

Differences in shoulder roll and hip roll: Implications for strength training 1

Title: Kinematic differences in shoulder roll and hip roll at different front crawl speeds

Running head: Shoulder and hip roll during front crawl swimming at different speeds

Research conducted at: The University of Edinburgh; The University of Sydney

Authors: Jordan T Andersen¹, Peter J Sinclair¹, Carla B McCabe², Ross H Sanders¹

¹Physical Activity, Lifestyle, Ageing and Wellness; Faculty of Health Sciences; The University of Sydney

²Sport and Exercise Sciences Research Institute; School of Sport; Faculty of Life & Health Sciences; Ulster University

Corresponding Author:

Jordan T Andersen

75 East St.

Sydney, NSW, AUSTRALIA

2141

M: +61 4 1038 3887

E: jordan.andersen@sydney.edu.au

No funding was received for this work.

Shoulder and hip roll during front crawl swimming at different speeds 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Title:** Kinematic differences in shoulder roll and hip roll at different front crawl speeds:

2 ~~Implications for torso muscle demands and dry land strength training in swimming~~

3

4 **Running head:** Shoulder and hip roll during front crawl swimming at different speeds

1
2
3
4 5 Dry-land strength training is a common component of swimming programs; however, its efficacy
5
6 6 is contentious. A common criticism of dry-land strength training for swimming is a lack of
7
8 7 specificity. An understanding of movement patterns in swimming can enable dry-land strength
9
10 8 training programs to be developed to elicit adaptations that transfer to improvements in swimming
11
12 9 performance. This study aimed to quantify the range and velocity of hip roll, shoulder roll, and
13
14 10 torso twist (produced by differences in the relative angle between shoulder roll and hip roll) in
15
16 11 front crawl at different swimming speeds. Longitudinal torso kinematics were compared between
17
18 12 sprint and 400m pace front crawl using 3D kinematics of thirteen elite Scottish front crawl
19
20 13 specialists. The range (sprint: 78.1°; 400m: 61.3°) and velocity of torso twist (sprint: 166.3°/s;
21
22 14 400m: 96.9°/s) were greater at sprint than 400m pace. These differences were attributed to
23
24 15 reductions in hip roll (sprint: 36.8°; 400m: 49.9°) without corresponding reductions in shoulder
25
26 16 roll (sprint: 97.7°; 400m: 101.6°) when participants swam faster. Shoulder roll velocity (sprint:
27
28 17 190.9°/s; 400m: 139.2°/s) and hip roll velocity (sprint: 75.5°/s; 400m: 69.1°/s) were greater at sprint
29
30 18 than 400m pace due to a higher stroke frequency at sprint pace (sprint: 0.95 strokes/s; 400m: 0.70
31
32 19 strokes/s). These findings imply that torques acting to rotate the upper torso and the lower torso
33
34 20 are greater at sprint than 400m pace. Dry-land strength training specificity can be improved by
35
36 21 designing exercises that challenge the torso muscles to reproduce the torques required to generate
37
38 22 the longitudinal kinematics in front crawl.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 23 Keywords: torso twist, biomechanics, sprint, middle-distance, performance
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

24 INTRODUCTION

25 To maximise the probability that strength training adaptations will transfer to improvements in
26 performance, training must be based on the demands of a sport (12, 13). The lack of
27 effectiveness of many dry-land strength training programs in improving swimming performance
28 is often attributed to a lack of specificity in training (11, 32, 33). Transference of strength
29 training gains to performance can be enhanced by designing exercises that match the demands
30 associated with the movement patterns used within a sport (37). Dry-land strength training
31 specificity for swimming can therefore be improved with a better understanding of the
32 movement patterns used in swimming.

