

**Research Bank**

Journal article

**The relationship between the piriformis muscle, low back pain, lower limb injuries and motor control training among elite football players**

**Leung, Felix T., Dilani Mendis, Marianne, Stanton, Warren R. and Hides, Julie A.**

This is the accepted manuscript version. For the publisher's version please see:

Leung, F. T., Dilani Mendis, M., Stanton, W. R. and Hides, J. A. (2015). The relationship between the piriformis muscle, low back pain, lower limb injuries and motor control training among elite football players. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 18(4), pp. 407-411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2014.06.011>

This work © 2015 is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International.

## Accepted Manuscript

Title: The relationship between the piriformis muscle, low back pain, lower limb injuries and motor control training among elite football players

Author: Felix T. Leung M. Dilani Mendis Warren R. Stanton  
Julie A. Hides



PII: S1440-2440(14)00122-4  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2014.06.011>  
Reference: JSAMS 1050

To appear in: *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*

Received date: 24-11-2013  
Revised date: 10-6-2014  
Accepted date: 20-6-2014

Please cite this article as: Leung FT, Mendis MD, Stanton WR, Hides JA, The relationship between the piriformis muscle, low back pain, lower limb injuries and motor control training among elite football players, *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport* (2014), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2014.06.011>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**The relationship between the piriformis muscle, low back pain, lower limb injuries and motor control training among elite football players**

Felix T. Leung<sup>1,2</sup>

M. Dilani Mendis<sup>1</sup>

Warren R. Stanton<sup>1</sup>

Julie A. Hides<sup>1,3</sup>

1. School of Physiotherapy, Australian Catholic University, Brisbane Campus (McAuley at Banyo), Qld 4104, Australia.
2. The University of Queensland, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, Division of Physiotherapy, Brisbane, 4072, Australia.
3. Mater/UQ Back Stability Clinic, Mater Health Services, South Brisbane, Qld 4101, Australia.

**Correspondence Address:**

Felix Leung

School of Physiotherapy, Australian Catholic University, Brisbane Campus (McAuley at Banyo), 1100 Nudgee Rd, Banyo 4014 AUSTRALIA.

Tel. Int. 61.7.3623 7769, Fax. Int. 61.7.3623 7650 Email: [felix.leung@acu.edu.au](mailto:felix.leung@acu.edu.au)

**Word Count:** 3028

24       **The relationship between the piriformis muscle, low back pain, lower limb injuries and motor**  
25                                   **control training among elite football players**

26

27   **Abstract**

28   *Objectives:* Australian Football League (AFL) players have a high incidence of back injuries. Motor  
29   control training to increase lumbopelvic neuromuscular control has been effective in reducing low back  
30   pain (LBP) and lower limb injuries in elite athletes. Control of pelvic and femoral alignment during  
31   functional activity involves the piriformis muscle. This study investigated a) the effect of motor control  
32   training on piriformis muscle size in AFL players, with and without LBP, during the playing season, and  
33   b) whether there is a relationship between lower limb injury and piriformis muscle size.

34   *Design:* Stepped-Wedge Intervention

35   *Methods:* 46 AFL players participated in a motor control training program consisting of two 30 minute  
36   sessions per week over 7-8 weeks, delivered across the season as a randomised 3 group single-blinded  
37   stepped-wedge design. Assessment of piriformis muscle cross-sectional area (CSA) involved magnetic  
38   resonance imaging (MRI) at 3 time points during the season. Assessment of LBP consisted of player  
39   interview and physical examination. Injury data were obtained from club records.

40   *Results:* An interaction effect for Time, Intervention Group and LBP group ( $F=3.7$ ,  $p=0.03$ ) was found.  
41   Piriformis muscle CSA showed significant increases between Times 1 and 2 ( $F=4.24$ ,  $p=0.046$ ), and  
42   Times 2 and 3 ( $F=8.59$ ,  $p=0.006$ ). Players with a smaller increase in piriformis muscle CSA across the  
43   season had higher odds of sustaining an injury ( $OR=1.08$ ).

