London International Consensus and Delphi study on hamstring injuries part 3: rehabilitation, running and return to sport

Bruce M Paton ,[1,2,3] Paul Read,[1,3,4] Nicol van Dyk ,[5,6] Mathew G Wilson,[3,7] Noel Pollock ,[1,8] Nick Court,[9] Michael Giakoumis,[8] Paul Head,[10] Babar Kayani,[11] Sam Kelly,[12,13] Gino M M J Kerkhoffs,[14,15] James Moore,[16] Peter Moriarty,[11] Simon Murphy,[17] Ricci Plastow ,[11] Ben Stirling,[18] Laura Tulloch,[19] David Wood,[20] Fares Haddad[1,3,7,11]

► Additional supplemental material is published online only. To view, please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2021-105384).

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

Correspondence to
Dr Bruce M Paton, Institute of Sport Exercise and Health, University College London, London W1T 7HA, UK; b.paton@ucl.ac.uk

Accepted 16 November 2022
Published Online First 17 January 2023

To cite: Paton BM, Read P, van Dyk N, *et al*. *Br J Sports Med* 2023;**57**:278–291.

ABSTRACT

Hamstring injuries (HSIs) are the most common athletic injury in running and pivoting sports, but despite large amounts of research, injury rates have not declined in the last 2 decades. HSI often recur and many areas are lacking evidence and guidance for optimal rehabilitation. This study aimed to develop an international expert consensus for the management of HSI. A modified Delphi methodology and consensus process was used with an international expert panel, involving two rounds of online questionnaires and an intermediate round involving a consensus meeting. The initial information gathering round questionnaire was sent to 46 international experts, which comprised open-ended questions covering decision-making domains in HSI. Thematic analysis of responses outlined key domains, which were evaluated by a smaller international subgroup (n=15), comprising clinical academic sports medicine physicians, physiotherapists and orthopaedic surgeons in a consensus meeting. After group discussion around each domain, a series of consensus statements were prepared, debated and refined. A round 2 questionnaire was sent to 112 international hamstring experts to vote on these statements and determine level of agreement. Consensus threshold was set a priori at 70%. Expert response rates were 35/46 (76%) (first round), 15/35 (attendees/invitees to meeting day) and 99/112 (88.2%) for final survey round. Statements on rehabilitation reaching consensus centred around: exercise selection and dosage (78.8%–96.3% agreement), impact of the kinetic chain (95%), criteria to progress exercise (73%–92.7%), running and sprinting (83%–100%) in rehabilitation and criteria for return to sport (RTS) (78.3%–98.3%). Benchmarks for flexibility (40%) and strength (66.1%) and adjuncts to rehabilitation (68.9%) did not reach agreement. This consensus panel recommends individualised rehabilitation based on the athlete, sporting demands, involved muscle(s) and injury type and severity (89.8%). Early-stage rehab should avoid high strain loads and rates. Loading is important but with less consensus on optimum progression and dosage. This panel recommends rehabilitation progress based on capacity and symptoms, with pain thresholds dependent on activity, except pain-free criteria supported for sprinting (85.5%). Experts focus on the demands and capacity required for match play when deciding the rehabilitation end goal and timing of RTS (89.8%). The expert panellists in this study followed evidence on aspects of rehabilitation after HSI, suggesting rehabilitation prescription should be individualised, but clarified areas where evidence was lacking. Additional research is required to determine the optimal load dose, timing and criteria for HSI rehabilitation and the monitoring and testing metrics to determine safe rapid progression in rehabilitation and safe RTS. Further research would benefit optimising: prescription of running and sprinting, the application of adjuncts in rehabilitation and treatment of kinetic chain HSI factors.

INTRODUCTION

Hamstring injuries (HSIs) remain the most significant time loss injury in football and high-intensity running sports,[1 2] with large financial, physical and emotional costs. Research on prevention strategies has not been effective in reducing injury incidence and recurrences have remained constant in elite soccer,[3 4] whereas the incidence of other injuries has reduced.[5]

Rehabilitation of HSI has evolved to address inflammation, promote biological healing and emphasise optimal loading throughout the rehabilitation.[6] The individual hamstring muscles have often been treated uniformly as they work in conjunction, but evidence has emerged, demonstrating that they have different functional roles, capabilities and injury mechanisms,[7] based on their anatomy and nerve supply,[8] fibre type composition[9 10] and connective tissue (CT) architecture.[8 11 12] Each muscle may therefore require a different rehabilitation approach,[11 13 14] influencing exercise selection in rehabilitation.[15 16] Evidence has emerged to inform exercise prescription in HSI prevention,[17 18] but exercise selection to inform rehabilitation remains unclear and some consensus reviews ignore exercise completely.[19]

The effects of rehabilitation approaches investigating single exercises are common[20–22] but few studies have examined combined programmes. These exist in football, sprinting,[23–26] general sports[27] and Australian rules football[28]; however, they differ significantly, and few rehabilitation protocols investigate higher grade tendon HSIs requiring longer rehabilitation and time to return to sport (RTS).[29] A 2015 review of rehabilitation

KEY FINDINGS

- ⇒ Differences in hamstring musculotendinous tissue, muscle anatomy and functional roles should direct the rehabilitation prescription for different muscles and myotendinous tissues after hamstring injury (HSI).
- ⇒ In early-stage rehab, most experts advocate protection of injured tissue from loading at length and elastic loads (ie, high strain and strain rate loads).
- ⇒ In early loading, the types of load/contraction considered appropriate, and the order of their application varied greatly between experts. While experts initially prescribe isometric exercises, there is evidence of less force development with concentric exercise compared with isometric exercise and consequently less connective tissue strain.
- ⇒ Experts considered the key kinetic chain deficits as possible contributing factors to (re)injury.
- ⇒ Adjuncts such as strength training with blood flow restriction are increasingly used to allow earlier strength adaptation but did not achieve global consensus agreement.
- ⇒ Experts use an integrated assessment of symptoms, strength and response to previous loading as criteria for progressing and dosing exercise and deciding on safety to return to running (RTR) and return to sport (RTS). Other criteria such as flexibility and special RTS tests are used less widely.
- ⇒ On criteria related to pain, experts suggest some activities should be pain free through rehabilitation (ie, sprinting) but with other exercise activities, a pain threshold approach can be permitted.
- ⇒ In later loading, experts aim to achieve full outer length strength and eccentric strength as key criteria for RTR and RTS.
- ⇒ In later-stage rehab, experts advocate prescription of running and sprinting as key components of HSI rehabilitation and as key progression criteria for RTS.
- ⇒ Experts focus on the demands and capacity required for competition when deciding the rehabilitation end goal and timing of RTS. Experts monitor and test athletes through rehabilitation and use modalities such as global positioning system to give sports-specific information on loading/running dosages, speed and RTS readiness.

studies was unable to pool the rehabilitation literature due to heterogeneity.[30] Interventions included: strength exercises (lengthened vs shortened),[24 31] progressive agility and trunk stabilisation,[32] progressive running and stretching,[33] static stretching[34] and sacroiliac manipulation.[35] Separated meta-analyses of these studies found that lengthening exercises reduce time to RTS but none of the other types provided superior results. Reinjury rates, when reported, were not significantly different between programmes. These interventions did not follow a clinically reasoned rehabilitation approach. Given this heterogenous small sample (6 studies with around 386 HSI athletes), there is a need for more robust evidence to inform rehabilitation after HSI.

There are guidelines and reviews published on criteria for RTS after HSI,[28 36–41] but these are in lower grade injuries. Criteria tests often do not mimic specific sporting loads or functional demands,[39 40] and do not quantify subsequent reinjury risk.[40] There is a need to determine if and how current criteria are used in practice and if this aligns with the available evidence. There may be a need to develop more specific criteria for RTS that link more closely with hamstring function in specific sports.

The volume of the literature on HSI rehabilitation is increasing, but current rehabilitation practice does not always follow research.[42] Less evidence is available in elite sport athletes. Research contains small sample sizes, and decision-making draws on clinical expertise. While there are significant drivers to achieve a faster more robust RTS, multiple stakeholder interests frequently result in athletes RTS while still vulnerable to reinjury.[43] To more clearly understand current practice, innovation and level of expertise pertaining to HSI rehabilitation in elite sport settings, a qualitative research approach is required to outline assessment and treatment decision-making of global experts whose aim is to achieve the best outcome for their athletes.

The London International Hamstring Injury consensus group was convened in 2020. Our aim was to determine, based on expert consensus, the key aspects in rehabilitation and RTS decision-making in the assessment and treatment of HSIs.

METHODS

Study design

We used a modified Delphi research design, including an international panel of experts, with the aim of reaching a consensus on best practice for decision-making in rehabilitation and RTS after HSI. The Delphi process is a scientific, iterative, multistage process used to achieve expert consensus in a given subject, particularly, where a limited literature is available to guide decision-making.[44 45] It takes into account expert opinion and expert clinical practice.[46] There have been previous Delphi studies in prevention[47] and RTS after HSI,[48 49] but the group sought to obtain expert consensus on best-practice rehabilitation, given current disparate and conflicting approaches.

The methodology followed guidance on Delphi studies[44 50] web survey design[51] (the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys[51] and the reporting standard for conducting and reporting Delphi studies)[50] to avoid bias and is described below and in online supplemental file 1 and methodology in paper 1 in this series.

Expert panel

An international representative group of multidisciplinary clinicians and researchers were invited to participate, based on their expertise in assessment and management (including rehabilitation and RTS) of HSI. A purposive, heterogeneous representative sample of experts was chosen with a mix of: professional discipline (sport and exercise medicine physicians, physiotherapists, surgeons, sport and exercise scientists/researchers and athletic trainers), international location (or work schedule), gender and sporting discipline, in line with Delphi methodology.[52]

The criteria for expert inclusion were: a high level of expertise assessing, managing, rehabilitating and/or researching HSIs, based on: the number and type of HSI seen per year, years worked with athletes who sustain HSI, willingness to complete the digital survey and or attend the consensus meeting, sufficient level of written and spoken English and/or peer reviewed publication (authorship) in hamstring research. Possible experts were excluded if they had (1) insufficient experience of assessment or management of HSI, (2) insufficient time to fully complete the online survey. Clinicians and non-clinicians were included but asked to answer only those survey questions related to their fields of expertise (see online supplemental methodology). Domains of surgery, postsurgical recovery, diagnosis and classification were also identified and experts were chosen, with sufficient expertise in these combined areas, as well as rehabilitation.

Coaches and trainers comprised 6% of the experts for the final survey. While they did not all have experience in diagnosis or surgery domains, or early rehabilitation, their expertise in late-stage rehabilitation, running and RTS was sought. Athletes were not included; however, we would acknowledge their voices as vital. Many of our experts have also been athletes and 38% of the final survey expert respondents reported a personal history of HSI, being patients themselves.

Modified Delphi process

The study was undertaken after a review of decision-making aspects of the assessment and management and rehabilitation of HSI. The literature was searched, the evidence discussed and the author team led a review of the evidence presented as a narrative summary to inform the consensus rationale and knowledge gaps. The study comprised two rounds of a purposive digital survey interspersed with a face-to-face meeting round. Each round was modified, based on feedback to achieve a consensus among the international panel of experts. Each Delphi round comprised a digital questionnaire, an analysis and a feedback report.

Round one involved a digital survey, with open-ended questions to a global group of clinicians with expertise in treating HSI. The round one survey (see online supplemental methods appendix 1) aimed to gather information, and understand, from the experts' viewpoint, where are the gaps in the literature evidence and clinical practice in HSI rehabilitation, return to running (RTR), sprinting and RTS. The initial round 1 survey comprised open-ended qualitative information gathering questions. The survey used a digital institution-based software package—Opinio V.7.12 (1998–2020 ObjectPlanet, Oslo, Norway).

The responses from the initial survey were collated and analysed with a thematic and factor analysis[53] (see online supplemental file 1). The expert panel identified four key domains, which included rehabilitation and RTR and RTS. This paper deals with results of rehabilitation and RTS, with previous papers covering classification and surgery. The questions were presented for discussion. All the panel members who completed the survey were invited to the discussion meeting, which comprised a 2-day meeting, alongside an international conference, to allow as many of the participants to join as possible. A nominal group consensus model was followed with a facilitated, structured approach to gather qualitative information, from this group.[54] This approach has been followed in other consensus projects.[55 56] In discussions, facilitators maintained impartiality and ensured balanced discussion to avoid discussions being dominated by the most eminent clinicians/academics ('eminence' bias). They aimed to work toward agreement but not force consensus. Dissenting and outlier views were considered important, representing differences in practice. This approach aimed to avoid 'herding' bias.[57] The key consensus statements were synthesised and refined. The rehabilitation sessions were chaired by the steering committee author related to their area of specialisation—rehabilitation (BMP), RTR/RTS (MG). Statements were gradually refined through a process of facilitated debate until the entire panel were satisfied and on day 2 were put to the group for anonymous electronic voting (see online supplemental appendix 4 for the complete list of statements—rehabilitation, RTS/RTR, classification and surgery).

The consensus steering committee established an a priori criterion threshold of 70%, with ≥70% agreed/yes responses constituting statement acceptance. Overall, 70% has been used successfully by other Delphi studies.[58–60] Statements reaching group consensus were retained, with rehabilitation (11), RTR (8) and RTS (12).

The final Delphi round involved a further online survey to test these statements with this survey to a wider international group of experts who met the previous inclusion/exclusion criteria. The participants voted on the statements with yes, no, uncertain ('forced choice') responses. This made the final survey shorter and less onerous for participants but some further Likert or factor ranking questions determined level of agreement (LOA) (see online supplemental examples methodology).

These experts voted on statements and ranked their key decision-making factors or justifications related to the domain areas found in the round 1 survey. See tables 1–3 for consensus statements, voting results and typical discussion points or areas of disagreement (open-ended questions).

Expert panel for final round

The final survey, with voting on the consensus statements, was split into domain sections—classification, surgery, rehabilitation, RTR/RTS. The expert panel in this survey were asked to complete only the domains (sections of the survey) that were within their field and scope of expertise. The survey responses were evaluated for completeness. Survey responses in each domain were evaluated by two steering group members and any incomplete responses from non-experts in that particular domain were removed from the analysis. Within their expertise areas, panel members were asked to complete sections as carefully as possible and provided with response options such as 'uncertain'. Open-ended boxes after each consensus statement also allowed them to comment, and comments and areas of disagreement were collated and analysed and grouped by theme.

Steering committee

The surveys were designed by two experienced clinical academic physiotherapists, and a professor of orthopaedic surgery, who each have greater than 20 years clinical experience treating HSI and research expertise in HSI, as well as previous experience with Delphi research. A structured, iterative process was undertaken to develop the survey and it was piloted by a mixed group of five sports medicine physicians, five physiotherapists and five orthopaedic surgeons, and the survey was further refined based on their feedback. The expert panel were approached by email located from publicly available correspondence information on organisational web sites or peer reviewed journal articles. Information was provided prior to participation but actively completing the survey was implied (and stated) as the consent to participate. Any participant who withdrew had data removed.

RESULTS

The response rate and participant characteristics for those who participated in each round of the survey are reported in figure 1 and table 4 below.

Round 1 of the survey obtained baseline information from our experts on which areas of rehabilitation and RTS required more research. The open-ended responses were grouped and analysed thematically (see tables 5–7).

Consensus statements were constructed, refined and agreed after facilitated debate at the face-to-face meeting days. Statements were sent in round 2 of the survey to a wider body of global experts and the LOA with statements are represented in tables 1, 2 and 7. Those statements reaching 70% agreement or above are highlighted. Typical discussion points are also shown to display common responses and disagreement from open-ended

Table 1 Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey—global expert panel and rehabilitation

Statements related to general rehabilitation		True	False	Undecided	Samples of typical responses—discussion points or areas of disagreement
Initial and progressive loading of injured hamstring muscles should include exercise with different: contraction types, muscle lengths, functional movements, body positions, but the type of exercise will depend on the sports-specific adaptation required, symptoms and risks of reinjury.		89.8%	8.5%	1.7%	Initial loading about neuromuscular stimulation and improving healing/ muscle tension at length not ideal/initial loading isometric to minimise stress or shearing on tendon/eccentric contractions should be the focus.
The order and speed of progression of exercises—(concentric/isometric/eccentric exercises), hip and knee-based exercises, inner and outer length exercises and open and closed kinetic chain exercises)—will depend on:	Adaptation required	96.2%	0.0%	3.8%	The level of agreement reflects the importance of the target adaptations required as a criterion for prescription.
	Symptoms	88.9%	7.4%	3.7%	Symptoms were the main criterion used by rehabilitation clinicians to make decisions.
	Type of injury	75.0%	15.4%	9.6%	Overall, the injury and tissue type were major considerations for clinicians in deciding on exercise.
	Risk of recurrence	60.4%	26.4%	13.2%	No comments made? Possibly reflecting the little literature available on this.
	Stage of tissue healing	90.7%	5.6%	3.7%	Tissue and stage of healing showed strong agreement—discussions suggested that it was harder to know at tissue level how healing was progressing, and symptoms were used as a surrogate to this.
The criteria for progression of exercise should include:	Symptoms pain	90.7%	1.9%	7.4%	Symptoms were the main criterion used by rehabilitation clinicians to make decisions.
	Strength	92.7%	3.6%	3.6%	While strength overall showed good agreement—there was less agreement on which components of strength were thought to be most important.
	Special tests	62.7%	13.7%	23.5%	Lack of agreement on specific tests—but a combination of factors was thought to be more important.
	Functional milestones	87.3%	5.5%	7.3%	Function was agreed to be important—but the panel could not agree on which functional milestones are most important.
	Flexibility	67.9%	17.0%	15.1%	Flexibility and range of movement (ROM) were thought by the panel to be less important as a criterion—and comments were that strength exercises at longer length were sometimes used to build flexibility concurrently with strength.
	The severity of the injury	73.1%	15.4%	11.5%	After the initial diagnosis and early treatment stage, the progressions were led more by the above criteria than the severity of the injury—although many issued cautions with tendon injuries and higher-grade tendon injuries due to risk of re rupture.
The dosage of exercise (frequency, intensity, duration) should be based on:	The response to previous loading	96.3%	1.9%	1.9%	Graded process of loading and assessing response—both during and after exercise—especially in terms of pain—it was felt this gave the optimum speed of rehab.
	Examination findings	88.2%	9.8%	2.0%	High agreement that examination was vital prior to progressions in dosage.
	Stage of Healing	86.5%	7.7%	5.8%	Appropriate healing level to tolerate applied loads.
	Periodisation factors	88.2%	3.9%	7.8%	Weekly and seasonal factors affect decisions on dosage and are key considerations in elite sport environments.
	Sporting level	82.7%	15.4%	1.9%	These three questions related to knowing the end goal in load capacity for match fitness, which will depend on type and level of sport.
	Current and previous capacity	88.7%	7.5%	3.8%	
	The target adaptations related to the patient's goals and or sport	92.3%	3.8%	3.8%	
	Strength	92.6%	3.7%	3.7%	Training principles of overload—ensuring strength loads are progressed to enable muscle to keep adapting—that is, avoid accommodation to the equivalent applied loads.
	Fitness	78.8%	13.5%	7.7%	Cardiovascular fitness may not affect dosage in gym-based work but will affect running work.
	Severity of the injury	84.6%	11.5%	3.8%	It may not be appropriate to load some injuries too heavily—as they may not have symptoms but still be at risk of retear—i.e. biceps femoris and central tendon involvement.
The whole rehabilitation process should be agreed within the MDT and have athlete engagement.		96.8%	1.6%	1.6%	MDT and athlete engagement were key—the discussions were around all the stakeholders' potentially conflicting goals and timeframes.
The patient's sport and previous level of participation will impact the progression of exercise selection and ultimate return to activity.		95.2%	3.2%	1.6%	The discussions were like the three questions above.
It is important to consider the possibility of sciatic nerve/neural symptoms when considering a patient's progression through rehabilitation. Neural mobility could be considered in treatment but the protection of the repaired or vulnerable tissue should be maintained.		90.5%	0.0%	9.5%	Strong agreement.
Adjuncts to rehabilitation, such as blood flow restriction (BFR), electrical stimulation and hydrotherapy should be considered in the early stages to enhance tissue healing and recovery (caution should be used with cuff pressures over repairing tissues when using BFR training).		68.9%	6.6%	24.6%	There was less uniform global practice when relating to use of adjuncts such as BFR—this reflects small evidence base only in HSI
Rehabilitation should be monitored with appropriate markers that are progressive with recovery.		98.4%	0.0%	1.6%	Monitoring was agreed but the most common form of monitoring was very varied—most panellists mentioned monitoring with global positioning system data allowing on field training/match play load data.
Final stage strengthening should aim to achieve adequate symptom free, outer range, eccentric and isometric strength in injured and uninjured limb.		95.2%	1.6%	3.2%	Panel had agreement on the types of strength to be achieved by final stage rehab—with outer length eccentric and isometric strength—in line with evidence on strength.

