



University of
Salford
MANCHESTER

Biomechanical responses to changes in friction on a clay court surface

Starbuck, C, Stiles, V, Urà, D, Carré, M and Dixon, S

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2016.08.019>

Title	Biomechanical responses to changes in friction on a clay court surface
Authors	Starbuck, C, Stiles, V, Urà, D, Carré, M and Dixon, S
Type	Article
URL	This version is available at: http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/40208/
Published Date	2016

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: usir@salford.ac.uk.

1 **Biomechanical responses to changes in friction on a clay court surface**

1 **1. Abstract**

2 *Objectives:* To examine the influence of clay court frictional properties on tennis players'
3 biomechanical response.

4 *Design:* Repeated measures

5 *Methods:* Lower limb kinematic and force data were collected on sixteen university tennis
6 players during 10 x 180° turns (running approach speed $3.9 \pm 0.20 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) on a synthetic clay
7 surface of varying friction levels. To adjust friction levels the volume of sand infill above the
8 force plate was altered (kg per m^2 surface area; 12, 16 and $20 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$). Repeated measures
9 ANOVA and Bonferroni's corrected alpha post-hoc analyses were conducted to identify
10 significant differences in lower limb biomechanics between friction levels.

11 *Results:* Greater sliding distances ($\eta_p^2 = 0.355$, $p = 0.008$) were observed for the lowest friction
12 condition ($20 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$) compared to the 12 and $16 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ conditions. No differences in ankle joint
13 kinematics and knee flexion angles were observed. Later peak knee flexion occurred on the
14 $20 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ condition compared to the $12 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ ($\eta_p^2 = 0.270$, $p = 0.023$). Lower vertical ($\eta_p^2 =$
15 0.345 , $p = 0.027$) and shear ($\eta_p^2 = 0.396$, $p = 0.016$) loading rates occurred for the $20 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^2$
16 condition compared to the $16 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^2$.

17 *Conclusions:* Lower loading rates and greater sliding distances when clay surface friction was
18 reduced suggests load was more evenly distributed over time reducing players' injury risks.
19 The greater sliding distances reported were accompanied with later occurrence of peak knee
20 flexion, suggesting longer time spent braking and a greater requirement for muscular control
21 increasing the likelihood of fatigue.

22 **Keywords:** Kinematics; loading rate; sliding; lower limb; injury risks

2. Introduction

Tennis court surfaces differ greatly in mechanical properties, particularly in those influencing friction.¹⁻³ Tennis players must adapt to the varied mechanical properties throughout a season, which can influence player movements and loading.^{4,5} Strategies previously suggested to reduce potentially high loading on high friction surfaces have included longer braking time, greater delayed peak knee flexion and altered pressure distribution patterns.^{4,6,7} It has been suggested that players' ability to slide on lower friction clay surfaces has resulted in lower loading and therefore reduced injury risks.^{4,5,7}

Different playing styles reported between acrylic and clay courts have also been attributed differences in frictional properties of the surfaces.⁸ Longer rally lengths, greater player distances covered and greater proportion of baseline points on clay courts have been suggested to lead to greater physiological responses such as increased heart rate and blood lactate.^{9,10} However, when duration of rally, proportion of baseline shots and distances covered were maintained, greater physiological response was still apparent on a clay court compared to an acrylic court.¹¹ Altered movement patterns such as sliding during rapid decelerations or changes in direction on clay court surfaces allows players to reposition quicker following a tennis shot.¹² Sliding has also been associated with increased muscle activity¹³, which could provide some explanation to the greater physiological response observed when duration and distance are comparable.

