

From Risk Assessment to Recovery: Multidisciplinary Approaches in Sports Injury Prevention

Harshit Verma^{1*}, Atul Kumar Singh², Himanshu Mathur³, Ruchita Narsia⁴

¹Assistant Professor, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

²HOD & Professor, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

³Professor, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

⁴Assistant Professor, NITTE (Deemed to be University), Nitte Institute of Physiotherapy (NIPT), Mangaluru, Karnataka, India.

*Corresponding Author: Harshit Verma, Assistant Professor, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

<https://doi.org/10.58624/SVOAOR.2026.06.027>

Received: August 19, 2026

Published: October 05, 2026

Citation: Verma H, Singh AK, Mathur H, Narsia R. From Risk Assessment to Recovery: Multidisciplinary Approaches in Sports Injury Prevention. SVOA Orthopaedics 2026, 6:5, 210-218. doi: 10.58624/SVOAOR.2026.06.027

Abstract

Background and Aim: Sports injury prevention has progressed beyond isolated Physical risk factors toward a comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach that recognizes injury as the result of interacting biomechanical, Physiological, Psychological, and Contextual influences. This chapter presents an integrated overview of Contemporary Sports Injury Prevention, tracing the pathway from structured Risk Assessment to Recovery and Safe Return to Sport decision-making.

Methods: Emphasis is placed on hypothesis-driven clinical reasoning, particularly the seven-domain framework proposed by Mark A. Jones, to support individualized assessment and reduce variability in Clinical Decision Making. The chapter highlights the limitations of traditional linear models and adopts a Biopsychosocial and systems-based perspective, acknowledging the dynamic and context-dependent nature of Injury risk. Key components of modern risk profiling—including Biomechanical Movement Analysis, Neuromuscular Control, Psychological Readiness, Physiological capacity, Workload Monitoring, and Environmental factors—are discussed within applied sporting contexts.

Results: Evidence-based prevention strategies are explored, encompassing Neuromuscular Training, Psychological skill development, Load Management, Recovery Optimization, and Behavior change principles to enhance athlete adherence. The growing role of Technology, such as Wearable sensors, Athlete management systems, and Data driven monitoring tools, is addressed for real-time risk identification and individualized intervention planning. Psychological readiness and return to sport considerations are integrated as essential elements rather than afterthoughts in injury prevention and rehabilitation.

Conclusion: The chapter concludes by emphasizing knowledge translation through multidisciplinary collaboration among clinicians, coaches, psychologists, and organizations. By aligning clinical reasoning, technological innovation, and athlete-centered care, this framework supports sustainable injury reduction, improved performance, and long-term athletic health.

Keywords: Sports Injury Prevention; Risk Assessment; Return to Sport; Biopsychosocial Approach

Introduction

Sports injuries constitute a major concern in contemporary sports and rehabilitation practice, affecting athletic participation, performance, and long-term health. They represent a significant burden across recreational, competitive, and elite sport, affecting athlete health, performance, and career longevity. Historically, sports injury management followed a reactive, biomedical, pathology-driven approach emphasizing post-injury treatment and tissue-focused intervention.

However, evolving evidence has established that injury occurrence, recovery, and return-to-sport outcomes are influenced by a complex interaction of biological, biomechanical, psychological, and social factors. Contemporary perspectives recognize that advances in sports medicine have shifted the emphasis toward proactive, preventive strategies grounded in multidisciplinary collaboration. This represents a fundamental paradigm shift from linear risk-factor models to complex, Biopsychosocial and systems-based approaches.

Modern sports physiotherapy therefore emphasizes preventive, multidisciplinary, and individualized approaches, supported by structured clinical reasoning. This chapter presents a comprehensive overview of sports injury prevention from risk assessment to recovery, integrating Biopsychosocial principles, stress-coping theory, and Mark A. Jones' clinical reasoning framework. Emphasis is placed on systematic assessment, reduction of clinical decision variability, evidence-based intervention, and comprehensive return-to-sport decision-making.