44   *Conclusion:* Piriformis muscle size increases across the season in elite AFL players and is affected by the  
45   presence of LBP and lower limb injury. Motor control training positively affects piriformis muscle size in  
46   players with LBP.

47

47  
48 **Key Words:** Piriformis, Australian Football League, lower limb injury, motor control training, magnetic  
49 resonance imaging.

50  
51 **Introduction**

52 Low back pain (LBP) is a common problem in sports which require repetitive rotating motion and flexion  
53 or extension of the hip and spine <sup>1</sup>. Australian Football League (AFL) involves high intensity, continuous  
54 activities such as fast running, direction changes<sup>2</sup>, kicking and jumping. The AFL injury report has  
55 reported high incidence and prevalence of trunk and back injuries over the last 10 years <sup>3</sup>. AFL also has  
56 the highest rate of non-contact soft tissue injuries compared with other football codes such as rugby league  
57 and rugby union <sup>4</sup>, with hamstring injuries being the most prevalent injury at the elite level <sup>5</sup>. While many  
58 factors may contribute to injuries in elite AFL players, a growing body of literature identifies the  
59 important role of optimal neuromuscular control of the lumbopelvic region in preventing lower limb  
60 injury<sup>6-8</sup> and LBP<sup>9,10</sup>.

61  
62 Control and stability of the lumbopelvic region is important in the transfer of forces between the lower  
63 limbs and spine <sup>11</sup>. Inability to stabilise the lumbopelvic region during dynamic lower extremity  
64 movements could lead to excessive load on joints<sup>1</sup>. Inadequate control of pelvic-femoral alignment  
65 (alignment of the femur relative to the pelvis) in the frontal and transverse planes may contribute to lower  
66 limb injury. Imbalances in hip and pelvic muscles involved in controlling pelvic-femoral alignment may  
67 contribute to potentially injurious misalignment of the lower extremity in the frontal and transverse  
68 planes<sup>12</sup>. The position of hip adduction and hip internal rotation with knee valgus and foot pronation is  
69 thought to lead to lower extremity injuries<sup>13,14</sup>. Although hip adductor muscle weakness has been  
70 associated with lower limb injury in football players<sup>15,16</sup>, and hip abductor muscle dysfunction found in

71 certain types of lower limb injury<sup>17-19</sup>, little research has investigated the deeper hip muscles that control  
72 pelvic-femoral alignment in the frontal and transverse planes.

73  
74 Trunk and hip neuromuscular control measurements have been shown to predict the incidence of knee  
75 injury<sup>20</sup>. Neuromuscular control training has been shown to improve lower extremity biomechanics and  
76 hip strength<sup>20-22</sup>. Recently, lumbopelvic motor control training in elite athletes was shown to increase  
77 targeted muscle size, reduce LBP<sup>7,9,23</sup>, and reduce occurrence and severity of lower limb injuries<sup>6,7</sup>. A  
78 relationship between motor control training and lower limb injury reduction suggests enhancement of  
79 control through the kinetic chain. Therefore motor control training targeting muscles of the lumbopelvic  
80 region may also affect other muscles involved in the control of pelvic-femoral position and stability.

81  
82 Pelvic muscles provide proximal stability for movement of the lower extremity by adapting to postural  
83 and loading changes<sup>13</sup>. Of the deep hip muscles that control pelvic-femoral position and stability, recent  
84 EMG studies indicate that the piriformis muscle has a role in controlling transverse plane movement as a  
85 hip external rotator<sup>24,25</sup>. The piriformis muscle was also found to be active during hip abduction<sup>24,25</sup> and  
86 there is greatest activation of this muscle when the hip joint is in extension or requires extension<sup>25</sup>. During  
87 weight bearing activities, the piriformis muscle restrains excessive axial internal rotation during gait to  
88 provide optimal hip joint loading and positioning<sup>26</sup>. Considering its role in controlling hip abduction and  
89 rotation, studying the piriformis muscle in elite AFL players is important as it may affect the lower limb  
90 kinetic chain. However, currently, there is no research regarding the role of the piriformis muscle in  
91 lumbopelvic stability and its relationship with LBP or lower limb injuries.

