

# Brazilian Journal of Physical Therapy



https://www.journals.elsevier.com/brazilian-journal-of-physical-therapy

### SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

## Prevalence of knee osteoarthritis in former athletes: a systematic review with meta-analysis



Fernanda O. Madaleno<sup>a</sup>, Bruna A. Santos<sup>a</sup>, Vanessa L. Araújo<sup>a</sup>, Vinicius C. Oliveira<sup>b</sup>, Renan A. Resende<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Physical Therapy, School of Physical Education, Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil

<sup>b</sup> Postgraduate Program in Rehabilitation and Functional Performance, Universidade Federal dos Vales do Jequitinhonha e Mucuri (UFVJM), Diamantina, Minas Gerais, Brazil

Received 24 November 2017; received in revised form 13 March 2018; accepted 22 March 2018 Available online 4 April 2018

| KEYWORDS<br>Sports;<br>Knee joints;<br>Osteoarthroses;<br>Data pooling | Abstract<br>Background: Prevalence of knee osteoarthritis in former athletes is still unclear.<br>Objective: To investigate prevalence of knee osteoarthritis in former athletes. Moreover, the<br>secondary aim was to investigate whether poor methodological quality of included studies,<br>different diagnosis criteria for knee osteoarthritis, different sports modality or sex impact on<br>overall estimated prevalence of knee osteoarthritis in former athletes.<br>Methods: Searches on MEDLINE, EMBASE, AMED, SPORTDiscus and CINAHL from the earli-<br>est record to February 2018 and hand-searching identified studies investigating prevalence<br>of knee osteoarthritis in former athletes. Meta-analysis was conducted and the GRADE sys-<br>tem summarized strength of the current recommendations. Sensitivity analyses investigated |
|--|---|
|  | whether methodological quality, diagnostic criteria, type of sports or sex impacted on the overall estimated prevalence in former athletes. This review was registered at PROSPERO (CRD42016050903).<br><i>Results:</i> Fifteen studies were included and pooling of 3100 participants estimated overall prevalence of knee osteoarthritis in former athletes of 30.0% (95% CI: 20.0 to 40.0%). The strength of the current recommendations was low-quality. Sensitivity analyses suggested that different diagnostic criteria for knee osteoarthritis and type of sports may impact on the overall estimated prevalence.   |
|  | Conclusions: Prevalence of knee osteoarthritis in former athletes was 30.0%. Researchers, clin-<br>icians and policymakers should be careful about potential prevalence differences among type<br>of sports and diagnostic criteria. Current low-quality evidence shows that future high-quality<br>studies are likely to impact on the estimated prevalence.<br>© 2018 Associação Brasileira de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Fisioterapia. Published by Elsevier<br>Editora Ltda. All rights reserved.  |

\* Corresponding author at: Avenida Antônio Carlos 6627, Pampulha, School of Physical Education, Physical, Therapy and Occupational Therapy, Department of Physical Therapy, Rehabilitation, Sciences Program, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

E-mail: renan.aresende@gmail.com (R.A. Resende).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjpt.2018.03.012

<sup>1413-3555/© 2018</sup> Associação Brasileira de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Fisioterapia. Published by Elsevier Editora Ltda. All rights reserved.

#### Introduction

Osteoarthritis (OA) is a degenerative disease characterized by loss and degradation of articular cartilage in addition to synovial inflammation, leading to joint stiffness, swelling, pain and loss of mobility.1 It is influenced by genetic and epigenetic factors,<sup>2,3</sup> sex,<sup>4</sup> ethnicity,<sup>5</sup> age,<sup>1</sup> obesity,<sup>4,6</sup> sedentary lifestyle<sup>7</sup> and joint injuries.<sup>1</sup> For example, obesity increases joint loading<sup>1,4,6</sup> and inflamatory mediators,<sup>1</sup> which helps to explain its relationship with OA. In addition, sedentary lifestly increases the risk of having metabolic syndrome, type 2 diabetes and insulin resistance, which are also related to the development of the disease.<sup>8</sup> According to epidemiological studies, the knee is the most frequently affected joint by OA, with prevalence ranging from 164 to 250 cases per 100,000 in the general population.9,10 This may be explained by the higher knee vulnerability to direct (knocked) and indirect (twisted) trauma,<sup>11</sup> along with the high load supported by this joint.

Sports participation might be beneficial for knee joint cartilage and consequently protect against the occurrence of knee OA in former athletes. Jones et al.<sup>12</sup> demonstrated that children who participated in more vigorous sports gained twice as much tibial articular cartilage as those who participated in less active sports, suggesting that articular cartilage positively responds to increased loads. Although studies with adults did not demonstrate effects of sports participation in cartilage thickness,<sup>13</sup> most athletes start participating in sports in childhood or adolescence,<sup>14</sup> which may act as a protective factor for knee OA later in life. It should be noted that sports participation also reduces body fat mass,<sup>15</sup> a known risk factor for OA,<sup>9</sup> prevents the loss of cartilage proteoglicans, 16,17 which are responsible for cartilage's viscoelastic properties,<sup>18</sup> and increases muscle mass and strength,<sup>19,20</sup> which might reduce loading on joint passive components (e.g. cartilage).

On the other hand, athletes are under high physical demands during many years, which increases their susceptibility to knee joint injuries.<sup>21,22</sup> Chen et al.<sup>21</sup> demonstrated that the knee was the joint most frequently affected by sports injuries, with 58.8% of athletes having some type of knee injury. This may occur because the knee is particularly vulnerable to direct and indirect trauma.<sup>11</sup> Knee injuries produce a local inflammation associated with degradation of the articular cartilage.<sup>23,24</sup> Moreover, athletes are more frequently submitted to knee surgeries<sup>25–30</sup> and often become overweight after retirement, which are also risk factors for knee OA.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, considering that the knee injuries are common in athletes, former athletes might actually have a high prevalence of knee OA.

Previous reviews<sup>32–35</sup> on this topic did not focus on knee OA<sup>35</sup> prevalence or presented important limitations, and thus, prevalence of knee OA in former athletes is still unclear. For instance, they restricted date of publication<sup>32–34</sup> and language<sup>32–34</sup> of included studies. The primary aim of this systematic review with meta-analysis was to investigate the prevalence of knee OA in former athletes. The secondary aim was to investigate whether poor methodolog-ical quality of included studies, different diagnosis criteria, type of sport or sex impact on overall estimated prevalence of knee OA in former athletes.

athletes would present high prevalence of knee OA, and that methodological quality of included studies, different diagnosis criteria, type of sport and sex would influence on this prevalence. Knee OA causes disability and consequently increases health care costs.<sup>36</sup> Therefore, the results of this systematic review may help to improve understanding about the relationship between sports practice and knee OA prevalence and also provide sports organizations and health care systems important data on a highly prevalent health condition in the general population.

#### Methods

The protocol of this review was prospectively registered at PROSPERO (CRD42016050903) and methods followed recommendations from the Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers' Manual (The Systematic Review of Prevalence and Incidence Data),<sup>37</sup> the Cochrane Collaboration<sup>38</sup> and PRISMA reporting guidelines.<sup>39</sup>

#### Searches and inclusion criteria

Electronic searches were conducted on MEDLINE (via Ovid), EMBASE, AMED, SPORTDiscus and CINAHL from the earliest record to February 2018, without language restriction. In addition, we hand-searched identified reviews in the field. Hand-searching was performed trough the reading of the entire list of references of all identified systematic reviews related to the topic of our study. Detailed search strategy using descriptors related to "prevalence", "former athletes" and "osteoarthritis" is presented in Appendix 1.

All published studies that investigated prevalence of knee OA in former athletes were considered in this review. To be included, studies had to investigate participants with knee OA based on at least one of the following diagnosis criteria: (a) imaging; (b) clinical examination; and/or (c) self-reported. Due to inconsistency in how former athletes are named in the literature, we included studies in which at least one of the following descriptors was used by the authors as their included sample of former athletes: "former athletes"; "ex-athletes"; "former elite athletes"; "master athletes"; and "retired athletes".

#### Study selection

Two independent reviewers (BAS and FOM) screened titles and abstracts, and assessed potential full-texts. We included potential full-texts fulfilling eligibility criteria described in previous section. Between-reviewer agreement was tested through Kappa statistics, showing a moderate agreement (k = 0.7, p < 0.001). Between-reviewer disagreements were solved by a third reviewer (RAR).

#### Data extraction and study rating

Two independent reviewers extracted data (BAS and FOM), and disagreements were solved by consulting a third reviewer (RAR). Extracted data included study design, setting, study population, OA definition, diagnostic criteria and prevalence of knee OA. For prevalence, we extracted percentage and/or number of knee OA cases. As most of the studies did not clearly state in which of the knee joints the OA prevalence was investigated (i.e. tibiofemoral, patellofemoral or both joints), we decided to report prevalence of OA in both joints altogether. In addition, when studies reported prevalence of OA in different knee joints (i.e. tibiofemoral or patellofemoral joints), different lower limb sides, or using different diagnostic criteria, the higher prevalence data were computed and reported. Finally, when studies reported prevalence in different sport modalities, we computed and reported the general prevalence for that study.

Two independent reviewers (BAS and FOM) also assessed risk of bias for each included study using ''The Joanna Briggs Institute Prevalence Critical Appraisal Tool''.<sup>37</sup> Each item was rated as 'yes', 'no' or 'unclear' according to information available in each study, with a maximum score of 10

sample size = 
$$\frac{Z_{1-\alpha/2}:p(1-p)}{d^2}$$

where *p* was the expected prevalence (19.0%), defined based on a previous study,<sup>40</sup> *Z* was the confidence level (1.96) and *d* was the precision (5.0%).<sup>41</sup> Sample size estimation resulted in an appropriate sample size of 236 participants. A third reviewer (RAR) solved potential disagreements regarding risk of bias scoring.

#### Data analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize data.  $I^2$  statistics was used to assess among-study heterogeneity and



\*Abstracts and potentially relevant full-texts could be excluded due to more than one inclusion criterion. OA, osteoarthritis.

Figure 1 PRISMA flow-chart of studies through the review. \*Abstracts and potentially relevant full-texts could be excluded due to more than one inclusion criterion. OA, osteoarthritis.

pooling estimated prevalence of knee OA in former athletes, following the Cochrane recommendations.<sup>38</sup> For pooling, fixed-effects model was used when  $l^2 < 50.0\%$  and random-effects model was used when  $l^2 \ge 50.0\%$ .<sup>38</sup> Findings from pooling and individual studies were presented in forest plots with 95% Confidence Interval (CI).

The GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) system was used to summarize the overall quality of the evidence.<sup>42</sup> The four levels of the GRADE system range from high-quality evidence, in which further research is very unlikely to change the estimate of prevalence, to very low-guality evidence, in which the estimate of prevalence is very uncertain.<sup>42</sup> Scoring of evidence started at high-quality evidence, which was downgraded one level if one of the following pre-specified criteria was present: (i) poor methodological quality (average risk of bias <5 points out of  $10^{43}$ ); (ii) imprecision (when >50.0%of the analyzed studies did not present appropriate sample size - minimum of 236 participants); (iii) indirectness (when >50.0% of the studies did not report reliability of the diagnostic criteria for knee OA); and (iv) inconsistency (if  $l^2 > 50.0\%$ ). Two independent reviewers (BAS and FOM) assessed guality of the evidence. Kappa statistics showed a perfect between-reviewer agreement between raters for GRADE assessment (k = 1.00, p < 0.046).

Sensitivity analysis investigated whether poor methodological quality of included studies, different diagnosis criteria for knee OA, different type of sports and sex may impact on overall estimated prevalence of knee OA in former athletes. For methodological quality, we removed studies with methodological quality  $\leq 5$  out of 10. For diagnostic criteria, we pooled data for imaging, clinical examination and self-reported separately. For type of sports, we pooled data for different types of sports separately. For sex, we removed studies with female samples. All analyses were performed using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis, version 2.2.04 (Biostat, Inc.©, Englewood, New Jersey).

