

# Quality of Knee Strengthening Exercises Performed at Home Deteriorates After One Week

**Ulrike H. Mitchell**

Brigham Young University

**Hyunwook Lee** (✉ [hyunwook.lee31@gmail.com](mailto:hyunwook.lee31@gmail.com))

Brigham Young University

**Hayden E. Dennis**

Brigham Young University

**Matthew K. Seeley**

Brigham Young University

---

## Research Article

**Keywords:** Physical therapy exercises, exercise retention, motion capture system

**Posted Date:** October 6th, 2021

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-951919/v1>

**License:** © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published at BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders on February 19th, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12891-022-05120-3>.

# Abstract

**Background:** To compare the performance (as determined by lower extremity kinematics) of knee exercises in healthy middle-aged and older individuals immediately after instruction and one week later.

**Methods:** This is a cross-sectional study in a laboratory setting. Nineteen healthy volunteers (age [y]  $63.1 \pm 8.6$ , mass [kg]  $76.3 \pm 14.7$ , height [m]  $1.7 \pm 0.1$ ) participated in this study. High speed video and reflective markers were used to track motion during four exercises. The exercises were knee flexion, straight leg raise, and “V” in supine position, and hip abduction in side lying position. All participants received verbal and tactile cues during the training phase and the therapist observed and, if necessary, corrected the exercises. Upon return a week later the participants performed the same exercises without any further instructions. Knee and hip sagittal and rotational angles were extracted from the motion capture. A repeated measures t-test was used to compare the motions between two visits.

**Results:** Participants demonstrated more knee flexion during straight leg raise and “V in” exercises at the 2<sup>nd</sup> visit compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> visit (both  $p < 0.05$ ). During the “V out” exercise, they performed more external rotation ( $p < 0.05$ ) while they showed more internal rotation during the “V in” exercise at the 2<sup>nd</sup> visit compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> visit.

**Conclusions:** Exercise performance declined significantly in healthy middle-aged and older individuals one week after instruction. This decline occurred despite an instructional exercise sheet being given to every participant. Improper execution of exercise programs might prolong the rehabilitation time and increase levels of pain and impairment unnecessarily.

## Background

The 2020 Clinical Practice Guidelines for the physical therapy management after total knee arthroplasty [1] (TKA) recommend supervised postoperative physical therapy for patients who have undergone TKA. This “moderately strong” recommendation is based on two studies that showed that approaches with more supervision from a physical therapist yielded better quality-of-life scores 3 and/or 6 months after surgery [2] and better self-reported outcomes, mobility scores, and balance at the end of the intervention compared with the less-supervised group [3].

Unfortunately, due to inconvenient logistics, non-availability of physical therapy, patient’s lack of insurance and other factors, many patients cannot or do not take advantage of this important service. In those cases, patients are sent home with exercise instructions. Several studies (e.g.[4, 5]) have shown that direct supervision from a physical therapist may not be required for effective physical therapy; these studies reported no difference in outcomes between patients after TKA who received physical therapy in an outpatient clinic and those who performed exercises at home. However, non-compliance to home exercise programs is common with over 50% of the patients only partially adhering to their program and over 15% not adhering at all [6]. The reasons vary and include that exercises are too boring, the patient forgot about them or did not remember how to do them correctly [6]. Non-compliance to exercise

programs affects the effectiveness of the intervention [7], might prolong the rehabilitation time unnecessarily, and increase levels of pain and impairment [8].

Written exercise instructions are often given to the patient as a reminder. This simple strategy has been shown to be effective in promoting adherence to exercise[9] and improve compliance to home-based exercises[10]. Unfortunately, depending on the age of the individual, some patients do not remember exercises effectively after a single teaching session, even if they were given an instructional exercise pamphlet [11].

Previous studies [12-14] have assessed exercise performance, mostly by using pre-defined clinical observation protocols. These protocols assess the amount of cueing needed, and control, coordination and rhythm of the exercise [14] or specific physical components of each exercise [12, 13]. However, those can be subjective and might not be able to detect subtle changes in exercise performance. In this study we used a marker-based motion capture system that yields objective quantitative data [15].

The purpose of this study was to determine whether older adults can accurately replicate physical therapy exercises that are often used following TKA, when those exercises are performed away from the direct supervision of a licensed physical therapist. We hypothesized that older adults are unable to accurately replicate the aforementioned physical therapy exercises.