Continued

Table 1 Continued

Statements related to general rehabilitation	True	False	Undecided	Samples of typical responses—discussion points or areas of disagreement
It is key during a hamstring rehabilitation to assess, treat and prescribe exercises addressing the whole kinetic chain.	90.5%	3.2%	6.3%	Panel agreed that biomechanical kinetic chain was important but there was less agreement on which were the most important components—many panellists suggested that it should be individualised and decided based on thorough subject and objective examination.

MDT, multidisciplinary team.

questions. The order of the statements is based around the decision-making stages of rehabilitation—early/middle/late/and RTR/RTS stages.

DISCUSSION

This modified Delphi aimed to reach expert consensus on the rehabilitation of HSI over three rounds, comprising two online surveys separated by a consensus group meeting which established consensus statements around: rehabilitation (11), RTR (8) and RTS (12). Further expert voting in the final round online survey further refined these statements, with key statements reaching the a priori agreed 70% agreement (rehabilitation (11), RTR (8) and RTS (9)). The discussion is ordered around the consensus statements relevant for the stages of rehabilitation—early/middle/late stages.

Initial and progressive loading: type and dosage of exercise

Exercise prescription should aim to prepare the injured hamstring for the sports-specific capacity required (LOA 89.5%). Multiple types of exercise were agreed to be important but there was no agreement on which exercises were best at each rehabilitation stage. When deciding on initial loading, pain, athlete confidence and classification of injury were important, but flexibility, gait and strength were ranked low. This is not aligned with evidence, suggesting that strength in outer lengths and flexibility are both associated with early rehabilitation progression,[61] but other reviews suggest range of movement (ROM) and flexibility are less important.[62 63] Motor control and recruitment were not prioritised by as many experts, possibly reflecting lower volumes of evidence and difficulties with measurement. Clinical reasoning to inform load prescription using assessment and specific criteria, rather than time associated prescription, was preferred. Outer length eccentric and isometric strength capacity was required by the end stage of rehabilitation, in alignment with review evidence on prevention of injury[17 18 64] and prevention of recurrence.[65 66] The response to previous loading and strength (92.3% LOA) should be prioritised to decide the dosage of exercise/load (LOA 96.2%).

Influence of tissue healing

The stage of healing was important in deciding dosage of loading (LOA 86%). Components of muscle tissue (fascia, muscle cells and tendon) heal and adapt to loading at different rates after injury[67] and this has implications for time frames of healing, loading and recovery.[68 69] Rehabilitation should be clinically reasoned and individualised, based on the type of injured tissue, and its speed of healing and adaptation.[70–74] Optimising progressive dosage of loading (volume, frequency, intensity and duration) should encompass sufficient overload to promote adaptations but not cause tissue reinjury,[75] which may vary for

Table 2 Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey—global expert panel and return to running

Statements related to return to running	True	False	Undecided	Samples of typical responses—discussion points or areas of disagreement
On pitch/track/field (sport specific) running is a significant part of hamstring rehabilitation.	98.4%	1.6%	0.0%	Levels of agreement for these two questions reflects the importance of running as part of hamstring injury (HSI) rehabilitation.
Running dosages should be gradually increased to ensure return to full sprinting.	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Hamstring muscle function discussed and difference in function at speed was acknowledged.
Sprinting dosage loads should approach game level intensities and volumes to reduce risk of recurrence on return to sport.	95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	Sprinting in games presents injury risk and sprint work is a key component in final phase rehabilitation.
Further research should investigate the specific actions, bias, roles of individual muscles in function of running and sprinting to aid rehab exercise prescription.	84.7%	0.0%	15.3%	Differences in muscle roles were discussed and the panel expressed need for more research into how the differences in muscle function will then impact rehabilitation.
Further research should investigate types (styles) and dosages of running (quantity, speed) that promote adaptations but reduce risk of recurrence.	90.3%	1.6%	8.1%	Discussions suggested that running had not been prioritised sufficiently in literature and identified a research need.
Further research should investigate safe time frames to commence running post HSI or surgery.	90.3%	1.6%	8.1%	Risk of reinjury is high when re-exposing HSI athletes to running—and the panel wanted after time frames for return—and more research into timeframes.
Mild pain with running is permissible in rehabilitating certain HSI, but we need to consider the function of the individual, the anatomy, injury, classification and the 24-hour pain pattern (subjective and objective).	83.9%	9.7%	6.5%	The panel acknowledged many athletes have pain when restarting running—there was less agreement on how much pain was permissible/deleterious—the stated consideration factors reached agreement but other factors did not.
In HSI, pain-free running is a criterion for return to sprinting.	85.5%	8.1%	6.5%	The panel agreed that pain levels should be reduced prior to permitting sprinting—the panel acknowledged that the initial commencement of full sprinting—was a high-risk period for reinjury.

MDT, multidisciplinary team.

Table 3 Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey—global expert panel and return to sport

Statements related to return to sport	True	False	Undecided	Samples of typical responses—discussion points or areas of disagreement
In hamstring injury, range of motion is a consideration for return to sport (RTS). If previous data is available, then within 10% of previous scores should be used otherwise within 20% of the other limb.	45.0%	23.3%	31.7%	Flexibility was not considered a key factor by many clinicians—stretching did not always produce improvements in function or performance and less agreement over acceptable levels.
Kinetic chain strength/function is a consideration criterion for RTS.	78.3%	6.7%	15.0%	All agreed kinetic chain was important—but panel did not agree on key kinetic chain factors. A clinical reasoning approach was advocated to assess each athlete based on the required sporting demand and key injury risk activities.
Progression to peak isometric force in mid and outer range, isotonic strength (eccentric only/eccentric and concentric) are all considerations for RTS.	83.3%	1.7%	15.0%	Optimal types of exercise were controversial but consistent with literature—eccentric or isometric exercises at length were considered important and reached agreement.
Benchmarks for strength should reflect the end goal demands of the athlete but should be within 10% of previous data or population means.	66.1%	10.2%	23.7%	The low agreement for this question reflected differences in opinion on strength benchmarks.
Athlete subjective apprehension is a consideration for RTS criteria.	98.3%	0.0%	1.7%	The strong agreement reflects the importance the panel placed on the athletes leading the RTS/return to running process—and ensuring their opinion was prioritised.
Athlete self-assessment of their readiness to RTS is a key factor in the RTS decision-making process.	86.7%	5.0%	8.3%	
Askling H-test is a useful test in the return to sprinting decision process.	57.6%	18.6%	23.7%	The respondents were divided on use of pain provocation tests. Their usefulness was acknowledged but it was felt that no one specific test could assess readiness to return to sprinting—and the tests should form part of an ongoing assessment and clinical reasoning process.
Endurance capacity testing of the hamstrings should be a consideration for RTS.	78.3%	6.7%	15.0%	Endurance was felt to be important, but it was harder to get agreement on which endurance tests were most important—running endurance was felt to be important but the panel suggested that the level of endurance related to the specific sporting demands.
Pain-free sprinting is a criterion for return to play.	96.7%	1.7%	1.7%	The importance of sprinting in match play/competition was acknowledged, with high agreement. There was less agreement on the dosage of full sprinting. While some pain was permitted in running, sprinting in RTS—was expected to be pain free.
Completing full unrestricted training session should be a criterion for RTS.	93.3%	6.7%	0.0%	Training sessions reached agreement—particularly as this assessed the athlete with sports-specific demands and endurance requirements.
The use of previous GPS metrics can guide the required dosage of appropriate metrics, that is, volume, sprints, speed, high-speed running.	83.3%	3.3%	13.3%	Many in the panel were using GPS to measure running dosage—and their usefulness was thought to be key—with practice expertise moving faster than research evidence base—this was thought to be an area requiring greater research.
RTS should be a multidisciplinary process that involves all stakeholders ideally.	98.3%	0.0%	1.7%	The importance of a whole MDT and coaching athlete stakeholder involvement reached hight level of agreement—but many clinicians acknowledged significant pressure from stakeholder groups to modify their clinical decision-making.

GPS, global positioning system; MDT, multidisciplinary team.

each myotendinous structure (fascia/muscle/musculotendinous junction (MTJ)/tendon). This follows evidence of faster time frames for healing of myofascial (type a),[76] versus MTJ (type b), which heals via satellite cell induced myogenesis and tendon (type c) injuries,[77 78] which depend on collagen synthesis and replacement and remodelling.[79 80] The type of tissue may influence the amount of early protection required[80] and the risk of recurrence, with more protection required and greater risk in type c or tendon type injuries.[81] Hamstrings have complex intramuscular tendon architecture and injuries to these structures are often poorly recognised,[82] with poor rehabilitation outcomes[83] and may require further protection, although this remains controversial.[84] Repaired tendon tissue may not regain preinjury biomechanical properties, even at 12 months.[85] Longer protection may be required, particularly from elastic or strain loads like running, sprinting, jumping and other sports-specific movements requiring tissue elasticity[6] (LOA 92.3%). For HSI, our panel suggested early protection may be required from activities such as weight-bearing (high-grade injury), stairs and high force contractions, contraction at long lengths, eccentric contractions and stretch shortening cycle (SSC) contractions (jumping, plyometrics and running). They disagreed, however, on the time frames for protection, with most suggesting that timing or protection should relate to presence or level of symptoms. Symptoms, however, were thought to provide only a surrogate measure of healing, and in some types of injury, adequate fixed tissue healing time may be required (ie, tendon and CT injuries). Symptoms may resolve while the healing tissue is still vulnerable. This represents a conflict between symptom-based and time-based rehabilitation approaches and both may be required.

Commencement of loading and exercise prescription

After initial protection, the primary rehabilitation goal is to progressively load recovering tissue to promote its optimal adaptation back to full strength, elasticity, capability and function.[6]

The type of muscle contraction prescribed in exercise (eccentric,[35] isometric[86] and concentric[87]) produces different force



Figure 1 Flow diagram of expert participants and response rates (RR).

outputs and loads on muscle tissues, leading to different adaptation and requiring different periodisation and recovery times.[88 89] Early eccentric loading was typically avoided by our experts due to perceived reinjury risk and loading commences with isometric contraction at shortened lengths. This follows historical guidance.[90] Isometric contractions, however, (depending on the muscle length and effort) can produce greater tensile force loads within tendinous CT than do eccentric loads.[91] Heavy loads may, therefore, be applied too early, but this may inadvertently allow earlier adaption within CT and speed rehabilitation. However, some of our panel and some authors suggest that it may be advantageous to safely expose tissue to paced eccentric loads.[28 92] Outer length, eccentric and isometric strength work was certainly an ultimate goal (LOA 95%). Loading hamstring at longer lengths may increase fascicle length,[92 93] changing the length tension relationship in muscle and reducing injury risk.[94]

The hamstring muscle group comprises two joint muscles and muscle function differs depending on the mobile joint, but also whether the mobile segment is fixed (or in a closed kinetic chain) or free, in an open kinetic chain. Recruitment will differ with reversal of the mobile versus fixed attachments.[95 96] For hamstrings, hip versus knee dominant exercises load different parts of the muscles,[97–100] with different training effects. Our panel advocated applying both types, but without agreement on which should be first.

Exercise speed and elastic function in rehabilitation prescription was emphasised by only small numbers in our panels (outlier view), but evidence suggests that adaptations to training

Table 4 Participant characteristics of the expert panels

Characteristic	Categories	Survey round 1 N=35	Meeting N=15	Survey final round N=99
Sex	(M:F)	33:2	14:1	81:18
Age (years)	27–36	11 (31.4 %)	6	32 (31.6%)
	37–46	13 (37.1%)	4	33 (33.7%)
	47–56	9 (25.7%)	4	20 (20.4%)
	57–70	2(5.7%)	1	14 (14.3%)
Role clinician	Clinician only	3 (5.7%)		26 (25%)
	Researcher/scientist only	2 (8.6%)		11 (11 %)
	Clinician+researcher	30 (85.7%)	15 (100%)	62 (63%)
	Neither clinician nor researcher	0		1 (1%)
Hamstring cases/year	None	0		5 (5%)
	0–5	1 (2.9%)		6 (6%)
	5–9	6 (17.1%)		25 (24%)
	10–14	7 (20%)		12 (12%)
	15–19	10 (28.6%)		13 (13%)
	20 or more	11 (31.4%)		38 (38%)
Healthcare profession	Sports medicine physician	4 (10%)	1 (7%)	21 (18 %)
	Orthopaedic surgeon	8 (21%)	5 (35%)	18 (17 %)
	Physical therapist	22 (55%)	10 (64%)	43 (40 %)
	Sports scientist	1 (3%)		25 (24 %)
	Athletic trainer/strength and conditioning coach	2 (5%)		7 (6 %)
	Other	2 (5%)		2 (2%)
Country of practice	North America	4 (11%)		10 (10%)
	Europe	26 (66%)	12 (80%) (UK, Neth, Ir)	65 (64%)
	Middle East/Africa	4 (11%)	1 (7%) SAf	12 (12%)
	Southeast Asia			1 (1%)
	South America			1 (1%)
	Australasia/pacific	5 (13%)	2 (13%) (Aust)	10 (10%)
Sports	Football	31 (29%)	4 (27%)	79 (80%)
	Athletics	19 (19%)	2 (13%)	59 (60%)
	Rugby codes	13 (12%)	4 (27%)	40 (40%)
	NFL (North American football)	5 (5%)		9 (9%)
	AFL (Australian Rules football)	3 (3%)		9 (9%)
	Basketball	9 (9%)		30 (30%)
	Volleyball	4 (4%)		1 (1%)
	Skiing and winter sports	9 (9%)		21 (21%)
	Hockey	3 (3%)	1 (7%)	22 (21%)
	Judo/martial arts/wrestling	2 (2%)		24 (24%)
	Cricket			15 (15%)
	Ice hockey			12 (12%)
	Acrobatics/gymnastics/dance			17 (17%)
	Gaelic football			7 (7%)
	Racquet sports			17 (17%)
	Handball			20 (20%)
	Other	9 (8%)	4 (27%)	6 (6%)
Years working with hamstring injury pathology	0–4	5 (14.3%)		17 (17%)
	5-9	8 (22.9%)		13 (13%)
	10-14	9 (25.7%)		22 (21%)
	15–20	4 (11.4%)		23 (23%)
	More than 20	9 (25.7%)		24 (24%)
Highest academic achievement	Bachelor/diploma			14 (14%)
	Masters			35 (35%)
	PhD			34 (35%)
	Clinical doctorate			15 (15%)
Had hamstring injury personally	Hamstring problem			38 (38%)
	Not applicable			61 (62%)

Aust, Australia ; IR, Ireland; Neth, Netherlands; SAf, South Africa.

are influenced by contraction speed and elastic function. Muscle CT is an elastic energy store and tendon strain and elastic/spring behaviour are vital to hamstring muscle function, but involve high tensile loads on the tendon and muscle CT.[101] This elastic/spring behaviour must be restored for activities such as running or jumping.[102] Elasticity also works across long fascial slings of CT, as well as within individual muscles.[103] Deciding when to allow elastic load and SSC activities has importance,[102] including running at low and high speeds.[104] Reinjury risk is high during introduction of these activities.[81 105] In SSC and elastic work, the speed of activity increases strain rates on CT, placing the CT under greatest load and risk, although high strain amounts may be tolerated by recovering tissue if applied slowly, and may stimulate connect tissue cells/fibroblasts, tenocytes to adapt fastest. This raises the importance of the speed of the exercise. In hamstrings, as running speed increases, elastic strain behaviour, the amount of negative work[106] and force[107] all increase. Typically, our experts reported not exposing injured tissue to running early, but in certain injury types, in controlled situations, this loading, may allow earlier tissue adaptation.

We did not reach consensus around neural activation and motor control, which were only highlighted by small numbers on our panel (outlier viewpoint), reflecting some evidence finding neuromuscular deficits and inhibition after HSI.[108–110] Many clinicians include exercise for muscle activation, to address this inhibition and control,[111] and different hamstring exercises activate muscles very differently,[112–114] with implications for neural components to strength. Reinjury risk can be higher with lower levels of muscle activation in warm up.[115] Neural movement may be important, with neuromeningeal mechanisms to some HSI proposed,[116] and assessment and treatment of neurodynamics can have significant effects on symptoms and flexibility.[117–119]

Flexibility

The commencement of flexibility work recommended after HSI is varied and we did not reach consensus. Lack of hamstring flexibility is a possible risk factor for HSI and reinjury[120] but can be present after injury.[121] Some authors advocate flexibility work after HSI[34 122] but other evidence suggests flexibility may not be a risk factor for reinjury.[63]

Monitoring and progression of exercise

Progression of exercise maintains ongoing adaptation to training.[123] There was strong agreement for monitoring through rehabilitation (LOA 98.4%). Exercise progressions should ideally be made based on criteria. Having specific adaptation goals (LOA 96.1%), considering tissue healing (90.4%), or the type of injury (75%), and using symptoms (88.5%), such as pain, were considered important criteria for progression. There was less agreement on recurrence risk (60.4%) affected decision-making. Risk of recurrence did not reach consensus. This may reflect the lack of research into what types or speeds of progression affect reinjury risk. Strength, rather than pain, was the most important criterion for progression, indicating that some clinicians prefer to tolerate some level of pain (pain threshold), although, a high proportion of the panel wanted tissue to be pain free prior to progression.[28 92]

We did not achieve consensus on the optimal order of exercise progression but did agree that this should be individualised based on the level and type of sport and required capacity (LOA 95%). Rehabilitation should be commenced and progressed with a sport-specific end target goal/capacity (LOA 96.2%) and that loading of the injured muscle(s) should follow the muscle actions, demands roles in the athlete's sport and level of play. Injury patterns in some sports relate to slow speed stretch type forces with contracting muscles.[124] Sports such as rugby or American football see different HSI mechanisms with high load slow stretch injury, typically involving the semimembranosus and

Table 5 Round 1 survey: what are the key questions that you would like answered regarding the early phase of rehabilitation after hamstring injury (HSI)?

Domain area (theme)	Responses	Typical responses
Early interventions (STM/neural mobilisation /+adjuncts blood flow restriction/EMS)	9	Is there a role for adjunct treatment modalities? At what time point are they safe and to what level of intensity?
Progression criteria (including pain)	6	What outcomes should we be aiming to achieve for criteria-based progression along stages?
Optimum exercise/load types	6	What are the optimal exercises to use in this phase? How early can we safely prescribe eccentric/long length exercises?
Pain importance	5	What are the outcomes of pain monitored/threshold approach to rehabilitation?
Modalities for inflammation/healing (RICE, Meds)	5	Does prolonged use of ice, compression or medication positively or negatively affect hamstring healing rates?
Timescales (start and progress load)	4	How early can we safely prescribe eccentric/long length exercises?
Flexibility/range of movement	3	Is there a role for knee flexibility work?
Immobilisation and bracing (optimum, effects)	3	Does initial immobilisation positively or negatively affect hamstring healing rates?
Neural factors, inhibition and activation	3	What are the outcomes of return to run process, early versus delayed versus criteria based, versus early introduction of eccentrics—any effect on neuromuscular inhibition?
Optimum dosing (frequency, intensity, duration)	2	What exercise dosages are optimal for loading early phase after hamstring injury?
Safety of early loading	1	Does early mobilisation/rehab including stretching and activation of the hamstring speed or limit recovery?
Tissue strain load/exercise	1	What is the strain placed on muscle/tendon by different rehab exercises?
Weight-bearing	1	When does initial reduction in weight-bearing help or hinder healing?
Early strength	1	What are the outcomes of early introduction of eccentric exercises?
Total	50	

EMS, electromagnetic stimulation; RICE, rest, ice, compression, elevation; STM, soft tissue massage.

fascia, with extremes of hip flexion and knee extension.[124 125] Sports involving jumping, pivoting or kicking[126] differ again in hamstring and lower limb kinetic chain function.[127] Rehabilitation exercise should, therefore, be chosen, adapted and targeted specifically to the functional requirements of the injured muscle[98 111] in the sport and its injury risk movements.

It is historically suggested that knee-based exercise be introduced prior to hip-based exercise. Hip-based protocols such as the L Protocol require the hamstrings to function at longer muscle lengths and are effective in elite sprinters[23] and footballers[24] for HSI prevention. The advantage of hip over knee-based protocols, and when to commence them, is less clear in rehabilitation. Hamstring contractions in high-speed running (HSR), however, involve controlling concurrent knee and hip high-speed single leg angular motions[128] and it may be appropriate to consider biarticular single leg exercise.