#### Results

#### Characteristics of the included studies

Searches retrieved 1409 titles and, after initial screening, we selected 110 potential full-texts. After evaluation of the 110 potential full-texts, 15 original studies were included in the review. Included studies were from the years of 1980 to 2016. Reasons for exclusion of potential full-texts were: not published study (n=8); participants were not former athletes (n=67); prevalence was not investigated (n=15); or diagnosis of knee OA was not reported (n=5) (Fig. 1).

Participants of all studies were male, except for one study.<sup>44</sup> Ten out of fifteen included studies were cross-sectional,<sup>45–54</sup> four were cohort<sup>44,55–57</sup> and one was a case-control study.<sup>58</sup> For diagnostic criteria, ten out of fifteen studies used imaging<sup>44–46,48–50,53–55,58</sup> (i.e. Ultrasound,<sup>49</sup> X-ray<sup>30–32,34,36,39–41,45</sup> and/or Magnetic Resonance Imaging<sup>45</sup>), five used clinical exams<sup>46,53,55,56,58</sup> and three used self-reported.<sup>51,52,57</sup> Three reported prevalence in different sport modalities<sup>33,41,42</sup> (Table 1).

#### Methodological quality

Mean methodological quality was 6.3 out of 10 (ranging from 4 to 9). Four studies out of fifteen scored  $\leq$ 5 out of 10.<sup>46,47,51,57</sup> Methodological quality issues are reported in Table 2. Out of fifteen studies, five did not analyze data with sufficient coverage of the identified sample, <sup>46,47,50,51,55</sup> four did not use reliable diagnostic criteria for knee OA<sup>47,51,52,57</sup> (i.e. self-reported diagnosis), eight did not present reliability of the method used to identify knee OA, <sup>46,47,49,51,52,54,56,57</sup> twelve did not report subpopulations using objective criteria<sup>44–46,48–54,57,58</sup> and eleven did not reach appropriate sample size. <sup>44–46,48–51,53,55,57,58</sup>

#### Prevalence of knee OA in former athletes

Pooling of 3100 participants from the 15 included studies estimated prevalence of knee OA (Fig. 2). According to the GRADE system used in the review, studies provided low-quality evidence that prevalence of knee OA in former athletes is 30.0% (95% CI: 20.0 to 40.0%). Evidence was downgraded from high- to low-quality because of imprecision (when  $\geq$ 50.0% of the analyzed studies did not present appropriate sample size – minimum of 236 participants) and inconsistency (if  $I^2 \geq$  50.0%).

#### Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analyses showed that exclusion of studies with methodological quality  $\leq 5$  out of  $10^{46,47,51,57}$  and sex<sup>44</sup> did not impact on the estimated prevalence. However, prevalence varied among diagnosis criteria and type of sports. For diagnostic criteria, estimates were 40.0% (95% CI: 20.0 to 60.0%) for imaging, 30.0% (95% CI: 20.0 to 30.0%) for self-reported and 10.0% (95% CI: 10.0 to 30.0%) for clinical examination. For type of sports, estimates were 30.0% (95% CI: 20.0 to 50.0%) for soccer; 20.0% (95% CI: 20.0 to 30.0%) for track and field; and 10.0% (95% CI: 0.0 to 50.0%) for rifle shooting. Therefore, analyses suggested that diagnostic criteria and type of sports impact on estimated prevalence, but not poor methodological quality or sex. See Fig. 3 for detailed sensitivity analyses.

#### Discussion

This is the first systematic review with meta-analysis primarily aiming to investigate prevalence of knee OA in former athletes. Prevalence of knee OA was 30.0% (95% CI 20.0 to 40.0%). Current low-quality evidence suggests that estimated prevalence is likely to change with future high-quality studies.

Previous studies showed that the prevalence of knee OA in general population ranged from 19.0 to 28.0%.<sup>40,55</sup> Thus, the prevalence of knee OA in former athletes may be higher than in general population, which may be related to higher frequency of knee injuries<sup>21,22,40,59-62</sup> and increased knee loading<sup>56,58,59,61-64</sup> during sports participation. Knee injuries, such as fractures, ligament ruptures and meniscal tears are strong risk factors for the development of knee OA.<sup>9,55,65,66</sup> According to Kujala et al.,<sup>55</sup> the risk of developing knee

| Table 1 Characteristics of the included studies ( | ( <i>n</i> = 15). |
|---|-------------------|
|---|-------------------|

| Study, year                              | Design                   | Setting  | Study Population   | OA definition and<br>measurement  | Prevalence  |
|--|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Arliani et al., <sup>45</sup><br>2014    | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location: N/A<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience     | n° = 27<br>Average age: 45.6 (5.9)<br>years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football)<br>Practice duration: Sports<br>career that lasted at<br>least 5 years   | Bilateral knee<br>radiography and<br>magnetic resonance<br>imaging  | Knee OA <sup>*</sup> : Not reported<br>OA in dominant knee <sup>*</sup> :<br>(18) <sup>**</sup> 66.6%<br>OA in non-dominant<br>knee <sup>*</sup> : (18) <sup>**</sup> 66.6%   |
| Drawer and<br>Fuller, <sup>51</sup> 2001 | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location: England<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience | n° = 185<br>Average age: 47.6 (13.2)<br>years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football)<br>Practice duration: Not<br>reported  | Self-administered postal<br>questionnaire based on<br>established published<br>knowledge and criteria<br>for assessing the causes,<br>presence and severity of<br>OA  | Knee OA <sup>*</sup> : Not reported<br>Right knee OA <sup>*</sup> : (35) <sup>**</sup><br>19.0%<br>Left knee OA <sup>*</sup> : (39) <sup>**</sup><br>21.3%  |
| Elleuch et al., <sup>46</sup><br>2008    | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location: Tunisia<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience | n <sup>°</sup> = 50<br>Average age: 49.2 (3.8)<br>years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football)<br>Practice duration: Sports<br>career that lasted at<br>least 10 years  | Radiological criteria and clinical examination  | Knee OA*: (40)** 80.0%  |
| losifidis et al., <sup>58</sup><br>2015  | Case-control study       | Location: Greece<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience  | n° = 218 (Soccer: 121,<br>skiing: 42, volleyball: 17,<br>martial arts: 16, track<br>and field: 11, basketball:<br>11)<br>Average age: 50.1 (8.5)<br>years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football),<br>skiing, volleyball,<br>martial arts, basketball<br>and track and field<br>Practice duration: 15.3<br>(6.3) years | Radiological criteria<br>classified according to<br>the<br>Kellgren and Lawrence<br>classification scale,<br>Clinical examination<br>Questionnaire including<br>items on<br>physician-diagnosed<br>knee OA (yes/no) | Clinical knee OA: (19)**<br>8.7%<br>Soccer: (11)** 9.0%,<br>Skiing: (4)** 9.5%,<br>Volleyball: (1)** 5.8%,<br>Marcial Arts: (1)** 6.2%,<br>Track and Field: (1)**<br>9.1%, Basketball: (1)**<br>9.1%<br>Radiographic knee OA:<br>(34)** 19.76<br>Soccer: (20)** 16.5%,<br>Skiing: (7)** 16.6%,<br>Volleyball: (2)** 11.7%,<br>Martial Arts: (1)** 6.2%,<br>Track and Field: (1)**<br>9.0%, Basketball: (3)**<br>27.2% |

| Table 1         (Continued)            |                          |  |  |   |   |
|--|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Study, year                            | Design                   | Setting  | Study Population   | OA definition and measurement   | Prevalence  |
| Kettunen et al., <sup>47</sup><br>2001 | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location: Finland<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience | <pre>n<sup>*</sup> = 867 (Endurance<br/>sport: 122, track and<br/>field: 212, team sport:<br/>228, power sport: 253,<br/>shooting: 52)<br/>Average age: Endurance<br/>sport<br/>68.8 (9.4), track and<br/>field sport 64.4 (9.3),<br/>team sport: 61.8 (8.3),<br/>power sport 64.5 (8.3),<br/>shooting 70.7 (10.8)<br/>Gender: Male<br/>Sport: Endurance sports<br/>(Long-distance running,<br/>Cross-country skiing),<br/>team sports (Soccer<br/>(football), Hockey,<br/>Basketball), track and<br/>field, power sports<br/>(Boxing, Wrestling,<br/>Weight lifting, Throwing)<br/>and shooting<br/>Practice duration: Not<br/>reported</pre> | Questionnaire in which<br>respondents were asked<br>whether they have ever<br>been diagnosed by a<br>physician before or after<br>the age of 45 | Knee OA <sup>*</sup> : (230) <sup>**</sup> 26.5%<br>Endurance: (31) <sup>**</sup> 25.4%<br>Track and field: (49) <sup>**</sup><br>23.1%, Team sport: (70) <sup>**</sup><br>30.7%, Power sport:<br>(69) <sup>**</sup> 27.3%, Shooting:<br>(11) <sup>**</sup> 21.2% |
| Kettunen et al., <sup>57</sup><br>2006 | Cohort study             | Location: Finland<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience | n° = 84<br>Average age: 58.3 (10.3)<br>years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Track and field<br>Practice duration: Not<br>reported   | Health questionnaire  | Knee OA*: (17)** 20.2%  |
| Klunder et al., <sup>53</sup><br>1980  | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location: Denmark<br>Sample selection:<br>Randomly   | n° = 30<br>Average age: 56.4<br>(range, 40-79) years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football)<br>Practice duration: 22.8<br>(range 11-41 years)   | Radiological criteria and clinical examination  | Knee OA*: (8)** 26.7%   |

| Study, year                           | Design                   | Setting   | Study Population   | OA definition and<br>measurement   | Prevalence   |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Krajnc et al., <sup>48</sup><br>2010  | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location: Slovenia<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience | n° = 40<br>Average age: 49.2 (9.7)<br>years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football)<br>Practice duration: At<br>least 3 years of<br>involvement at the<br>professional level   | Radiological criteria<br>classified according to<br>the Kellgren and<br>Lawrence classification<br>scale                         | Knee OA <sup>*</sup> : Not reported<br>Non-dominant leg: (23) <sup>**</sup><br>57.5%<br>Dominant leg: (17) <sup>**</sup><br>42.5%  |
| Kujala et al., <sup>55</sup><br>1995  | Cohort study             | Location: Finland<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience  | n° = 117 (long-distance<br>runners: 28, soccer<br>players: 31, weight<br>lifters: 29, shooting: 29)<br>Average age: 45–68<br>years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football),<br>long distance running,<br>weightlifting and<br>shooting<br>Practice duration: Not<br>reported | Radiological criteria and clinical examination   | Knee OA: (23) <sup>44</sup> 19.6%<br>Shooting (1) <sup>45</sup> 3.0%,<br>soccer players (9) <sup>45</sup><br>29.0%, weight lifters (9) <sup>46</sup><br>31.0% and long-distance<br>runners (4) <sup>46</sup> 14.2% |
| Paxinos et al., <sup>49</sup><br>2016 | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location: Greece<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience   | n <sup>*</sup> = 100<br>Average age: 46.9 (5.9)<br>years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football)<br>Practice duration: 20.5<br>years   | Ultrasound examination<br>of the knee was<br>performed according to<br>published guidelines and<br>bilateral knee<br>radiography | Sonographic prevalence<br>of knee OA*: (52)** 52.0%  |
| Rajabi et al., <sup>50</sup><br>2012  | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location: Iran<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience     | n° = 22<br>Average age: 56.6 (5.17)<br>years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Table tennis<br>Practice duration: At<br>least 10 years of<br>involvement at the<br>professional level  | Radiological criteria<br>classified according to<br>the Kellgren and<br>Lawrence classification<br>scale                         | Radiographic knee OA <sup>*</sup> :<br>(12) <sup>**</sup> 54.5%  |

