

# **SPORTS TURF INJURY RESEARCH SUMMARY**

2011 Sports Turf Managers Association  
Conference and Exhibition

T.J. Serensits

Penn State's Center for Sports Surface Research

<http://ssrc.psu.edu>

Study	Background	Major Findings	Strengths and Limitations
<p>Aoki, et al., 2010</p> <p>Incidence of injury among adolescent soccer players: a comparative study of artificial and natural grass turfs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compared injuries to Japanese youth soccer players (age 12-17) on natural turf and synthetic turf (training and gameplay)</li> <li>- 332 participants followed for 1 year</li> <li>- 233 athletes on natural grass, 99 on synthetic turf</li> <li>- investigated acute injuries and chronic pain</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total acute injuries: 256 on natural turf, 169 on synthetic turf</li> <li>- 47% of players playing on natural grass complained of chronic pain; 52% of players playing on synthetic turf complained of chronic pain</li> <li>- There was no difference in acute injuries on natural grass or synthetic turf in both training and gameplay</li> <li>- Higher incidence of low back pain (chronic) for participants training on synthetic turf</li> </ul>	<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluated chronic pain in addition to acute injuries</li> <li>- evaluated youth athletes</li> </ul> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- small study</li> <li>- No mention of the manufacturer of the synthetic turf</li> <li>- No description of the type of natural turf and condition</li> </ul>
<p>Bjorneboe, J. et al., 2010</p> <p>Risk of injury on third generation artificial turf in Norwegian professional football</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compared injury rates in male professional soccer in Norway (14 teams)</li> <li>- Injuries were recorded by team medical staffs from 2004 to 2007</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Match injury rate: 17.0 injuries per 1000 match hours on grass, 17.6 injuries per 1000 match hours on synthetic turf (no statistical difference)</li> <li>- Training injuries: 1.8 (grass), 1.9 (synthetic turf) per 1000 training hours (no statistical difference)</li> <li>- No difference in injury location or severity</li> </ul>	<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Injuries reported by trained medical staffs</li> </ul> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No description of field conditions</li> </ul>

Study	Background	Major Findings	Strengths and Limitations
<p>Ekstrand et al., 2010</p> <p>Comparison of injuries sustained on artificial turf and grass by male and female elite football players</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compared incidences and patterns of injury for female and male soccer players</li> <li>- 20 teams (15 male, 5 female); 767 players</li> <li>- Injuries from Feb 2003 to Oct 2008</li> <li>- 2105 injuries (1791 male, 314 female)</li> <li>- 71% injuries were traumatic (acute); 29% were overuse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No difference in the nature of overuse injuries for men or women between surfaces</li> <li>- No difference in incidence of acute injuries for men or women between surfaces</li> <li>- Trend (no statistical difference): on synthetic – men more less likely to sustain quadriceps strain and more likely to sustain ankle sprain</li> <li>- Trend (no statistical difference): incidence of muscle/rupture strains in matches for men were lower on synthetic turf</li> </ul>	<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- First study to evaluate the incidence and pattern of injury for female elite players on synthetic</li> </ul> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Small number of women in study</li> <li>- No description of natural turf conditions</li> </ul>
<p>Fuller et al., 2010</p> <p>Risk of injury associated with rugby union played on artificial turf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluated incidence, nature, and cause of injury in rugby</li> <li>- 2 seasons, match injuries: 6 teams in Hong Kong (282 players); training injuries: 2 teams in English Premiership (169 players)</li> <li>- <u>Matches</u> synthetic turf player hours: 1360 natural grass player hours: 1040 Total match injuries: 80 (52 on synthetic, 28 natural grass)</li> <li>- <u>Training</u> 8924 player hours (all synthetic) Compared injury rates from Brooks et al., 2005 Total injuries (synthetic): 27</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No difference in overall incidence or severity of injuries during matches or training</li> <li>- ACL injuries 4 times higher on synthetic turf, but statistically there was no difference</li> </ul>	<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- First study comparing injury rates on synthetic turf and natural grass for rugby</li> </ul> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Injuries not matched with manufacturer of synthetic turf</li> <li>- No description of natural turf conditions</li> </ul>

