

Supplementary Table 1. Modified quality assessment tool derived from Downs and Black (50)

Category	Item	Question	
Reporting	1	Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described?	
	2	Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the Introduction or Methods section?	
	3	Are the characteristics of the patients included in the study clearly described?	
	5	Are the distributions of the principal confounders in each group of subjects to be compared clearly described?	
	6	Are the main findings of the study clearly described?	
	7	Does the study provide estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes?	
	10	Have actual probability values (e.g. 0.035 rather than <0.05) for the main outcomes except where the probability value is less than 0.001	
	External Validity	11	Were the subjects asked to participate in the study representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?
		12	Were those subjects who were prepared to participate representative of the entire population of which they were recruited?
	Internal Validity (bias)	16	If any of the results of the study were based on “data dredging”, was this made clear?
18		Were the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate?	
20		Were the main outcome measures used accurate (valid and reliable)?	
Internal Validity (confounding)	21	Were the patients in the different intervention groups (trials and cohorts studies) or cases and controls (case control studies) recruited from the same population?	
	25	Was there adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses from which the main findings were drawn?	
Power	27	Did the study have a calculation of power and was this met?	
Additional Internal Validity (bias)	28*	Was the diagnosis of injury appropriate?	
Additional Internal Validity (confounding)	29 [#]	Was the rehabilitation of participants controlled and/or reported?	

*, item added by authors with assessment scoring, 2 points if injury of all participants was diagnosed by clinical exam (or clinical notes from diagnosing practitioner obtained) and investigated by imaging, 1 point if diagnosis was made by clinical exam (or clinical notes from diagnosing practitioner provided) or imaging, 0 points if diagnosis was made by self-report, questionnaire, clinical criteria or unclear methods of diagnosis were provided. [#]Item added by current authors with assessment scoring, 2 points if rehabilitation was reported (described or referenced) and controlled or measures were taken at initial exam (prior to rehabilitation intervention), 1 point if rehabilitation was reported but not controlled or controlled but not reported, 0 points if rehabilitation was not reported or controlled.

Supplementary Table 2. Concentric knee flexor isokinetic strength in previously injured and contralateral uninjured legs.

Author	Days since injury (mean ± SD)	n	Injured leg (mean ± SD)	Contralateral leg (mean ± SD)	Mean difference			Effect size	
					Mean	95%CI [Lower, Upper]	Percent difference (%)	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95%CI [Lower, Upper]
60°/sec peak torque (N.m)									
Brockett [67]	Unclear	9	114 ± 24	123 ± 25	-9	[-32, 14]	-7	-0.37	[-1.30, 0.56]
Tol [63]	21 (7-43)	81	114 ± 22	122 ± 22 [^]	-8	[-15, -1]	-7	-0.36	[-0.68, -0.05]
Mackey [62]	<365	9	97 ± 12	95 ± 13	2	[-10, 14]	2	0.16	[-0.77, 1.09]
O'Sullivan [40]	<365	19	119 ± 29	132 ± 29 [#]	-13	[-28, 2]	-10	-0.45	[-0.96, 0.06]
Opar [29]	161 ± 132	13	132 ± 21	146 ± 15	-14	[-28, 0]	-10*	-0.77	[-1.56, 0.03]
O'Sullivan [72]	<730	7	76 ± 13	70 ± 10	6	[-6, 18]	9	0.52	[-0.55, 1.58]
Crosier [37]	60-365	26	No data	No data	No data	-	-11*	-	-
Silder [33]	150- 690	18	No data	No data	No data	-	8	-	-
60°/sec relative peak torque (N.m/kg)									
Sanfillipo [68]	17-49	25	1.2 ± 0.3	1.3 ± 0.3	-0.1	[-0.27, 0.07]	-8	-0.33	[-0.89, 0.22]
	199-231	25	1.3 ± 0.3	1.3 ± 0.3	0.0	[-0.16, 0.16]	0	0.00	[-0.55, 0.55]
Sole [48]	109 ± 106	15	1.5 ± 0.4	1.6 ± 0.3	-0.1	[-0.35, 0.15]	-6	-0.28	[-1.00, 0.44]
Arumugam [64]	147 ± 121	17	1.5 ± 0.4	1.6 ± 0.3	-0.1	[-0.37, 0.17]	-6*	-0.25	[-0.92, 0.42]
O'Sullivan [40]	<365	19	1.5 ± 0.3	1.6 ± 0.3 [#]	-0.1	[-0.25, 0.05]	-6	-0.33	[-0.84, 0.18]
O'Sullivan [72]	<730	7	1.3 ± 0.2	1.2 ± 0.2	0.1	[-0.11, 0.31]	8	0.50	[-0.56, 1.56]
Crosier [36]	60-365	23	1.5	1.7	-0.2	-	-12*	-	-
180°/sec peak torque (N.m)									
Opar [29]	161 ± 132	13	109 ± 13	119 ± 12	-10	[-20, 0]	-8*	-0.80	[-1.60, 0.00]

