, Moran KA, Warrington GD. A 4-Week Instructed Minimalist Running Transition and Gait-Retraining Changes Plantar Pressure and Force. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2014; 24: 964-73.

Warne JP, Smyth BP, Fagan JO, Hone ME, Richter C, Nevill AM, Moran KA, Warrington GD. Kinetic Changes during a Six-Week Minimal Footwear and Gait-Retraining Intervention in Runners. *J Sports Sci* 2016: 1-9.

Watari R, Hettinga B, Osis S, Ferber R. Validation of a Torso-Mounted Accelerometer for Measures of Vertical Oscillation and Ground Contact Time during Treadmill Running. *J Appl Biomech* 2016; 32: 306-310.

Wen DY. Risk Factors for Overuse Injuries in Runners. *Curr Sports Med Rep* 2007; 6: 307-313.

Wille CM, Lenhart RL, Wang S, Thelen DG, Heiderscheit BC. Ability of Sagittal Kinematic Variables to Estimate Ground Reaction Forces and Joint Kinetics in Running. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2014; 44: 825-830.

Williams DS,III, Davis IM, Scholz JP, Hamill J, Buchanan TS. High-Arched Runners Exhibit Increased Leg Stiffness Compared to Low-Arched Runners. *Gait Posture* 2004; 19: 263-269.

Willson JD, Sharpee R, Meardon SA, Kernozek TW. Effects of Step Length on Patellofemoral Joint Stress in Female Runners with and without Patellofemoral Pain. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* 2014; 29: 243-247.

Willy RW, Halsey L, Hayek A, Johnson H, Willson JD. Patellofemoral Joint and Achilles Tendon Loads during Overground and Treadmill Running. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2016; 46: 664-672.

Windt J, Gabbett TJ. How do Training and Competition Workloads Relate to Injury? the Workload-Injury Aetiology Model. *Br J Sports Med* 2017; 51: 428-435.

Wren TA, Yerby SA, Beaupre GS, Carter DR. Mechanical Properties of the Human Achilles Tendon. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* 2001; 16: 245-251.

Xu SY, Li SF, Ni GX. Strenuous Treadmill Running Induces a Chondrocyte Phenotype in Rat Achilles Tendons. *Med Sci Monit* 2016; 22: 3705-3712.

sms_12883_f1.jpg

sms_12883_f2.jpg

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Bertelsen, ML;Hulme, A;Petersen, J;Brund, RK;Sørensen, H;Finch, CF;Parner, ET;Nielsen, RO

Title:

A framework for the etiology of running-related injuries.

Date:

2017-11

Citation:

Bertelsen, M. L., Hulme, A., Petersen, J., Brund, R. K., Sørensen, H., Finch, C. F., Parner, E. T. & Nielsen, R. O. (2017). A framework for the etiology of running-related injuries.. Scand J Med Sci Sports, 27 (11), pp.1170-1180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12883>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/292787>