

Elsevier required licence: © <2019>. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

The definitive publisher version is available online at

[\[https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1440244018302573?via%3Dihub\]](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1440244018302573?via%3Dihub)

1 Article category: Original Research

2

3 Sub-discipline: Sports injury

4

5 Financial support: There was no financial support for this submission

6

7 Ethics: This study received human ethics committee approval from Australian Catholic University.

8 Reference number 2015-196N

9

10 Declaration of Interest: The authors have no disclosures or competing interests.

11

12 Contributorship: All authors contributed to all items in the ICMJE contributorship guidelines

13

14 This submission has not been published elsewhere and is not being considered for publication

15 elsewhere. This submission will not be submitted elsewhere until the authors are informed of the final

16 decision.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 Full Title: A multi-year injury epidemiology analysis of an elite national junior tennis
30 program.

31

32 **Abstract**

33 **Objective:** To profile multi-year injury incidence and severity trends in elite junior tennis players
34 from a national program. **Design:** Prospective Cohort. **Methods:** Injury data was collated by sex, age
35 and region for all nationally-supported Australian junior players between 2012-2016. Injury was
36 defined as a physical complaint from training/matchplay interrupting training/matchplay determined
37 by presiding physiotherapists and doctors. Severity represented the days of interrupted
38 training/matchplay per injury. Injury incidence was reported per 1,000 exposure hours. Incidence
39 rates \pm 95% confidence intervals and rate ratios (RR) were used to assess changes over time. **Results:**
40 There was no difference in male and female injury incidence (2.7 ± 0.0 v 2.8 ± 0.0) yet male injuries
41 were more severe (3.6 ± 0.6 v 1.1 ± 0.9 days). The lumbar spine was the most commonly and severely
42 injured region in both sexes (4.3 ± 0.2 , 9.9 ± 1.4 days). Second to the lumbar spine was shoulder injury
43 incidence in both sexes (3.1 ± 0.2) as well as male injury severity (7.3 ± 1.4 days). Knee injuries were
44 also common in males (2.3 ± 0.2) yet reduced over time (0.4 RR) as pelvis/buttock injuries increased
45 (3.4 RR). Females had high trunk and abdominal injury incidences (2.5 ± 0.3) which increased over
46 time (6.1 RR). Independent of sex, the incidence of injury increased with age from 13-18 years old
47 (2.0 ± 0.1 , 2.9 ± 0.1). **Conclusion:** Despite no sex-based difference in injury incidence, male injuries
48 resulted in more interrupted days of training/matchplay. In both sexes, the lumbar spine and shoulder
49 were the most commonly and severely injured body regions. The relative number of injuries sustained
50 by players also increased as they aged.

51

52 **Key Words:** Injury rates, Racket sports, tennis epidemiology

53

54

55

56 **Introduction**

57 Limited evidence of the injury epidemiology of junior tennis players exists, and that which does is
58 inconsistent in reporting of injury incidence by anatomical region or sex¹⁻³. This is largely due to
59 variation in study design and quality, the age and standard of athletes, injury classification, period of
60 data capture and exposure measure are highly variable¹⁻³. More specifically, much of the research has
61 focused on the epidemiology of junior injuries at tournaments and thus ignores training settings^{2,3}.
62 Further, previous studies report injury profiles of predominantly recreational cohorts and also fail to
63 provide empirical insight into injury severity²⁻⁴. The understanding of injury epidemiology in elite
64 junior players is therefore incomplete and limits the acumen of medical, physiotherapy and strength
65 and conditioning practitioners who monitor and manage the health of young elite tennis athletes.

66

67 Few studies have reported the injury incidence and trends of elite junior tennis players and of those,
68 the majority are dated in their findings^{3,5}. A three-year analysis of 16 to 20 year old players in a
69 national program in the 1980's found that lower limb injuries were the most common in both genders
70 as compared to trunk and upper limb injuries⁵. However, the findings were reported as absolute values
71 and not relative to training volume or other extrinsic risk factors. Since then, the sport has observed
72 dramatic changes in equipment and strategy^{6,7}, which has likely influenced the sport's injury profile⁶.
73 More generally though, and as abovementioned, injuries have been reported across differing standards
74 of players. For example, boys have been shown to be more prone to injury than girls over a 2-year
75 period of injury data collection at a local tennis club¹; but girls were reported as more susceptible to
76 injury than boys during higher level national competitions². As studies have also featured players of
77 varying age within the same cohort, the examination of age as an intrinsic risk factor⁸ has been
78 limited. In sum, this highlights the need for further research from a homogenous sample of elite junior
79 tennis players using the same exposure method, to establish if there are meaningful sex and age
80 differences in injury patterns⁹.