Mackey [62]	<365	9	81 ± 20	83 ± 14	-2	[-18, 14]	-2	-0.12	[-1.04, 0.81]
O'Sullivan [40]	<365	19	101 ± 20	103 ± 20#	-2	[-12, 8]	-2	-0.10	[-0.61, 0.41]
O'Sullivan [72]	<730	7	62 ± 6	54 ± 8	8	[0, 15]	15	1.13	[0.00, 2.26]
180°/sec relative peak torque (N.m/kg)									
O'Sullivan [40]	<365	19	1.2 ± 0.2	1.3 ± 0.2#	-0.1	[-0.20, 0.00]	-8	-0.50	[-1.01, 0.01]
O'Sullivan [72]	<730	7	1.0 ± 0.1	0.9 ± 0.2	0.1	[-0.07, 0.27]	11	0.63	[-0.44, 1.71]
240°/sec peak torque (N.m)									
Crosier [37]	60-365	26	No data	No data	No data	-	-10*	-	-
240°/sec relative peak torque (N.m/kg)									
Sanfillipo [68]	17-49	25	0.7 ± 0.2	0.8 ± 0.2	-0.1	[-0.21, 0.01]	-13	-0.50	[-1.06, 0.06]
	199-231	25	0.8 ± 0.2	0.9 ± 0.2	-0.1	[-0.21, 0.01]	-11	-0.50	[-1.06, 0.06]
Crosier [36]	60-365	23	1.1	1.2	-0.1	-	-8	-	-
300°/sec peak torque (N.m)									
Tol [63]	21 (7-43)	80	95 ± 33	91 ± 17^	4	[-4, 12]	4	0.15	[-0.16, 0.46]
O'Sullivan [40]	<365	19	93 ± 18	92 ± 17#	1	[-8, 10]	1	0.06	[-0.45, 0.57]
O'Sullivan [72]	<730	7	61 ± 6	59 ± 9	2	[-6, 10]	3	0.26	[-0.79, 1.31]
300°/sec relative peak torque (N.m/kg)									
O'Sullivan [40]	<365	19	1.1 ± 0.2	1.1 ± 0.2#	0.0	[-0.10, 0.10]	0	0.00	[-0.51, 0.51]
Lee [39]	578 ± 365	14	1.0 ± 0.2	1.0 ± 0.2	0.0	[-0.15, 0.15]	0	0.00	[-0.74, 0.74]
O'Sullivan [72]	<730	7	1.0 ± 0.1	1.0 ± 0.1	0.0	[-0.10, 0.10]	0	0.00	[-1.05, 1.05]

Negative differences indicate that the outcome variable of interest was lesser in the injured leg compared to the contralateral leg.

Included in review but excluded from this table due to: no contralateral leg comparisons: Jonhagen [42]; Insufficient data: Dauty [43]; Prone position: Worrell [49].

SD, standard deviation

^Contralateral legs did not have same numbers as injured (60°/sec, n = 79; 300°/sec, n = 78); #Contralateral legs were pooled with control group legs (O'Sullivan et al. [40], total legs n = 69);

*Statistically significant difference (p < 0.05)

Supplementary Table 3. Eccentric knee flexor strength in previously injured and contralateral uninjured legs.

