



Influence of the forehand stance on knee biomechanics: Implications for potential injury risks in tennis players

Martin Caroline, Anthony Sorel, Pierre Touzard, Benoit Bideau, Ronan Gaborit, Hugo Degroot, Richard Kulpa

► To cite this version:

Martin Caroline, Anthony Sorel, Pierre Touzard, Benoit Bideau, Ronan Gaborit, et al.. Influence of the forehand stance on knee biomechanics: Implications for potential injury risks in tennis players. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 2021, 39 (9), pp.992-1000. 10.1080/02640414.2020.1853335 . hal-03100646

HAL Id: hal-03100646

<https://hal.science/hal-03100646>

Submitted on 4 Feb 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Influence of the forehand stance on knee biomechanics: implications for potential injury risks in tennis players

Caroline Martin^{a*}, Anthony Sorel^a, Pierre Touzard^a, Benoit Bideau^a, Ronan Gaborit^a, Hugo DeGroot^a, Richard Kulpa^a

^aM2S Laboratory, Rennes 2 University, Rennes, France

*Corresponding author:

Caroline Martin

E-mail address: caroline.martin@univ-rennes2.fr

Postal address: M2S Laboratory, ENS de Rennes, Avenue Robert Schuman, 35170 Bruz, France

Phone number: +33683988420

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4114-8947>

Word count: 4917 words

Abstract

The open stance forehand has been hypothesized to be more traumatic for knee injuries in tennis than the neutral stance forehand. This study aims to compare kinematics and kinetics at the knee during three common forehand stroke stances (attacking neutral stance ANS, attacking open stance AOS, defensive open stance DOS) to determine if the open stance forehand induces higher knee loadings and to discuss its potential relationship with given injuries. Eight advanced tennis players performed eight repetitions of forehand strokes with each stance (ANS: forward run and stroke with feet parallel with the hitting direction, AOS: forward run and stroke with feet perpendicular to the hitting direction, DOS: lateral run and stroke with feet perpendicular to the hitting direction) at maximal effort. All the trials were recorded with an optoelectronic motion capture system. The flexion-extension, abduction-adduction, external-internal rotation angles, intersegmental forces and torques of the right knee were calculated. Ground reaction forces were measured with a forceplate. The DOS increases vertical GRF, maximum knee flexion and abduction angles, range of knee flexion-extension, peak of compressive, distractive and medial knee forces, peak of knee abduction and external rotation torques. Consequently, the DOS appears potentially more at risk for given knee injuries.

Keywords: knee injuries, knee kinematics, knee loadings

1. Introduction

Tennis players execute repetitive lateral, start/stop and turning motions with quick anterior or posterior transitions followed by powerful strokes, which can induce tremendous stress on the musculoskeletal system of the lower limbs^{1 2}. Each change of direction creates a load of 1.5 to 2.7 times body weight on the planted knee and ankle³. Due to the repetitive loadings during matches, which can last up to 5 hours, lower limb injuries are very common in tennis players^{4 5}.

Knee injuries concern 19% of tennis injuries^{6 7}. For professional players, it has been shown that the knee is the most common injury region in male and the 3rd in female at the 2011-2016 Australian Open Grand Slam⁸. For junior tennis players, ankle sprain, low back pain and knee injuries are the most common⁹. In recreational competitive players, the knee concerns 12% of all injuries¹⁰. The majority (60 – 74%) of the knee injuries in tennis players are classified as overuse^{9 11} including patella-femoral tendinopathies or pain, patella dislocation, quadriceps tendinopathy, iliotibial band friction syndrome and Osgood Schlatter's disease. The traumatic injuries such as collateral ligament, anterior cruciate ligament and meniscal injuries less often occur in tennis players but represent around 30-40% of knee injuries^{9 11 12}. These knee injuries can be particularly problematic not only for players' performance and career but also for their work and daily quality of life¹³. Indeed, for example, more than 50% of athletes with patellar tendinopathy were forced to retire from sport but continue to have pain with stairs climbing (15 years later)^{14 15}. The dominant knee is involved in 57% of injuries in tennis players⁹.

Indeed, the dominant knee is a crucial joint allowing the energy transfer from the ankle to the hip during tennis strokes such as serves or groundstrokes. The knee helps to generate force and absorb impact during specific movements allowing tennis players to hit the ball with efficiency. Indeed, there is a significant relationship between the peak angular velocity of dominant-side knee joint extension and post-impact ball speed in the forehand¹⁶. Moreover, it has been shown that initial knee positioning and range-of-motion are positively related to racket velocity during the forehand¹⁷.

Concerning feet and knee positioning in forehands, players can use different stances: the neutral, the semi-open and the open stances. For the neutral stance, the player's feet and knees are perpendicular to the net while they are parallel to the net for the open stance. The semi-open stance concerns any feet positioning between the neutral and open stances. When the ball speed is reduced and the players are in attacking position into the court, the majority of forehand shots are played in a neutral stance¹⁸. However, with the game acceleration during the last decades, high-level tennis players give priority to open stances for saving time during defensive baseline forehands¹⁹. For example, it has been reported that Federer hit 77% of his forehands with an open stance during a set played against Falla¹⁹ during the 2010 French Open. Moreover, in the 2010 Miami Open Final between Clijsters and Williams, 68% of all forehands were executed in open stance and only 32% of all forehands were executed in neutral stance²⁰. In advanced tennis players, data about the ratios of stances are really limited. According to Schonborn (1999), about 90% of all forehands are played by advanced players in an open stance position²¹. The open stance forehand is thought to be more traumatic than the neutral one because it could

increase loadings on the dominant side leg and consequently favor injuries appearance in lower limb injuries of tennis players²². However, there is no data in the literature about the influence of the forehand stance on lower limb biomechanics and injury risks for the dominant knee. Consequently, it remains unclear if one of the forehand stances could increase knee injuries. Yet, such scientific information is crucial for coaches, scientists, physiotherapists and medical staff to improve the prevention, management and rehabilitation of knee injuries in players.