34 Longitudinal body rotation is essential for maximising performance in front crawl swimming (6,
35 17). Rotation of the shoulders and hips about the body's longitudinal axis, known respectively as
36 shoulder roll and hip roll, depend on swimming speed (27). Some characteristics of shoulder roll
37 and hip roll remain consistent across different front crawl speeds; for example, the shoulders roll
38 through a greater range of motion than the hips regardless of swimming speed (3, 35). The effect
39 of swimming speed on several features of longitudinal rotation in front crawl, however, remain
40 unclear. For example, it is unknown how torso twist produced by differences in the relative
41 angles of hip roll and shoulder roll varies with swimming speed. Further, the influence of
42 swimming speed on the rate of change (or velocity) of hip roll, shoulder roll, and torso twist has
43 never been reported. Considering the association between torso muscle activity and the
44 magnitude and speed of twisting motions of the spine (16, 19), differences in the range and
45 velocity of torso twist in front crawl may influence the demands on the torso muscles. Our

46 understanding of the torso muscle requirements in front crawl may therefore be limited by the
47 lack of evidence of torso twist characteristics in front crawl swimming.

48
49 Total hip roll, a measurement of the range of hip roll from one side to the other, tends to decrease
50 as swimming speed increases while total shoulder roll, which is the range of shoulder roll from
51 one side to the other, does not seem to change with increasing speed as much as total hip roll.
52 McCabe and Sanders (21) reported a total hip roll of 57 degrees at 1.50 m/s during a 400m
53 maximal effort while Psycharakis and Sanders (26) reported a total hip roll of 44 degrees at 1.68
54 m/s in the first 50m of a 200m maximal front crawl test. Psycharakis and McCabe (25) reported
55 an even lower total hip roll of 39 degrees at 1.81 m/s during a maximal 25m sprint. Despite the
56 18 degrees difference in total hip roll between 400m pace and sprint front crawl swimming, total
57 shoulder roll remained between 105 and 111 degrees across all three studies. Differences in the
58 range and/or timing of hip roll and shoulder roll require twist within the torso. Data from the
59 studies by McCabe and Sanders (21), Psycharakis and Sanders (26), and Psycharakis and
60 McCabe (25) indicate that the range of torso twist is likely to increase with swimming speed;
61 however, differences in torso twist from the same group of swimmers swimming at different
62 front crawl speeds have never been examined.

63
64 The time for the hips and shoulders to roll from one side to the other and back again is
65 determined by the duration of the arm stroke cycle (28, 34). The velocities of hip roll and
66 shoulder roll are therefore influenced by the range of hip roll and shoulder roll, respectively, and
67 the number of stroke cycles per unit of time, or stroke frequency. It is well documented that

1
2
3
4 68 stroke frequency increases as swimming speed increases (4, 7, 29, 30); however, the influence of
5
6 69 swimming speed on hip roll velocity and shoulder roll velocity is unknown. Changes in the
7
8
9 70 relative angle between hip roll and shoulder roll and differences in stroke frequency across front
10
11 71 crawl speeds suggest that torso twist velocity may also change with swimming speed, but torso
12
13
14 72 twist velocity has yet to be quantified in the scientific literature.

15
16
17 73
18
19
20 74 Although twist of the shoulders and hips relative to each other is influenced by the torques
21
22
23 75 produced by the actions of the upper and lower limbs, it may be hypothesised that the differences
24
25 76 between shoulder and hip rotation, manifest in changing torso twist angles, is also influenced by
26
27
28 77 the actions of the torso muscles connecting the shoulders and hips. Therefore, it is likely that
29
30 78 differences in torso twist rates of change, that is, torso twist velocities, may reflect differences in
31
32
33 79 demands on the torso muscles to control posture and maintain stability of the swimmer's torso.
34
35 80 Further, if there are differences in the relative magnitudes and velocities of shoulder and hip roll
36
37
38 81 between paces, demands on the torso muscles are likely to differ between swimming speeds.
39
40 82 Therefore, insights into these demands may be gained by quantifying the differences in the range
41
42
43 83 and velocity of torso twist at different swimming paces.