81

82 An understanding of the severity of injury is important for determining the extent to which injuries
83 impede training, yet this has been poorly examined in the tennis injury literature. For example, the

84 severity of injuries in Swedish local junior tennis players was collected over a two-year period via
85 player recall¹. However, the use of recall to quantify injury time-loss has been criticised for its bias
86 and inaccuracy¹⁰. Conversely, a study of elite Brazilian juniors has described severity as the number
87 of treatments per injury within national tournaments over a season². The limitation with this measure
88 of severity is that it doesn't reflect the actual time-loss of each injury which may extend outside the
89 tournament timeframes. As a result of the definitional differences and reporting limitations, the
90 findings from these studies are not generalisable. More so, no tennis injury study has described injury
91 severity by region. An anatomical-based analysis of injury severity in tennis would therefore be a
92 valuable addition to the sport's knowledge base.

93

94 Another gap in the current junior tennis injury epidemiology literature, particularly among elite
95 players, is the lack of systematic investigation of the change in injury profile over time. This is
96 particularly important among adolescent cohorts where maturation and risk of injury have been
97 linked¹¹. Specifically, the relevance of previous attempts has been limited by their timing^{3,5},
98 tournament-only focus³, length of data collection⁴ and lack of trend analysis^{4,5}. Therefore, the aim of
99 this study was to comprehensively examine the injury epidemiology of junior, elite tennis players of
100 both sexes over a five-year time period. Specifically, we assessed the injury incidence between the
101 ages of 13 and 18, utilising a recommended exposure measure¹², and evaluated injury incidence and
102 severity over time.

103

104 **Methods**

105 Fifty-eight male and forty-three female Australian junior tennis players were included in the study
106 The mean \pm SD age and national rankings for the male and female players were $16.1 \pm 1.7y$, $117 \pm$
107 139 and $15.8 \pm 1.7y$, 57 ± 48 respectively. All players were full-time scholarship-holders between
108 2012 and 2016 in a national tennis academy governed by Tennis Australia. The players did not
109 participate in other sports. Given the lack of data prior to 2012, this year was used as the base year for
110 ensuing analysis. Data was collected and stored in a secure, Tennis Australia managed data repository

111 (Athlete Management System). This study received human ethics committee approval from Australian
112 Catholic University (reference number 2015-196N) with informed consent obtained from all players.

113

114 An injury was diagnosed by Tennis Australia's physiotherapists and doctors and defined as a physical
115 complaint from training/matchplay resulting in interrupted training or matchplay¹³. Interruptions to
116 training were defined as any restrictions to tennis and off-court training resulting in an athlete unable
117 to take a part in the full session¹³. Injuries were calculated as injury incidence, which describes the
118 number of new injuries within the population over the period of time¹⁴. Severity was defined as the
119 mean number of days since injury onset to a particular region to the day that the player returned to full
120 training¹² both on and off court. Injury data was classified by region as per the Orchard Sports Injury
121 Classification System (OSICS)¹⁵. The injury data was entered and stored on the Athlete Management
122 System by the designated Tennis Australia treating physiotherapist (n = 32, mean 2.3 ± 1.3 years
123 treating Tennis Australia athletes) and doctors (n = 14, mean 3.1 ± 2.0 years). Injury severity was also
124 entered and stored in the repository via athlete self-reporting. All consultations and injury severity on
125 the studied population between 2012-2016 were exported for analysis. This included 327 male
126 injuries and 258 female injuries. Injury incidence was reported per 1,000 exposure hours which is
127 consistent with recommendations in the consensus statement on epidemiological studies of medical
128 conditions in tennis¹². Exposure hours include the durations of both on and off court training and
129 matchplay. This was recorded via athlete self-reporting and equated to a mean ± SD of 648.8 ± 108.6
130 and 661.8 ± 112.6 training hours per year for male and female players respectively.