Consequently, this study aims to evaluate knee kinematics and kinetics during three common forehand stroke stances (attacking neutral stance ANS¹, attacking open stance AOS, defensive open stance DOS) to know if the open stance forehand induces higher knee loadings and to discuss its potential relationship with given knee injuries

2. Materials and methods

8 right-handed male tennis players (age: 26.3 ± 11.0 years; height: 1.76 ± 0.02 m; weight: 65.9 ± 4.6 kg) voluntarily participated in this study. Inclusion criteria consisted of uninjured advanced tennis players with an International Tennis Number (ITN) of 4 or 5 (International Tennis Federation, 2009) and the ability to properly perform each forehand stroke stance (ANS, AOS, DOS). The ITN is a tennis rating, internationally recognized, that represents a player's general level of play. The International Tennis Federation (2009) describes the level of ITN 4 and ITN 5 players as follows: "*ITN 4 players can use power and spins and have begun to handle pace. They have sound footwork, can control depth of shots, and can vary game plan according to opponents.*" "*ITN 5 players have dependable strokes, including directional control and depth on both groundstrokes and on moderate shots. The players have the ability to use lobs, overheads, approach shots and volleys with some success.*" The ability of the players to properly perform each forehand stroke stance was confirmed by a professional tennis coach.

Before participation, they were fully informed of the experimental procedures. At the time of the experiment, all players were considered healthy, with no pain or injury. Written consent was obtained for each player. The study respected all local laws for studies involving human participants and was approved by the Local Ethics Board.

Before the motion capture, participants viewed a demonstration of the experimental procedure and the three forehand stroke stances (ANS, AOS, DOS) performed by a professional coach. They had sufficient time to familiarize themselves with the testing environment and the landmarks set, as well as to test all forehand stroke stances (ANS, AOS, DOS). After a warm-up of 10 minutes, each player performed eight forehand strokes with each stance at maximal effort. The order of the forehand stroke stances was randomly assigned. The players were asked to move as quickly as possible and to hit a foam tennis ball as hard as they can. The foam tennis ball was fixed and attached to a scaffold with a rope,

¹ ANS : attacking neutral stance, AOS: attacking open stand, DOS: defensive open stance

allowing the investigators to adapt the impact height according to the players' height and the type of forehand strokes (Fig. 1).

***** Fig. 1 near here*****

For the AOS and the ANS, the players ran a total distance of 6.2m. For the ANS, the players ran along a 45° line (3.6m) on the left side of the force plate before stepping onto the plate with the right leg to execute a jab run. Then, they placed their left leg in front of the right leg. Consequently, they hit the foam ball with a neutral stance (feet parallel with the hitting direction, left leg in front of the right leg located on the force plate). They left the plate at 45° angle towards the left until the finishing point (Fig. 1a). The height of the foam ball was adjusted to the right hip' height of each player to simulate an attacking neutral stance forehand.

For the AOS, the running motion was similar to the ANS but the players were asked to hit the ball with an open stance with the feet perpendicular to the hitting direction (Fig. 1b). The right leg was located on the force plate and the left leg was beside the right leg. The height of the foam ball was adjusted to the right shoulder' height of each player to simulate an attacking open stance forehand.

For the DOS, the players performed a 9.6m lateral shuttle run. First, they started from a standing position. After a split step, they laterally ran towards the force plate (Fig. 1c). When the force plate was reached, they stepped onto the plate with the right leg, performed an open stance with the feet perpendicular to the hitting direction (left leg beside the right leg), and hit the foam ball. Then, they ran back to the starting point. The distance between the starting point and the middle of the force plate was 4.8m. The height of the foam ball was adjusted to the right pocket's height of each player to simulate a defensive forehand. The characteristics of the movement patterns (covered distances, lateral shuttle run in DOS, jab run in ANS and AOS) and forehands strokes (attacking and defensive strokes) have been validated by a professional tennis coach and have been chosen because they are reported to occur frequently in tennis^{19 23 24}. For the DOS, five steps were performed before landing on the force plate while for the ANS and AOS, four steps were performed before landing on the force plate to ensure that a maximal speed was achieved, as recommended in the literature²⁵.

Players were equipped with 38 retroreflective markers placed on anatomical landmarks determined in agreement with previously published data^{26 27 28}. A Vicon motion capture system (Oxford Metrics Inc., Oxford, UK) was used to record the trajectories of the 3-dimensional anatomical landmarks. The system was composed of 20 high-resolution cameras (4 megapixels) operating at a nominal frame of 200 Hz. Players were shirtless and wore only tight short to limit movement of the markers. After the capture, the 3D coordinates of the landmarks were reconstructed with Blade software (Blade; Vicon, Oxford, UK) with a residual error of less than 1 mm. A force platform operating at 2000 Hz (60 x 120 x 5.7 cm, Advanced Mechanical Technology Incorporation, Watertown, MA, USA) was used to measure peak of ground reaction forces (GRF) on the right step during forehand strokes. All the right

knee kinetic and kinematic data were processed with CusTom in Matlab software (Mathworks, Natick, Massachusetts, USA), which is a Customizable Toolbox for Musculoskeletal simulation allowing to solve inverse kinematics and inverse dynamics from motion capture data ²⁹.

In each of the three forehand stances, the minimum, maximum, and range of motion were computed in each plane of motion at the dominant (right) knee during the right foot standing on the force plate. Intersegmental forces and torques at the dominant knee were also computed.

One-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) with repeated measures were used to analyze differences in GRF, knee kinematics and kinetics between the 3 forehand stances (ANS, AOS, DOS). Significant main effects were decomposed using post hoc Holm-Sidak method to determine the source of difference. To determine the clinical relevance of differences, each post hoc contrast was presented using a mean difference (MD). Where data were not normally distributed, significance was determined using ANOVA with repeated measures on ranks and a post hoc Tukey test. Mean and SD values were computed for all parameters. The effect sizes were calculated and the clinical significance of the differences was classified as small (Cohen's $d < 0.2$), medium (Cohen's $d = 0.5$), or large (Cohen's $d > 0.8$), according to the Cohen scale. The level of significance was established at $p < 0.05$ (SigmaStat 3.1; Jandel Corporation, San Rafael, CA). In accordance with Altman (1991), statistical result with p value between 0.05 and 0.1 is reported as tendency towards a difference³⁰.

