University of Dundee

Comparison of 3 ankle braces in reducing ankle inversion in a basketball rebounding task

Dewar, R. A.; Arnold, G. P.; Wang, W.; Drew, T. S.; Abboud, R. J.

Published in:
Foot

DOI:
[10.1016/j.foot.2019.05.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foot.2019.05.007)

Publication date:
2019

Licence:
CC BY-NC-ND

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Dewar, R. A., Arnold, G. P., Wang, W., Drew, T. S., & Abboud, R. J. (2019). Comparison of 3 ankle braces in reducing ankle inversion in a basketball rebounding task. *Foot*, 39, 129-135.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foot.2019.05.007>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Comparison of 3 ankle braces in reducing ankle inversion in a basketball rebounding task

R.A. Dewar^{a,b}, G.P. Arnold^a, W. Wang^a, T.S. Drew^a, R.J. Abboud^{a,c*}

^{ab}Institute of Motion Analysis & Research (IMAR)
Department of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery
Tayside Orthopaedic Rehabilitation Technology (TORT) Centre
Ninewells Hospital and Medical School – University of Dundee
Dundee, United Kingdom
DD1 9SY

^b2/2 3 Abercromby Street
Glasgow, United Kingdom
G40 2HW

^cFaculty of Engineering, University of Balamand, Al Koura, Lebanon

Corresponding author: Professor R. J. Abboud
Email: r.j.abboud@dundee.ac.uk
Phone: 44 (0) 1382 383502

4 Highlights

- All ankle braces reduced ankle and foot inversion when compared to the unbraced condition
- First study to examine dominant and non-dominant ankle inversion moments simultaneously in braced conditions

113
114
115 **10 Abstract** (Word count = 247 words)
116

117 **11** Lateral ankle injury incidence rates are very high in the sport of basketball, with a significant
118 **12** proportion occurring during rebounding. Ankle braces are often used as preventative and
119 **13** rehabilitative techniques in hope of minimizing the likelihood of experiencing excessive ankle
120 **14** inversion. This study aims to evaluate the effect of different ankle braces in preventing ankle
121 **15** inversion during a basketball rebounding task.

122
123
124
125
126 **16** Sixteen subjects participated in the study (11 males, 5 females; mean age = 26.94 years, SD=5.32;
127 **17** mean height 1.72 m, SD=0.08; mean weight 73.95 kg, SD=13.68).

128
129
130 **18** Participants performed a simulated rebounding task in multiple braced conditions: unbraced
131 **19** (UB), Ossur Formfit (OF), Talarmade Ankleguard Air/Gel Stirrup (TAG) and Bauerfeind
132 **20** Malleoloc (BF). Ankle and foot inversion angles, ankle inversion moments and peroneus longus
133 **21** EMG activity were recorded and analysed to determine the effectiveness of each condition to
134 **22** resist inversion.

135
136
137
138
139 **23** All braced conditions reduced ankle and foot inversion angles compared to UB. In the non-
140 **24** dominant limb, OF showed reduced maximum ankle inversion compared to BF (non-dominant
141 **25** mean difference = 0.630°, p<0.001) and reduced foot inversion compared to TAG (non-dominant
142 **26** mean difference = 0.966°, p=0.035). Compared to UB, OF and TAG increased ankle inversion
143 **27** moments in the dominant ankle and showed decreases in the non-dominant ankle. BF reduced
144 **28** mean peak peroneus longus EMG activity compared to all other trials.

145
146
147
148
149 **29** Whilst statistically significant differences that were demonstrated between several braced
150 **30** conditions are relatively small, they are clinically significant knowing that the maximum
151 **31** barefoot inversion whilst standing is less than 17 degrees.

152
153
154
155 **32 Key Words**
156

157 **33** Ankle Brace, Inversion, Basketball, Rebounding, Landing
158

159
160 **34 Acknowledgments**
161

162 **35** I would like to express my gratitude to XXX, for his technical support, to XXX and to XXX and
163 **36** XXX for their assistance throughout the writing process.
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

37 **Funding**

38 The research did not receive any funding from agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-

39 profit sectors.

40

41 Introduction

42 Ankle injuries account for approximately 20% of all injuries suffered in sports [1]. The
43 likelihood of suffering an ankle sprain is subject to a number of factors, but most notably the
44 increased frequency for recurring ankle sprains following a primary injury [2-6]. Financial
45 consequences can be significant when considering absence from work and other daily activities.
46 Due to the frequent occurrence of ankle sprains and their resulting implications, several
47 preventative and rehabilitative measures exist. Among these, the use of prophylactic ankle braces
48 is often considered.