## Methods

### Participants

Nineteen healthy volunteers (age [y]  $63.1 \pm 8.6$ , mass [kg]  $76.3 \pm 14.7$ , height [m]  $1.7 \pm 0.1$ ) participated in this study. These individuals were recruited by word of mouth. Inclusion criteria were > age 45 and no recent injury to the legs. IRB approval was obtained from the appropriate institutional review board.

### Data collection

All data collection occurred in the university biomechanics laboratory. To obtain kinematic data, 36 reflective markers were attached on participant's lower extremity over the following anatomical landmarks: anterior/posterior superior iliac spines, top of the iliac crest, medial/lateral epicondyles of the femur, medial/lateral malleolus, dorsal aspect of the heads of 1st and fifth metatarsals, lateral aspect of calcaneus. Rigid clusters of 4 markers each were attached to the distal-lateral thigh and lower leg. Twelve high speed video cameras (100Hz; Qualisys, Inc., Gothenburg, Sweden) were used to track the 3D positions of each reflective marker while the participants perform the rehabilitative exercises.

Each participant was instructed in and performed a series of four exercises, see Figure 1. All exercises are open chain exercises that are meant to promote neuromuscular control and strength of the intended muscle group [16]. They were selected because they are commonly used as part of a knee rehabilitation protocol and do not require special equipment. The participants were positioned on a treatment table with a pillow placed under the head. The sequence of exercise was always the same though the starting side

(right or left) was randomized. Each exercise was performed 5 times on each side. The first exercise was called 'knee flexion'. While in supine position the participant was told to bend the knee by sliding the heel as close to the buttocks as possible, then return to the original position. This basic exercise was chosen as a standard or control movement. There should not be a difference in its performance, i.e. knee flexion and hip rotation angles, between the two visits. The second exercise was called 'straight leg raise' (SLR). A rolled-up hand towel was placed underneath the knee of the exercising leg. The participant was told to push the knee into the towel and lift off the heel, draw the toes toward the nose and let the heel be the guide of the raising leg motion. The contralateral knee was flexed to about 90° with the foot resting on the table. Once the knee of the raising leg was at the same height of the contralateral knee the raising leg could be lowered again. The muscles were to relax after each exercise. This exercise is typically chosen to focus on and strengthen terminal knee extension. The third exercise was called 'the V' and was separated into two parts. During the first part the straight leg was internally rotated at the hip and, while performing hip flexion/abduction, the heel was "writing" the one side of the V. For the second part of this exercise the leg was externally rotated at the hip and, while performing a SLR into adduction, the heel was writing the other side of the V. This exercise focuses on the lateral (hip abductors and internal rotators)[17] and medial muscle groups (vastus medialis oblique and hip adductors) [18] of the lower extremity kinematic chain, respectively. It is crucial to perform this exercise with the hip rotated in the correct direction in order to recruit the targeted muscle groups [17, 18]. The fourth exercise was called the 'Jane Fonda exercise' and was performed in side lying position. It required the participant to abduct the hip in the frontal plane with neutral hip rotation. Care was taken to point out that the abduction was to happen in the plane of the body and the hip was not to be flexed. This single-plane open chain exercise promotes neuromuscular control and strength of the gluteus medius when performed properly [16].

All participants received feedback in form of tactile stimuli and verbal cues during the instructional phase. During the first data collection phase the physical therapist observed exercise performance after the instruction was given and, when necessary, corrected the movements by guiding the participant verbally. At the end of the first data collection day each participant received an instructional pamphlet with pictures and the recognizable names of the exercises. Each participant was encouraged to perform the exercises every day for one week, five repetitions each. The instructions were meant to reflect the routine of clinical practice. The participants were informed that they were expected to perform the same exercises again one week later without instructions.

One week later, the participants returned to the aforementioned biomechanics laboratory. Reflective markers were attached to the bony landmarks in the same arrangement as before and the participants were asked to perform the same exercises. No cues, other than the names of the exercises, were given.