2. Results

2.1 Absolute running velocity of the center of mass at the instant of the first contact between the right foot and the force plate

Results show a significant main effect of the type of forehand stances on the absolute running velocity of the center of mass at the instant of the first contact between the right foot and the force plate ($p < 0.002$; retrospective statistical power = 0.949). Post hoc tests reveal that the absolute running velocity was significantly higher in ANS (3.7 m.s⁻¹) and AOS (3.6 m.s⁻¹) than in DOS (3.2 m.s⁻¹) (respectively, MD: 0.5 m.s⁻¹; $p < 0.001$; respectively, MD: 0.4 m.s⁻¹; $p = 0.006$).

2.2. Ground reaction forces

There are significant main effects of the type of forehand stances on lateral GRF ($p < 0.001$; retrospective statistical power = 1) and vertical GRF ($p = 0.035$; retrospective statistical power = 0.524). Post hoc comparisons show that the DOS involved significant greater peak of lateral GRF than ANS (MD: 599 N; $p < 0.001$) and AOS (MD: 350 N; $p = 0.002$) (Table 1). Post hoc test demonstrates also a significant difference between ANS and AOS concerning peak of lateral GRF (MD: 249 N; $p = 0.018$). The peak of vertical GRF is significantly higher in DOS than in ANS (MD: 488 N; $p = 0.011$, $d = 1.26$). There is also a tendency toward a difference concerning peak of vertical GRF between DOS and AOS (MD: 298 N; $p = 0.097$).

***** Table 1 near here *****

178

2.3. Knee kinematics

Results show significant main effects of the type of forehand stances maximal knee flexion ($p < 0.001$; retrospective statistical power = 0.999) and knee flexion range of motion ($p = 0.003$; retrospective statistical power = 0.913). Post hoc results reveal that the maximal knee flexion angle is significantly higher in DOS compared with ANS (MD: 13.3°; $p < 0.001$) and AOS (MD: 16.4°; $p < 0.001$). Post-hoc analyses show that the range of knee flexion is significantly lower in AOS than in ANS (MD: 10.5°; $p = 0.008$) and DOS (MD: 13.7°; $p = 0.001$).

Moreover, there are significant main effects of the type of forehand stances on maximal knee abduction ($p < 0.001$; retrospective statistical power = 0.999) and adduction-abduction knee range of motion ($p = 0.004$; retrospective statistical power = 0.884). Post hoc comparisons show that DOS induces higher values of knee abduction angle in comparison with ANS (MD: 23.0°; $p < 0.05$) and AOS (MD: 13.0°; $p < 0.05$). ANS is the only stance that shows maximal knee adduction angle, in comparison with AOS (MD: 24.0°; $p < 0.001$) and DOS (MD: 29.0°; $p < 0.001$). Post hoc test shows that ANS has higher knee adduction-abduction range of motion than AOS (MD: 13.6°; $p = 0.001$). There is also a tendency toward a difference concerning the knee adduction-abduction range of motion between DOS and AOS (MD: 7.8°; $p = 0.058$) and between ANS and DOS (MD: 5.9°; $p = 0.098$). No significant difference exists between the three forehand stances concerning maximal knee internal and external rotation angles and knee internal – external rotation range of motion (Table 2).

***** Table 2 near here *****

2.4. Knee kinetics

3.3.1. Knee joint forces

Results only show tendencies across the three forehand stances concerning maximal posterior ($p = 0.091$, retrospective statistical power = 0.313) and anterior knee joint forces ($p = 0.052$, retrospective statistical power = 0.438) (Table 3). Significant main effects are recorded in compressive ($p = 0.023$, retrospective statistical power = 0.614), distractive ($p < 0.001$, retrospective statistical power = 0.994) and medial forces ($p < 0.002$, retrospective statistical power = 0.933) between the forehand stances. Post hoc test reveals that the ANS involves significantly lower peak of compressive knee joint force than DOS (MD: 564.6 N; $p = 0.007$). There is also a tendency for this variable with AOS (MD: 330.8 N; $p < 0.086$). According to post hoc results, the peak of distractive knee force is significantly increased in DOS than in ANS (MD: 82.3 N; $p < 0.001$) and AOS (MD: 90.6 N; $p < 0.001$). The peak of medial knee joint force is significantly higher in DOS than in ANS (MD: 117.6 N and $p = 0.001$) and AOS (MD: 101.3 N and $p = 0.004$).

***** Table 3 near here *****

3.3.2. *Knee joint torques*

Significant main effects are recorded in knee flexion ($p = 0.013$, retrospective statistical power = 0.728), abduction ($p < 0.001$, retrospective statistical power = 1.000), internal ($p < 0.001$, retrospective statistical power = 0.998) and external torques ($p < 0.001$, retrospective statistical power = 0.976) between the forehand stances (Table 4). Post hoc tests show that the DOS involves significantly greater peak of flexion knee torque than ANS (MD: 60.3 Nm and $p = 0.004$) (Table 4). There is a tendency toward a difference in comparison with AOS (MD: 31.9 Nm and $p = 0.087$). The peak of internal knee joint torque is significantly higher in ANS than in DOS (MD: 17.2 Nm and $p < 0.001$) and AOS (MD: 18.7 Nm and $p < 0.001$). Conversely, the peak of external knee joint torque is increased in DOS in comparison with ANS (MD: 24.0 Nm and $p < 0.001$) and AOS (MD: 20.5 Nm and $p < 0.001$). The peak of abduction knee joint torque is significantly higher in DOS than in ANS (MD: 146.5 Nm and $p < 0.001$) and AOS (MD: 128.5 Nm and $p < 0.001$).