Author	Days since injury (mean ± SD)	<i>n</i>	Injured leg (mean ± SD)	Contralateral leg (mean ± SD)	Mean difference			Effect size	
					Mean	95%CI [Lower, Upper]	Percent difference (%)	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95%CI [Lower, Upper]
30°/sec peak torque (N.m)									
Mackey [62]	<365	9	130 ± 39	143 ± 35	-13	[-47, 21]	-9	-0.35	[-1.28, 0.58]
Crosier [37]	60-365	26	No data	No data	No data	-	-22*	-	-
30°/sec relative peak torque (N.m/kg)									
Crosier [36]	60-365	23	1.4	1.8	-0.4	-	-22*	-	-
60°/sec peak torque (N.m)									
Tol [63]	21 (7-43)	74	170 ± 37	174 ± 39	-4	[-16, 8]	-2	-0.11	[-0.43, 0.22]
Opar [29]	161 ± 132	13	167 ± 30	185 ± 25	-18	[-40, 0]	-10*	-0.65	[-1.44, 0.14]
60°/sec relative peak torque (N/m/kg)									
Sole [48]	109 ± 106	15	2.5 ± 0.6	2.7 ± 0.5	-0.2	[-0.60, 0.20]	-7	-0.36	[-1.08, 0.36]
Arumugam [64]	147 ± 121	17	2.4 ± 0.5	2.5 ± 0.5	-0.1	[-0.44, 0.24]	-4	-0.20	[-0.87, 0.47]
Doherty ^I [71]	261 ± 195	16	1.6 ± 0.4	1.7 ± 0.4	-0.1	[-0.38, 0.18]	-6	-0.25	[-0.95, 0.45]
Doherty ^{III} [71]	261 ± 195	26	1.5 ± 0.3	1.5 ± 0.2	0	[-0.14, 0.14]	0	0.00	[-0.54, 0.54]
120°/sec peak torque (N.m)									
Crosier [37]	60-365	26	No data	No data	No data	-	-24*	-	-
120°/sec relative peak torque (N.m/kg)									
Crosier [36]	60-365	23	1.4	1.8	-0.4	-	-22*	-	-
180°/sec peak torque (N.m)									
Opar [29]	161 ± 132	13	164 ± 30	184 ± 22	-20	[-40, 0]	-11*	-0.76	[-1.56, 0.04]
Doherty ^I [71]	261 ± 195	16	1.7 ± 0.4	1.5 ± 0.3	0.2	[-0.04, 0.44]	13	0.57	[-0.14, 1.27]

Doherty ^{III} [71]	261 ± 195	26	1.7 ± 0.4	1.6 ± 0.3	0.1	[-0.09, 0.29]	6	0.28	[-0.26, 0.83]
300°/sec relative peak torque (N.m/kg)									
Lee [39]	578 ± 365	14	1.8 ± 0.3	2.0 ± 0.4	-0.2	[-0.46, 0.06]	-10*	-0.57	[-1.32, 0.19]
Nordic hamstring exercise (N)									
Opar [41]	171	20	295 ± 100	345 ± 116	-50	[-117, 17]	-14*	-0.46	[-1.09, 0.17]
Timmins [34]	291 ± 115	16	289 ± 85	341 ± 100	-52	[-116, 12]	-15*	-0.56	[-1.27, 0.15]
Opar [65]	134 ^{MED}	17	298 ± 90	311 ± 83	-13	[-71, 45]	-4	-0.15	[-0.82, 0.52]

Negative differences indicate that the outcome variable of interest was lesser in the injured leg compared to the contralateral leg.

Included in review but excluded from this table due to: no contralateral leg comparisons: Jonhagen [42]; Insufficient data: Dauty [43]; Prone position: Worrell [49]

^Contralateral legs did not have same numbers as injured (60°/sec, n = 73)

*Statistically significant difference (p < 0.05). ^{MED} = median. SD, standard deviation. ^IDivision one athletes; ^{III}Division three athletes.

Supplementary Table 4. Knee flexor isometric strength in previously injured and contralateral uninjured legs.

