ANGULAR KINEMATICS OF THE DEEP SQUAT TEST IN FUNCTIONAL MOVEMENT SCREEN™ ACCORDING TO THE SCORING SYSTEM

Introduction

Functional movement is the ability to produce and maintain a balance between mobility and stability along the kinetic chain while performing fundamental patterns with accuracy and efficiency (25, 27). Muscular flexibility, strength, coordination, balance, endurance, and movement efficiency are components necessary to achieve functional movement, which is integral to performance and sport-related skills (10) and also in health promotion environments, like gyms for general population (26). Physically active people may face the risk of long or short term injuries and these injuries are commonly as lower extremity especially in sportive activities/games and may occur after an intensive exercises or/and neuromuscular fatigue (4, 8).

Preventing injuries, it should be determined whether the athletes are in the risk group (4). One of the popular screening tool for this, is the Functional Movement Screen™ (FMS)™. FMS™ has demonstrated some efficacy in the prediction of injuries and is thus used by many practitioners to make recom-
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recommendations for exercise\textsuperscript{3,10,22}. As the fundamental of functional training system and the classic test of body functional movement, FMS\textsuperscript{TM} is widely applied in physical therapy and strength and conditioning area, and has good reliability and validity\textsuperscript{28}. It consists of 7 fundamental movements which are scored on a 0-3 ordinal scale; involving locomotor, manipulative, and stabilizing actions that assess balance, mobility, and stability\textsuperscript{12,17,20,21}.

It also has developed a series of corrective exercises that are prescribed based on the level and type of faulty movement patterns achieved. So together with these corrective exercises, the FMS\textsuperscript{TM} is promoted to reduce the risk of sport-related musculoskeletal injury\textsuperscript{20}. Chorba et al 2010 indicated that the risk of injury in female collegiate athletes could be identified by using a functional movement screening tool\textsuperscript{29}. However McCunn et al 2016 mentioned that in their review, none of the movement screens that appear within the scientific literature currently had enough evidence to justify the tag of ‘injury prediction tool’\textsuperscript{30}. The scoring of the screening is made according to the criteria given by the guidelines provided by Cook et al., (2010). However, within this criterion, no angular evaluation of the subjects were found and the angular differences of the individuals who score 1-2 and 3 are not specified. One of the potential confounders is the issue of whether a knowledge of a task’s scoring criteria can change how individuals perform. If someone can influence their score based on their knowledge or understanding of the test, the outcomes of any strategy to prevent injury and improve performance, be it coaching or exercise related, could be compromised\textsuperscript{30}. The main purpose of this study was to determine the angular differences of related joints according to the FMS\textsuperscript{TM} scoring criteria and its classifications. It was hypothesized that segmental angles would change as individuals adapted their movement in an attempt to meet the scoring criteria.

**Materials and methods**

**Participants**

23 students (6 women, mean age 22.66±1.96yrs; mean height 172.50±1.97cm and mean weight 56.83±3.71kg; 17 men, mean age 22.25±1.41yrs; mean height 178.94±6.18cm and mean weight 56.83±3.71kg) from Halic University, School of Physical Education and Sport Department participated in this study as voluntarily. The students have not experienced any lower extremity injuries before. The study was conducted consistent with the recommendations of the Declaration of Helsinki. Before participating to the study, the subjects were informed about the research, including potential the risks and benefits of the study. Written consent was obtained from all the students.

**Procedures**

The data collection was done in Halic University, Department of Physical Education and Sport’s Laboratory, Istanbul and asked all participants to refrain from alcohol, caffeine and ergogenic aids the day before the test. According to the procedure, there was no given warming time for the participants. Since there is no additional weight added to the athlete and the screens are designed to uncover limitations to movement, extensive warm-up is not required\textsuperscript{5}.

The reflector markers which 3 cm diameter were attached to their selected joints of right and left acromion, olecranon, medial styloid, great trochanter, proximal patella, lateral malleolus and the dowel. These markers were applied to the participants with double-sided tape (Figure 1).  
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Figure 1: Marker Positions.

Kinematic data were collected by using 8 high speed (120 Hz) Oqus 7+ cameras (Dimensions: 18.7×11×12.5cm; Weight: 1.9-2.1kg) which were connected directly to the computer. The cameras were placed to each other about 3-4 meters distance and 4-6meters to the participants. For analyses of the 3D angular kinematics, Qualisys Track Manager (QTM) Version 2.12, which is proprietary tracking software, designed to work seamlessly with any model of Qualisys camera, ensuring fast and precise data collection (Qualisys AB, 2011), were used. A dynamic calibration method which was a wand cali-
ibration was used. T stick was simply moved around in the volume while a stationary reference object in the volume defines the coordinate system for the motion capture. Calibration time was set for 45 sec (Figure 2). Marker trajectories were low pass filtered at 5 Hz using Butterworth filter.