On low friction surfaces, such as clay, it is not unusual to observe players sliding during rapid decelerations such as during changes in direction.³ Tennis players have been reported to utilise greater shear forces and shear loading rates in order to increase utilised coefficient of friction (COF), allowing for sliding to occur on clay surfaces.⁴ Furthermore, sliding on clay surfaces have been reported to result in greater ankle inversion angles and lower initial knee flexion angles,⁴ which are associated with ankle inversion injuries and ACL injuries respectively.^{14,15} However, the authors suggested that although ankle and knee orientation

1 suggests players were more at risk on a clay surface compared to an acrylic, the lower
2 mechanical friction properties on the clay would minimise risk of sudden stopping and
3 overloading of the joints.⁴

4 The COF on clay courts can vary between 0.5 and 0.7;² as a result of differences in infill
5 properties such as volume of infill, the degree of saturation and infill particle size.^{1,16} Previous
6 studies have examined the biomechanical differences between acrylic and clay courts which
7 have distinctly different frictional properties.^{4,5,7} Yet, there is a lack of evidence regarding
8 tennis players' biomechanical response to small changes in friction, occurring between and
9 within clay courts, and the implications these may have upon performance or injury risks.
10 Therefore the current study aims to examine the influence of changes in frictional properties
11 of a clay surface on biomechanical response. From the literature evidence, it is hypothesised
12 that the level of friction will influence the tennis players' response such that as friction is
13 reduced, greater shear forces (H_1) and shear loading rates (H_2) will occur. Reduced friction is
14 hypothesised to result in lower initial knee flexion (H_3) and delayed peak knee flexion (H_4). At
15 the ankle, it is hypothesised that ankle inversion angle will increase as a result of reduced
16 mechanical friction (H_5). There is no evidence to suggest changes in sagittal plane ankle
17 movement will occur (H_6) when friction is reduced on the clay surface.

18 **3. Methods**

19 Sixteen university tennis players (age 19.93 ± 0.96 years, mass 66.75 ± 10.36 kg, height 1.74
20 ± 0.10 m, and LTA rating 7.48 ± 2.18) volunteered for the present study. All participants were
21 free from injury and trained regularly (at least once a week) on acrylic courts. Players reported
22 that they had minimal experience of playing on clay courts (i.e. playing on clay once a year or
23 less). The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee. Informed consent and
24 physical activity readiness questionnaire results were obtained before any testing occurred.

1 A 9 m runway, which consisted of a synthetic clay surface, comprising of a carpet base layer
2 (a dense, red, polypropylene fibrillated surface) and a top layer with a red granulate infill,¹ was
3 used in a laboratory setting during the present study. In the area where participants were
4 turning (above the force plate), the frictional conditions were altered through the use of
5 different volumes of sand (Table 1). To enable ease of preparing the infill a removable square
6 of the synthetic clay surface was placed over the force plate and was secured using Velcro®
7 to enable quick removal of the sand and to ensure no movement of the synthetic clay surface
8 during data collection. The three levels of friction were achieved using 12 kg.m⁻² (as
9 recommended by the manufacturers), 16 kg.m⁻² and 20 kg.m⁻² of sand infill. Differences in
10 mechanical friction were determined using a traction test device¹⁶ and provided surface
11 conditions which were within ITF regulations.¹⁷ The traction test device replicated sliding on
12 clay with the forefoot of a clay court shoe set at 7° against the surface and 90° against the
13 direction of movement). Static and dynamic COF were recorded for a range of normal forces
14 (1000 – 1600 N) which were selected based on data from previous research examining tennis-
15 specific skills.⁴ Static COF was defined as the peak COF indicating the transition between the
16 static and dynamic regimes. The dynamic COF was taken as the average COF following the
17 peak COF measured between 0.05 m and 0.20 m. Further details on the traction device and
18 methods used to determine the conditions are reported by Clarke et al.¹ and Ura et al.¹⁶

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

20 Prior to each trial the infill sand on the area of interest (force plate) was removed, the sand for
21 the next condition was then weighed and placed on the area of interest and spread evenly.
22 During all testing participants wore the same tennis shoe model (Adidas Barricade 6.0 clay
23 shoes). Ten successful 180° turning movements were performed, without a tennis racket, for
24 each condition in a random order. Participants approached the turn at $3.9 \pm 0.20 \text{ m.s}^{-1}$, which
25 was assessed using timing gates set 2.3 m apart and 1.2 m from the force plate. Participants
26 were asked to perform each 180° turn with their dominant leg (i.e. forehand side) and turn as

1 efficiently as possible. Each turn was performed on the force plate (with the required friction
2 condition).

