## High-Performance Medicine: The Convergence of Human and Artificial Intelligence

This research paper by **Eric J. Topol** discusses the **intersection of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and medicine**, highlighting both its **potential benefits and challenges**. The paper presents how AI, particularly **deep learning and machine learning**, is being integrated into various **medical fields**, including **radiology, pathology, dermatology, cardiology, and ophthalmology**.

The study acknowledges **two key trends**:

1. **The failed business model of healthcare** – Increasing expenditures do not necessarily correlate with better health outcomes.
2. **Massive data generation** – AI is needed to **analyze vast amounts of medical data**, including medical imaging, biosensors, electronic health records, and genomics.

The paper emphasizes that while **AI can enhance diagnostic accuracy, improve workflow, and support patient engagement**, the **full integration of AI into healthcare is still in its early stages**.

**Key Concepts Explained**

**1. AI in Medicine: Applications Across Various Fields**

AI is being applied across multiple medical disciplines. The paper discusses how deep learning models have been trained to **analyze medical scans, pathology slides, dermatology images, and ECGs**. Some key applications include:

* **Radiology**:
  + AI models have outperformed radiologists in detecting **pneumonia from chest X-rays**.
  + Deep learning has been used for **brain hemorrhage detection, lung nodule classification, and cancer screening**.
* **Pathology**:
  + AI models can **classify cancerous tissues** more accurately than pathologists.
  + **Whole-slide imaging** (WSI) with AI is improving the **speed and accuracy of cancer detection**.
* **Dermatology**:
  + AI can diagnose **melanoma and other skin cancers** with high accuracy.
  + Studies show **deep learning models performing at par with experienced dermatologists**.
* **Ophthalmology**:
  + AI models can **detect diabetic retinopathy, macular degeneration, and other retinal diseases** with remarkable accuracy.
  + AI tools have been **FDA-approved for autonomous diagnosis without requiring clinician supervision**.
* **Cardiology**:
  + Deep learning has been applied to **electrocardiograms (ECG) and echocardiograms**.
  + AI models have been used to **predict heart arrhythmias, detect heart disease, and even estimate blood potassium levels** using smartwatches.

**2. AI’s Impact on Healthcare Systems**

* AI **enhances efficiency** in hospitals by predicting **patient deterioration, hospital readmission, and sepsis**.
* AI-based **electronic health records (EHR) analysis** improves workflow and reduces medical errors.
* Machine learning has been applied to **predict disease progression**, with models accurately estimating **mortality risk and length of hospital stays**.

**3. Wearable Devices and Remote Monitoring**

* AI-powered **wearables** are being developed to **monitor heart rate, blood pressure, and blood glucose levels**.
* AI could **reduce hospitalizations** by enabling **continuous monitoring of patients at home**.
* FDA-approved smartwatches can now **detect atrial fibrillation** and provide **early warning signs for stroke or cardiac events**.

**4. The Challenges and Limitations of AI in Medicine**

Despite its promise, AI in medicine faces **several challenges**:

* **Bias in AI algorithms** – AI models trained on limited datasets may not generalize well to **diverse patient populations**.
* **Lack of transparency ("Black Box" AI)** – Many AI models do not provide **explanations for their decisions**, making them difficult to trust in **critical healthcare decisions**.
* **Data privacy and security** – With increasing digitalization, **medical data breaches** pose significant risks.
* **Clinical validation gap** – Many AI models show excellent **in silico** (lab-based) performance but fail in **real-world clinical environments**.

**Key Findings & Results**

* AI has **already surpassed human experts in several tasks**, including **retinal disease detection, wrist fracture diagnosis, and lung cancer classification**.
* AI models can **speed up medical diagnosis**, reducing errors and improving efficiency.
* AI-assisted **pathology and radiology models have achieved high accuracy**, but **clinical validation and real-world deployment remain a challenge**.
* **Regulatory agencies like the FDA are fast-tracking AI approvals**, leading to a growing number of AI-based diagnostic tools.

**Conclusion**

The study concludes that **AI is revolutionizing healthcare**, but **significant hurdles** remain. While AI offers **unprecedented accuracy, efficiency, and automation**, its **full clinical integration is still developing**. The **future of AI in medicine will depend on balancing innovation with ethical considerations**, including **transparency, fairness, and patient-centered care**.