Subjective and objective longitudinal monitoring throughout rehabilitation

Progression of rehabilitation should be reasoned and based on ongoing assessment including both subjective and objective

Table 6 What questions would you most like answered on exercise prescription in hamstring injury (HSI) rehabilitation?

Domain area (theme)	Responses	Typical responses
Progression of exercise	8	What is optimum order of progression of exercise? inner to outer? short length to long concentric to eccentric to isometric? open kinetic chain versus closed kinetic chain? knee to hip based?
Dosage	5	What is the optimum dosage of strength exercise?
Contraction types	5	What type of contraction should be emphasised during hamstring injury rehabilitation?
Running/sprinting	4	What is a safe but stimulating dosage of pitch-based running?
Exercise choice	4	what are the optimal exercises for hamstring injury prevention?
Importance of symptoms	3	How effective is early introduction of eccentrics and pain threshold training?
Safety versus effectiveness balance	3	What is a safe but stimulating dosage of strength exercise?
Tissue healing stage	2	What modes of exercise should be carried out at certain healing stages?
Timing	2	When should certain exercise types, isometric, concentric, eccentric, stretch shortening cycle be implemented throughout rehabilitation?
Insufficient evidence	2	Can we get more insights to the specific mechanisms of HSI at a contraction mode, neural and structural level to aid prevention and rehabilitation exercise choices?
Flexibility	1	What are the effects of flexibility exercises?
Strength	1	What types of strength are crucial?
Which muscles	1	How best do we target loading the biceps femoris long or short head and do we need to?
Functional exercise	1	More randomised controlled trials (analogous to those employing the Nordic) exploring the functional effectiveness of different exercises.
Neural factors	1	Which exercises promote optimal hamstring activation?
Total	43	

Table 7 What are the questions you would like answered on return to running and sport after hamstring injury?

Domain area (theme)	Responses	Typical responses
Running mechanics	8	Does early return to running effect rehab outcomes?
Optimum monitoring	7	What key benchmarks should we be considering before each stage and research about?
Recovery	2	How long to leave it between bouts of high-speed running?
Sport specifics	3	What are the sport-specific match demands that we can replicate towards the end of rehabilitation?
Load tolerance	1	Does early return to running effect rehab outcomes?
Strength	3	What are key strength components and levels to enable safe return?
Dosage	2	What dosage of running should be permitted before sprinting is safe?
Timing	4	How early is it safe to sprint?
Total	30	

measures,[129] as well as evidenced-based criteria. Many of the criteria that clinicians use to progress load are investigated only in subsets of the HSI population[61] or not at all.[28]

Imaging

None of our expert panel recommended using imaging findings as criteria for progression, and this was not added as a consensus statement. MRI findings show poor significance at RTP[130 131] and our outcomes align with another consensus statement in football, where medical imaging was not recommended to inform RTS decisions.[49] While imaging is used for classification and grading of injury, which assists rehabilitation prescription in practice,[16 29] imaging could not be used to determine restoration of muscle and CT architecture and load capacity.

Clinical examination findings/assessment

Many studies use clinical examination components as the main decision-makers for progressions as they show greater predictive value than imaging modalities such as MRI.[132 133] Several studies have investigated the most important examination findings.[134–137]

Pain was the most important criterion for rehabilitation progression (LOA 90.4%). Traditionally, the absence of pain was the criterion for progression,[40] although some pain is acceptable[28 49] and rehabilitation with a permitted pain threshold has been found to be beneficial.[65 138 139] Slower pain-free progression is advocated in high-grade or tendinous HSIs.[16 140 141] Pain threshold rehabilitation may not accelerate time to RTS, but may accelerate restoration of isometric knee flexor strength and maintain biceps femoris long head fascicle length, compared with pain-free rehabilitation.[92]

ROM/muscle flexibility scored highly with our experts as progression criteria (LOA 67.9%) but did not quite reach consensus threshold. Some evidence suggests that flexibility and ROM tests, however, may correlate with time to return to sport.[61] Tests such as Maximal Hip Flexion Active Knee Extension (MHFAKE)[142] and straight leg raise[120] may be useful. Clinicians may also consider the use of modified Thomas Test[143] or a slump test for neurodynamic assessment.[118 119]

Muscle strength was scored highly by our panel as a key examination progression criterion (LOA 92.5%), following evidence of strength tests correlating closely with clinical progression and running effort.[61 132] We did not have consensus on the most important types of strength or optimum measurement methods but agreed that outer length and eccentric strength were key (LOA 95%). This follows evidence that outer length tests correlated more with progression than mid or inner range strength tests.[61 132] Quick convenient tests, such as manual muscle tests show low validity and reliability.[144 145] Instrumented tests such as handheld dynamometry (HHD) are more reliable, but still show questionable validity and reliability.[146] Tests such as prone knee bend testing at 15° with HHD[26] or knee flexion in supine with hip flexed, which test outer length hamstring function, can better mimic sporting or injury risk situations. Other measurement devices such as the Nordbord[147] have been used as a criterion for RTS and progression, citing evidence of Nordic hamstring exercise (NHE) to prevent HSI[148] but a recent meta-analysis reported inconclusive evidence of NHE preventing HSI.[149]

Other muscle strength tests, such as hand held dynamometry and isokinetic dynamometry,[150] and the derived hamstring to quadriceps[151] or concentric to eccentric[121 152 153] ratios may be beneficial,[28] although other evidence suggest less utility to predict risk of reinjury[154 155] or RTS.[156] Tests, however, cannot isolate/quantify individual hamstring or posterior chain muscle contribution[157] and other knee and hip muscles, such as gastrocnemius or adductor magnus, may compensate for hamstring muscle deficits. The different sport-specific body positions, functional roles and speeds of the individual hamstring muscles in sporting tasks (ie, sprinting) are difficult to assess with these tests and our experts reported combining these tests to measure multiple parameters of strength.[158] More valid/sports-specific tests to aid progression in strength prescription in rehabilitation are needed.

Some of our experts used surface electromyography (sEMG), measuring the contribution of each posterior chain (hamstring) muscle in exercises and detect neuromuscular inhibition[108]; however, other authors highlight poor validity and reliability of sEMG.[159] Further research is warranted, as some central nervous system changes are present after HSI[110] and may be implicated in recurrence.

Adjuncts

Adjuncts to strengthening which enhance muscle adaptation, but with lower tissue joint loads are frequently used in early rehabilitation. Examples include muscle stimulation and strength training with blood flow restriction (BFR), which allow earlier commencement of strength training, at lower levels of load. Their utility did not reach consensus in the final round (LOA 67.8%), although BFR was used by all the rehab clinicians in our consensus meeting panel, reflecting differences in global clinical practice. Few studies have examined their use after HSI. There is growing evidence for effectiveness in other conditions such as anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction,[160] and our panel reported adapting protocols for HSI.

The use of EMS and hydrotherapy was identified as being part of current practice,[161 162] particularly in the early phase of

rehabilitation,[26] although the optimal use of these modalities remain unknown.

Contribution of the kinetic chain

During hamstring rehabilitation, it is important to assess the kinetic chain (LOA 90.2%), but there was less agreement on which structures to prioritise. Several clinicians commented on posterior chain muscle sling function, suggesting that treatment should be individualised, based on assessment and clinical reasoning, with correction of dysfunctions as a criterion for RTS (LOA 77.6%). The statement around sciatic nerve showed strong agreement (90.5%), reflecting its proximity and frequent involvement in high-grade HSI, where the nerve can be tractioned or tethered. Associated symptoms warrant investigation and possible surgical consideration.

Some of our experts suggested hip and pelvis biomechanics influence HSI risk. Sacroiliac joint mobility and force closure[163 164] and ilial asymmetry both affect the pelvis and ischial tuberosity position, altering length tension relationships in the hamstrings. Pelvic control and gluteal muscle activation associates with HSI in running.[165] Gluteal versus hamstring contribution in hip extension,[166] femoroacetabular impingement,[167 168] lack of hip flexion,[169] lumbar spine L5/S1 nerve root pathology[170] and trunk strength with altered EMG activity[171] have all been implicated in HSI risk. Other studies, however, do not implicate proximal kinetic chain muscles after HSI and the picture may be more complicated.[172] Our panel advocated for a kinetic chain approach that individualises assessment and clinical reasoning for each athlete.

Return to running

Running and sprinting were identified as a key components of rehabilitation after HSI (LOA98.4%) (table 6). This reflected literature suggesting HSR exposure[173 174] and poor prescription of running[64] are risk factors for HSI and reinjury. The hamstrings are integral to running and sprinting,[175 176] particularly in end swing and early stance phases[177] when large forces and rates/amounts of strain[178] are present within the hamstring CT.[101 104 179] In running, the three hamstring muscles show different activation, at different lengths[178] and velocities,[12 180] and with different force outputs.[98 111 175] In sprinting, semitendinosus undergoes the largest lengthening velocity, with semimembranosus, functioning with the greatest force production and biceps femoris undergoing the largest strain,[11 175] with some studies suggesting thatBiceps Femoris long head can reach 112% of its resting length[179 181] (possibly the reason why this muscle is more frequently injured in HSR mechanism[31 182 183]). The muscles may also function differently based on the levels of acceleration.[184] This may mean each muscle requires a different rehabilitation prescription for RTR.

Strong agreement between our experts highlighted that different hamstring muscles play different roles in running, which affects rehabilitation prescription (LOA 84.2%) and safe time frames to progress running (LOA 90%).

Criteria for RTR

Consensus was reached on a criteria-based approach rather than time frames for RTR but differed on their preferred criteria. Clinicians indicated their use of criteria related to pain, strength and flexibility, but assessed running specific muscle functions and capacities.[17]

Pain level was the main criterion chosen by the panel for RTR, either on examination (palpation)[65] or with a specific test or activity.[185] Some pain is expected, and they agreed mild pain may be acceptable (LOA83.1%) but did not agree on a tolerated pain threshold. They suggested a tolerated threshold level of pain was preferred, decided between the athlete and rehabilitation team.[92] Further research was recommended on the relationship between pain, recovery time and reinjury risk during or after running (table 6).

Strength was chosen as a criterion for RTR, but with disagreement on what type or quantity of strength was adequate or again how to test. Many panel members identified outer length eccentric or isometric strength criteria, in line with literature on hamstring functional demands in running and rehabilitation programmes.[23 24]

The panel identified flexibility and ROM factors as important prior to RTR, with tests such as MHFAKE,[61] although the literature suggests flexibility is not a risk factor for reinjury.[63] Large differences were present in their choice of special tests for RTR, with examination type tests or jump/hop testing was also used,[186] in line with evidence on reactive strength index[187] as a risk factor for injury but these tests also lacked agreement, reflecting conflicting evidence on evaluating HSI risk using power and plyometric testing.[63]

Criteria for sprinting

No consensus was reached on criteria for safe return to sprinting, reflecting the lack of evidence quantifying sprint loads and risk of reinjury. There was 100% agreement that loads should be increased to full sprinting prior to RTS. This reflects their awareness of the hamstrings functional role in full sprinting and the increased tissue strain rates with elevated running speeds.[188] Progressing running too rapidly in rehabilitation may risk retear but altered running kinematics[63] and even insufficient running conditioning[189 190] may also increase risk of reinjury. More research into optimum dosages of running to prevent reinjury risk is needed (LOA 90%).

There was some difference in criteria that our panel used to permit return to sprinting, with higher speeds emphasised in strength testing. Few of our panel mentioned power or rate of force development testing, and clinicians disagreed on the required threshold of strength, often using only the percentage of strength of the uninjured limb—the limb symmetry index (%LSI) to quantify, but with strong acknowledgement that the unaffected limb was rarely normal. Special tests as criteria for sprinting (such as the Askling H-Test[185]) did not reach high levels of agreement (56.1%), but there was strong agreement on completion of submaximal running phases as a criterion for returning to sprinting, although the panel disagreed on threshold volumes, intensities or speeds. This reflects the lack of evidence around the dosages of running required to reduce injury risk, and our panel showed high LOA on the need for future running research into muscle roles (84.2%)/types of running (90%) and safe time frames (90%). Many of our panel prioritised global positioning system (GPS) data to benchmark, grade and target running loads, and evaluated on symptom response (pain tightness) to graded running loads. They agreed that pain-free running was a criterion for sprinting (LOA 85.5%). In the situation of sprinting, where injury risk is higher, pain-free versus pain threshold criteria were preferred.

Return to sport

We acknowledged that the RTS phase was a reinjury risk period and safe management was vital (table 7). Many athletes demonstrate deficits in function, despite being cleared to RTS.[122 147] The

highest risk period for reinjury after RTS is the first month,[191] with risks raised for the first year[136] and competition running levels can remain suppressed even after RTS.[43]

Criteria for RTS

Several Delphi consensus studies outline RTS criteria,[48 49] emphasising pain (clinical examination/testing), functional performance, strength, flexibility and athlete confidence. While these components are acknowledged, we also identified criteria around running and return to full training and sports-specific criteria, correlating with performance. It should be noted that a decision to RTS is a shared decision and the clinician's role may be to provide information regarding risk rather than strict criteria to RTS.[192] However, completion of full unrestricted training sessions was crucial (LOA 93.3%), as well as pain-free sprinting (96.7%), with volume, speed and intensity at (and preferably beyond) competition levels. This reflects evidence showing ongoing deficits in force production and power in running—even at RTS,[193] although appropriate prescription and progression of loads can reduce reinjury risk.[189] It should also be recognised that in some sports, players can RTS but adjust their exposure to HSR loads.[43] Monitoring external running workload using GPS allows more quantifiable, on-field sports-specific (position-specific) loads, speeds as part of expert rehabilitation. The clinicians also recommended using historical training and match play GPS baseline data as a benchmark (LOA 83.3%). Running load metrics include: speed, accelerations, distance, direction changes and number of sprints efforts.[49 194]

We agreed that endurance was a consideration (LOA 78.3%) but there was less agreement on what type of endurance. It should be sports specific, relating to the sport's volume of high-speed running. This follows evidence suggesting increased risk of injury with lack of fitness[195] and fatigue.[196]

Factors such as ROM and flexibility, traditionally rated as important, failed to reach threshold agreement (45%). This may reflect evidence on flexibility and static stretching causing some detriment to elastic function and performance[197] and review evidence suggesting flexibility and ROM were less important as reinjury risk factors.[63] Few in the panel suggested imaging was useful for RTS decision-making, in line with current evidence.[63]

Strength

Strength as a criterion for RTS reached consensus but the group disagreed on which strength components were key. Mid and outer length isometric and eccentric strength was agreed on (LOA 83.3%) in line with evidence on types of strength deficits posing injury risk.[65 66] The quantity of strength required is not clear, particularly in relation to the uninjured side (including the frequent benchmark of <10% deficit) (LOA 66.1%). This reflects a movement away from %LSI as a strength measure due to loss of unaffected leg strength post injury. Preseason benchmark screening on variables such as strength/fitness, flexibility did not have a high LOA (64.9%) on which screening data to prioritise and what % difference was permissible. General population data were thought to be too non-specific. Sports differed in priority benchmark screening data and the %LSI considered acceptable. The panel suggested less correlation between strength components and the ability to run and more research may be required to understand if running criteria should be prioritised over strength criteria for RTS (90.3%).

Performance tests and sports-specific/position-specific testing

On-field tests of performance have also been used alongside running tests for return to play. These include hop and jump tests.[198] However, they may not replicate the type of match play hamstring loads. Special criterion tests exist, such as the Prone Hip Extension[199] and Askling H-Test[185] aim to reproduce hamstring loads during sprinting, but they are not performed upright, and do not approach the speed or amount of hamstring strain in sprinting, and did not reach agreement for use by our panel (LOA 57.6%).

Athlete confidence

Athlete confidence and apprehension ranked highly in criteria for RTS (LOA 98.6%). Player self-assessment, psychological readiness and confidence were seen as vital for RTS (86.7%), with negative emotions such as anxiety and fear avoidance detrimental to performance and pain.[200 201] Athlete confidence is the most significant predictor of return to full performance in some conditions such as ACL reconstruction.[202] However, in HSI, some athletes may present with few symptoms until sprinting, or SSC activity and athletes may feel ready to RTS but are still at risk of reinjury.

Our panel reported decision-making pressure from other non-medical factors[203–207] and players can RTS in spite of poor test results.[208] They strongly agreed that decision-making should include members of the medical/rehabilitation team, the coaches, other stakeholders and especially athletes themselves (LOA 98.3%)[192 209].

Limitations

There are many potential weaknesses of the Delphi and consensus research methodology. Bias is possible with inadequate stakeholder/expert inclusion/exclusion or with inadequate design of surveys or meetings.[210] In spite of invitation, many international round 1 expert panel respondents were unable to attend our face-to-face meeting days, The London 2020 international Delphi and hamstring consensus meeting group comprised 15 out of 35 respondents/experts (43%) to the initial survey. This could result in inclusion bias; however, the panel attending were heterogenous, with a mix of profession, sport, age and domain expertise in treatment of HSI. They comprised clinicians from Australia, Netherlands, Ireland, the Middle East, but the majority of the meeting panel were UK based. We sought and invited experts from Asia, Africa and South America; however, there were less identifiable experts (clinical or published), and they could not attend due to pandemic travel restrictions. This may mean their HSI management practices are not represented, possibly introducing a further bias. Our meeting panel all worked in elite sport in international jobs with work schedules with international patient/athlete cohorts. Many did not train professionally in the UK and their work experience and current work schedules comprised the USA, Africa, Middle East, Australia and Asia. They reported that many of their athletes trained internationally, reflecting the current international nature of elite and Olympic sport. To further reinforce the integrity of the consensus, and provide more international perspective, authors were included with significant Middle East hamstring work experience.

Our group had multiple domains of expertise. These included surgery, postsurgical and conservative rehabilitation, classification, diagnosis, running and RTS. It was harder to evaluate expertise in rehabilitation and RTS, and the criteria chosen for

expertise were harder to establish for rehabilitation. Academic criteria were thought to be important, but very few rehabilitation specialists had published. Clinical criteria were therefore deemed important. For clinical experience, the number of patients seen annually with his by the expert was chosen (ie, quantity of experience), but it was difficult to determine the range of injury types or severity and gauge the quality of rehabilitation experience. Choosing criteria for expertise is difficult for any Delphi study and represents one weakness of this methodology.[211] While we trusted the survey respondents to complete only those fields that encompassed their expertise (the reason for lack of full response rate for every section), it may be possible that some respondents completed sections that were outside their domain and level of expertise or scope of practice. Open-ended questions in the first round meant that only the information that clinicians submitted was used and adapted for the basis of subsequent rounds.

The perspectives of some groups may be under-represented in this work, with coaches and athletes comprising a smaller proportion of our panel, and, their view is vital,[212] although 38% of the panel in the final survey had undergone HSI, possibly contributing to the 'patient/athlete' voice.

While we attempted to be inclusive, the representation of women is low in our panels, (2/39, 1/15 and 18/99). We found the response rates lower for the women experts we surveyed and invited to our meeting. It was found that female rates of publication are lower in HSI, with less publicly available information on expertise. This also holds for experts from low-to-middle income countries, and other deserving groups with lower publication rates, or fewer English language publications, and less publicly available information on expertise. This has been a weakness in other consensus research and the voices of these groups are also vital.

Recommendations for future research

The consensus panel members suggested the following area of HSI rehabilitation areas of future research: tolerability of tissue for early loading and the greatest injury risk loads or dosages, which order of progression of exercise was optimal, neuromuscular control of running, muscle tendon interaction/sling function and elasticity and optimum methods to measure and train these, and finally, the optimal and minimal effective doses of running exposure to reduce reinjury risk.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our Delphi study and expert panel suggest that rehabilitation prescription after HSI should be individualised, based on the athlete's sports-specific hamstring demands, the nature of the injury and required capacities. Decision-making should consider differences in hamstring musculotendinous tissue, individual muscle anatomy and functional roles. This should direct rehabilitation prescription for different muscles and myotendinous tissues after HSI. In early-stage rehabilitation, most experts advocate protection of injured tissue from elastic load or stretch shortening (high strain amount and rate loads), but the types of load/contraction and the order of their application varied greatly between our experts.

Experts recommend addressing dysfunctions in the whole lower limb and kinetic chain related to hamstring function. While not reaching consensus, many experts are increasingly using adjuncts such as BFR training to achieve early strength gains with lower tissue loads.