## **Data acquisition and processing**

The 3D trajectories for each reflective marker were tracked using Qualisys software (more info likely needed here), and then exported to Visual 3D software (C-Motion, Germantown, MD, USA) in order to

calculate the 3D hip and knee joint angles. Before the joint angles were calculated, the marker trajectories were smoothed using a fourth-order, low-pass Butterworth filter with a cutoff frequency of 6Hz and time normalized in percentage. To calculate hip joint internal and external rotation, during the V exercises, we used a foot segment and lab coordinate as reference segments to eliminate errors from marker trajectories on the hip. The kinematic variables that were compared between the first and second data collection sessions are described in Table 2. For each of the following kinematic variables, the average of 5 cycles in each variable (knee flexion angles for all 4 exercises, hip rotational angles for the V exercises and SLR, and hip sagittal angles for knee flexion and hip abduction exercises) was used to analyze the data statistically.

## Statistical Analysis

A mean of peak angles and the averaged angles throughout each variable were used to identify overall angle throughout each cycle. A repeated measures t-test was used to compare the performance of the same exercises between with and without supervision of a physical therapist. Significance was set *a priori* at  $p < .05$ . All statistical analyses were conducted using JMP Pro 15 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, NC).

## Results

Between the first and second data collection sessions the participants reported that they performed the exercises at home an average of  $4.83 \pm 1.75$  days a week. (Table 1) Participants also reported that they were involved in other exercises, such as walking, biking, stretching (Table 1).

Table 1  
Participants Demographics

Characteristics	Mean (SD)
Gender, male/female	9/10
Age, y	63.1 (8.6)
Height, cm	169.1 (10.2)
Mass, kg	76.2 (14.7)
Physical Activity, day	4.3 (1.4)
Compliance, day	4.8 (1.8)

Mean peak joint angles and average angles throughout the five repetitions are shown in Table 2. As expected, there was no difference in mean peak knee flexion angles during the knee flexion exercise between the two visits (Table 2).

Table 2  
Joint Angles of Each Variable

	Exercises	Kinematic Variables	Joint Angle, Mean (SD)		P value
			1st visit	2nd visit	
<b>Peak Angle</b>	<b>Knee Flexion</b>	Knee Flexion	117.3 (12.2)	116.1 (14.3)	0.691
	<b>SLR</b>	Knee Extension	-7.7 (5.5)	-10.8 (6.0)	0.024*
<b>Average Angle (5 repetitions)</b>	<b>SLR</b>	Knee Flexion	2.1 (4.6)	6.4 (4.9)	0.001*
		<b>V "Out"</b>	Knee Flexion	4.4 (5.6)	7.3 (5.2)
		Hip IR (+)/ER(-)	12.4 (19.0)	-16.3 (29.4)	0.0003*
	<b>V "In"</b>	Knee Flexion	3.4 (3.3)	8.4 (3.8)	0.000*
		Hip IR (+)/ER(-)	-46.1 (12.5)	-12.5 (30.2)	< .0001*
	<b>"Jane Fonda"</b>	Knee Flexion	1.6 (5.8)	5.3 (9.5)	0.069
Hip Flexion		8.3 (9.4)	13.0 (12.8)	0.125	

Abbreviation: SD, standard deviation; SLR, straight leg raise

\*: significant difference between 1st and 2nd visit.

The "V" exercise exhibited the largest changes in kinematics between visits and between participants, with second visits demonstrating standard deviations up to twice the magnitude of the mean. On average, the participants used almost 30° less hip internal rotation and over 30° less hip external rotation during "V out" (p = 0.0003) and "V in" (p < 0.0001) exercises, respectively, at the second visit compared to the first visit.

Table 2 represents kinematic data and statistical results. During SLR the participants exhibited almost 3° less peak knee extension at the second visit compared to the first visit (p = 0.024). In addition, they demonstrated 4.3° and 5° greater average knee flexion angle (i.e. less extension) throughout the 5 repetitions during SLR (p = 0.001) and "V out" (p = 0.0001) exercises at the 2nd visit compared to the 1st visit, respectively. There were no differences in knee flexion (p = 0.069) and hip flexion (p = 0.125) averaged angles during "Jane Fonda" exercise between visits.

Figures 2 and 3 represent an example of one participant who showed significant differences between 1st and 2nd visits. Figure 4 and 5 show figures as examples where there is no statistical difference between the angles between visits.

## Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether healthy middle-aged and older adults can accurately replicate post TKA physical therapy exercises one week after learning how to perform the exercises from

a licensed physical therapist. In order to answer this query we obtained objective and quantitative data by using a marker-based motion capture system. Our results show that not one of the participants was able to accurately replicate all the aforementioned physical therapy exercises (Table 3) and that exercise performance (as determined by hip and knee joint kinematics) declined significantly one week after instruction. This decline occurred although every participant was given an instructional exercise sheet.