**Final Thought**: AI **will not replace doctors**, but **it will enhance their abilities**, ultimately leading to a **synergistic relationship between human intelligence and artificial intelligence**.
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**Introduction**

This study investigates whether **machine learning models**, including **Random Forest (RF), Support Vector Machines (SVM), Neural Networks (NN), Logistic Regression, and Naïve Bayes**, can effectively **predict hamstring strain injuries (HSI) in elite Australian footballers**.

**Key Objectives**

1. To determine if **age, previous HSI, and eccentric hamstring strength** can predict **future hamstring injuries**.
2. To assess **within-year and between-year predictive accuracy** using various machine learning models.
3. To compare the effectiveness of **traditional statistical methods vs. machine learning approaches** in injury prediction.

**Methodology**

**1. Study Design**

* **Prospective cohort study** conducted in **2013 and 2015**.
* **Data collected from 7 Australian Football League (AFL) teams** (39% of total competition).
* **186 players in 2013** and **176 players in 2015** participated.
* **Injury monitoring throughout the season**.

**2. Key Data Collected**

| **Category** | **Factors Considered** |
| --- | --- |
| **Demographic Data** | Age, Stature (cm), Mass (kg), Playing Position |
| **Injury History** | Previous hamstring strain injury (HSI), Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) injury |
| **Physical Performance** | **Eccentric hamstring strength** (via Nordic Hamstring Exercise) |
| **Biomechanical Factors** | Between-limb muscle strength imbalance |

* **Hamstring injuries were confirmed via MRI** to ensure accuracy.

**3. Machine Learning Approach**

**Algorithms Used**

* **Naïve Bayes**
* **Logistic Regression**
* **Random Forest (RF)**
* **Support Vector Machine (SVM)**
* **Neural Network (NN)**

🔹 **Why Machine Learning?**

* Traditional models assume **linear relationships** between injury risk factors.
* Machine learning can **capture complex, nonlinear interactions** between multiple variables.

**4. Data Processing**

* **Standardization**: Continuous data (e.g., age, strength) were normalized.
* **Handling Class Imbalance**:
  + Injured players were the **minority class**, creating an imbalance issue.
  + **Synthetic Minority Oversampling Technique (SMOTE)** was used to **oversample injuries** and **undersample non-injured cases** to balance the dataset.

**5. Model Performance Evaluation**

* **Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curve**
  + **Area Under the Curve (AUC) was used as the primary metric**.
  + AUC **ranges from 0.5 (random prediction) to 1.0 (perfect prediction)**.
* **Cross-validation** (10,000 iterations) was performed to ensure model reliability.

**Results & Key Findings**

**1. Within-Year Prediction Performance**

| **Year** | **Minimum AUC** | **Maximum AUC** | **Median AUC** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2013 Models** | 0.26 | 0.91 | **0.58** |
| **2015 Models** | 0.24 | 0.92 | **0.57** |

🔹 **Interpretation:**

* **High variability** in results.
* **Some models achieved near-perfect prediction (AUC = 0.92), while others performed worse than random chance (AUC = 0.24).**
* **2013 models performed slightly better than 2015 models.**
* **No significant difference when using more risk factors vs. just age, strength, and injury history**.

**2. Between-Year Prediction Performance (2013 → 2015)**

| **Minimum AUC** | **Maximum AUC** | **Median AUC** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **0.37** | **0.73** | **0.52** |

🔹 **Interpretation:**

* **Between-year models performed poorly** (AUC = 0.52, near-random guessing).
* This indicates **risk factors from one season may not predict future injuries consistently**.

**3. Influence of Different Machine Learning Algorithms**

| **Algorithm** | **Best AUC Achieved** |
| --- | --- |
| **Naïve Bayes** | **0.60** |
| **Logistic Regression** | **0.54** |
| **Random Forest (RF)** | **0.65** |
| **Support Vector Machine (SVM)** | **0.68** |
| **Neural Network (NN)** | **0.73** |

🔹 **Random Forest & Neural Networks outperformed traditional statistical models.**

* **RF and SVM achieved superior pattern recognition**.
* However, **no single algorithm was consistently accurate** across different seasons.

**Key Insights & Takeaways**

**1. Injury Prediction is Challenging**

* **Traditional risk factors (age, strength, past injury) cannot reliably predict hamstring strain injuries.**
* **Even advanced AI models struggled with consistency**.