They recommend criteria of symptoms, strength and response to previous loading as criteria for progressing and dosing exercise and deciding on safety to RTR and RTS. Other criteria such as flexibility and special RTS tests are used less widely. On criteria related to pain, experts suggest some activities should be pain free through rehabilitation (sprinting), but with other exercise activities a pain threshold approach can be permitted. In later loading, experts aim to achieve full outer length strength and eccentric strength as a key criterion for RTR and RTS.

In later-stage rehab, experts advocate prescription of running and sprinting as a key component of HSI rehabilitation and as a key progression criterion for RTS. Experts focus on the demands and capacity required for match play when deciding the rehabilitation end goal and RTS—they continuously monitor and test athletes through rehabilitation and are using modalities such as GPS to give more sports-specific on-field information on loading and running dosages and RTS readiness and would like more research into optimising these testing modalities.

Author affiliations
[1]Institute of Sport Exercise and Health (ISEH), University College London, London, UK
[2]Physiotherapy Department, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
[3]Division of Surgery and Intervention Science, University College London, London, UK
[4]School of Sport and Exercise, University of Gloucestershire, Gloucester, UK
[5]High Performance Unit, Irish Rugby Football Union, Dublin, Ireland
[6]Section Sports Medicine, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa
[7]Princess Grace Hospital, London, UK
[8]British Athletics, London, UK
[9]AFC Bournemouth, Bournemouth, UK
[10]School of Sport, Health and Applied Science, St. Mary's University, London, UK
[11]Trauma and Orthopaedic Surgery, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
[12]Salford City Football Club, Salford, UK
[13]Blackburn Rovers Football Club, Blackburn, UK
[14]Orthopaedic Surgery and Sports Medicine, Amsterdam Movement Sciences, Amsterdam University Medical Centers, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
[15]Amsterdam Collaboration for Health and Safety in Sports (ACHSS), Amsterdam IOC Research Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
[16]Sports & Exercise Medicine, Centre for Human Health and Performance, London, UK
[17]Medical Services, Arsenal Football Club, London, UK
[18]Welsh Rugby Union, Cardiff, UK
[19]Saracen's Rugby Club, London, UK
[20]Trauma & Orthopaedic Surgery, North Sydney Orthopaedic and Sports Medicine Centre, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

Twitter Bruce M Paton @bpatphys, Nicol van Dyk @NicolvanDyk, Noel Pollock @drnoelpollock, Michael Giakoumis @MickGiakoumis, Paul Head @PHphysio, Sam Kelly @skelly_2, James Moore @JMoorePhysio and Simon Murphy @simonmurphy23

Acknowledgements We would like to thank the large number of hamstring experts who contributed their valuable time, effort and expertise in completing our surveys. The consensus process and meeting were cocreated and funded by the Institute of Sport Exercise and Health, London, UK and the Academic Centre for Evidence Based Sports Medicine, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The consensus and the launch of PHAROS were partly made possible by a grant from the International Olympic Committee. We would like to thank also to Naomi Shah PT (India) and Magnus Hilmarsson PT (Iceland) who assisted with meeting days.

Contributors This manuscript is the combined effort of the attached authors. BMP drafted the initial manuscript. PR, MW, NvD, NP and JM contributed significant drafting comments and edits. Other authors were all responsible for minor edits. BMP, FH and JM were responsible for steering committee, research and survey design and facilitating the consensus meeting days (MG facilitated for running and return to sport).

Funding This study was supported by IOC via Academic Centre for Evidence Based Sports Medicine, Amsterdam, the Netherlands and Institute of Sport Exercise and Health.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Consent obtained directly from patient(s).

Ethics approval This study involves human participants and was approved by UCL Research Ethics Committee Office for The Vice Provost Research, approved project ID: 5938/002 - http://ethics.grad.ucl.ac.uk. Participants gave informed consent to participate in the study before taking part.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

ORCID iDs
Bruce M Paton http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2581-599X
Nicol van Dyk http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0724-5997
Noel Pollock http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4660-2835
Ricci Plastow http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4820-8831

REFERENCES

1 Ekstrand J, Hägglund M, Waldén M. Injury incidence and injury patterns in professional football: the UEFA injury study. *Br J Sports Med* 2011;45:553–8.
2 Edouard P, Branco P, Alonso J-M. Muscle injury is the principal injury type and hamstring muscle injury is the first injury diagnosis during top-level international athletics championships between 2007 and 2015. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:619–30.
3 Ekstrand J, Waldén M, Hägglund M. Hamstring injuries have increased by 4% annually in men's professional football, since 2001: a 13-year longitudinal analysis of the UEFA Elite Club injury study. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:731–7.
4 Ekstrand J, Spreco A, Bengtsson H, *et al*. Injury rates decreased in men's professional football: an 18-year prospective cohort study of almost 12 000 injuries sustained during 1.8 million hours of play. *Br J Sports Med* 2021;55:1084–92.
5 Ekstrand J, Hägglund M, Kristenson K, *et al*. Fewer ligament injuries but no preventive effect on muscle injuries and severe injuries: an 11-year follow-up of the UEFA champions League injury study. *Br J Sports Med* 2013;47:732–7.
6 Bleakley CM, Glasgow P, MacAuley DC. PRICE needs updating, should we call the POLICE? *Br J Sports Med* 2012;46:220–1.
7 Afonso J, Rocha-Rodrigues S, Clemente FM, *et al*. The Hamstrings: anatomic and physiologic variations and their potential relationships with injury risk. *Front Physiol* 2021;12:694604.
8 Woodley SJ, Mercer SR. Hamstring muscles: architecture and innervation. *Cells Tissues Organs* 2005;179:125–41.
9 Dahmane R, Djordjevič S, Smerdu V. Adaptive potential of human biceps femoris muscle demonstrated by histochemical, immunohistochemical and mechanomyographical methods. *Med Biol Eng Comput* 2006;44:999–1006.
10 Garrett WE, Bassett FH, Bassett FH. Histochemical correlates of hamstring injuries. *Am J Sports Med* 1984;12:98–103.
11 Kellis E, Galanis N, Kapetanos G, *et al*. Architectural differences between the hamstring muscles. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2012;22:520–6.
12 Higashihara A, Nagano Y, Ono T, *et al*. Differences in hamstring activation characteristics between the acceleration and maximum-speed phases of sprinting. *J Sports Sci* 2018;36:1313–8.
13 Bourne MN, Duhig SJ, Timmins RG, *et al*. Impact of the Nordic hamstring and hip extension exercises on hamstring architecture and morphology: implications for injury prevention. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51:469–77.
14 Mendiguchia J, Garrues MA, Cronin JB, *et al*. Nonuniform changes in MRI measurements of the thigh muscles after two hamstring strengthening exercises. *J Strength Cond Res* 2013;27:574–81.
15 Hamilton B. Hamstring muscle strain injuries: what can we learn from history? *Br J Sports Med* 2012;46:900–3.
16 Macdonald B, McAleer S, Kelly S, *et al*. Hamstring rehabilitation in elite track and field athletes: applying the British athletics muscle injury classification in clinical practice. *Br J Sports Med* 2019;53:1464–73.
17 Guex K, Millet GP. Conceptual framework for strengthening exercises to prevent hamstring strains. *Sports Med* 2013;43:1207–15.
18 Bourne MN, Timmins RG, Opar DA, *et al*. An evidence-based framework for strengthening exercises to prevent hamstring injury. *Sports Med* 2018;48:251–67.
19 Hotfiel T, Seil R, Bily W, *et al*. Nonoperative treatment of muscle injuries - recommendations from the GOTS expert meeting. *J Exp Orthop* 2018;5:24.
20 Mjølsnes R, Arnason A, Østhagen T, *et al*. A 10-week randomized trial comparing eccentric vs. concentric hamstring strength training in well-trained soccer players. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2004;14:311–7.
21 Macdonald B, O'Neill J, Pollock N, *et al*. Single-Leg Roman chair hold is more effective than the Nordic hamstring curl in improving hamstring Strength-Endurance in Gaelic footballers with previous hamstring injury. *J Strength Cond Res* 2019;33:3302–8.
22 Oliver GD, Dougherty CP. The razor curl: a functional approach to hamstring training. *J Strength Cond Res* 2009;23:401–5.
23 Askling CM, Tengvar M, Tarassova O, *et al*. Acute hamstring injuries in Swedish elite sprinters and jumpers: a prospective randomised controlled clinical trial comparing two rehabilitation protocols. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:532–9.
24 Askling CM, Tengvar M, Thorstensson A. Acute hamstring injuries in Swedish elite football: a prospective randomised controlled clinical trial comparing two rehabilitation protocols. *Br J Sports Med* 2013;47:953–9.
25 Mendiguchia J, Martinez-Ruiz E, Edouard P, *et al*. A multifactorial, Criteria-based progressive algorithm for hamstring injury treatment. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2017;49:1482–92.
26 Mendiguchia J, Brughelli M. A return-to-sport algorithm for acute hamstring injuries. *Phys Ther Sport* 2011;12:2–14.
27 Sherry MA, Johnston TS, Heiderscheit BC. Rehabilitation of acute hamstring strain injuries. *Clin Sports Med* 2015;34:263–84.
28 Hickey JT, Timmins RG, Maniar N, *et al*. Criteria for progressing rehabilitation and determining Return-to-Play clearance following hamstring strain injury: a systematic review. *Sports Med* 2017;47:1375–87.
29 Pollock N, Kelly S, Lee J, *et al*. A 4-year study of hamstring injury outcomes in elite track and field using the British athletics rehabilitation approach. *Br J Sports Med* 2022;56:257–63.
30 Pas HIMFL, Reurink G, Tol JL, *et al*. Efficacy of rehabilitation (lengthening) exercises, platelet-rich plasma injections, and other conservative interventions in acute hamstring injuries: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2015;49:1197–205.
31 Askling CM, Tengvar M, Saartok T, *et al*. Acute first-time hamstring strains during high-speed running: a longitudinal study including clinical and magnetic resonance imaging findings. *Am J Sports Med* 2007;35:197–206.
32 Sherry MA, Best TM. A comparison of 2 rehabilitation programs in the treatment of acute hamstring strains. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2004;34:116–25.
33 Silder A, Sherry MA, Sanfilippo J, *et al*. Clinical and morphological changes following 2 rehabilitation programs for acute hamstring strain injuries: a randomized clinical trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2013;43:284–99.
34 Malliaropoulos N, Papalexandris S, Papalada A, *et al*. The role of stretching in rehabilitation of hamstring injuries: 80 athletes follow-up. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2004;36:756–9.
35 Cibulka MT, Rose SJ, Delitto A, *et al*. Hamstring muscle strain treated by mobilizing the sacroiliac joint. *Phys Ther* 1986;66:1220–3.
36 Maffulli N, Oliva F, Frizziero A, *et al*. ISMuLT guidelines for muscle injuries. *Muscles Ligaments Tendons J* 2013;3:241–9.
37 Fournier-Farley C, Lamontagne M, Gendron P, *et al*. Determinants of return to play after the Nonoperative management of hamstring injuries in athletes: a systematic review. *Am J Sports Med* 2016;44:2166–72.
38 Orchard J, Best TM, Verrall GM. Return to play following muscle strains. *Clin J Sport Med* 2005;15:436–41.
39 Ardern CL, Glasgow P, Schneiders A, *et al*. 2016 consensus statement on return to sport from the first world Congress in sports physical therapy, Bern. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:853–64.
40 van der Horst N, van de Hoef S, Reurink G, *et al*. Return to play after hamstring injuries: a qualitative systematic review of definitions and criteria. *Sports Med* 2016;46:899–912.
41 Belk JW, Kraeutler MJ, Mei-Dan O, *et al*. Return to sport after proximal hamstring tendon repair: a systematic review. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2019;7:232596711985321.
42 Delvaux F, Rochcongar P, Bruyère O, *et al*. Return-to-play criteria after hamstring injury: actual medicine practice in professional soccer teams. *J Sports Sci Med* 2014;13:721–3.
43 Whiteley R, Massey A, Gabbett T, *et al*. Match high-speed running distances are often suppressed after return from hamstring strain injury in professional footballers. *Sports Health* 2021;13:290–5.
44 Hasson F, Keeney S, McKenna H. Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *J Adv Nurs* 2000;32:1008–15.
45 Powell C. The Delphi technique: myths and realities. *J Adv Nurs* 2003;41:376–82.
46 Negrini S. Why evidence-based medicine is a good approach in physical and rehabilitation medicine. thesis. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* 2014;50:585–91.
47 McCall A, Pruna R, Van der Horst N, *et al*. Exercise-Based strategies to prevent muscle injury in male elite footballers: an Expert-Led Delphi survey of 21 practitioners belonging to 18 teams from the Big-5 European Leagues. *Sports Med* 2020;50:1667–81.
48 van der Horst N, Backx F, Goedhart EA, *et al*. Return to play after hamstring injuries in football (soccer): a worldwide Delphi procedure regarding definition, medical criteria and decision-making. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51:1583–91.
49 Zambaldi M, Beasley I, Rushton A. Return to play criteria after hamstring muscle injury in professional football: a Delphi consensus study. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51:1221–6.

50 Jünger S, Payne SA, Brine J, *et al*. Guidance on Conducting and REporting DElphi Studies (CREDES) in palliative care: recommendations based on a methodological systematic review. *Palliat Med* 2017;31:684–706.
51 Eysenbach G. Improving the quality of web surveys: the checklist for reporting results of Internet E-Surveys (cherries). *J Med Internet Res* 2004;6:e34.
52 Hsu CC, Sandford BA. The Delphi technique: making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation* 2007;12:1–8.
53 Harper D, Thompson AR. *Qualitative research methods in mental health and psychotherapy: a guide for students and practitioners*, 2011.
54 Fink A, Kosecoff J, Chassin M, *et al*. Consensus methods: characteristics and guidelines for use. *Am J Public Health* 1984;74:979–83.
55 Fuller CW, Ekstrand J, Junge A, *et al*. Consensus statement on injury definitions and data collection procedures in studies of football (soccer) injuries. *Clin J Sport Med* 2006;16:97–106.
56 Schwank A, Blazey P, Asker M, *et al*. 2022 Bern consensus statement on shoulder injury prevention, rehabilitation, and return to sport for athletes at all participation levels. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2022;52:11–28.
57 Shrier I. Consensus statements that fail to recognise dissent are flawed by design: a narrative review with 10 suggested improvements. *Br J Sports Med* 2021;55:545–9.
58 Verhagen AP, de Vet HC, de Bie RA, *et al*. The Delphi list: a criteria list for quality assessment of randomized clinical trials for conducting systematic reviews developed by Delphi consensus. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1998;51:1235–41.
59 Huisstede BMA, Hoogvliet P, Coert JH, Henk Coert J, *et al*. Multidisciplinary consensus guideline for managing trigger finger: results from the European HANDGUIDE study. *Phys Ther* 2014;94:1421–33.
60 Kleynen M, Braun SM, Bleijlevens MH, *et al*. Using a Delphi technique to seek consensus regarding definitions, descriptions and classification of terms related to implicit and explicit forms of motor learning. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e100227.
61 Whiteley R, van Dyk N, Wangensteen A, *et al*. Clinical implications from daily physiotherapy examination of 131 acute hamstring injuries and their association with running speed and rehabilitation progression. *Br J Sports Med* 2018;52:303–10.
62 Freckleton G, Pizzari T. Risk factors for hamstring muscle strain injury in sport: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2013;47:351–8.
63 Green B, Bourne MN, van Dyk N, *et al*. Recalibrating the risk of hamstring strain injury (HSI): a 2020 systematic review and meta-analysis of risk factors for index and recurrent hamstring strain injury in sport. *Br J Sports Med* 2020;54:1081–8.
64 Opar DA, Williams MD, Shield AJ. Hamstring strain injuries: factors that lead to injury and re-injury. *Sports Med* 2012;42:209–26.
65 De Vos R-J, Reurink G, Goudswaard G-J, *et al*. Clinical findings just after return to play predict hamstring re-injury, but baseline MRI findings do not. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:1377–84.
66 Goossens L, Witvrouw E, Vanden Bossche L, *et al*. Lower eccentric hamstring strength and single leg hop for distance predict hamstring injury in PETE students. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2015;15:436–42.
67 Khan KM, Scott A. Mechanotherapy: how physical therapists' prescription of exercise promotes tissue repair. *Br J Sports Med* 2009;43:247–52.
68 Chargé SBP, Rudnicki MA. Cellular and molecular regulation of muscle regeneration. *Physiol Rev* 2004;84:209–38.
69 Connell DA, Schneider-Kolsky ME, Hoving JL, *et al*. Longitudinal study comparing sonographic and MRI assessments of acute and healing hamstring injuries. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2004;183:975–84.
70 Van Etten LM, Verstappen FT, Westerterp KR. Effect of body build on weight-training-induced adaptations in body composition and muscular strength. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1994;26:515–21.
71 Hubal MJ, Gordish-Dressman H, Thompson PD, *et al*. Variability in muscle size and strength gain after unilateral resistance training. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2005;37:964–72.
72 Timmons JA. Variability in training-induced skeletal muscle adaptation. *J Appl Physiol* 2011;110:846–53.
73 Beaven CM, Cook CJ, Gill ND. Significant strength gains observed in rugby players after specific resistance exercise protocols based on individual salivary testosterone responses. *J Strength Cond Res* 2008;22:419–25.
74 Ahtiainen JP, Walker S, Peltonen H, *et al*. Heterogeneity in resistance training-induced muscle strength and mass responses in men and women of different ages. *Age* 2016;38:10.
75 Magnusson SP, Langberg H, Kjaer M. The pathogenesis of tendinopathy: balancing the response to loading. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2010;6:262–8.
76 Lau FH, Pomahac B. Wound healing in acutely injured fascia. *Wound Repair Regen* 2014;22 Suppl 1:14–17.
77 Jakobsen JR, Jakobsen NR, Mackey AL, *et al*. Remodeling of muscle fibers approaching the human myotendinous junction. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2018;28:1859–65.
78 Yang G, Rothrauff BB, Tuan RS. Tendon and ligament regeneration and repair: clinical relevance and developmental paradigm. *Birth Defects Res C Embryo Today* 2013;99:203–22.
79 Nourissat G, Berenbaum F, Duprez D. Tendon injury: from biology to tendon repair. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2015;11:223–33.
80 James R, Kesturu G, Balian G, *et al*. Tendon: biology, biomechanics, repair, growth factors, and evolving treatment options. *J Hand Surg Am* 2008;33:102–12.
81 Pollock N, Patel A, Chakraverty J, *et al*. Time to return to full training is delayed and recurrence rate is higher in intratendinous ('c') acute hamstring injury in elite track and field athletes: clinical application of the British Athletics Muscle Injury Classification. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:305–10.
82 van der Made AD, Tol JL, Reurink G, *et al*. Potential hamstring injury blind spot: we need to raise awareness of proximal hamstring tendon avulsion injuries. *Br J Sports Med* 2019;53:390–2.
83 Entwisle T, Ling Y, Splatt A, *et al*. Distal Musculotendinous T junction injuries of the biceps femoris: an MRI case review. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2017;5:232596711771499.
84 van der Made AD, Almusa E, Reurink G, *et al*. Intramuscular tendon injury is not associated with an increased hamstring reinjury rate within 12 months after return to play. *Br J Sports Med* 2018;52:1261–6.
85 Miyashita H, Ochi M, Ikuta Y. Histological and biomechanical observations of the rabbit patellar tendon after removal of its central one-third. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 1997;116:454–62.
86 Van Hooren B, Bosch F. Is there really an eccentric action of the hamstrings during the swing phase of high-speed running? Part I: a critical review of the literature. *J Sports Sci* 2017;35:2313–21.
87 Kay D, St Clair Gibson A, Mitchell MJ, *et al*. Different neuromuscular recruitment patterns during eccentric, concentric and isometric contractions. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2000;10:425–31.
88 Byrne C, Twist C, Eston R. Neuromuscular function after exercise-induced muscle damage: theoretical and applied implications. *Sports Med* 2004;34:49–69.
89 Johnston MJ, Cook CJ, Drake D, *et al*. The neuromuscular, biochemical, and endocrine responses to a Single-Session vs. Double-Session training day in elite athletes. *J Strength Cond Res* 2016;30:3098–106.
90 Kujala UM, Orava S, Järvinen M. Hamstring injuries. current trends in treatment and prevention. *Sports Med* 1997;23:397–404.
91 Westing SH, Seger JY, Karlson E, *et al*. Eccentric and concentric torque-velocity characteristics of the quadriceps femoris in man. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 1988;58:100–4.
92 Hickey JT, Timmins RG, Maniar N, *et al*. Pain-Free versus Pain-Threshold rehabilitation following acute hamstring strain injury: a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 2020;50:91–103.
93 Timmins RG, Ruddy JD, Presland J, *et al*. Architectural changes of the biceps femoris long head after concentric or eccentric training. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2016;48:499–508.
94 Timmins RG, Bourne MN, Shield AJ, *et al*. Short biceps femoris fascicles and eccentric knee flexor weakness increase the risk of hamstring injury in elite football (soccer): a prospective cohort study. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:1524–35.
95 Lutz GE, Palmitier RA, An KN, *et al*. Comparison of tibiofemoral joint forces during open-kinetic-chain and closed-kinetic-chain exercises. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1993;75:732–9.
96 Stien N, Saeterbakken AH, Andersen V. Electromyographic comparison of five lower-limb muscles between single- and Multi-Joint exercises among trained men. *J Sports Sci Med* 2021;20:56–61.
97 Malliaropoulos N, Mendiguchia J, Pehlivanidis H, *et al*. Hamstring exercises for track and field athletes: injury and exercise biomechanics, and possible implications for exercise selection and primary prevention. *Br J Sports Med* 2012;46:846–51.
98 Schoenfeld BJ, Contreras B, Tiryaki-Sonmez G, *et al*. Regional differences in muscle activation during hamstrings exercise. *J Strength Cond Res* 2015;29:159–64.
99 Fernandez-Gonzalo R, Tesch PA, Linnehan RM, *et al*. Individual muscle use in hamstring exercises by soccer players assessed using functional MRI. *Int J Sports Med* 2016;37:559–64.
100 Feyzioğlu Özlem, Öztürk Özgul, Sirmen B, Ö F, Ö Öztürk, *et al*. Does an accelerated program give equivalent results in both elite athletes and nonathletes? *J Sport Rehabil* 2020;29:572–7.
101 Thelen DG, Chumanov ES, Best TM, *et al*. Simulation of biceps femoris musculotendon mechanics during the swing phase of sprinting. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2005;37:1931–8.
102 Fukashiro S, Hay DC, Nagano A. Biomechanical behavior of muscle-tendon complex during dynamic human movements. *J Appl Biomech* 2006;22:131–47.
103 Roberts TJ. Contribution of elastic tissues to the mechanics and energetics of muscle function during movement. *J Exp Biol* 2016;219:266–75.
104 Schache AG, Dorn TW, Wrigley TV, *et al*. Stretch and activation of the human biarticular hamstrings across a range of running speeds. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2013;113:2813–28.
105 Brukner P, Connell D. 'Serious thigh muscle strains': beware the intramuscular tendon which plays an important role in difficult hamstring and quadriceps muscle strains. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:205–8.
106 Thelen DG, Chumanov ES, Sherry MA, *et al*. Neuromusculoskeletal models provide insights into the mechanisms and rehabilitation of hamstring strains. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev* 2006;34:135–41.