3 Three-dimensional lower limb kinematic data (120 Hz) were collected to examine ankle and
4 knee movement. Data were collected using a passive marker motion capture system
5 consisting of eight cameras (opto-electronic system; Peak Performance Technologies, Inc.,
6 Englewood, CO), placed in an oval shape around the force plate. Eleven lower limb markers
7 (greater trochanter, medial and lateral femoral epicondyle, anterior aspect of shank, proximal
8 and distal bisection of posterior shank, proximal and distal bisection of the calcaneus, lateral
9 malleolus, base of 2nd metatarsal and 5th metatarsal phalange) on the turning leg were used
10 to construct joint coordinate systems with a custom written Matlab code (Matlab, R2011b,
11 MathsWorks, Natick, MA, USA). A quintic spline filter was applied to the raw data (Peak
12 Performance default optimal smoothing technique using 5th degree quintic polynomials). All
13 kinematic data were presented relative to a relaxed standing trial. Initial and peak angles for
14 sagittal plane ankle and knee rotations, and frontal plane ankle rotations were obtained.
15 Occurrence times of peak angles were reported relative to initial foot contact. Relative
16 occurrence times were also obtained and expressed as a percentage of contact time.

17 Sliding was determined using the velocity of centre of the foot (determined from the distal
18 calcaneus marker and 2nd metatarsal marker). A sliding phase was determined when the
19 velocity was greater than a threshold of 1 mm.s⁻¹ and maintained for more than 10 ms. During
20 this sliding phase, sliding distance was determined by the resultant distance covered by the
21 centre of the foot.

22 Ground reaction forces were measured at 960 Hz using an AMTI force plate (Advanced
23 Mechanical Technology, Inc, Newton, MA). Vertical force parameters included peak impact
24 force, peak active force, average loading rate and peak loading rate. Shear forces (FShear)
25 were calculated as the resultant force of the anterior-posterior (Fy) and medio-lateral forces
26 (Fx). Shear force parameters included peak shear force magnitude and loading rate. The

1 utilised COF was determined as the ratio between the shear force (F_{shear}) and the vertical
2 force (F_z). Peak utilised COF, suggested to indicate the transition between the static and
3 dynamic regimes,¹ was determined as the maximum COF value. Examples of the force data,
4 utilised COF and sliding distance are demonstrated in Figure 1.

5 ****Figure 1 near here****

6 An ANOVA with repeated measures (SPSS v.11) was conducted to examine tennis players'
7 biomechanical response to the different friction conditions. Bonferroni's corrected alpha post-
8 hoc analyses were applied to establish where differences occurred. An alpha level of 0.05 was
9 used to identify any significant differences. Standardised effect sizes were calculated using
10 partial η^2 (η_p^2) to provide the degree to which any differences were present.

11 **4. Results**

12 Friction was a contributing factor that influenced the sliding distances achieved ($\eta_p^2 = 0.355$,
13 $p = 0.008$). For instance, the lowest level of friction ($20 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$; $0.23 \pm 0.16 \text{ m}$) produced
14 significantly greater sliding distance compared to the $16 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ ($0.17 \pm 0.12 \text{ m}$) and $12 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$
15 ($0.18 \pm 0.13 \text{ m}$) conditions which had greater mechanical friction.

16 The analysis revealed no differences in the initial and peak knee angle between the three
17 friction conditions (Table 2). However, friction level was found to have a significant influence
18 on the occurrence time of peak knee flexion ($\eta_p^2 = 0.270$, $p = 0.023$). Post hoc analysis
19 revealed that the $20 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ condition ($0.34 \pm 0.09 \text{ s}$) resulted in a later peak knee flexion than
20 observed for the $12 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ condition ($0.31 \pm 0.07 \text{ s}$). When represented as a percentage of
21 contact time, the relative occurrence of peak knee flexion were similar between conditions. As
22 presented in Table 2, no differences in ankle movement were reported between the friction
23 conditions.

