

# Functional movement test scores improve following a standardized off-season intervention program in professional football players

**K. Kiesel<sup>1,2</sup>, P. Plisky<sup>2</sup>, R. Butler<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>University of Evansville, Evansville, Indiana, USA, <sup>2</sup>ProRehab PC, Evansville, Indiana, USA

Corresponding author: Kyle Kiesel, PT, PhD, ATC CSCS, University of Evansville, Wallace Graves Hall 206, Evansville, Indiana 47722, USA. Tel: +812 479 2646, Fax: +812 479 2717, E-mail: [kk70@evansville.edu](mailto:kk70@evansville.edu)

Accepted for publication 30 July 2009

The purpose of this study was to determine if an off-season intervention program was effective in improving Functional Movement Screen™ (FMS) scores in professional American football players. Pre- and post-intervention FMS scores were obtained on 62 subjects who completed a 7-week off-season intervention program. A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the training program on FMS scores. A chi-square was performed to determine if there were a greater number of players who met the injury threshold and if asymmetries were reduced following intervention. Logistic regression was used to

predict what factors were associated with failure (post-test score of <14). There was a positive main effect for time ( $P < 0.01$ ) and a greater number of individuals with a score >14 following than intervention. At post-test, 41 players were free of asymmetry as compared with 31 at the pre-test. The strongest predictor of program failure was a low squat score at pre-test. This study demonstrated that fundamental movement characteristics do change with a standardized intervention. Further research is required to determine if injury risk is reduced when a player's score improves beyond the established cut-off of 14 and/or asymmetry is resolved.

There are limited published reports on injury risk factors for professional football players (Powell, 1987). The most prominent risk factor identified in prospective injury risk studies in athletics is previous injury (Turbeville et al., 2003; Tyler et al., 2006). Previous injury is a complex risk factor implying that something fundamentally changes following injury. It is possible that following injury there is a fundamental change in motor control that is not measurable with a single traditional impairment measurement such as strength or range of motion. In an attempt to capture the complex construct of motor control, movement oriented tests that assess functional movement and dynamic balance have been developed (Cook et al., 2006; Plisky et al., 2006). Tasks requiring coordinated full body movements may, in part, help us understand what fundamentally changes following injury. One test that has been established to assess neuromuscular impairments with movement is the Functional Movement Screen™ (FMS).

The FMS is a test of seven fundamental movements that has previously been determined to be able to predict injury in professional football players. Previous research has shown that players scoring lower than a 14 on the FMS were more likely to be injured than those scoring above 14 (Kiesel et al., 2007). A follow-up study to this initial investigation, validated the previous finding and in addition observed that players with any asymmetry on the FMS, regardless of total

score, had  $2.3 \times$  greater risk for injury (Kiesel et al., 2008). While it appears the FMS may be beneficial in injury prediction, no studies have assessed whether changes in an individual's FMS score can be achieved with a training program.

As a result of the aforementioned literature, the purpose of this study was to determine if an off-season intervention program is effective in improving FMS scores in professional American football players. In addition, this study wanted to examine if there was a greater percentage of players above the injury threshold of a score of 14 at the end of the study compared with the beginning of the study. Because, right and left asymmetry in the FMS has also been related to injury we also examined if more players were free of asymmetry at the end of the study compared with the beginning of the study. Finally, we wanted to determine if it was possible to predict who would not improve their score above the injury threshold score using data from the pre-screen.

## Methods

This study was completed on a sample of 62 healthy American football players from one professional team who participated in a structured off-season strength and conditioning program. In addition to traditional strength and conditioning components, the program also included an individualized interven-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

	S M S	1 0 3 8	<b>B</b>	Dispatch: 6.10.09	Journal: SMS	CE: Sangeeta
	Journal Name	Manuscript No.		Author Received:	No. of pages: 6	PE: Chris/Elan

tion program which was prescribed based on the individual's score on the FMS™ as described by Cook (2001).