Author	Days since injury (mean ± SD)	<i>n</i>	Injured leg (mean ± SD)	Contralateral leg (mean ± SD)	Mean difference			Effect size	
					Mean	95%CI [Lower, Upper]	Percent difference (%)	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95%CI [Lower, Upper]
Long length (0° hip, 0-15° knee) (N.m)									
Asking [28] sprinters	2	18	36 ± 15	95 ± 18	-59*	[-70, -48]	-62	-3.56	[-4.61, -2.51]
	10	18	66 ± 15	98 ± 20	-32*	[-44, -20]	-33	-1.81	[-2.59, -1.03]
	21	18	80 ± 25	93 ± 26	-13*	[-30, 4]	-14	-0.51	[-1.17, 0.15]
	42	18	93 ± 19	102 ± 20	-9*	[-22, 4]	-9	-0.46	[-1.12, 0.20]
Asking [28] dancers	2	15	56 ± 19	69 ± 17	-13*	[-26, 0]	-19	-0.72	[-1.46, 0.02]
	10	15	66 ± 18	72 ± 17	-6*	[-19, 7]	-8	-0.34	[-1.06, 0.38]
	21	15	70 ± 17	73 ± 17	-3	[-15, 9]	-4	-0.18	[-0.89, 0.54]
	42	15	70 ± 19	71 ± 18	-1	[-14, 12]	-1	-0.05	[-0.77, 0.66]
Long length (0° hip, 0-15° knee) (N)									
Reurink [69]	3	74	175 ± 79	246 ± 60	-71	[-94, -48]	-29	-1.01	[-1.35, -0.67]
	10	76	210 ± 68	241 ± 54	-31	[-51, -11]	-13	-0.50	[-0.83, -0.18]
	185	72	253 ± 68	255 ± 63	-2	[-23, 19]	-1	-0.03	[-0.36, 0.30]
Timmins [34]	237	16	237 ± 53	263 ± 51	-26	[-62, 10]	-10	-0.5	[-1.20, 0.20]
Short length (0° hip, 90° knee) (N)									
Reurink [69]	3	74	160 ± 55	195 ± 38	-35	[-50, -20]	-18	-0.74	[-1.07, -0.41]
	10	76	180 ± 50	198 ± 42	-18	[-33, -3]	-9	-0.39	[-0.71, -0.07]
	185	72	194 ± 42	199 ± 39	-5	[-18, 8]	-3	-0.12	[-0.45, 0.20]

Negative differences indicate that the isometric strength of the injured legs were less than the uninjured contralateral legs

*Statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$). SD, standard deviation.

Supplementary Table 5. Conventional H:Q ratio (expressed as a %) collected during seated isokinetic dynamometry in previously injured and contralateral uninjured legs.

Author	Days since injury (mean ± SD)	n	Injured leg (mean ± SD)	Contralateral leg (mean ± SD)	Mean difference		Percent difference (%)	Effect size	
					Mean	95%CI [Lower, Upper]		Cohen's <i>d</i>	95%CI [Lower, Upper]
60:60°/sec									
Crosier [36]	61-365	23	53 ± 14	58 ± 6	-5	[-11, 1]	-9	-0.46	[-1.05, 0.12]
Crosier [37]	61-365	26	55 ± 14	59 ± 5	-4	[-10, 2]	-7	-0.38	[-0.93, 0.17]
Sole [48]	109 ± 106	15	59 ± 11	60 ± 9	-1	[-8, 6]	-2	-0.10	[-0.82, 0.62]
Doherty ^I [71]	261 ± 195	16	76 ± 35	80 ± 28	-4	[-26, 18]	-5	-0.13	[-0.82, 0.57]
Doherty ^{III} [71]	261 ± 195	26	81 ± 45	99 ± 81	-18	[-54, 18]	-18	-0.27	[-0.82, 0.27]
Mackey [62]	<365	9	53 ± 5	51 ± 5	2	[-3, 7]	4	0.40	[-0.53, 1.33]
O'Sullivan [40]	<365	19	62 ± 10	69 ± 10#	-7*	[-12, -2]	-10	-0.70	[-1.22, -0.18]
Dauty [43]	328 ± 198	11	62 ± 13	67 ± 9#	-5	[-13, 3]	-7	-0.51	[-1.17, 0.16]
O'Sullivan [72]	<730	7	55 ± 9	52 ± 6	3	[-5, 11]	6	0.39	[-0.67, 1.45]
Silder [33]	152-699	18	No data	No data	6	-	-	-	-
Brockett [67]	Unclear	9	55	58	-3	-	-5	-	-
180:180°/sec									
Doherty ^I [71]	261 ± 195	16	89 ± 42	90 ± 37	-1	[-28, 26]	1	-0.03	[-0.72, 0.67]
Doherty ^{III} [71]	261 ± 195	26	110 ± 74	110 ± 107	-0	[-50, 50]	0	0.00	[-0.54, 0.54]
Mackey [62]	<365	9	63 ± 7	61 ± 4	2	[-3, 7]	3	0.35	[-0.58, 1.28]
O'Sullivan [40]	<365	19	69 ± 10	71 ± 10#	-2	[-7, 3]	-3	-0.20	[-0.71, 0.31]
O'Sullivan [72]	<730	7	61 ± 9	55 ± 7	6	[-3, 15]	11	0.74	[-0.39, 1.86]
240:240°/sec									