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

2 The analysis revealed no significant differences in peak impact force, peak active force and
3 peak shear force between the three friction conditions (Table 2). Peak vertical loading rate
4 was significantly lower during the 20 kg.m⁻² condition (135.52 ± 23.16 BW/s; $\eta_p^2 = 0.345$, $p =$
5 0.027) compared to the 16 kg.m⁻² condition (147.67 ± 25.77 BW/s). Friction level significantly
6 influenced peak shear loading rate ($\eta_p^2 = 0.396$, $p = 0.016$), with lower shear loading rates
7 produced during the 20 kg.m⁻² condition (53.25 ± 10.45 BW/s) compared to the 16 kg.m⁻²
8 condition (58.78 ± 10.92 BW/s). The occurrence time of peak utilised COF was later for 20
9 kg.m⁻² friction level (0.043 ± 0.004 s; $\eta_p^2 = 0.306$, $p = 0.040$) compared to the 16 kg.m⁻² friction
10 level (0.037 ± 0.003 s). However, the magnitude of the peak utilised COF was similar between
11 the three conditions.

12 **5. Discussion**

13 Sliding on clay is a common feature of tennis,³ where players aim to initiate sliding in a timely
14 manner to enable a quick change of direction.¹² In the current study, greater sliding distances,
15 reduced loading rates and later peak knee flexions were achieved when friction was reduced.
16 These findings suggest loading was more evenly distributed over time when clay court surface
17 friction was reduced. In addition, greater sliding distances and later peak knee flexion suggest
18 longer time was spent controlling the slide when friction was reduced, which could increase
19 the likelihood of fatigue.

20 Sliding occurs when the shear force applied is greater than the static friction force.^{1,4} Previous
21 reports have identified higher shear forces on low friction clay surfaces compared to a high
22 friction acrylic surfaces, which resulted in increased utilised COF leading to players sliding on
23 the clay court.⁴ However, the present study reported no differences in shear forces and peak
24 utilised COF between the different friction conditions on the clay surface. These different

1 results are most likely due to differences in player movement mechanics on different court
2 surface types. In previous work, Damm et al.⁴ examined two distinct levels of friction (acrylic
3 and clay surfaces), resulting in differences in the utilisation of friction. For example, when on
4 the acrylic surface participants reduced their shear loading to reduce coefficient of friction,
5 possibly reducing injury risks associated with loading on high friction surfaces.⁴ Whilst, on the
6 clay court the greater shear forces would enable participants to overcome the static friction
7 and initiate sliding.^{1,4} However, the present study focused on clay surfaces where participants
8 were able to slide during all conditions. With no differences in shear force observed across
9 the three surface friction levels, the lower friction surfaces allowed greater sliding distances
10 owing to a lower resistance to sliding (lower mechanical COF).

11 Sliding reported for the lowest friction condition resulted in reduced shear and vertical loading
12 rates compared to the 16 kg.m⁻². The lower rate of loading on the lower friction surface as a
13 result of further sliding suggests a reduced risk of injury by increasing the time spent applying
14 the shear and vertical loads.¹⁸ Reduced mechanical friction reduces the initial shear stiffness
15 of the surface, i.e. lower resistance to movement or sliding, therefore reducing the load
16 experienced by the players during impact¹ The reduced loading rate reported in the current
17 study occurred in conjunction with later occurrence of peak knee flexion. Longer braking
18 phases, through later peak knee flexion, have previously been suggested to result in reduced
19 loading to accommodate the potential high loading when turning on high friction surfaces,
20 therefore reducing the risk of injury.⁶ However, findings in the current study suggest later peak
21 knee flexion, and thus later braking occurred on the lower friction clay condition rather than for
22 the higher friction clay conditions. It is important to note that the surfaces reported in the Durá
23 et al.⁶ study had a greater range of mechanical friction (0.43 - 0.93) which span those
24 previously observed for clay and acrylic courts². However, the present study focused on low
25 friction levels on a clay surface where the coefficient of friction ranged between 0.54 - 0.63,
26 similar to that previously reported for clay court surfaces². Marked differences in friction (acrylic
27 and clay) have previously resulted in distinct differences in technique and pressure

