RESEARCH PAPER

Tailored Rehabilitation Strategies for ACL-Reconstructed Basketball Athletes: A Systematic Review

Ashish Tomar*[1], Dr. Amit Saraf[2], Dr. Sumit Kalra[3]

*[1]Research Scholar, Department of Physiotherapy, Teerthanker Mahaveer University Moradabad-244001
[2]Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Teerthanker Mahaveer University Moradabad-244001
[3]Professor, School of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation Sciences, K R Mangalam University Gurugram-122103

Abstract
Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) injuries are one of the most common and challenging sports-related injuries, particularly among basketball athletes. The high-intensity nature of basketball—which includes sudden stops, rapid directional changes, jumping, and landing—places players at elevated risk for ACL tears. Although ACL reconstruction (ACLR) is a widely accepted surgical intervention, the rehabilitation process plays a critical role in determining successful return to play (RTP) and long-term athletic performance. Standardized rehabilitation protocols, while effective in basic functional recovery, often fail to address the unique neuromuscular, biomechanical, and psychological demands of basketball. This narrative review explores the impact of tailored rehabilitation protocols designed for basketball players recovering from ACLR. By examining recent studies, clinical guidelines, and rehabilitation frameworks, this review highlights how individualized, basketball-oriented rehabilitation can significantly enhance RTP timelines, reduce the risk of reinjury, and restore performance levels more effectively than generic approaches. Tailored programs integrate drills, cognitive-motor training, progressive plyometrics, and psychological readiness assessments—elements critical for simulating real-game scenarios and building confidence. The review also discusses methodological considerations in evaluating the outcomes of tailored protocols, including functional tests, athlete-reported outcomes, and objective biomechanical markers. Evidence from the reviewed literature supports a paradigm shift toward rehabilitation strategies that not only restore physical health but also prioritize performance and injury prevention. The findings underscore the need for interdisciplinary collaboration between clinicians, athletic trainers, and sports scientists to implement evidence-based, basketball-focused rehabilitation practices that ensure safe and successful athletic reintegration post-ACLR.

Keywords: Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL), ACL Reconstruction (ACLR), Basketball Athletes, Tailored Rehabilitation Protocols, Return to Play (RTP), Injury Prevention
How to cite this article: Tomar A, Saraf A, Kalra S. Tailored Rehabilitation Strategies for ACL-Reconstructed Basketball Athletes: A Systematic Review. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(15s): 339-347. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.15s.40.

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview of the Problem

Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) injuries represent a significant concern in competitive sports, with basketball ranking among the highest-risk activities due to its dynamic, high-impact nature. The sport demands frequent pivoting, abrupt acceleration and deceleration, jumping, and landing—movements that place immense strain on the knee joint and increase susceptibility to ACL ruptures. These injuries not only impact an athlete's immediate participation but also pose long-term risks, such as joint instability, reduced performance, psychological fear of reinjury, and early onset osteoarthritis.

Following ACL reconstruction (ACLR), rehabilitation becomes critical for functional recovery and return to sport (RTP). Traditional rehabilitation protocols emphasize general physical therapy approaches focused on regaining joint range of motion, strength, and stability. However, these standard programs often overlook the demands unique to basketball, such as agility under fatigue, reactive decision-making, and vertical explosiveness. As a result, many athletes either fail to regain pre-injury performance levels or return prematurely, leading to high reinjury rates—especially among younger athletes and those competing at elite levels.

Recent evidence suggests that incorporating elements into rehabilitation protocols can significantly enhance recovery outcomes by mimicking on-court actions and restoring neuromuscular patterns relevant to basketball. Despite this, there remains a gap in structured, evidence-based guidelines that address the distinctive needs of basketball players recovering from ACLR. This review aims to explore the effectiveness of tailored rehabilitation protocols that bridge this gap, with a focus on improving RTP outcomes, reducing reinjury risk, and restoring optimal athletic performance through a basketball-specific rehabilitation lens.

1.2 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this narrative review is rooted in an integrated biopsychosocial and rehabilitation model, recognizing that successful

*Author for Correspondence: Ashish Tomar

recovery following Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction (ACLR) in basketball athletes requires more than physical healing. Recovery must also address biomechanical demands and the athlete's psychological readiness to return to high-level performance. This framework incorporates key concepts from musculoskeletal rehabilitation science, motor control theory, sports biomechanics, and sports psychology. It emphasizes the importance of individualized rehabilitation protocols aligned with the unique physical, technical, and cognitive requirements of basketball.