SECTION I: CLINICAL REASONING AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Clinical Reasoning: Foundation of Expert Practice

Clinical reasoning is the cognitive process by which practitioners collect information, generate hypotheses, interpret findings, and make decisions regarding assessment and intervention. Effective reasoning moves beyond protocol based care to deliver individualized management.[1][3] **Dual-Process Theory:**[1] Expert clinicians employ two distinct cognitive systems:

- **System 1 (Fast Thinking):** Automatic pattern recognition based on clinical experience; efficient but vulnerable to cognitive biases
- **System 2 (Slow Thinking):** Deliberate, analytical reasoning; essential for complex, atypical presentations
- **Adaptive Expertise:** Strategic integration of both systems depending on case complexity[1]

Mark A. Jones' hypothesis-driven framework structures clinical assessment across seven domains, ensuring comprehensive evaluation and reducing clinical "noise" (unwanted variability in clinical judgments):[1][3]

Sr.no	Hypothesis Category	Key Focus Areas
1	Pathobiological	Tissue pathology, structural damage, healing status
2	Biomechanical	Movement dysfunction, loading patterns, kinetic chain integrity
3	Neuromuscular	Motor control, proprioception, muscle activation timing
4	Neurophysiological	Pain mechanisms (nociceptive, neuropathic, central sensitization)
5	Psychological	Cognitive, emotional, behavioral factors (fear, anxiety, catastrophizing, confidence)
6	Psychosocial	Social support, environmental stressors, organizational culture, team dynamics
7	Iatrogenic/Management	Whether current training, rehabilitation, or interventions contribute to problems

SECTION II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS THAT GUIDE MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES A. Transformation of Linear Models to Complex Systems Thinking

Early models of sports injuries were mostly reductionist and linear, attributing injury risk to separate components that include limited flexibility, weak muscles, or poor biomechanics. These models were useful for describing single-factor issues, but they were unable to account for the Multifactorial and Context-dependent nature of sports injuries. Depending on psychological preparedness, training exposure, social support, and organizational context, athletes with comparable physical deficiencies may exhibit significantly distinct injury outcomes.

Sports injuries are viewed by contemporary injury prevention research as complex system phenomena resulting from dynamic interactions between biological, psychological, and social systems. Nowadays, injury prevention is regarded as a "wicked problem," which means that standardized or universal protocols cannot effectively address it. Instead, prevention strategies must be adaptable, context-specific, and developed collaboratively.

Context sensitivity, which ensures that strategies are in line with organizational culture, resources, and athlete characteristics; stakeholder collaboration, which involves athletes, coaches, clinicians, and administrators in shared decision-making; and iterative refinement, which emphasizes ongoing monitoring, feedback, and modification rather than static implementation, are important tenets of complex systems approaches.

This framework divides injury prevention into three stages: Prepare (individual risk assessment and preseason planning), Perform (real-time risk management and in-season monitoring), and Recover (recovery optimization and return-to-sport decision-making).

This method is demonstrated in the Cirque du Soleil case study. By using a context-driven, sense– think–act strategy and engaging performers, medical staff, choreographers, and administrators, injury prevention strategies were continuously adapted rather than standardized. Over four years, this led to a 15% reduction in injuries, a 26% decrease in performance cancellations, and a 27% reduction in overuse injuries, with sustained improvements.

B. The Biopsychosocial Model of Sports Injury

The older biomedical model assumes that pain comes straight from tissue damage and that more damage means more pain. It works reasonably well for fresh injuries where the structure is clearly harmed, but it cannot explain why some people still hurt long after tissues have healed, why some people have pain without visible damage, or why two people with the same injury can be affected very differently.

The Biopsychosocial model offers a broader view. It says that pain and injury result from the combined influence of the body, the mind, and the social environment. In this view, pain is both a physical and emotional experience that is shaped by a person's beliefs, stress levels, expectations, and surroundings, not just by tissue damage alone.

Tissue integrity, neuromuscular control, strength, flexibility, proprioception, and nervous system function are illustrations of biological factors. Injury risk and recovery are independently dependent on psychological factors, including anxiety, catastrophizing, fear of re-injury, motivation, coping skills, and mood. Rehabilitation results are also impacted by social factors, such as team culture, coach-athlete relationships, social support, and organizational expectations. Two athletes with identical ACL injuries serve as examples of this model. One athlete exhibits good rehabilitation adherence and high psychological preparedness for a return to sport with strong support and constructive coping mechanisms. The other exhibits avoidance behaviors and a delayed return to sport due to high pressure and little support. Because of biopsychosocial factors, results vary even when tissue pathology is the same.