44
45
46 84
47
48
49 85 While the ranges of hip roll and shoulder roll at different swimming speeds have been examined
50
51
52 86 in separate studies, the differences in the velocities of hip roll and shoulder roll between
53
54 87 swimming speeds have never been reported. Moreover, the range and velocity of torso twist
55
56
57 88 produced by differences in hip and shoulder roll at different front crawl speeds have never been
58
59 89 examined to our knowledge. These gaps in swimming research present a barrier to understanding
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 90 the movement patterns in front crawl swimming that can be used to improve the specificity of
5
6 91 dry-land strength training for swimmers. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to quantify the
7
8
9 92 range and velocity of hip roll, shoulder roll, and torso twist in front crawl at different swimming
10
11 93 speeds. The differences in the longitudinal kinematics between speeds will further our
12
13
14 94 understanding of the movement patterns in front crawl swimming which can be used to develop
15
16 95 insight into the demands on the torso muscles in front crawl swimming.
17
18
19
20 96

21 22 23 97 METHODS

24 25 26 98 Experimental Approach to the Problem

27
28
29
30 99 This cross-sectional study of three-dimensional kinematics enabled analysis of the movement
31
32 100 patterns of high level front crawl swimming for two different event distances (i.e. 50m and 400m
33
34 101 freestyle). National and international level swimmers were recruited because of their ability to
35
36
37 102 produce movement patterns that can provide insights into the requirements for high level
38
39 103 swimming performance. While experienced swimmers are known to reliably produce consistent
40
41
42 104 swimming technique, multiple trials at both swimming paces were collected to account for
43
44 105 individual variability inherent of human movement.
45
46
47
48 106

49 50 51 107 Subjects

52
53
54 108 Three-dimensional coordinate data of a 15 segment whole-body model of thirteen national and
55
56 109 international level male Scottish front crawl specialists (age: 17.54 ± 1.98 years, range 15 to 22
57
58
59 110 years; height: 181.18 ± 4.98 cm; weight: 71.58 ± 6.26 kg) were analysed from a data set that was
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 111 previously utilized in the studies of McCabe, Psycharakis and Sanders (20) and McCabe and
5
6 112 Sanders (21). Participants had specialized in front crawl for a minimum of two years, were not
7
8
9 113 currently injured or recovering from injury, and held a short course personal best time of either
10
11 114 less than 24.60s for 50m or less than 4min10s for 400m. The protocols and procedures were
12
13 115 approved by the university ethics committee. All participants were informed of the risks and
14
15 116 benefits of the study and provided written consent prior to data collection. For participants under
16
17
18 117 the age of 18, participants and a parent or guardian provided written consent.
19
20
21
22 118

23 24 25 119 Procedures

26
27
28
29 120 The data collection by McCabe was conducted in an indoor 25m pool. Participants were marked
30
31 121 to enable identification of the following anatomical landmarks: the vertex of the head (on top of
32
33 122 the swim cap), the left and right: tip of the 3rd distal phalanx of the finger, wrist axis, elbow axis,
34
35 123 shoulder axis, hip axis, knee axis, ankle axis, lateral aspect of the 5th metatarsophalangeal joint,
36
37 124 and tip of 1st phalanx of the foot (big toe). After an individualized warm up, participants swam
38
39 125 4x25m at sprint pace and one 400m effort at a pace that would result in the fastest time possible.
40
41 126 After each sprint trial, participants swam back to the start position at recovery pace and rested in-
42
43 127 water for two minutes before beginning the next trial. The order of swimming pace was
44
45 128 randomized and participants swam for at least five minutes to recover after completing the first
46
47 129 pace, then exited the pool for an additional ten minute rest before warming up again and
48
49 130 completing the second pace.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 131
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 132 As participants swam through a calibration volume (4.5m long, 1.0m wide, and 1.5 in height)
5
6 133 located 15.25m from the starting wall, their motion was captured by six synchronized JVC KY32
7
8
9 134 CCD cameras (four below and two above the water surface) at a frame rate of 50 Hz. Each trial
10
11 135 began from a push start and participants were required to not breathe as they swam through the
12
13 136 calibration volume to avoid any effect of the breathing actions on their swimming technique (25,
14
15 137 30). Swimmers familiarized themselves with the breath-holding requirement during warm up.
16
17
18
19 138 All participants used a six-beat flutter kick at both swimming paces.
20
21

