

	N	Mean ± Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	P Value
Pre Treatment Visual Analogue Scale	16	7.06 ± 1.06	0.26566	0
Post Treatment Visual Analogue Scale	16	3.87 ± 1.36	0.34004	

Table 4: Independent Sample T Test for SF-36.

Independent Sample T Test				
	Groups	N	Mean ± Std. Deviation	P Value
Pre Treatment Physical Function (PF)	Experimental Group	8	42 ± 8.07	0.818
	Control Group	8	43 ± 8.94	
Post Treatment Physical Function (PF)	Experimental Group	8	61.25 ± 8.22	0.011
	Control Group	8	45.75 ± 12.37	
Pre Treatment Social Function (SC)	Experimental Group	8	45.5 ± 9.69	0.108
	Control Group	8	38.62 ± 5.82	
Post Treatment Social Function (SC)	Experimental Group	8	70.25 ± 11.59	0.002
	Control Group	8	42.62 ± 17.12	
Pre Treatment Mental Health (MH)	Experimental Group	8	47.5 ± 3.81	0.178
	Control Group	8	45 ± 3.20	
Post Treatment Mental Health (MH)	Experimental Group	8	75.25 ± 8.82	0
	Control Group	8	47.37 ± 8.46	
Pre Treatment Pain (P)	Experimental Group	8	50.25 ± 6.43	0.176
	Control Group	8	46.25 ± 4.65	
Post Treatment Pain (P)	Experimental Group	8	73 ± 11.36	0
	Control Group	8	47.25 ± 7.20	
Pre Treatment Change in health (CiH)	Experimental Group	8	49.75 ± 5.14	0.402
	Control Group	8	47.37 ± 5.82	
Post Treatment Change in health (CiH)	Experimental Group	8	78.5 ± 7.61	0
	Control Group	8	51.25 ± 14.88	
Pre Treatment Role limitation - Physical (RLP)	Experimental Group	8	50.25 ± 6.86	0.761
	Control Group	8	49.12 ± 7.62	
Post Treatment Role limitation - Physical (RLP)	Experimental Group	8	79.5 ± 3.58	0
	Control Group	8	51.75 ± 12.66	
Pre Treatment Role limitation - Mental (RLM)	Experimental Group	8	41.25 ± 14.89	0.62
	Control Group	8	37.87 ± 11.49	
Post Treatment Role limitation - Mental (RLM)	Experimental Group	8	72.5 ± 11.91	0.001
	Control Group	8	40.5 ± 18.70	

Pre Treatment Energy / Vitality (EV)	Experimental Group	8	49.25 ± 7.61	1
	Control Group	8	49.25 ± 7.77	
Post Treatment Energy / Vitality (EV)	Experimental Group	8	81.5 ± 10.94	0.002
	Control Group	8	53.62 ± 17.35	
Pre Treatment Health perceptions (HP)	Experimental Group	8	52.25 ± 9.92	0.655
	Control Group	8	50.25 ± 7.44	
Post Treatment Health perceptions (HP)	Experimental Group	8	70 ± 9.41	0.005
	Control Group	8	51.87 ± 11.93	

Table 5: Paired Sample T test for SF-36.

		Paired Samples Statistics			
		N	Mean ± Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	P Value
Pair 2	Pre Treatment Physical Function (PF)	16	42.50 ± 8.24	2.06155	0.002
	Post Treatment Physical Function (PF)	16	53.50 ± 12.92	3.23136	
Pair 3	Pre Treatment Social Function (SC)	16	42.06 ± 8.50	2.12616	0.001
	Post Treatment Social Function (SC)	16	56.43 ± 20.07	5.01993	
Pair 4	Pre Treatment Mental Health (MH)	16	46.25 ± 3.64	0.91059	0.001
	Post Treatment Mental Health (MH)	16	61.31 ± 16.64	4.16105	
Pair 5	Pre Treatment Pain (P)	16	48.25 ± 5.80	1.45057	0.004
	Post Treatment Pain (P)	16	60.12 ± 16.16	4.04132	
Pair 6	Pre Treatment Change in health (CiH)	16	48.56 ± 5.45	1.36311	0.001
	Post Treatment Change in health (CiH)	16	64.87 ± 18.12	4.53126	
Pair 7	Pre Treatment Role limitation - Physical (RLP)	16	49.68 ± 7.03	1.75765	0.001
	Post Treatment Role limitation - Physical (RLP)	16	65.62 ± 16.91	4.22973	
Pair 8	Pre Treatment Role limitation - Mental (RLM)	16	39.56 ± 12.97	3.2429	0.001
	Post Treatment Role limitation - Mental (RLM)	16	56.50 ± 22.42	5.60506	
Pair 9	Pre Treatment Energy / Vitality (EV)	16	49.25 ± 7.43	1.85854	0.001
	Post Treatment Energy / Vitality (EV)	16	67.56 ± 20.08	5.02242	
Pair 10	Pre Treatment Health perceptions (HP)	16	51.25 ± 8.53	2.13405	0.002

Post Treatment Health perceptions (HP)	16	60.93 ± 13.97	3.4946
--	----	---------------	--------

Table 6: Independent Sample T test for Foot and Ankle Outcome Score.