107 Chumanov ES, Heiderscheit BC, Thelen DG. The effect of speed and influence of individual muscles on hamstring mechanics during the swing phase of sprinting. *J Biomech* 2007;40:3555–62.
108 Sole G, Milosavljevic S, Nicholson H, *et al*. Altered muscle activation following hamstring injuries. *Br J Sports Med* 2012;46:118–23.
109 Opar DA, Williams MD, Timmins RG, *et al*. Rate of torque and electromyographic development during anticipated eccentric contraction is lower in previously strained hamstrings. *Am J Sports Med* 2013;41:116–25.
110 Summers SJ, Chalmers KJ, Wallwork SB, *et al*. Interrogating cortical representations in elite athletes with persistent posterior thigh pain - New targets for intervention? *J Sci Med Sport* 2021;24:135–40.
111 Bourne MN, Williams MD, Opar DA, *et al*. Impact of exercise selection on hamstring muscle activation. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51:1021–8.
112 Guruhan S, Kafa N, Ecemis ZB, *et al*. Muscle activation differences during eccentric hamstring exercises. *Sports Health* 2021;13:181–6.
113 Keerasomboon T, Mineta S, Hirose N. Influence of altered knee angle and muscular contraction type on electromyographic activity of hamstring muscles during 45° hip extension exercise. *J Sports Sci Med* 2020;19:630–6.
114 Hegyi A, Csala D, Péter A, *et al*. High-Density electromyography activity in various hamstring exercises. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2019;29:34–43.
115 Garrett WE, Safran MR, Seaber AV, *et al*. Biomechanical comparison of stimulated and nonstimulated skeletal muscle Pulled to failure. *Am J Sports Med* 1987;15:448–54.
116 Verrall GM, Slavotinek JP, Barnes PG, *et al*. Clinical risk factors for hamstring muscle strain injury: a prospective study with correlation of injury by magnetic resonance imaging. *Br J Sports Med* 2001;35:435–9.
117 Pietrzak M, Vollaard NBJ. Effects of a novel neurodynamic tension technique on muscle extensibility and stretch tolerance: a counterbalanced crossover study. *J Sport Rehabil* 2018;27:55–65.
118 López López L, Torres JR, Rubio AO, *et al*. Effects of neurodynamic treatment on hamstrings flexibility: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Phys Ther Sport* 2019;40:244–50.
119 Kaneda H, Takahira N, Tsuda K, *et al*. Effects of tissue flossing and dynamic stretching on hamstring muscles function. *J Sports Sci Med* 2020;19:681–9.
120 Witvrouw E, Danneels L, Asselman P, *et al*. Muscle flexibility as a risk factor for developing muscle injuries in male professional soccer players. A prospective study. *Am J Sports Med* 2003;31:41–6.
121 Jönhagen S, Németh G, Eriksson E. Hamstring injuries in sprinters. The role of concentric and eccentric hamstring muscle strength and flexibility. *Am J Sports Med* 1994;22:262–6.
122 Maniar N, Shield AJ, Williams MD, *et al*. Hamstring strength and flexibility after hamstring strain injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:909–20.
123 Pollard CW, Opar DA, Williams MD, *et al*. Razor hamstring curl and Nordic hamstring exercise architectural adaptations: impact of exercise selection and intensity. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2019;29:706–15.
124 Askling CM, Tengvar M, Saartok T, *et al*. Acute first-time hamstring strains during slow-speed stretching: clinical, magnetic resonance imaging, and recovery characteristics. *Am J Sports Med* 2007;35:1716–24.
125 Askling CM, Tengvar M, Saartok T, *et al*. Proximal hamstring strains of stretching type in different sports: injury situations, clinical and magnetic resonance imaging characteristics, and return to sport. *Am J Sports Med* 2008;36:1799–804.
126 Orchard J, Walt S, McIntosh A. Muscle activity during the drop punt kick. *J Sports Sci* 1999;17:837–8.
127 Samaan MA, Hoch MC, Ringleb SI, *et al*. Isolated hamstrings fatigue alters hip and knee joint coordination during a cutting maneuver. *J Appl Biomech* 2015;31:102–10.
128 Thelen DG, Chumanov ES, Hoerth DM, *et al*. Hamstring muscle kinematics during treadmill sprinting. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2005;37:108–14.
129 Jones M, Edwards I, Gifford L. Conceptual models for implementing biopsychosocial theory in clinical practice. *Man Ther* 2002;7:2–9.
130 Reurink G, Goudswaard GJ, Tol JL, *et al*. MRI observations at return to play of clinically recovered hamstring injuries. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:1370–6.
131 Reurink G, Almusa E, Goudswaard GJ, *et al*. No association between fibrosis on magnetic resonance imaging at return to play and hamstring reinjury risk. *Am J Sports Med* 2015;43:1228–34.
132 Jacobsen P, Witvrouw E, Muxart P, *et al*. A combination of initial and follow-up physiotherapist examination predicts physician-determined time to return to play after hamstring injury, with no added value of MRI. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:431–9.
133 Verrall GM, Slavotinek JP, Barnes PG, *et al*. Assessment of physical examination and magnetic resonance imaging findings of hamstring injury as predictors for recurrent injury. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2006;36:215–24.
134 Moen MH, Reurink G, Weir A, *et al*. Predicting return to play after hamstring injuries. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:1358–63.
135 Schneider-Kolsky ME, Hoving JL, Warren P, *et al*. A comparison between clinical assessment and magnetic resonance imaging of acute hamstring injuries. *Am J Sports Med* 2006;34:1008–15.
136 Warren P, Gabbe BJ, Schneider-Kolsky M, *et al*. Clinical predictors of time to return to competition and of recurrence following hamstring strain in elite Australian footballers. *Br J Sports Med* 2010;44:415–9.
137 Askling C, Saartok T, Thorstensson A. Type of acute hamstring strain affects flexibility, strength, and time to return to pre-injury level. *Br J Sports Med* 2006;40:40–4.
138 Smith BE, Hendrick P, Smith TO, *et al*. Should exercises be painful in the management of chronic musculoskeletal pain? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51:1679–87.
139 Hickey JT, Timmins RG, Maniar N, *et al*. Pain-free versus pain-threshold rehabilitation following acute hamstring strain injury: a randomized controlled trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2020;50:91–103.
140 Järvinen TAH, Järvinen TLN, Kääriäinen M, *et al*. Muscle injuries: optimising recovery. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* 2007;21:317–31.
141 Järvinen TAH, Järvinen TLN, Kääriäinen M, *et al*. Muscle injuries: biology and treatment. *Am J Sports Med* 2005;33:745–64.
142 Reurink G, Goudswaard GJ, Oomen HG, *et al*. Reliability of the active and passive knee extension test in acute hamstring injuries. *Am J Sports Med* 2013;41:1757–61.
143 Harvey D. Assessment of the flexibility of elite athletes using the modified Thomas test. *Br J Sports Med* 1998;32:68–70.
144 Bohannon RW. Manual muscle testing: does it meet the Standards of an adequate screening test? *Clin Rehabil* 2005;19:662–7.
145 Wadsworth CT, Krishnan R, Sear M, *et al*. Intrarater reliability of manual muscle testing and hand-held dynametric muscle testing. *Phys Ther* 1987;67:1342–7.
146 Kelln BM, McKeon PO, Gontkof LM, *et al*. Hand-held dynamometry: reliability of lower extremity muscle testing in healthy, physically active,young adults. *J Sport Rehabil* 2008;17:160–70.
147 Opar DA, Piatkowski T, Williams MD, *et al*. A novel device using the Nordic hamstring exercise to assess eccentric knee flexor strength: a reliability and retrospective injury study. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2013;43:636–40.
148 van Dyk N, Behan FP, Whiteley R. Including the Nordic hamstring exercise in injury prevention programmes halves the rate of hamstring injuries: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 8459 athletes. *Br J Sports Med* 2019;53:1362–70.
149 Impellizzeri FM, McCall A, van Smeden M. Why methods matter in a meta-analysis: a reappraisal showed Inconclusive injury preventive effect of Nordic hamstring exercise. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2021;140:111–24.
150 Drouin JM, Valovich-mcLeod TC, Shultz SJ, *et al*. Reliability and validity of the Biodex system 3 pro isokinetic dynamometer velocity, torque and position measurements. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2004;91:22–9.
151 Croisier J-L, Ganteaume S, Binet J, *et al*. Strength imbalances and prevention of hamstring injury in professional soccer players: a prospective study. *Am J Sports Med* 2008;36:1469–75.
152 Opar DA, Williams MD, Timmins RG, *et al*. Eccentric hamstring strength and hamstring injury risk in Australian footballers. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2015;47:857–65.
153 van Dyk N, Bahr R, Whiteley R, *et al*. Hamstring and quadriceps isokinetic strength deficits are weak risk factors for hamstring strain injuries: a 4-year cohort study. *Am J Sports Med* 2016;44:1789–95.
154 Bennell K, Wajswelner H, Lew P, *et al*. Isokinetic strength testing does not predict hamstring injury in Australian rules footballers. *Br J Sports Med* 1998;32:309–14.
155 Zvijac JE, Toriscelli TA, Merrick S, *et al*. Isokinetic concentric quadriceps and hamstring strength variables from the NFL Scouting combine are not predictive of hamstring injury in first-year professional football players. *Am J Sports Med* 2013;41:1511–8.
156 Green B, Bourne MN, Pizzari T. Isokinetic strength assessment offers limited predictive validity for detecting risk of future hamstring strain in sport: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2018;52:329–36.
157 Freckleton G, Cook J, Pizzari T. The predictive validity of a single leg bridge test for hamstring injuries in Australian rules football players. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:713–7.
158 Wiesinger H-P, Gressenbauer C, Kösters A, *et al*. Device and method matter: a critical evaluation of eccentric hamstring muscle strength assessments. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2020;30:217–26.
159 Devaprakash D, Weir GJ, Dunne JJ, *et al*. The influence of digital filter type, amplitude normalisation method, and co-contraction algorithm on clinically relevant surface electromyography data during clinical movement assessments. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2016;31:126–35.
160 Hughes L, Rosenblatt B, Haddad F, *et al*. Comparing the Effectiveness of Blood Flow Restriction and Traditional Heavy Load Resistance Training in the Post-Surgery Rehabilitation of Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Patients: A UK National Health Service Randomised Controlled Trial. *Sports Med* 2019;49:1787–805.
161 Cohen S, Bradley J. Acute proximal hamstring rupture. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 2007;15:350–5.
162 Sarimo J, Lempainen L, Mattila K, *et al*. Complete proximal hamstring avulsions: a series of 41 patients with operative treatment. *Am J Sports Med* 2008;36:1110–5.
163 Sato K, Nimura A, Yamaguchi K, *et al*. Anatomical study of the proximal origin of hamstring muscles. *J Orthop Sci* 2012;17:614–8.

164 Macdonald B. An investigation into the immediate effects of pelvic taping on hamstring eccentric force in an elite male sprinter - A case report. *Phys Ther Sport* 2017;28:15–22.
165 Franettovich Smith MM, Bonacci J, Mendis MD, *et al*. Gluteus medius activation during running is a risk factor for season hamstring injuries in elite footballers. *J Sci Med Sport* 2017;20:159–63.
166 Schuermans J, Van Tiggelen D, Witvrouw E. Prone hip extension muscle recruitment is associated with hamstring injury risk in amateur soccer. *Int J Sports Med* 2017;38:696–706.
167 Kennedy MJ, Lamontagne M, Beaulé PE. Femoroacetabular impingement alters hip and pelvic biomechanics during gait walking biomechanics of FAI. *Gait Posture* 2009;30:41–4.
168 Bedi A, Dolan M, Hetsroni I, *et al*. Surgical treatment of femoroacetabular impingement improves hip kinematics: a computer-assisted model. *Am J Sports Med* 2011;39 Suppl:43S–9.
169 Van Houcke J, Pattyn C, Vanden Bossche L, *et al*. The pelvifemoral rhythm in cam-type femoroacetabular impingement. *Clin Biomech* 2014;29:63–7.
170 Shield AJ, Bourne MN. Hamstring injury prevention practices in elite sport: evidence for eccentric strength vs. Lumbo-Pelvic training. *Sports Med* 2018;48:513–24.
171 Schuermans J, Danneels L, Van Tiggelen D, *et al*. Proximal neuromuscular control protects against hamstring injuries in male soccer players: a prospective study with electromyography time-series analysis during maximal sprinting. *Am J Sports Med* 2017;45:1315–25.
172 Bourne MN, Pollard C, Messer D, *et al*. Hamstring and gluteal activation during high-speed overground running: impact of prior strain injury. *J Sports Sci* 2021;39:2073–9.
173 Duhig S, Shield AJ, Opar D, *et al*. Effect of high-speed running on hamstring strain injury risk. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:1536–40.
174 Ruddy JD, Pollard CW, Timmins RG, *et al*. Running exposure is associated with the risk of hamstring strain injury in elite Australian footballers. *Br J Sports Med* 2018;52:919–28.
175 Schache AG, Dorn TW, Blanch PD, *et al*. Mechanics of the human hamstring muscles during sprinting. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2012;44:647–58.
176 Higashihara A, Ono T, Kubota J, *et al*. Functional differences in the activity of the hamstring muscles with increasing running speed. *J Sports Sci* 2010;28:1085–92.
177 Chumanov ES, Heiderscheit BC, Thelen DG. Hamstring musculotendon dynamics during stance and swing phases of high-speed running. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2011;43:525–32.
178 Higashihara A, Nagano Y, Ono T, *et al*. Relationship between the peak time of hamstring stretch and activation during sprinting. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2016;16:36–41.
179 Nagano Y, Higashihara A, Takahashi K, *et al*. Mechanics of the muscles crossing the hip joint during sprint running. *J Sports Sci* 2014;32:1722–8.
180 Schache AG, Dorn TW, Wrigley TV, *et al*. Stretch and activation of the human biarticular hamstrings across a range of running speeds. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2013;113:2813–28.
181 Wan X, Qu F, Garrett WE, *et al*. The effect of hamstring flexibility on peak hamstring muscle strain in sprinting. *J Sport Health Sci* 2017;6:283–9.
182 Malliaropoulos N, Isinkaye T, Tsitas K, *et al*. Reinjury after acute posterior thigh muscle injuries in elite track and field athletes. *Am J Sports Med* 2011;39:304–10.
183 Chumanov ES, Schache AG, Heiderscheit BC, *et al*. Hamstrings are most susceptible to injury during the late swing phase of sprinting. *Br J Sports Med* 2012;46:90.
184 Morin J-B, Gimenez P, Edouard P, *et al*. Sprint acceleration mechanics: the major role of hamstrings in horizontal force production. *Front Physiol* 2015;6:404.
185 Askling CM, Nilsson J, Thorstensson A. A new hamstring test to complement the common clinical examination before return to sport after injury. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2010;18:1798–803.
186 Goossens L, Witvrouw E, Vanden Bossche L, *et al*. Lower eccentric hamstring strength and single leg hop for distance predict hamstring injury in PETE students. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2015;15:436–42.
187 Venturelli M, Schena F, Zanolla L, *et al*. Injury risk factors in young soccer players detected by a multivariate survival model. *J Sci Med Sport* 2011;14:293–8.
188 Edouard P, Hollander K, Navarro L, *et al*. Lower limb muscle injury location shift from posterior lower leg to hamstring muscles with increasing discipline-related running velocity in international athletics championships. *J Sci Med Sport* 2021;24:653–9.
189 Blanch P, Gabbett TJ. Has the athlete trained enough to return to play safely? The acute:chronic workload ratio permits clinicians to quantify a player's risk of subsequent injury. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:471–5.
190 Moreno-Perez V, Paredes V, Pastor D, *et al*. Under-exposure to official matches is associated with muscle injury incidence in professional footballers. *Biol Sport* 2021;38:563–71.
191 Brooks JHM, Fuller CW, Kemp SPT, *et al*. Incidence, risk, and prevention of hamstring muscle injuries in professional rugby Union. *Am J Sports Med* 2006;34:1297–306.
192 Dijkstra HP, Pollock N, Chakraverty R, *et al*. Return to play in elite sport: a shared decision-making process. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51:419–20.
193 Mendiguchia J, Samozino P, Martinez-Ruiz E, *et al*. Progression of mechanical properties during on-field sprint running after returning to sports from a hamstring muscle injury in soccer players. *Int J Sports Med* 2014;35:690–5.
194 Cummins C, Orr R, O'Connor H, *et al*. Global positioning systems (GPS) and microtechnology sensors in team sports: a systematic review. *Sports Med* 2013;43:1025–42.
195 McCall A, Carling C, Nedelec M, *et al*. Risk factors, testing and preventative strategies for non-contact injuries in professional football: current perceptions and practices of 44 teams from various premier leagues. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:1352–7.
196 Woods C, Hawkins RD, Maltby S, *et al*. The Football Association Medical Research Programme: an audit of injuries in professional football--analysis of hamstring injuries. *Br J Sports Med* 2004;38:36–41.
197 Magnusson P, Renström P. The European College of sports sciences position statement: the role of stretching exercises in sports. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2006;6:87–91.
198 Hamilton RT, Shultz SJ, Schmitz RJ, *et al*. Triple-hop distance as a valid predictor of lower limb strength and power. *J Athl Train* 2008;43:144–51.
199 Thorborg K, Roos EM, Bartels EM, *et al*. Validity, reliability and responsiveness of patient-reported outcome questionnaires when assessing hip and groin disability: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2010;44:1186–96.
200 Glazer DD. Development and preliminary validation of the Injury-Psychological readiness to return to sport (I-PRRS) scale. *J Athl Train* 2009;44:185–9.
201 Conti C, di Fronso S, Pivetti M, *et al*. Well-come back! professional basketball players perceptions of psychosocial and behavioral factors influencing a return to pre-injury levels. *Front Psychol* 2019;10:222.
202 Webster KE, McPherson AL, Hewett TE, *et al*. Factors associated with a return to Preinjury level of sport performance after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery. *Am J Sports Med* 2019;47:2557–62.
203 Creighton DW, Shrier I, Shultz R, *et al*. Return-to-play in sport: a decision-based model. *Clin J Sport Med* 2010;20:379–85.
204 Hägglund M, Waldén M, Magnusson H, *et al*. Injuries affect team performance negatively in professional football: an 11-year follow-up of the UEFA champions League injury study. *Br J Sports Med* 2013;47:738–42.
205 Hickey J, Shield AJ, Williams MD, *et al*. The financial cost of hamstring strain injuries in the Australian football League. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:729–30.
206 Orchard J, Best TM. The management of muscle strain injuries: an early return versus the risk of recurrence. *Clin J Sport Med* 2002;12:3–5.
207 Shrier I. Strategic assessment of risk and risk tolerance (StARRT) framework for return-to-play decision-making. *Br J Sports Med* 2015;49:1311–5.
208 Tol JL, Hamilton B, Eirale C, *et al*. At return to play following hamstring injury the majority of professional football players have residual isokinetic deficits. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:1364–9.
209 Dijkstra HP, Pollock N, Chakraverty R, *et al*. Managing the health of the elite athlete: a new integrated performance health management and coaching model. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:523–31.
210 Murphy M, Black NL, McKee C D. Consensus development methods, and their use in clinical Guideline development (health technology assessment 2: 15). In: McColl E, Jacoby A, Thomas L, eds. *Design and use of questionnaires: a review of best practice applicable to surveys of health service staff and patients 1998*, 2001.
211 Blazey P, Crossley KM, Ardern CL, *et al*. It is time for consensus on 'consensus statements'. *Br J Sports Med* 2022;56:306–7.
212 Belton J, Hoens A, Scott A, *et al*. Patients as partners in research: it's the right thing to do. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2019;49:623–6.