49 Several companies produce a variety of models of ankle braces. Models differ in terms of
50 material and supportive features, but essentially serve the same purpose of stabilizing the ankle
51 joint. The majority of ankle braces are designed to prevent excessive inversion motions, in order
52 to protect the wearer from lateral ankle sprains. Such sprains are the most common ankle injury,
53 involving damage to the lateral ankle complex due to excessive inversion [2]. Many designs
54 involve a low-profile orthosis that can be used in everyday situations since the support fits inside
55 most shoes.

56 The ability to provide mechanical support without compromising function is the most important
57 factor when considering ankle braces in athletic situations. Several studies have been conducted
58 concerning the effects of ankle braces on athletic performance, incidence rate of ankle injuries,
59 and lower limb kinematics [7,8]. However, less is known about the effect of ankle braces on
60 ankle joint kinematics while performing specific athletic movements.

61 This study aimed to collect kinetic and kinematic data of the ankle during a basketball
62 rebounding task. The act of rebounding, or retrieving the ball after a missed shot attempt, is of
63 particular interest since nearly half of all basketball-related foot and ankle injuries occur during
64 this manoeuvre [3]. Ankle and foot inversion angles as well as electromyography (EMG) activity
65 of the peroneus longus was measured to compare the effects of different ankle braces on their
66 ability to stabilise the ankle joint complex. Additionally, ground reaction forces were measured
67 to analyze the effects of the braces on the ankle inversion moments produced when landing.

68

69 **Material and Methods**

70 All data were collected at the XXX of the XXX Centre, XXX Hospital and Medical School
71 XXX. Ethical permission was granted by the University's School of Medicine Research Ethics
72 Committee prior to data collection.

73 Participants

74 Sixteen participants (eleven male, five female) agreed to take part in this study and were
75 recruited by a number of means. Members of the University Women's Basketball Club and
76 Mixed Lacrosse Club were invited to participate via email. Recreational basketball players at the
77 Institute of Sport and Exercise were also invited to volunteer. In addition, a number of students
78 who were completing research projects within the department were encouraged to participate if
79 they had experience playing basketball.

80 Participants were required to be within the age range of 18-40 and be physically active. This was
81 defined as participating in physical activity, either sport or exercise, at least twice a week. Due to
82 the limited funds available to purchase ankle braces, participants were required to have a UK
83 shoe size between six and eleven. This ensured that the range of braces acquired would properly
84 fit each participant's foot and ankle according to manufacturer guidelines.

85 Experimental protocol

86 Participants attended the gait laboratory for a single testing session. Participants read a
87 participant information sheet and completed a written consent form. They were also informed
88 about the anonymous and confidential storage of the data collected over the course of the
89 research project. Lower-limb dominance was determined by asking which foot participants
90 would use to kick a ball. Anthropometric measurements of mass, height, leg length, inter-ASIS
91 width, knee-width, and ankle-width were measured and recorded. Ankle circumference was
92 measured to assign the appropriate size of ankle brace. A proper fitting VivoBarefoot Evo Pure
93 shoe was worn by all participants due to its thin sole and short quarter piece. The same model of
94 shoe was used to minimize inconsistencies in testing. Twenty-four retro-reflective markers were
95 fixed to the participant, according to a 24-marker foot-inversion model, using double-sided
96 adhesive tape. The peroneus longus muscle belly was identified and marked by asking the

participant to plantarflex and evert their foot. The skin on the identified area was shaved and treated using NuPrep gel to improve electrical conduction. EMG sensors were fixed on each peroneus longus muscle belly using the Delsys Trigno™ Sensor Skin Interface (SC-F03) and further secured using adhesive medical tape.

3D motion analysis and ground reaction forces were captured using a fourteen-camera Vicon Nexus Motion Capture system (Vicon Motion Systems Ltd., Oxford, UK) operated at 200 Hz. EMG activity was captured through a Delsys Trigno™ Wireless System (Delsys Inc., Massachusetts, USA). Data were collected simultaneously through the Vicon software using a desktop computer.