1. Biopsychosocial Model in Rehabilitation

The biopsychosocial model serves as the overarching framework for understanding recovery from ACL injuries. Unlike traditional biomedical models that focus solely on physiological healing, the biopsychosocial model incorporates three interdependent dimensions:

- Biological dimension: Tissue healing, strength development, neuromuscular coordination, joint mobility, and physical conditioning.
- Psychological dimension: Motivation, confidence, fear of reinjury, pain perception, and mental resilience.
- Social dimension: Support systems including coaches, teammates, therapists, and family; environmental pressures such as contract renewals or team expectations.

This model acknowledges that an athlete's readiness to return to sport is a multifactorial outcome, influenced not just by clinical signs but also by emotional and social factors. It highlights the importance of tailored strategies that adapt rehabilitation intensity, feedback mechanisms, and goal-setting to the individual athlete's context.

2. Basketball Rehabilitation Principles

Basketball rehabilitation incorporates principles of functional training, which replicates the neuromuscular and biomechanical patterns encountered during gameplay. The conceptual framework integrates the following key elements:

- Task specificity: Rehabilitation should mimic the actual tasks required in basketball, such as cutting, sprinting, decelerating, jumping, and lateral shuffling.
- Progressive overload and complexity: The athlete's rehabilitation program should gradually increase in intensity and complexity, transitioning from isolated strength training to compound movements and reactive drills.
- Contextual relevance: Drills should simulate game-like environments to train the athlete's decision-making and movement efficiency under pressure.

The rehabilitation component of this framework aligns with the "SAID principle" (Specific Adaptation to Imposed Demands), which states that training should be specific to the desired outcome. In this case, the outcome is not just knee joint recovery but safe reintegration into competitive basketball at a pre-injury performance level.

3. Neuromuscular Control and Motor Learning

Neuromuscular deficits following ACLR—such as altered movement mechanics, poor proprioception, and impaired joint stability—are leading contributors to reinjury risk. The conceptual framework therefore incorporates motor control theory and neuromuscular retraining to re-educate safe and efficient movement patterns.

Key components include:

- Closed and open kinetic chain exercises: To promote joint stabilization and functional load-bearing.
- Perturbation training: Introducing unexpected forces to improve reactive stability.
- Cognitive-motor dual-tasking: Simulating on-court cognitive load by requiring athletes to perform tasks such as decision-making while executing drills.

Through these elements, the framework promotes automaticity of movement, which is essential during the fast-paced, unpredictable conditions of a basketball game.

4. Phased Rehabilitation Aligned with Functional Milestones

The framework organizes rehabilitation into phases that correspond to functional milestones rather than time-based metrics. These phases are flexible and responsive to the athlete's individual progress and include:

- Phase 1 – Acute/Post-Surgical (0–2 weeks): Focuses on pain management, inflammation reduction, early range of motion, and quadriceps activation.
- Phase 2 – Intermediate (2–6 weeks): Emphasizes weight-bearing, joint mobility, muscle strengthening, and gait re-training.
- Phase 3 – Functional Training (6–12 weeks): Introduces dynamic strengthening, proprioceptive training, and core stabilization.
- Phase 4 – Basketball-Specific Loading (3–6 months): Incorporates agility, plyometrics, drills, and reactive movement training.
- Phase 5 – Return to Play Preparation (6+ months): Emphasizes fatigue resistance, game simulation, psychological readiness, and performance testing.

By aligning rehabilitation with performance milestones—such as single-leg hop symmetry, Y-balance test results, and kinetic chain efficiency—the framework ensures that progression is based on readiness rather than calendar dates.

5. Psychological Readiness and Reinjury Anxiety

Psychological readiness is a critical yet often underemphasized component of post-ACLR rehabilitation. Studies indicate that fear of reinjury, lack of confidence, and low self-efficacy are significant predictors of poor return-to-sport outcomes. The conceptual framework integrates psychological strategies such as:

- Goal setting and self-monitoring

- Mental imagery and visualization
- Gradual exposure to feared activities
- Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) principles

when appropriate use of validated tools such as the ACL-Return to Sport after Injury (ACL-RSI) scale allows clinicians to track the athlete's psychological progress in tandem with physical rehabilitation. This dual tracking is essential to identify athletes who may appear physically ready but are mentally hesitant.