London International Consensus and Delphi study on Hamstring Injuries

Supplementary material - Methodology

Modified Delphi design methodology

The current assessment and treatment of hamstring injury presents a challenge in many sports, with the incidence increasing despite incremental volumes of literature, and while this literature has provided many answers and solutions, there are still large gaps. Recent systematic reviews in aspects of hamstring injury (HSI) management report high risk of bias in many studies[1-3], making some treatment recommendations unreliable. Evidence is more often available for recreational, amateur, or sub-elite sport from multisport cohorts, with less clinical applicability / generalisability to elite populations. In this situation clinicians must make assessment and treatment decisions based on incomplete, weak, and poor-quality evidence. Clinical expertise and experience therefore become vital. A research approach to gain insight from practitioners' expertise would be useful. Single experts can be useful but a scientific approach that aims for a consensus/ agreement among a group of experts can provide more optimal recommendations.[4] The Delphi methodology was thought by this group to present a systematic and scientific approach to capture the decision-making experience and expertise of global experts to identify and investigate areas in HSI where new decision-making approaches could be developed. The London 2020 international hamstring consensus group was established as a multidisciplinary collaboration to advance the assessment management of HSI. An information gathering project was established to investigate current international decision-making, in the assessment and treatment of HSI. It was hoped that this could attain consensus on best practice decision-making in HSI and identify areas of research need in HSI and new decision-making approaches that could improve the outcomes after HSI.

Paton BM, *et al. Br J Sports Med* 2023;0:1–17. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105384

Aims

1/ To Examine whether global decision-making practice is aligned with best available evidence

2/ To identify areas where research evidence is lacking or of insufficient quality for clinicians to make assessment and treatment decisions.

3/ To achieve a consensus agreement on current global best practice in assessment and management of HSI.

Study Design

This study used a modified Delphi design aiming to bring an international panel of experts to a consensus on current best practice for decision-making in HSI.

The Delphi process is an iterative staged process utilising the opinion and expertise of a group of experts to achieve consensus on a topic. It is useful in topics where limited literature is available to guide decisions[5 6] and relies on expert opinion and expert clinical practice.[7]

A Delphi expert consensus approach was applied to decision-making after HSI. There have been previous Delphi consensus studies in muscle injuries[8 9] , injury prevention[10] and aspects of management of Hamstring injury, such as return to play [11 12] but other aspects of hamstring assessment and treatment may also benefit from this approach such as classification systems, decision making in rehabilitation and the justification for surgery, particularly given the disparate and conflicting approaches used currently.[13 14] The reporting standard for conducting and reporting Delphi studies (CREDES) was followed.[15]

Paton BM, *et al. Br J Sports Med* 2023;0:1–17. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105384

modified Delphi Process

This modified Delphi study focussed on decision-making in aspects of HSI. It was undertaken after a reviews of decision-making aspects of the assessment and management of HSI[16 17] (also see appendix 1 with paper 1 Classification). Ethical approval for the study was sought and obtained from the institutional ethical review board (Project ID 5938/002). The study comprised two rounds of a purposive digital survey interspersed with a face-to-face meeting round (see figure 1). Each round was modified based on feedback to achieve a consensus among an international panel of experts. Each Delphi round comprised a digital questionnaire, an analysis, and a feedback report.

Stage 1: A review of the literature informed the domains to be included in an online survey which was undertaken from November 2019 to January 2020.

Stage 2: The round 1 online survey gathered the opinions of a global expert panel, with open ended questions to identify the key domains requiring more investigation in HSI decision-making. The survey used institutionally based digital survey platform – Opinio (ObjectPlanet, Oslo, Norway), with a link to an online questionnaire sent out to each of the experts with an invitation to participate.

Stage 3: Open Meeting - The responses from the survey were collated and analysed, and the key domains were identified where there were gaps in literature evidence and clinical practice in Hamstring injury decision-making. This was fed back to a subset of the expert panel attending in 2 days of an open meeting during an international conference. They formed the ISEH hamstring injury consensus group They had an opportunity to discuss each key domain and produced a series of statements for consensus voting.

Stage 4: A round 2 survey was then developed to allow a wider international vote on the consensus statements produced. This included those experts who participated in round 1 but also others identified with significant hamstring expertise to ensure a representative global sample. Those clinical academics with expertise in rehabilitation completed the relevant sections of the survey. The survey responses were collated

Paton BM, *et al. Br J Sports Med* 2023;0:1–17. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105384



Figure 1 Study design for Delphi and Consensus

Participants – Expert Panel

An international representative multidisciplinary group of expert clinicians / researchers were Invited to participate in this HSI decision-making project, based on their expertise in the assessment and management of hamstring injuries. Identifying appropriate experts is vital to the Delphi process.[6] The criteria for expert inclusion comprised Academic criterion of peer reviewed publication (authorship) in hamstring research and or clinical criteria: - a high level of expertise assessing, managing and/or researching injuries, based on the number of injuries seen and years worked in HSI. All participants needed to be willing complete the digital survey and or attend the consensus meeting and a sufficient level of written and spoken English.

Possible experts were excluded if they had 1/ insufficient experience of assessment or management of hamstring injury (2) insufficient time to fully complete the online survey. Clinicians and non-clinicians were included but asked to answer only those survey questions related to their fields of expertise. A purposive, heterogeneous representative sample of experts were chosen with a mix of:- professional discipline (Sport and exercise medicine physicians, physiotherapists, orthopaedic surgeons, sport and exercise scientists/researchers), international location, gender, sporting discipline in line with Delphi methodology.[18]

Decision-making in HSI management crosses multiple domains of expertise, and a multiprofessional panel of experts was sought . This involved disparate domains of surgery, post-surgical and conservative rehabilitation, classification, diagnosis, running and return to sport. It was difficult to find experts with this combined domain expertise. This heterogenous group , meant that the criteria for expertise were difficult to choose, Academic criteria are important, but achieving publication alone was thought to be too narrow, with the potential to miss important stakeholders[15], as some academics have less clinical HSI diagnostic, decision-making and injury management expertise in some domains. Clinical criteria were also deemed important, as many experts have not published research. For clinical experience criteria, the number HSI/ year (requirement >5) and years of practice with HSI (requirement >5) were chosen, but to avoid eliminating important stakeholders, the respondents with <5 years of practice and seeing <5 HSI/yr were assessed and responses were included if they were researchers and had academic

publication in HSI. They were also included if they had <5 year working with HSI if they worked in elite sport but their annual case number was greater than 10. It was difficult to gauge clinical experience, as the range of injury types and severity, and the quality and recency of practice with these injuries varied between our experts. Some experts deal with only one aspect of the management pathway and surgeons, physiotherapists and athletic trainers/ coaches have very different domain expertise. Choosing criteria for expertise is difficult for any Delphi study and represents an area of possible bias and weakness in this methodology.[19]

Representation is also key to Delphi/ consensus methodology and lack of representation may allow for insufficient challenge of flawed current practice, or exacerbate current inequalities.[19] To avoid bias every effort was made to include multiple professions and regions/ countries globally, although it was found that there were more experts in HSI in some global locations. We sought to be as inclusive as possible to encompass all views , but to maintain appropriate expertise. This balance is difficult to maintain in Delphi studies.

There is no guideline for number of experts to be involved in a consensus[18], but the sample size was set at 30 for the initial survey to ensure a full international and multidisciplinary sport/ profession mix . A possible drop out and non-response rate was predicted. Research recommendations for the Delphi technique were followed with opinion-based research.[5 20]

Procedure Stage One and Two – Survey Round 1

The initial literature review allowed us to generate candidate decision-making domains in HSI (see table 1). The round one survey (Appendix 1) aimed to gather information, and understand, from the experts' viewpoint, where are the gaps in the literature evidence and clinical practice in Hamstring injury decision-making. We aimed to identify which were the key domains requiring further research. Expert opinion was then sought on these key domains in the meeting day and round 2 survey and a best expert

Paton BM, *et al. Br J Sports Med* 2023;0:1–17. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105384

consensus was produced on these domains. Four domains were identified – Classification and diagnosis, Surgery, rehabilitation (including rehabilitation post-surgery), return to running and sport.

Table 1 Topic/Domain areas for discussion around assessment and treatment in hamstring injury

Items for Survey Hamstring decision-making Candidate Domains identified from Systematic review	
Examination post HSI	
Imaging and Diagnosis	
Injury Classification systems	*
Surgical vs Conservative treatment	*
Surgical methods	
Injury Prognostication	
Prevention of HSI	
Rehabilitation of HSI	*
Exercise prescription	
Dosage of rehabilitation	
Progression of rehabilitation	
Returning to running	*
Returning to sprinting	*
Returning to sport	*

(* Domains chosen by panel in round 1 Survey)

The initial round 1 survey comprised open ended qualitative information gathering questions and some quantitative data questions using Likert scales determined level of agreement (see Appendix 1). The survey used a digital institution-based software package – Opinio 7.12 (copyright 1998-2020 ObjectPlanet, Oslo Norway). For the two surveys we followed the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES)[21] to avoid bias.

Steering Committee

The rehabilitation survey was designed by 2 experienced clinical academic physiotherapists, and a Professor of Orthopaedic surgery, who each have greater than 20 years clinical experience treating HSI and research expertise in HSI, as well as previous experience with Delphi research. A structured, iterative process was undertaken to develop the survey and it was piloted by a mixed group of 5 sports medicine physicians, 5 physiotherapists and 5 orthopaedic surgeons, and the survey was further refined based on their feedback. The expert panel were approached by Email located from publicly available correspondence information on peer reviewed journal articles, or on their publicly available institutional profile pages. Institutional ethical approval was obtained for the study from the institutional academic ethics committee (Project ID 5938/002) and information was provided prior to participation, but actively completing the survey was implied (and stated) as the consent to participate. Any participant with who withdrew had data removed.

Procedure Stage 3 – open consensus meeting

The above review, and the results of the initial survey were collated and analysed with a thematic and factor analysis.[22] The expert panel identified key domains (see * in table 1) and key questions for these domains (see tables in appendix 3), which were outlined and presented for discussion. All of the panel members who completed the survey were invited to the discussion. The discussion took place via a group consensus two-day meeting, alongside an international conference, to allow as many of the participants to join as possible. A nominal group consensus model was followed with a facilitated, structured approach to gather qualitative information, from this group.[23] This approach has been followed in other consensus projects.[24 25] After discussions, the key consensus statements were synthesised and refined. Note was made of key discussion and dissention points. Sessions were facilitated to encourage discussion and also draw out dissenting[26] and outlier views as these were considered important to avoid a "herding bias" as a consensus may not necessarily produce 'the correct' answer to a question.[19] The research was led and facilitated by a less published researcher/expert (BP) to maintain impartiality, to balance any opposing professional viewpoints and avoid any "Eminence bias". These sessions were chaired by each author related to their area of specialisation – classification

(JM), Rehabilitation (BP), Return to running/sport (MG) and surgery (FSH). Consensus statements were gradually refined through a process of facilitated debate, not forcing consensus, until the entire panel were satisfied and on day 2, were put to the group for anonymous electronic voting. See Appendix 4 for the list of statements – rehabilitation, RTS/RTR, classification and surgery.

The consensus committee (FSH, BP, and JM) made a criterion decision that the consensus threshold was set a priori at 70%, with ≥70% of agreed / yes responses constituting consensus acceptance of statement. This cut off has been used by other authors in Delphi studies.[27-29] Statements not achieving consensus were removed and new items were added based on comments in the discussion, with further voting until consensus was achieved.

Procedure Stage 4 – Final Round Online Survey

A further online survey was developed, to test these statements with a final round survey to a wider global international group of experts who met the previous inclusion / exclusion criteria. The participants voted on the statements with yes, no, uncertain responses. Some further Likert or factor ranking questions determined level of agreement. (See Example Question Appendix 2).

Candidates voted on statements and ranked their key decision-making factors or justifications related to the domain areas found in the round 1 Survey. See Appendix 4 – tables, for consensus statements, voting results and typical discussion points or areas of disagreement (open ended questions)

Expert Panel for the final round

The final survey was split into domain sections – Classification, surgery, rehabilitation, return to running / Sport. Participants were asked to complete only the domains (sections of the survey) that were within their field and scope of expertise. The survey responses were anonymous and were evaluated for completeness.. Within their expertise areas, panel members were asked to complete sections as carefully as possible. The participants voted on the statements with yes, no, uncertain ("forced choice") responses. This made the final survey shorter and less onerous for participants but some further Likert or factor ranking questions determined level of agreement. Open ended boxes after each consensus statement also allowed them to comment, and comments were collated and analysed Survey

responses in each domain were evaluated by 2 steering group members and any non-completed forms or incomplete responses from non-experts in that particular domain were removed from the analysis.

Time Frames

September 2019 to Jan 2020 Round 1 - design of questionnaire to be delivered online with round 1 questionnaire and collation of round 1 responses.

January 2020 consensus days and conference consensus meeting, with Feedback of round 1 responses to face to face expert panel and synthesis of consensus statements for voting, - initial small panel vote on consensus statements.

August 2020 - May 2021 – Final Round – design and online delivery of international survey based on consensus statements to obtain wider sample level of agreement.

May 2021 –Dec 2021collation of consensus day information and write up for possible publication.

Respondents

The volume of responses made reporting in one single paper difficult. For this reason, three papers are presented with decision-making domain areas of – Classification, surgery and rehabilitation and RTS. The compositions and characteristics of the expert panel for each round survey and the face-to-face meeting are reported below in table 2.

The response rates and the inclusion and exclusions for each survey round are given in the flow chart in figure 2 below.



Figure 2: Flow diagram of participants and response rates (RR)

Table 2 participant charactreristics of the Expert Panels

Characteristic	Categories	Survey Round	Meeting	Survey Final Round
Sex	**(M: F)**	33:2	**14:1**	**81:18**
Age (years)	**27 - 36**	11 (31.4 %)	**6**	**32 (31.6%)**
	37 - 46	13 (37.1%)	**4**	**33(33.7%)**
	47 - 56	9 (25.7%)	**4**	**20 (20.4%)**
	57 - 70	2(5.7%)	**1**	**14 (14.3%)**
Role clinician	**clinician only**	3 (5.7%)		**26 (25%)**
	researcher/scientist only	2 (8.6%)		**11 (11 %)**
	clinician + researcher	30 (85.7%)	**15 (100%)**	**62 (63%)**
	Neither clinician nor researcher	0		**1 (1%)**
Hamstring cases / year	**none**	0		**5 (5%)**
	0-5	1(2.9%)		**6 (6%)**
	5-10	6 (17.1%)		**25 (24%)**
	10-15	7 (20%)		**12 (12%)**
	15-20	10 (28.6%)		**13 (13%)**
	20 or more	11 (31.4%)		**38 (38%)**
Health care profession	**Sports medicine Physician**	**4 (10%)**	**1 (7%)**	**21 (18 %)**
	Orthopaedic surgeon	**8 (21%)**	**5 (35%)**	**18 (17 %)**
	Physical Therapist	**22 (55%)**	**10 (64%)**	**43 (40 %)**
	Sports scientist	**1 (3%)**		**25 (24 %)**
	Athletic trainer / Strength & Conditioning coach	**2 (5%)**		**7 (6 %)**
	Other	**2 (5%)**		**2 (2%)**
Country of practice	**North America**	**4 (11%)**		**10 (10%)**
	Europe	**26 (66%)**	**12 (80%) (UK,Neth,Ir)**	**65 (64%)**
	Middle East/Africa	**4 (11%)**	**1 (7%) SAf**	**12 (12%)**
	Southeast Asia			**1 (1%)**
	South America			**1 (1%)**
	Australasia / pacific	**5 (13%)**	**2(13%) (Aust)**	**10 (10%)**
Sports	**football**	**31 (29%)**	**4 (27%)**	**79 (80%)**

Paton BM, *et al. Br J Sports Med* 2023;0:1–17. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105384

	athletics	**19 (19%)**	**2 (13%)**	**59 (60%)**
	Rugby codes	**13(12%)**	**4 (27%)**	**40 (40%)**
	NFL	**5 (5%)**		**9 (9%)**
	AFL	**3 (3%)**		**9 (9%)**
	basketball	**9 (9%)**		**30 (30%)**
	volleyball	**4 (4%)**		**1 (1%)**
	Skiing and winter sports	**9(9%)**		**21 (21%)**
	hockey	**3 (3%)**	**1 (7%)**	**22 (21%)**
	judo/ martial arts/wrestling	**2 (2%)**		**24 (24%)**
	cricket			**15 (15%)**
	Ice hockey			**12 (12%)**
	Acrobatics/ gymnastics / dance			**17 (17%)**
	Gaelic football			**7 (7%)**
	Racquet sports			**17 (17%)**
	handball			**20 (20%)**
	Other	**9 (8%)**	**4 (27%)**	**6 (6%)**
Years working with HSI	**0-4**	**5 (14.3%)**		**17 (17%)**
	11-14	**8 (22.9%)**		**13 (13%)**
	5-10	**9 (25.7%)**		**22 (21%)**
	15-20	**4 (11.4%)**		**23 (23%)**
	more than 20	**9 (25.7%)**		**24 (24%)**
Highest academic	**Bachelor/Diploma**			**14 (14%)**
	Masters			**35(35%)**
	PhD			**34 (35%)**
	Clinical Doctorate			**15 (15%)**
Had hamstring injury	**hamstring problem**			**38 (38%)**
	not applicable			**61 (62%)**

UK-United Kingdom, Neth-Netherlands, IR-ireland, Aust-Australia , SAf- South Africa

Appendix 1 Hamstring Injury Survey

Hamstring survey

1. what is your profession

- ○ Sports medicine physician
- ○ Orthopaedic surgeon
- ○ Physical Therapist
- ○ Sports scientist
- ○ Athletic trainer / Strength & Conditioning coach
- ○ Coach
- ○ Other

2. Which sports do you work with

- ☐ football
- ☐ athletics
- ☐ Rugby codes
- ☐ AFL
- ☐ basketball
- ☐ volleyball
- ☐ skiing
- ☐ other winter sports
- ☐ Other

3. How many Hamstring injuries do you assess and or treat per year?

less than 5	5-10	10-20	20-30	more than 30
○	○	○	○	○

4. What are the questions that need to be answered on mechanism of Hamstring injury

5 top questions on Mechanism of Injury (in order of importance)

5. What are the questions that you would like to be answered on Pathology of hamstring injury?

list your top 5 key questions on pathology in hamstring injury (in order of importance)

6. what do you see as the most important risk factors for hamstring injury?

please list the most important risk factors (in order of importance)

7. what questions are most important to answer in terms of risk of hamstring injury?

Please list your top 5 questions (in order of importance)



8. what questions are most important to answer in terms of risk of RECURRENCE of Hamstring injury?