Independent Sample T Test				
	Groups	N	Mean ± Std. Deviation	P Value
Pre Treatment Foot and Ankle Outcome Score	Experimental Group	8	41.25 ± 14.89	0.62
	Control Group	8	37.87 ± 11.49	
Post Treatment Foot and Ankle Outcome Score	Experimental Group	8	72.5 ± 11.91	0.001
	Control Group	8	40.5 ± 18.70	

Table 7: Paired Sample T Test for Foot and Ankle Outcome Score.

Paired Sample T Test for Foot and Ankle Outcome Score				
Groups	N	Mean ± Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	P Value
Pre Treatment Foot and Ankle Outcome Score	16	46.25 ± 5.80	1.45057	0.003
Post Treatment Foot and Ankle Outcome Score	16	62.12 ± 16.16	4.04132	

Discussion

Among 16 participants 9 (56.3%) were male and 7 (43.8%) were female. Among 16 participants, mean age was 34 ± 5.35 with minimum 25 and maximum 40 years of age. Mean weight was 68.5 ± 5.83 with minimum 58 and maximum 76 kg. Mean height was 166 ± 11.65 cm with minimum 152 and maximum 190 cm. Mean Body Mass Index was 25.25 ± 4.38 with minimum 18.8 and maximum 32.50.

A study conducted by Rashi Goel in 2014. Study aimed to compare the effect of Kinesio taping and athletic taping on pain. According to this study Pain on the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) score comparison between kinesio and sports taping VAS stands for Visual Analogue Scale. I-VAS before taping, 2. VAS just after recording, and 3-VAS 30 minutes after taping. In this study, individuals with lateral epicondylalgia found that both kinesio and athletic taping reduced pain and increased muscular function immediately and after 30 minutes of application. This result might have therapeutic implications in that kinesio tape could be utilized to support a pain-free rehabilitation regimen. In this research, the average reduction in pain following diamond taping was 20% ($p=0.001$). PPT increased by 25.7 percent on average ($p=0.000$). The average gain in pain-free grip strength was 23% ($p=0.000$). It's thought to be due to a direct mechanical influence on the forearm muscles, similar to what orthotic braces for this disease are supposed to do but haven't been shown to do. According to our study Among 16 participants, Pre-treatment Visual Analogue Scale mean in experimental group was 7.37 ± 1.06 and in Control group was 6.75 ± 1.03 with P Value 0.253 which means that there is no remarkable variation among the mean values of both groups. Post-treatment Visual Analogue Scale mean in experimental group

was 4.5 ± 1.19 and in Control group was 3.25 ± 1.28 with P Value 0.063 which means that there is marked variability among the mean values of both groups [25].

A study conducted by nehal tazel in 2020 according to this study Physical Function Mean of group 1 was 34.92 ± 20.36 and group 2 mean was 39.52 ± 19.86 with P Value 0.122 and according to our study Among 16 participants, Pre-treatment Physical Function (PF) was 42.50 ± 8.24 and Post-treatment Physical Function (PF) mean was 53.50 ± 12.92 with P Value 0.002 which means that there is markable variation among the mean values of pre-treatment and post treatment Physical Function (PF) [26].

Social Functioning Mean of group 1 was 41.73 ± 26.47 and group 2 mean was 40.59 ± 14.84 with P Value 0.981 and according to our study Among 16 participants, Pre-treatment Social Function (SC) mean in experimental group was 45.5 ± 9.69 and in Control group was 38.62 ± 5.82 with P Value 0.108 which means that there is no remarkable variation among the mean values of both groups. Post-treatment Social Function (SC) mean in experimental group was 70.25 ± 11.59 and in Control group was 42.62 ± 17.12 with P Value 0.002 which means that there is absolute variability among the mean values of both groups. Physical role limitation Mean of group 1 was 18.05 ± 20.36 and group 2 mean was 17.15 ± 12.40 with P Value 0.846 and according to our study Among 16 participants, Pre-treatment Role limitation Physical (RLP) mean in experimental group was 50.25 ± 6.86 and in Control group was 49.12 ± 7.62 with P Value 0.761 which means that there is no absolute variation among the mean values of both groups. Post-treatment Role limitation Physical (RLP) mean in experimental group was 79.5 ± 3.58 and in Control group was 51.75 ± 12.66 with P

Value 0.00 which means that there is remarkable variation among the mean values of both groups [26].