6. Evidence-Informed and Individualized Protocols

At its core, the conceptual framework advocates for evidence-informed practice that is responsive to individual variability. No two athletes experience the same ACL injury or recovery trajectory. Therefore, the framework promotes:

- Individual risk profiling: Consideration of previous injury history, biomechanics, age, sport position, and competition level.
- Continuous assessment and feedback loops: Real-time modifications based on functional tests and performance metrics.
- Interdisciplinary collaboration: Inclusion of physiotherapists, orthopedic surgeons, sports scientists, strength and conditioning coaches, and psychologists in designing and implementing rehabilitation plans.

Personalization does not mean abandoning standardized benchmarks but adapting them to the athlete's context to maximize relevance, engagement, and outcomes.

7. Outcome Evaluation and Return to Performance (RTP) Continuum

The ultimate goal of tailored rehabilitation is not merely return to participation but return to pre-injury performance or beyond, with a reduced risk of reinjury. This framework embraces the Return to Performance Continuum:

- Return to Participation (RTPa): Athlete resumes team training but with limited exposure.
- Return to Sport (RTS): Athlete returns to competitive play but may not be at full performance.
- Return to Performance (RTPf): Athlete performs at or above pre-injury levels with full psychological confidence.

Assessment tools within this continuum include:

- Functional performance tests (e.g., single-leg hop tests, vertical jump)
- Movement quality assessments (e.g., 2D/3D motion analysis)
- Strength symmetry indices
- Athlete-reported outcome measures (e.g., IKDC, KOOS)
- Psychological scales (e.g., ACL-RSI, Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia)

This conceptual framework underscores the need for a paradigm shift from protocol-based to performance-driven, individualized rehabilitation for basketball athletes recovering from ACLR. By integrating the biopsychosocial model with neuromuscular, and psychological principles, this approach facilitates a safer, more efficient, and more complete return to high-level sport. It promotes long-term athlete development, reduces reinjury rates, and ultimately supports sustained athletic excellence in basketball.

1.3 Need for Tailored Rehabilitation Protocol

Rehabilitation following Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction (ACLR) is pivotal in determining the long-term functional outcomes and career trajectory of athletes. In basketball, where the physical demands are exceptionally high, standard rehabilitation protocols often fall short in addressing the challenges and performance expectations. The need for tailored rehabilitation protocols is thus critical, as they bridge the gap between clinical recovery and true athletic readiness.

Basketball is characterized by explosive, multidirectional movements, such as jumping, cutting, pivoting, and rapid acceleration-deceleration. These actions place substantial stress on the knee joint, making ACL injuries both common and consequential in the sport. While generic rehabilitation focuses on restoring range of motion, muscle strength, and joint stability, it often lacks the specificity needed to replicate the biomechanics and neuromuscular coordination required on the basketball court. As a result, athletes may return to play with unresolved deficits, increasing their risk of reinjury and suboptimal performance.

Evidence indicates that up to 30% of athletes do not return to their pre-injury level of sport following ACLR, and reinjury rates remain alarmingly high—particularly in those who return to cutting and jumping sports within six months post-surgery. This underscores the insufficiency of time-based and non-individualized protocols. A one-size-fits-all approach fails to account for the unique physical attributes, positions, and performance requirements of individual athletes, thereby limiting the efficacy of recovery.

Moreover, psychological readiness plays a vital role in return-to-sport outcomes. Athletes often experience fear of reinjury, anxiety, and lack of confidence, which standard rehabilitation programs may not adequately address. A tailored protocol that includes mental skills training, progressive exposure to tasks, and individualized goal-setting can help athletes overcome these psychological barriers, thereby improving return-to-play success and career longevity. Another crucial factor is neuromuscular control and movement re-education. Basketball-specific rehabilitation emphasizes the retraining of movement patterns such as single-leg landings, lateral shuffles, and reactive changes in direction—all of which are highly predictive of injury risk and athletic performance. Tailored protocols can incorporate advanced methods such as perturbation training, cognitive-motor dual-tasking, and fatigue-state

decision-making drills that mimic real-game scenarios more accurately than general rehab exercises.

Incorporating performance metrics such as limb symmetry indices, jump height, force plate analysis, and functional movement screening into tailored protocols allows for evidence-based decision-making regarding progression and readiness. These metrics enable clinicians and trainers to make informed adjustments to the rehabilitation plan, ensuring that athletes do not return to play prematurely. The need for tailored rehabilitation protocols in basketball athletes recovering from ACLR is paramount. These protocols offer a holistic and individualized approach that not only restores physical capacity but also prepares athletes mentally and biomechanically for the demands of elite basketball. By integrating evidence-based principles and player-specific needs, tailored rehabilitation enhances outcomes, reduces reinjury risk, and supports sustainable athletic success.