| Study, year                           | Design                   | Setting   | Study Population  | OA definition and<br>measurement  | Prevalence   |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Roos et al., <sup>54</sup> 1994       | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location:<br>Sweden<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience                  | n° = 286<br>Average age: 55.5 years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football)<br>Practice duration: Not reported  | Radiological criteria<br>classified according to<br>Ahlbäck   | Knee OA*: (20)** 7.0%  |
| Spector et al., <sup>44</sup><br>1996 | Cohort study             | Location: United<br>Kingdom, England<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience | n° = 81 (middle and<br>long-distance runners: 67,<br>tennis players: 14)<br>Average age: 52.3 (6.1) years<br>Gender: Female<br>Sport: Running (middle and<br>long distance) and tennis<br>Practice duration: Not reported   | Radiological criteria<br>classified according to<br>the Kellgren and<br>Lawrence classification<br>scale                    | Knee OA <sup>*</sup> : Not reported<br>Knee at tibiofemoral joint:<br>Osteophytes: (18) <sup>**</sup> 22.2%,<br>Narrowing: (28) <sup>**</sup> 34.6%;<br>Knee at patellofemoral<br>joint: Osteophytes: (34) <sup>**</sup><br>42.0%, Narrowing: (11) <sup>**</sup><br>13.6%            |
| Turner et al., <sup>52</sup><br>2000  | Cross-sectional<br>study | Location: United<br>Kingdom, England<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience | n° = 284<br>Average age: 56.1 (11.8) years<br>Gender: Male<br>Sport: Soccer (football)<br>Practice duration: 13.5 (5.3)<br>years in mean  | Questionnaire:<br>respondents were asked<br>if they had been<br>diagnosed with OA and<br>at what age they were<br>diagnosed | Knee OA <sup>*</sup> : Not reported<br>Right knee: (82) <sup>**</sup> 28.9%<br>Left knee: (62) <sup>**</sup> 21.8%   |
| Tveit et al., <sup>56</sup> 2012      | Cohort study             | Location: Sweden<br>Sample selection:<br>Expedience                     | <ul> <li>n° = 709 (Impact sports: former<br/>soccer players: 397, handball<br/>players: 147, ice hockey<br/>players; Nonimpact sports:<br/>canoeists: 43, long-distance<br/>runners: 20, weight lifters: 9,<br/>gymnasts: 8, swimmers: 8,<br/>biathletes: 6, racing cyclists: 2)<br/>Average age: 70 (range, 50–93)<br/>years<br/>Gender: Male<br/>Sport: Soccer (football),<br/>handball, ice hockey, canoeing,<br/>long-distance running,<br/>weightlifting, gymnastics,<br/>swimming, athletics and<br/>cycling<br/>Practice duration: 20.5 years</li> </ul> | Clinical examination  | Knee OA <sup>*</sup> : (129) <sup>**</sup> 19.4%<br>Nonimpact sports: (18) <sup>**</sup><br>20.0%,<br>Impact sports: (111) <sup>**</sup> 19.3%<br>being that: Soccer: (67) <sup>**</sup><br>18.2%, Handball: (30) <sup>**</sup><br>15.8% and Ice hockey: (14) <sup>**</sup><br>21.5% |

*n*, sample size; OA, osteoarthritis. <sup>\*</sup> Corresponds to the number of former athletes used to investigate the prevalence in these studies. <sup>\*\*</sup> Corresponds to the absolute prevalence of OA in former athletes.

F.O. Madaleno et al.

444

| Table 2 | Methodological | quality of | the included studies | ( <i>n</i> = 15). |
|---------|----------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------|
|         |                |            |                      |                   |

|                                       | - |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                      |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----------------------|
| Study                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Overall score (0-10) |
| Arliani et al., <sup>45</sup> 2014    | Ν | Y | Ν | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Ν  | 7                    |
| Drawer and Fuller, <sup>51</sup> 2001 | Ν | Y | Ν | Y | U | Ν | Ν | Y | Y | Ν  | 4                    |
| Elleuch et al., <sup>46</sup> 2008    | Ν | U | Ν | Y | U | Y | U | Y | Y | Ν  | 4                    |
| losifidis et al., <sup>58</sup> 2015  | Y | U | Ν | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Ν  | 7                    |
| Kettunen et al., <sup>47</sup> 2001   | Y | Ν | Y | Y | U | Ν | Ν | U | Y | Y  | 5                    |
| Kettunen et al., <sup>57</sup> 2006   | Ν | U | Ν | Y | Y | Ν | Ν | Y | Y | Ν  | 4                    |
| Klunder et al., <sup>53</sup> 1980    | Ν | Y | Ν | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Ν  | 7                    |
| Krajnc et al., <sup>48</sup> 2010     | Ν | Y | Ν | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Ν  | 7                    |
| Kujala et al., <sup>55</sup> 1995     | Y | U | Ν | Y | U | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y  | 7                    |
| Paxinos et al., <sup>49</sup> 2016    | Ν | Y | Ν | Y | Y | Y | U | Y | Y | Ν  | 6                    |
| Rajabi et al., <sup>50</sup> 2012     | Ν | Y | Ν | Y | Ν | Y | Y | Y | Y | Ν  | 6                    |
| Roos et al., <sup>54</sup> 1994       | Ν | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Ν | Y | Y | Ν  | 7                    |
| Spector et al., <sup>44</sup> 1996    | Y | Y | Ν | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Ν  | 8                    |
| Turner et al., <sup>52</sup> 2000     | Ν | Y | Y | Y | Y | Ν | Ν | Y | Y | Ν  | 6                    |
| Tveit et al., <sup>56</sup> 2012      | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | U | Y | Y | Y  | 9                    |

1. Was the sample representative of the target population?

2. Were study participants recruited in an appropriate way?

3. Was the sample size adequate?

4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?

5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?

6. Were objective, standard criteria used for the measurement of the condition?

7. Was the condition measured reliably?

8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?

9. Are all important confounding factors/subgroups/differences identified and accounted for?

10. Were subpopulations identified using objective criteria?

11. Y, yes; N, no; U, unclear; N/A, not applicable.

| Study name                                  | Event<br>rate | Lower<br>limit | Upper<br>limit | Event/<br>Total | Event rate and 95% CI |
|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> , 2014         | 0.7           | 0.5            | 0.8            | 18 / 27         | │ ┼┲╴│                |
| Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> , 2001      | 0.2           | 0.2            | 0.3            | 39 / 185        |                       |
| Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> , 2008         | 0.8           | 0.7            | 0.9            | 40 / 50         |                       |
| losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> , 2015       | 0.2           | 0.1            | 0.2            | 34 / 218        |                       |
| Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> , 2001        | 0.3           | 0.2            | 0.3            | 230 / 867       |                       |
| Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> , 2006        | 0.2           | 0.1            | 0.3            | 17 / 84         |                       |
| Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> , 1980         | 0.3           | 0.1            | 0.4            | 8 / 30          |                       |
| Krajnc et al.48, 2010                       | 0.6           | 0.4            | 0.7            | 23 / 40         |                       |
| Kujala et al. $55$ , 1995                   | 0.2           | 0.1            | 0.3            | 23 / 117        |                       |
| Paxinos et al.49, 2016                      | 0.5           | 0.4            | 0.6            | 52 / 100        |                       |
| Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> , 2012          | 0.5           | 0.3            | 0.7            | 12 / 22         |                       |
| Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> , 1994            | 0.1           | 0.0            | 0.1            | 20 / 286        |                       |
| Spector et al. <sup>44</sup> , 1996         | 0.4           | 0.3            | 0.5            | 34 / 81         |                       |
| Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> , 2000          | 0.3           | 0.2            | 0.3            | 82 / 284        |                       |
| Tveit et al. <sup>56</sup> , 2012           | 0.2           | 0.2            | 0.2            | 129 / 709       |                       |
| Pooling (l <sup>2</sup> = 49.2%; p < 0.001; | 0.3           | 0.2            | 0.4            | 761 / 3100      |                       |
| random-effects)                             |               |                |                |                 | 0.0 0.5 1.0           |
|   |               |                |                |                 | Prevalence            |

**Figure 2** Meta-analysis was conducted for the 15 studies that reported prevalence of knee osteoarthritis. Adjusted  $l^2$  was presented when analysis using random-effects model.

OA is almost five times higher in high-level male athletes with meniscal injuries, knee sprains or ligament ruptures than those without previous injuries. This finding may be explained by the articular cartilage degradation that follows joint injuries.<sup>1,62</sup> During the degradation process, the chondrocytes are not able to repair the cartilage damage,

making this process continuous and persistent.<sup>23,24</sup> In addition, trauma to the knee might cause kinematic changes that modify the cartilage region of load bearing.<sup>59</sup> For example, previous studies have demonstrated that patients following meniscectomy and anterior cruciate ligament repair have rotational and translational changes of the tibiofemoral

| Study name  | Event      | Lower<br>limit | Upper<br>limit | Event/ Event rate and 95% CI<br>Total |  |
|---|------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Excluding studies with:<br>Methodological quality $\leq 5$ or                             | rate       | mm             | mm             | Total                                 |  |
| Arliani et al. $45$ , 2014  | 0.7        | 0.5            | 0.8            | 18 / 27                               |  |
| losifidis et al $58$ 2015   | 0.2        | 0.1            | 0.2            | 34 / 218                              |  |
| losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> , 2015<br>Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> , 1980              | 0.3        | 0.1            | 0.4            | 8/30                                  |  |
| Krajnc et al. <sup>48</sup> , 2010  | 0.6        | 0.4            | 0.7            | 23 / 40                               |  |
| Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> , 1995  | 0.2        | 0.1            | 0.3            | 23 / 117                              |  |
| Paxinos et al <sup>49</sup> , 2016  | 0.5        | 0.4            | 0.6            | 52 / 100                              |  |
| Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> , 2012<br>Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> , 1994                    | 0.5        | 0.3            | 0.7            | 12 / 22                               |  |
| Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> , 1994  | 0.1        | 0.0            | 0.1            | 20 / 286                              |  |
| Spector et al. <sup>44</sup> , 1996   | 0.4        | 0.3            | 0.5            | 34/81                                 |  |
| Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> , 2000  | 0.3        | 0.2            | 0.3            | 82 / 284                              |  |
| Tveit et al. <sup>56</sup> , 2012   | 0.2        | 0.2            | 0.2            |                                       |  |
| Pooling ( $l^2 = 29.4\%$ ; $p < 0.002$ ; random-effects)                                  | 0.3        | 0.2            | 0.4            | 435 / 1914                            |  |
|   |            |                |                |                                       |  |
| Diagnostic criteria   |            |                |                |                                       |  |
| imaging examination   |            |                |                | 10-10                                 |  |
| Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> , 2014   | 0.7        | 0.5            | 0.8            | 18 / 27                               |  |
| Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> , 2008   | 0.8        | 0.7            | 0.9            | 40 / 50                               |  |
| losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> , 2015   | 0.2        | 0.1            | 0.2            | 34 / 218                              |  |
| Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> , 1980   | 0.3        | 0.1            | 0.4            | 8 / 30                                |  |
| Krajnc et al. <sup>48</sup> , 2010  | 0.6        | 0.4            | 0.7            | 23 / 40                               |  |
| Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> , 1995  | 0.2        | 0.1            | 0.3            | 23 / 117                              |  |
| Paxinos et al. <sup>49</sup> , 2016   | 0.5        | 0.4            | 0.6            | 52/100                                |  |
| Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> , 2012<br>Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> , 1994                    | 0.5        | 0.3            | 0.7<br>0.1     |                                       |  |
| Roos et al. <sup>97</sup> , 1994  | 0.1<br>0.4 | 0.0<br>0.3     | 0.1            | 20 / 286                              |  |
| Spector et al. <sup>44</sup> , 1996<br><i>Pooling (l<sup>2</sup> = 1.5%; p &lt; 0.29;</i> | 0.4        | 0.3            | 0.6            | 34 / 81                               |  |
| random-effects)   | 0.4        | 0.2            | 0.0            | 264 / 971                             |  |
| Self-reported diagnostic  |            |                |                |                                       |  |
| Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> , 2001  | 0.2        | 0.2            | 0.3            | 39 / 185                              |  |
| Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> , 2001  | 0.3        | 0.2            | 0.3            | 230 / 867                             |  |
| Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> , 2006  | 0.2        | 0.1            | 0.3            | 17 / 84                               |  |
| Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> , 2000  | 0.3        | 0.2            | 0.3            | 82 / 284                              |  |
| Pooling (I <sup>2</sup> = 41.1%; p < 0.001;   | 0.3        | 0.2            | 0.3            | 368 / 1420                            |  |
| fixed-effects)  |            |                |                |                                       |  |
| <i>Clinical diagnostic</i><br>Iosifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> , 2015                       | 0.1        | 0.1            | 0.1            | 19 / 218                              |  |
|   |            | 0.2            |                | 129 / 709                             |  |
| Tveit et al. <sup>56</sup> , 2012<br><i>Pooling (l<sup>2</sup></i> = 0.0%; p < 0.001;     | 0.2        |                | 0.2            |                                       |  |
| random-effects) random-effects  | 0.1        | 0.1            | 0.3            | 148 / 927                             |  |
|   |            |                |                |                                       |  |
| Sports modality   |            |                |                |                                       |  |
| <i>soccer</i><br>Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> , 20 <u>1</u> 4                             | 07         | 05             | 0.0            |                                       |  |
| Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> , 2001  | 0.7        | 0.5<br>0.2     | 0.8            |                                       |  |
| Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> , 2008   | 0.2        |                | 0.3            | 39 / 185                              |  |
|   | 0.8        | 0.7            | 0.9            |                                       |  |
| losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> , 2015   | 0.2        | 0.1            | 0.2            | 20 / 121                              |  |
| Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> , 1980   | 0.3        | 0.1            | 0.4            | 8/30                                  |  |
| Krajnc et al. <sup>48</sup> , 2010  | 0.6        | 0.4            | 0.7            | 23 / 40                               |  |
| Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> , 1995  | 0.3        | 0.2            | 0.5            | 9/31                                  |  |
| Paxinos et al. <sup>49</sup> , 2016   | 0.5        | 0.4            | 0.6            | 52 / 100                              |  |
| Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> , 1994  | 0.1        | 0.0            | 0.1            | 20 / 286                              |  |
| Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> , 2000  | 0.3        | 0.2            | 0.3            | 82 / 284                              |  |
| Tveit et al. <sup>56</sup> , 2012   | 0.2        | 0.1            | 0.2            | 67 / 368                              |  |
| Pooling $(l^2 = 31.5\%; p < 0.015;$   | 0.3        | 0.2            | 0.5            | 378 / 1522                            |  |
| random-effects)   |            |                |                | 0.0 0.5 1.0<br>Dravalance             |  |
|   |            |                |                | Prevalence                            |  |