***** Table 4 near here *****

4. **Discussion**

This study aims to evaluate 3-dimensional knee kinematics and kinetics during three common forehand stroke stances (attacking neutral stance ANS, attacking open stance AOS, defensive open stance DOS) to determine if the open stance forehands induces higher knee loadings and to discuss its potential relationship with several well-known knee injuries.

The DOS significantly increases lateral and vertical GRF. Among the three forehand stances, the DOS induces the highest magnitude of flexion and abduction at the dominant knee. Moreover, the DOS produces the greatest peak of compressive, distractive and medial forces at the dominant knee. Knee abduction, flexion and external torques are significantly increased with DOS in comparison with ANS and AOS. All these results confirm the formulated hypothesis that the dominant knee is more loaded with the open stance forehand during defensive shots. Consequently, the DOS could increase the risk of having knee injuries for tennis players.

4.1. *Forehand stance effects on knee biomechanics*

The magnitude of running velocity, knee kinematics and kinetics measured in the current study are similar or slightly higher than previous published results during side-step or shuttle run cutting in young athletes^{31 32 33}. However, our results demonstrate clear knee kinematic and kinetic differences between the three common forehand stroke stances which can be explained in the light of literature. The forehand stroke involves a sequence of motions referred to as a 'kinetic chain' that begins with the lower limb action and is followed by the trunk and then the upper limb. The knee joint allows to transfer a maximum

of energy from the lower limb to the hips and trunk. During the forehand, the vigorous flexion and extension of the knee contributes to the subsequent rotational drive of the hips and trunk to increase racket velocity during ball impact ³⁴. Our results show that knee flexion angle and torque are significantly higher in DOS than in AOS and ANS. This is logical since the ball height was lower in DOS to simulate defensive forehand strokes in our protocol. Moreover, the DOS significantly increases lateral and vertical GRF. One plausible explanation is the difference in the movement plane of study, which was executed predominantly in the medial-lateral and vertical directions during defensive forehand open stance strokes (DOS), compared with attacking forehand neutral stance strokes (ANS) that was executed in the anterior-posterior directions ^{35 36}. Knee abduction and external torques are significantly increased with DOS. This result seems logical because, during open stance strokes, players need to create higher amount of angular momentum about the longitudinal axis, than in neutral stance strokes, from greater knee and hip rotations to generate power at impact ^{35 36}.

4.2. Forehand stance effects on risks of knee injuries

4.2.1. Patellar tendinopathy and knee osteoarthritis

During tennis practice, players can suffer from anterior knee pain, which is commonly called jumper's knee ³⁷. This pain is also referred to as patellar tendinopathy that is a pathology affecting the bone-tendon junction during jumping, bending, cutting or pivoting actions performed by tennis players ¹⁴. In the literature, the mechanisms of patellar tendinopathy are multifactorial, both intrinsic and extrinsic factors have been identified. Among them, knee joint kinematics and loadings are considered as extrinsic risks for athletes. Indeed, for example, in elite volleyball players, it has been shown that maximum vertical GRF, maximum knee flexion angle, and peak knee external-rotation moment during spike-jump and block-jump takeoff or landing are strong and reliable indicators of patellar tendinitis in the dominant knee ³⁸. In our study, the magnitude of vertical GRF and maximal knee flexion angle in DOS are similar to the values measured during the take-off phase of both spike and block jumps in volleyball players ³⁸. Our results show that the DOS significantly increases vertical GRF in comparison with ANS and AOS. Moreover, the DOS induced higher maximum knee flexion angle than the two other stances, higher range of knee flexion-extension than AOS, and higher peak of compressive knee force than ANS. All these elements may lead to focal degeneration and microtears in the patellar tendon of athletes ³⁷. Consequently, one may argue that the continual repetition of compressive forces on the dominant knee during DOS in tennis players could increase the risk of patellar tendinopathy and joint osteoarthritis.

4.2.2 Osgood-Schlatter's disease

The Osgood-Schlatter's disease is a highly common knee injury in junior tennis players ^{39 9}. The pain is located at the insertion of the patellar tendon into the tibia. In growing individuals, the soft tissues such as tendon and muscles are stronger than the bone ⁵. It is known that excessive and repetitive tensile

or distractive forces may cause Osgood-Schlatter's disease by fragmenting the tendon's insertion¹². Our results show that the peak of distractive knee force is significantly more important during DOS than during ANS and AOS. Consequently, the repetition of DOS forehands could be riskier for Osgood-Schlatter's disease in tennis players.

4.2.3. *Meniscus tears*

The meniscus aims to absorb shock and distribute stress to protect the knee. It allows joint stabilization and margins protection. Moreover, it facilitates joint gliding and provides articular cartilage lubrication and nutrition⁴⁰. As a result of excessive knee pivoting motion, meniscus tears are very common among tennis players⁴¹, especially in middle-aged and elderly players⁵. Injury risks for the meniscus include loadings that exceeds the structural integrity of the tissue⁴². In athletes, menisci injuries are mainly produced by a compressive force coupled with tibiofemoral external or internal rotation as the knee moves from flexion to extension during rapid change of direction⁴⁰. While it is known that excessive loading of the menisci can lead to degenerative changes, it is not known at what magnitude compressive forces and rotation torques become injurious to cartilage⁴³. In this study, the results show that the peak of compressive knee force, the maximal knee flexion angle and the external rotation knee torque are significantly higher in DOS than in ANS. Moreover, while some areas of the meniscus aim to absorb compressive loads (inner sections), other meniscus areas deal with distractive loads (outer areas)⁴⁴. DOS induces more extreme distractive knee force than the two other stances. Consequently, all these results lead us to believe that the DOS could be potentially more traumatic for meniscus in tennis players.