Using a block-randomization process, participants were assigned the order in which they were to complete the four conditions: Talarmade Ankleguard Air/Gel Stirrup (TAG) (Figure 1), Ossur Formfit (OF) (Figure 2), Bauerfeind Malleoloc (BF) (Figure 3), and unbraced (UB). Ankle width was measured prior to the beginning of testing each condition to accompany the changes in width of the different braces.

Rebounding apparatus

The apparatus was designed and built within the department. The basketball was suspended from the device's lowest point using Velcro. The height at which the ball rested was adjustable to accommodate participants of different heights and jumping capabilities (Figure 4).

Rebounding task

Participants performed their regular exercise or sporting warm-up routine and were familiarized with the rebounding task prior to data collection. The ball was set to a height that required the participant to jump in order to retrieve it, but remained attainable over a minimum of 20 trials. During the rebounding task, participants began with each of their feet on its respective plate, at a width they would use naturally to jump. When signalled, participants would jump vertically, securing the basketball, and land back down on the force plates (Figure 4). Both feet were required to land completely on their respective force plates in order for the trial to be deemed successful. The rebounding task was performed under the four conditions and was repeated until five successful trials were obtained for each condition.

Data analysis

Using Vicon Nexus software, a 3D representation of each trial was formulated by manually marking all the reflective markers and running a custom foot inversion Pipeline. Gaps in the data were filled using the appropriate gap filling techniques.

Data from the whole trial were used when considering the maximum ankle and foot inversion angles. However, when observing maximum ankle inversion moments and EMG activity of the peroneus longus, only data from the landing portion of the trial were considered. There were two reasons for this. The first reason was that there were no ground reaction forces present while the participant was in the air, therefore joint moments could not be calculated. Secondly, in each trial the peroneus longus had two spikes in EMG activity: while jumping, and while landing. The spike in activity due to the jump, if included in analysis, could alter the interpretation of how the braces affected peroneus longus activity, and thus how the ankle and foot are stabilized during the landing portion.

Statistical Analysis

Data were analysed using IBM SPSS Version 22. The General Linear Model was used to calculate mean estimates of the four conditions, followed by pairwise comparisons to define any significant differences between these conditions. A p-value of 0.05 was used to establish statistical significance.

Results

A total of 16 participants completed the study. For quality purposes, data from 15 participants was included for calculations involving maximum ankle and foot inversion angles as well as ankle inversion moments, whilst data from 14 participants was used for analysis of EMG activity of the peroneus longus. Regarding ankle and foot inversion angles as well as ankle inversion moments, data from one participant was excluded due to excessive gaps in Vicon data. Regarding EMG, data was excluded from two participants due to technical difficulties with the electrodes.

Table 1: Sample means for maximum ankle and foot inversion angles, maximum ankle inversion moments, mean peak EMG activity of peroneus longus and peak value EMG activity of peroneus longus for unbraced (UB), Ossur Formfit (OF), TalarMade Ankleguard (TAG) and Bauerfeind Malleoloc (BM) trials. Values are presented as sample mean $\pm$ standard deviation for the dominant (D) and non-dominant (ND) limbs

	Maximum ankle inversion (degrees)		Maximum foot inversion (degrees)		Maximum ankle inversion moments (Nm/kg)		Mean peak EMG activity of peroneus longus (mV)		Peak EMG activity of peroneus longus (mV)	
	D	ND	D	ND	D	ND	D	ND	D	ND
UB	5.719	6.568	7.422	7.048	0.283	0.359	0.0354	0.0555	0.0982	0.0795
	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$
OF	3.984	5.131	3.229	3.237	0.200	0.259	0.0192	0.0285	0.0394	0.0270
	4.012	4.315	5.669	4.086	0.331	0.303	0.0320	0.0554	0.0931	0.0874
TAG	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$
	2.865	3.929	2.885	2.733	0.317	0.195	0.0171	0.0344	0.0352	0.0504
BF	4.147	4.501	6.558	5.052	0.322	0.322	0.0366	0.0558	0.1046	0.0790
	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$
BF	3.195	4.489	2.898	2.859	0.278	0.204	0.0333	0.0286	0.0914	0.0241
	4.198	4.945	5.675	4.428	0.291	0.310	0.0275	0.0463	0.0929	0.0846
	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$
	2.970	4.621	1.811	2.480	0.237	0.213	0.0142	0.0260	0.0380	0.0604

Table 2: Pairwise comparisons between unbraced (UB), Ossur Formfit (OF), Talarmade Ankleguard (TAG) and Bauerfeind Malleoloc (BM) in the dominant limb