All participants performed a deep squat three times, permitting the observer to vary their view of the athlete’s movement through different planes of motion (i.e., sagittal and frontal), respectively. It was scored according to Cook’s guidelines. The best trial was used for kinematic data analysis. 3D data for the lower extremity during the deep squat trials were analyzed to examine differences between the three scores of the FMS. Left and right joint angles (knee, hip and shoulder); trunk flexion angles; hip, calf segmental angle, dowel angle in frontal axis; and also thigh segmental angle in horizontal axis were assessed to examine differences between the three groups.

**Functional Movement Screen™**

The full system of the FMS™ included 7 tests; deep squat, hurdle step (right then left), inline lunge (right then left), shoulder mobility (right then left), active straight leg raise (right then left), trunk stability push-up, and rotary stability (right then left)\(^{(21,13,23)}\). The equipment consisted of a 121.9*5.1*15.3 cm PVC measurement board with removable dowel (76.2 cm) inserts, a 121.9 cm PVC dowel, and elastic band for the hurdle step movement\(^{(21)}\). Clinicians certified to perform FMS™ are taught to demonstrate and evaluate each of the 7 movements. Evaluators assign 0 if there is any pain during the movement, 1 if the movement is not performed, 2 if there is any compensation, and 3 if the movement is performed without pain or compensation. For 3 of the movements, there is also an additional clearing test that the client performs. If there is pain on the clearing test, 0 is scored for that movement. A sum composite score for the 7 components ranges from 0 to 21\(^{(13,17,12)}\).

**The Deep Squat Test**

The deep squat is a test that challenges total body mechanics when performed properly. It is used to assess bilateral, symmetrical, functional mobility of the hips, knees, and ankles. The dowel held overhead assesses bilateral, symmetrical mobility of the shoulders, as well as the thoracic spine\(^{(5)}\).

The individual assumes the starting position by placing his/her feet approximately shoulder width apart with the feet aligned in the sagittal plane. Then adjusts their hands on the dowel to assume a 90° degree angle of the elbows with the dowel over-head. Next, the dowel is pressed overhead with the shoulders flexed and abducted, and the elbows extended. The individual is then instructed to descend slowly into a squat position. The squat position should be assumed with the heels on the floor, head and chest facing forward and the dowel maximally pressed overhead. The individual may repeat the movement up to three times. If the criteria for a score of III is not achieved, the athlete is then asked to perform the test with a 2 x 6 board under their heels (Figure 3)\(^{(5,12)}\). Scoring criteria has shown in Figure 3 according to the classifications\(^{(5,10,12)}\).

**Statistical Analysis**

The data of angular kinematic variables from FMS™ deep squat trials were statistically analysed.
using SPSS 18.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) program. The results were presented as Means± SD. Kruskal-Wallis test were utilized to identify any differences between specific groups (group 1, 2 and 3) and Mann-Whitney-U test was used as a Post Hoc. The statistical significance level was set at 0.05.

Table 1: The Mean and Std. Deviation of Angular Parameters for Deep Squat Test according to Classifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Group 1 (n=4) Mean±Std. D</th>
<th>Group 2 (n=6) Mean±Std. D</th>
<th>Group 3 (n=13) Mean±Std. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hip Flexion Angle (Right) (º)</td>
<td>83,46±16,63</td>
<td>62,42±10,10</td>
<td>60,29±8,62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee Extension Angle (Right) (º)</td>
<td>81,75±20,51</td>
<td>49,32±12,53</td>
<td>49,16±8,81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Angle (Right) (º)</td>
<td>111,26±3,09</td>
<td>112,14±6,88</td>
<td>112,29±6,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip Flexion Angle (Left) (º)</td>
<td>73,59±20,35</td>
<td>60,69±10,06</td>
<td>60,05±9,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee Extension Angle (Left) (º)</td>
<td>80,71±21,78</td>
<td>50,52±12,49</td>
<td>48,85±9,10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Angle (Left) (º)</td>
<td>117,07±1,61</td>
<td>115,13±8,65</td>
<td>112,94±3,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk Flexion Angle (º)</td>
<td>32,35±9,98</td>
<td>25,74±7,67</td>
<td>24,54±5,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Calf Angle (Frontal Plane) (º)</td>
<td>30,28±13,13</td>
<td>32,77±7,96</td>
<td>30,14±6,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Calf Angle (Frontal Plane) (º)</td>
<td>29,54±10,79</td>
<td>29,66±6,04</td>
<td>31,25±5,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Thigh Angle (Horizontal Plane) (º)</td>
<td>-23,25±11,93</td>
<td>6,02±11,93</td>
<td>8,76±7,97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Thigh Angle (Horizontal Plane) (º)</td>
<td>-20,74±14,19</td>
<td>7,56±12,08</td>
<td>9,44±8,29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip Segment Angle (Frontal Plane) (º)</td>
<td>0,73±2,27</td>
<td>1,36±1,37</td>
<td>-0,22±2,99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowel Angle (Frontal Plane) (º)</td>
<td>-1,34±2,72</td>
<td>-1,07±1,46</td>
<td>-0,70±2,48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