4.2.4. *Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL)*

ACL injuries often occur without physical contact between athletes in sports with sudden deceleration, landing and pivoting motions⁴⁵. From a mechanical point of view, it can be the case when an athlete himself produces great forces and moments on his knee, generating excessive loading on the ACL which can break. In tennis, the ACL injury is usually induced by a cutting motion toward one side, followed by a quick twisting motion toward the other side¹². However, ACL rupture is not a common injury during tennis playing. Indeed, a study reported a 2% overall ACL rupture incidence from tennis related injuries⁴⁶. Another study reported that 11% of knee injuries in tennis players concern ACL injury⁴⁷. Knee abduction or valgus, internal rotation and anterior shear force at the tibia have been associated with non-contact ACL injuries in video studies describing ACL mechanisms during sport motions^{48 49}⁵⁰ but also in cadaver studies^{51 52}. Hewett et al. (2005, 2009) reported that maximal knee flexion and abduction angles, maximal knee abduction torque and maximal vertical GRF were significantly higher in ACL-injured than in injured athletes during a jump-landing task⁴⁸ or a cutting task⁴⁹. Consequently, all these parameters are considered as predictors of anterior cruciate ligament injury risk in athletes. Our results demonstrate that maximal knee flexion angle, maximal knee abduction angle and torque, and

peak of vertical GRF are significantly higher in DOS. All these values measured in DOS are similar or higher than those reported by Hewett et al. (2005, 2009) ^{48 49}.

Moreover, it has been reported that excessive compressive loads caused by impact loads along the tibial shaft (e.g., load from a powerful stroke) may contribute to ACL injuries, especially when the knee is flexed ^{53 54}. In our study, the peak of compressive knee force is significantly higher in DOS and is close to the peak compression loads for ACL failure measured in human cadavers (2900 N) ^{53 54}. There is a tendency toward a difference between the three stances concerning peak of anterior knee force with the highest values observed in AOS. AOS also tends to produce higher peak of compressive knee force than ANS. There is no significant difference concerning internal and external rotation knee angles between the three stances. But the internal rotation knee torque is significantly higher in ANS, even if the values are quite small. All these results suggest that DOS and AOS could be potentially more at risk for ACL injuries. However, they have to be interpreted with caution because among knee abduction, internal rotation torques, anterior and compressive forces, some debates exist about the main biomechanical contributor in non-contact ACL injuries ^{55 45}.

4.2.5 Medial collateral ligament (MCL)

The main function of the MCL is to stabilize the medial side of the knee joint. Its role is very important for providing support against valgus stress, rotational forces, and anterior translational forces on the tibia ⁵⁶. In tennis, the MCL is the most commonly injured knee ligament ¹². The injury usually occurs during a twisting situation when the knee is forced into a valgus position with external rotation⁴². For example, it has been reported that MCL strain increases with the increase of knee abduction moment (between 2 and 115 N.m⁻¹) in cadavers⁵⁷ and in a simulation study ⁵⁸. Moreover, in ski accidents, it has been reported that the moments required to rupture the MCL were estimated at 92 N.m⁻¹ for knee abduction moment and 123 N.m⁻¹ for external moment through a simple model ⁵⁹. In our study, the results show that maximal knee abduction angle, peak of knee abduction and external rotation torques are significantly higher in DOS (16°, 230 N.m⁻¹, 52 N.m⁻¹, respectively). Moreover, the peak of knee medial force increases significantly in DOS. As a result, DOS seems riskier for MCL injuries.

4.3. Limitations

This study has some limitations. First, our sample size is limited because we only included advanced tennis players and their participation was voluntary. Some results tend to show differences between forehand stances' biomechanics. It seems reasonable to assume that nonsignificant results are due to lack of power caused by the small number of subjects involved in the study. Second, players were asked to hit a foam tennis ball and the forehand strokes were simulated and not played "under time pressure" as it is the case during training sessions or matches. Since the data were collected in simulated stroking conditions with ITN 4 or 5 skilled players, the results may not be generalizable to other skills levels or match play conditions.

Moreover, knee joint kinetics were measured using the inverse dynamics method. Musculoskeletal modeling and computer simulations could have been provided complementary results on knee muscle and ligament forces during the forehand strokes. Finally, the etiology of the injuries in tennis players reveals that numerous extrinsic (playing surface, racquet properties) and intrinsic (age, sex, volume of play, skill level, biomechanics, anatomy, range of motion) risk factors are implied in the occurrence of injuries⁶⁰. In this study, we restricted our research to biomechanical data concerning knee kinematics and kinetics across three common forehand stances. It could be interesting for further studies to combine biomechanical analysis and prospective registration of knee injuries to specifically assess the relation between specific forehand stance patterns and knee injury risks. Furthermore, it could be relevant to also analyze the influence of semi-open stance on knee kinetics and kinematics.

4.4. Conclusion

To conclude, this study aimed to compare knee kinematics and kinetics in tennis players during three common forehand stroke stances (attacking neutral stance ANS, attacking open stance AOS, defensive open stance DOS). Tennis experts generally believe that the forehand open stance constitutes a risk factor for dominant leg injuries in tennis²². Our findings are in line with this hypothesis by showing that the DOS increases vertical GRF, maximum knee flexion and abduction angles, range of knee flexion-extension, peak of compressive, distractive and medial knee forces, peak of knee abduction and external rotation torques. Consequently, the DOS appears potentially more at risk for given knee injuries: patellar tendinopathy, knee osteoarthritis, Osgood-Schlatter's disease, meniscus tears, ACL and MCL. Coaches with players suffering from knee pain or injuries should encourage them to use more neutral stance and to develop aggressive playing style to avoid defensive open stance where knee motions and loadings are more extreme, especially in young or elderly players. After knee rehabilitation program, players should favor the use of neutral stance to reduced loadings on the dominant knee during forehand strokes.