Crosier [36]	61-365	23	54 ± 15	59 ± 7	-5	[-12, 2]	8	-0.43	[-1, 0]
Crosier [37]	61-365	26	56 ± 12	60 ± 5	-4	[-9, 1]	7	-0.44	[-1, 0]
300:300°/sec									
O'Sullivan [40]	<365	19	73 ± 10	75 ± 10 [#]	-2	[-7, 3]	-3	-0.20	[-0.71, 0.31]
Lee [39]	578 ± 365	14	60 ± 10	60 ± 10	0	[-7, 7]	0	0.00	[-0.74, 0.74]
O'Sullivan [72]	<730	7	75 ± 9	75 ± 7	0	[-8, 8]	0	0.00	[-1.05, 1.05]

Negative differences indicate that the H:Q were lower in previously injured legs compared to the uninjured contralateral legs.

[#]Contralateral legs were pooled with control group legs (O'Sullivan et al. [40], total legs $n = 69$; Dauty et al. [43], total legs $n = 45$). *Statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$). SD, standard deviation. ^IDivision one athletes; ^{III}Division three athletes.

Supplementary Table 6. Functional H:Q ratio (expressed as a %) collected during seated isokinetic dynamometry in previously injured and contralateral uninjured legs.

Author	Days since injury (mean ± SD)	<i>n</i>	Injured leg (mean ± SD)	Contralateral leg (mean ± SD)	Mean difference		Percent difference (%)	Effect size	
					Mean	95%CI [Lower, Upper]		Cohen's <i>d</i>	95%CI [Lower, Upper]
30:60°/sec									
Mackey [62]	<365	9	69 ± 15	76 ± 17	-7	[-22, 8]	-9	-0.44	[-1.37, 0.50]
30:180°/sec									
Mackey [62]	<365	9	101 ± 27	107 ± 34	-6	[-34, 22]	-6	-0.20	[-1.12, 0.73]
30:240°/sec									
Sanfillipo [68]	17-49	13	130 ± 26	162 ± 31	-32*	[-54, -10]	-20	-1.12	[-1.95, -0.29]
	199-231	13	139 ± 26	146 ± 15	-7*	[-23, 9]	-5	-0.33	[-1.10, 0.44]
Crosier [36]	61-365	15	75 ± 23	90 ± 16	-15*	[-29, -1]	-17	-0.76	[-1.50, -0.02]
Crosier [37]	61-365	26	73 ± 24	90 ± 16	-17*	[-28, -6]	-19	-0.83	[-1.40, -0.27]
60:60°/sec									
Sole [48]	109 ± 106	15	96 ± 12	101 ± 14	-5	[-14, 4]	-5	-0.38	[-1.11, 0.34]
Arumugam [64]	147 ± 121	17	88 ± 14	90 ± 16	-2	[-12, 8]	-2	-0.13	[-0.81, 0.54]
Doherty ^I [71]	261 ± 195	16	111 ± 35	114 ± 38	-3	[-28, 22]	-3	-0.08	[-0.78, 0.61]
Doherty ^{III} [71]	261 ± 195	26	130 ± 76	125 ± 72	5	[-35, 45]	4	0.07	[-0.48, 0.61]
Dauty [43]	328 ± 198	11	65 ± 21	80 ± 15#	-15*	[-28, -2]	-19	-0.92	[-1.60, -0.24]
180:180°/sec									
Doherty ^I [71]	261 ± 195	16	149 ± 101	152 ± 100	-3	[-73, 67]	-2	-0.03	[-0.72, 0.66]
Doherty ^{III} [71]	261 ± 195	26	242 ± 213	254 ± 223	-12	[-131, 107]	-5	-0.06	[-0.60, 0.49]
300:300°/sec									