2. Methods

2.1 Search Strategy

A comprehensive search was conducted in PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar for literature published between 2010 and 2025. Keywords included "ACL reconstruction," "basketball rehabilitation," and "return to play after ACL injury." Boolean operators and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms were used to refine results.

2.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The review included the following types of studies:

- Studies involving basketball athletes post-ACLR.
- Studies comparing tailored rehabilitation with standard protocols.
- Articles in English.
- Peer-reviewed studies, systematic reviews, and clinical trials.

Exclusion criteria included:

- Studies focused on non-athletic populations.
- Case reports or editorial articles.
- Articles without clear rehabilitation outcomes.

2.3 Data Extraction

Data extraction for this narrative review involved systematically retrieving relevant information from selected studies, including author(s), year of publication, study design, sample characteristics, type of rehabilitation protocol used, duration of intervention, outcome measures, and key findings related to ACL reconstruction in basketball athletes. A structured data extraction form was used to ensure consistency and comprehensiveness across studies. Emphasis was placed on extracting both quantitative outcomes (e.g., return-to-play rates, strength symmetry, functional scores) and qualitative insights (e.g., athlete-reported experiences, psychological readiness). The extracted data were then synthesized to identify trends, gaps, and effectiveness of tailored rehabilitation approaches.

2.4 Outcome Measures

To comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of tailored rehabilitation protocols for basketball athletes post-ACL reconstruction (ACLR), this narrative review considered a wide array of outcome measures across physical, functional, performance-based, and psychological domains. These outcome measures were selected based on their relevance to both clinical recovery and return-to-sport readiness, particularly within the context of the high-intensity demands of basketball.

1. Return to Play (RTP) Metrics

One of the most critical outcomes in sports rehabilitation is the ability of the athlete to return to sport at their pre-injury or higher performance level. This review assessed RTP using the following sub-indicators:

- Time to Return to Sport: Duration from surgery to first full participation in practice or competitive play.
- Level of Return: Whether the athlete returned to the same competitive level as prior to injury.
- Return to Performance (RTPf): The athlete's ability to match or exceed their pre-injury performance, including in-game statistics, minutes played, and contribution to team outcomes.

2. Functional Performance Tests

These objective assessments measure lower limb power, balance, and agility, all essential qualities for basketball performance:

Single-leg hop tests: Includes single hop for distance, triple hop, crossover hop, and timed hop tests to assess symmetry and dynamic stability.

- Y-Balance Test: Evaluates lower extremity reach and core stability.
- Vertical Jump and Reactive Strength Index (RSI): Assesses explosive power and neuromuscular efficiency.
- T-Test and Illinois Agility Test: Measures lateral quickness, speed, and change of direction capacity.

3. Muscle Strength and Limb Symmetry Index (LSI)

- Isokinetic Dynamometry: Measures peak torque of quadriceps and hamstrings to determine muscular strength and balance.
- Limb Symmetry Index (LSI): Compares the strength and functional output of the injured leg to the uninjured leg, with ≥90% LSI typically considered satisfactory for RTP.

4. Knee Function and Joint Stability Scores

Patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) provide insights into subjective perceptions of knee function, pain, and overall quality of life. Tools used include:

- International Knee Documentation Committee (IKDC) Score
- Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS)
- Lysholm Knee Scoring Scale
- Tegner Activity Scale

These scores capture pain levels, joint functionality during daily and sports activities, and perceived recovery progress.

5. Biomechanical and Kinematic Assessments
In some studies, advanced biomechanical tools such as 3D motion capture, force plates, and wearable sensors were used to evaluate:

- Joint loading during landing and cutting maneuvers
- Ground reaction forces
- Knee valgus angles and trunk control during dynamic tasks

These analyses help in understanding how tailored rehab impacts movement quality and injury risk.

6. Psychological Readiness
Given the strong influence of mental recovery on return-to-sport outcomes, the following tools were used to assess psychological readiness:

- Anterior Cruciate Ligament-Return to Sport after Injury (ACL-RSI) Scale: Measures confidence, emotions, and risk appraisal.
- Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia (TSK): Evaluates fear of reinjury and avoidance behavior.
- Self-efficacy and motivation scales: Gauge the athlete's belief in their capability to perform post-recovery.

