



UNIVERSITY OF
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

This is supplemental material of the following published document and is licensed under Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 license:

Ayala, Francisco ORCID: 0000-0003-2210-7389, Robles-Palazón, Francisco Javier, Blázquez-Rincón, Desirée, López-Valenciano, Alejandro, López-López, José Antonio and De Ste Croix, Mark B ORCID: 0000-0001-9911-4355 (2024) A systematic review and network meta-analysis on the effectiveness of exercise-based interventions for reducing the injury incidence in youth team-sport players. Part 2: An analysis by movement patterns. *Annals of Medicine*, 56 (1). doi:10.1080/07853890.2024.2337724

Official URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07853890.2024.2337724>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07853890.2024.2337724>

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/13797>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

Supplementary file 5a. Results of the network meta-analysis for lower extremity injuries: Estimates and 95% confidence intervals for comparisons between each pair of programs (programs in rows vs. programs in columns).

Program	
1	1
2	0.77 [0.672, 0.883]
3	0.537 [0.443, 0.651]
5	0.743 [0.538, 1.025]
6	0.614 [0.485, 0.777]
7	0.848 [0.65, 1.106]
9	0.333 [0.165, 0.669]
10	0.549 [0.317, 0.952]
11	0.953 [0.48, 1.892]
	2
	0.697 [0.551, 0.883]
	3
	1.383 [0.95, 2.013]
	5
	0.964 [0.68, 1.368]
	1.144 [0.844, 1.55]
	0.827 [0.555, 1.232]
	6
	1.101 [0.816, 1.485]
	1.579 [1.137, 2.193]
	1.142 [0.752, 1.734]
	1.381 [0.968, 1.969]
	7
	0.432 [0.212, 0.88]
	0.62 [0.3, 1.279]
	0.448 [0.208, 0.967]
	0.542 [0.259, 1.132]
	0.392 [0.186, 0.829]
	9
	0.713 [0.404, 1.257]
	1.023 [0.571, 1.833]
	0.74 [0.391, 1.4]
	0.894 [0.492, 1.627]
	0.648 [0.351, 1.194]
	1.651 [0.678, 4.017]
	10
	1.238 [0.616, 2.489]
	1.776 [0.872, 3.618]
	1.284 [0.602, 2.737]
	1.552 [0.752, 3.203]
	1.124 [0.539, 2.345]
	2.865 [1.077, 7.623]
	1.736 [0.721, 4.18]
	11

Note. Program 1 = Control; Program 2 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Acceleration + Lower body stability; Program 3 = Upper body pushing and pulling + Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Lower body stability; Program 5 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Lower body stability; Program 6 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics; Program 7 = Core + Lower body stability; Program 9 = Upper body pushing and pulling + Lower body concentric and eccentric + Lower body stability; Program 10 = Core; Program 11 = Upper body pushing and pulling + Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Acceleration + Lower body stability. Values below 1 favor the row intervention.

Supplementary file 5b. Results of the network meta-analysis for thigh injuries: Estimates and 95% confidence intervals for comparisons between each pair of programs (programs in rows vs. programs in columns).

Program							
1	1						
2	0.959 [0.646, 1.425]	2					
3	0.628 [0.381, 1.035]	0.654 [0.346, 1.238]	3				
5	3.411 [0.164, 71.057]	3.557 [0.166, 76.007]	5.435 [0.25, 117.925]	5			
6	0.624 [0.292, 1.333]	0.651 [0.276, 1.531]	0.994 [0.401, 2.467]	0.183 [0.008, 4.184]	6		
9	1.231 [0.024, 62.037]	1.283 [0.025, 65.978]	1.961 [0.038, 102.02]	0.361 [0.003, 51.369]	1.972 [0.036, 106.916]	9	
10	0.598 [0.19, 1.884]	0.623 [0.185, 2.098]	0.952 [0.272, 3.33]	0.175 [0.007, 4.501]	0.958 [0.242, 3.792]	0.486 [0.008, 28.852]	10

Note. Program 1 = Control; Program 2 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Acceleration + Lower body stability; Program 3 = Upper body pushing and pulling + Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Lower body stability; Program 5 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Lower body stability; Program 6 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics; Program 9 = Upper body pushing and pulling + Lower body concentric and eccentric + Lower body stability; Program 10 = Core. Values below 1 favor the row intervention.

Supplementary file 5c. Results of the network meta-analysis for knee injuries: Estimates and 95% confidence intervals for comparisons between each pair of programs (programs in rows vs. programs in columns).

Program	
1	1
2	0.772 [0.581, 1.026]
3	0.496 [0.346, 0.712]
5	0.78 [0.283, 2.15]
6	0.762 [0.546, 1.064]
9	0.308 [0.065, 1.449]
10	1.883 [0.58, 6.115]
	2
	0.642 [0.405, 1.017]
	3
	1.572 [0.536, 4.614]
	5
	0.987 [0.636, 1.53]
	1.536 [0.939, 2.513]
	0.977 [0.336, 2.843]
	6
	0.398 [0.082, 1.926]
	0.62 [0.126, 3.046]
	0.395 [0.062, 2.515]
	0.404 [0.083, 1.971]
	9
	3.796 [1.107, 13.014]
	2.415 [0.51, 11.428]
	2.471 [0.726, 8.406]
	6.119 [0.874, 42.85]
	10

Note. Program 1 = Control; Program 2 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Acceleration + Lower body stability; Program 3 = Upper body pushing and pulling + Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Lower body stability; Program 5 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Lower body stability; Program 6 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics; Program 9 = Upper body pushing and pulling + Lower body concentric and eccentric + Lower body stability; Program 10 = Core. Values below 1 favor the row intervention.

Supplementary file 5d. Results of the network meta-analysis for ankle injuries: Estimates and 95% confidence intervals for comparisons between each pair of programs (programs in rows vs. programs in columns).

Program							
1	1						
2	0.896 [0.712, 1.128]	2					
3	0.579 [0.397, 0.846]	0.647 [0.415, 1.007]	3				
5	0.938 [0.377, 2.332]	1.047 [0.409, 2.679]	1.619 [0.604, 4.341]	5			
6	0.277 [0.128, 0.601]	0.31 [0.138, 0.693]	0.479 [0.202, 1.132]	0.296 [0.09, 0.976]	6		
9	0.321 [0.131, 0.789]	0.358 [0.142, 0.906]	0.554 [0.209, 1.469]	0.342 [0.095, 1.23]	1.158 [0.354, 3.788]	9	
10	0.139 [0.041, 0.474]	0.156 [0.045, 0.54]	0.241 [0.067, 0.865]	0.149 [0.032, 0.683]	0.503 [0.118, 2.136]	0.434 [0.095, 1.98]	10

Note. Program 1 = Control; Program 2 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Acceleration + Lower body stability; Program 3 = Upper body pushing and pulling + Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Lower body stability; Program 5 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics + Lower body stability; Program 6 = Lower body concentric and eccentric + Core + Mechanics; Program 9 = Upper body pushing and pulling + Lower body concentric and eccentric + Lower body stability; Program 10 = Core. Values below 1 favor the row intervention.