## FMS

The FMS is a comprehensive screen that assesses quality of fundamental movement patterns to identify an individual's limitations or asymmetries (Cook et al., 2006). The FMS includes seven tests which are scored on a 0–3 ordinal scale. The seven tests of the FMS are the squat, hurdle step, lunge, shoulder mobility, active straight leg raise, push up and rotary stability. A score of 3 indicates the movement was completed as instructed and is free of compensation and pain. A score of 2 indicates the subject could complete the movement pain-free but with some level of compensation, while a score of 1 indicates the subject could not complete the movement as instructed. A score of 0 is assigned if the subject experiences pain with any portion of the movement. The reliability of the FMS has been established in a recent study (Minick et al., 2009) which reported weighted kappa values to range from 0.80 to 1.00.

Of the seven tests that comprise the FMS, five of them (hurdle step, lunge, shoulder mobility, active straight leg raise and rotary stability) are performed and scored separately for the right and left sides of the body. Because of the established relationship between neuromuscular asymmetry (right vs left differences) and injury risk, it is common practice to track right vs left sided differences on the FMS. Asymmetry is dichotomized for research purposes and if an asymmetry exists in an individual's score it is prioritized in the corrective program in an attempt to achieve the goal of symmetrical movement on all five of the right/left FMS tests.

## Off-season training program

After initial FMS scores were obtained, subjects were prescribed an individual training program, based on their FMS score, designed to correct the identified movement deficits. This program consisted of a "movement preparation" component that included self and partner stretching and self-administered trigger point treatment done using The Stick (The Stick/RPI Atlanta, Georgia, USA) of major muscle groups thought to be contributing to the dysfunctional movement patterns. Individual "corrective exercises" were also prescribed and performed with the supervision and instruction of the strength and conditioning staff as needed. The corrective exercises are intended to utilize the range of motion gained from the stretching and allow for motor learning to occur as the subject moves through previously limited patterns of movement. Additionally, the corrective exercises are designed to stimulate natural core muscle activation to enhance the relationship between core muscle function and fundamental movement (Cook & Fields, 1997).

The goal was for the subjects to become independent with performing both components of the program. The exercises were progressed in a standardized manner with the goal of achieving the best possible movement strategy related to each of the seven movements tested. The program also included traditional strength and conditioning activities. See Table 1 for an example of an individual intervention program utilized in this study that incorporates movement preparation and corrective exercise as defined.

Athletes were required to participate in the 7-week program which included supervised sessions 4 days/week and two optional sessions per week. The program followed a structured progression with the goal of completing the final phase of corrective exercises as part of the routine strength and conditioning program. Post-test FMS scores were obtained at the completion of the program.

## Statistical analysis

For the purposes of analysis, the subjects were grouped by position with lineman and linebackers (lineman,  $n = 32$ ) in one group and all others position players in another group (non-lineman,  $n = 30$ ). Mean and standard deviations for the pre-test and post-test FMS scores were calculated for each group. To determine if there was a change in FMS scores following the intervention period, a repeated measures ANOVA with the significance level set at  $P < 0.05$  was conducted with the repeated measure being time (pre-test and post-test scores) and the between subjects variable being group (lineman and non-lineman). A one-way chi-square was performed to determine if there was a significant increase in the number of players scoring above the injury threshold score of 14 following the program. A similar analysis was performed to determine if there was an increase in the number of players that were free from asymmetry at the end of the program. For the chi-square analysis, the expected distribution utilized for the analysis was the distribution that was obtained at baseline. Finally, a logistic regression was utilized, using the variables position, asymmetry present and baseline score on the deep squat in order to predict which individuals did not improve their score to above the injury score threshold at the end of the program. Further rationale for the selection of these variables is highlighted in the discussion section of the manuscript.

## Results

There was no time by position interaction for the FMS scores over the course of the training program (Fig. 1,  $F = 0.08$ ,  $P = 0.78$ ), however there was a main effect of time (Fig. 1,  $F = 180.4$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). The mean pre-test score for the lineman was 11.8 (SD 1.8) and for the non-lineman group was 13.3 (SD 1.9). The mean post-test score for the lineman was 14.8 (SD 2.4) and for the non-lineman group was 16.3 (SD 2.4). Combined data for all subjects for the pre-test and post-test for each component of the FMS are presented in Fig. 2.