92  
93 This study aimed to use magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to, a) determine the effect of a motor control  
94 training program on piriformis muscle size in AFL players, with and without low back pain, during the  
95 football playing season, and b) examine whether there is a relationship between lower limb injury and  
96 piriformis muscle size in elite football players.

97

98

99 **Methods**

100 Forty-six male AFL players representing the full training squad of a professional club aged 19-32 years of  
101 age were eligible to participate in the study. The mean ( $\pm$ SD) age, height and weight of the participants  
102 were 22.8 ( $\pm$ 3.5) years, 187.9 ( $\pm$ 6.0) centimetres and 88.3 ( $\pm$ 6.6) kilograms respectively. All participants  
103 gave written informed consent and the study was approved by the relevant institution's ethics committee.  
104 No participant needed to be excluded from the study because of metal implants, claustrophobia or any  
105 other contraindication to MRI.

106

107 The intervention is a published motor control training program<sup>6,7</sup>. Initially players learnt to contract  
108 abdominal and back muscles voluntarily, using feedback from ultrasound imaging. If muscles were  
109 overactive (such as inability to relax the abdominal wall), players were taught how to decrease this activity  
110 and to breathe using the diaphragm. When able, players progressed to functional weight bearing positions.  
111 Weight bearing exercises included trunk forward lean, sit-to-stand and squatting to develop spinal  
112 extensor muscle endurance. Maintenance of spinal curve and alignment of the lower limbs in functional  
113 positions were emphasised. Major goals were dissociation of hip movements from trunk movements, and  
114 increasing endurance in these functional positions. Resistance was added using Theraband (The Hygenic  
115 Corporation, Akron, OH).

116

117 The AFL playing season occurs from March to August. A single-blinded 3 group stepped-wedge design  
118 was used in which Group 3 acted as a wait-list control group for Groups 1 and 2. The intervention trial  
119 was delivered in three blocks, each of 7 or 8 weeks duration. Complete randomization was used to allocate  
120 players into one of three intervention groups. Groups 1(n=17) and 2 (n=15) received 8 weeks of motor  
121 control training. Group 1 received an additional 7 weeks of training, to assess the benefits of a prolonged  
122 intervention. Group 3 (n=14) received the training during the last 7 weeks of competition games. The

123 motor control training consisted of two 30 minute sessions per week under the supervision of qualified  
124 physiotherapists with expertise in the motor control training program. No players were lost to follow-up.

125  
126 MRI scans at the start of block 1 (Time 1), end of block 2 (Time 2), and end of block 3 (Time 3) were  
127 taken using a 1.5 Tesla Siemens Sonata MR system (Siemens AG, Munich, Germany) using a previously  
128 published protocol<sup>7</sup>. Participants lay supine on the imaging table in the MRI tunnel with a foam wedge  
129 under their knees. Transverse slices perpendicular to the anterior abdominal wall were taken from the  
130 lumbar spine to the hip joint, with a thickness of 8mm and an interslice distance of 0.5mm. Images were  
131 saved for later off-site analysis.

132  
133 Piriformis muscle measurement used ImageJ software (Version 1.42q, National Institutes of Health,  
134 <http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/>) (See Figure 1). Muscle cross-sectional area (CSA) was measured by manually  
135 outlining the piriformis muscle boundary on 3 consecutive axial slices, from the point where the muscle  
136 was first visible on the image. The average CSA of the 3 slices was taken for each side<sup>27</sup>. Intra-rater  
137 reliability of piriformis muscle measurement was high (left Intra-class Correlation Coefficient ( $ICC_{1,1}$ )=  
138 0.90, right  $ICC_{1,1}$  = 0.99).

139  
140 LBP was defined as pain localized between T12 and the gluteal fold, severe enough to interfere with  
141 sporting or training performance. An experienced physiotherapist assessed LBP by physical examination  
142 during an interview, and grouped subjects as having current LBP, history of LBP (not current) or no LBP.  
143 ‘Players with current LBP’ had positive findings on physical examination of the lumbar spine and reported  
144 pain in the previous week. Players with no current pain, who reported past episodes of LBP severe enough  
145 to interfere with playing games and training, were counted in the history group. ‘Players with no LBP’ had  
146 never experienced LBP and did not report pain on examination. Of the 46 players, 13 reported current  
147 LBP, 14 only had LBP history, and 19 had no LBP.