22 139

25 140 Data Processing

27
28
29 141 One stroke cycle (SC) was defined as the moment the tip of the third digit of one hand entered
30
31 142 the water to the subsequent entry of that digit on the same hand performed completely within the
32
33 143 calibrated space. At sprint pace, one SC was analysed for each of the four 25m trials. During the
34
35 144 400m effort, one SC was recorded from the first 25m length of each 50m lap. SCs from laps 2, 3,
36
37 145 4 and 5 during the 400m effort were analysed, totaling four observations per swimmer at 400m
38
39 146 pace. These laps were selected to align with previous findings that laps 1, 7, and 8 were
40
41 147 consistently different from laps 2-6 (21). Lap 6 was excluded to further minimize the effect of
42
43 148 fatigue on swimming technique. Due to marker occlusion during data collection that prevented
44
45 149 digitization of landmarks over several consecutive frames, one trial from one participant at 400m
46
47
48
49 150 pace (P4) was discarded. Data were retained for all four trials at both paces from every other
50
51
52
53 151 participant.
54
55

56 152

1
2
3
4 153 Three-dimensional reconstruction from manual digitization of the anatomical landmarks was
5
6 154 conducted using the Ariel Performance Analysis System (direct linear transformation algorithms
7
8
9 155 from Abdel-Aziz and Karara (1)). Errors due to digitization for the variables used in the current
10
11
12 156 study were considered small from digitization reliability tested in a previous study (20). To
13
14 157 prevent data loss during filtering, an additional 30 frames were extrapolated by reflection.
15
16 158 Fourier truncation was used to filter the position data of the body landmarks. This filtering
17
18
19 159 strategy was deemed appropriate because the cyclic nature of movements in front crawl
20
21 160 swimming results in periodic data (2). Residual analysis indicated that a 6 Hz cut-off was
22
23
24 161 suitable to smooth the data. SC length was then standardized to 201 points using a Fourier
25
26 162 transform and inverse transform so that each datum represented a half percentage of the SC (i.e.
27
28
29 163 0-100%).

30
31
32 164
33
34
35 165 The filtered anatomical landmark data were entered into a bespoke MATLAB (Mathworks, Inc.)
36
37
38 166 analysis program written by the last author. The orthogonal external reference system was
39
40 167 defined by the horizontal X-axis pointing in the swimming direction, the Y-axis pointing
41
42
43 168 vertically up, and the horizontal Z-axis pointing to the swimmer's right. Shoulder roll and hip
44
45 169 roll were calculated independently for each percentile of the SC as the angle, expressed in
46
47
48 170 degrees, between the Z-axis and vectors connecting the shoulders and hips, respectively,
49
50 171 projected onto the YZ plane.

51
52
53 172
54
55
56 173 Data Analysis
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 174 Average swimming velocity, calculated by dividing the horizontal component of the centre of
5
6
7 175 mass displacement by SC time, was 1.81 ± 0.06 m/s at sprint pace and 1.47 ± 0.06 m/s at 400m
8
9 176 pace.

10
11
12 177
13
14
15 178 Stroke frequency was determined using the inverse of the time to complete one SC (stroke/s).
16
17
18 179 Torso twist was the difference in the relative angles of shoulder roll and hip roll and was
19
20 180 calculated for each percentile of the SC in degrees. Hip roll velocity, shoulder roll velocity, and
21
22
23 181 torso twist velocity were the rate of change of hip roll, shoulder roll, and torso twist,
24
25 182 respectively, and were expressed as angular velocities (in degrees per second) using the time
26
27
28 183 derivatives of hip roll, shoulder roll, and torso twist with the central difference method.
29
30

31 184
32
33
34 185 Range of hip roll, range of shoulder roll, and range of torso twist were determined separately for
35
36
37 186 each trial by summing the maximum magnitude of hip roll, shoulder roll, and torso twist,
38
39 187 respectively, to the left side and to the right side. Averages for hip roll velocity, shoulder roll
40
41
42 188 velocity, and torso twist velocity were calculated using the mean of the absolute values of hip
43
44 189 roll velocity, shoulder roll velocity, and torso twist velocity, respectively, over each entire SC.
45
46

47 190
48
49
50
51 191 Statistical Analyses
52

53
54 192 Statistical tests were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 24 ($\alpha = 0.05$), with the exception of
55
56
57 193 effect sizes which were calculated manually (10). Intra-class correlations between swimming
58
59 194 trials were determined using a single-rating, absolute agreement, two-way mixed random effects
60
61
62
63
64
65

195 model analysis (14) for stroke frequency, range of hip roll, range of shoulder roll, range of torso
196 twist, average hip roll velocity, average shoulder roll velocity, and average torso twist velocity at
197 sprint pace and 400m pace.