Among 16 participants, Pre-treatment Health perceptions (HP) mean in experimental group was 52.25 ± 9.92 and in Control group was 50.25 ± 7.44 with P Value 0.655 which means there is no relative or remarkable variation among the mean values of both groups. Post-treatment Health perceptions (HP) mean in experimental group was 70 ± 9.41 and in Control group was 51.87 ± 11.93 with P Value 0.005 which means that there is significant difference between the mean values of both groups.[27] Emotional role limitation Mean of group 1 was 22.66 ± 20.37 and group 2 mean was 23.46 ± 17.55 with P Value 0.715 and according to our study among 16 participants, Pre-treatment Role limitation mental (RLM) mean in experimental group was 41.25 ± 14.89 and in Control group was 37.87 ± 11.49 with P Value 0.62 which means that there are no significant changes seen among the mean values of both groups. Post-treatment Role limitation - Mental (RLM) mean in experimental group was 72.5 ± 11.91 and in Control group was 40.5 ± 18.70 with P Value 0.001 which means that there are significant changes among the mean values of both groups [27].

Cynthia J Wright et al, conducted a controlled trial research in 2017 which states that Mental Health Mean of group 1 was 36.91 ± 19.13 and group 2 mean was 37.11 ± 7.61 with P Value 0.914 and according to our study Among 16 participants, Pre-treatment Mental Health (MH) mean in experimental group was 47.5 ± 3.81 and in Control group was 45 ± 3.20 with P Value 0.178 which means that there is no significance seen among the mean values of both groups. Post-treatment Mental Health (MH) mean in experimental group was 75.25 ± 8.82 and in Control group was 47.37 ± 8.46 with P Value 0.00 which means that there is significant difference between the mean values of both groups Energy Mean of group 1 was 36.93 ± 16.36 and group 2 mean was 31.19 ± 12.58 with P Value 0.097 and according to our study Among 16 participants, Pre-treatment Energy/Vitality (EV) mean in experimental group was 49.25 ± 7.61 and in Control group was 49.25 ± 7.77 with P Value 1.00 which means that there is no significant difference between the mean values of both groups. Post-treatment Energy/Vitality (EV) mean in experimental group was 81.5 ± 10.94 and in Control group was 53.62 ± 17.35 with P Value 0.002 which means that there are significant changes among the mean values of both groups. Pain Mean of group 1 was 25.20 ± 21.42 and group 2 mean was 26.36 ± 19.46 with P Value 0.619 and according to our study Among 16 participants, Pre-treatment Pain (P) mean in experimental group was 50.25 ± 6.43 and in Control group was 46.25 ± 4.65 with P Value 0.176 which means that there are absolute changes seen among the mean values of both groups. Post-treatment Pain (P) mean in experimental group was 73 ± 11.36 and in Control group was 47.25 ± 7.20 with P Value 0.00 which means there are significant changes seen among the mean values of both groups [28]. Hence, research supports the results of our current study. But this previous research was compromising general population instead of athletes alone.

As studied from different articles and literature this study was different to previous studies or research as it showed how much weight bearing is important in chronic ankle sprain along with the use of kinesio tape.

Conclusion

There was significant difference between the mean Value of Visual Analogue Scale, SF-36 and Foot and Ankle Outcome Score, Pre Treatment and after treatment. Significant difference was also found between the Treatment group and Control group in the favor of treatment group with Kinesiotape. The study should be conducted on a larger sample for future purpose with a decline in the drop-out rate to assess these results. For more precise study, follow-up sessions should verify the long-term results of treatments.

References

1. Delahunt E, Bleakley CM, Bossard DS, Caulfield BM, Docherty CL, Doherty C, et al. Clinical assessment of acute lateral ankle sprain injuries (ROAST): 2019 consensus statement and recommendations of the International Ankle Consortium. *Br J Sports Med.* 2018; 52(20):1304-10.
2. Hubbard-Turner T. Lack of medical treatment from a medical professional after an ankle sprain. *J Athl Train.* 2019;54(6):671-675.
3. Hartley EM, Hoch MC, Boling MC. Y-balance test performance and BMI are associated with ankle sprain injury in collegiate male athletes. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2018;21(7):676-80.
4. Miklovic TM, Donovan L, Protzuk OA, Kang MS, Feger MA. Acute lateral ankle sprain to chronic ankle instability: a pathway of dysfunction. *Phys Sportsmed.* 2018;46(1):116-22.
5. Wolfe MW, Uhl TL, Mattacola CG, McCluskey LC. Management of ankle sprains. *Am Fam Physician.* 2001;63(1):93.
6. Pellow JE, Brantingham JW. The efficacy of adjusting the ankle in the treatment of subacute and chronic grade I and grade II ankle inversion sprains. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.* 2001;24(1):17-24.
7. Pourkazemi F, Hiller CE, Raymond J, Nightingale EJ, Refshauge KM. Predictors of chronic ankle instability after an index lateral ankle sprain: a systematic review. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2014;17(6):568-573.
8. Kemler E, van de Port I, Backx F, van Dijk CN. A systematic review on the treatment of acute ankle sprain. *medSport.* 2011;41(3):185-97.
9. De Loes M, Goldie I. Incidence rate of injuries during sport activity and physical exercise in a rural Swedish municipality: incidence rates in 17 sports. *Int J Sports Med.* 1988;9(06):461-467.
10. Owoeye OB, Palacios-Derflingher LM, Emery CA. Prevention of ankle sprain injuries in youth soccer and basketball: effectiveness of a neuromuscular training program and examining risk factors. *J Sport Med.* 2018;28(4):325-31.
11. Davis DS, Quinn RO, Whiteman CT, Williams JD, Young CR. Concurrent validity of four clinical tests used to measure

