

# Comparing two hands-on therapy methods for improving ankle motion in college athletes

<b>Submission date</b> 08/08/2025	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered
		<input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 13/08/2025	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 13/08/2025	<b>Condition category</b> Injury, Occupational Diseases, Poisoning	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Record updated in last year

## Plain English summary of protocol

### Background and study aims

The primary aim of this study was to compare the effectiveness of two manual therapy interventions on ankle motion. The second aim was to look at the association between ankle joint assessment and the movement of the bones around the joint. The third aim was to find out how manual therapy techniques aimed at the ankle joint can affect the injury risk of ankle sprains.

### Who can participate?

Athletes aged 18 to 25 years from the men's and women's soccer, basketball, and lacrosse teams

### What does the study involve?

Participants have their ankle motion measured and are randomly allocated to one of three groups:

1. Control group
2. High-velocity low amplitude thrust (HVLAT)
3. Closed kinetic chain mobilization with movement (CKCMWM)

The researchers determine the short-term impact of the manual therapy interventions on ankle motion.

### What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

Participation in this study involved minimal risk to subjects. Potential risks included temporary soreness, mild discomfort or joint stiffness following manual therapy interventions. These effects were

expected to be short-lived and to resolve without lasting harm. The screening and intervention procedures carried no known risk of serious injury when performed by licensed physical therapists trained in the study techniques.

Potential benefits to participants included an improvement in ankle range of motion, which may enhance function and potentially reduce the risk of ankle sprains. Participants also contributed to advancing clinical knowledge regarding the effectiveness of manual therapy techniques in sports medicine, which may benefit future athletes.

Where is the study run from?  
Lebanon Valley College (USA)

When is the study starting and how long is it expected to run for?  
September 2018 to October 2019

Who is funding the study?  
Investigator initiated and funded

Who is the main contact?  
Dr Michael E. Lehr, mlehr@messiah.edu

## Contact information

### Type(s)

Public, Scientific, Principal investigator

### Contact name

Dr Michael Lehr

### Contact details

401 Winding Hill  
Mechanicsburg, PA  
United States of America  
17055  
+1 (0)7172221001  
mlehr@messiah.edu

## Additional identifiers

### Clinical Trials Information System (CTIS)

Nil known

### ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT)

Nil known

### Protocol serial number

Nil known

## Study information

### Scientific Title

A randomized control trial comparison of high-velocity low amplitude thrust and closed kinetic chain mobilization with movement on dorsiflexion range of motion and lateral ankle sprain risk in collegiate athletes

### Acronym

MT-DFROM-LAS

### Study objectives

Closed kinetic chain mobilization with movement (CKCMWM) will produce greater improvements in closed chain dorsiflexion range of motion compared to high-velocity low amplitude thrust (HVLAT) and control. Observed association of the relationship of joint play of the talocrural joint and osteokinematic motion of ankle dorsiflexion.

### **Ethics approval required**

Ethics approval required

### **Ethics approval(s)**

approved 24/09/2018, Andrew's University Institutional Review Board (IRB) (8488 E Campus Circle Drive, Berrien Springs, MI, 49104-0355, United States of America; +1 (0) (269)471-6361; irb@andrews.edu), ref: 18-075

### **Study design**

Randomized control trial experimental and interventional pre- and post-test design

### **Primary study design**

Interventional

### **Study type(s)**

Other, Treatment

### **Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied**

Injury risk for lateral ankle sprains and ankle range of motion

### **Interventions**

A randomized control trial experimental and interventional pre- and post-test design, participants were randomized in a block manner within one's sport into one of three interventional groups:

1. Control group
2. High-velocity low amplitude thrust (HVLAT)
3. Closed kinetic chain mobilization with movement (CKCMWM)

Participants proceeded through a standardized station sequence for data collection, which included the following:

1. Initial intake
2. Pre-test CKCDFROM
3. Joint play assessment
4. Intervention or control
5. Post-test CKCDFROM
6. Exit station/debrief

### **CKCDFROM Assessment Instrumentation & Procedures:**

CKCDFROM was measured using a digital inclinometer via an iPhone device. The front leg was placed on a 30 cm box in height, with the medial aspect of the calcaneus and medial first ray aligned along a vertical line on the box. A medial longitudinal arch wedge was used to maintain navicular height in weight bearing to control for excessivemidtarsal joint pronation and rearfoot eversion. The inclinometer was placed 15 cm from the most prominent portion of the tibial tuberosity. Standardized verbal instructions complemented a demonstration of the test via a video. Each subject's right and left CKCDFROM were assessed and recorded in degrees. Examiners for CKCDFROM were blinded to the participant's group assignment.