198

199 Means and 95% confidence intervals (i.e. the t -value for the sample size ($n = 13$) multiplied by
200 the standard error of the sample mean) were calculated at both swimming paces for stroke
201 frequency, range of hip roll, range of shoulder roll, range of torso twist, average hip roll velocity,
202 average shoulder roll velocity, and average torso twist velocity. Confidence intervals improved
203 our ability to compare and interpret differences between swimming paces by providing a range
204 about the mean of each kinematic variable in which the true mean was likely to fall for either
205 pace. The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that all variables were normally distributed. Separate
206 paired t -test were conducted to evaluate the differences in stroke frequency, range of hip roll,
207 range of shoulder roll, range of torso twist, average hip roll velocity, average shoulder roll
208 velocity, and average torso twist velocity between sprint pace and 400m pace. Effect sizes were
209 determined using Cohen's d and interpreted with the following recommendations: small 0.2,
210 moderate 0.5, and large 0.8 (5). *Post hoc* power analysis was conducted using open-source
211 software (G*Power 3.1) (9).

212

213 RESULTS

214 Intra-class correlations were high for stroke frequency (sprint pace: 0.93; 400m pace: 0.98) range
215 of hip roll (sprint pace: 0.90; 400m pace: 0.93), range of shoulder roll (sprint pace: 0.85; 400m
216 pace: 0.94), range of torso twist (sprint pace: 0.82; 400m pace: 0.91), average hip roll velocity

217 (sprint pace: 0.90; 400m pace: 0.91), average shoulder roll velocity (sprint pace: 0.83; 400m
218 pace: 0.96), and average torso twist velocity (sprint pace: 0.84; 400m pace: 0.89) at both paces.

219
220 Time series for ensemble averages of hip roll, shoulder roll, and torso twist are shown in Figure
221 1 and time series for ensemble averages of hip roll velocity, shoulder roll velocity, torso twist
222 velocity are shown in Figure 2 for one SC at sprint and 400m pace.

223
224 [INSERT FIGURE 1 NEAR HERE]

225 [INSERT FIGURE 2 NEAR HERE]

226
227 Table 1 shows means, 95% confidence intervals using the t -distribution of the sample mean,
228 effect sizes, and statistical power for comparisons between paces of stroke frequency, range of
229 hip roll, range of shoulder roll, range of torso twist, average hip roll velocity, average shoulder
230 roll velocity, and average torso twist velocity. Stroke frequency was greater at sprint pace than at
231 400m pace ($t(12) = 12.27, p < 0.01$) with a large effect size. Range of hip roll was greater at
232 400m pace than at sprint pace ($t(12) = 6.77, p < 0.01$) with a large effect size while range of
233 shoulder roll was similar between paces ($p = 0.14$). Range of torso twist ($t(12) = 6.88, p < 0.01$),
234 average shoulder roll velocity ($t(12) = 9.17, p < 0.01$), and average torso twist velocity ($t(12) =$
235 $12.30, p < 0.01$) were greater at sprint pace than at 400m pace with large effect sizes. Average
236 hip roll velocity was also greater at sprint pace than at 400m pace ($t(12) = 2.98, p < 0.05$) but
237 with a moderate effect size.

238

[INSTERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE]

240

241 DISCUSSION

242 The purpose of this study was to quantify the range and velocity of hip roll, shoulder roll, and
243 torso twist in front crawl at different swimming speeds. The differences in hip roll and shoulder
244 roll that contributed to the changes in the range and velocity of torso twist between paces will
245 further understanding of the demands on the torso muscles in front crawl swimming. The
246 findings from this study contribute to the knowledge of movement patterns in front crawl that
247 can be used to improve the specificity of dry-land strength training for swimmers.