148



149 AFL club staff collected injury data throughout the pre-season and playing season (late November to late  
150 August). Team medical staff diagnosed each recorded injury from playing or training and determined a  
151 player's ability to participate in training. An injury was defined as a condition resulting from training or  
152 playing football that prevented a player from completing a full training session or game. Injury severity  
153 was based on players' availability for weekly competition games. This was extracted from club records of  
154 squad members available for selection in the 22 competition season games or unavailable because of  
155 injury.

156  
157 Analysis of the complete dataset ( $n = 46$ ) was conducted with SPSS (version 17.0; SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL,  
158 USA), and statistical significance set at  $p < 0.05$ . Repeated measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA)  
159 with a Type I sum-of-squares model was used to assess differences in piriformis muscle size over time and  
160 between LBP groups, with or without intervention. The repeated measures factor was 'time' (Time 1, 2  
161 and 3). The between subjects factors were 'LBP' (coded as current or no current LBP) and 'intervention'  
162 (coded as intervention or control at T2). Age and height were included as covariates. Binomial logistic  
163 regression analysis was used to assess the effect of piriformis muscle size and the occurrence of injury  
164 during the competition playing season. Injury severity was the binomial outcome measure, coded as less  
165 than 2 games missed ( $n=22$ ) versus 2 or more consecutive games missed ( $n=24$ ) due to an injury, based on  
166 a sensitivity analysis to define more severe injuries<sup>6</sup>. The predictor variables were age, height, number of  
167 injuries in the pre-season, intervention group (coded as intervention or control at T2), LBP (coded as  
168 current or no current LBP), piriformis muscle CSA at Time 1 and percentage change in average piriformis  
169 muscle CSA between Times 1 and 3. The variable 'weight' was not included due to high co-linearity with  
170 height ( $r=0.75$ ).

171

## 172 **Results**

173 Initial ANOVA for age and height revealed no statistically significant association between the number of  
174 players with or without LBP, or LBP history, and their distribution across the three intervention groups

175 ( $\chi^2=3.6$ ,  $P = 0.46$ ). Preliminary analysis of the injured players indicated no relationship between injury  
176 side and muscle size ( $p>0.05$ ), therefore injury side was not included as a factor in the final model.

177  
178 Results of the ANCOVA showed an overall main effect for piriformis muscle CSA change over time  
179 ( $p<0.05$ ). A-priori contrast for this result indicated significant differences between Times 1 and 2 ( $F =$   
180  $0.24$ ,  $P = 0.046$ ), and between Times 2 and 3 ( $F = 8.59$ ,  $P = 0.006$ ) (means shown in Table 1). However,  
181 there was also a 3-way interaction effect for Time, Intervention Group and LBP group ( $F = 3.7$ ,  $p = 0.03$ ).  
182 Between Times 1 and 2, for players with no current LBP, the piriformis muscle CSA increased whether or  
183 not they did motor control training by Time 2. For players with current LBP, piriformis muscle CSA  
184 increased with motor control training. Between Times 2 and 3, the means show both groups' piriformis  
185 muscle CSA increased. Notably, players who had not received the intervention by Time 2 (Wait-list  
186 Control) with current LBP had a decrease in piriformis muscle size between Times 1 and 2, followed by a  
187 20% increase in piriformis muscle CSA between Times 2 and 3, after receiving the intervention.

188  
189 During the competition season, 12 players (26.1%) were available for all games and 34 (73.9%) players  
190 were injured, resulting in missing a game. Of these, 70.6% missed 2 or more games. The majority of  
191 players (67.4%) also had a pre-season injury. 21 players (45.7%) were injured in the pre-season and also  
192 the playing season. A small number ( $n = 4$ ) with upper body injuries only missed one game so were not in  
193 the severity group. One player with an upper body injury also had a lower limb injury for which he  
194 missed 2 or more consecutive games ( $n = 1$ ).