C. Key Theoretical Models Informing Practice

According to Williams and Andersen's Model of Stress and Athletic Injury, stress raises the risk of injury by increasing muscle tension and attentional narrowing, which lowers awareness and movement efficiency. This relationship is moderated by coping mechanisms like social support and personality traits.

This framework is expanded by the Biopsychosocial Model of Stress, Athletic Injury, and Health (BMSAIH), which incorporates physiological pathways such as hormonal responses, sleep disturbance, impaired recovery, and altered pain perception.

Overtraining risk models show how psychosocial pressures, exhaustion, mood disorders, interpersonal factors, and insufficient sleep all contribute to an imbalance between training stress and recovery, which leads to overuse injuries. When taken as a whole, these models highlight the need of multidisciplinary, situation-specific injury prevention techniques.

SECTION III: RISK ASSESSMENT – COMPREHENSIVE MULTIDISCIPLINARY EVALUATION

Modern views on sports injury prevention recognize that injuries rarely arise from a single cause. Instead, risk builds up through the combined effects of many factors that interact over time. These include how the athlete moves, their physical conditioning, mental state, training load, environment, and the way the team or organization is structured. Because of this, thorough risk assessment needs input from multiple disciplines and should always interpret findings in light of the athlete's real sporting context, not just isolated test results.

A. Biomechanical Risk Assessment

Biomechanical risk assessment looks at how athletes produce, control, and transmit forces through the body during sport-specific actions such as running, jumping, landing, and changing direction. In practice, this usually combines precise laboratory testing with simpler field-based tests, so that clinicians can balance accuracy with relevance to real play. Since injury patterns differ across sports and even between positions on the same team, assessments must be tailored to the demands and typical movement patterns of the individual athlete.

Laboratory tools can include Three-dimensional motion analysis to track joint motion in all planes, and Force Plates to measure Ground Reaction Forces, loading rates, impulses, and differences between limbs. Wearable Inertial Measurement Units (IMUs) allow continuous tracking of movement characteristics during training and competition, while Electromyography can be used to study the timing and intensity of muscle activation. In clinical and applied settings, these methods are often complemented by Functional tests such as single-leg hop tasks, balance and postural control assessments, and sport-specific movement screens.

Several Biomechanical features have been linked with higher Injury risk. Persistent side-to-side differences—often expressed as a Limb Symmetry Index—are associated with increased risk of reinjury after lower limb injuries when asymmetries remain above accepted thresholds. Movement patterns observed during landing and cutting, such as increased knee valgus, greater hip adduction, and poor trunk control, are frequently reported in relation to anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury risk. Sagittal-plane measures like hip and knee flexion angles during landing tend to be more reliable and practically useful than some frontal or transverse plane variables, and indicators of force production, loading characteristics, and overall movement quality add important context to biomechanical risk profiles.

At the same time, Biomechanical testing has clear limitations. Movement patterns can change between sessions, tasks, and environments, and laboratory tasks may not fully reproduce the speed, fatigue, or decision-making demands of actual competition. Importantly, biomechanical measures on their own explain only a modest portion of who does and does not get injured—some analyses suggest they account for roughly a quarter of the total variance in injury occurrence. This underlines the need to interpret biomechanical findings within a broader Multifactorial framework that also considers psychological, physiological, environmental, and organizational influences.

B. Psychological and Psychosocial Risk Profiling

Psychological and psychosocial factors significantly influence both injury occurrence and recovery, yet have traditionally been under-emphasized in clinical practice. Injury risk is strongly associated with cumulative stress, including academic, occupational, financial, and interpersonal demands. Elevated stress impairs attentional focus and neuromuscular coordination, increasing vulnerability to injury.

Additional risk factors include anxiety, mood disturbance, maladaptive coping strategies, perfectionism, and excessive athletic identity investment. Neurocognitive factors, such as slowed reaction time, reduced processing speed, impaired attention, and poor decision-making under pressure, are increasingly recognized as independent contributors to injury risk.

Validated tools—including the Athletic Coping Skills Inventory, Brief COPE, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), and Perceived Social Support Scales—enable systematic identification of psychological vulnerabilities. Beyond the individual, organizational and team-level factors such as coach–athlete relationship quality, team cohesion, leadership style, and pressure to compete while injured play a decisive role in risk exposure and recovery outcomes.