Figure 3 Sensitivity analyses for poor methodological quality, different diagnostic criteria, sports modality and sex. Adjusted  $l^2$ was presented when analysis using random-effects model.

| Continuing sp | ports modality |
|---------------|----------------|
|---------------|----------------|

| Kujala et al. $^{56} = 1995$ 0.0       0.0       0.2       1/29         Pooling ( $P = 0.0\%$ ; $p < 0.033$ ;<br>random-effects)       0.0       0.0       0.5       12/81         Track and field<br>losifidis et al. $^{47} = 2001$ 0.2       0.2       0.3       49/212         Returnen et al. $^{47} = 2001$ 0.2       0.2       0.3       17/84         Pooling ( $P = 0.0\%$ ; $p < 0.001$ ;       0.2       0.2       0.3       67/307         random-effects)       0.2       0.2       0.3       30/141       Image: transform effects)         Basketball<br>losifidis et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       1/16         Handball<br>Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       1/16         Martial arts<br>losifidis et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       1/16         Sking<br>losifidis et al. $^{56} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.3       1/16         Sking<br>losifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.3       1/16         Sking<br>losifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.4       2/17         Weight ifters<br>Kujala et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.4       2/17         Martial et al. $^{59} = 1995$ <td></td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>11 / 50</td> <td></td> <td>Ĩ</td>  |                                    | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 11 / 50  |              | Ĩ   |
|---|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----------|--------------|-----|
| Proving ( $P = 0.0\%, p < 0.03$ ;<br>random-effects)<br>Track and field<br>losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015<br>kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006<br>0.2<br>0.2<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.1<br>0.4<br>1/11<br>kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006<br>0.2<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.1<br>0.6<br>3/11<br>Handball<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015<br>0.2<br>0.2<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.1<br>0.6<br>3/11<br>Handball<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2012<br>0.2<br>0.2<br>0.1<br>0.3<br>1/16<br>Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015<br>0.2<br>0.2<br>0.1<br>0.3<br>1/16<br>Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015<br>0.2<br>0.1<br>0.3<br>1/16<br>Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015<br>0.2<br>0.1<br>0.3<br>1/16<br>Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015<br>0.1<br>0.0<br>0.3<br>1/16<br>Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015<br>0.1<br>0.0<br>0.4<br>2/17<br>Weight itlers<br>Kugla et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015<br>0.1<br>0.0<br>0.4<br>2/17<br>Weight itlers<br>Kugla et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015<br>0.1<br>0.0<br>0.4<br>2/17<br>Weight itlers<br>Kugla et al. <sup>59</sup> = 1995<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.4<br>2/17<br>Weight itlers<br>Kugla et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2012<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.7<br>12/22<br>Volleyball<br>losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015<br>0.1<br>0.0<br>0.4<br>2/17<br>Weight itlers<br>Kugla et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015<br>0.2<br>0.1<br>0.2<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.5<br>9/29<br>Excluding studies with:<br>Fermale sample<br>Artiani et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015<br>0.2<br>0.1<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.4<br>7<br>2/22<br>Volleyball<br>losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015<br>0.2<br>0.1<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.4<br>7<br>2/20<br>Returnen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006<br>0.2<br>0.1<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.4<br>7<br>2/20<br>Returnen et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015<br>0.2<br>0.1<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.3<br>0.2<br>0.4<br>7<br>2/27<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.4<br>0.5<br>0.5<br>0.5<br>0.5<br>0.5<br>0.5<br>0.5<br>0.5 |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| $\begin{array}{c} \mbox{random-effects} \\ \hline \mbox{random-effects} \\ \hline \mbox{Track and field} \\ \mbox{lossfidis et al.} \\ \mbox{set al.} \\ \mbox{random-effects} \\ \hline \mbox{Returnen et al.} \\ \mbox{set al.} \\ \mbox{random-effects} \\ \hline \mbox{Basketbal} \\ \mbox{lossfidis et al.} \\ \mbox{set al.} \\ set al$   | •                                  |     | 0.0 |     |          |              |     |
| losificis et al. <sup>89</sup> = 2015 0.1 0.0 0.4 1/11<br>Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001 0.2 0.2 0.3 49/212<br>Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006 0.2 0.1 0.3 17/84<br>Pooling ( $P = 0.0\%; p < 0.001;$ 0.2 0.2 0.3 67/307<br>random-effects)<br>Basketball<br>losificis et al. <sup>89</sup> = 2015 0.3 0.1 0.6 3/11<br>Handball<br>Tveit et al. <sup>69</sup> = 2012 0.2 0.2 0.3 30/141<br>Ise hockey<br>Tveit et al. <sup>69</sup> = 2012 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.3 14/65<br>Long distance rumers<br>Kugla et al. <sup>56</sup> = 1995 0.1 0.1 0.3 4/28<br>Martial arts<br>losificis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015 0.2 0.1 0.3 7/42<br>Table tennis<br>Rajabi et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015 0.2 0.1 0.3 7/42<br>Table tennis<br>Rajabi et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015 0.1 0.0 0.4 2/17<br>Weight lifters<br>Kugla et al. <sup>56</sup> = 1995 0.3 0.2 0.5 9/29<br>Excluding studies with:<br>Fermale sample<br>Aritani et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2014 0.7 0.5 0.8 18/27<br>Drawer and fulle <sup>61</sup> = 2001 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.3 17/84<br>Ketturen et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2016 0.2 0.1 0.2 34/218<br>Ketturen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001 0.2 0.2 0.3 39/185<br>Elleuch et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2015 0.2 0.1 0.3 17/84<br>Ketturen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001 0.3 0.2 0.3 230/867<br>Ketturen et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010 0.3 0.1 0.4 8/30<br>Krajne et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010 0.3 0.1 0.4 8/30<br>Krajne et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010 0.5 0.3 0.7 12/22<br>Formale sample<br>Aritani et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010 0.3 0.2 0.3 230/867<br>Ketturen et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010 0.3 0.2 0.3 230/867<br>Ketturen et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010 0.3 0.2 0.3 230/867<br>Ketturen et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010 0.5 0.4 0.6 52/100<br>Rajabi et al. <sup>59</sup> = 1995 0.2 0.1 0.3 23/117<br>Paintons et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2012 0.5 0.3 0.7 12/22<br>Roos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2012 0.5 0.3 0.7 12/22<br>Roos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010 0.6 0.4 0.7 23/40<br>Kujat et al. <sup>59</sup> = 1995 0.2 0.1 0.3 23/117<br>Paintons et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010 0.3 0.2 0.3 82/284<br>Tveit et al. <sup>59</sup> = 1995 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.2 129/709<br>Pooling ( $P = 50.0\%; p < 0.007;$ 0.3 0.2 0.4 727/3019<br>Roos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2000 0.3 0.2 0.4 727/3019<br>Roos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2000 0.3 0.2 0.4 727/3019<br>Roos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2000 0.3 0.2 0.4 727/3019<br>Roos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2000;<br>Roos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2000;<br>Roo   |                                    |     |     |     | ,        |              |     |
| Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3       49/212         Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006       0.2       0.1       0.3       17/84         Pooling ( $\mathcal{P} = 0.0\%$ ; $p < 0.001$ ;       0.2       0.2       0.3       67/307         Basketball       losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.3       0.1       0.6       3/11         Handball       Tveit et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.2       0.3       30/141         Lice hockey       Tveit et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.1       0.3       14/65         Long distance runners       Kujala et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.1       0.3       1/16         Sking       losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3       1/16         Sking       losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.3       7/42         Table tennis       Rajabi et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7       12/22         Volleyball       losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4       2/17         Weight lifters       Kujala et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.2       0.3       39/185         Eleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2004       0.8       0.7       0.9       40/50       10.0 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Kettunen et al. $5^{5} = 2006$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 17/84<br>Point (P = 0.0%; p < 0.001; 0.2 0.2 0.3 67/307<br>Paradom-effects)<br>Basketball<br>losifidis et al. $5^{6} = 2015$ 0.3 0.1 0.6 3/11<br>Handball<br>Tveit et al. $5^{6} = 2012$ 0.2 0.2 0.3 30/141<br>Lee hockey<br>Tveit et al. $5^{6} = 2012$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 14/65<br>Long distance runners<br>Kujala et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.1 0.1 0.3 4/28<br>Martial arts<br>losifidis et al. $5^{9} = 2015$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 1/16<br>Skiing<br>losifidis et al. $5^{9} = 2015$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 7/42<br>Table tennis<br>Rajabi et al. $5^{9} = 2015$ 0.1 0.0 0.4 2/17<br>Weight lifters<br>Kujala et al. $5^{5} = 1995$ 0.3 0.2 0.5 9/29<br>Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample<br>Antian et al. $5^{6} = 2015$ 0.2 0.1 0.2 3/17<br>Weight lifters<br>Kujala et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.3 0.2 0.5 9/29<br>Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample<br>Antian et al. $5^{6} = 2015$ 0.2 0.1 0.2 3/207<br>Kettunen et al. $5^{6} = 2015$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 17/84<br>Kunder et al. $5^{6} = 2015$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 17/84<br>Kunder et al. $5^{6} = 2015$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 23/117<br>Paixnos et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 23/117<br>Paixnos et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 22/10<br>Rajabi et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 22/10<br>Rajabi et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 22/10<br>Rajabi et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 22/10<br>Rajabi et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 22/10<br>Rajabi et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 22/10<br>Rajabi et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 22/10<br>Rajabi et al. $5^{6} = 1995$ 0.2 0.1 0.3 22/10<br>Rajabi et al. $5^{6} = 2012$ 0.5 0.3 0.7 12/22<br>Poos et al. $5^{6} = 2012$ 0.2 0.2 0.2 129/709<br>Pool (P = 50.0%; p < 0.001; 0.3 0.2 0.4 727/3019<br>Pool (P = 50.0%; p < 0.001; 0.3 0.2 0.4 727/3019<br>Radom-detets)<br>0.0 0.5 1.000000000000000000000000000000  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Pooling ( $l^2 = 0.0\%$ ; $p < 0.001$ ;<br>andom-effects)       0.2       0.2       0.3       67 / 307         Basketball<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.3       0.1       0.6       3 / 11         Handball<br>Verit et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.2       0.3       30 / 141         Los hockey<br>Tveit et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.1       0.3       14 / 65         Long distance runners<br>Kujala et al. <sup>58</sup> = 1995       0.1       0.1       0.3       1 / 16         Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4       2 / 17         Weight iffere<br>Kujala et al. <sup>58</sup> = 1995       0.3       0.2       0.5       9 / 29         Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample<br>Ariani et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8       18 / 27         Drawer and fulle <sup>61</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.3       2.3       230 / 867         Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8       17 / 84         Kettunen et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2015   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| random-effects)       Basketball         losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.3       0.1       0.6       3 / 11         Handball       Tveit et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.2       0.3       30 / 141         Le hockey       Tveit et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.1       0.3       14 / 65         Long distance runners       Kujala et al. <sup>58</sup> = 1995       0.1       0.1       0.3       1 / 16         Sking       losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Josifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Sking       losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3       7 / 42         Table tennis       Rajabi et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4       2 / 17         Weight lifters       Kujala et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4       2 / 17         Weight lifters       Logo       0.3       0.2       0.5       9 / 29       Image: 2016         Eleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008       0.8       0.7       0.9       40 / 50       50       Image: 2016       0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 17         Female sample       Aniani et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2006  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.3       0.1       0.6       3 / 11         Handball<br>Tveit et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.2       0.3       30 / 141         Ice hockey<br>Tveit et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.1       0.3       14 / 65         Long distance runners<br>Kujala et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.1       0.3       4 / 28         Martial arts<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Sking<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.3       7 / 42         Table tennis<br>Rajabi et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Volleyball<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4       2 / 17         Weight lifters<br>Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.3       0.2       0.5       9 / 29         Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample<br>Artiani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8       18 / 27         Drawer and fulle <sup>61</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.1       0.3       230 / 867         Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.3       0.2       0.1       0.3       230 / 867         Kettuner et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22       4       4 <td< td=""><td></td><td>0.2</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.3</td><td>67/307</td><td>•</td><td></td></td<>  |                                    | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 67/307   | •            |     |