Results

Deep squat angular kinematics for some selected joints and segments differed between the classifications. The angles for all evaluated parameters were shown in Table 1. Hip and knee angle were greater in score 1 compared to score 2 and 3 for both right and left side (Table 1). According to the results the significant difference were found at right and left knee angle between group 1 and 2 (p<0.03; p<0.05 respectively); between group 1 and 3 (p<0.06). Also in horizontal plane, right and left thigh were significantly difference between group 1 and 2 (p<0.01); 1 and 3 (p<0.001). There were no significant differences found in other parameters. (p>0.05).

Discussion

This study examined the differences of angular kinematics of FMS™ deep squat test according to the scoring classifications. Similar to present study there were some researches done for deep squat testing(3, 10), although most researchers have determined to investigate either reliability of the FMS™ testing system(3, 10, 20, 21) or relationships between other performance and health parameters(1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 15).

The ability to perform the deep squat requires closed-kinetic chain dorsiflexion of the ankles, flexion of the knees and hips, and extension of the thoracic spine, as well as flexion and abduction of the shoulders(3). Results showed that squat performances were differed. The significance differences were found between group 1 and 2, 3, especially in knee angles and thigh segments (p<0.05). Findings suggest that the knee angles create different positions during examination. The knee joint is the primary modulator of lower extremity motion during the deep squat and has to resolve large joint moments proximally from the hip and distally from the ankle(3). Since the FMS™ deep squat test is commonly used to identify mobility or stability impairments of the entire kinetic chain(10), the participants who have a lower scores, cannot completed proper movements. In present study, right knee extension angle was 81,75±20,51º for 1; 49,32±12,53º for group 2; 49,38±8,81º for group 3 and left knee extension angle was 80,71±21,78º for group 1; 50,52±12,49º for group 2; 48,85±9,30º for group 3. These extension angles were similar with literature(3, 14). Butler et al., 2010, found peak knee flexion as 84.7±4.3º for group 1; 111.0±4.9º for group 2 and 130.7±3.8º. Krause et al., (2015) was found knee flexion angle as 109.9º after a 3d motion analysis. There were no any differences found between group 2 and 3 angular kinematics for all parameters (p>0.05). It is thought that this was caused by the fact that a platform was placed under the feet of the participants. The platform may have affected the squat mechanism because it would change the dorsiflexion angle of the participants. Butler et al., (2010), found significant difference of the three variables of interest at the ankle joint was that the peak dorsiflexion excursion was greater in group 3 compared to group 1 (p<0.03) and they emphasized that there was a large effect size difference (p<0.04) between group 1 and group 3 along with a moderate effect size difference (p<0.27) between group 2 and group 3 for peak dorsiflexion (p<0.10) (3). In this study dorsiflexion angle was not examined.

In the present study, there were no any significant differences in hip angular changes (p>0.05). Similar results found in different studies especially between group 2 and 3(3, 10, 21). In group 1, a greater range of motions was observed in the lower limb.
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movement. Because of the high center of mass, the hip range of motion was wider than the other groups. Although the study did not reveal any significant difference from the statistical point of view, the movement angles were found higher in group 1 than in the other groups. This might be due to the low number of subjects. A limitation of this study was that the sample size was small (Group 1 n=4; Group 2 n=6; Group 3 n=13), which could limit the generalizability of the investigation. Also, it was excluded subjects that had any present musculoskeletal injury, surgery, or neurological condition; therefore, findings can only be generalized to a population of healthy, young athletes from different sport branches and variable training experiences between the ages of 20-25. Cook et al., 2010 indicated that limited mobility in the lower extremity including poor closed-kinetic chain poor flexion of the hips may also cause poor test performance.

Another consequence of the study was the angular differences of the thigh segment in the horizontal plane. Participants in group 1 had some excursions in knee horizontal angles to get more range of motion from their joints (-23.25±11.95° for right knee; -20.74±14.19° for left knee). In some joints, some positions of the body were manipulated in order to increase the range of motion. It is important that such mistakes are taken into consideration when scoring of the deep squat performance in FMS™.

In conclusion, the squat is a movement needed in most athletic events and is required for most power movements involving the lower extremities. It is important to the creation of a chain movement from the lower limbs and to apply these movements during squat technique, students/athletes/clients should stay away from inconsistent angular movements and keep the body posture stable at proper angular positions. It is recommended that the corrective exercises should be applied, according to the motion of ranges obtained in this study.
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