At the end of the intervention, a greater number of players exhibited a score that improved to above the injury threshold compared with before the intervention ( $\chi^2 = 164.9$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). Thirty-nine subjects exhibited a score that exceeded the injury risk threshold at the end of the program compared with seven that exhibited a score  $> 14$  at baseline (Table 2).

In regards to the changes in symmetry scores, a greater percentage of players were free from asymmetry at the end of the study as compared with the beginning of the study ( $\chi^2 = 7.8$ ,  $P = 0.01$ ). Following the intervention, 42 players were free of asymmetry compared with the 31 players that demonstrated at least one asymmetry at baseline (Table 2).

The results of the logistic regression suggest that failure to improve above the injury threshold score of 14 can be predicted by a low deep squat score during the initial data collection. Neither position nor the presence of asymmetry was a significant predictor of whether or not the players score was able to be improved above the score of 14.

Q8 Table 1. Example of an individual off-season intervention program based on pre-test Functional Movement Screen™ score

Test	Score	Final	Movement prep	Corrective exercise
Deep squat	2	2		
Hurdle step	R-2 L-3	2	 <p>Anterior thigh stick work</p>	 <p>Straight leg bridge</p>
In-line lunge	R-2 L-2	2	 <p>Stride Self-Stretch</p>	 <p>Single leg stance w/core engagement</p>
Shoulder mobility	R-3 L-3	3		
Active straight leg raise	R-1 L-2	1	Anterior thigh Stick work (see above)	
			 <p>Straight leg partner stretch</p>	 <p>Leg lowering w/core engagement</p>
			 <p>Leg lowering progression</p>	 <p>Single-leg toe touch w/stick</p>
Trunk stability push-up	3	3		
Rotary stability	R-2 L-2	2		
Composite		15		
Asymmetry?		Yes		

**Discussion**

There is currently no evidence of the ability to change scores on the FMS based on an off-season training program. The results of this study support that an off-season training program can significantly improve scores on the FMS. In addition, the off-season

training program significantly increased the percentage of players who scored above the previously determined injury threshold score and also significantly improved the percentage of players who were free of asymmetry. Finally, the results of the study suggest that one of the primary predictors of the inability to improve a player's score above the injury

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000




Fig. 1. Composite Functional Movement Screen™ (FMS) scores for non-lineman and lineman before and after the 7-week intervention.




Fig. 2. Mean pre/post-values for the all subjects for each individual component of the Functional Movement Screen™ (FMS). DS, deep squat; HS, hurdle step; ILL, in-line lunge; ASLR, active straight leg raise; SM, shoulder mobility; TSPU, trunk stability push-up; RS, rotary stability.

Table 2. Changes in number of players composite Functional Movement Screen™ score (FMS) and presence of asymmetries from pre-to post-test

	Pre-test	Post-test	$\chi^2$	P
FMS $\geq 14$	7	30	164.9	<0.01
14 > FMS	55	32		
Asymmetry	31	20	7.8	0.01
No asymmetry	31	42		

threshold score was a low score on the deep squat during the pre-test.

While there was no position by time interaction, all players, on average, exhibited an 11% increase in their FMS score as a result of the off-season training program. This suggests that functional movement, as measured by the FMS, can be improved when a

structured intervention is applied. While this result is promising, caution should be taken when interpreting this result as no control group was included in this study. It is possible that the changes observed in this study were an affect of repeated measures of test taken at the start and again at the completion of the program. However, while there was no control group, the change in FMS scores from pre-test to post-test ranged from  $-1$  to  $+7$  suggesting not all players systematically improved their score as a function of repeated measures.

It is difficult to directly compare our results to other research as we are unaware of any other published study to date which has tested the FMS in this manner. Our results are similar to those reported using other body relative movement tests. Significant improvement in the Star Excursion Balance Test has been reported following standardized intervention programs including Pilates, (English & Howe, 2007) dynamic hop and balance training (McKeon et al., 2008) and functional rehabilitation programs (Hale et al., 2007).

Potentially more important than the absolute improvement in scores was the significant increase in the number of players who scored above the injury threshold at the post-test. At the pre-test only 11% of the players exhibited a score  $>14$  while 63% of players exhibited a score  $>14$  at the post-test. This finding may be of benefit to sports medicine professional who work with professional football players as 52% of the players in the program were able to improve their score from below to above the established threshold score for injury risk ( $\leq 14$ ).