Study	Background	Major Findings	Strengths and Limitations
<p>Meyers, 2010</p> <p>Incidence, Mechanisms, and Severity of Game-Related College Football Injuries on FieldTurf Versus Natural Grass: A 3-Year Prospective Study</p>	<p>- 3-year comparison of game related collegiate football injuries on FieldTurf and natural turfgrass (24 universities)</p> <p>- 465 games - 230 on FieldTurf (49.5%), 235 on natural grass (50.5%)</p> <p>- Injuries evaluated and reported by certified athletic trainers</p>	<p>- <u>Total injuries: 2253:</u> FieldTurf: 1050 (46.6%), Natural grass: 1203 (53.4%)</p> <p>- <u>Total injuries per team game:</u> FieldTurf: 4.6 Natural grass: 5.1</p> <p>- <u>Minor injuries per team game:</u> FieldTurf: 3.8 Natural grass: 4.0</p> <p>- <u>Substantial injuries per team game:</u> FieldTurf: 0.50 Natural grass: 0.72</p> <p>- <u>Severe injuries per team game:</u> FieldTurf: 0.27 Natural grass: 0.41</p> <p>- <u>No differences between surfaces in:</u> Head injury Knee injury Shoulder injury</p> <p>- Playing on FieldTurf resulted in a general lower injury risk than playing on natural grass</p>	<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <p>- Certified athletic trainers evaluated injuries and directly reported data</p> <p>- Followed several universities during the 3-year period, which prevented seasonal injury fluctuations and individual team effects</p> <p>- Direct comparison of FieldTurf versus natural grass</p> <p>- Large sample size allows for more power in statistical testing</p> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <p>- inherent variability in high-collision sport</p> <p>- Limited tracking of weather conditions</p> <p>- No tracking of field characteristics (Gmax, infill depth, etc.)</p> <p>- No tracking of equipment being used when injury occurred (cleat type, padding, etc.)</p>
<p>Soligard et al., 2010</p> <p>Injury risk on artificial turf and grass in youth tournament football</p>	<p>- Youth male and female soccer players (ages 13-19)</p> <p>- tracked 60,000 athletes over 4 years in Norway Cup tournaments</p>	<p>- Injury rate: 39.2 per 1000 match hours (34.2 on synthetic turf; 39.7 on natural grass)</p> <p>- No statistical difference in overall injury risk</p> <p>- Lower risk of ankle injuries and higher risk of back/spine and shoulder/collar bone on synthetic turf</p>	<p><u>Limitations</u></p> <p>- Injuries reported by coaches – not trainers</p> <p>- No description of field conditions</p>

Study	Background	Major Findings	Strengths and Limitations
<p>Fuller et al., 2007 Part 1</p> <p>Comparison of the incidence, nature and cause of injuries sustained on grass and new generation artificial turf by male and female football players. Part 1: match injuries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compared incidence, nature, severity, and cause of injuries on synthetic turf and natural turf during collegiate soccer games for men and women</li> <li>- 2 seasons of data from NCAA Injury Surveillance System</li> <li>- Teams: Men: 52 (year 1), 54 (year 2) Women: 64 (year 1), 72 (year 2)</li> <li>- Athletic trainers evaluated and recorded results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total injuries: men: 848, women: 946</li> <li>- There were no major differences in the incidence, severity, nature or cause of match injuries sustained on third generation synthetic turf and grass by either male or female players</li> </ul>	<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Men and women athletes</li> <li>- Large sample size</li> </ul> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No differentiation between manufacturers of synthetic turf</li> <li>- Limited tracking of weather conditions</li> <li>- No tracking of field characteristics (Gmax, infill depth, etc.)</li> <li>- No tracking of equipment worn when injury occurred (shoe type, etc.)</li> </ul>
<p>Fuller et al., 2007 Part 2</p> <p>Comparison of the incidence, nature and cause of injuries sustained on grass and new generation artificial turf by male and female football players. Part 2: training injuries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- same as above except training injuries instead of game injuries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total injuries: men: 818, women: 774</li> <li>- There were no major differences in the incidence, severity, nature or cause of training injuries sustained on new generation artificial turf and grass by either male or female players.</li> </ul>	<p>Same as above</p>
<p>Steffen et al., 2007</p> <p>Risk of injury on artificial turf and natural grass in young female football players</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Injury comparison of young female soccer players in the U-17 soccer league in Norway (average age = 15.4)</li> <li>- 2020 players from 109 teams</li> <li>- Injuries tracked for 1 season</li> <li>- Injuries monitored and reported by physical therapists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total injuries: 526</li> <li>- Incidence of acute injuries during both gameplay and training was not different for synthetic turf and natural grass</li> <li>- In games, the incidence of serious injury was higher on synthetic turf than natural turf (twice as many)</li> <li>- Overall risk of injury is the same on both surfaces</li> </ul>	<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only study to evaluate injuries related to surface type for youth (females)</li> </ul> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Relatively small sample size of injuries (limited statistical power)</li> <li>- No tracking of extrinsic factors (weather conditions, fitness level, field maintenance, player equipment)</li> </ul>