Lee [39]	578 ± 365	14	110 ± 20	120 ± 20	-10*	[-25, 5]	-8	-0.50	[-1.25, 0.25]
----------	-----------	----	----------	----------	------	----------	----	-------	---------------

Negative differences indicate the functional H:Q was lower in previously injured legs compared to the contralateral uninjured leg
 #Contralateral legs were pooled with control group legs (Dauty et al. [43], total legs $n = 45$). *Statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$). SD, standard deviation. ^IDivision one athletes; ^{III} Division three athletes.

Supplementary Table 7. Knee flexor angle of peak torque (reported in degrees from full knee extension) in previously injured compared to contralateral uninjured legs during seated isokinetic dynamometry.

Author	Days since injury (mean ± SD)	n	Injured leg (mean ± SD)	Contralateral leg (mean ± SD)	Mean difference			Effect size	
					Mean	95%CI [Lower, Upper]	Percent difference (%)	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95%CI [Lower, Upper]
60°/sec concentric									
Brockett [67]	Unclear	9	41 ± 8	30 ± 5	12*	[5, 17]	36	1.65	[0.58, 2.72]
Sanfillipo [68]	17-49	22	40 ± 15	40 ± 14	0	[-9, 9]	0	0.00	[-0.59, 0.59]
	199-231	22	29 ± 12	30 ± 15	-1	[-9, 7]	-3	-0.07	[-0.66, 0.52]
Mackey [62]	<365	9	59 ± 15	59 ± 9	0	[-12, 12]	0	0.00	[-0.92, 0.92]
Silder [33]	150-690	18	No data	No data	2	-	-	-	-
240°/sec concentric									
Sanfillipo [68]	17-49	22	43 ± 11	45 ± 10	2	[-8, 4]	-4	-0.19	[-0.78, 0.40]
	199-231	22	40 ± 9	42 ± 8	2	[-7, 3]	-5	-0.24	[-0.83, 0.36]
300°/sec concentric									
Lee [39]	578 ± 365	14	46 ± 5	51 ± 7	-5	[-10, 0]	-10	-0.82	[-1.59, -0.05]
30°/sec eccentric									
Mackey [62]	<365	9	40 ± 19	26 ± 3	14*	[1, 27]	54	1.03	[0.05, 2.01]
300°/sec eccentric									
Lee [39]	578 ± 365	14	59 ± 20	50 ± 16	9	[-4, 22]	18	0.50	[-0.26, 1.25]

Negative differences indicate that the angle of peak torque of the injured legs were at a smaller knee flexion angle (longer muscle lengths) than the uninjured contralateral legs, 0° = full extension, SD, standard deviation

*Statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$). SD, standard deviation.