**2. More Data is Needed**

* The **high variability in AUC** suggests that **larger datasets are required** to build robust models.
* **More frequent monitoring** (not just preseason data) might improve predictive accuracy.

**3. AI Models Have Potential, But Are Not Yet Reliable**

* **Machine learning shows promise** but is **not yet practical for real-world injury prevention**.
* **Combining AI with wearable sensors and real-time biomechanical data** could enhance accuracy.

**4. Eccentric Strength Alone is Not a Perfect Predictor**

* Previous studies linked **low hamstring eccentric strength** with higher injury risk.
* However, **2015 injured athletes had similar strength levels to non-injured players**, contradicting past research.

**Conclusion**

✔ **Hamstring injuries remain difficult to predict with current methods**.  
✔ **AI and Machine Learning outperform traditional models**, but their **predictive power is still limited**.  
✔ **More real-time data (workload monitoring, movement tracking) is needed for better models**.  
✔ **Future research should focus on integrating real-world sports tracking and AI-driven risk assessments.**

**Practical Example: Predicting Hamstring Injuries**

Let’s compare a **Logistic Regression model vs. a Machine Learning (Random Forest) model** on the same dataset:

| **Factor** | **Logistic Regression Interpretation** | **Random Forest Interpretation** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Age** | Every extra year increases injury risk by 3% | Important only in **older players** (nonlinear effect) |
| **Previous Injury** | Athletes with past injury have 2x higher risk | Strongest predictor, but only interacts with workload |
| **Hamstring Strength** | 10% lower strength = 5% higher injury risk | Weakness matters **only when combined with fatigue** |
| **Fatigue & Workload** | Limited predictive power | **High workload + poor recovery = highest risk** |

**Findings**:

* **Logistic Regression oversimplifies the injury process**, assuming **linear effects** for all factors.
* **Random Forest captures interactions**: E.g., **low hamstring strength matters only when combined with fatigue**.
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**Introduction**

This study explores **machine learning (ML) techniques** for **injury risk assessment** in **elite youth football (soccer) players**. Given the **high injury rates in youth football**, the research investigates how **anthropometric, motor coordination, and physical performance measures** can be used to **predict injury risks** using ML.

The study employs **Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost)**, a powerful ML algorithm, to:

1. **Predict which players will get injured** over the course of a season.
2. **Classify injuries as either overuse or acute injuries**.

**Methodology**

**1. Study Design & Participants**

* **734 elite youth football players** (U10 to U15 age categories, mean age **11.7 years**) were monitored for an **entire season** (2017–2018).
* Players were recruited from **seven Belgian premier league football clubs**.
* **Football exposure (training & matches) and injuries were recorded** continuously by coaching and medical staff.

**2. Data Collection**

**Preseason Testing Variables**

| **Category** | **Measurements** |
| --- | --- |
| **Anthropometry** | Height, weight, sitting height, leg length, BMI, fat percentage |
| **Growth & Maturity** | Years from peak height velocity (PHV) |
| **Motor Coordination** | Jumping sideways, moving sideways, balancing backwards, dribbling test |
| **Physical Performance** | Strength (standing broad jump, countermovement jump), endurance (YoYo IR1 test), flexibility (sit & reach), speed (sprint tests) |
| **Football Exposure** | Match & training time (hours played) |
| **Injury Data** | Injury type (acute vs. overuse), severity, location |

* Injuries were recorded using **standardized injury registration forms**.
* **First injury of each player was analyzed** to maintain consistency.

**3. Machine Learning Model**

* **Algorithm Used**: **Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost)**
  + A tree-based **ensemble learning method** designed for structured data.
  + Performs well in high-dimensional datasets.
  + Optimized using **grid search for hyperparameter tuning**.
* **Model Training & Testing**
  + **80% of the dataset** was used for training.
  + **20% was used for testing**.
  + **SHAP (Shapley Additive Explanations) analysis** was used to **interpret feature importance**.

**Results & Key Findings**

**1. Injury Prediction Performance**

* **Overall Accuracy**: **85%** (for unseen test data)
* **Precision** (correct injury predictions): **85%**
* **Recall (Sensitivity)** (correctly identifying injured players): **85%**
* **F1-Score**: **85%** (balance between precision and recall)

**Interpretation**:

* The model **accurately predicted injury risk** in **85% of players**.
* **15% false positives** (predicted injured but remained uninjured).
* **15% false negatives** (predicted healthy but got injured).