131

132 Statistical programming (R Core Team, 2012) was used for the all analyses. The 'metafor' package
133 was used to implement the fixed-effects meta-regression analysis of incidence rates ± 95% CI with
134 precision weights. Incidence rates represent the year-on-year change in injury counts by region and
135 severity, where 2012 was the base year. The magnitude of change over time is inferred by rate ratios
136 (RR) whereby a ratio of greater than 1 is considered to be an increase, and less than 1, a decrease.

137 Results are reported as mean ± SD, incidence rates ± 95% CI, and rate ratios.

138 **Results**

139 Injuries were comparable between sexes over the time period with 2.7 ± 0.0 and 2.8 ± 0.0 in female
140 and males per 1,000 exposure hours respectively (Table 1).

141

142 ***Insert Table 1 here***

143

144 The lumbar spine, followed by the shoulder, had the highest incidence of injuries by region in both
145 sexes over the observed time period (Table 1). Junior female tennis players experienced an increase in
146 upper limb (shoulder, elbow, wrist), neck, thoracic spine, trunk and abdominal, knee and foot injury
147 incidence over time ($RR \geq 2.3$). There was also a reduction in hip and groin and lower leg injuries over
148 time ($0.4 RR$; Table 2). Males experienced an increase pelvis/buttock injuries ($3.4 RR$) over time,
149 with a reduction in thoracic spine, knee, ankle and wrist injuries ($RR \leq 0.4$; Table 1).

150

151 Male injury severity was greater than females with 3.6 ± 0.6 days lost (Table 2), compared to a female
152 injury severity of 1.1 ± 0.9 days lost. Lumbar spine injury severity was the highest in both sexes (>4.6
153 ± 0.6 days lost). The shoulder, hip and groin and wrist also had high injury severity in male tennis
154 players, with an increase in pelvis/buttock injury severity ($3.4 RR$) and a reduction in trunk and
155 abdominal severity ($0.3 RR$) over time. Female tennis players experienced high elbow, ankle and knee
156 injury severity with an increase in neck ($2.3 RR$), elbow ($2.5 RR$), thoracic spine ($6.1 RR$) and foot
157 ($7.5 RR$) injury severity over time.

158

159 ***Insert Table 2 here***

160

161 Injury incidence increased with age with 13 through to 18 year-olds incurring 2.0, 2.3, 2.2, 2.9, 3.0
162 and 2.9 injuries per 1,000 exposure hours respectively. The lumbar spine featured as the most
163 common injury region for 14 to 18 year olds, whereas the shoulder and hip and groin were the most
164 common injury regions for 13 year old players (Table 3). Changes over time highlighted an increase

165 in wrist injuries in the 13th (9.2 RR) and 18th birth years (3.4 RR), pelvis/buttock injuries in the 14th
166 (5.2 RR) and 15th birth year (2.2 RR), knee injuries in the 16th (3.0 RR) birth year and shoulder
167 injuries in the 17th (6.0 RR) birth year (Table 3).

168

169 *** Insert Table 3 here***

170

171 **Discussion**

172 This study provides a comprehensive longitudinal examination of injury incidence and severity in
173 elite junior tennis players by sex and region. Injury incidence was also assessed by athlete age
174 inclusive of injury region and time. Injury incidence in junior male and female tennis players were
175 comparable when expressed relative to exposure hours. This finding is novel in elite junior tennis,
176 although this homogeneity in injury incidence has been reported in collegiate tennis playing
177 populations¹⁶. While numerous studies have highlighted training volume as an injury risk factor^{16,17}, it
178 seems that both sexes in this cohort had the same injury response when reported relative to exposure
179 hours. Further, and in line with previous research³, the lumbar spine was the most commonly and
180 severely injured region across both sexes. Additionally, when all body regions were considered, male
181 junior players experienced higher injury severity than female juniors.