Although a significant number of players improved their score to  $>14$ , the question remains as to why 20 subjects failed to improve their score enough to exceed the threshold of 14? In order to address this issue, a logistic regression model was developed in an attempt to identify if any factors were present which could predict failure (not improving to above a score of 14). The sample size of 32 allowed us to only include three factors into the model which were selected by the research group to include position, presence of an asymmetry and scoring a 1 on the Deep Squat test. Position was chosen because of the different movement demands inherent to the different positions in this sport. Asymmetry was chosen because it is a well-known injury risk factor and because we hypothesized that the presence of an asymmetry may be a contributing factor to overall movement limitations. The squat test was included because it involves a balance of mobility (ankles, knees, hip, thoracic spine and shoulders) and stability (pelvic stability to allow the hips to break parallel while maintaining an upright trunk). As a result of the complexity of this task, failure of this test may be an indication of a substantial movement dysfunction in need of an individual examination

rather than a basic screen and exercise program. The results indicated that those players scoring a 1 on the Deep Squat Test were approximately 5 × more likely to fail (OR 5.27, 95% CI 1.49–18.65) while the other factors were not shown to be significant predictors of failure. The fact that not all subjects improved their score beyond the threshold of 14 (failure) and that poor deep squat performance was related to failure, suggests that a more robust program may be needed for these individuals to normalize their movement patterns. Perhaps an individual assessment may be required to identify the underlying neuromuscular factors contributing to the persistent dysfunctional movement.

The final area that was examined was asymmetry of movement, due to the fact that musculo-skeletal asymmetry is a well established risk factor for injury (Ekstrand & Gillquist, 1983; Knapik et al., 1991; Baumhauer et al., 1995; Nadler et al., 2000; Soderman et al., 2001; Plisky et al., 2006; Myer et al., 2008; Yeung et al., 2009). At the pre-test 50% of the players demonstrated asymmetrical movement and this was reduced to 32% following the interventions. This result would suggest that the off-season program was not only able to normalize for poor total body movements but was also able to neutralize some of the asymmetries that were measured in the players.

Some additional limitations of this study should be noted. There was a lack of a control group, therefore, no clear cause/effect relationship can be established without randomization and control. A second potential limitation is associated with the repeated measurement testing which has been previously discussed. Additionally, there was not control for co-interventions. It is possible that some of the subjects were receiving additional intervention such as personal massage or chiropractic care that may have influenced the outcome of the study. Finally, there was no short-term follow-up, perhaps the changes in scores observed occurred much earlier in the program than at the terminal 7-week point. Additional research should focus on examining the change in the FMS as it relates to dosage of a corrective exercise program.

Although the specific results of this study cannot be generalized beyond the population tested, limitations and asymmetries in fundamental movement patterns which are measured by the FMS are basic components of human movement and are not sport

specific. Therefore, it may be beneficial to perform additional studies in other active populations.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that movement can improve with an individualized exercise program. Injury prevention and performance enhancement programs should consider including the FMS or a similar movement screen and associated exercises to normalize dysfunctional movement with the goal of injury reduction and performance improvement.

## Perspectives

It is known that previous injury is the most robust risk factor in sport. Although individual components of athletic movement such as strength, flexibility and power are routinely addressed in contemporary rehabilitation, this may not serve as a protective factor against injury. Motor control changes exist following injury and movement oriented testing and training programs to address these deficits are needed in sports (Minick et al., 2009). Recent research (Paterno, 2009), reported that there was no relationship between strength, power, or flexibility and performance on the star excursion balance test. This may indicate that movement oriented tests measure a separate construct which could be helpful in understanding more about motor control changes following injury. The FMS has identified individuals at risk of injury in professional football but it has yet to be determined if an individual's FMS score could be altered by a training program. The results of this study suggest that American professional football players can improve their score with an off-season training program. It has yet to be determined if these improvements will occur in other active populations and if prospective improvements in the FMS actually reduce injury risk. The FMS may be a tool to assist the sports medicine professional in reducing injury risk.