Table 3  
Individual angle differences between visits

	Angle differences (2nd visit – 1st visit), degree			
	SLR Knee Flexion	“V Out” hip rotation	“V In” Knee Flexion	“V In” hip rotation
Participant 1	-0.1	-0.1	-6.5	5.6
Participant 2	5.3	-40.7	9.2	57.0
Participant 3	-1.0	-72.0	31.0	102.2
Participant 4	1.0	-10.2	1.1	74.5
Participant 5	9.3	-6.0	-5.6	26.8
Participant 6	9.8	-53.6	-4.6	60.0
Participant 7	3.2	-6.9	3.0	38.3
Participant 8	10.4	-43.9	1.1	57.0
Participant 9	8.1	-3.2	10.1	-0.6
Participant 10	2.3	-1.0	-1.7	11.2
Participant 11	2.3	-80.1	8.4	18.2
Participant 12	1.2	-58.5	-0.2	57.2
Participant 13	10.8	-47.2	4.7	43.3
Participant 14	4.4	-22.5	5.7	23.9
Participant 15	4.6	-9.4	-0.1	32.4
Participant 16	15.2	-8.3	2.0	-0.9
Participant 17	-1.4	-69.5	1.5	17.0
Participant 18	-2.6	-12.8	1.9	14.2
Participant 19	0.4	-0.1	7.8	0.6
<b># of participants who performed exercise parts “correctly”</b>	12	8	11	4

Bold values represent “correct exercise performance” during the second visit. “Correct performance” was defined as a knee flexion angle difference between the two visits of less than 5 ° for the SLR and “V” exercise and a hip rotation angle difference of less than 10 ° for the “V” exercise.

More specifically, the most obvious and severe change in exercise performance within one week of instruction occurred with the “V exercises”. In order to target the lateral hip muscles the “V out” phase needs to be performed with hip internal rotation [17]. However, during the second visit the hip was, on average, rotated 232% more into external rotation during this exercise compared to the first visit. Consequently, it was performed using the anterior muscle chain (quadriceps) and not, as intended, the abductors. The “V in” phase was performed with 73% less hip external rotation in the second visit compared to the first, therefore also promoting the anterior muscle chain, and not, as intended, the adductors [18]. Throughout all exercises that require terminal knee extension the knee was, on average, held in more flexion during the second visit. This indicates that terminal extension was, on average, not maintained. Full extension is an important part of the exercises because it is the position in which the oblique head of the vastus medialis is best activated [19].

Standard deviation was up to twice as high during the second visit for hip rotation during the “V in” phase compared to the first visit. With the exception of one variable (knee flexion during the “V out” exercise) all standard deviations were higher during the second visit. This could be a reason why some of the differences in joint angles between visits are not statistically significant. More importantly the greater variability between participants during the second visit indicates that some participants retained the exercises better than others, suggesting that the exercise benefits, i.e. strengthening of the targeted muscle groups, also varied. A similar phenomenon was reported by Faber et al [12]. who compared shoulder exercise form and quality during time of exercise instruction and two weeks thereafter. Exercise form was determined using a pre-defined clinical observation protocol, and exercise quality was defined by the muscle’s time under tension. They found that only 13 of the 29 participants used correct exercise form. In addition, the standard deviation of the exercise quality, i.e. time under tension, was almost four times as high during the second visit compared to the first. The authors surmised that this variability in quality reflects the fact that some participants received a 50% higher exercise dose and others a 40% lower exercise dose than intended [12].

No participant was able to perform all exercises correctly in our study. “Correct performance” was defined by the following variables: hip rotation difference of less than 10° and knee extension difference by more than 5° during the 2nd visit compared to the 1st (Table 3). Hip flexion during the “Jane Fonda” exercise was also considered as a potential source for incorrect performance, but this variable was not different between the two visits. Six of the 19 participants performed only one exercise incorrectly, while one participant made a mistake on every exercise. Only four participants exhibited the correct (external) hip rotation amount and angle during the “V in” exercise.

As expected, there was no difference in mean peak knee flexion angles during the knee flexion exercise between the two visits (117° and 116°, respectively). This exercise was used as reference exercise, meaning, no change was expected to occur over one week. Had there been a disagreement between the data collected on the first visit and the ones collected on the second visit it could have indicated that our methodology was not sound.