1 distributions to enable sliding on clay.^{4,7,19} This may explain the contrasting results with those
2 of Durá et al.⁶ The present study reported players sliding for all conditions, which was not
3 reported by Durá et al.⁶ When occurrence time was represented relative to contact time, no
4 differences between conditions were reported. These findings suggest that a similar technique
5 was used, but sliding increased the total time of the step.

6 Sliding movements in tennis have been demonstrated to require greater muscular control
7 compared to regular footwork.¹³ Greater sliding distances and later peak knee flexions
8 reported in the current study are likely to be associated with longer eccentric muscle
9 contractions in order to control the movement, which is likely to increase physiological
10 demands, such as increased heart rate and blood lactate accumulation. These findings
11 suggest that reductions of friction below the manufacturer's recommendations could increase
12 the physiological demand placed on players and therefore increase the likelihood of fatigue.
13 Therefore, on surfaces such as clay that result in longer rally lengths and permit sliding,
14 players could experience even greater increases in physiological strain, therefore increasing
15 the likelihood of fatigue. Fatigue in tennis has been associated with reduced performance^{20,21}
16 and increased risk of injury.^{22,23}

17 It must be noted that the current study was undertaken within laboratory conditions which
18 limited the movements analysed, therefore reducing the ecological validity of the data.
19 However, the turning movement was selected to reproduce a typical movement seen in tennis.
20 The composition of the synthetic clay surface (carpeted base layer and red granulated infill)
21 used in the current study differs to outdoor clay courts. Mechanical properties of these
22 surfaces may differ and therefore alter players' response. However, the current study provides
23 an insight to players' response to changes in friction on a surface that permits sliding.

6. Conclusions

Sliding is an influencing factor in players' response when examining clay court surface friction. Contrary to the study hypothesis, the current study did not report changes in shear force magnitudes (H_1), whilst shear force loading rates were reduced as friction decreased (H_2). Greater sliding distances accompanied by reduced shear loading rates on the lower friction conditions suggests reduced injury risks. In contrast to the study's hypothesis, no differences in knee flexion angles (H_3) and ankle inversion angles (H_5) were identified. Sagittal plane ankle kinematics remained similar between friction conditions (H_6), as expected. As hypothesised, later knee flexion (H_4) was observed during the lower friction conditions when greater sliding distances were also observed. Although sliding on clay enables efficient changes of direction and reduces injury risks through lower forces and longer time applying these forces, the current study's findings suggest that prolonged sliding on clay surfaces with low shoe-surface friction may lead to greater physiological strain. Therefore, it is important to maintain the manufacturer recommendations for infill volume, between and within matches, to limit excessive physiological strain due to greater sliding whilst still allowing players to benefit from sliding on the low friction surfaces.

7. Practical implications

- Clay court frictional properties influence player movement and loading during sliding, likely affecting injury risks and physiological responses
- It is important to maintain manufacturer recommendations for infill volume, between and within matches, to allow the benefits observed from sliding to be maintained but limit the physiological strain associated with lower friction surfaces