PARAMETER	I	J	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	STD. ERROR	P- VALUE
MAXIMUM ANKLE INVERSION (°)	UB	OF	1.715*	.173	.000
		TAG	1.627*	.590	.007
		BF	1.509*	.155	.000
	OF	UB	-1.715*	.173	.000
		TAG	-0.088	.478	.855
		BF	-0.206*	.100	.043
	TAG	UB	-1.627*	.590	.007
		OF	0.088	.478	.855
		BF	-0.118	.504	.816
	BF	UB	-1.509*	.155	.000
		OF	0.206*	.100	.043
		TAG	0.118	.504	.816
MAXIMUM ANKLE INVERSION MOMENT (NM/KG)	UB	OF	-0.048*	0.018	.011
		TAG	-0.039*	0.015	.011
		BF	-0.008	0.040	.839
	OF	UB	0.048*	0.018	.011
		TAG	0.009	0.014	.511
		BF	0.040	0.049	.419
	TAG	UB	0.039*	0.015	.011
		OF	-0.009	0.014	.511
		BF	0.031	0.047	.509
	BF	UB	0.008	0.040	.839
		OF	-0.040	0.049	.419
		TAG	-0.031	0.047	.509
MAXIMUM FOOT INVERSION (°)	UB	OF	1.732*	.416	.000
		TAG	0.894	.523	.093
		BF	1.738*	.438	.000
	OF	UB	-1.732*	.416	.000
		TAG	-0.838	.489	.093
		BF	0.006	.327	.985
	TAG	UB	-0.894	.523	.093
		OF	0.838	.489	.093
		BF	0.844*	.381	.031
	BF	UB	-1.738*	.438	.000
		OF	-0.006	.327	.985
		TAG	-0.844*	.381	.031
MEAN PEAK PERONEUS LONGUS EMG ACTIVITY (MV)	UB	OF	0.003	.002	.131
		TAG	-0.001	.004	.791
		BF	0.008*	.002	.002
	OF	UB	-0.003	.002	.131
		TAG	-0.005	.005	.317
		BF	0.004	.002	.074
	TAG	UB	0.001	.004	.791
		OF	0.005	.005	.317
		BF	0.009*	.004	.033
	BF	UB	-0.008*	.002	.002
		OF	-0.004	.002	.074
		TAG	-0.009*	.004	.033
PEAK VALUE PERONEUS LONGUS ACTIVITY (MV)	UB	OF	0.005	.006	.395
		TAG	-0.007	.011	.569
		BF	0.005	.006	.362
	OF	UB	-0.005	.006	.395
		TAG	-0.012	.012	.327
		BF	0.000	.005	.970
	TAG	UB	0.007	.011	.569
		OF	0.012	.012	.327
		BF	0.012	.010	.245
	BF	UB	-0.005	.006	.362
		OF	0.000	.005	.970
		TAG	-0.012	.010	.245

Table 3: Pairwise comparisons between unbraced (UB), Ossur Formfit (OF), Talarmade Ankleguard (TAG) and Bauerfeind Malleoloc (BM) the non-dominant limb