The leg of interest was the ankle that demonstrated the greatest restriction of CKCDFROM. If both ankles were equally restricted, then the default selection was the right. Pre- and post-test measures were taken in all subjects. The examiners were blinded to the pre-test measures during post-testing procedures and the experimental group assignments.

#### **Joint Play Assessment of the Talocrural Joint:**

Joint play assessment (posterior talar glide) was performed in an open-packed position in an open kinetic chain (OKC). Joint play assessment was administered by the primary investigator of the study, who was a board-certified orthopedic specialist (OCS) by the American Board of Physical Therapy Specialties (ABPTS), holding an advanced certification in manual therapy. The assessment was conducted in an open-packed OKC position on the most restricted side, followed by either HVLAT or CKCMWM, unless the subject was in the control group. The assessment was performed in an open-packed position OKC on the most restricted side, followed by one of the interventions (HVLAT or CKCMWM) unless the subject was assigned to the control group. The examiners were blinded to the pre- and post-test CKCDFROM findings.

#### **Manual Therapy Techniques for the Talocrural Joint:**

Participants were randomly assigned within their respective sport to either group #2 (HVLAT) or group #3 (MWM). Participants received the HVLAT "J stroke" technique or the MWM, applied to the most restricted CKCDFROM side based on pre-test CKCDFROM assessment. Two licensed physical therapists, both certified orthopedic clinical specialists with additional advanced manual therapy certification, performed the interventions. To ensure reliability within the study, one examiner conducted manual technique #1 HVLAT (talocrural distraction "J stroke" technique), while the other performed manual technique #2 (CKC MWM) as described by Mulligan. Participants assigned to the control group remained standing against a wall until completing the circuit - no sham intervention was used. Technique #1 involved the HVLAT method. The HVLAT-modified technique combined distraction force with a slight posterior glide of the talus bone. Technique #2 included the CKCMWM procedure in the weight-bearing position on the standardized footstool and aligning the medial aspect of the foot with the vertically lined tape. The CKC mobilization with movement (MWM) involved a sustained posterior glide of the talus in a weight-bearing position while the subject performed five successful repetitions. This technique was modified slightly from the weight-bearing technique originally described by Vincenzo and did not utilize a belt for anterior translation of the tibia. The therapist imposed a slight IR of the tibia to assist with relative external rotation of the talus during the posterior translation.

#### **Intervention Type**

Behavioural

#### **Primary outcome(s)**

Closed kinetic chain dorsiflexion range of motion (CKCDFROM) measured using a digital inclinometer via an iPhone device at baseline (pre-test) and post-test within a single session

#### **Key secondary outcome(s)**

Injury risk factors present for lateral ankle sprains, including the evidence-informed cut points of <35 degrees of CKCDFROM or >5 cm asymmetry between right and left ankle. CKCDFROM was measured with a digital inclinometer via the iPhone device for both pre- and post-testing sessions, which occurred in stations 2 and 5, respectively, averaging 17 minutes (10-21 min) between stations.

#### **Completion date**

01/10/2019

## Eligibility

### Key inclusion criteria

1. No reported musculoskeletal injury within 3 months before the start of the study
2. No lower extremity musculoskeletal pain at the time of testing
3. Medical clearance for sport participation
4. No previous lower extremity surgery that included hardware in the ankle/foot complex that is currently in place
5. No weight-bearing restrictions
6. Hip active range of motion of 0-90 degrees
7. Knee active range of motion of 0-120 degrees
8. Previously diagnosed concussion over the last year
9. Presence of any contraindication to orthopedic manual therapy (OMT) to the ankle complex

### Participant type(s)

Healthy volunteer

### Healthy volunteers allowed

No

### Age group

Adult

### Lower age limit

18 years

### Upper age limit

25 years

### Sex

All

### Total final enrolment

73

### Key exclusion criteria

1. Under medical restrictions
2. Inability to bear weight on limb due to pain

### Date of first enrolment

21/10/2018

### Date of final enrolment

28/11/2018

## Locations

### Countries of recruitment

United States of America

**Study participating centre**  
**Lebanon Valley College**  
101 College Avenue  
Annville, PA  
United States of America  
17003

## Sponsor information

**Organisation**  
Andrews University

**ROR**  
<https://ror.org/04aaa2n62>

## Funder(s)

**Funder type**  
Other

**Funder Name**  
Investigator initiated and funded

## Results and Publications

### Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

The de-identified dataset generated and analyzed for the study will be made available upon request to Michael E. Lehr (mlehr@messiah.edu)

**IPD sharing plan summary**  
Available on request

### Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">Participant information sheet</a>	Participant information sheet	11/11/2025	11/11/2025	No	Yes