- hamstring flexibility. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2008;22(2):583-588.
12. Halabchi F, Hassabi M. Acute ankle sprain in athletes: Clinical aspects and algorithmic approach. *World J Orthop.* 2020;11(12):534.
 13. Waldhelm A, Gacek M, Davis H, Saia C, Kirby B. Acute effects of neural gliding on athletic performance. *Int J Sports Phys Ther.* 2019;14(4):603.
 14. Witvrouw E, Mahieu N, Danneels L, McNair P. Stretching and injury prevention. *Sports Med.* 2004;34(7):443-449.
 15. D'Hooghe P, Cruz F, Alkhelaifi K. Return to play after a lateral ligament ankle sprain. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med.* 2020;13(3):281-8.
 16. Robb A, Sajko S. Conservative management of posterior interosseous neuropathy in an elite baseball pitcher's return to play: a case report and review of the literature. *J CanChiroprAssoc.* 2009;53(4):300.
 17. Castellote-Caballero Y, Valenza MC, Martín-Martín L, Cabrera-Martos I, Puentedura EJ, Fernández-de-Las-Peñas C. Effects of a neurodynamic sliding technique on hamstring flexibility in healthy male soccer players. A pilot study. *Phys Ther Sport.* 2013;14(3):156-162.
 18. Turki O, Chaouachi A, Behm DG, Chtara H, Chtara M, Bishop D, et al. The effect of warm-ups incorporating different volumes of dynamic stretching on 10-and 20-m sprint performance in highly trained male athletes. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2012;26(1):63-72.
 19. Koldenhoven RM, Hart J, Saliba S, Abel MF, Hertel J. Gait kinematics & kinetics at three walking speeds in individuals with chronic ankle instability and ankle sprain copers. *Gait Posture.* 2019;74:169-75.
 20. Bellows R, Wong CK. The effect of bracing and balance training on ankle sprain incidence among athletes: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Int J Sports Phys Ther.* 2018;13(3):379.
 21. Cox T, Sneed T, Hamann H. Neurodynamic mobilization in a collegiate long jumper with exercise-induced lateral leg and ankle pain: A case report. *J Phys Ther Sci.* 2018;34(3):241-9.
 22. Cha H-K, Cho H-S, Choi J-D. Effects of the nerve mobilization technique on lower limb function in patients with poststroke hemiparesis. *J Phys Ther Sci.* 2014;26(7):981-3.
 23. Halseth T, McChesney JW, DeBeliso M, Vaughn R, Lien J. The effects of kinesio™ taping on proprioception at the ankle. *J Sports Sci Med.* 2004;3(1):1.
 24. Sarvestan J, Ataabadi PA, Svoboda Z, Kovacicova Z, Needle AR. The effect of ankle Kinesio taping on ankle joint biomechanics during unilateral balance status among collegiate athletes with chronic ankle sprain. *Phys Ther Sport.* 2020;45:161-7.
 25. Goel R, Balthilaya G, Reddy RS. Effect of Kinesio taping versus athletic taping on pain and muscle performance in lateral epicondylalgia. *Int J Physiother Res.* 2015;3(1):839-44.
 26. Tezel N, Umay E, Bulut M, Cakci A. Short-term efficacy of kinesiotaping versus extracorporeal shockwave therapy for plantar fasciitis: A randomized study. *Saudi J Med Sci.* 2020;8(3):181.
 27. Kuru T, Yaliman A, Dereli E. Comparison of efficiency of Kinesio® taping and electrical stimulation in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc* 2012;46(5):385-92.
 28. Wright CJ, Linens SW, Cain MS. A randomized controlled trial comparing rehabilitation efficacy in chronic ankle instability. *J Sport Rehabil.* 2017;26(4):238-249.