248

249 The larger range of torso twist at sprint pace than at 400m pace seemed to be the result of a
250 reduction in hip roll without a corresponding reduction in shoulder roll when participants were
251 swimming faster. The range of hip roll and range of shoulder roll observed in the current study
252 are consistent with trends of total hip roll and total shoulder roll across different swimming
253 speeds from previous findings (26). The similar range of shoulder roll between paces and the
254 higher stroke frequency at sprint pace than at 400m pace meant the swimmers rolled their
255 shoulders faster as swimming speed increased. This was reflected in an average shoulder roll
256 velocity that was 37% greater at sprint pace than at 400m pace (Table 1). Despite the smaller
257 range of hip roll at sprint pace than at 400m pace, the higher stroke frequency resulted in an
258 increase in hip roll velocity as swimming speed increased; however, average hip roll velocity

1
2
3
4 259 was only 9% greater at sprint pace than at 400m pace. Moreover, the effect size of the difference
5
6
7 260 in average hip roll velocity was moderate while all other statistically significant differences
8
9 261 between paces had large effect sizes (Table 1). The difference in torso twist velocity between
10
11 262 swimming paces therefore seemed to be the result of the swimmers' ability to maintain their
12
13
14 263 range of shoulder roll, despite an increase in stroke frequency, and to reduce their range of hip
15
16 264 roll as they increased swimming speed.

17
18
19
20 265
21
22
23 266 The patterns of hip roll, shoulder roll, and torso twist in Figure 1 suggest the magnitude of
24
25 267 rotation between the upper and lower torso was greater at sprint pace than at 400m pace.
26
27
28 268 Furthermore, the difference in torso twist velocity between swimming paces implies the
29
30 269 swimmers in this study rotated their upper torso with respect to their lower torso more rapidly at
31
32
33 270 sprint pace than at 400m pace. Increases in the magnitude and speed of rotation between the
34
35 271 upper and lower torso are associated with higher torso muscle activity (18, 19). These findings
36
37
38 272 suggest that the demands on the torso muscles are likely to be higher at faster swimming speeds
39
40 273 but this cannot be stated with confidence without further research measuring the muscle activity
41
42
43 274 at different paces.

44
45
46 275
47
48
49 276 Torques that produce rotation of the upper torso must have been higher at sprint pace than at
50
51 277 400m pace in order for the swimmers to achieve a similar range of shoulder roll at both paces
52
53
54 278 considering the increase in stroke frequency as swimming speed increased. Hydrodynamic and
55
56
57 279 buoyancy torques associated with the arm stroke produce longitudinal body rotation (23, 34, 36)
58
59 280 and could have contributed to the differences in shoulder roll velocity observed in the current
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 281 study. Though the shoulders and hips roll somewhat independently in front crawl (28),
5
6 282 longitudinal rotation is likely transferred from the shoulders to the hips. For example, motion can
7
8
9 283 be transferred along the torso during twisting motions of the spine through passive mechanisms
10
11
12 284 (e.g. via connective tissue and intervertebral discs) (15, 16) or with the assistance of muscle
13
14 285 torques (19, 24, 31). Greater torque acting to rotate the lower torso, separate from the torques
15
16 286 acting to rotate the upper torso, may have therefore been required to reduce the range of hip roll
17
18
19 287 as swimming speed increased. Sanders and Psycharakis (28), for instance, hypothesized that hip
20
21 288 roll is “dampened” compared to shoulder roll from torques associated with the flutter kick.
22
23
24 289 Considering swimmers tend to increase kicking frequency as swimming speed increases (4, 8,
25
26 290 22), torques from the flutter kick acting on the lower torso may have been greater at sprint pace
27
28
29 291 than at 400m pace, which could have contributed to the reduction in hip roll as swimming speed
30
31 292 increased. The differences in the longitudinal kinematics presented here indicate that the torques
32
33 293 acting to rotate the upper torso and the torques acting to rotate the lower torso may be greater at
34
35
36 294 sprint pace than at 400m pace. This may also indicate that the demands on the torso muscles
37
38 295 increase as swimming speed increases. Quantification of the torques acting on the upper torso
39
40
41 296 and lower torso in front crawl is required to test this hypothesis.
42
43