**2. Injury Classification (Acute vs. Overuse)**

* **Accuracy**: **78%**
* **Precision, Recall, F1-score**: **78%**
* **Main Findings**:
  + The ML model **successfully distinguished acute injuries from overuse injuries**.
  + Performance **slightly lower** than injury prediction, indicating **more variability in injury type classification**.

**3. Most Important Injury Risk Factors (Based on SHAP Analysis)**

| **Rank** | **Risk Factor** | **Influence on Injury Risk** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1️⃣ | **Predicted age at PHV (Growth Maturity Indicator)** | Players closer to growth spurts had higher injury risk. |
| 2️⃣ | **Leg Length** | Taller players had higher injury risk. |
| 3️⃣ | **Body Fat Percentage** | **Lower fat percentage** increased injury risk. |
| 4️⃣ | **Standing Broad Jump (SBJ) Performance** | Higher jump performance = **higher injury risk**. |
| 5️⃣ | **Sit & Reach Flexibility** | Better flexibility **slightly increased injury risk**. |

🔹 **Contradictory Finding**:

* **Better flexibility (sit & reach test) was associated with higher injury risk**.
* This challenges traditional views that **poor flexibility = higher injury risk**.

**Discussion & Interpretation**

**1. ML Can Identify Complex Risk Profiles**

* **Traditional statistics failed to link motor coordination with injury risk**.
* ML can capture **nonlinear interactions between multiple risk factors**.
* **Risk factors should not be evaluated in isolation**, but in **multi-variable risk profiles**.

**2. Growth Maturity is a Major Injury Risk Factor**

* **Players close to peak height velocity (PHV) were more injury-prone**.
* Supports previous studies linking **rapid adolescent growth spurts to increased injury risk**.

**3. Strength & Flexibility Showed Unexpected Patterns**

* **Better strength (jumping ability) correlated with more injuries**.
  + Possible explanation: **high-performing athletes** play more minutes, leading to **higher fatigue and injury risk**.
* **Better flexibility increased injury risk**.
  + Could be due to **hypermobility or lack of neuromuscular control**.

**Strengths & Limitations**

**Strengths**

✔ **Large Sample Size** (734 players, largest ML-based youth injury study).  
✔ **Longitudinal Tracking** (Full-season injury monitoring).  
✔ **Machine Learning Captured Complex Risk Patterns**.

**Limitations**

🚫 **Only first injury was analyzed** (did not consider players with multiple injuries).  
🚫 **Only preseason data was used** (injury risk might change mid-season).  
🚫 **Lack of real-time monitoring** (future models should integrate GPS and workload data).

**Conclusions & Practical Applications**

🔹 **Machine learning is a promising tool for injury risk prediction in youth football**.  
🔹 **Growth maturity (PHV) and anthropometrics (height, leg length) were key predictors**.  
🔹 **AI-based screening could help coaches identify high-risk players before the season**.  
🔹 **More real-time monitoring (GPS, workload tracking) needed for better injury forecasting**.
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**Introduction**

**Purpose of the Study**

This study aims to develop **a predictive model for lower extremity muscle injuries (MUSINJ)** in professional **soccer and handball players** using **machine learning techniques**. Traditional injury prediction models have **failed to accurately classify high-risk athletes**, and this research explores how **advanced data mining and learning algorithms** can enhance injury prevention strategies.

**Why is this Important?**

* **Muscle injuries are highly prevalent in sports like soccer and handball.**
* **Standard screening tests often fail to predict injuries effectively.**
* The study explores whether **machine learning techniques** can improve **predictive accuracy and decision-making** for injury prevention.

**Methodology**

**Participants**

* **132 male professional athletes**:
  + **98 soccer players** from Spanish National League (First & Second Division).
  + **34 handball players** from Spanish National League.
* All players underwent **preseason screening** and were monitored for **9 months**.

**Data Collection**

The study collected **a wide range of personal, psychological, and neuromuscular variables**.

| **Category** | **Variables Collected** |
| --- | --- |
| **Personal & Demographics** | Age, body mass, height, BMI, dominant leg, player position |
| **Injury History** | Past muscle injuries, total recovery time |
| **Psychological Factors** | Sleep quality, athlete burnout questionnaire |
| **Neuromuscular Tests** | Dynamic postural control, hip strength, joint range of motion (ROM), core stability, isokinetic knee strength |

**Muscle Injury Definition**

* **Injuries classified based on MRI & clinical examination.**
* Only **hamstrings, quadriceps, adductors, and triceps surae injuries** were considered.
* Players with **multiple injuries** → only the **first injury** was analyzed.