195  
196 Table 2 shows the results of the logistic regression analysis of baseline measures related to lower limb  
197 injury during the playing season. There was a statistically significant effect for the factor of height ( $\chi^2 =$   
198  $4.47$ ,  $p = 0.03$ ) and the percentage change in piriformis muscle CSA between Times 1 and 3 ( $\chi^2 = 4.27$ ,  $p$   
199  $= 0.04$ ). The odds of sustaining a severe injury (resulting in 2 or more games missed) are 16% higher for  
200 taller players ( $OR=1.16$ ). In relation to change in piriformis CSA between Times 1 and 3, for every 1%

201 decrease below the mean percentage change ( $11.56 \pm 13.0$ ), there was an 8% higher odds (OR = 1.08) of  
202 incurring a severe injury during the season.

203

#### 204 **Discussion**

205 This study found elite AFL players' piriformis muscle size increased during the playing season. Players  
206 with no LBP had an overall increase in piriformis muscle CSA at all 3 time points, whether or not they  
207 received the motor control training program. These findings indicate piriformis hypertrophy is perhaps a  
208 response to playing football and training, which included strength, endurance and game specific training.  
209 Currently, there is little understanding of the piriformis' role in lumbopelvic stability in kicking sports or  
210 single-leg stance activities. Piriformis is a deep muscle that inserts directly onto the greater trochanter  
211 from the sacrum. It exerts its effect more locally at the hip joint and allows movement of the femur to act  
212 upon the sacrum and sacroiliac joint<sup>26</sup>. Piriformis hypertrophy in footballers may be explained by its  
213 proposed role maintaining optimal hip joint load and positioning in stance phase, by restricting excessive  
214 axial internal rotation<sup>26</sup>. Because of the increased forces and muscular demands of elite level competition,  
215 it is possible that muscles vital to the athletes' performance of sports specific skills adapt accordingly.

216

217 Results also showed that LBP affected the piriformis muscle during the playing season. Players with  
218 current LBP showed reduced piriformis muscle CSA between time points 1 and 2. Assuming piriformis  
219 muscle hypertrophy across the season reflects the appropriate response to playing football, this result  
220 suggests that the presence of LBP during the season may affect the ability of the piriformis muscle to  
221 adapt in response to physical demands. Due to the difficulty in examining the piriformis muscle within the  
222 pelvis, it is often neglected in terms of musculoskeletal function and its role in lumbopelvic and hip  
223 stability. From a clinical perspective, the piriformis muscle is often subjected to soft tissue release and  
224 stretching techniques to inhibit spasm and lengthen the muscle<sup>28</sup>. However, there is a lack of evidence  
225 that demonstrates an understanding of the relationship between the piriformis muscle and LBP.

226

227 Motor control training was shown to affect piriformis muscle size in players with LBP. Players with LBP  
228 who underwent motor control training showed a steady increase in piriformis muscle size across the  
229 season similar to that seen in the players without LBP. The effect of motor control training was further  
230 demonstrated by players in the control group that had LBP who originally had a decrease in piriformis  
231 muscle CSA. They displayed an increase of piriformis muscle CSA by time point 3 after commencement  
232 of motor control training. That is, motor control training affected the piriformis muscle in players with  
233 LBP, maintaining or restoring piriformis muscle size similarly to players without LBP. A study by Myer  
234 et al <sup>21</sup> demonstrated an increase in hip strength with motor training of the trunk and hip. Our current study  
235 has found that a motor training program primarily targeting proximal muscles of the lumbopelvic region  
236 also affects the piriformis muscle that is distal to the muscles targeted in the intervention. A possible  
237 explanation for this finding is that positions adopted during motor control training of the lumbopelvic  
238 region also required activation of the piriformis muscle to maintain optimal alignment of the pelvis on the  
239 femur.