44 297

47 PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

48
49
50
51 299 This is the first study to investigate the velocity of hip roll, shoulder roll, and torso twist in front
52
53 300 crawl swimming. Coaches can use these findings to guide recommendations for changes to
54
55
56 301 swimming technique between sprint and middle-distance swimming. For example, swimmers
57
58 302 can be encouraged to maintain their range of shoulder roll as stroke frequency increases with
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 303 swimming speed. From the differences in the range and velocity of torso twist between
5
6 304 swimming paces, torques acting to produce rotation of the upper torso and the lower torso are
7
8
9 305 likely to increase as swimming speed increases. Dry-land strength training specificity may be
10
11 306 improved by designing exercises that challenge the torso muscles to generate torques that
12
13
14 307 produce or resist longitudinal rotation of the upper torso and the lower torso. **Coaches are**
15
16 308 **encouraged to consider the differences in the demands placed on swimmers competing over**
17
18 309 **different distances when designing dry-land strength training. For instance, torques required**
19
20 310 **from the torso muscles may be greater at faster swimming speeds than at slower swimming**
21
22 311 **speeds. ~~As swimming speed increases, exercises should increase the amount of torque required~~**
23
24 312 **~~from the torso muscle. This~~ Acknowledgement of the differences in demands between swimming**
25
26 313 **speeds could increase the likelihood that benefits from dry-land strength training will transfer to**
27
28
29 314 improvements in swimming performance.
30
31
32
33
34 315

37 316 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

38
39
40
41 317 The authors would like to thank the swimmers and coaches for their participation in data
42
43 318 collection. There are no conflicts of interest to declare.
44
45
46 319

49 320 REFERENCES

- 50
51
52
53 321 1. Abdel-Aziz Y and Karara H. Direct linear transformation from comparator coordinates
54 322 into object space coordinates in close-range photogrammetry. Presented at Proceedings of
55 323 the symposium on close-range photogrammetry, Falls Church, VA, 1971.
56 324 2. Bartlett R. *Introduction to sports biomechanics: Analysing human movement patterns*.
57 325 Routledge, 2007.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65