182

183 A novel outcome was the profiling of injury incidence by age and time-loss per region. This showed
184 that the lumbar spine was most commonly and severely injured region among 14 to 18 year-olds in
185 both sexes. Previous research has identified the mechanical loading of serving, primarily through
186 lateral flexion and extension, as a risk factor for the development of low back pain in adolescent
187 tennis players¹⁸. The performance of the kick serve is known to be particularly problematic in this
188 regard with coaches generally introducing and then emphasising this type of serve to players between
189 the ages of 12 to 15¹⁸. The combination of high joint loads, increased repetition of an unaccustomed
190 skill and physical growth during this time may therefore contribute to the high incidence of lumbar
191 region injuries¹⁸. Interestingly, the high eccentric-concentric activation of the abdominals during the
192 serve would also appear to be implicated in the high incidence and growth of trunk and abdominal

193 injuries sustained by junior female players¹⁹. Further research is required to determine why this injury
194 is less common among junior male players. Given trunk injuries are of concern in elite junior tennis
195 players, careful monitoring of serve loads, technique via biomechanical analyses and targeted injury
196 prevention programs may mitigate the risk of occurrence and severity.

197

198 The shoulder was found to be the second most common region of injury in both sexes and the second
199 most severe in junior males. Consistently, the shoulder has been highlighted to be the most common
200 upper limb injury region in tennis irrespective of age and standard²⁰. Shoulder injuries in tennis are
201 generally reported to be overuse injuries as opposed to acute²⁰. As the joint is utilized in all strokes in
202 tennis, it is likely the repetitive strain on the shoulder results in the large injury incidence often
203 observed²⁰. As context, profiling of junior tennis matchplay suggests that players hit 2.5 to 3 strokes
204 per point²¹ and in excess of 90 serves per tennis match²². When extrapolated to include the potential
205 multiple singles and doubles matches completed in a day and then on repeated days²³, the escalation
206 in shoulder joint loading from hitting volumes and intensity may be cause for concern²⁰. Similarly,
207 these playing demands expose the wrist to large forces which may explain the high incidence and
208 severity of wrist injuries in both sexes in this study. Alongside the total hitting load, the eccentric
209 forces through wrist extension during the backhand movement have been associated with wrist
210 injuries in tennis players⁸. In turn, these ballistic and repetitive movements are performed with
211 equipment that is selected with little systematic regard to the loading implications for the upper limb⁶.
212 The adverse effects of the inappropriate selection of equipment are likely to be magnified by
213 biomechanical limitations that may also be associated with injury²⁴. Consequently, when these factors
214 are coupled with high or increasing hitting volumes and intensities, the high incidence of wrist and
215 global upper limb injuries among juniors is explicable.

216

217 Junior males had a high yet diminishing incidence of knee injuries, similar to the pattern observed for
218 ankle injuries. Australian tennis players have naturally trained on hard rather than clay tennis courts,
219 yet almost the same amount of international junior tournaments are offered on clay as compared to
220 hard²⁵. As a result, Australian junior tennis players have recently increased their clay-court training

221 leading to some of the juniors sampled in the current study spending up to 5 times more time training
222 on clay over the time period than previous cohorts in this National program. The increase in time
223 spent training on clay, as compared to hard, may play a role in the reduction in knee and ankle injuries
224 over time, as clay courts transmit less force through the body and allows players to slide more
225 freely²⁶. However, the rise in pelvis/buttock injuries over the time period may have been a byproduct
226 of this increased clay-based hitting, as the movement and sliding actions on clay courts result in
227 greater strain on the gluteus muscles²⁷. In comparison, a reduction in pelvis/buttock injuries over time
228 was found at the Australian Open which is competed on hard court²⁸. Court surface may impact on
229 junior tennis injuries and should be considered by both athletes and performance staff during junior
230 athletic development.

231

232 The age-based analysis of injury incidence in this study provides a novel insight into the increasing
233 injury occurrence in a developing junior population. Peak height velocity is generally experienced
234 between the ages of 13 to 15 years¹¹, whereby soon after, the risk of injury is suggested to be
235 greatest¹¹. In addition to physical growth, training and matchplay volume and intensity rise as junior
236 tennis players begin to specialise in the sport and compete more often. This increase in load has been
237 linked to a rise in injury risk²². Given the highest incidence of lumbar injuries across sexes in this
238 cohort, the finding that lumbar spine injuries were the most common injury region for players aged 14
239 to 18 was anticipated. Shoulder, hip and groin injuries were the most common in 13 year-olds. The
240 age analysis of injuries over time highlights a rise in upper limb injuries in early and late teen players
241 (13, 17 and 18 year-olds) and lower limb and trunk injuries in mid teen players. This infers that junior
242 tennis injury trends are not confined to one anatomical region. Changes in technique, tactical
243 approach, physicality of the players and matchplay, as well as equipment selection may all contribute
244 to the variations in anatomical injury incidence by age over time^{6,19,21}.