Supplementary Table 8. Range of motion in passive and active straight leg raise tests (reported in degrees from neutral hip position) in previously injured and contralateral uninjured legs

Author	Days since injury (mean ± SD)	<i>n</i>	Injured leg (mean ± SD)	Contralateral leg (mean ± SD)	Mean difference			Effect size	
					Mean	95%CI [Lower, Upper]	Percent difference (%)	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95%CI [Lower, Upper]
Passive									
Askling [28] sprinters	2	18	54 ± 16	88 ± 14	-34*	[-44, -24]	-39	-2.26	[-3.10, -1.43]
	10	18	71 ± 14	89 ± 15	-18*	[-27, -9]	-20	-1.24	[-1.95, -0.53]
	21	18	81 ± 14	90 ± 15	-9*	[-18, 0]	-10	-0.62	[-1.29, 0.05]
	42	18	84 ± 15	90 ± 16	-6*	[-16, 4]	-7	-0.39	[-1.05, 0.27]
Askling [28] dancers	2	15	95 ± 14	119 ± 19	-24*	[-36, -12]	-20	-1.44	[-2.24, -0.64]
	10	15	104 ± 14	119 ± 17	-15 *	[-26, -4]	-13	-0.96	[-1.72, -0.21]
	21	15	106 ± 14	118 ± 18	-12 *	[-24, 0]	-10	-0.74	[-1.48, 0.00]
	42	15	108 ± 19	118 ± 19	-10 *	[-24, 4]	-8	-0.53	[-1.25, 0.20]
Reurink [69]	3	80	57 ± 10	61 ± 9	-4	[-7, -1]	-7	-0.42	[-0.73, -0.11]
	10	80	59 ± 9	61 ± 8	-2	[-5, 1]	-3	-0.23	[-0.55, 0.08]
	185	72	60 ± 9	59 ± 8	1	[-2, 4]	2	0.12	[-0.21, 0.44]
Silder ^{PATS} [26]	4 ^{Med}	16	63 ± 18	81 ± 14	-18 [^]	[-29, -7]	-22	-1.12	[-1.86, -0.37]
	25 ± 6	13	83 ± 13	86 ± 14	-3	[-13, 7]	-3	-0.22	[-0.99, 0.55]
Silder ^{PRES} [26]	6 ^{Med}	13	70 ± 16	80 ± 15	-10	[-22, 2]	-13	-0.64	[-1.43, 0.14]
	29 ± 11	11	80 ± 13	78 ± 13	2	[-9, 13]	3	0.15	[-0.68, 0.99]
Askling [66]	55 ± 25	11	91 ± 18	91 ± 19	0	[-15, 15]	0	0.00	[-0.84, 0.84]
Active									
Askling [66]#	55 ± 25	11	110 ± 14	119 ± 12	-9*	[-20, 2]	-8	-0.69	[-1.55, 0.17]

Hennessy [45]	<365	18	78 ± 11	78 ± 8	0	[-6, 6]	0	0.00	[-0.65, 0.65]
---------------	------	----	---------	--------	---	---------	---	------	---------------

Negative differences indicate that the range of motion of the injured legs were less than the uninjured contralateral legs, 0° = neutral hip, SD = standard deviation
^{PATS}, Progressive agility and trunk stabilisation rehabilitation protocol; ^{PRES}, Progressive running and eccentric strengthening rehabilitation protocol; ^{Med} Median

#Askling H-test is an explosive straight leg raise

*Statistically significant difference (p < 0.05). ^ = Statistically significant (p<0.05), not calculated by original authors, but performed by the current investigators. SD, standard deviation.

Supplementary Table 9. Range of motion in passive and active knee extension tests (reported in degrees from full knee extension) in previously injured and contralateral uninjured legs.