240  
241 In addition, players with a relatively smaller increase in piriformis muscle CSA (Time 1 to Time 3) had  
242 higher odds of sustaining a severe lower limb injury during the playing season. Most studies in this area  
243 have assessed superficial gluteal muscles and measured hip strength in relation to lower limb injuries<sup>18, 19,</sup>  
244 <sup>29</sup>. Leetun et al <sup>29</sup> found that weak hip external rotator muscles correlated with incidences of knee injury.  
245 It has been proposed that the inability of lumbopelvic musculature to generate appropriate force to  
246 withstand external moments at the hip and knee may affect the dynamic stability of the knee<sup>12</sup>. As  
247 baseline piriformis muscle size at Time 1 did not significantly predict injury, the most likely explanation  
248 for a significant relationship between piriformis muscle size and injury, is that the injury affected the  
249 piriformis muscle. However, reduced training load during recovery from a severe lower limb injury may  
250 also explain the smaller increase in piriformis muscle size. Nadler et al <sup>30</sup> have shown that lower limb  
251 overuse or acquired ligamentous injuries increased the risk of LBP in athletes. The findings of the current  
252 study suggest that piriformis muscle hypertrophy across the season in response to physical demands was

253 affected by the presence of a lower limb injury. This link may be due to the entire lower extremity being  
254 one continuous kinetic chain, where an injury may lead to muscle changes in proximal or distal body  
255 areas.

256  
257 Additional findings from this study indicated that height was a risk factor for injury. As indicated in Hides  
258 et al <sup>6</sup> shorter players had less chance of sustaining a severe injury during the season. Pre-season injury  
259 was not found to be a predictor of injury during the season. The main limitation to this study is the small  
260 sample size which is characteristic of studies in this area, and results from elite athletes. The number of  
261 players with LBP in this study was relatively small and further studies on a larger sample should be  
262 conducted to validate this finding. Further research examining the piriformis muscle and other deep hip  
263 musculature could help researchers understand the clinical significance of muscles of the hip and pelvic  
264 region, and their effect on LBP and the lower limb. Use of ultrasound imaging rather than MRI would be  
265 more cost effective, and use of clinical tests such as dynamometry could provide additional information in  
266 future research.

267

### 268 **Conclusion**

269 This study found changes of deep hip musculature in elite footballers which were related to LBP and  
270 lower limb injury. Motor control training of the lumbopelvic region had beneficial effects on the size of  
271 the piriformis muscle.

272

### 273 **Practical Implications**

- 274 • Rehabilitation of lower limb injuries should involve motor control training of the
- 275 lumbopelvic region.
  
- 276 • Motor control training effectively maintains or restores piriformis muscle size

277           • This study supports ongoing research into deep hip and pelvic musculature in LBP and injury

278

279   **Acknowledgements**

280   The authors wish to thank the football players who participated in the study, Dr Andrew Smith (Medical  
281   consultant, Lions AFC), Nathan Carloss (Physiotherapist, Lions AFC), Lachlan Penfold (Performance  
282   Manager, Lions AFC), Assoc. Prof. Steve Wilson (School of ITEE, The University of Queensland), Dr  
283   Mark Strudwick (UQ Centre for Advanced Imaging), and Margot Sexton and Jan Gildea who assisted  
284   with the project. This study was funded by a sports medicine research grant provided by the Brisbane  
285   Lions Australian Football Club.