245

246 Limitations in the study do exist. Although reporting tennis injuries per 1,000 exposure hours has
247 been recommended as the best exposure measure¹², recent findings suggest that training/match
248 duration may not be the optimal denominator for reporting injuries²⁹. However, a more descript

249 measure of training and matchplay, such as hitting volume and distance covered, was not available in
250 the dataset. Additionally, no gender and severity analysis by age was undertaken due to limitations
251 with sample size dilution³⁰. Furthermore, there was a lack of control in the injury prevention and
252 interventions implemented during the time period. This may have impacted injury incidence by
253 region, gender and age over time.

254

255 **Conclusion**

256 The profile of junior injuries in the Australian national tennis program revealed that there was no sex
257 difference in injury incidence, yet male injuries were more severe. The lumbar spine presented as the
258 most frequent region of injury resulting in the most time-loss. Junior males experienced high
259 shoulder, wrist and knee injury incidence and severity yet knee incidence reduced over time. Junior
260 females also experienced a high incidence of shoulder as well as trunk and abdominal injuries which
261 increased over time. The incidence of injuries also increased with age. Collectively, these findings
262 describe common injury trends in elite junior tennis via assessment of injury incidence, severity, age
263 and changes over time, whilst utilising a recommended exposure measure. In practice, this insight can
264 inform injury prevention and training programs, equipment selection as well as tournament
265 scheduling for elite junior tennis players.

266

267 **Practical Implications**

- 268 • No sex-difference in injury incidence relative to exposure hours, and greater junior male
269 injury severity compared to females provides insight for sex-specific injury prevention and
270 treatment programs
- 271 • There is a need for enhanced lumbar spine injury prevention strategies in both sexes and all
272 junior ages
- 273 • The awareness of the increase with injury incidence with age from 13 through to 18 year old
274 national, junior tennis players may assist with load monitoring, tournament scheduling,
275 equipment selection and training programs to mitigate the injury risk.

277

- 278 1. Hjelm N, Werner S, and Renstrom P. Injury profile in junior tennis players: a
279 prospective two year study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2010. 18(6):845-
280 850.
- 281 2. Silva, R, Takahashi R, Berra B, et al. Medical assistance at the Brazilian juniors
282 tennis circuit—a one-year prospective study. *J Sci Med Sport* 2003;6(1):14-18.
- 283 3. Hutchinson MR, Laprade RF, Burnett QM et al. Injury surveillance at the USTA
284 Boys' Tennis Championships: a 6-yr study. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1995;27(6):826-31.
- 285 4. Pluim, BM, Loefen, FGJ, Clarsen, B, et al. A one-season prospective study of injuries
286 and illness in elite junior tennis. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2016;26:564-571.
- 287 5. Reece, LA, Fricker, PA, and Maguire KF. Injuries of elite young tennis players at the
288 Australian Institute of Sport. *Aust J Sci Med Sport* 1986;18(4):11-15.
- 289 6. Miller S. Modern tennis rackets, balls, and surfaces. *Br J Sports Med* 2006;
290 40(5):401-405.
- 291 7. Reid M, Morgan S, and Whiteside D. Matchplay characteristics of Grand Slam tennis:
292 implications for training and conditioning. *J Sports Sci* 2016;19:1791-1798
- 293 8. Bylak, J and Hutchinson, MR. Common sports injuries in young tennis players.
294 *Sports Med* 1998;26(2):119-132.
- 295 9. McCurdie I, Smith S, Bell PH, et al. Tennis injury data from The Championships,
296 Wimbledon, from 2003 to 2012. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(7):607-611.
- 297 10. Gabbe, BJ, Finch, CF, Bennell, KL, et al. How valid is a self reported 12 month sports
298 injury history? *Br J Sports Med* 2003;37(6):545-547.
- 299 11. Van der Sluis, A, Elferink-Gemser, MT, Brink, MS et al. Importance of peak height
300 velocity timing in terms of injuries in talented soccer players. *Int J Sports Med*
301 2015;36(04):327-332.
- 302 12. Pluim BM, Fuller CW, Batt ME et al. Consensus statement on epidemiological
303 studies of medical conditions in tennis, April 2009. *Br J Sports Med* 2009;43(12):893-
304 897.
- 305 13. Fuller, CW, Ekstrand, J, Junge, A, et al. Consensus statement on injury definitions
306 and data collection procedures in studies of football (soccer) injuries. *Scand J Med Sci*
307 *Sports* 2006;16(2):83-92.
- 308 14. Hennekens, CH, Buring, JE, and Mayrent, SL. Epidemiology in medicine. *Boston:*
309 *Little Brown and Company* 1987.
- 310 15. Orchard J. Orchard sports injury classification system (OSICS). In: Bloomfield J,
311 Fricker P, Fitch K, eds. *Science and medicine in sport*. 2nd ed. Melbourne: Blackwell,
312 1995:674–81, Current version available at:
313 <http://www.injuryupdate.com.au/research/OSICS.htm>.
- 314 16. Ristolainen, L, Heinonen, A, Waller, B, et al. Gender differences in sport injury risk
315 and types of injuries: A retrospective twelve-month study on cross-country skiers,
316 swimmers, long-distance runners and soccer players. *J Sports Sci Med* 2009;8(3):443-
317 451.
- 318 17. Hulin, BT, Gabbett, TJ, Blanch, P, et al. Spikes in acute workload are associated with
319 increased injury risk in elite cricket fast bowlers. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:708-712.
- 320 18. Campbell, A, Straker, L, O'Sullivan, P, et al. Lumbar loading in the elite adolescent
321 tennis serve: link to low back pain. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2013;45(8):1562-1568.
- 322 19. Ellenbecker, TS, and Roetert, EP. An isokinetic profile of trunk rotation strength in
323 elite tennis players. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2004;36(11):1959-1963.