We are aware that not every participant, and patient, responds to and retains home exercise instructions the same. One could argue that five exercises are too many to recall. We decided to use 5 exercises based on the findings by Henry et al [14]. They found that there is no difference in quality of performance between executing two or five exercises as measured by the amount of cueing needed, and control, coordination, and rhythm of the exercise. Others[13] have used the same amount of exercises in their studies that test their recall.

While our study's methodology was strengthened by its use of objective and validated outcome measures, the fact that our participants were not actual patients remains a limitation. A strong barrier for adherence to a home exercise program is pain when performing the exercises [20]. Since our sample consisted of healthy participants who had not undergone any knee surgery, this barrier was not, or at least not strongly present. Additionally, the correct execution of the exercises might not have presented a priority to our participants, as it might have been to patients after knee surgery. On the flipside, our participants were probably able to perform the exercises better because they were not actual patients. Either way, our results cannot be generalized to actual patients. Nonetheless, the clinician must keep in mind that many patients who are not supervised for these particular knee exercises may not perform them correctly.

## **Conclusion**

Thorough and individual instructions into lower extremity exercises and an instructional pamphlet are not enough to ensure proper execution of the home exercise program. Other methods need to be explored to get the greatest possible benefit from home exercises.

## **Abbreviations**

TKA

Total Knee Arthroplasty

SLR

Straight Leg Raise

## **Declarations**

### **Acknowledgement**

I would like to thank to our colleagues and the devotion of the participants.

### **Author's Contributions**

UM, MS, and HL designed the study. US, MS, HL, and HD collected the data. HL analyzed the data. UM and HL wrote the manuscript and MS provided in-depth feedback on the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Funding

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation (CBET-1901845).

## Availability of data and materials

The datasets supporting the conclusions of this article are included within the article. The raw data can be requested from the corresponding author.

## Declarations

## Ethic approval and consent to participate

This study was approved by institutional review board in Brigham Young University. The participants provided written informed consent to participate in this research.

## Consent for publication

The written informed consent for publication was obtained from all participants.

## Competing interests

The authors certify that they have no affiliations with or financial involvement in any organization or entity with a direct financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in the article.

## References

1. Jette DU, Hunter SJ, Burkett L, Langham B, Logerstedt DS, Piuze NS, et al. Physical Therapist Management of Total Knee Arthroplasty. *Phys Ther*. 2020;100(9):1603-31.
2. Hudakova Z, Zieba HR, Lizis P, Dvorakova V, Cetlova L, Friediger T, et al. Evaluation of the effects of a physiotherapy program on quality of life in females after unilateral total knee arthroplasty: a prospective study. *J Phys Ther Sci*. 2016;28(5):1412-7.
3. Akbaba YA, Yeldan I, Guney N, Ozdinler AR. Intensive supervision of rehabilitation programme improves balance and functionality in the short term after bilateral total knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2016;24(1):26-33.
4. Rajan RA, Pack Y, Jackson H, Gillies C, Asirvatham R. No need for outpatient physiotherapy following total knee arthroplasty. *Acta Orthop Scand*. 2004;75(1):71-3.
5. Kramer JF, Speechley M, Bourne R, Rorabeck C, Vaz M. Comparison of clinic- and home-based rehabilitation programs after total knee arthroplasty. *Clinic Orthop Relat Res*. 2003(410):225-34.
6. Bonnechère B. Do patients perform their exercises at home and why (not)? A survey on patients' habits during rehabilitation exercises. *Ultras Med J*. 2016;2(1):41-6.