1 **8. Acknowledgements**

2 The authors would like to thank the International Tennis Federation for their support during
3 the study.

9. References

- 1 1. Clarke J, Carré MJ, Damm L et al. The development of an apparatus to
2 understand the traction developed at the shoe-surface interface in tennis. *Proc*
3 *Inst Mech Eng Part P J Sport Eng Technol* 2013; 227(3):149–160.
- 4 2. Nigg BM. Injury and performance on tennis surfaces: The effect of tennis
5 surfaces on the game of tennis. Available at:
6 http://cn.hartru.com.planitapps.com/uploads/downloads/Doc_7.pdf.
- 7 3. Miller S. Modern tennis rackets, balls, and surfaces. *Br J Sports Med* 2006;
8 40(5):401–405.
- 9 4. Damm L, Low D, Richardson A et al. The effects of surface traction
10 characteristics on frictional demand and kinematics in tennis. *Sport Biomech*
11 2013; 12(4):1–14.
- 12 5. Girard O, Eicher F, Fourchet F et al. Effects of the playing surface on plantar
13 pressures and potential injuries in tennis. *Br J Sports Med* 2007; 41(11):733–
14 738.
- 15 6. Durá J V, Hoyos J V, Martínez A et al. The influence of friction on sports surfaces
16 in turning movements. *Sport Eng* 1999; 2(2):97–102.
- 17 7. Damm L, Starbuck C, Stocker N et al. Shoe-surface friction in tennis: influence
18 on plantar pressure and implications for injury. *Footwear Sci* 2014; 6(3):155–
19 164.
- 20 8. O'Donoghue P, & Ingram B. A notational analysis of elite tennis strategy. *J*
21 *Sports Sci* 2001; 19(2):107–115.
- 22 9. Martin C, Thevenet D, Zouhal H et al. Effects of playing surface (hard and clay
23 9. Martin C, Thevenet D, Zouhal H et al. Effects of playing surface (hard and clay

- 1 courts) on heart rate and blood lactate during tennis matches played by high-
2 level players. *J Strength Cond Res* 2011; 25(1):163–170
3 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181fb459b.
- 4 10. Murias JM, Lanatta D, Arcuri CR et al. Metabolic and functional responses
5 playing tennis on different surfaces. *J Strength Cond Res* 2007; 21(1):112–117.
- 6 11. Reid MM, Duffield R, Minett G et al. Physiological, perceptual, and technical
7 responses to on-court tennis training on hard and clay courts 2013; 27(6):1487–
8 1495.
- 9 12. Pavailler S, & Horvais N. Sliding allows faster repositioning during tennis specific
10 movements on hard court. *Procedia Eng* 2014; 72(72):859–864.
- 11 13. Pavailler S, & Horvais N. Trunk and lower limbs muscular activity during tennis-
12 specific movements: effect of sliding on hard and clay court. *Footwear Sci* 2015;
13 7(sup1):S68–S70.
- 14 14. Newton R, Doan B, Meese M et al. Wrestling: interaction of wrestling shoe and
15 competition surface: effects on coefficient of friction with implications for injury.
16 *Sport Biomech* 2002; 1(2):157–166.
- 17 15. Dowling A V, Corazza S, Chaudhari AMW et al. Shoe-surface friction influences
18 movement strategies during a sidestep cutting task: implications for anterior
19 cruciate ligament injury risk. *Am J Sports Med* 2010; 38(3):478–485.
- 20 16. Ura D, Carré MJ, Starbuck C et al. Effect of varying the volume infill sand on
21 synthetic clay surfaces in terms of the shoe-surface friction. *Procedia Eng* 2014;
22 72:877–882.
- 23 17. International Tennis Federation. *ITF Approved Tennis Balls, Classified Surfaces*
24 *and Recognised Courts - a guide to products and test methods*. London, ITF