| Handball<br>Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.3       30 / 141 <i>lce hockey</i><br>Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       14 / 65         Long distance runners<br>Kujala et al. $^{56} = 1995$ 0.1       0.1       0.3       4 / 28         Martial arts<br>Iosifidis et al. $^{58} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Sking<br>Iosifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       7 / 42         Table tennis<br>Rajabi et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       7 / 42         Table tennis<br>Rajabi et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.4       2 / 17         Weight lifters<br>Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.3       0.2       0.5       9 / 29         Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample<br>Arliani et al. $^{46} = 2004$ 0.7       0.5       0.8       18 / 27         Drawer and fuller <sup>61</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3       39 / 185       18         Elleuch et al. $^{46} = 2008$ 0.8       0.7       0.9       40 / 50       10         Iosifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84       10         Kunder et al. $^{49} = 2010$ 0.6       0.4       0.7       23 / 217  | Basketball                         |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.3       30 / 141 <i>lce hockey</i> Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       14 / 65         Long distance runners       Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.1       0.1       0.3       4 / 28         Martial arts       losifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Sking       losifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       7 / 42         Table tennis       Rajabi et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       7 / 42         Valleyball       losifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.4       2 / 17         Weight lifters       Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.3       0.2       0.5       9 / 29         Excluding studies with: <i>Female sample</i> Arliani et al. $^{45} = 2014$ 0.7       0.5       0.8       18 / 27         Drawer and fuller $^{51} = 2001$ 0.2       0.1       0.2       3 9 / 185       16         Elleuch et al. $^{46} = 2004$ 0.7       0.5       0.8       17 / 84       18         Kettunen et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 40       17     <   | losifidis et al.58 = 2015          | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 3 / 11   |              |     |
| Ice hockey<br>Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       14 / 65         Long distance runners<br>Kujala et al. $^{56} = 1995$ 0.1       0.1       0.3       4 / 28         Martial arts<br>losifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Sking<br>losifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       7 / 42         Table tennis<br>Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Volleyball<br>losifidis et al. $^{59} = 2015$ 0.1       0.0       0.4       2 / 17         Weight lifters<br>Kujala et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.2       0.5       9 / 29         Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample<br>Artiani et al. $^{45} = 2014$ 0.7       0.5       0.8       18 / 27         Drawer and fullef <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.1       0.2       3 230 / 867       9         Kettunen et al. $^{47} = 2006$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84       9         Kuidat et al. $^{59} = 1995$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 17       9         Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100       9       9       9   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Tveit et $dl.^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       14 / 65         Long distance runners       Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.1       0.1       0.3       4 / 28         Marital arts       losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3       1 / 16         Skiing       losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.3       7 / 42         Table tennis       Rajabi et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.3       7 / 42         Volleyball       losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4       2 / 17         Weight lifters       Kujala et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4       2 / 17         Weight lifters       Kujala et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8       18 / 27         Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3       39 / 185       10         Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008       0.8       0.7       0.9       40 / 50       10         losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84       10         Kutunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.3       0.2       0.3       23 / 40       10         Kattunen et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010       0.6       <   | Tveit et al.56 = 2012              | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 30 / 141 |              |     |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Kujala et al. <sup>56</sup> = 1995       0.1       0.1       0.3 $4/28$ Martial arts       losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.3 $1/16$ Skiing       losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.3 $7/42$ Table tennis       Rajabi et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7 $12/22$ Volleyball       losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4 $2/17$ Weight lifters       Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.3       0.2       0.5 $9/29$ Excluding studies with:       Female sample       Arliani et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8 $18/27$ Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3       39/185       IB         Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2018       0.8       0.7       0.9       40/50         losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.3       17/84         Kunnen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.3       0.2       0.3       17/84         Kunner et al. <sup>59</sup> = 1995       0.2       0.1       0.3       23/117         Paxinos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010       0.6       0.4       0.7       23/40  | l veit et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 14 / 65  |              |     |
| Martial arts       Image: Second Secon   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  | Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 4 / 28   |              |     |
| Skiing<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015 $0.2$ $0.1$ $0.3$ $7/42$ Table tennis<br>Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012 $0.5$ $0.3$ $0.7$ $12/22$ Volleyball<br>losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015 $0.1$ $0.0$ $0.4$ $2/17$ Weight lifters<br>Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995 $0.3$ $0.2$ $0.5$ $9/29$ Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample<br>Artiani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014 $0.7$ $0.5$ $0.8$ $18/27$ Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001 $0.2$ $0.3$ $0.2$ $0.3$ $39/185$ Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008 $0.8$ $0.7$ $0.9$ $40/50$ $0.6$ losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015 $0.2$ $0.1$ $0.2$ $3230/867$ Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001 $0.3$ $0.2$ $0.3$ $23/40$ Kujala et al. <sup>59</sup> = 1995 $0.2$ $0.1$ $0.3$ $23/40$ Kujala et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2012 $0.5$ $0.3$ $0.7$ $12/22$ Roos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2016 $0.5$ $0.4$ $0.6$ $52/100$ Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012 $0.2$ $0.2$ $0.2$ $0.2$ $0.2$ </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.3 $7/42$ Table tennis       Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7 $12/22$ Volleyball       losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4 $2/17$ Weight lifters       Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.3       0.2       0.5 $9/29$ Excluding studies with:       Female sample       Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8 $18/27$ Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.3       39/185       Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008       0.8       0.7       0.9       40/50         losifidis et al. <sup>59</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.2       34/218       Image: additional state of the s  | losifidis et al.58 = 2015          | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1 / 16   |              |     |
| Table tennis       Table tennis         Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7 $12/22$ Volleyball       losificitis et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4 $2/17$ Weight lifters       Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.3       0.2       0.5 $9/29$ Excluding studies with:       Female sample       Artiani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8 $18/27$ Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3 $39/185$ Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008       0.8       0.7       0.9 $40/50$ losificitis et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.2 $34/218$ $46/218$ Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.3       0.2       0.3 $23/17/84$ Klunder et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006       0.2       0.1       0.3 $23/117$ Paxinos et al. <sup>48</sup> = 2016       0.5       0.4       0.6 $52/100$ Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7 $12/22$ Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> = 1994       0.1       0.0       0.1 $20/286$ Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> = 2000       0.3       0.2       0.2 $22/27/09$ <  | Skiing                             |     |     |     |          | <u>.</u>     |     |
| Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7       12/22         Volleyball<br>losifidis et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4       2/17         Weight lifters<br>Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.3       0.2       0.5       9/29         Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample  | losifidis et al.58 = 2015          | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 7 / 42   |              |     |
| Volleyball       losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4 $2/17$ Weight lifters       Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.3       0.2       0.5 $9/29$ Excluding studies with:       Female sample         Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8 $18/27$ Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3 $39/185$ Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008       0.8       0.7       0.9 $40/50$ losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.2 $320/867$ Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.3       0.2       0.3 $230/867$ Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006       0.2       0.1       0.3 $17/84$ Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> = 1980       0.3       0.1       0.4 $8/30$ Krajne et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010       0.6       0.4       0.7 $23/40$ Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.2       0.1       0.3 $23/117$ Paxinos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2016       0.5       0.4       0.6 $52/100$ Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.3       0.2       0.3 $82/284$ Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> = 20  | Table tennis                       |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4 $2/17$ Weight lifters<br>Kujat et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.3       0.2       0.5 $9/29$ Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample         Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8 $18/27$ Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3 $39/185$ Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008       0.8       0.7       0.9 $40/50$ losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.2 $34/218$ Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.3       0.2       0.3 $230/867$ Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006       0.2       0.1       0.3 $17/84$ Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> = 1980       0.3       0.1       0.4 $8/30$ Krajnc et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010       0.6       0.4       0.7 $23/40$ Kujala et al. <sup>50</sup> = 1995       0.2       0.1       0.3 $23/117$ Paxinos et al. <sup>54</sup> = 1994       0.1       0.0       0.1 $20/286$ Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> = 2000       0.3       0.2       0.3 $82/284$ Tveit et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.2       0.2 $22$   | Rajabi et al.50 = 2012             | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 12 / 22  |              | •   |
| losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.1       0.0       0.4 $2/17$ Weight lifters<br>Kujat et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.3       0.2       0.5 $9/29$ Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample         Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8 $18/27$ Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3 $39/185$ Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008       0.8       0.7       0.9 $40/50$ losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.2 $34/218$ Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.3       0.2       0.3 $230/867$ Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006       0.2       0.1       0.3 $17/84$ Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> = 1980       0.3       0.1       0.4 $8/30$ Krajnc et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010       0.6       0.4       0.7 $23/40$ Kujala et al. <sup>50</sup> = 1995       0.2       0.1       0.3 $23/117$ Paxinos et al. <sup>54</sup> = 1994       0.1       0.0       0.1 $20/286$ Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> = 2000       0.3       0.2       0.3 $82/284$ Tveit et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.2       0.2 $22$   | Volleyball                         |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.3       0.2       0.5       9 / 29         Excluding studies with:       Female sample         Arliani et al. $^{45} = 2014$ 0.7       0.5       0.8       18 / 27         Drawer and fuller $^{51} = 2001$ 0.2       0.2       0.3       39 / 185         Elleuch et al. $^{46} = 2008$ 0.8       0.7       0.9       40 / 50         losifidis et al. $^{50} = 2015$ 0.2       0.1       0.2       34 / 218         Kettunen et al. $^{47} = 2001$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       230 / 867         Kettunen et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84         Klunder et al. $^{53} = 1980$ 0.3       0.1       0.4       8 / 30         Krajnc et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100         Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       82 / 284         Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.2       129 / 709         Pooling ( $l^2 = 50.0\%; p < 0.001;$ 0.3   | losifidis et al.58 = 2015          | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 2/17     |              |     |
| Excluding studies with:<br>Female sample<br>Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014 0.7 0.5 0.8 18 / 27<br>Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001 0.2 0.2 0.3 39 / 185<br>Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008 0.8 0.7 0.9 40 / 50<br>losifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015 0.2 0.1 0.2 34 / 218<br>Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001 0.3 0.2 0.3 230 / 867<br>Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006 0.2 0.1 0.3 17 / 84<br>Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> = 1980 0.3 0.1 0.4 8 / 30<br>Krajnc et al. <sup>48</sup> = 2010 0.6 0.4 0.7 23 / 40<br>Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995 0.2 0.1 0.3 23 / 117<br>Paxinos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2016 0.5 0.4 0.6 52 / 100<br>Rajabi et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012 0.5 0.3 0.7 12 / 22<br>Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> = 1994 0.1 0.0 0.1 20 / 286<br>Turner et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012 0.2 0.2 0.2 129 / 709<br>Pooling ( $P$ = 50.0%; p < 0.001; 0.3 0.2 0.4 727 / 3019<br>random-effects) 0.0 0.5 1.0  | Weight lifters                     |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Female sample         Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8       18 / 27         Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3       39 / 185         Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008       0.8       0.7       0.9       40 / 50         Iosifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.2       34 / 218         Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.3       0.2       0.3       230 / 867         Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006       0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84         Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> = 1980       0.3       0.1       0.4       8 / 30         Krajnc et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010       0.6       0.4       0.7       23 / 40         Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 117         Paxinos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2016       0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100         Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> = 1994       0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> = 2000       0.3       0.2       0.2       12 / 709         Pooling (l <sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; p < 0.001;  | Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 9 / 29   |              |     |
| Female sample         Arliani et al. <sup>45</sup> = 2014       0.7       0.5       0.8       18 / 27         Drawer and fuller <sup>51</sup> = 2001       0.2       0.2       0.3       39 / 185         Elleuch et al. <sup>46</sup> = 2008       0.8       0.7       0.9       40 / 50         Iosifidis et al. <sup>58</sup> = 2015       0.2       0.1       0.2       34 / 218         Kettunen et al. <sup>47</sup> = 2001       0.3       0.2       0.3       230 / 867         Kettunen et al. <sup>57</sup> = 2006       0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84         Klunder et al. <sup>53</sup> = 1980       0.3       0.1       0.4       8 / 30         Krajnc et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2010       0.6       0.4       0.7       23 / 40         Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 117         Paxinos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2016       0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100         Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> = 1994       0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. <sup>52</sup> = 2000       0.3       0.2       0.2       12 / 709         Pooling (l <sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; p < 0.001;  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Arliani et al. $^{45} = 2014$ 0.70.50.818 / 27Drawer and fuller $^{51} = 2001$ 0.20.20.339 / 185Elleuch et al. $^{46} = 2008$ 0.80.70.940 / 50losifidis et al. $^{58} = 2015$ 0.20.10.234 / 218Kettunen et al. $^{47} = 2001$ 0.30.20.3230 / 867Kettunen et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.20.10.317 / 84Klunder et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.20.10.317 / 84Klunder et al. $^{53} = 1980$ 0.30.10.48 / 30Krajnc et al. $^{48} = 2010$ 0.60.40.723 / 40Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.20.10.323 / 117Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.50.40.652 / 100Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.50.30.712 / 22Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.10.00.120 / 286Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.30.20.382 / 284Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.20.20.2129 / 709Pooling (l² = 50.0%; p < 0.001;  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Drawer and fuller $^{51} = 2001$ 0.20.20.339 / 185Elleuch et al. $^{46} = 2008$ 0.80.70.940 / 50losifidis et al. $^{58} = 2015$ 0.20.10.234 / 218Kettunen et al. $^{47} = 2001$ 0.30.20.3230 / 867Kettunen et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.20.10.317 / 84Klunder et al. $^{53} = 1980$ 0.30.10.48 / 30Krajnc et al. $^{48} = 2010$ 0.60.40.723 / 40Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.20.10.323 / 117Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.50.40.652 / 100Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.50.30.712 / 22Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.10.00.120 / 286Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.30.20.382 / 284Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.20.20.2129 / 709Pooling ( $l^2 = 50.0\%; p < 0.001;$ 0.30.20.4727 / 3019random-effects)0.00.51.0   | -                                  | 07  | 0.5 | 0.8 | 18/27    |              |     |
| Elleuch et al. $^{46} = 2008$ 0.8       0.7       0.9       40 / 50         losifidis et al. $^{58} = 2015$ 0.2       0.1       0.2       34 / 218         Kettunen et al. $^{47} = 2001$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       230 / 867         Kettunen et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84         Klunder et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84         Klunder et al. $^{53} = 1980$ 0.3       0.1       0.4       8 / 30         Krajnc et al. $^{48} = 2010$ 0.6       0.4       0.7       23 / 40         Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 117         Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100         Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.2       12 / 709         Pooling (l <sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; $p < 0.001$ ;       0.3       0.2       0.4       727 / 3019         random-effects)       0.0       0.5       1.0  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              | 8   |
| losifidis et al. $^{58} = 2015$ 0.2       0.1       0.2 $34 / 218$ Kettunen et al. $^{47} = 2001$ 0.3       0.2       0.3 $230 / 867$ Kettunen et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.2       0.1       0.3 $17 / 84$ Klunder et al. $^{53} = 1980$ 0.3       0.1       0.4 $8 / 30$ Krajnc et al. $^{48} = 2010$ 0.6       0.4       0.7 $23 / 40$ Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.2       0.1       0.3 $23 / 117$ Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.5       0.4       0.6 $52 / 100$ Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7 $12 / 22$ Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1 $20 / 286$ Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.2 $12 / 22$ Pooling ( $l^2 = 50.0\%; p < 0.001;$ 0.3       0.2       0.4 $727 / 3019$ <i>pooling (l<sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; p &lt; 0.001;</i> 0.3       0.2       0.4 $727 / 3019$ <i>pooling (l<sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; p &lt; 0.001;</i> 0.3       0.2       0.4 $727 / 3019$   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Kettunen et al. $^{47} = 2001$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       230 / 867         Kettunen et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84         Klunder et al. $^{53} = 1980$ 0.3       0.1       0.4       8 / 30         Krajnc et al. $^{48} = 2010$ 0.6       0.4       0.7       23 / 40         Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 117         Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100         Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       82 / 284         Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.2       129 / 709         Pooling (l <sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; p < 0.001;   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Kettunen et al. $^{57} = 2006$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       17 / 84         Klunder et al. $^{53} = 1980$ 0.3       0.1       0.4       8 / 30         Krajnc et al. $^{48} = 2010$ 0.6       0.4       0.7       23 / 40         Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 117         Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100         Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       82 / 284         Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.2       129 / 709         Pooling (l <sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; p < 0.001;  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Klunder et al. $^{53} = 1980$ 0.3       0.1       0.4       8 / 30         Krajnc et al. $^{48} = 2010$ 0.6       0.4       0.7       23 / 40         Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 117         Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100         Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       82 / 284         Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.2       129 / 709         Pooling (l <sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; p < 0.001;   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Krajnc et al. <sup>48</sup> = 2010       0.6       0.4       0.7 $23/40$ Kujala et al. <sup>55</sup> = 1995       0.2       0.1       0.3 $23/117$ Paxinos et al. <sup>49</sup> = 2016       0.5       0.4       0.6 $52/100$ Rajabi et al. <sup>50</sup> = 2012       0.5       0.3       0.7 $12/22$ Roos et al. <sup>54</sup> = 1994       0.1       0.0       0.1 $20/286$ Turner et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012       0.2       0.2       0.2 $22/284$ Pooling ( $l^2 = 50.0\%$ ; $p < 0.001$ ;       0.3       0.2       0.4 $727/3019$ random-effects)       0.0       0.5       1.00   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Kujala et al. $^{55} = 1995$ 0.2       0.1       0.3       23 / 117         Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100         Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       82 / 284         Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.2       129 / 709         Pooling (l <sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; p < 0.001;   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              | ~   |
| Paxinos et al. $^{49} = 2016$ 0.5       0.4       0.6       52 / 100         Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7       12 / 22         Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       82 / 284         Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.2       129 / 709         Pooling ( $l^2 = 50.0\%$ ; $p < 0.001$ ;       0.3       0.2       0.4       727 / 3019         random-effects)       0.0       0.5       1.0   | •                                  |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Rajabi et al. $^{50} = 2012$ 0.5       0.3       0.7 $12/22$ Roos et al. $^{54} = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1 $20/286$ Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.3 $82/284$ Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.2 $129/709$ Pooling ( $l^2 = 50.0\%$ ; $p < 0.001$ ;       0.3       0.2       0.4 $727/3019$ nadom-effects)       0.0       0.5       1.0   | ,                                  |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Roos et al. $54 = 1994$ 0.1       0.0       0.1       20 / 286         Turner et al. $52 = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       82 / 284         Tveit et al. $56 = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       0.2       129 / 709         Pooling ( $l^2 = 50.0\%; p < 0.001;$ 0.3       0.2       0.4       727 / 3019         random-effects)       0.0       0.5       1.0  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Turner et al. $^{52} = 2000$ 0.3       0.2       0.3       82 / 284         Tveit et al. $^{56} = 2012$ 0.2       0.2       129 / 709         Pooling ( $l^2 = 50.0\%$ ; $p < 0.001$ ;       0.3       0.2       0.4       727 / 3019         random-effects)       0.0       0.5       1.0   | •                                  |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Tveit et al. <sup>56</sup> = 2012         0.2         0.2         0.2         129 / 709           Pooling (l <sup>2</sup> = 50.0%; p < 0.001;   |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| Pooling (l² = 50.0%; p < 0.001;         0.3         0.2         0.4         727 / 3019         Image: Team of the second se  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              |     |
| random-effects) 0.0 0.5 1.0   |                                    |     |     |     |          | _ <b>_</b> ▲ |     |
| Prevalence  |                                    |     |     |     |          |              | 1.0 |
|   |                                    |     |     |     |          | Prevalen     | e   |