286

287 **References**

- 288 1. Harris-Hayes M, Sahrman SA, Van Dillen LR: Relationship Between the Hip and Low Back  
289 Pain in Athletes Who Participate in Rotation-Related Sports. *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation*  
290 2009, 18(1):60-75.
- 291 2. Dawson B, Hopkinson R, Appleby B *et al*: Player movement patterns and game activities in the  
292 Australian Football League. *J Sci Med Sport* 2004, 7(3):278-291.
- 293 3. Orchard J, Seward H, Orchard J: 20th Annual Injury Report: Season 2011. In. Sydney, Australia:  
294 AFL Medical Officers Association; 2012.
- 295 4. Seward H, Orchard J, Hazard H *et al*: Football Injuries In Australia At The Elite Level. *Med J*  
296 *Aust* 1993, 159(5):298-301.
- 297 5. Orchard J, Seward H: Epidemiology of injuries in the Australian Football League, seasons 1997-  
298 2000. *Br J Sports Med* 2002, 36(1):39-44.
- 299 6. Hides J, Stanton W: Can motor control training lower the risk of injury for professional football  
300 players? *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2014, 46(4):9.
- 301 7. Hides JA, Stanton WR, Mendis MD *et al*: Effect of Motor Control Training on Muscle Size and  
302 Football Games Missed from Injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2012, 44(6):1141-1149.
- 303 8. Hides JA, Brown CT, Penfold L *et al*: Screening the Lumbopelvic Muscles for a Relationship to  
304 Injury of the Quadriceps, Hamstrings, and Adductor Muscles Among Elite Australian Football  
305 League Players. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2011, 41(10):767-775.
- 306 9. Hides J, Stanton W, McMahon S *et al*: Effect of stabilization training on multifidus muscle cross-  
307 sectional area among young elite cricketers with low back pain. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2008,  
308 38(3):101-108.
- 309 10. Hides JA, Boughen CL, Stanton WR *et al*: A Magnetic Resonance Imaging Investigation of the  
310 Transversus Abdominis Muscle During Drawing-in of the Abdominal Wall in Elite Australian

- 311 Football League Players With and Without Low Back Pain. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2010,  
312 40(1):4-10.
- 313 11. Kibler WB, Press J, Sciascia A: The role of core stability in athletic function. *Sports medicine*  
314 (*Auckland, NZ*) 2006, 36(3):189-198.
- 315 12. Colston MA: Core Stability, Part 2: The Core-Extremity Link. *International Journal of Athletic*  
316 *Therapy & Training* 2012, 17(2):10-15.
- 317 13. Willson JD, Dougherty CP, Ireland ML *et al*: Core stability and its relationship to lower extremity  
318 function and injury. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 2005, 13(5):316-325.
- 319 14. Willson JD, Ireland ML, Davis I: Core strength and lower extremity alignment during single leg  
320 squats. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2006, 38(5):945-952.
- 321 15. Thorborg K, Branci S, Nielsen MP *et al*: Eccentric and Isometric Hip Adduction Strength in Male  
322 Soccer Players With and Without Adductor-Related Groin Pain: An Assessor-Blinded  
323 Comparison. *Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine* 2014, 2(2).
- 324 16. Crow JF, Pearce AJ, Veale JP *et al*: Hip adductor muscle strength is reduced preceding and during  
325 the onset of groin pain in elite junior Australian football players. *J Sci Med Sport* 2010, 13(2):202-  
326 204.
- 327 17. Franettovich Smith MM, Honeywill C, Wyndow N *et al*: Neuromotor Control of Gluteal Muscles  
328 in Runners with Achilles Tendinopathy. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2014, 46(3):594-599.
- 329 18. Morrissey D, Graham J, Screen H *et al*: Coronal plane hip muscle activation in football code  
330 athletes with chronic adductor groin strain injury during standing hip flexion. *Man Ther* 2012,  
331 17(2):145-149.
- 332 19. Cowan SM, Crossley KM, Bennell KL: Altered hip and trunk muscle function in individuals with  
333 patellofemoral pain. *Br J Sports Med* 2009, 43(8):584-588.
- 334 20. Zazulak BT, Hewett TE, Reeves NP *et al*: Deficits in neuromuscular control of the trunk predict  
335 knee injury risk - A prospective biomechanical-epidemiologic study. *Am J Sports Med* 2007,  
336 35(7):1123-1130.