PARAMETER	I	J	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	STD. ERROR	P- VALUE
MAXIMUM ANKLE INVERSION (°)	UB	OF	2.275*	.187	.000
		TAG	2.317*	.944	.017
		BF	1.636*	.140	.000
	OF	UB	-2.275*	.187	.000
		TAG	0.041	.810	.959
		BF	-0.640*	.141	.000
	TAG	UB	-2.317*	.944	.017
		OF	-0.041	.810	.959
		BF	-0.681	.862	.432
	BF	UB	-1.636*	.140	.000
		OF	0.640*	.141	.000
		TAG	0.681	.862	.432
MAXIMUM ANKLE INVERSION MOMENT (NM/KG)	UB	OF	0.056*	.018	.003
		TAG	0.037	.020	.066
		BF	0.049	.046	.294
	OF	UB	-0.056*	.018	.003
		TAG	-0.019	.013	.151
		BF	-0.007	.038	.853
	TAG	UB	-0.037	.020	.066
		OF	0.019	.013	.151
		BF	0.012	.039	.764
	BF	UB	-0.049	.046	.294
		OF	0.007	.038	.853
		TAG	-0.012	.039	.764
MAXIMUM FOOT INVERSION (°)	UB	OF	3.031*	.516	.000
		TAG	1.996*	.552	.001
		BF	2.599*	.554	.000
	OF	UB	-3.031*	.516	.000
		TAG	-1.034*	.387	.010
		BF	-0.432	.335	.203
	TAG	UB	-1.996*	.552	.001
		OF	1.034*	.387	.010
		BF	0.602	.367	.107
	BF	UB	-2.599*	.554	.000
		OF	0.432	.335	.203
		TAG	-0.602	.367	.107
MEAN PEAK PERONEUS LONGUS EMG ACTIVITY (MV)	UB	OF	5.848E-5	.005	.990
		TAG	0.000	.004	.927
		BF	0.009*	.004	.032
	OF	UB	-5.848E-5	.005	.990
		TAG	0.000	.005	.930
		BF	0.009	.005	.075
	TAG	UB	0.000	.004	.927
		OF	0.000	.005	.930
		BF	0.010*	.004	.023
	BF	UB	-0.009*	.004	.032
		OF	-0.009	.005	.075
		TAG	-0.010*	.004	.023
PEAK VALUE PERONEUS LONGUS ACTIVITY (MV)	UB	OF	-0.008	.007	.268
		TAG	0.000	.004	.912
		BF	-0.005	.008	.547
	OF	UB	0.008	.007	.268
		TAG	0.008	.006	.191
		BF	0.003	.009	.752
	TAG	UB	0.000	.004	.912
		OF	-0.008	.006	.191
		BF	-0.006	.007	.426
	BF	UB	0.005	.008	.547
		OF	-0.003	.009	.752
		TAG	0.006	.007	.426

164 Discussion

165 Maximum ankle inversion angles

166 When compared to UB in the dominant side, OF, TAG and BF reduced ankle inversion by
167 1.707° ($p < 0.001$), 1.572° ($p = 0.009$) and 1.521° ($p < 0.001$), respectively. Although there were
168 no significant differences between braces conditions, OF showed a reduction of 0.186° ($p =$
169 0.067) when compared to BF.

170 Similarly to the dominant leg, all braced conditions reduced ankle inversion when compared to
171 UB. OF, TAG, and BF significantly reduced ankle inversion by 2.252° ($p < 0.001$), 2.067° ($p =$
172 0.035) and 1.623° ($p < 0.001$) respectively. Additionally, OF reduced ankle inversion by 0.630°
173 ($p < 0.001$) when compared to BF.

174 Whilst the present study suggests all braced conditions reduced ankle inversion when compared
175 to the control group, only semi-rigid braces reduced ankle inversion during forced inversion
176 trials, whilst lace-up braces showed no significant differences from the control group [7].
177 Similarly, less ankle inversion has been observed in semi-rigid ankle braces than in lace-up ankle
178 braces while performing a change-of-direction manoeuvre [8]. Considering these two studies and
179 the present results, it may be suggested that differences arise due to the nature of the task, thus
180 the degree of protection provided by specific braces against ankle inversion may be dependent on
181 the activities being performed.

182 Maximum foot inversion angles

183 When compared to UB, OF and BF significantly reduced the maximum foot inversion angle in the
184 dominant foot by 1.753° ($p < 0.001$) and 1.747° ($p < 0.001$). TAG also appeared to reduce foot
185 inversion by 0.864° ($p = 0.093$) when compared to UB but did not reach statistical significance.
186 When compared to TAG, BF significantly reduced the foot inversion angle by 0.0884° ($p = 0.020$),
187 while OF showed a reduction of 0.889° ($p = 0.066$) nearly reaching statistical significance.

188 All braced conditions reduced maximum foot inversion in the non-dominant leg when compared
189 to UB. OF, TAG, and BF decreased the maximum foot inversion angle by 2.962° ($p < 0.001$),
190 1.996° ($p < 0.001$) and 2.620° ($p < 0.001$), respectively. When considering TAG, OF significantly

191 reduced the maximum foot inversion by 0.966° ($p = 0.012$) while the reduction seen by BF is on
192 the cusp of statistical significance (0.624° , $p = 0.079$). Despite attaining statistically significant
193 differences in ankle and foot inversion angles between trials, the clinical significance of these
194 findings may be disputed. However, as maximum standing foot inversion angle is less than 17° , a
195 reduction of 1° would yield a relative decrease of nearly 6% and therefore must be considered
196 clinically significant [9, 10].

197 The loading required to cause an injury changes with different positions of the foot [11]. Being
198 able to control, or maintain awareness of, the position of the foot whilst in the air may play a role
199 in preventing foot and ankle injuries.