Figure 3 (Continued)

posture.<sup>67–69</sup> These kinematic changes shift loading to cartilage regions that typically sustain lower loads, <sup>59–61</sup> initiating a cascade of degenerative changes that leads to cartilage thinning.<sup>59</sup> Finally, prevalence of knee OA in former athletes might also be explained by repetitive and increased loading associated with sports participation, <sup>55,70</sup> which may overtake muscles capacity to protect the knee, resulting in joint degeneration.<sup>34,71</sup>

The 30.0% mean prevalence of knee OA in former athletes seems to be similar to the prevalence demonstrated by other populations at higher risk of developing knee OA. For example, a previous study<sup>31</sup> estimated 27.0% of knee OA prevalence in obese individuals. Moreover, one study showed association of squatting with increased prevalence of knee OA.<sup>72</sup> More specifically, the prevalence of knee OA ranged from 30.2 to 37.5% in individuals who spend more than 60 min squatting per day. Thus, the prevalence of knee OA in former athletes is comparable to that presented by populations that present risk factors for knee OA, such as increased body fat tissue and knee loading.

Sensitivity analyses suggested that methodological quality of the included studies and sex do not impact on the prevalence of knee OA in former athletes. However, analyses suggested that diagnosis using imaging may overestimate the prevalence of knee OA (40.0%; 95% CI: 20.0 to 60.0%) when compared to self-reported (30.0%; 95% CI: 20.0 to 30.0%) and clinical diagnosis (10.0%; 95% CI: 10.0 to 30.0%). It is possible that radiographic signs of knee OA are more prevalent than its clinical symptoms. such as pain and stiffness.<sup>73</sup> In addition, radiographic signs may precede the clinical onset of knee OA,<sup>58</sup> mainly in athletes. More specifically, it is suggested that the protective effects of increased muscle strength and better joint proprioception<sup>58,71</sup> developed during sports participation increase athletes' pain threshold, <sup>58,70</sup> which contributes to the late clinical diagnosis after the onset of radiographic knee OA in this population.<sup>70</sup> Sensitivity analyses also suggested that type of sports impact on prevalence estimates. Specific demands, such as the abrupt changes of direction and increased knee loading related to sprinting, squatting, cutting and pivoting may explain differences in knee OA prevalence between different sports.<sup>34,54</sup>

Considering the high prevalence of knee OA in former athletes, sports organizations, teams and professionals should implement preventive strategies during and after athletes' careers, which might help to reduce knee OA prevalence and its associated disabilities<sup>74</sup> and socioeconomic impact.<sup>36</sup> For example, prevention strategies such as neuromuscular training associated with warm-up,<sup>75</sup> were able to reduce the occurrence of anterior cruciate ligament injuries.<sup>76,77</sup> Olsen et al.<sup>76</sup> showed that this program improves awareness and control of the knee during landing and spinning movements, reducing the occurrence of lower limbs injuries. Finally, previous studies have demonstrated that 78.0 to 80.0% of former soccer players are overweight,<sup>46,78</sup> which increases the risk of developing knee OA.<sup>79</sup> Therefore, educational programs related to healthy diet and maintenance of an active lifestyle may reduce weight gain after retirement and consequently reduce knee OA prevalence in former athletes.

Previous systematic reviews investigating the prevalence of knee OA in former athletes had methodological limitations, such as restricted date and language<sup>35</sup> of publication, lack of protocol registration in PROSPERO and non-evaluation of the strength of the evidence.<sup>32-35</sup> Moreover, no meta-analysis with the primary purpose of estimating the prevalence of knee OA in former athletes was conducted. The current systematic review with meta-analysis had its protocol prospectively registered at PROSPERO and the strength of the evidence evaluated using the GRADE system. The prevalence of knee OA found by the present study was higher than the prevalence demonstrated by one previous study<sup>34</sup> and lower than two other studies.<sup>32,33</sup> This may be explained by differences in the specific purposes and inclusion criteria between studies, which also help to explain the different number of studies included in each systematic review. Moreover, the procedures used to extract prevalence data were different. Moreover, some procedures used to evaluate quality of the included studies were different. For example, Driban et al.,<sup>34</sup> unlike others reviews,<sup>32,33</sup> assessed the quality of included studies using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS). At this moment, considering the limitations demonstrated by previous systematic reviews, we believe that this review provides timely and relevant information on prevalence of knee OA in former athletes for researchers, clinicians, people with knee OA and policymakers.

Low-quality evidence suggests that future high quality studies with higher samples and clear and reliable inclusion criteria for knee OA are likely to impact on the estimated prevalence. The strength of the current evidence was downgraded due to imprecision and inconsistency.

This study had some potential limitations. It was not possible to define specific criteria to characterize former athletes, since most of the studies do not provide information regarding this construct. In order to solve this limitation, we only included studies that clearly stated that the sample was former athletes. Level of competition, OA onset and history of knee injury might influence on estimated prevalence of knee OA. These potential influences were not considered in the current study because most studies do not report them. Future studies should define specific criteria to operationalize former athletes, such as time of exposure to sport and time since retirement. In addition, they should also standardize the diagnostic criteria of knee OA. Level of competition. OA onset and history of knee injury may influence on estimated prevalence of knee OA. However, we did not consider these variables because most studies do not report them. Small number of studies was found, mainly investigating specific sports (e.g. former long distance runners, weight lifters and basketball, handball and table tennis players), which limited sensitivity analysis for some sports. Finally, most studies had small sample sizes<sup>30,32,34-37,39,41,44</sup> and there is a lack of studies investigating former female athletes. Future studies including this population are warranted.

#### Conclusion

This systematic review with meta-analysis showed that the prevalence of knee OA in former athletes was 30.0%

(95% CI 20.0 to 40.0%). Current low-quality evidence suggests that prevalence is likely to change with future high-quality studies. Increased knee loading and risk of injuries during sports participation might explain the high prevalence of knee OA in former athletes. Diagnostic criteria for knee OA and sport modality may impact on estimated prevalence. The high prevalence of knee OA in former athletes challenges researches, clinicians and policymakers to prevent and treat this health condition. It is possible that different strategies may reduce the knee OA prevalence and associated disabilities in former athletes.

#### **Conflicts of interest**

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

#### Acknowledgement

The authors are thankful to the Brazilian Government Funding Agency FAPEMIG, Grant Number APQ-01139-15, for its financial support.

#### Appendix 1. Search strategy conducted on November 9th 2016 and updated on February 22nd 2018

#### OVID (Medline, Embase, AMED)

- 1. prevalence.mp. or Prevalence/
- 2. Incidence.mp. or Incidence/
- 3. epidemiolog\$.mp.
- 4. probability.mp. or Probability/
- 5. athlete\$.mp. or Athletes/
- 6. Sports/ or Athletic Injuries/ or Sportsperson.mp.
- 7. Sports Medicine/ or Sportsman.mp.
- 8. Sportswoman.mp.
- 9. former athlete\$.mp. [mp=ab, hw, ti, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, nm, kf, px, rx, an, ui]
- retired athlete\$.mp. [mp=ab, hw, ti, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, nm, kf, px, rx, an, ui]
- 11. elite athlete\$.mp. [mp=ab, hw, ti, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, nm, kf, px, rx, an, ui]
- ex-athlete\$.mp. [mp=ab, hw, ti, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, nm, kf, px, rx, an, ui]
- osteoarthr\$.mp. [mp=ab, hw, ti, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, nm, kf, px, rx, an, ui]
- 14. degenerative joint disease\$.mp. [mp=ab, hw, ti, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, nm, kf, px, rx, an, ui]
- arthr\$.mp. [mp=ab, hw, ti, tn, ot, dm, mf, dv, kw, nm, kf, px, rx, an, ui]
- 16. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4
- 17. or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12
- 18. 13 or 14 or 15
- 19. 16 and 17 and 18

#### EBSCO (SPORTDiscus and CINAHL)

| S19 | S16 AND S17 AND S18                             |
|-----|---|
| S18 | S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4                            |
| S17 | S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8 OR S9 OR S10 OR S11 OR S12 |
| S16 | S13 OR S14 OR S15                               |
| S15 | arthr*  |
| S14 | degenerative joint disease*                     |
| S13 | osteoarthr*                                     |
| S12 | ex-athlete*                                     |
| S11 | elite athlete*                                  |
| S10 | retired athlete*                                |
| S9  | former athlete*                                 |
| S8  | Sportswoman                                     |
| S7  | Sportsman                                       |
| S6  | Sportsperson                                    |
| S5  | athlete*  |
| S4  | probability                                     |
| S3  | epidemiolog*                                    |
| S2  | Incidence                                       |
| S1  | prevalence                                      |

#### References

- Musumeci G, Aiello FC, Szychlinska MA, Di Rosa M, Castrogiovanni P, Mobasheri A. Osteoarthritis in the XXIst century: risk factors and behaviours that influence disease onset and progression. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2015;16(3):6093–6112, http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijms16036093.
- Kellgren JH, Lawrence JS, Bier F. Genetic factors in generalized osteo-arthrosis. Ann Rheum Dis. 1963;22:237–255.
- Palotie A, Vaisanen P, Ott J, et al. Predisposition to familial osteoarthrosis linked to type II collagen gene. *Lancet*. 1989;1(8644):924–927.
- 4. Davis MA, Ettinger WH, Neuhaus JM, Cho SA, Hauck WW. The association of knee injury and obesity with unilateral and bilateral osteoarthritis of the knee. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1989;130(2):278–288.
- Cruz-Almeida Y, Sibille KT, Goodin BR, et al. Racial and ethnic differences in older adults with knee osteoarthritis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2014;66(7):1800–1810, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/art.38620.
- Anderson JJ, Felson DT. Factors associated with osteoarthritis of the knee in the first national Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (HANES I). Evidence for an association with overweight, race, and physical demands of work. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1988;128(1):179–189.
- 7. Lee J, Chang RW, Ehrlich-Jones L, et al. Sedentary behavior and physical function: objective evidence from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2015;67(3):366–373, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/acr.22432.
- Zhuo Q, Yang W, Chen J, Wang Y. Metabolic syndrome meets osteoarthritis. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2012;8(12):729–737, http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrrheum.2012.135.
- Cooper C, Snow S, McAlindon TE, et al. Risk factors for the incidence and progression of radiographic knee osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2000;43(5):995–1000.
- Wilson MG, Michet CJ Jr, Ilstrup DM, Melton LJ. Idiopathic symptomatic osteoarthritis of the hip and knee: a population-based incidence study. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 1990;65(9):1214–1221.
- Fischer B. Joelho: Lesões, principais formas de tratamento e prevenção. Available at: http://www.gease.pro.br/ artigo\_visualizar.php?id=152 [accessed 23.01.18].
- 12. Jones G, Ding C, Glisson M, Hynes K, Ma D, Cicuttini F. Knee articular cartilage development in children: a

longitudinal study of the effect of sex, growth, body composition, and physical activity. *Pediatr Res.* 2003;54(2):230-236, http://dx.doi.org/10.1203/01.PDR.0000072781.93856.E6.

- Muhlbauer R, Lukasz TS, Faber TS, Stammberger T, Eckstein F. Comparison of knee joint cartilage thickness in triathletes and physically inactive volunteers based on magnetic resonance imaging and threedimensional analysis. *Am J Sports Med.* 2000;28(4):541–546, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/03635465000280041601.
- Kamper SJ, Henschke N, Hestbaek L, Dunn KM, Williams CM. Musculoskeletal pain in children and adolescents. *Braz J Phys Ther*. 2016;20(3):275–284, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/</u> bjpt-rbf.2014.0149.
- 15. Williams PT. Maintaining vigorous activity attenuates 7-yr weight gain in 8340 runners. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2007;39(5):801–809, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/</u> mss.0b013e31803349b1.
- Ross JR, Bedi A, Stone RM, Sibilsky Enselman E, Kelly BT, Larson CM. Characterization of symptomatic hip impingement in butterfly ice hockey goalies. *Arthroscopy*. 2015;31(4):635–642, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.arthro.2014.10.010.
- Tiderius CJ, Olsson LE, Leander P, Ekberg O, Dahlberg L. Delayed gadolinium-enhanced MRI of cartilage (dGEM-RIC) in early knee osteoarthritis. *Magn Reson Med.* 2003;49(3):488–492, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/mrm.10389.
- Lu XL, Sun DD, Guo XE, Chen FH, Lai WM, Mow VC. Indentation determined mechanoelectrochemical properties and fixed charge density of articular cartilage. *Ann Biomed Eng.* 2004;32(3):370–379.
- St-Onge MP. Relationship between body composition changes and changes in physical function and metabolic risk factors in aging. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care*. 2005;8(5):523–528.
- Rahmann AE. Exercise for people with hip or knee osteoarthritis: a comparison of land-based and aquatic interventions. *Open Access J Sports Med.* 2010;1:123–135.
- Chen SK, Cheng YM, Lin YC, Hong YJ, Huang PJ, Chou PH. Investigation of management models in elite athlete injuries. *Kaohsiung J Med Sci*. 2005;21(5):220–227, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1607-551X(09)70191-3.
- Cunniffe B, Proctor W, Baker JS, Davies B. An evaluation of the physiological demands of elite rugby union using Global Positioning System tracking software. J Strength Cond Res. 2009;23(4):1195–1203.
- Bruns J, Volkmer M, Luessenhop S. Pressure distribution in the knee joint. Influence of flexion with and without ligament dissection. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 1994;113(4):204–209.
- 24. Lohmander LS, Atley LM, Pietka TA, Eyre DR. The release of crosslinked peptides from type II collagen into human synovial fluid is increased soon after joint injury and in osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2003;48(11):3130–3139, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/art.11326.
- 25. Powell JW, Barber-Foss KD. Injury patterns in selected high school sports: a review of the 1995-1997 seasons. J Athl Train. 1999;34(3):277–284.
- 26. Messina DF, Farney WC, DeLee JC. The incidence of injury in Texas high school basketball. A prospective study among male and female athletes. *Am J Sports Med.* 1999;27(3):294–299, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/03635465990270030401.
- Yard EE, Schroeder MJ, Fields SK, Collins CL, Comstock RD. The epidemiology of United States high school soccer injuries, 2005–2007. Am J Sports Med. 2008;36(10):1930–1937, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0363546508318047.
- Borowski LA, Yard EE, Fields SK, Comstock RD. The epidemiology of US high school basketball injuries, 2005–2007. Am J Sports Med. 2008;36(12):2328–2335, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0363546508322893.
- 29. Fernandez WG, Yard EE, Comstock RD. Epidemiology of lower extremity injuries among U.S. high

school athletes. Acad Emerg Med. 2007;14(7):641-645, http://dx.doi.org/10.1197/j.aem.2007.03.1354.