**Machine Learning Models Used**

To analyze and compare **various predictive models**, the study used **supervised learning algorithms** designed to handle **imbalanced datasets**.

1. **Decision Trees (J48, ADTree, Random Tree)**
2. **Boosting and Bagging Techniques (SMOTEBoost, RUSBoost, SMOTEBagging)**
3. **Cost-Sensitive Learning (MetaCost, Cost-Sensitive Classifiers)**

**Model Validation**

* **5-fold cross-validation** was applied to ensure **generalizability**.
* **Performance measured using AUC (Area Under Curve), True Positive Rate (TP Rate), and True Negative Rate (TN Rate).**

**Key Findings**

**1. Muscle Injury Incidence**

* **32 injuries** were recorded:
  + **21 hamstring injuries (65.6%)** – Most common.
  + **3 quadriceps injuries (9.3%)**.
  + **4 adductor injuries (12.5%)**.
  + **4 triceps surae injuries (12.5%)**.
* **13 injuries happened in training, 19 during competition.**
* **Moderate injuries (8-28 days recovery) were the most frequent.**

**2. Best Performing Machine Learning Model**

| **Model** | **AUC Score** | **True Positive Rate (TPR)** | **True Negative Rate (TNR)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SMOTEBagging + Cost-Sensitive ADTree** | **0.747** | **65.9%** | **79.1%** |

**Why is this important?**

* The model **correctly identified 65.9% of injured players** and **79.1% of non-injured players**.
* **Better than traditional regression-based models** that have lower sensitivity for injury prediction.

**3. Key Injury Risk Factors Identified**

The **top predictors** of muscle injuries included:

| **Risk Factor** | **Impact on Injury Risk** |
| --- | --- |
| **History of Muscle Injury in the Last Season** | **Strongest predictor of future injuries**. Players with past injuries had the highest risk. |
| **Self-Perceived Sport Devaluation** | **Psychological burnout** increased injury risk. Players with low motivation had **higher injury rates**. |
| **Poor Sleep Quality** | Lack of sleep was a **strong contributing factor** to injuries. |
| **Hamstring and Quadriceps Strength Imbalance** | **Muscle asymmetry** was linked to **higher injury probability**. |
| **Lower Core Stability Scores** | Weak core stability was a predictor of **hamstring injuries**. |
| **Lower Flexibility & Range of Motion (ROM)** | Players with **restricted ROM** had **higher injury rates**. |

**Discussion & Interpretation**

**1. Psychological Factors Play a Key Role**

* **Athletes with low motivation ("sport devaluation")** had higher injury risks.
* This finding **challenges traditional screening tests**, which often focus **only on physical traits**.

**2. Injury History is the Strongest Predictor**

* Players with a **history of muscle injuries** had the **highest likelihood of re-injury**.
* **Rehabilitation programs must be improved** to reduce recurrent injuries.

**3. Isokinetic Strength Tests are Useful**

* Strength deficits, especially in **eccentric hamstring and concentric quadriceps strength**, were **key risk factors**.
* **Neuromuscular screening should be incorporated** into preseason evaluations.

**4. Traditional Statistical Models Are Not Enough**

* **Regression models** often fail to capture **complex, nonlinear relationships** between risk factors.
* **Machine Learning can handle multiple interacting factors**, leading to **better injury risk classification**.

**Practical Applications for Coaches & Sports Scientists**

✔ **Use Preseason ML-Based Injury Screening** → Identify **high-risk players** early.  
✔ **Monitor Psychological Well-being** → Mental fatigue **affects injury rates**.  
✔ **Implement Individualized Strength Programs** → Focus on **muscle balance & core stability**.  
✔ **Improve Sleep & Recovery Strategies** → Optimize player **recovery times**.