- 324 20. Van der Hoeven H and Kibler WB. Shoulder injuries in tennis players. *Br J Sports*
325 *Med* 2006;40(5):435-440.
- 326 21. Fernandez-Fernandez, J, Sanz-Rivas, D, Fernandez-Garcia, B et al. Match activity
327 and physiological load during a clay-court tennis tournament in elite female players. *J*
328 *Sport Sci* 2008;26(14):1589-1595.
- 329 22. Myers NL, Sciascia AD, Kibler WB et al. Volume-based Interval Training Program
330 for Elite Tennis Players. *Sports Health* 2016;8(6):536-40.
- 331 23. Murphy, AP, Duffield, R, Kellet, A et al. The Relationship of Training Load to
332 Physical Capacity Changes During International Tours in High Performance Junior
333 Tennis Players. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 2015;10:253-260.
- 334 24. Campbell, A, Straker, L, Whiteside, D, et al. Lumbar mechanics in tennis
335 groundstrokes: differences in elite adolescent players with and without low back pain.
336 *J Appl Biomech* 2016;32(1):32-39.
- 337 25. International Tennis Federation. Juniors Tournament Calendar. [cited 2017 1/09/17];
338 Available from: <http://www.itftennis.com/juniors/tournaments/calendar.aspx>.
- 339 26. Pieper, S, Exler, T, and Weber, K. Running speed loads on clay and hard courts in
340 world class tennis. *Med Sci Tennis* 2007;12(2):14-17.
- 341 27. Girard, O, Eicher, F, Fourchet, F, et al. Effects of the playing surface on plantar
342 pressures and potential injuries in tennis. *Br J Sports Med* 2007;41(11):733-738.
- 343 28. Gescheit, DT, Cormack, SJ, Duffield, R, et al. Injury epidemiology of tennis players
344 at the 2011–2016 Australian Open Grand Slam. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(17):1289-
345 1294.
- 346 29. Reid, M, Cormack, J, Duffield, R, et al. Should the rate of tennis injuries be reported
347 per unit of time or can new workload data provide better denominators? *Br J Sports*
348 *Med* 2017; In Review.
- 349 30. Tomczak, M, Tomczak, E, Kleka P, et al. Using power analysis to estimate
350 appropriate sample size. *Trends in Sport Sci* 2014;21(4):195-206.

351
352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