- 337 21. Myer GD, Brent JL, Ford KR *et al*: A pilot study to determine the effect of trunk and hip focused  
338 neuromuscular training on hip and knee isokinetic strength. *Br J Sports Med* 2008, 42(7):614-619.
- 339 22. Myer GD, Chu DA, Brent JL *et al*: Trunk and hip control neuromuscular training for the  
340 prevention of knee joint injury. *Clin Sports Med* 2008, 27(3):425-448.
- 341 23. Hides JA, Stanton WR, Wilson SJ *et al*: Retraining motor control of abdominal muscles among  
342 elite cricketers with low back pain. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2010, 20(6):834-842.
- 343 24. Hodges PW, McLean L, Hodder J: Insight into the function of the obturator internus muscle in  
344 humans: Observations with development and validation of an electromyography recording  
345 technique. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2014(In Press).
- 346 25. Giphart JE, Stull JD, LaPrade RF *et al*: Recruitment and Activity of the Pectineus and Piriformis  
347 Muscles During Hip Rehabilitation Exercises An Electromyography Study. *Am J Sports Med*  
348 2012, 40(7):1654-1663.
- 349 26. Snijders CJ, Hermans PFG, Kleinrensink GJ: Functional aspects of cross-legged sitting with  
350 special attention to piriformis muscles and sacroiliac joints. *Clin Biomech* 2006, 21(2):116-121.
- 351 27. Grimaldi A: MRI Investigations of the muscles involved in lateral stability of the hip [PhD  
352 Thesis]. St Lucia, QLD: University of Queensland; 2008.
- 353 28. Miller TA, White KP, Ross DC: The Diagnosis and Management of Piriformis Syndrome: Myths  
354 and Facts. *Can J Neurol Sci* 2012, 39(5):577-583.
- 355 29. Leetun DT, Ireland ML, Willson JD *et al*: Core stability measures as risk factors for lower  
356 extremity injury in athletes. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2004, 36(6):926-934.
- 357 30. Nadler SF, Wu KD, Galski T *et al*: Low back pain in college athletes - A prospective study  
358 correlating lower extremity overuse or acquired ligamentous laxity with low back pain. *Spine*  
359 1998, 23(7):828-833.

360

360  
 361 **Table 1:** Marginal means and standard error (adjusted for age, height and weight) of the piriformis muscle  
 362 CSA for players with current LBP and players with no current LBP based on whether intervention was  
 363 received by the end of Time 2.  
 364

<b>LBP</b>	<b>Intervention by Time 2</b>	<b>TIME 1 (Mean <math>\pm</math> SE)</b>	<b>TIME 2 (Mean <math>\pm</math> SE)</b>	<b>TIME 3 (Mean <math>\pm</math> SE)</b>
<b>No current LBP</b> n = 33	Yes	13.83 $\pm$ 0.47	14.51 $\pm$ 0.56	15.55 $\pm$ 0.60
	No	13.93 $\pm$ 0.70	14.97 $\pm$ 0.83	15.35 $\pm$ 0.88
<b>Current LBP</b> n = 13	Yes	14.51 $\pm$ 0.77	15.74 $\pm$ 0.92	16.15 $\pm$ 0.97
	No	13.42 $\pm$ 1.12	<b>12.06 <math>\pm</math> 1.34</b>	14.51 $\pm$ 1.41

365 CSA measurements in cm<sup>2</sup>

366

367 **Table 2:** Logistic regression results for variables related to sustaining an injury resulting in 2 or more  
 368 games missed.

Variables <sup>a</sup>	Chi-Square	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval
Intervention ( <b>Yes</b> )	3.36	0.21	(0.04, 1.12)
Height ( <b>Taller</b> )	<b>4.47*</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>(1.01, 1.34)</b>
Age ( <b>Older</b> )	0.00	1.01	(0.80, 1.25)
Preseason Injuries ( <b>Higher</b> )	2.98	2.41	(0.89, 6.52)
Current LBP ( <b>Yes</b> )	1.19	0.95	(0.88, 1.04)
Piriformis CSA at Time 1 ( <b>Bigger</b> )	0.02	0.97	(0.69, 1.37)
% increase in piriformis CSA Time 1 and 3 ( <b>Smaller</b> )	<b>4.27*</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>(1.01, 1.16)</b>

369 \*: p<0.05, a: For each variable, odds ratio refers to category in bold

370

370

371 **Figure 1:** Axial MRI through the pelvis with the piriformis muscle on both sides outlined using ImageJ

372 software.

Accepted Manuscript