C. Physiological and Biological Screening

The athlete's ability to handle the demands of training and competition is assessed through physiological screening. The **Gold standard** for evaluating strength and power is Isokinetic Dynamometry, which is complemented by isometric and isotonic testing, rate of force development, and muscle endurance tests. Preventing injuries requires the identification of Intermuscular imbalances and bilateral asymmetries.

Tissue extensibility testing, Dynamic flexibility assessment, and joint-specific Goniometry are all part of the flexibility and range-of-motion evaluation process. Health and recovery screening takes into account factors that affect tissue healing and recovery capacity, such as sleep quality, illness history, nutritional status, menstrual cycle factors in female athletes, and prior injury history.

Sex- and age-related considerations refine risk profiling. Female athletes demonstrate distinct neuromuscular and hormonal characteristics requiring sex-specific prevention strategies. Youth athletes require growth- and maturation-appropriate loading, while older athletes need adjusted training and recovery due to reduced regenerative capacity.

D. Environmental and Contextual Factors

The Environment and Contextual Factors influence the risk of injury. Playing surface quality, lighting, equipment sufficiency, and environmental factors (temperature, humidity, altitude) are examples of physical factors. Injury exposure is directly impacted by organizational structures, including training volume, competition density, recovery time, access to medical personnel, and facility quality. Cultural norms pertaining to injury reporting, pain tolerance, and striking a balance between health and performance are also very important.

E. Integrated Risk Models

Contemporary injury prevention emphasizes integrated, dynamic risk models that combine biomechanical, psychological, physiological, and contextual data. Machine learning and predictive analytics allow identification of complex interaction patterns, individualized athlete profiling, and longitudinal risk monitoring. When aligned with training periodization, repeated assessment enables adaptive modification of interventions across preparation, competition, and recovery phases.

SECTION IV: INJURY PREVENTION INTERVENTIONS – EVIDENCE-BASED STRATEGIES

Injury prevention interventions translate identified risk factors into practical, evidence-based actions aimed at reducing injury incidence while maintaining or enhancing athletic performance. Effective prevention follows a multidisciplinary model, integrating physical conditioning, psychological preparedness, load management, environmental support, and behavior-change principles to ensure sustainable outcomes.

Component	Key Focus	Example Methods / Tools	Primary Outcomes
Neuromuscular & strength-based prevention	Improve strength, proprioception, neuromuscular control, and movement efficiency to handle sport loads safely	Nordic hamstring exercise, plyometric and agility drills, core stabilization, hip and ankle strengthening; FMS, LESS, YBalance Test, single-leg squat, hand-held dynamometry to detect asymmetry and deficits	Reduced non-contact injury risk; better force absorption and transfer; correction of movement faults and asymmetries

table continued...

Psychological interventions & mental skills	Address stress, fear, attention, and maladaptive beliefs that impair motor control and decisionmaking	Cognitive restructuring, breathing and relaxation training, mindfulness strategies, acceptance–commitment approaches; I-PRRS, Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia, stress and mood questionnaires to screen readiness and threat	Improved arousal regulation and focus; better rehabilitation adherence and return-to-sport readiness
Load management & recovery optimization	Match training load to capacity and support tissue repair to prevent acute and overuse injuries	Monitoring internal load via sRPE, wellness questionnaires, SF-36, sleep quality scales; periodized training, structured deload weeks, and targeted strategies for sleep, nutrition, hydration, active recovery, and psychological restoration	Early detection of excessive fatigue, reduced overuse injuries, optimized adaptation, and sustained performance over a season

SECTION V: KNOWLEDGE TRANSLATION AND MULTIDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION

Translating research into practice demands active involvement from stakeholders, customized strategies, and continuous monitoring. Multidisciplinary teamwork—bringing together clinicians, coaches, psychologists, organizations, and athletes—delivers unified, evidencebased care and smarter decision-making.

Proven frameworks steer this work: Knowledge-to-Action covers knowledge creation through application.