Disclosure of interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

References

1. Manske R, Paterno M. Rehabilitation of Knee Injuries. In: *Tennis Medicine: A Complete Guide to Evaluation, Treatment, and Rehabilitation*. Cham, Switzerland, 2018.p.415–38.
2. Kovacs MS. Applied physiology of tennis performance. *Br J Sports Med* 2006;**40**:381–6. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2005.023309>.
3. Kibler W, Safran M. Musculoskeletal injuries in the young tennis player. *Clinics in Sports Medicine* 2012;**19**:781–792.
4. Okholm Kryger K, Dor F, Guillaume M, Haida A, Noirez P, Montalvan B, et al. Medical reasons behind player departures from male and female professional tennis

- competitions. *Am J Sports Med* 2015;**43**:34–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546514552996>.
5. Renström A. Knee pain in tennis players. *Clin Sports Med* 1995;**14**:163–75.
6. Kibler B, Safran M. Tennis Injuries. In: *Epidemiology of Pediatric Sports Injuries. Individual Sports, Vol.48*. Basel: Karger, 2005.p.120–37. (Medicine and Sport Science; vol. 48).
7. O'Connor S, Huseyin OR, Whyte EF, Lacey P. A 2-year prospective study of injuries and illness in an elite national junior tennis program. *The Physician and Sportsmedicine* 2020;1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913847.2020.1714512>.
8. Gescheit DT, Cormack SJ, Duffield R, Kovalchik S, Wood TO, Omizzolo M, et al. Injury epidemiology of tennis players at the 2011–2016 Australian Open Grand Slam. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;**51**:1289–94. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2016-097283>.
9. Hjelm N, Werner S, Renstrom P. Injury profile in junior tennis players: a prospective two year study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2010;**18**:845–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-010-1094-4>.
10. Jayanthi N, Sallay P, Hunker P, Przybylski M. Skill-level related injuries in recreational competition tennis players. *Journal of Medicine and Science in Tennis* 2005;**40**:12–15.
11. Chard M, Lachmann S. Racquet sports—patterns of injury presenting to a sports injury clinic. *British Journal of Sports Biomechanics* 1987;**21**:150–153.
12. Renstrom P, Lynch S. Knee injuries in tennis. In: *Handbook of Sports Medicine and Science: Tennis*. Oxford, Great Britain, 2002.p.186–203.
13. De Vries A, Koolhaas W, Zwerver J, Diercks R, Nieuwenhuis K, Van Der Worp H, et al. The impact of patellar tendinopathy on sports and work performance in active athletes. *Research in Sports Medicine* 2017;**25**:253–65.
14. Leong HT, Cook J, Docking S, Rio E. Physiotherapy management of Patellar Tendinopathy in Tennis Players. In: *Tennis Medicine: A complete Guide to Evaluation, Treatment and Rehabilitation*. Cham, Switzerland, 2018.p.401–14.
15. Kettunen JA, Kvist M, Alanen E, Kujala UM. Long-term prognosis for jumper's knee in male athletes. A prospective follow-up study. *Am J Sports Med* 2002;**30**:689–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03635465020300051001>.
16. Seeley MK, Funk MD, Denning WM, Hager RL, Hopkins JT. Tennis forehand kinematics change as post-impact ball speed is altered. *Sports Biomech* 2011;**10**:415–26.
17. Nesbit SM, Serrano M, Elzinga M. The Role of Knee Positioning and Range-of-Motion on the Closed-Stance Forehand Tennis Swing. *J Sports Sci Med* 2008;**7**:114–24.
18. Landlinger J, Lindinger S, Stoggl T, Wagner H, Muller E. Key Factors and Timing Patterns in the Tennis Forehand of Different Skill Levels. *J Sports Sci Med* 2010;**9**:643–51.
19. Reid M, Elliott B, Crespo M. Mechanics and Learning Practices Associated with the Tennis Forehand: A Review. *J Sports Sci Med* 2013;**12**:225–31.
20. Zusa A, Lanka J, Vagin A. Biomechanical analysis of forehand in modern tennis. *LASE Journal of Sport Science* 2010;**1**:13–7.
21. Schönborn R. Advanced Techniques for Competitive Tennis. Meyer & Meyer Sport, Limited, 2000. 280 p.
22. Ellenbecker T. The relationship between stroke mechanics and injuries in tennis. *The USTA Newsletter for Tennis Coaches* 2006;**8**:4–9.
23. Roetert EP, Kovacs M, Knudson DV, Groppel J. Biomechanics of the tennis groundstrokes : implications for strength training. *Strength and Conditioning Journal* 2009;**31**:41–9.
24. Hughes M, Meyers R. Movement patterns in elite men's singles tennis. *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport* 2005;**5**:110–34.
25. Graf ES, Stefanyshyn D. The effect of footwear torsional stiffness on lower extremity