7. Campbell R, Evans M, Tucker M, Quilty B, Dieppe P, Donovan JL. Why don't patients do their exercises? Understanding non-compliance with physiotherapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2001;55(2):132-8.
8. Chandra H, Oakley I, Silva H, editors. Designing to support prescribed home exercises: understanding the needs of physiotherapy patients. 7th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction Making Sense Through Design -NordiCHI '12; 2012; Copenhagen.
9. Peek K, Sanson-Fisher R, Mackenzie L, Carey M. Interventions to aid patient adherence to physiotherapist prescribed self-management strategies: a systematic review. *Physiother*. 2016;102(2):127-35.
10. Schneiders A, Zusman M, Singer K. Exercise therapy compliance in acute low back pain patients. *Man Ther*. 1998;3(3):147-52.
11. Smith J, Lewis J, Prichard D. Physiotherapy exercise programmes: are instructional exercise sheets effective? *Physiother Theory Pract*. 2005;21(2):93-102.
12. Faber M, Andersen M, Sevel C, Thorborg K, Bandholm T, Rathleff M. The majority are not performing home-exercises correctly two weeks after their initial instruction - an assessor-blinded study. *PeerJ*. 2015.
13. Reo JA, Mercer VS. Effects of live, videotaped, or written instruction on learning an upper-extremity exercise program. *Phys Ther*. 2004;84(7):622-33.
14. Henry KD, Rosemond C, Eckert LB. Effect of number of home exercises on compliance and performance in adults over 65 years of age. *Phys Ther*. 1999;79(3):270-7.
15. Liao Y, Vakanski A, Xian M, Paul D, Baker R. A review of computational approaches for evaluation of rehabilitation exercises. *Comput Biol Med*. 2020;119:103687.
16. McBeth JM, Earl-Boehm JE, Cobb SC, Huddleston WE. Hip muscle activity during 3 side-lying hip-strengthening exercises in distance runners. *J Athl Train*. 2012;47(1):15-23.
17. Neumann DA. Kinesiology of the hip: a focus on muscular actions. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2010;40(2):82-94.
18. Sykes K, Wong Y. Electrical activity of vastus medialis oblique muscle in straight leg raise exercise with different angles of hip rotation. *Physiother*. 2003;89(7):423-30.
19. O'Sullivan SP, Popelas CA. Activation of vastus medialis obliquus among individuals with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2005;19(2):302-4.
20. Jack K, McLean SM, Moffett JK, Gardiner E. Barriers to treatment adherence in physiotherapy outpatient clinics: a systematic review. *Man Ther*. 2010;15(3):220-8.

## Figures






Figure 1

Panel A: knee flexion exercise; panel B: straight leg raise; panel C: "V out" exercise; panel D: "V in" exercise; panel E: "Jane Fonda" exercise




**Figure 2**

Graphs of the hip and knee angles during knee flexion, SLR, and “Jane Fonda” exercises. The graphs represent only participant 6. Panel A: knee angles in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) and panel B: hip angle in the transverse plane (rotation) during the knee flexion exercise; panel C: knee angles in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) during SLR and panel D: hip angle in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) during the “Jane Fonda” exercise). Solid lines represent the average of 5 repetitions for each exercise at the first visit while dotted lines represent the same for the second visit; the shaded gray area around each line represents standard deviation of the 5 repetitions; X-axis: time normalized in percentage




**Figure 3**

Graphs of the hip and knee angles during “V out” and “V in” exercise. The graphs represent only participant 6. Panel A: knee angles in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) and panel B: hip angle in the transverse plane (rotation) during the “V out” exercise; panel C: knee angles in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) and panel D: hip angle in the transverse plane (rotation) during the “V in” exercise. Solid lines represent the average of 5 repetitions for each exercise at the first visit while dotted lines represent the same for the second visit; the shaded gray area around each line represents standard deviation of the 5 repetitions; X-axis: time normalized in percentage



**Figure 4**

Graphs describing no difference between visits for the flexion exercise, SLR, and “Jane Fonda” exercise. Panel A: knee angles in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) and panel B: hip angle in the transverse plane (rotation) during the knee flexion exercise; panel C: knee angles in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) during SLR and panel D: hip angle in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) during the “Jane Fonda” exercise). Solid lines represent the average of 5 repetitions for each exercise at the first visit while dotted lines represent the same for the second visit; the shaded gray area around each line represents standard deviation of the 5 repetitions; X-axis: time normalized in percentage



**Figure 5**

Graphs describing no difference between visits for the “V out” and “V in” exercises. Panel A: knee angles in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) and panel B: hip angle in the transverse plane (rotation) during the “V out” exercise; panel C: knee angles in the sagittal plane (flexion/extension) and panel D: hip angle in the transverse plane (rotation) during the “V in” exercise. Solid lines represent the average of 5 repetitions for each exercise at the first visit while dotted lines represent the same for the second visit; the shaded gray area around each line represents standard deviation of the 5 repetitions; X-axis: time normalized in percentage