Please list your top 5 questions (in order of importance)

Paton BM, *et al. Br J Sports Med* 2023;0:1–17. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105384

9. what exercises do you use for the prevention of injury?

- ☐ Eccentric
- ☐ concentric
- ☐ isometric
- ☐ hip based
- ☐ knee based
- ☐ other

what dosages do you prescribe

10. please rank the above exercises in terms of importance for prevention of Hamstring injury.

Rank your top 5 in order of importance

11. What are the questions you would most like answered around prevention of hamstring injury?

Please list your top 5 questions (in order of importance)

12. What are the key questions you would like answered around prevention of RECURRENCE of hamstring injury?

Please list your top 5 questions (in order of importance)

13. Which Hamstring injury classification systems do you use?

List your top 5 classification systems in order of preference

14. What are the questions you think need answering regarding Hamstring injury classification?

List your top 5 questions in order of importance

15. Which imaging do you use after hamstring injury?

- ☐ ultrasound
- ☐ Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)
- ☐ Xray
- ☐ other

16. What are the key factors that influence your decisions for ordering imaging?

top 5 decision making factors for ordering imaging (list in order of importance)

17. What are the most important questions that need answering around Imaging in hamstring injury?

Please list your top 5 questions (in order of importance)

18. What are the questions you would most like answered regarding diagnostic tests after Hamstring injury?

please list your top 5 questions in order of importance

19. What other aspects of examination or examination tests do you put most weight on for Diagnosis?

Paton BM, *et al. Br J Sports Med* 2023;0:1–17. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105384

please list your top 5 examination tests for diagnosis. (In order of importance)

20. Do you use bracing in the early-stage post injury or surgery?

- no Bracing
- hip Brace
- knee brace
- used only after surgery

if you use bracing - what ROM? and What time period

21. what are the factors you would consider in precautions?

please list the top 5 factors in decision making for precautions post injury or surgery (in order of importance)

22. what are the key criteria that you use to progress Range of movement and initial loading of the injured hamstring?

Please list your top 5 criteria for progression (in order of importance)

23. What are the key questions that you would like answered regarding the early phase of rehabilitation?

Please list your top 5 questions (in order of importance)

24. what are the most important factors for you when considering choice of hamstring exercise?

Please list your 5 most important factors (in order of importance)

25. what factors do you use to determine - DOSAGE of exercise (ie frequency duration and intensity)

Dosage factors

26. what factors do you use to determine - when to PROGRESS exercise (ie frequency duration and intensity)

Progression factors

27. what other muscle groups do you prioritise in the kinetic chain?

- ☐ Adductors
- ☐ Gluteals
- ☐ Quadriceps
- ☐ Calf
- ☐ Hip flexors
- ☐ other

What top 5 questions would you most want answered relating to Hamstring injury and other muscles in kinetic chain? (List them in order of importance

28. what adjuncts do you find useful for strengthening Hamstring muscles in rehabilitation? (ie adjuncts like - electrical stimulation, Blood Flow restriction training, etc)

adjuncts (please list your top 5 in order of utility)

29. What questions would you most like answered on exercise prescription in Hamstring injury rehabilitation?

    Please list your top 5 questions (in order of importance)



30. What are your criteria for return to running?

    Criteria for return to running. (Please list your top 5 in order of importance)



31. What are your criteria for return to full sprinting?

    Criteria for return to full sprinting? (Please list your top 5 in order of importance)



32. What are your criteria for return to sport (match / competition)?

    Criteria for return to full sport (competition / match)? Please list your top 5 in order of importance.

33. What are the questions you would like answered on return to running and sport after hamstring injury?

    Please list your top 5 questions (in order of importance)

34. What factors would influence your decision making when deciding if surgery would be indicated?

    Please list the top 5 factors (in order of importance)



35. What are the questions you would most want answered on surgery for Hamstring injury?

Paton BM, *et al. Br J Sports Med* 2023;0:1–17. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105384

Please list your top 5 questions on surgery (in order of importance)

36. What are the questions you would most want answered regarding rehabilitation after surgery?

List your top 5 questions in order of importance

Appendix 2 Round 2 Draft Question Examples –matrices responses



27. (combined statement)
Factors that drive surgical intervention include:-

- Previous hamstring harvest or hamstring injury,

- Recurrent injury,

- Gapping at the zone of injury

- Injuries with a high recurrence rate and

- Loss of tension

	True	False	Undecided
Previous hamstring harvest or hamstring injury	○	○	○
Recurrent injury	○	○	○
Gapping at the zone of injury	○	○	○
Injuries with a high recurrence rate	○	○	○
Loss of tension	○	○	○

Other important factors or comments ?

Appendix 3 Survey round 1 Questions and typical responses

Nb Questions on classification and imaging are supplied in the classification paper.

Table 1 What are the key questions that you would like answered regarding the early phase of rehabilitation after HSI?

Domain Area	*responses*	*Typical Responses*
Early interventions (STM / neural mob/ + adjuncts BFR / EM stim)	***9***	Is there a role for adjunct treatment modalities? At what time point are they safe and to what level of intensity?
Progression criteria (including pain)	***6***	What outcomes should we be aiming to achieve for criteria-based progression along stages
Optimum exercise/ load types	***6***	What are the optimal exercises to use in this phase? How early can we safely prescribe eccentric / long length exercises?
Pain importance	***5***	What are the outcomes of pain monitored/threshold approach to rehabilitation?
Modalities for inflammation / healing (RICE, Meds)	***5***	Does prolonged use of Ice, Compression or medication positively or negatively affect hamstring healing rates?
Timescales (start and progress load)	***4***	How early can we safely prescribe eccentric / long length exercises?
Flexibility/ ROM	***3***	Is there a role for Knee flexibility work?
Immobilisation & Bracing (optimum, effects)	***3***	Does initial immobilisation positively or negatively affect hamstring healing rates?
Neural factors, inhibition & activation	***3***	What are the outcomes of return to run process, early vs delayed vs criteria based, vs early introduction of eccentrics - any effect on neuromuscular inhibition?
Optimum dosing (Frequency, Intensity, Duration)	***2***	What exercise dosages are optimal for loading early phase after HSI?
Safety of early loading	***1***	Does early mobilization / rehab (including stretching), and activation of the hamstring speed or limit recovery?
Tissue strain load /exercise	***1***	What is the strain placed on muscle/tendon by different rehab exercises?
Weight bearing	***1***	When does initial reduction in weightbearing help or hinder healing?
Early strength	***1***	What are the outcomes of early introduction of eccentric exercises?
Total	***50***	

Table 2 What questions would you most like answered on exercise prescription in HSI rehabilitation?

Domain Area	***responses***	***Typical Responses***
Progression of exercise	***8***	What is optimum order of progression of exercise? inner to outer? short length to long concentric to eccentric to isometric? OKC vs CKC? knee to hip based?
Dosage	***5***	What is the optimum dosage of strength exercise?
Contraction types	***5***	What type of contraction should be emphasised during hamstring injury rehabilitation?
Running /sprinting	***4***	What is a safe but stimulating dosage of pitch-based running?
Exercise choice	***4***	what are the optimal exercises for hamstring injury prevention?
Importance of symptoms	***3***	How effective is early introduction of eccentrics and pain threshold training?
Safety vs effectiveness balance	***3***	What is a safe but stimulating dosage of strength exercise?
Tissue healing stage	***2***	What modes of exercise should be carried out at certain healing stages?
Timing	***2***	When should certain exercise types, isometric, concentric, eccentric, SSC be implemented throughout rehabilitation
Insufficient evidence	***2***	Can we get more insights to the specific mechanisms of HSI at a contraction mode, neural and structural level to aid prevention and rehabilitation exercise choices?
Flexibility	***1***	What are the effects of flexibility exercises?
Strength	***1***	What types of strength are crucial?
Which Muscles	***1***	How best do we target loading the Biceps femoris long or short head and do we need to?
Functional exercise	***1***	More RCTs (analogous to those employing the Nordic) exploring the functional effectiveness of different exercises
Neural factors	***1***	Which exercises promote optimal hamstring activation?
Total	***43***	

Table 3 What are the questions you would like answered on return to running and sport after HSI?

Domain Area	***responses***	***Typical responses***
running mechanics	***8***	Does early return to running effect rehab outcomes?
optimum monitoring	***7***	What key benchmarks should we be considering before each stage and research about
recovery	***2***	How long to leave it between bouts of HSR?
sport specifics	***3***	What are the sport-specific match demands that we can replicate towards the end of rehabilitation?
load tolerance	***1***	Does early return to running effect rehab outcomes?
strength	***3***	What are key strength components and levels to enable safe return
dosage	***2***	What dosage of running should be permitted before sprinting is safe
timing	***4***	How early is it safe to sprint?
Total	***30***	

Table 4 What are the questions you would most want answered on Surgery for HSI?

Domain Area	***responses***	***Typical responses***
Outcomes	***8***	Does it affect functional outcomes?
Indications	***9***	What level of tendon disruption requires surgery?
Surgery vs Conservative	***7***	Is it more effective than conservative management?
Long term effects	***4***	What are the long-term outcomes for elite athletes having had surgery?
Surgery & RTS	***3***	Does it affect time to return preinjury level of sporting activity?
Recurrence rate	***3***	Does surgery reduce reinjury?
Techniques	***3***	Can surgical drainage of large intramuscular haemorrhage improve recovery without repair of muscle?
Timing post injury	***3***	How soon after certain pathologies should surgery be undertaken?
Rehabilitation post-Surgery	***1***	Development of an evidence-based rehabilitation protocol.
Terminology	***1***	Consistent terminology much-needed
Injury factors	***1***	Can we grade injuries needing surgery
Surgery never required	***1***	
Relationship w classification	***1***	When is surgery indicated for particular hamstring classifications?
Total	***45***	

Appendix 4 Consensus statements – and voting for Round 2 Survey

Table 1 - Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey – Global expert Panel - ***Rehabilitation***

Statements related to General Rehabilitation		TRUE	FALSE	Undecided	Samples of typical responses - discussion points or areas of disagreement
Initial and progressive loading of injured hamstring muscles should include exercise with different: - -contraction types, muscle lengths, functional movements, body positions, but the type of exercise will depend on the sports specific adaptation required, symptoms and risks of reinjury		**89.8%**	**8.5%**	**1.7%**	Initial loading about neuromuscular stimulation and improving healing / Muscle tension at length not ideal/ initial loading isometric to minimise stress or shearing on tendon / eccentric contractions should be the focus.
The ORDER and SPEED of PROGRESSION of exercises - (concentric / isometric / eccentric exercises), hip and knee-based exercises, Inner and outer length exercises and open and closed kinetic chain exercises) - will depend on: -	***adaptation required***	**96.2%**	**0.0%**	**3.8%**	Level of agreement reflects the importance of the target adaptations required as a criterion for prescription.
	symptoms	**88.9%**	**7.4%**	**3.7%**	Symptoms were the main criterion used by rehabilitation clinicians to make decisions.
	type of injury	**75.0%**	**15.4%**	**9.6%**	Overall, the injury and tissue type were major considerations for clinicians in deciding on exercise.
	risk of recurrence	**60.4%**	**26.4%**	**13.2%**	No comments made -? Possibly reflecting the little literature available on this.
	stage of tissue healing	**90.7%**	**5.6%**	**3.7%**	Tissue and stage of healing showed strong agreement - discussions suggested that it was harder to know at tissue level how healing was progressing, and symptoms were used as a surrogate to this.
The CRITERIA FOR PROGRESSION of exercise should include: -	***symptoms pain***	**90.7%**	**1.9%**	**7.4%**	Symptoms were the main criterion used by rehabilitation clinicians to make decisions.
	strength	**92.7%**	**3.6%**	**3.6%**	While strength overall showed good agreement - there was less agreement on which components of strength were thought to be most important.
	Special tests	**62.7%**	**13.7%**	**23.5%**	Lack of agreement on specific tests - but a combination of factors was thought to be more important
	Functional milestones	**87.3%**	**5.5%**	**7.3%**	Function was agreed to be important - but panel could not agree on which functional milestones are most important.
	Flexibility	**67.9%**	**17.0%**	**15.1%**	Flexibility and ROM were thought by the panel to be less important as a criterion- and comments were that strength exercises at longer length were sometimes used to build flexibility concurrently with strength.
	The severity of the injury	**73.1%**	**15.4%**	**11.5%**	After the initial diagnosis and early treatment stage the progressions were led more by the above criteria than the severity of the injury - although many issued cautions with tendon injuries and higher-grade tendon injuries due to risk of re rupture.
The Dosage of exercise (frequency, intensity, duration) should be based on: -	***The response to previous loading***	**96.3%**	**1.9%**	**1.9%**	Graded process of loading and assessing response - both during and after exercise - especially in terms of pain - it was felt this gave the optimum speed of rehab
	Examination findings	**88.2%**	**9.8%**	**2.0%**	High agreement that examination was vital prior to progressions in dosage.
	Stage of Healing	**86.5%**	**7.7%**	**5.8%**	Appropriate healing level to tolerate applied loads.
	Periodisation factors	**88.2%**	**3.9%**	**7.8%**	Weekly and seasonal factors affect decisions on dosage and are key considerations in elite sport environments.
	Sporting level	**82.7%**	**15.4%**	**1.9%**	These 3 questions related to knowing the end goal in load capacity for match fitness, which will depend on type and level of sport.
	Current and previous capacity	**88.7%**	**7.5%**	**3.8%**	
	The target adaptations related to the patient's goals and or sport	**92.3%**	**3.8%**	**3.8%**	
	Strength	**92.6%**	**3.7%**	**3.7%**	Training principles of overload - ensuring strength loads are progressed to enable muscle to keep adapting - i.e., avoid accommodation to the equivalent applied loads.

Fitness	**78.8%**	**13.5%**	**7.7%**	Cardiovascular fitness may not affect dosage in gym-based work but will affect running work.
Severity of the injury	**84.6%**	**11.5%**	**3.8%**	It may not be appropriate to load some injuries too heavily - as they may not have symptoms but still be at risk of retear - it biceps femoris and central tendon involvement.
The whole rehabilitation process should be agreed within the MDT and have athlete engagement	**96.8%**	**1.6%**	**1.6%**	MDT and athlete engagement were key - the discussions were around all the stakeholders' potentially conflicting goals and timeframes.
The patient's sport and previous level of participation will impact the progression of exercise selection and ultimate return to activity	**95.2%**	**3.2%**	**1.6%**	The discussions were like the 3 questions above.
It is important to consider the possibility of sciatic nerve / neural symptoms when considering a patient's progression through rehabilitation. Neural mobility could be considered in treatment but the protection of the repaired or vulnerable tissue should be maintained.	**90.5%**	**0.0%**	**9.5%**	Strong agreement. Neural Tethering / scarring in the healing process was also thought to be one reason for lack of progression with conservative treatment.
ADJUNCTS to REHABILITATION, such as blood flow restriction, electrical stimulation and hydrotherapy should be considered in the early stages to enhance tissue healing and recovery (Caution should be used with cuff pressures over repairing tissues when using blood flow restriction (BFR) training)	**68.9%**	**6.6%**	**24.6%**	There was less uniform global practice when relating to use of adjuncts such as BFR- this reflects small evidence base only in HIS.
Rehabilitation should be MONITORED with appropriate markers that are progressive with recovery	**98.4%**	**0.0%**	**1.6%**	Monitoring was agreed but the most common form of monitoring was very varied!! - most panellists mentioned monitoring with GPS data allowing on field training / match play load data.
Final stage strengthening should aim to achieve adequate symptom free, outer range, eccentric and isometric strength in injured and uninjured limb.	**95.2%**	**1.6%**	**3.2%**	Panel had agreement on the types of strength to be achieved by final stage rehab - with outer length eccentric and isometric strength - in line with evidence on strength.
It is key during a hamstring rehabilitation to assess, treat and prescribe exercises addressing the whole kinetic chain.	**90.5%**	**3.2%**	**6.3%**	Panel agreed that biomechanical kinetic chain was important but there was less agreement on which were the most important components - many panellists suggested that it should be individualised and decided based on thorough subject and objective examination.

Table 2 - Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey – Global expert Panel - ***Return to Running***

Statements related to return to running	TRUE	FALSE	Undecided	Samples of typical responses - discussion points or areas of disagreement
On pitch/track/field (sport specific) running is a significant part of hamstring rehabilitation.	**98.4%**	**1.6%**	**0.0%**	Levels of agreement for these 2 questions reflects the importance of running as part of HSI rehabilitation.
Running dosages should be gradually increased to ensure return to full sprinting.	**100.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	Hamstring muscle function discussed and difference in function at speed was acknowledged.
Sprinting dosage loads should approach game level intensities and volumes to reduce risk of recurrence on return to sport	**95.2%**	**4.8%**	**0.0%**	Sprinting in games presents injury risk and sprint work is a key component in final phase rehabilitation.
Further research should investigate the specific actions, bias, roles of individual muscles in function of running and sprinting to aid rehab exercise prescription.	**84.7%**	**0.0%**	**15.3%**	Differences in muscle roles were discussed and the panel expressed need for more research into how the differences in muscle function will then impact rehabilitation.
Further research should investigate types (styles) and dosages of running (quantity, speed) that promote adaptations but reduce risk of recurrence	**90.3%**	**1.6%**	**8.1%**	Discussions suggested that running had not been prioritised sufficiently in literature and identified a research need.
Further research should investigate safe time frames to commence running post Hamstring injury or surgery	**90.3%**	**1.6%**	**8.1%**	Risk of reinjury is high when reexposing HSI athletes to running - and the panel wanted safter time frames for return - and more research onto timeframes.

Mild pain with running is permissible in rehabilitating certain HSI, but we need to consider the function of the individual, the anatomy, injury, classification and the 24-hour pain pattern (subjective and objective)	**83.9%**	**9.7%**	**6.5%**	The panel acknowledged many athletes have pain when restarting running - there was less agreement on how much pain was permissible / deleterious - the stated consideration factors reached agreement but other factors did not.
In HSI Pain free running is a criterion for return to sprinting.	**85.5%**	**8.1%**	**6.5%**	The panel agreed that pain levels should be reduced prior to permitting sprinting - the panel acknowledged that the initial commencement of full sprinting - was a high-risk period for reinjury.

Table 3 - Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey – Global expert Panel - ***Return to sport***

Statements related to Return to Sport	TRUE	FALSE	Undecided	Samples of typical responses - discussion points or areas of disagreement
In HSI, Range of motion is a consideration for RTS. If previous data is available, then within 10% of previous scores should be used otherwise within 20% of the other limb	**45.0%**	**23.3%**	**31.7%**	Flexibility was not considered a key factor by many clinicians - stretching did not always produce improvements in function or performance and less agreement over acceptable levels.
Kinetic chain strength/function is a consideration criterion for RTS.	**78.3%**	**6.7%**	**15.0%**	All agreed Kinetic chain was important - but panel did not agree on key kinetic chain factors. A clinical reasoning approach was advocated to assess each athlete based on the required sporting demand and key injury risk activities.
Progression to Peak isometric force in mid and outer range, isotonic strength (eccentric only/eccentric & concentric) are all considerations for RTS	**83.3%**	**1.7%**	**15.0%**	Optimal types of exercise were controversial but consistent with literature - eccentric or isometric exercises at length were considered important and reached agreement.
Benchmarks for strength should reflect the end goal demands of the athlete but should be within 10% of previous data or population means	**66.1%**	**10.2%**	**23.7%**	The low agreement for this question reflected differences in opinion on strength benchmarks.
Athlete subjective apprehension is a consideration for RTS criteria.	**98.3%**	**0.0%**	**1.7%**	The strong agreement reflects the importance the panel placed on the athletes leading the RTS / RTR process - and ensuring their opinion was prioritised.
Athlete self-assessment of their readiness to RTS is a key factor in the return to sport decision making process.	**86.7%**	**5.0%**	**8.3%**	
Askling H-Test is a useful test in the return to sprinting decision process	**57.6%**	**18.6%**	**23.7%**	The respondents were divided on use of pain provocation tests. Their usefulness was acknowledged but it was felt that no one specific test could assess readiness to return to sprinting - and the tests should form part of an ongoing assessment and clinical reasoning process.
Endurance Capacity testing of the hamstrings should be a consideration for RTS	**78.3%**	**6.7%**	**15.0%**	Endurance was felt to be important, but it was harder to get agreement on which endurance tests were most important - running endurance was felt to be important but the panel suggested that the level of endurance related to the specific sporting demands.
Pain free sprinting is a criterion for return to play	**96.7%**	**1.7%**	**1.7%**	The importance of sprinting in match play / competition was acknowledged, with high agreement. There was less agreement on the dosage of full sprinting. While some pain was permitted in running, sprinting in RTS - was expected to be pain-free.
Completing full unrestricted training session should be a criterion for Return to Sport	**93.3%**	**6.7%**	**0.0%**	Training sessions reached agreement - particularly as this assessed the athlete with sports specific demands and endurance requirements.
The use of previous GPS metrics can guide the required dosage of appropriate metrics i.e., volume, sprints, speed, HSR	**83.3%**	**3.3%**	**13.3%**	Many in the panel were using GPS to measure running dosage - and their usefulness was thought to be key - with practice expertise moving faster than research evidence base - this was thought be an area requiring greater research.
Return to sport should be a multidisciplinary process that involves all stakeholders ideally	**98.3%**	**0.0%**	**1.7%**	The importance of a whole MDT and coaching athlete stakeholder involvement reached high LOA - but many clinicians acknowledged significant pressure from stakeholder groups to modify their clinical decision-making.