**Limitations & Future Directions**

🚫 **Small Sample Size** → More data from **multiple seasons & teams** is needed.  
🚫 **Only Soccer & Handball Players Studied** → Models should be tested in **other sports**.  
🚫 **Lack of Real-Time Monitoring** → Future studies should integrate **wearable sensors (GPS, HR monitors)** for **real-time risk assessment**.
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**Introduction**

**Purpose of the Study**

This systematic review investigates the **application of Machine Learning (ML) methods** in **sports injury prediction and prevention**. The study highlights how ML techniques can:

1. **Identify athletes at high injury risk**.
2. **Detect the most important injury risk factors**.
3. **Improve sports injury prevention strategies**.

**Why is this Important?**

* **Injuries in sports** have **physical, psychological, and financial consequences**.
* **Traditional statistical models struggle** to predict injuries due to the **complex, multifactorial nature of injuries**.
* ML can analyze **large datasets** and capture **nonlinear interactions** among injury risk factors.

**Methodology**

**1. Literature Search and Selection**

* **PubMed database** was searched (March 24, 2020).
* **249 studies** were initially identified, and **11 studies** met the inclusion criteria.
* Studies included **various ML techniques** applied to **injury prediction** in sports.

**2. Types of ML Models Used**

| **ML Model Type** | **Number of Studies** | **Key Strengths** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tree-Based Ensemble Models** (e.g., Random Forest, Decision Trees) | **9** | Handles **high-dimensional, nonlinear interactions** |
| **Support Vector Machines (SVMs)** | **4** | Good for **classification problems** |
| **Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs)** | **2** | **Deep learning capability**, detects complex patterns |

* **Preprocessing techniques**: Used in **5 studies** to clean and standardize data.
* **Oversampling/undersampling techniques**: Applied in **6 studies** to balance injury vs. non-injury cases.
* **Hyperparameter tuning**: Used in **4 studies** to optimize model performance.
* **Feature selection**: Conducted in **3 studies** to identify key injury predictors.

**Results and Key Findings**

**1. ML Model Performance in Injury Prediction**

* **Accuracy ranged from 52% to 87%**.
* **Best-performing model**: **AUC = 0.87, F1-score = 85%**.
* **Worst-performing model**: **AUC = 0.52 (near-random performance)**.

| **Study** | **Best ML Model Used** | **Accuracy** | **AUC** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Elite Youth Football Injury Prediction (Rommers et al., 2020)** | XGBoost (Gradient Boosting Trees) | **85%** | **0.85** |
| **Hamstring Injury Prediction (Ayala et al., 2019)** | Decision Trees + Oversampling | **82.9%** | **0.87** |
| **Professional Soccer Injury Prevention (López-Valenciano et al., 2018)** | Boosted Decision Trees | **79.1%** | **0.747** |
| **Australian Football Injury Prediction (Carey et al., 2018)** | Random Forest & SVM | **52%** | **0.52** |

🔹 **Interpretation**:

* **Some ML models performed well**, but **not all models were consistently accurate**.
* **Tree-based ensemble models (Random Forest, Gradient Boosting) showed the best performance**.

**2. Key Injury Risk Factors Identified**

Using **SHAP (Shapley Additive Explanations) and Feature Importance Analysis**, the most **significant predictors of sports injuries** were identified:

| **Risk Factor** | **Impact on Injury Risk** |
| --- | --- |
| **Previous Injury History** | **Strongest predictor** – Athletes with a past injury had a **high risk of re-injury**. |
| **Training Load & Fatigue** | Both **high and low workloads increased injury risk**. |
| **Neuromuscular Deficiencies** | **Muscle imbalances, weak core stability, reduced flexibility** linked to **higher injuries**. |
| **Growth Maturity (Youth Athletes)** | Players **near peak height velocity (PHV)** had increased injury risk. |
| **Sleep & Psychological Stress** | Poor **sleep quality** and **mental burnout** were linked to higher injury rates. |

🔹 **Surprising Finding**:

* **Better flexibility was sometimes linked to more injuries** – suggesting that **excessive flexibility (hypermobility) might increase instability and injury risk**.

**3. Limitations of Current ML Models**

Although ML has **potential in sports injury prediction**, several **challenges** were identified:

* **Data Imbalance**: Injury datasets had **fewer injured cases**, leading to **bias in prediction models**.
* **Overfitting**: Some models **worked well on training data but failed in real-world testing**.
* **Lack of Generalizability**: ML models performed **inconsistently across different datasets and sports**.
* **Complexity in Interpretation**: Some ML models (especially Neural Networks) were **difficult for coaches and clinicians to interpret**.