- Rechel JA, Collins CL, Comstock RD. Epidemiology of injuries requiring surgery among high school athletes in the United States, 2005 to 2010. J Trauma. 2011;71(4):982–989, http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/TA.0b013e318230e716.
- Ackerman IN, Osborne RH. Obesity and increased burden of hip and knee joint disease in Australia: results from a national survey. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2012;13:254, http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2474-13-254.
- Gouttebarge V, Inklaar H, Backx F, Kerkhoffs G. Prevalence of osteoarthritis in former elite athletes: a systematic overview of the recent literature. *Rheumatol Int*. 2015;35(3):405–418, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00296-014-3093-0.
- Kuijt M, Inklaar H, Gouttebarge V, Frings-Dresen M. Knee and ankle osteoarthritis in former elite soccer players: a systematic review of the recent literature. J Sci Med Sport. 2012;15(6):480–487.
- Driban JB, Hootman JM, Sitler MR, Harris K, Cattano NM. Is participation in certain sports associated with knee osteoarthritis? A systematic review. J Athl Train. 2017;52(6):497–506, http://dx.doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-50.2.08.
- Tran G, Smith TO, Grice A, Kingsbury SR, McCrory P, Conaghan PG. Does sports participation (including level of performance and previous injury) increase risk of osteoarthritis? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med. 2016;50(23):1459–1466, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/</u> bjsports-2016-096142.
- 36. Yelin E, Murphy L, Cisternas MG, Foreman AJ, Pasta DJ, Helmick CG. Medical care expenditures and earnings losses among persons with arthritis and other rheumatic conditions in 2003, and comparisons with 1997. Arthritis Rheum. 2007;56(5):1397–1407, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/art.22565.
- Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D. The Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers' Manual 2014. The Systematic Review of Prevalence and Incidence Data. Adelaide (Australia): The Joanna Briggs Institute; 2014. Available at: http://joannabriggs.org/assets/ docs/sumari/ReviewersManual\_2014-The-Systematic-Reviewof-Prevalence-and-Incidence-Data\_v2.pdf [accessed 27.11.16].
- Higgins JP, Green S, eds. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0. The Cochrane Collaboration [update November, 2016].
- Moher D, Stewart L, Shekelle P. Implementing PRISMA-P: recommendations for prospective authors. Syst Rev. 2016;5:15.
- Neogi T. The epidemiology and impact of pain in osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2013;21(9):1145-1153, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2013.03.018.
- Charan J, Biswas T. How to calculate sample size for different study designs in medical research? Indian J Psychol Med. 2013;35(2):121-126, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/</u> 0253-7176.116232.
- Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol. 2011;64(4):383–394, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.04.026.
- Mata Diz JB, de Souza JR, Leopoldino AA, Oliveira VC. Exercise, especially combined stretching and strengthening exercise, reduces myofascial pain: a systematic review. *Clin Biochem*. 2017;63(1):17–22, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jphys.2016.11.008.
- 44. Spector TD, Harris PA, Hart DJ, et al. Risk of osteoarthritis associated with long-term weight-bearing sports: a radiologic survey of the hips and knees in female ex-athletes and population controls. *Arthritis Rheum*. 1996;39(6):988–995.
- **45.** Arliani GG, Astur DC, Yamada RK, et al. Early osteoarthritis and reduced quality of life after retirement in former professional soccer players. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*. 2014;69(9): 589–594.

- 46. Elleuch MH, Guermazi M, Mezghanni M, et al. Knee osteoarthritis in 50 former top-level soccer players: a comparative study. Ann Readapt Med Phys. 2008;51(3):169–173, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annrmp.2008.01.002.
- Kettunen JA, Kujala UM, Kaprio J, Koskenvuo M, Sarna S. Lowerlimb function among former elite male athletes. *Am J Sports Med.* 2001;29(1):2–8.
- 48. Krajnc Z, Vogrin M, Recnik G, Crnjac A, Drobnic M, Antolic V. Increased risk of knee injuries and osteoarthritis in the non-dominant leg of former professional football players. Wien Klin Wochenschr. 2010;122(Suppl 2):40–43, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00508-010-1341-1.
- Paxinos O, Karavasili A, Delimpasis G, Stathi A. Prevalence of knee osteoarthritis in 100 athletically active veteran soccer players compared with a matched group of 100 military personnel. Am J Sports Med. 2016;44(6):1447–1454, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0363546516629648.
- Rajabi R, Johnson GM, Alizadeh MH, Meghdadi N. Radiographic knee osteoarthritis in ex-elite table tennis players. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2012;13(no pagination 12), http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2474-13-12.
- Drawer S, Fuller CW. Propensity for osteoarthritis and lower limb joint pain in retired professional soccer players. Br J Sports Med. 2001;35(6):402–408, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/</u> bjsm.35.6.402.
- Turner AP, Barlow JH, Heathcote-Elliott C. Long term health impact of playing professional football in the United Kingdom. *Br J Sports Med*. 2000;34(5):332–336.
- Klunder KB, Rud B, Hansen J. Osteoarthritis of the hip and knee joint in retired football players. Acta Orthop Scand. 1980;51(6):925–927.
- 54. Roos H, Lindberg H, Gardsell P, Lohmander LS, Wingstrand H. The prevalence of gonarthrosis and its relation to meniscectomy in former soccer players. Am J Sports Med. 1994;22(2):219–222.
- 55. Kujala UM, Kettunen J, Paananen H, et al. Knee osteoarthritis in former runners, soccer players, weight lifters, and shooters. Arthritis Rheum. 1995;38(4):539–546, <u>http://dx.doi.org/</u> 10.1002/art.1780380413.
- 56. Tveit M, Rosengren BE, Nilsson JA, Karlsson MK. Former male elite athletes have a higher prevalence of osteoarthritis and arthroplasty in the hip and knee than expected. Am J Sports Med. 2012;40(3):527–533.
- Kettunen JA, Kujala UM, Kaprio J, Sarna S. Health of master track and field athletes: a 16-year follow-up study. *Clin J Sport Med.* 2006;16(2):142–148.
- Iosifidis MI, Tsarouhas A, Fylaktou A. Lower limb clinical and radiographic osteoarthritis in former elite male athletes. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2015;23(9):2528–2535, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00167-014-3047-9.
- **59.** Andriacchi TP, Mundermann A, Smith RL, Alexander EJ, Dyrby CO, Koo S. A framework for the in vivo pathomechanics of osteoarthritis at the knee. *Ann Biomed Eng.* 2004;32(3):447–457.
- **60.** Andriacchi TP, Briant PL, Bevill SL, Koo S. Rotational changes at the knee after ACL injury cause cartilage thinning. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2006;442:39–44.
- Andriacchi TP, Favre J. The nature of in vivo mechanical signals that influence cartilage health and progression to knee osteoarthritis. *Curr Rheumatol Rep.* 2014;16(11):463, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11926-014-0463-2.
- Takeda H, Nakagawa T, Nakamura K, Engebretsen L. Prevention and management of knee osteoarthritis and knee cartilage injury in sports. *Br J Sports Med.* 2011;45(4):304–309.
- 63. Messier SP, Legault C, Mihalko S, et al. The Intensive Diet and Exercise for Arthritis (IDEA) trial: design

and rationale. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2009;10:93, http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2474-10-93.

- Buckwalter JA, Lane NE. Athletics and osteoarthritis. Am J Sports Med. 1997;25(6):873–881, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/</u> 036354659702500624.
- Rall KL, McElroy GL, Keats TE. A study of long term effects of football injury to the knee. *Mo Med.* 1964;61:435–438.
- 66. Gelber AC, Hochberg MC, Mead LA, Wang NY, Wigley FM, Klag MJ. Joint injury in young adults and risk for subsequent knee and hip osteoarthritis. Ann Intern Med. 2000;133(5):321–328.
- Netravali NA, Giori NJ, Andriacchi TP. Partial medial meniscectomy and rotational differences at the knee during walking. J Biomech. 2010;43(15):2948–2953, <u>http://dx.doi.org/</u> 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2010.07.013.
- Georgoulis AD, Papadonikolakis A, Papageorgiou CD, Mitsou A, Stergiou N. Three-dimensional tibiofemoral kinematics of the anterior cruciate ligament-deficient and reconstructed knee during walking. *Am J Sports Med*. 2003;31(1):75–79, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/03635465030310012401.
- Scanlan SF, Chaudhari AM, Dyrby CO, Andriacchi TP. Differences in tibial rotation during walking in ACL reconstructed and healthy contralateral knees. J Biomech. 2010;43(9):1817–1822, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbio</u> mech.2010.02.010.
- Amoako AO, Pujalte GG. Osteoarthritis in young, active, and athletic individuals. *Clin Med Insights Arthritis Musculoskelet Disord*. 2014;7:27–32, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.4137/</u> CMAMD.S14386.
- Molloy MG, Molloy CB. Contact sport and osteoarthritis. Br J Sports Med. 2011;45(4):275-277, <u>http://dx.doi.org/</u> 10.1136/bjsm.2011.083956.
- Zhang Y, Hunter DJ, Nevitt MC, et al. Association of squatting with increased prevalence of radiographic tibiofemoral knee osteoarthritis: the Beijing Osteoarthritis Study. Arthritis Rheum. 2004;50(4):1187–1192, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/</u> art.20127.
- Bedson J, Croft PR. The discordance between clinical and radiographic knee osteoarthritis: a systematic search and summary of the literature. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2008;9:116, http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2474-9-116.
- 74. Ferreira AH, Godoy PB, Oliveira NR, et al. Investigation of depression, anxiety and quality of life in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a comparative study. *Rev Bras Reumatol*. 2015;55(5):434–438.
- 75. Soligard T, Myklebust G, Steffen K, et al. Comprehensive warmup programme to prevent injuries in young female footballers: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2008;337:a2469, http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a2469.
- 76. Olsen OE, Myklebust G, Engebretsen L, Holme I, Bahr R. Exercises to prevent lower limb injuries in youth sports: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2005;330(7489):449, http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.38330.632801.8F.
- 77. Myklebust G, Engebretsen L, Braekken IH, Skjolberg A, Olsen OE, Bahr R. Prevention of anterior cruciate ligament injuries in female team handball players: a prospective intervention study over three seasons. *Clin J Sport Med.* 2003;13(2):71–78.
- Arliani GG, Lara PS, Astur DC, Cohen M, Goncalves JP, Ferretti M. Impact of sports on health of former professional soccer players in Brazil. Acta Ortop Bras. 2014;22(4):188–190, http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1413-78522014220400954.
- Reyes C, Leyland KM, Peat G, Cooper C, Arden NK, Prieto-Alhambra D. Association between overweight and obesity and risk of clinically diagnosed knee, hip, and hand osteoarthritis: a population-based cohort study. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2016;68(8):1869–1875, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/art.39707.