Table 4 - Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey – Global expert Panel - ***Classification***

Consensus statements related to Classification		TRUE	FALSE	Undecided	Samples of typical responses - discussion points or areas of disagreement
Anatomical (radiological) classification is essential in the diagnostic process		**62.0%**	**22.0%**	**16.0%**	It is essential in the higher-grade hamstrings to determine the tendon involvement however with smaller strains radiology is non-essential.
There is a need for One main classification system (agreed terminology and nomenclature).		**84.8%**	**2.0%**	**13.1%**	A 'one size fits all' may not be appropriate. Different sports have different mechanisms of injury, demands and therefore RTP times, and re injury rates. Seems logical that what may work for track and field doesn't necessarily hold true for football. Difficult to fit everything into one main classification anatomy, function, and prognostication.
Classification needs clear parameters such as (but not limited to) :-	***Anatomical, radiological classification***	**95.9%**	**0.0%**	**4.1%**	It appears research remains undecided for the influence of anatomical location and free vs central tendon involvement in classification systems.
	Free Tendon vs Central Tendon	**86.9%**	**6.1%**	**7.1%**	Again, the evidence is limited in the classification of tendon vs MTJ injuries (as an example). No evidence suggests central tendon involved injuries are better off with surgical intervention or not. The only evidence we do have is that treating without the MRI and using clinical markers to guide progression is the only consistent approach, whether central tendon is involved or not.
	Should evolve to include surgical criteria	**52.1%**	**19.8%**	**28.1%**	Surgical criteria would be useful for practitioners deciding on prognosis and management.
Classification systems should have agreed Terminology		**91.8%**	**2.0%**	**6.1%**	Diagnostic classification system should be clear in reports and research. Only for consistency's sake from both a scientific and clinical perspective.
There is a need for a registry for hamstring injuries		**68.7%**	**10.1%**	**21.2%**	more data is useful, but I fear people will bias their interpretation of it (E.g., all central tendon injuries take longer to rehab than MTJ - but this is because you treated them based on the MRI which showed central tendon and you were conservative as a result). This bias is tough to avoid in these registry datasets and people will misconstrue the data. Would be difficult with so many sports. Maybe intra sport registry.
Mechanism of injury should be commented alongside the classification (where appropriate / known)		**82.0%**	**11.0%**	**7.0%**	This always allows for a clearer prognosis/ This is more useful than the classification system. /Affects anatomical involvement, prognosis, and rehab decisions.
We SHOULD differentiate between muscles in the classification?		**88.9%**	**4.0%**	**7.1%**	Obvious/Different muscles have different functions so a classification that guides rehab is desirable hamstrings have different structure and therefore function which needs to be clearly stated to understand if certain muscles are at greater re-injury risk or require longer / Requires a very demanding system that may be too difficult to adhere to.
Beyond anatomical classification, there is a need to have: -	***functional criteria running beside***	**90.0%**	**6.0%**	**4.0%**	Time to walk pain free/Confidence to Sprint/ patient expected time to return to sport.
	PROMS running beside	**80.4%**	**10.3%**	**9.3%**	Current PROMs for hamstring injury may not be particularly useful/ PHAT LEFS/ Marx score/ FASH.

Imaging is vital in the classification system		**70.5%**	**14.7%**	**14.7%**	To decide between conservative or surgery, not otherwise/ Would prefer that classification would guide us to ask for imaging. Not that imaging is always essential especially in low grade injury/ in professional sport, imaging is more often required than not, however does not always change management.
Immediate Physical Examination signs like bruising, loss of muscle tension, palpable defects and /*or significant* ***weakness and excessive/no response on provoking activities warrant further investigation***		**92.6%**	**2.1%**	**5.3%**	In this presentation you are suspecting a free tendon or complete rupture which may require surgery/ Pain level and mechanism (suggesting a complete tear, avulsion, or anything else that might require a surgical opinion.
MRI is the preferred imaging for diagnosis and classification		**89.5%**	**4.2%**	**6.3%**	If used, I prefer MRI/ Ultrasound imaging can be very useful if conducted by a physician/ sonographer with lots of training. Ultrasound is also very suited to examine the damaged muscle- connective tissue area under movement. Ultrasound can also be a good cheaper alternative.
MRI side to side comparison is ideal for classification		**49.5%**	**25.3%**	**25.3%**	This does not happen that often due to financial restrictions. Enough information can likely be gained from a unilateral MRI to give an accurate diagnosis. /Contralateral side is not always a 'healthy' side/Should be used together with US/I prefer a correct protocolized MRI only of the affected side.
When is Ultrasound most useful / relevant as	***primary imaging after injury PRE 48 hours***	**14.8%**	***58.0%***	**27.3%**	Ultrasound is not particularly useful when there is a lot of oedema, in the early post-injury period.
	primary imaging after injury POST 48 hours	**25.8%**	***42.7%***	**31.5%**	4-day deadline is best to see well the hematic collection.
	in the rehabilitation phase	**61.8%**	**16.9%**	**21.3%**	It depends in what aspect. Architecture - yes. Lesion tracking -no.

Table 5. Consensus statements and percentage agreement for round 2 survey – Global expert Panel - ***Surgery***

Statements related to domain of Surgery		**responses**	**not answered**	**TRUE**	**FALSE**	**Undecided**	**Samples of typical responses - discussion points or areas of disagreement**
Factors that drive surgical intervention include: -	***Previous hamstring harvest or HSI***	**83**	**32**	**26.5%**	**38.6%**	**34.9%**	I think all of these are relevant but none of them determine/ drive/ necessarily require surgical intervention. Undecided if any of these factor into surgical intervention unless coupled with poor functional outcomes (e.g., lack of rehab progress etc). The level of athlete and stage of competition are also factors to consider.
	Recurrent Injury	**83**	**32**	**33.7%**	**38.6%**	**27.7%**	All factors should be considered, and the importance of each factor differs depending on type of injury and type of patient. Recurrence: not been proven that surgery will reduce recurrence rate. I am not aware of any convincing, high quality scientific data on the success of surgery following hamstring injuries.
	Injuries with a high recurrence rate	**84**	**31**	**40.5%**	**28.6%**	**31.0%**	
	Gapping at the zone of injury	**86**	**29**	**87.2%**	**2.3%**	**10.5%**	This was felt to be the main driver. Degree of tendon retraction important the main indication for surgery if complete free tendon (BA grade 4) for grade intra tendon injury > 50% of the CSA. High (3b) grade injuries can make a complete return to sport.
	Loss of tension	**82**	**33**	**70.7%**	**13.4%**	**15.9%**	Loss of tension is evident in most injuries, as an acute sign, but improves with healing, it is less important than size of gap and loss of tendon tension more important than myofascial tension
The indications for surgery in hamstring injuries are dependent on: - the anatomy of the injury the demands on the athlete/patient and the expected functional outcome.		**85**	**30**	**87.1%**	**9.4%**	**3.5%**	I don't know that we have enough information now to be able to say with any confidence who is truly in need of surgery (if anyone), Until we simply have decent outcome studies looking at usual care, and something comes out of the data, we're guessing. Dependent on the anatomy but not the demands of the athlete/ patient or the expected functional outcome. Function, recurrence, and lack of progress are the main ones for me. Failure of conservative care would seem to be the only indication at the moment as near as I can tell. This is true but just in some type of injuries (e.g., those affecting the free tendon).

							Anatomy yes If conjoint tendon full rupture in elite athlete, I would advocate surgery. Semimembranosus full rupture would advocate conservative. Degree of tendon retraction important in ST or BF rupture. If small and healing possible then would trial conservative first.
Surgical management has the capacity to: -	***Speed up recovery timescales***	**86**	**29**	**36.0%**	**36.0%**	**27.9%**	Speed up: not supported by literature/surveys. Current protocols are very slow. For Speed up recovery timescales = I would say speeds up and gives more consistent/ predictable recovery which gives us good outcomes. Only for high grade avulsions.
	Restore Anatomy and function	**85**	**30**	**87.1%**	**1.2%**	**11.8%**	We need more research into this, but potentially true as surgery is often undertaken with failed conservative management.
	Reduce risk of recurrence	**85**	**30**	**48.2%**	**17.6%**	**34.1%**	Need more research into this but potentially true as surgery often undertaken with failed conservative management. Reduced recurrence has been the experience in our cohort. Recurrence: not been proven that surgery will reduce recurrence rate. I have seen reinjury at different location following grade 4 injuries and free tendon repair. Reoccurrence will be hugely influenced by post operative rehabilitation and a progressive RTP. Surgery will restore anatomy, but an injury may reoccur due to ineffective rehabilitation. Recurrent injury only relevant if recurrent tendon or previous surgery, or sciatic nerve issue requiring neurolysis. Reduces recurrence we believe but less predictability with conservative treatment in high grade tendon injury.
Hamstring fixation should be performed endoscopically		**84**	**31**	**9.5%**	**25.0%**	***65.5%***	Need better field of view - attachment footprint is too large and sciatic nerve involvement should be checked
The reporting of hamstring recurrence should be based on the IOC criteria and cover a two-year time frame		**84**	**31**	**53.6%**	**11.9%**	**34.5%**	Long term outcomes certainly would make for a fairer appraisal of benefits. Assume this in reference to the Methodological consensus statement on reporting of injuries? I think as we standardize our approach, this is certainly the most relevant and up to date reference for reporting. Yes, for research purposes but 2 years is a long time. I would prefer 1 season
Undisplaced bony hamstring avulsions DO NOT require immediate operative intervention		**81**	**34**	**50.6%**	**18.5%**	**30.9%**	There are several factors that contribute to this decision-making process, having a binary approach is too difficult. In addition, there needs clarity of what type of bony avulsion is being referenced. It depends on athlete characteristics. Function during rehab should dictate this. Need to be re-imaged and monitored closely.
Displaced bony avulsions of the ischium should be managed operatively if symptomatic		**81**	**34**	**72.8%**	**4.9%**	**22.2%**	Depends on function, how much displacement, and athlete level and characteristics.
Surgical intervention for bony avulsions of the ischium should be: -	***Internal fixation***	**78**	**37**	**46.2%**	**5.1%**	**48.7%**	It depends on the time frame and the fragment size, bone to bone healing is preferable. If the fragment is too small, non-union may develop with internal fixation and in this scenario resection and soft tissue repair is favoured.
	Resection of Avulsed bone and Soft Tissue Repair	**77**	**38**	**31.2%**	**14.3%**	**54.5%**	
Undisplaced soft tissue hamstring avulsions can be initially managed non operatively		**80**	**35**	**61.3%**	**7.5%**	**31.3%**	Depends on time frames and upcoming competitions. Maybe able to be managed non-operatively if time frames allow. However, surgery will help give an accurate RTP prediction. This is dependent on several factors such as extent of injury, which hamstring, playing position etc
Undisplaced proximal hamstring origin tears should be managed operatively in athletes		**79**	**36**	**32.9%**	**27.8%**	**39.2%**	We don't have RCTs,
Criteria for surgical intervention in the proximal free tendon injuries include	***loss of muscle and tendon tension which results in a gap***	**79**	**36**	**83.5%**	**1.3%**	**15.2%**	Dependent on size of gap, and the level of athlete?
	risk of functional loss / performance deficit with non-operative management	**79**	**36**	**72.2%**	**7.6%**	**20.3%**	Proven loss of function in a patient who has a thorough understanding of the outcomes of surgical and conservative care and the patient still wishes to undergo surgery. We don't have RCTs, tough one. Dependant on whether elite or recreational athlete.
The management of free tendon injuries with displacement differs from that of intramuscular tendon injuries where the overall fascial envelope is still intact		**79**	**36**	**69.6%**	**6.3%**	**24.1%**	Intramuscular tendon injuries benefit from the 'scaffold' of surrounding muscular tissue I think free tendon injuries are a different type of injury than a hamstring injury with damage to the intramuscular tendon and require therefore specific treatment. The jury is still out on this. It would be a good topic for a well-coordinated multi-centre RCT.
	corticosteroid injections	**80**	**35**	**2.5%**	**80.0%**	**17.5%**	Evidence conflicting, but panel consensus disagreement on this statement.

Undisplaced soft tissue hamstring avulsions is there a role for	***injecting Blood / Platelet Rich Plasma (PRP)?***	**80**	**33**	**16.3%**	***50.0%***	**33.8%**	? PRP although evidence is weak at best. We have not used PRP but can see why it is worth consideration if you were going to trial conservative management.
	Other injections	**69**	**46**	**1.4%**	***53.6%***	**44.9%**	Dry needling. No conclusive evidence that these approaches improve outcomes.
Does haematoma aspiration have a role in	***avulsions***	**79**	**36**	**19.0%**	**40.5%**	**40.5%**	Perhaps large haematoma around the sciatic nerve - risk of fibrosis and adhesions.
	Tendon Injuries	**79**	**36**	**19.0%**	**41.8%**	**39.2%**	Injections/aspirations increase infection risk and haematomas often recur after aspiration. However, there may be. Has a role but precaution as the blood product may actually assist healing and fibrosis/ tear bridging. exceptions in case of very large or painful haematomas where the patient is fully informed and decides to take the risk. Only when it gives symptoms (content of haematoma is comparable to PRP).
	Other types of HSI	**78**	**37**	**28.2%**	**33.3%**	**38.5%**	Morel-lavallae lesion Contusions for symptomatic relief
There is a role for drainage of haematomas without surgery for hamstring muscle injuries and avulsions		**77**	**38**	**29.9%**	**32.5%**	**37.7%**	The haematoma being a space occupying lesion and preventing complete healing makes theoretical sense, but the few times we've tried it, the gap promptly refilled with blood despite firm compression bandaging. Maybe there's a technically better way to do this, but we've not figured it out yet. Hematoma potentially contributes to regeneration.

REFERENCES

1. Fanchini M, Steendahl IB, Impellizzeri FM, et al. Exercise-Based Strategies to Prevent Muscle Injury in Elite Footballers: A Systematic Review and Best Evidence Synthesis. *Sports Medicine* 2020;50(9):1653-66. doi: 10.1007/s40279-020-01282-z
2. McCall A, Carling C, Davison M, et al. Injury risk factors, screening tests and preventative strategies: A systematic review of the evidence that underpins the perceptions and practices of 44 football (soccer) teams from various premier leagues. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2015;49(9):583-89. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2014-094104
3. Michalis AH, Apostolos S. Hamstring strains in football. Prevention and rehabilitation rules. Systematic review. *Biol Exerc* 2016;12(1):121-48.
4. Minas H, Jorm AF. Where there is no evidence: Use of expert consensus methods to fill the evidence gap in low-income countries and cultural minorities. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems* 2010;4 doi: 10.1186/1752-4458-4-33
5. Hasson F, Keeney S, McKenna H. Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2000;32(4):1008-15.
6. Powell C. The Delphi technique: Myths and realities. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2003;41(4):376-82. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02537.x
7. Negrini S. Why evidence-based medicine is a good approach in physical and rehabilitation medicine. Thesis. *European Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine* 2014;50(5):585-91.
8. McCall A, Pruna R, Van der Horst N, et al. Exercise-Based Strategies to Prevent Muscle Injury in Male Elite Footballers: An Expert-Led Delphi Survey of 21 Practitioners Belonging to 18 Teams from the Big-5 European Leagues. *Sports Medicine* 2020;50(9):1667-81. doi: 10.1007/s40279-020-01315-7
9. Mueller-Wohlfahrt HW, Haensel L, Mithoefer K, et al. Terminology and classification of muscle injuries in sport: the Munich consensus statement. *Br J Sports Med* 2013;47(6):342-50. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2012-091448 [published Online First: 2012/10/20]
10. Donaldson A, Cook J, Gabbe B, et al. Bridging the gap between content and context: Establishing expert consensus on the content of an exercise training program to prevent lower-limb injuries. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine* 2015;25(3):221-29. doi: 10.1097/JSM.0000000000000124
11. van der Horst N, Backx F, Goedhart EA, et al. Return to play after hamstring injuries in football (soccer): a worldwide Delphi procedure regarding definition, medical criteria and decision-making. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2017;51(22):1583-91. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-097206
12. Zambaldi M, Beasley I, Rushton A. Return to play criteria after hamstring muscle injury in professional football: A Delphi consensus study. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2017;51(16):1221-26. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-097131
13. Lightsey HM, Kantrowitz DE, Swindell HW, et al. Variability of United States Online Rehabilitation Protocols for Proximal Hamstring Tendon Repair. *Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine* 2018;6(2) doi: 10.1177/2325967118755116
14. Hamilton B, Alonso JM, Best TM. Time for a paradigm shift in the classification of muscle injuries. *J Sport Health Sci* 2017;6(3):255-61. doi: 10.1016/j.jshs.2017.04.011 [published Online First: 2018/10/26]
15. Jünger S, Payne SA, Brine J, et al. Guidance on Conducting and REporting DElphi Studies (CREDES) in palliative care: Recommendations based on a methodological systematic review. *Palliat Med* 2017;31(8):684-706. doi: 10.1177/0269216317690685 [published Online First: 2017/02/14]
16. Chang JS, Kayani B, Plastow R, et al. Management of hamstring injuries: current concepts review. *Bone Joint J* 2020;102-B(10):1281-88. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.102B10.BJJ-2020-1210.R1 [published Online First: 2020/10/01]
17. Hillier-Smith R, Paton B. Outcomes following surgical management of proximal hamstring tendon avulsions. *Bone & Joint Open* 2022;3(5):415-22. doi: 10.1302/2633-1462.35.Bjo-2021-0196.R1
18. Hsu CC, Sandford BA. The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation* 2007;12(10):1-8.
19. Blazey P, Crossley KM, Ardern CL, et al. It is time for consensus on 'consensus statements'. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2022;56(6):306. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-104578
20. de Villiers MR, de Villiers PJT, Kent AP. The Delphi technique in health sciences education research. *Medical Teacher* 2005;27(7):639-43. doi: 10.1080/13611260500069947
21. Eysenbach G. Improving the quality of Web surveys: the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES). *Journal of medical Internet research* 2004;6(3):e34-e34. doi: 10.2196/jmir.6.3.e34
22. Harper D, Thompson AR. Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy: A Guide for Students and Practitioners2011.
23. Fink A, Kosecoff J, Chassin M, et al. Consensus methods: characteristics and guidelines for use. *American journal of public health* 1984;74(9):979-83. doi: 10.2105/ajph.74.9.979

24. Fuller CW, Ekstrand J, Junge A, et al. Consensus statement on injury definitions and data collection procedures in studies of football (soccer) injuries. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine* 2006;16(2):97-106. doi: 10.1097/00042752-200603000-00003
25. Griffin DR, Dickenson EJ, O'Donnell J, et al. The Warwick Agreement on femoroacetabular impingement syndrome (FAI syndrome): An international consensus statement. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;50(19):1169-76. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096743
26. Shrier I. Consensus statements that fail to recognise dissent are flawed by design: a narrative review with 10 suggested improvements. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2020:bjsports-2020-102545. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-102545
27. Verhagen AP, De Vet HCW, De Bie RA, et al. The Delphi list: A criteria list for quality assessment of randomized clinical trials for conducting systematic reviews developed by Delphi consensus. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998;51(12):1235-41. doi: 10.1016/S0895-4356(98)00131-0
28. Huisstede BMA, Hoogvliet P, Henk Coert J, et al. Multidisciplinary consensus guideline for managing trigger finger: Results from the European HANDGUIDE study. *Physical Therapy* 2014;94(10):1421-33. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20130135
29. Kleynen M, Braun SM, Bleijlevens MH, et al. Using a Delphi technique to seek consensus regarding definitions, descriptions and classification of terms related to implicit and explicit forms of motor learning. *PLoS ONE* 2014;9(6) doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0100227