- 1 Licensing (UK) Ltd, 2014.
- 2 18. Stiles V, & Dixon S. Biomechanical response to systematic changes in impact
3 interface cushioning properties while performing a tennis-specific movement. *J*
4 *Sports Sci* 2007; 25(11):1229–1239.
- 5 19. Starbuck C, Damm L, Clarke J et al. The influence of tennis court surfaces on
6 player perceptions and biomechanical response. *J Sports Sci* 2015;
7 34(17):1627–1636.
- 8 20. Lyons M, Al-Nakeeb Y, Hankey J et al. The effect of moderate and high-intensity
9 fatigue on groundstroke accuracy in expert and non-expert tennis players. *J*
10 *Sport Sci Med* 2013; 12(2):298–308.
- 11 21. Hornery D, Farrow D, Mujika I et al. Fatigue in tennis: mechanisms of fatigue
12 and effect on performance. *Sport Med* 2007; 37(3):199–212.
- 13 22. Bylak J, & Hutchinson MR. Common sports injuries in young tennis players.
14 *Sports Med* 1998; 26(2):119–132.
- 15 23. Kovacs MS. Movement for tennis: the importance of lateral training. *Strength*
16 *Cond J (Lippincott Williams Wilkins)* 2009; 31(4):77–85.

17

18

1 **10. Tables and captions**

2 **Table 1: Range of static coefficient of friction (COF) during a range of normal forces**
3 **(1000N – 1600N) for three volumes of sand infill**

COF	
12 kg.m ⁻²	0.61 - 0.64
16 kg.m ⁻²	0.59 - 0.65
20 kg.m ⁻²	0.54 – 0.59

4

1 **Table 2: Means and standard deviations for kinematic and kinetic data collected for**
 2 **each friction condition**

Variable	12 kg.m⁻²	16 kg.m⁻²	20 kg.m⁻²
<i>Kinematic data</i>			
Knee flexion angle			
At impact (°)	17.3 ± 13.6	13.6 ± 13.6	16.5 ± 12.0
Peak (°)	40.0 ± 5.2	39.5 ± 5.7	39.6 ± 6.2
Time of peak (s)	0.31 ± 0.07	0.30 ± 0.07	0.34 ± 0.09*
Relative time of peak (%)	53.44 ± 9.81	51.94 ± 9.20	57.46 ± 9.92
Ankle flexion angle			
At impact (°)	4.4 ± 12.6	3.0 ± 11.3	4.6 ± 12.0
Peak (°)	-12.2 ± 7.3	-10.9 ± 8.9	-12.3 ± 7.4
Time of peak (s)	0.26 ± 0.12	0.19 ± 0.12	0.22 ± 0.12
Relative time of peak (%)	53.32 ± 7.10	53.41 ± 7.38	50.37 ± 6.19
Ankle inversion angle			
At impact (°)	-4.6 ± 17.2	2.2 ± 13.3	-2.8 ± 17.0
Peak (°)	-30.4 ± 8.5	-29.3 ± 7.5	-27.9 ± 8.7
Time of peak (s)	0.24 ± 0.09	0.23 ± 0.08	0.19 ± 0.08
Relative time of peak (%)	49.72 ± 8.00	48.03 ± 8.40	45.60 ± 8.67
<i>Kinetic data</i>			
Peak impact force (BW)	1.80 ± 0.49	1.92 ± 0.55	1.90 ± 0.50
Peak active force (BW)	1.32 ± 0.24	1.33 ± 0.88	1.28 ± 0.27
Peak shear force (BW)	0.76 ± 0.28	0.81 ± 0.23	0.78 ± 0.22
Average loading rate (BW/s)	37.75 ± 19.31	42.19 ± 21.18	41.67 ± 19.78
Peak vertical loading rate (BW/s)	140.22 ± 87.74	147.67 ± 25.77**	135.52 ± 23.16
Horizontal peak loading rate (BW/s)	54.94 ± 26.84	58.78 ± 10.92**	53.25 ± 10.45
Peak utilised COF	0.62 ± 0.13	0.55 ± 0.08	0.53 ± 0.14
Time of peak utilised COF (s)	0.035 ± 0.002	0.040 ± 0.003**	0.043 ± 0.004

3 *denotes a significant difference with the 12 kg.m⁻²condition, ** denotes a significant difference with the 20
 4 kg.m⁻²condition

5

1 **11. Figure and captions**




Figure 1: Examples of vertical (Fz) and shear (Fshear) ground reaction forces, utilised coefficient of friction (COF) and associated sliding distance for one subject during the turning movement

2