**Key words:** assessment, injury prevention, motor control.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Jeff Fish, Director of Athletic Performance and Bill Hughan Assistant Strength Coach both of the Atlanta Falcons for their assistance with data collection for this manuscript.

## References

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Baumhauer JF, Alosa DM, Renstrom AF, Trevino S, Beynonn B. A prospective study of ankle injury risk factors. <i>Am J Sports Med</i> 1995; 23(5): 564–570. | Cook G. Athletic body balance. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2001.   | assessment of function – part 1. <i>NAJSPT</i> 2006; 1: 62–72.                                |
|   | Cook G, Burton L, Hogenboom B. The use of fundamental movements as an | Cook G, Fields K. Functional training for the torso. <i>Strength Cond</i> 1997; 19(2): 14–19. |

- Ekstrand J, Gillquist J. Soccer injuries and their mechanisms: a prospective study. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1983; 15(3): 267–270.
- English T, Howe K. The effect of pilates exercise on trunk and postural stability and throwing velocity in college baseball pitchers: single subject design. *NAJSPT* 2007; 2: 8–19. **Q3**
- Hale SA, Hertel J, Olmsted-Kramer LC. The effect of a 4-week comprehensive rehabilitation program on postural control and lower extremity function in individuals with chronic ankle instability. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2007; 37: 303–311.
- Kiesel K, Plisky P, Kersey P. Functional movement test score as a predictor of time-loss during a professional football team's pre-season American college of sports medicine annual conference. Indianapolis, IN, 2008. **Q4**
- Kiesel K, Plisky P, Voight M. Can serious injury in professional football be predicted by a preseason functional movement screen? *North Am J Sports Phys Ther* 2007; 2: 147–158.
- Knapik JJ, Bauman CL, Jones BH, Harris JM, Vaughan L. Preseason strength and flexibility imbalances associated with athletic injuries in female collegiate athletes. *Am J Sports Med* 1991; 19(1): 76–81.
- McKeon PO, Ingersoll CD, Kerrigan DC, Saliba E, Bennett BC, Hertel J. Balance training improves function and postural control in those with chronic ankle instability. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2008; 40: 1810–1819.
- Minick K, Burton L, Butler R, Kiesel K. A reliability study of the functional movement screen. *Natl J Strength Cond Res* 2009, in press.
- Myer GD, Ford KR, Paterno MV, Nick TG, Hewett TE. The effects of generalized joint laxity on risk of anterior cruciate ligament injury in young female athletes. *Am J Sports Med* 2008; 36(6): 1073–1080.
- Nadler SF, Malanga GA, DePrince M, Stitik TP, Feinberg JH. The relationship between lower extremity injury, low back pain, and hip muscle strength in male and female collegiate athletes. *Clin J Sport Med* 2000; 10(2): 89–97.
- Paterno MVSL, Ford K, Hewett T. Contribution of lower extremity strength and postural stability to performance on the star excursion balance test combined section conference of the American physical therapy association. Las Vegas, NV, 2009.
- Plisky PJ, Rauh MJ, Kaminski TW, Underwood FB. Star excursion balance test as a predictor of lower extremity injury in high school basketball players. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2006; 36: 911–919.
- Powell J. Incidence of injury associated with playing surfaces in the national football league. *J Athl Train* 1987; 22: 202–206.
- Soderman K, Alfredson H, Pietila T, Werner S. Risk factors for leg injuries in female soccer players: a prospective investigation during one out-door season. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2001; 9(5): 313–321. **Q5**
- Turbeville S, Cowan L, Owen W. Risk factors for injury in high school football players. *Am J Sports Med* 2003; 31: 974–980.
- Tyler TF, McHugh MP, Mirabella MR, Mullaney MJ, Nicholas SJ. Risk factors for noncontact ankle sprains in high school football players: the role of previous ankle sprains and body mass index. *Am J Sports Med* 2006; 34: 471–475.
- Yeung SS, Suen AM, Yeung EW. A prospective cohort study of hamstring injuries in competitive sprinters: preseason muscle imbalance as a possible risk factor. *Br J Sports Med* 2009. **Q7** **Q6**