4E emphasizes - Exposure, Experience, Expertise, and Embedding for lasting impact; Intervention Mapping handles needs assessment, co-design, program building, rollout, and evaluation. Team success comes from doctors, physios, trainers, strength coaches, psychologists, staff, leaders, athletes, and families sharing expertise via regular case meetings, shared records, clear roles, athlete-focused talks, and open information flow. Shared decisions blend views, set joint goals, keep interventions evidence-driven while honoring athlete choice, boosting compliance, refining prevention, and building lasting collaboration.

SECTION VI: Future Directions And Emerging Trends

Future Direction	Key Focus	Example Developments / Actions	Expected Impact on Practice
Technological integration	Use of advanced digital tools for injury prediction and monitoring	Refinement of AI and machine learning models for risk prediction; miniaturized wearable sensors for real-time, unobtrusive monitoring; standardized digital platforms to integrate data from multiple devices; improved access to basic monitoring tools in grassroots and community sport	Earlier identification of high-risk athletes, continuous on-field monitoring, better data-driven decisions, and wider reach of prevention strategies beyond elite sport

table continued...

Personalized medicine	Tailoring prevention to individual biological and clinical profiles	Athlete phenotyping combining history, biomechanics, and neuromuscular profile; incorporation of genetics and biomarkers into risk stratification; algorithm-guided, individualized exercise and load programs; iterative updating of models as individual responses are observed	More accurate risk prediction, targeted interventions, reduced trial-and-error in rehab and prevention, and more efficient use of resources at the athlete level
Systems-level implementation	Embedding prevention into organizations, policy, and global practice	Applying organizational change and implementation science to integrate prevention into daily routines; international consensus and guidelines to standardize best practices; policy and funding structures that incentivize prevention; strategies to improve equity and access in low-resource and community settings	Sustainable, large-scale injury reduction, consistent standards across levels of sport, and reduced disparities in access to effective prevention programs

SECTION VII: ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Comprehensive multidisciplinary assessment integrates:

Biomechanical: Motion capture, force plates, video analysis, functional hop tests, Y-Balance Test

Neuromuscular: Balance assessments (single-leg stance, proprioceptive tests), EMG (muscle activation timing)

Psychological: ACL-RSI Scale (adequacy threshold >56), Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia (TSK; threshold <37), Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS), GAD-7, PHQ-9

Psychosocial: Structured interviews assessing social support, coach pressure, team culture, financial stress

Pathobiological: Imaging (MRI, ultrasound), healing stage assessment, tissue quality evaluation

Conclusion

Sports injury prevention has evolved into a cohesive, multidisciplinary field that integrates Biopsychosocial Principles with Systems-level thinking. At its core lies Comprehensive, Hypothesis-driven Evaluation using the seven-category framework—from Pathobiological tissue healing and Biomechanical movement patterns, through Neuromuscular control and Neurophysiological pain mechanisms, to psychological confidence, Psychosocial support systems, and Iatrogenic training factors. This structured approach ensures no critical risk factor is overlooked. Psychological integration connects directly to physical recovery, as fear, stress, and catastrophizing can undermine even optimal rehabilitation. Evidence-based practices bridge this gap, combining mental skills training with neuromuscular exercises for holistic protection. Technological advancements enhance precision, from AI-driven risk prediction to real-time wearable monitoring, feeding data into personalized load management that prevents overuse while optimizing adaptation. While all these Factors comes into the picture, true success depends on Multidisciplinary Collaboration—Physiotherapists, Psychologists, S&C coaches, and Strength specialists working together through shared clinical reasoning and athlete-centered decision-making. This unified approach boosts adherence, ensures safe return-to-sport, and sustains long-term performance.

Future prevention will combine clinical skills, real-time data, and team support to proactively cut injuries by linking biology, psychology, and environment for longer athletic careers.

Conclusion

Sports injury prevention has evolved into a cohesive, multidisciplinary field that integrates Biopsychosocial Principles with Systems-level thinking. At its core lies Comprehensive, Hypothesis-driven Evaluation using the seven-category framework—from Pathobiological tissue healing and Biomechanical movement patterns, through Neuromuscular control and Neurophysiological pain mechanisms, to psychological confidence, Psychosocial support systems, and Iatrogenic training factors. This structured approach ensures no critical risk factor is overlooked. Psychological integration connects directly to physical recovery, as fear, stress, and catastrophizing can undermine even optimal rehabilitation. Evidence-based practices bridge this gap, combining mental skills training with neuromuscular exercises for holistic protection. Technological advancements enhance precision, from AI-driven risk prediction to real-time wearable monitoring, feeding data into personalized load management that prevents overuse while optimizing adaptation. While all these Factors comes into the picture, true success depends on Multidisciplinary Collaboration—Physiotherapists, Psychologists, S&C coaches, and Strength specialists working together through shared clinical reasoning and athlete-centered decision-making. This unified approach boosts adherence, ensures safe return-to-sport, and sustains long-term performance.