200 The reduction in foot inversion seen in the present study may be influenced by the design of the
201 ankle braces. TAG possesses only two straps to secure the medial and lateral stirrups to each other.
202 The straps wrap around the leg, perpendicularly to the long axis of the brace, and are fastened
203 using Velcro. They do not at any point cross over each other. OF and BF use straps that cross each
204 other on the anterior portion of the shank. Furthermore, the OF and BF are more securely
205 positioned under the heel. This, in combination with the crossing of straps may provide additional
206 support, and/or keep the stirrups of the braces in better positions to resist inversion motions.

207 Maximum ankle inversion moments

208 When compared to UB, OF and TAG showed a significant increase in the maximum ankle
209 inversion moment in the dominant ankle by 0.048 Nm/kg ($p = 0.011$) and 0.039 Nm/kg ($p = 0.011$),
210 respectively. No significant differences existed between the braces.

211 In the non-dominant ankle, when compared to UB only OF showed a significant difference in
212 reducing the maximum ankle inversion moment by 0.056 Nm/kg ($p = 0.003$). TAG also showed
213 evidence of decreasing the maximum ankle moment by 0.037 Nm/kg ($p = 0.066$), but does not
214 quite reach statistical significance. No significant differences existed between braced conditions.

215 When compared to UB, the increases on the dominant side and decreases on the non-dominant
216 side suggest that participants relied more heavily on their dominant limb to perform the task in
217 braced conditions. Some studies have shown that athletes tend to favour their dominant side for

jumping, kicking and landing [12,13]. However, these studies did not observe the effects of braces on lower limb kinetics.

Mean peak EMG value of peroneus longus during landing

When compared to BF, both UB and TAG demonstrated significant increases in mean peak EMG value in the dominant leg, with increases of 0.0079 mV ($p = 0.002$) and 0.0091 ($p = 0.033$), respectively. OF reports a slight increase of 0.0045 mV ($p = 0.074$), narrowly missing statistical significance.

Similar results were seen in the non-dominant leg. When compared to BF, both UB and TAG demonstrated significant increases in mean peak EMG value, with increases of 0.0092 mV ($p = 0.032$) and 0.0095 ($p = 0.023$), respectively. OF displayed an increase of 0.0091 mV ($p = 0.075$) and nearly reached statistical significance.

The reduction in peroneus longus activity displayed by BF can be interpreted in two ways. The first interpretation suggests that the brace is providing mechanical support, and resisting inversion, therefore the peroneus longus, being the primary evertor of the foot, does not have to activate so intensely. The second idea proposes that the external support actually inhibits the muscle, and may in fact pose an increased risk of ankle inversion injury to the wearer [14]. It is unclear as to whether this phenomenon holds, since both OF and TAG decrease inversion of the foot and ankle compared to UB. Therefore, a reduction in inversion is not necessarily associated with decreases in peroneus longus muscle activity.

In a study examining change of direction manoeuvres, no significant differences in mean peroneus longus activity were noted between braced and unbraced trials [15]. This inconsistency in results may be explained by the different tasks performed or the types of braces worn.

Peak EMG value of peroneus longus during landing

No significant differences were found concerning peak EMG activity between any of the conditions. The similar peak EMG readings between conditions may be explained by the repetitive motion of retrieving the ball from a consistent height. Similar consistencies have been found in other studies which involve performing an athletic task repeatedly. No significant differences in

peak peroneus longus activity were observed while performing change of direction manoeuvres in braced and unbraced conditions [15], nor between semi-rigid and lace-up braces [14].

However, the latter study did report a decrease in EMG activity in the braced conditions when compared to the unbraced trials [14]. This raises concerns as to how differences in experimental procedures and protocols may yield different results, despite relative similarities. Therefore, further studies should be conducted in an attempt to more accurately describe the effects of ankle bracing on peak EMG activity of the peroneus longus during athletic trials.

Limitations

Due to the relatively small sample size, nearly statistically significant values were mentioned several times in the discussion section. These were mentioned when statistically significant differences were noted in the opposing limb in the conditions being considered. Further studies should include larger sample sizes to observe whether these differences would reach statistical significance with more participants.

It is important to consider that data were not collected during an actual basketball game. The task that was performed allowed for safe and successful completion. Therefore, the simulated rebounding task did not include many of the factors that may contribute to lateral ankle injuries sustained during a match.