Study	Background	Major Findings	Strengths and Limitations
<p>Ekstrand, et al., 2006</p> <p>Risk of injury in elite football played on artificial turf versus natural grass: a prospective two-cohort study</p>	<p>- Injury risk comparison for elite, male soccer players on synthetic turf and natural grass</p> <p>- 290 players from 10 elite soccer clubs with synthetic turf; 202 players Swedish Premier League with either synthetic turf or natural grass</p>	<p>- Total injuries: 775</p> <p>- Overall incidence of injury during training and games did not differ between synthetic turf and natural grass</p> <p>- Increased risk of ankle sprains during games on synthetic turf compared to natural grass (4.83 v 2.66 injuries/1000 match hours)</p> <p>- Lower incidence of injury for teams playing games on synthetic turf than natural grass (15.26 v 23.08 injuries/1000 match hours)</p>	<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <p>- Elimination of some confounding factors because one cohort played home games on synthetic turf and away games on natural grass</p> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <p>- Small sample size</p> <p>- No distinction between synthetic turf products</p> <p>- No tracking of extrinsic factors (weather conditions, fitness level, field maintenance, player equipment)</p>
<p>Meyers and Barnhill, 2004</p> <p>Incidence, causes, and severity of high school football injuries on FieldTurf versus natural grass: a 5-year prospective study</p>	<p>- Comparison of incidence, causes, and severity of high school football injuries on FieldTurf versus natural grass</p> <p>- 8 high school teams (4 teams for first 4 years, 8 teams in fifth year)</p> <p>- 240 total games (150 on FieldTurf, 90 on natural grass)</p> <p>- Injuries reported by certified athletic trainers</p>	<p>- Total injuries: 353</p> <p>- <u>On FieldTurf, higher incidence of:</u>  Zero-day time-loss injuries  Non-contact injuries  Surface and epidermal injuries  Muscle-related trauma  Injuries during higher temperatures</p> <p>- <u>On natural grass, higher incidence of:</u>  1-2 day time-loss injuries  22+ day time-loss injuries  Head and neural trauma  Ligament injuries</p> <p>- Majority of injuries on natural turfgrass occurred under dry field conditions.</p>	<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <p>- Certified athletic trainers evaluated injuries and directly reported data</p> <p>- Direct comparison of FieldTurf versus natural grass</p> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <p>- small sample size</p> <p>- variability in high-collision sport</p> <p>- Limited tracking of weather conditions</p> <p>- No tracking of field characteristics (Gmax, infill depth, etc.)</p> <p>- No tracking of equipment being used when injury occurred (cleat type, padding, etc.)</p>

**REFERENCES****2010**

Aoki, H., T. Kohno, H. Fujiya, H. Kato, K. Yatabe, T. Morikawa, and J. Seki. 2010. Incidence of injury among adolescent soccer players: A comparative study of artificial and natural grass turfs. *Clin. J. Sport Med.* 20:1-7.

Bjorneboe, J., R. Bahr, and T.E. Andersen. 2010. Risk of injury on third-generation artificial turf in Norwegian professional football. *Br. J. Sports Med.* 44:794-798.

Ekstrand, J., M. Hagglund, and C.W. Fuller. 2010. Comparison of injuries sustained on artificial turf and grass by male and female elite football players. *Scand. J. Med. Sci. Sports.*

Fuller, C.W., L. Clarke, and M.G. Molloy. 2010. Risk of injury associated with rugby union played on artificial turf. *J. Sports Sci.* 28:563-570.

Meyers, M.C. 2010. Incidence, mechanisms, and severity of game-related college football injuries on FieldTurf versus natural grass: A 3-year prospective study. *Am. J. Sports Med.* 38:687-97

Soligard, T., R. Bahr, and T.E. Andersen. 2010. Injury risk on artificial turf and grass in youth tournament football. *Scand. J. Med. Sci. Sports (In Press).*

**2007**

Fuller, C.W., R.W. Dick, J. Corlette, and R. Schmalz. 2007a. Comparison of the incidence, nature and cause of injuries sustained on grass and new generation artificial turf by male and female football players. part 1: Match injuries. *Br. J. Sports Med.* 41 Suppl 1: 20-16.

Fuller, C.W., R.W. Dick, J. Corlette, and R. Schmalz. 2007b. Comparison of the incidence, nature and cause of injuries sustained on grass and new generation artificial turf by male and female football players. part 2: Training injuries. *Br. J. Sports Med.* 41 Suppl 1: 27-32.

Steffen, K., T.E. Andersen, and R. Bahr. 2007. Risk of injury on artificial turf and natural grass in young female football players. Br. J. Sports Med. 41 Suppl 1:i33-7.

### **2006**

Ekstrand, J., T. Timpka, and M. Hagglund. 2006. Risk of injury in elite football played on artificial turf versus natural grass: A prospective two-cohort study. Br. J. Sports Med. 40:975-980.

### **2004**

Meyers, M.C., and B.S. Barnhill. 2004. Incidence, causes, and severity of high school football injuries on FieldTurf versus natural grass: A 5-year prospective study. Am. J. Sports Med. 32:1626-1638.

*Penn State's Center for Sports Surface Research*  
*<http://ssrc.psu.edu>*