- and kinetics during lateral cutting movements. *Footwear Science* 2013;5:101–9.
26. Leardini A, Cappozzo A, Catani F, Toksvig-Larsen S, Petitto A, Sforza V, et al. Validation of a functional method for the estimation of hip joint centre location. *Journal of Biomechanics* 1999;32:99–103.
 27. Reed M, Manary M, L S. Methods for measuring and representing automobile occupant posture. Technical Paper 990959. *SAE Transactions Journal of Passengers Cars* 1999;108:1–15.
 28. Zatsiorsky V, Seluyanov V, Chugunova L. Contemporary problems of biomechanics. In: Chernyi G, Regirer S, editors. Massachusetts: CRC Press, 1990.p.272–91.
 29. Muller A, Pontonnier C, Puchaud P, Dumont G. CusToM: a Matlab toolbox for musculoskeletal simulation. *Journal of Open Source Software* 2019;4:927. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00927>.
 30. Altman D. Practical Statistics for Medical Research, Chapman&Hall. 1991. 624 p.
 31. Ishii H, Nagano Y, Ida H, Fukubayashi T, Maruyama T. Knee kinematics and kinetics during shuttle run cutting: comparison of the assessments performed with and without the point cluster technique. *J Biomech* 2011;44:1999–2003. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2011.05.001>.
 32. Sigward S, Powers CM. The influence of experience on knee mechanics during side-step cutting in females. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* 2006;21:740–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2006.03.003>.
 33. Zaslow T, Pace JL, Mueske N, Chua M, Katzel M, Dennis S, et al. Comparison of lateral shuffle and side-step cutting in young recreational athletes. *Gait & Posture* 2016;44:189–93.
 34. Iino Y, Kojima T. Role of knee flexion and extension for rotating the trunk in a tennis forehand stroke. *Journal of Human Movement Studies* 2003;45:133–52.
 35. Elliott B. Biomécanique du tennis de haut niveau. Elliott B, Reid M, Crespo M, editors. London: International Tennis Federation, 2003. 221 p.
 36. Bahamonde RE. Biomechanics of the forehand stroke. *ITF Coaching and Sport Science Review* 2001:6–8.
 37. Hale S. Etiology of patellar tendinopathy in athletes. *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation* 2005:258–72.
 38. Richards DP, Ajemian SV, Wiley JP, Zernicke RF. Knee joint dynamics predict patellar tendinitis in elite volleyball players. *Am J Sports Med* 1996;24:676–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/036354659602400520>.
 39. Georgevia D, Poposka A, Dzoleva-Tolevska R, Maneva-Kuzevska K, Georgiev A, Vujica Z. Osgood-Schlatter disease: a common problem in young athletes. *Research in Physical Education, Sport & Health* 2015;4:47–9.
 40. Brindle T, Nyland J, Johnson DL. The Meniscus: Review of Basic Principles With Application to Surgery and Rehabilitation. *J Athl Train* 2001;36:160–9.
 41. Fu MC, Ellenbecker TS, Renstrom PA, Windler GS, Dines DM. Epidemiology of injuries in tennis players. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med* 2018;11:1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12178-018-9452-9>.
 42. Rattner JB, Matyas JR, Barclay L, Holowaychuk S, Sciore P, Lo IKY, et al. New understanding of the complex structure of knee menisci: implications for injury risk and repair potential for athletes. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2011;21:543–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0838.2009.01073.x>.
 43. Escamilla R, Fleisig G, Zheng N, Lander J, Barrentine S, Andrews J, et al. Effects of technique variations on knee biomechanics during the squat and leg press. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise* 2001;33:1552–66.
 44. Hellio Le Graverand MP, Ou Y, Schield-Yee T, Barclay L, Hart D, Natsume T, et al.

- The cells of the rabbit meniscus: their arrangement, interrelationship, morphological variations and cytoarchitecture. *J Anat* 2001;**198**:525–35. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1469-7580.2000.19850525.x>.
45. Yu B, Garrett WE. Mechanisms of non- contact ACL injuries. *Br J Sports Med* 2007;**41**:i47–51. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2007.037192>.
46. Kuhne C, Zettl R, Nast-Kolb D. Injuries and frequency of complaints in competitive tennis and leisure sports. *Sportverletz Sportschaden* 2004;**18**:85–89.
47. Majewski M, Susanne H, Klaus S. Epidemiology of athletic knee injuries: A 10-year study. *Knee* 2006;**13**:184–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2006.01.005>.
48. Hewett TE, Myer GD, Ford KR, Heidt RS, Colosimo AJ, McLean SG, et al. Biomechanical measures of neuromuscular control and valgus loading of the knee predict anterior cruciate ligament injury risk in female athletes: a prospective study. *Am J Sports Med* 2005;**33**:492–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546504269591>.
49. Hewett TE, Torg JS, Boden BP. Video analysis of trunk and knee motion during non-contact anterior cruciate ligament injury in female athletes: lateral trunk and knee abduction motion are combined components of the injury mechanism. *Br J Sports Med* 2009;**43**:417–22. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2009.059162>.
50. Olsen O, Myklebust G, Engebretsen L, Bahr R. Injury mechanisms for anterior cruciate ligament injuries in team handball: a systematic video analysis. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 2004;**32**:1002–1012.
51. Berns GS, Hull ML, Patterson HA. Strain in the anteromedial bundle of the anterior cruciate ligament under combination loading. *J Orthop Res* 1992;**10**:167–76. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jor.1100100203>.
52. Markolf KL, Burchfield DM, Shapiro MM, Shepard MF, Finerman GA, Slauterbeck JL. Combined knee loading states that generate high anterior cruciate ligament forces. *J Orthop Res* 1995;**13**:930–5. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jor.1100130618>.
53. Meyer EG, Haut RC. Excessive compression of the human tibio-femoral joint causes ACL rupture. *Journal of Biomechanics* 2005;**38**:2311–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.10.003>.
54. Meyer E, Baumer T, Slade J, Smith W, Haut R. Tibiofemoral contact pressures and osteochondral microtrauma during anterior cruciate ligament rupture due to excessive compressive loading and internal torque of the human knee. *American Journal of Sport Medicine* 2008;**36**:1966–77.
55. Quatman CE, Hewett TE. The anterior cruciate ligament injury controversy: is “valgus collapse” a sex-specific mechanism? *Br J Sports Med* 2009;**43**:328–35. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2009.059139>.
56. Andrews K, Lu A, Mckean L, Ebraheim N. Review: Medial collateral ligament injuries. *J Orthop* 2017;**14**:550–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jor.2017.07.017>.
57. Bates N, Schilaty N, Nagelli C, Krych A, Hewett T. Multiplanar loading of the knee and its influence on anterior cruciate ligament and medial collateral ligament strain during simulated landings and noncontact tears. *American Journal of Sport Medicine* 2019;**47**:1844–53.
58. Shin C, Chaudhari A, Andriacchi T. The effect of isolated valgus moments on ACL strain during single-leg standing: a simulation study. *Journal of Biomechanics* 2009;**42**:280–5.
59. Johnson R, Pope M, Weisman G, Ettlinger C. Knee injury in skiing: a multifaceted approach. *American Journal of Sport Medicine* 1979;**7**:321–7.
60. Abrams G, Renstrom P, Safran M. Epidemiology of musculoskeletal injury in the tennis player. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2012;**46**:492–498.