Author	Days since injury (mean ± SD)	n	Injured leg (mean ± SD)	Contralateral leg (mean ± SD)	Mean difference			Effect size	
					Mean	95%CI [Lower, Upper]	Percent difference (%)	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95%CI [Lower, Upper]
Passive									
Reurink [70]	3 ^{Med}	50	132 ± 16	142 ± 13	-10	[-16, -4]	-7	-0.69	[-1.09, -0.28]
Silder ^{PATS} [26]	4 ^{Med}	16	146 ± 20	146 ± 17	0	[-13, 13]	0	0.00	[-0.69, 0.69]
	25 ± 6	13	167 ± 9	167 ± 9	0	[-7, 7]	0	0.00	[-0.77, 0.77]
Silder ^{PRES} [26]	6 ^{Med}	13	145 ± 21	141 ± 22	4	[-13, 21]	3	0.19	[-0.58, 0.96]
	29 ± 11	11	162 ± 9	159 ± 11	3	[-5, 11]	2	0.30	[-0.54, 1.14]
Worrell [49]	<540	16	143 ± 11	148 ± 13	-5*	[-13, 3]	-3	-0.42	[-1.12, 0.29]
Lowther [46]	<365	9	No data	No data	-6*	-	-	-	-
Active									
Reurink [69]	3 ^{Med}	80	128 ± 15	140 ± 11	-12	[-16, -8]	-9	-0.91	[-1.24, -0.59]
	10	80	134 ± 13	139 ± 10	-5	[-9, -1]	-4	-0.43	[-0.74, -0.12]
	185	72	140 ± 12	140 ± 11	0	[-4, 4]	0	0.00	[-0.33, 0.33]
Silder ^{PATS} [26]	4 ^{Med}	16	159 ± 21	157 ± 10	2	[-9, 13]	1	0.12	[-0.57, 0.82]
	25 ± 6	13	162 ± 10	162 ± 8	0	[-7, 7]	0	0.00	[-0.77, 0.77]
Silder ^{PRES} [26]	6 ^{Med}	13	154 ± 9	151 ± 12	3	[-5, 11]	2	0.28	[-0.49, 1.06]
	29 ± 11	11	157 ± 11	154 ± 12	3	[-7, 13]	2	0.26	[-0.58, 1.10]
Sole [48]	108 ± 105	15	159 ± 9	160 ± 19	-1	[-12, 10]	-1	-0.07	[-0.78, 0.65]

Negative differences indicate that the range of motion of the injured legs were less than the uninjured contralateral legs, 0° = full extension, SD = standard deviation
^{PATS}, Progressive agility and trunk stabilisation rehabilitation protocol; ^{PRES}, Progressive running and eccentric strengthening rehabilitation protocol; ^{Med} Median

Included in review but excluded from this table due to: no contralateral leg comparisons: O'Sullivan et al. [47]

*Statistically significant difference (p < 0.05). SD, standard deviation

Supplementary Table 10. Sensitivity analysis for pooled estimate with heterogeneity (≥30%)

Variable (subgroup)	Pooled				Study omitted	Post-removal		
	Effect size		Heterogeneity			Effect size		Heterogeneity
	Cohen's d	95%CI [Lower, Upper]	I ² (%)	95%CI [Lower, Upper]		Cohen's d	95%CI [Lower, Upper]	I ² (%)
PSLR (<10)	-1.12	[-1.76, -0.48]	81	[55, 92]	Askling 2006a	-0.79	[-1.26, -0.33]	55
PSLR (10-20)	-0.74	[-1.38, -0.09]	76	[21, 93]	Reurink 2015	-1.08	[-1.60, -0.56]	0
AKE (<10)	-0.23	[-1.02, 0.55]	84	[53, 95]	Reurink 2015	0.18	[-0.33, 0.70]	0
AKE (10-30)	-0.19	[-0.63, 0.24]	33	[0, 93]	Reurink 2015	0.11	[-0.45, 0.68]	0
PKE (<10)	-0.24	[-0.81, 0.32]	63	[0, 90]	Reurink 2015	0.08	[-0.43, 0.60]	0
AngPT (60)	0.48	[-0.53, 1.50]	73	[11, 93]	Brocket 2004	0.00	[-0.50, 0.50]	0
Concentric (180)	-0.05	[-0.72, 0.62]	60	[0, 87]	O'Sullivan 2009	-0.26	[-0.68, 0.14]	3
Eccentric (180)	-0.06	[-0.68, 0.80]	70	[0, 91]	Opar 2013	0.38	[-0.05, 0.81]	0

PSLR, passive straight leg raise; AKE, active knee extension; PKE, passive knee extension; AngPT, angle of peak torque; <10, less than 10 days post injury; 10-20, between 10 and 20 days post injury; 10-30, between 10 and 30 days post injury; 60, concentric isokinetic velocity of 60°/sec; 180, isokinetic velocity of 180°/sec