Future prevention will combine clinical skills, real-time data, and team support to proactively cut injuries by linking biology, psychology, and environment for longer athletic careers.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Jones MA, Rivett DA. *Clinical Reasoning in Musculoskeletal Practice*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: Elsevier; 2017.
2. Czuppon S, Racette BA, Klein SE, Harris-Hayes M. Variables associated with return to sport following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2014;48(5):356-364.
3. Edwards I, Jones M, Carr J, Braunack-Mayer A, Jensen GM. Clinical reasoning and population health: using the questions, answers, and values of clients to improve health outcomes. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2004;10(2):201-214.
4. FIFA Medical Assessment and Research Centre (F-MARC). *FIFA 11+ Program: An Effective Tool to Prevent Football Injuries Worldwide*. Zurich: FIFA; 2018.
5. Rommers N, Ausma B, Rombaut L, Vanderstraeten G. Efficacy of the FIFA 11+ injury prevention program in male indoor soccer: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness*. 2018;58(2):144-151.
6. Nakase J, Tomita Y, Inaki A, Gokita T, Kusuda T, Tsuchiya H. Proprioceptive training for the prevention of ankle sprains in adolescent athletes. *Am J Sports Med*. 2016;44(4):987-992.
7. Hale SA, Hertel J, Olmsted-Kramer LC. The effect of a 4-week comprehensive rehabilitation program on postural control and lower extremity function in individuals with chronic ankle instability. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2007;37(6):303-310.
8. Van der Horst N, Smits DW, Petersen J, Gouttebarga V, Backx FJG. Severe musculoskeletal injuries in professional soccer: ten-year trends of the Dutch elite football injury registry. *Br J Sports Med*. 2021;55(2):101-107.
9. Al Attar WSA, Soomro N, Pappas E, Sinclair PJ, Sanders RH. Effect of Injury Prevention Programs that Include the Nordic Hamstring Exercise on Hamstring Injury Rates in Soccer Players: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med*. 2017;47(5):907-916.
10. Huang P, Wang K, Erickson BJ, Cvetanovich GL, Romeo AA. Shoulder injuries in overhead athletes. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med*. 2016;9(1):126-134.

11. Healy R, Dijkstra HP, Driller M, Naghii M. Nutritional supplementation in sport: potential for ergogenic effect and/or benefits to health. *Nutrients*. 2024;13(5):1712.
12. Warden SJ. Prophylaxis: preventing the occurrence of bone stress injuries. *Curr Sports Med Rep*. 2006;5(3):126-130.
13. Herzberg SD, Motu'apuaka ML, Lambert W, Fu R, Brady J, Gupta A. The effect of menstrual cycle and contraceptives on ACL injuries and laxity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Orthop J Sports Med*. 2017;5(7):2325967117718781.
14. Foss KDB, Myer GD. The female athlete: evaluation and management of lower extremity injuries. *Int J Sports Phys Ther*. 2016;11(3):372-383.
15. Burland JP, Toonstra J, Edmonds K, Gable RK, Sherwood R, Reiling G. Decision to Return to Sport After Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction, Part II: Self-Reported and Psychological Outcomes. *J Athl Train*. 2018;53(5):464-474.
16. Finch C. A new framework for research leading to sports injury prevention. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2006;9(1-2):3-9.
17. Kahneman D. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 2011.
18. American Academy of Pediatrics. Pitch Smart—Protecting Young Baseball Players. Available at: <https://www.aap.org>. [Accessed 31 December 2025].
19. Tee JC, McLaren SJ, Jones B. A temporal examination of injury incidence and burden throughout an Australian Super League season. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2020;23(8):750-756.

Copyright: © 2026 All rights reserved by Verma H and other associated authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.