Figure 1




Figure caption

Fig. 1. Experimental set-up protocol with the three forehand stances. FP: force plate

Figure 1






Table 1

Statistical comparison of GRF peaks across the 3 forehand stances.

GRF (N)	ANS	AOS	DOS	ANOVA <i>p</i> value	Effect size <i>d</i>	Post Hoc Differences <i>p</i> value
Anterior GRF	468 ± 195	458 ± 86	382 ± 92	0.256	/	/
Lateral GRF	786 ± 235	1035 ± 229	1385 ± 165	< 0.001	0.748	DOS-ANS DOS-AOS ANS-AOS
Vertical GRF	1684 ± 370	1873 ± 387	2171 ± 513	0.035	0.380	DOS-ANS DOS-AOS ^T

Values are expressed as mean ± SD. Abbreviations: ANS = attacking neutral stance, AOS = attacking open stance, DOS = defensive open stance. DOS-ANS, significant difference between defensive open stance and attacking neutral stance forehands. DOS-AOS, significant difference between defensive open stance and attacking open stance forehands. ANS-AOS, significant difference between attacking neutral stance and attacking open stance forehands. DOS-AOS^T, tendency toward a difference between defensive open stance and attacking open stance forehands.

Table 2

Statistical comparison of the ranges of knee motion across the 3 forehand stances.

Knee kinematics (°)	ANS	AOS	DOS	ANOVA <i>p</i> value	Effect size <i>d</i>	Post Hoc Differences <i>p</i> value
Knee flexion						
Minimum	30 ± 6	27 ± 7	30 ± 9	0.306	/	/
Maximum	83 ± 8	70 ± 6	86 ± 7	< 0.001	0.732	DOS-ANS DOS-AOS
Flexion-extension range of motion	53 ± 7	42 ± 8	56 ± 7	0.003	0.566	DOS-AOS ANS-AOS
Knee abduction / adduction						
Minimum	-12 ± 12	-22 ± 15	-35 ± 19	0.008	0.432	DOS-ANS DOS-AOS
Maximum	13 ± 16	-11 ± 11	-16 ± 16	< 0.001	0.546	DOS-ANS AOS-ANS
Adduction-abduction range of motion	25 ± 7	11 ± 5	19 ± 7	0.004	0.543	ANS-AOS DOS-ANS ^T DOS-AOS ^T
Knee internal / external rotation						
Minimum	-18 ± 11	-12 ± 12	-21 ± 8	0.355	/	/
Maximum	12 ± 19	13 ± 16	15 ± 23	0.591	/	/
Internal – external rotation range of motion	30 ± 22	25 ± 10	37 ± 23	0.245	/	/

Values are expressed as mean ± SD. Abbreviations: ANS = attacking neutral stance, AOS = attacking open stance, DOS = defensive open stance. DOS-ANS, significant difference between defensive open stance and attacking neutral stance forehands. DOS-AOS, significant difference between defensive open stance and attacking open stance forehands. ANS-AOS, significant difference between attacking neutral stance and attacking open stance forehands. DOS-AOS^T, tendency toward a difference between defensive open stance and attacking open stance forehands. DOS-ANS^T, tendency toward a difference between defensive open stance and attacking neutral stance forehands.

Table 3

Statistical comparison of the maximal values of knee forces across the 3 forehand stances.

Knee joint forces (N)	ANS	AOS	DOS	ANOVA <i>p</i> value	Effect size <i>d</i>	Post Hoc Differences <i>p</i> value
Posterior force	149 ± 45	234 ± 126	243 ± 109	0.091	/	/
Anterior force	604 ± 148	755 ± 168	580 ± 227	0.052	/	/
Compressive force	1475 ± 335	1806 ± 400	2040 ± 445	0.023	0.417	DOS-ANS AOS-ANS ^T
Distractive force	107 ± 24	99 ± 26	189 ± 60	< 0.001	0.680	DOS-ANS DOS-AOS
Medial force	204 ± 40	221 ± 71	322 ± 112	< 0.002	0.579	DOS-ANS DOS-AOS
Lateral force	94 ± 36	68 ± 35	97 ± 73	0.654	/	/

Values are expressed as mean ± SD. Abbreviations: ANS = attacking neutral stance, AOS = attacking open stance, DOS = defensive open stance. DOS-ANS, significant difference between defensive open stance and attacking neutral stance forehands. DOS-AOS, significant difference between defensive open stance and attacking open stance forehands. DOS-ANS^T, tendency toward a difference between defensive open stance and attacking neutral stance forehands.

Table 4

Statistical comparison of the maximal values of knee torques across the 3 forehand stances.

Knee flexion torques (Nm)	ANS	AOS	DOS	ANOVA <i>p</i> value	Effect size <i>d</i>	Post Hoc Differences <i>p</i> value
Extension	189 ± 30	179 ± 45	182 ± 75	0.901	/	/
Flexion	51 ± 13	80 ± 32	112 ± 46	0.013	0.464	DOS-ANS DOS-AOS ^T
Adduction (varus)	55 ± 36	58 ± 23	59 ± 76	0.985	/	/
Abduction (valgus)	83 ± 24	101 ± 20	230 ± 41	< 0.001	0.899	DOS-ANS DOS-AOS
Internal torque	27 ± 12	9 ± 7	10 ± 7	< 0.001	0.703	DOS-ANS ANS-AOS
External torque	28 ± 5	32 ± 11	52 ± 13	< 0.001	0.631	DOS-ANS DOS-AOS

Values are expressed as mean ± SD. Abbreviations: ANS = attacking neutral stance, AOS = attacking open stance, DOS = defensive open stance. DOS-ANS, significant difference between defensive open stance and attacking neutral stance forehands. DOS-AOS, significant difference between defensive open stance and attacking open stance forehands. ANS-AOS, significant difference between attacking neutral stance and attacking open stance forehands. DOS-AOS^T, tendency toward a difference between defensive open stance and attacking open stance forehands.