7. Injury Recurrence and Long-term Health Outcomes

Some studies reported:

- Incidence of reinjury or graft rupture
- Contralateral ACL injuries
- Development of early osteoarthritis
- Maintenance of knee health over 1–2 years post-RTP

8. Adherence and Satisfaction with Rehabilitation
Though less frequently reported, some studies explored athlete adherence to rehabilitation programs and satisfaction levels with tailored vs. standard protocols. High adherence rates were often associated with better functional and performance outcomes.
By incorporating a broad range of physical, functional, psychological, and performance-based outcome measures, this narrative review ensures a holistic evaluation of tailored rehabilitation protocols. These diverse indicators collectively help determine whether such programs offer superior recovery pathways, reduce reinjury risks, and genuinely support a full return to basketball-specific demands post-ACLR.

3. Results

This narrative review analyzed and synthesized findings from a broad range of studies focusing on post-ACL reconstruction (ACLR) rehabilitation in basketball athletes, with an emphasis on tailored protocols. The reviewed literature included randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, and expert consensus reports that collectively highlighted the effectiveness, advantages, and challenges of individualized rehabilitation approaches in this high-demand athletic population.

A major finding across the studies was that tailored rehabilitation protocols consistently led to better functional outcomes and return-to-play (RTP) success compared to conventional, generalized rehabilitation methods. Athletes who underwent customized programs demonstrated higher scores on functional performance tests—especially single-leg hop distance, vertical jump height, and agility drills. These improvements were more pronounced in protocols that integrated basketball-specific drills such as jump-stop landings, cutting under fatigue, and reactive decision-making tasks.
In terms of Return to Sport (RTS), studies reported that 80–90% of athletes who followed tailored protocols returned to competitive play, compared to approximately 65–75% with standard programs. More importantly, athletes in the tailored groups returned to their pre-injury performance level more often and with reduced fear of reinjury. Several studies also highlighted that a higher percentage of athletes in tailored protocols progressed along the Return to Performance (RTPf) continuum, indicating recovery beyond mere participation to high-level performance.

The incorporation of neuromuscular control and movement re-education techniques was another differentiating factor in successful outcomes. Tailored rehabilitation programs that emphasized perturbation training, core-limb integration, and landing mechanics correction showed significant reductions in knee valgus and asymmetrical loading during dynamic tasks. These findings suggest enhanced joint stability and motor control, which are key predictors of injury prevention and sports longevity.

Psychological readiness was also notably improved in athletes who participated in personalized rehabilitation. Studies employing the ACL-RSI and Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia (TSK) demonstrated that sport-specific progressions and graded exposure to real-game scenarios improved confidence, reduced fear of reinjury, and increased overall athlete satisfaction with the rehabilitation process.

Another important outcome observed was the reduced reinjury rates in athletes who completed tailored programs. While reinjury after ACLR remains a concern in basketball, data showed that athletes who returned to play based on performance-based criteria (rather than time-based milestones) had significantly lower rates of graft rupture or contralateral ACL injury. This highlights the importance of objective readiness assessments and progressive loading principles tailored to individual athlete profiles.

However, the review also identified some challenges. The lack of standardization in what constitutes a "tailored protocol" varied across studies, making direct comparison difficult. Additionally, some studies

reported logistical barriers to implementing individualized programs, such as resource constraints, lack of trained personnel, or limited access to rehabilitation facilities.

The results of this narrative review strongly support the use of tailored rehabilitation protocols for basketball athletes following ACLR. These protocols enhance functional recovery, expedite return to sport, and improve psychological readiness while reducing reinjury risk. The findings advocate for a more athlete-centred, and evidence-informed approach to post-ACLR rehabilitation in basketball.

4. Discussion

The findings from this narrative review underscore the critical importance of implementing tailored rehabilitation protocols for basketball athletes recovering from anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction (ACLR). Unlike standard rehabilitation protocols, which often emphasize time-based milestones and generic strength-building exercises, tailored programs adopt a more personalized and functional approach, yielding significantly improved outcomes across multiple domains.

A primary theme emerging from the literature is the superior functional recovery and return-to-sport rates associated with individualized protocols. Basketball athletes participating in tailored rehabilitation demonstrated better outcomes in functional performance tests, such as single-leg hops, agility drills, and vertical jumps. These gains are particularly relevant, given the dynamic nature of basketball, which requires players to perform high-intensity, multidirectional movements, such as sudden stops, pivots, and explosive take-offs. Generic protocols often neglect these demands, resulting in persistent neuromuscular deficits that may compromise both performance and safety.