Consistencies in peroneus longus activity may be explained by the lack of horizontal movement and the consistent height of the basketball during trials. Adding lateral movement to a similar study, as well as varying the height of the suspended basketball, may provide more realistic interpretations as to how ankle braces affect peroneus longus activity during game situations.

Variability within the data may be due to the array of athletic profiles possessed by participants. Both the type of sport, as well as the level of competition, could influence the results. In order to improve this, recruitment could involve a specific core of athletes who compete at the same level. However, the range of athletic profiles allowed for more general consensus concerning the effectiveness of the braces in reducing ankle inversion.

272 Future considerations

273 The aim of this study was to evaluate the effects of different ankle braces on resisting ankle
274 inversion in a basketball rebounding task. However, no inter-limb differences were analyzed
275 within each condition. In braced conditions, the increased ankle inversion moments on the
276 dominant side and decreases on the non-dominant side suggest that there are some changes in
277 landing kinematics versus those observed in the unbraced condition. Future studies should consider
278 investigating EMG activity of other lower limb muscles involved in jumping and landing in order
279 to understand better how forces are distributed while wearing braces bilaterally.

280 Pressure platforms or insoles could be used while performing a rebounding task to further
281 understanding of how weight distribution is affected while wearing ankle braces. Pressure
282 distribution in combination with other kinetic and kinematic data would provide valuable
283 information regarding how the ankle and foot behave during jumping and landing. Additionally,
284 pressure sensors within the shoe/ankle braces would provide information concerning the proper
285 fitting of braces.

286 In addition to peak EMG values, the time required to reach this maximum should be considered.
287 People suffering from chronic ankle instability demonstrate slower eversion reaction times [16].
288 Perhaps more can be learned from the time required to reach peak peroneus longus activity, rather
289 than the magnitude of the peak itself.

290 Furthermore, to better understand how the braces affect ankle and foot inversion throughout the
291 course of the trial, future studies should investigate these values at specific points in the rebounding
292 task. These could include, for example, inversion angles at maximum loading, the instant prior to
293 landing and on landing as these may be when ankle sprains occur with varying footwear
294 configurations [17].

295 **Conclusion**

296 There is an overall agreement throughout the literature that wearing ankle braces provides
297 protection against ankle inversion injuries, likely through the increased mechanical support they
298 provide. However, the effect of ankle braces on peroneus longus activity is not consistent
299 throughout the literature and needs to be further explored.

This research study aimed to investigate the effect of wearing different ankle braces in reducing ankle inversion, specifically in a basketball rebounding task. By examining the inversion angles of the foot and ankle, the inversion moments of the ankle joint, and the muscle activity of the primary evertor of the foot, a general idea can be conceived regarding how ankle braces protect the foot during this precise task.

All braces reduced ankle and foot inversion when compared to the unbraced condition. The lace-up brace (Ossur Formfit) reduced ankle inversion compared to one semi-rigid brace (Bauerfeind Malleoloc), and also reduced foot inversion when compared to the second semi-rigid brace (Talarmade Airguard Air/Gel Stirrup). Bauerfeind Malleoloc reported lower mean peak EMG in the peroneus longus compared to all other conditions. However, no peak value EMG differences were noted between any of the conditions.

Of the ankle braces examined, the Ossur Formfit seems to be the most efficient ankle brace overall in preventing ankle inversion during the rebounding task. This was demonstrated by its ability to restrict ankle and foot inversion better than the Bauerfeind Malleoloc and Talarmade Ankleguard Air/Gel Stirrup, respectively. Since rebounding is one of many actions performed during basketball, research using these same braces in different basketball manoeuvres should be conducted to deduce which brace offers the best overall protection. This would in turn would help clinicians and athletic coaches provide reliable recommendations thus reducing the risk of ankle injury.

Brief Summary

What is known

- There is a general consensus in the literature that semi-rigid and lace-up ankle braces are effective in preventing ankle inversion.
- Semi-rigid braces are more efficient in reducing ankle inversion in change of direction manoeuvres, however less is known about how the braces perform in the array of tasks performed during an actual basketball game.

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
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008

What this study adds

- The results suggest that lace-up ankle braces are the most effective design of brace in resisting ankle inversion in a basketball rebounding task, as seen in the reduction of ankle and foot inversion when compared to the semi-rigid braces.
- Peak peroneus longus activity is not affected by wearing ankle braces during the landing portion of the trial.
- There is some evidence that semi-rigid ankle braces reduce mean peak peroneus longus activity during the landing portion of the trial.