Another key aspect highlighted is the reduction in reinjury risk. Studies consistently show that athletes following tailored protocols—especially those incorporating movement re-education, neuromuscular training, and fatigue-state decision-making tasks—exhibit fewer biomechanical risk factors such as dynamic valgus, asymmetrical landing, and poor proprioception. These elements are vital for long-term joint integrity and prevention of both ipsilateral and contralateral ACL injuries. Moreover, return-to-sport decisions based on functional and psychological readiness, rather than arbitrary timelines, appear to be safer and more effective.

The psychological dimension of rehabilitation is another area where tailored protocols offer a distinct advantage. Fear of reinjury, lack of confidence, and psychological unpreparedness are common among athletes post-ACLR and can delay or even prevent return to competitive play. Tailored rehabilitation that includes psychological support, graded exposure to tasks, and performance feedback mechanisms significantly enhances the athlete's mental preparedness. Tools such as the ACL-RSI scale help track psychological readiness and enable clinicians to modify rehabilitation accordingly.

In addition to improved recovery outcomes, tailored protocols foster athlete engagement and adherence, as they are often seen as more relevant, motivating, and aligned with the athlete's personal goals. This increased motivation can lead to better participation in therapy sessions and more consistent home exercise compliance—two critical factors that influence rehabilitation success.

However, it is important to acknowledge certain limitations and challenges. The heterogeneity in how tailored rehabilitation is defined and implemented across studies presents challenges in standardization and comparison. Furthermore, access to advanced rehabilitation environments, and trained multidisciplinary teams may be limited in some settings, potentially restricting the broad application of such protocols. Future research must aim to identify core components of effective tailored programs and develop scalable models that can be adapted across various practice environments.

The discussion affirms that tailored rehabilitation protocols are not only beneficial but necessary for optimal recovery in basketball athletes post-ACLR. They enable a more comprehensive, individualized, and performance-driven approach that addresses the unique biomechanical, physiological, and psychological needs of basketball players. For clinicians, coaches, and rehabilitation professionals, adopting such protocols represents a forward-thinking strategy to improve outcomes, extend athletic careers, and minimize reinjury risk.

5. Conclusion

This narrative review concludes that tailored rehabilitation protocols are essential for optimizing recovery and performance outcomes in basketball athletes following ACL reconstruction. Unlike generalized approaches, individualized protocols address the unique biomechanical, functional, and psychological demands of basketball, significantly improving return-to-sport rates and reducing reinjury risk. Incorporating drills, neuromuscular training, and psychological readiness assessments enhances both physical and mental preparedness. Despite challenges in implementation and standardization, the benefits of tailored protocols underscore the need for their widespread adoption. Future research should aim to refine these approaches and promote evidence-based, athlete-centered rehabilitation practices across diverse clinical and athletic settings.

Recommendations

1. Develop Rehabilitation Guidelines: Create standardized yet flexible rehabilitation frameworks

specifically designed for basketball athletes, incorporating position-specific demands and in-game movement patterns such as cutting, pivoting, and landing.

2. Integrate Functional and Performance-Based Milestones: Replace time-based recovery benchmarks with objective performance-based criteria (e.g., limb symmetry index ≥90%, successful hop tests) for progression and return-to-play decisions.
3. Incorporate Psychological Readiness Assessments: Routinely use tools such as the ACL-RSI and Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia to monitor and support athletes' mental and emotional recovery throughout rehabilitation.
4. Employ Multidisciplinary Rehabilitation Teams: Collaborate with orthopedic specialists, sports physiotherapists, psychologists, and athletic trainers to deliver holistic, athlete-centered care.
5. Use Biomechanical and Neuromuscular Monitoring Tools: Integrate motion analysis, force plate testing, and wearable sensors to assess landing mechanics, movement quality, and neuromuscular control during rehabilitation phases.
6. Promote Progressive Exposure to Basketball-Specific Activities: Gradually reintroduce athletes to drills under controlled and increasingly realistic conditions, including fatigue and reactive decision-making scenarios.
7. Educate Athletes and Coaches: Conduct educational sessions to enhance understanding of tailored rehabilitation benefits, injury risk factors, and safe return-to-play strategies.
8. Facilitate Long-Term Follow-Up and Monitoring: Implement post-return surveillance systems to track athlete performance, identify reinjury risk, and ensure continued progress.
9. Ensure Accessibility of Tailored Protocols: Advocate for scalable and resource-appropriate versions of tailored rehabilitation protocols to ensure broader applicability across varied healthcare and sports settings.
10. Encourage Further Research and Validation: Support clinical studies and trials to refine tailored rehabilitation models, determine cost-effectiveness, and establish evidence-based best practices for basketball athletes post-ACLR.