References

- [1] Fong, D. T.-P., Hong, Y., Lap-Ki, C., Yung, P. S-H., Chan K.-H., 2007. A systematic review on ankle injury and ankle sprain in sports. *Sports Medicine*, 37(1), pp. 73-94.
- [2] Abboud, R., 2002. Relevant foot biomechanics. *Current orthopaedics*, Issue 16, pp. 165-179.
- [3] Ramanathan, A. K., Parish, E. J., Arnold, G. P., Drew, T. S., Wang, W. & Abboud, R. J., 2011. The influence of shoe sole's varying thickness on lower limb muscle activity. *Foot and Ankle Surgery*, Volume 17, pp. 218-223.
- [4] Kerr, R., Arnold, G. P., Drew, T. S. & Cochrane, L. A., Abboud, R. J., 2009. Shoes influence lower limb muscle activity and may predispose the wearer to lateral ankle ligament injury. *Journal of Orthopaedic Research*, pp. 318-324.
- [5] McKay, G., Goldie, P., Payne, W. & Oakes, B., 2001. Ankle injuries in basketball: Injury rate and risk factors. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, Volume 35, pp. 103-108.
- [6] Attenborough, A. S., Hiller, C. E., Smith, M. S., Suelcken, M., Greene, A., & Sinclair, P. J., 2014. Chronic ankle instability in sporting populations. *Sports medicine*, Issue 44, pp. 1545-1556.
- [7] Ubell, M., Boylan, J., Ashton-Miller, J. & Wojtys, E., 2003. The effect of ankle braces on the prevention of dynamic forced ankle inversion. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 31(6), pp. 935-940.
- [8] Klem, N., Wild, C., Williams, S. & Ng, L., 2017. Effect of external ankle support on ankle and knee biomechanics during the cutting maneuver in basketball players. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 43(3), pp. 685-691.
- [9] Alfuth, M., Klein, D., Koch, R. & Rosenbaum D., 2014. Biomechanical comparison of 3 ankle braces with and without free rotation in the sagittal plane. *Journal of Athletic Training*. 49 (5), pp. 608-616.

- [10] Dewar, R. A., Arnold, G. P., Wang, W., Drew, T. S., Abboud, R. J., 2019. The effects of wearing and ankle stabilising orthosis (ASO) ankle brace on ankle joints kinetics and kinematics during a basketball rebounding task. *The Foot*, Volume 40, pp. 34-38.
- [11] Wright, I., Neptune, R., van den Bogert, A. & Nigg, B., 2000. The influence of foot position on ankle sprains. *Journal of Biomechanics*, Issue 33, pp. 513-519.
- [12] Beynnon, B. D., Murphy, D. F. & Alosa, D. M., 2002. Predictive factors for lateral ankle sprains: A literature review. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 37(4), pp. 376-380.
- [13] Murphy, D., Connolly, D. & Beynnon, B., 2003. Risk factors for lower extremity injury: A review of the literature. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, Volume 37, pp. 13-29.
- [14] Cordova, M. L., Armstrong, C. W., Rankin, J. M. & Yeasting, R. A., 1998. Ground reaction forces and EMG activity with ankle bracing during inversion stress. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 30(9), pp. 1363-1370.
- [15] Gribble, P. A., Radcliff, S. & Armstrong, C. W., 2006. The effects of ankle bracing on the activation of the peroneal muscles during a lateral shuffling movement. *Physical Therapy in Sport*, Volume 7, pp. 14-21.
- [16] Kavanagh, J. J., Bisset, L. M. & Tsao, H., 2012. Deficits in reaction time due to increased motor time of peroneus longus in people with chronic ankle instability. *Journal of Biomechanics*, Volume 45, pp. 605-608.
- [17] Ramanathan, A. K., Wallace, D.T., Arnold, G. P., Drew, T. S., Wang, W. & Abboud, R. J., 2011. The effect of varying footwar configurations on the peroneus longus muscle function following inversion. *The Foot*, Volume 21(1), pp. 31-36.

1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176

382	Figure captions	
383	Figure 1	Talarmade Ankleguard Air/Gel Stirrup
384	Figure 2	Ossur Formfit
385	Figure 3	Bauerfeind Malleoloc
386	Figure 4	Rebounding task

387

388