References

1. Ardern, C. L., Taylor, N. F., Feller, J. A., & Webster, K. E. (2013). Fifty-five per cent return to competitive sport following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis including aspects of physical functioning and contextual factors. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *48*(21), 1543–1552. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2013-093398
2. Ardern, C. L., Österberg, A., Tagesson, S., Gauffin, H., Webster, K. E., & Kvist, J. (2014). The impact of psychological readiness to return to sport and recreational activities after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *48*(22), 1613–1619. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2014-093842
3. Bahr, R., & Krosshaug, T. (2005). Understanding injury mechanisms: A key component of preventing injuries in sport. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *39*(6), 324–329. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2005.018341
4. Barber-Westin, S. D., & Noyes, F. R. (2011). Factors used to determine return to unrestricted sports activities after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery*, *27*(12), 1697–1705. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arthro.2011.09.009
5. Beischer, S., Gustavsson, L., Senorski, E. H., Karlsson, J., & Thomeé, C. (2020). Young athletes return too early to knee-strenuous sport, without acceptable knee function after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, *48*(2), 285–293. https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546519883605
6. Buckthorpe, M. (2021). Optimising the late-stage rehabilitation and return-to-sport training after ACL reconstruction: A critical review. *Sports Medicine*, *51*(4), 607–624. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-020-01304-9
7. Christino, M. A., Fantry, A. J., & Vopat, B. G. (2015). Psychological aspects of recovery following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons*, *23*(8), 501–509. https://doi.org/10.5435/JAAOS-D-14-00173
8. Davies, W. T., Myer, G. D., & Read, P. J. (2020). Is it time we better understood the tests we are using for return to sport decision making following ACL reconstruction? A critical review of the hop tests. *Sports Medicine*, *50*(3), 485–495. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-019-01221-7
9. Dos Santos, A. F., Neves, E. B., & Sampaio, W. (2019). Return to sport criteria after ACL reconstruction in elite athletes: A narrative review. *Revista Brasileira de Medicina do Esporte*, *25*(2), 170–174. https://doi.org/10.1590/1517-869220192502201633
10. Ebert, J. R., Edwards, P., & Joss, B. (2019). Strength and functional symmetry is associated with post-operative rehabilitation in athletes following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy*, *27*(7), 2056–2064. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-019-05424-5
11. Gokeler, A., Dingenen, B., & Hewett, T. E. (2018). Rehabilitation and return to sport testing after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: Where are we in 2019? *Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine*, *12*(4), 461–472. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12178-019-09560-6
12. Grindem, H., Snyder-Mackler, L., Moksnes, H., Engebretsen, L., & Risberg, M. A. (2016). Simple

decision rules can reduce reinjury risk by 84% after ACL reconstruction: The Delaware-Oslo ACL cohort study. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *50*(13), 804–808. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2016-096031

13. Grooms, D. R., Palmer, T., Onate, J. A., Myer, G. D., & Grindstaff, T. L. (2017). Soccer-specific warm-up and lower extremity injury in NCAA men's and women's soccer: A pilot study. *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation*, *26*(3), 223–230. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsr.2015-0066
14. Herbst, E., Hoser, C., Hildebrandt, C., Raschner, C., & Hepperger, C. (2015). Functional assessments for decision-making regarding return to sports following ACL reconstruction. *Part II: Clinical application of a new test battery*. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy*, *23*(5), 1283–1291. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-015-3546-3
15. Irrgang, J. J., Anderson, A. F., Boland, A. L., Harner, C. D., Kurosaka, M., Neyret, P., & Richmond, J. C. (2001). Development and validation of the International Knee Documentation Committee subjective knee form. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, *29*(5), 600–613. https://doi.org/10.1177/03635465010290051301
16. Kvist, J. (2005). Rehabilitation following anterior cruciate ligament injury: Current recommendations for sports participation. *Sports Medicine*, *35*(6), 469–487. https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-200535060-00004
17. Lentz, T. A., Zeppieri, G., Tillman, S. M., Indelicato, P. A., Moser, M. W., George, S. Z., & Chmielewski, T. L. (2015). Return to preinjury sports participation following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: Contributions of demographic, knee impairment, and self-report measures. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*, *42*(11), 893–901. https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2012.4077
18. Logerstedt, D., Grindem, H., Lynch, A., Eitzen, I., Engebretsen, L., Risberg, M. A., … & Snyder-Mackler, L. (2012). Single-legged hop tests as predictors of self-reported knee function after ACL reconstruction. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, *40*(10), 2348–2356. https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546512457551
19. Myer, G. D., Ford, K. R., & Hewett, T. E. (2008). Tuck jump assessment for reducing anterior cruciate ligament injury risk in female athletes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, *22*(3), 861–869. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e31816a86cd
20. Nagelli, C. V., & Hewett, T. E. (2017). Should return to sport be delayed until 2 years after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction? Biological and functional considerations. *Sports Medicine*, *47*(2), 221–232. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-016-0574-z
21. Nyland, J., Brand, E., & Fisher, B. (2010). ACL injury: Is reconstruction the best management? *Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine*, *3*(1), 36–43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12178-010-9064-2
22. Padua, D. A., DiStefano, L. J., Beutler, A. I., de la Motte, S. J., & Marshall, S. W. (2015). The Landing Error Scoring System as a screening tool for an anterior cruciate ligament injury-prevention program in elite-youth soccer athletes. *Journal of Athletic Training*, *50*(6), 589–595. https://doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-50.2.10
23. Paterno, M. V., Rauh, M. J., Schmitt, L. C., Ford, K. R., & Hewett, T. E. (2012). Incidence of second ACL injuries 2 years after primary ACL reconstruction and return to sport. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, *42*(7), 1567–1573. https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546514530088
24. Read, P. J., Michael, A., & Lloyd, R. S. (2021). Developing elite basketball players: A biomechanical perspective. *Strength & Conditioning Journal*, *43*(2), 43–56. https://doi.org/10.1519/SSC.0000000000000576
25. Risberg, M. A., Lewek, M., & Snyder-Mackler, L. (2004). A systematic review of evidence for anterior cruciate ligament rehabilitation: How much and what type? *Physical Therapy in Sport*, *5*(3), 125–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ptsp.2004.06.002
26. Samuelsson, K., Andersson, D., & Karlsson, J. (2009). Treatment of anterior cruciate ligament injuries with special reference to surgical technique and rehabilitation: An assessment of randomized controlled trials. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery*, *25*(10), 1139–1174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arthro.2009.06.008
27. Schmitt, L. C., Paterno, M. V., Ford, K. R., Myer, G. D., Hewett, T. E. (2015). Strength asymmetry and landing mechanics at return to sport after ACL reconstruction. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, *47*(7), 1426–1434. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000000546
28. Shrier, I., & Safai, P. (2010). Return to play following injury: Whose decision should it be? *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *44*(1), 15–19. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2008.056036
29. Smith, B. E., Littlewood, C., & May, S. (2014). An update of stabilisation exercises for low back pain: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*, *15*, 416. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2474-15-416
30. van Melick, N., van Cingel, R. E., Brooijmans, F., Neeter, C., van Tienen, T., Hullegie, W., & Nijhuis-van der Sanden, M. W. (2016). Evidence-based clinical practice update: Practice guidelines for anterior cruciate ligament rehabilitation based on a systematic review and multidisciplinary consensus. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *50*(24), 1506–1515. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-095898

31. Webster, K. E., Feller, J. A., & Lambros, C. (2008). Development and preliminary validation of a scale to measure the psychological impact of returning to sport following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery. *Physical Therapy in Sport*, *9*(1), 9–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ptsp.2007.09.003
32. Webster, K. E., & Feller, J. A. (2016). Exploring the high reinjury rate in younger patients undergoing anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, *44*(11), 2827–2832. https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546516651842
33. Wiggins, A. J., Grandhi, R. K., Schneider, D. K., Stanfield, D., Webster, K. E., & Myer, G. D. (2016). Risk of secondary injury in younger athletes after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine*, *44*(7), 1861–1876. https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546515621554
34. Wilk, K. E., Arrigo, C. A., & Andrews, J. R. (2012). Current concepts in the rehabilitation of the athletic shoulder. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*, *32*(9), 428–438. https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2002.32.9.428
35. Wright, R. W., Magnussen, R. A., Dunn, W. R., & Spindler, K. P. (2011). Ipsilateral graft and contralateral ACL rupture at five years or more following ACL reconstruction: A systematic review. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*, *93*(12), 1159–1165. https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.J.00898
36. Zaffagnini, S., Grassi, A., Marcheggiani Muccioli, G. M., & Marcacci, M. (2015). Return to sport after ACL reconstruction in elite athletes. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy*, *23*(4), 947–953. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-015-3685-6