- 1
2
3
4 326 3. Cappaert JM, Pease DL, and Troup JP. Three-Dimensional Analysis of the Men's 100-m
5 327 Freestyle during the 1992 Olympic Games. *J Appl Biomech* 11: 103-112, 1995.
- 6 328 4. Chollet D, Chalies S, and Chatard JC. A new index of coordination for the crawl:
7 329 description and usefulness. *Int J Sports Med* 21: 54-59, 2000.
- 8 330 5. Cohen J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences 2nd edn. Erlbaum
9 331 Associates, Hillsdale, 1988.
- 10 332 6. Counsilman JE and Counsilman BE. *The new science of swimming*. Englewood Cliffs,
11 333 NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1994.
- 12 334 7. Craig AB, Skehan PL, Pawelczyk JA, and Boomer WL. Velocity, stroke rate, and
13 335 distance per stroke during elite swimming competition. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 17: 625-
14 336 634, 1985.
- 15 337 8. de Jesus K, Sanders RH, de Jesus K, Ribeiro J, Figueiredo P, Vilas-Boas JP, and
16 338 Fernandes RJ. The effect of intensity on 3-dimensional kinematics and coordination in
17 339 front-crawl swimming. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 11:
18 340 768-775, 2016.
- 19 341 9. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang A-G, and Buchner A. G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power
20 342 analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research*
21 343 *Methods* 39: 175-191, 2007.
- 22 344 10. Fritz CO, Morris PE, and Richler JJ. Effect size estimates: current use, calculations, and
23 345 interpretation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 141: 2, 2012.
- 24 346 11. Giroid S, Maurin D, Dugue B, Chatard J-C, and Millet G. Effects of dry-land vs. resisted-
25 347 and assisted-sprint exercises on swimming sprint performances. *Journal of Strength and*
26 348 *Conditioning Research* 21: 599, 2007.
- 27 349 12. González-Badillo JJ and Sánchez-Medina L. Movement velocity as a measure of loading
28 350 intensity in resistance training. *Int J Sports Med* 31: 347-352, 2010.
- 29 351 13. Izquierdo M, Häkkinen K, Gonzalez-Badillo JJ, Ibanez J, and Gorostiaga EM. Effects of
30 352 long-term training specificity on maximal strength and power of the upper and lower
31 353 extremities in athletes from different sports. *European journal of applied physiology* 87:
32 354 264-271, 2002.
- 33 355 14. Koo T and Li M. A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients
34 356 for reliability research. *J Chiropr Med*. 2016; 15 (2): 155-63. Epub 2016/03/31.
35 357 10.1016/j. jcm. 2016.02. 012. [https://doi. org/10.1016/j. jcm. 2016.02. 012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jcm. 2016.02. 012) PMID:
36 358 27330520, 2017.
- 37 359 15. Kumar S, Narayan Y, and Garand D. An electromyographic study of isokinetic axial
38 360 rotation in young adults. *The Spine Journal* 3: 46-54, 2003.
- 39 361 16. Kumar S, Narayan Y, and Zedka M. An electromyographic study of unresisted trunk
40 362 rotation with normal velocity among healthy subjects. *Spine* 21: 1500-1512, 1996.
- 41 363 17. Maglischo EW. *Swimming fastest*. Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics, 2003.
- 42 364 18. Marras W, Davis K, and Granata K. Trunk muscle activities during asymmetric twisting
43 365 motions. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology* 8: 247-256, 1998.
- 44 366 19. Marras WS and Granata KP. A biomechanical assessment and model of axial twisting in
45 367 the thoracolumbar spine. *Spine* 20: 1440-1451, 1995.
- 46 368 20. McCabe CB, Psycharakis S, and Sanders RH. Kinematic differences between front crawl
47 369 sprint and distance swimmers at sprint pace. *Journal of Sports Sciences* 29: 115-123,
48 370 2011.

- 1
2
3
4 371 21. McCabe CB and Sanders RH. Kinematic differences between front crawl sprint and
5 372 distance swimmers at a distance pace. *Journal of Sports Sciences* 30: 601-608, 2012.
6 373 22. Millet G, Chollet D, Chabies S, and Chatard J. Coordination in front crawl in elite
7 374 triathletes and elite swimmers. *Int J Sports Med* 23: 99-104, 2002.
8 375 23. Payton CJ, Bartlett RM, Baltzopoulos V, and Coombs R. Upper extremity kinematics and
9 376 body roll during preferred-side breathing and breath-holding front crawl swimming.
10 377 *Journal of sports sciences* 17: 689-696, 1999.
11 378 24. Pink M, Perry J, and Jobe FW. Electromyographic analysis of the trunk in golfers. *The*
12 379 *american journal of sports medicine* 21: 385-388, 1993.
13 380 25. Psycharakis S and McCabe C. Shoulder and hip roll differences between breathing and
14 381 non-breathing conditions in front crawl swimming. *Journal of Biomechanics* 44: 1752-
15 382 1756, 2011.
16 383 26. Psycharakis S and Sanders RH. Shoulder and hip roll changes during 200-m front crawl
17 384 swimming. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise* 40: 2129-2136, 2008.
18 385 27. Psycharakis S and Sanders RH. Body roll in swimming: A review. *Journal of Sports*
19 386 *Sciences* 28: 229-236, 2010.
20 387 28. Sanders RH and Psycharakis SG. Rolling rhythms in front crawl swimming with six-beat
21 388 kick. *Journal of Biomechanics* 42: 273-279, 2009.
22 389 29. Schnitzler C, Seifert L, Ernwein V, and Chollet D. Arm coordination adaptations
23 390 assessment in swimming. *Int J Sports Med* 29: 480-486, 2008.
24 391 30. Seifert L, Chollet D, and Bardy B. Effect of swimming velocity on arm coordination in
25 392 the front crawl: a dynamic analysis. *Journal of sports sciences* 22: 651-660, 2004.
26 393 31. Shaffer B, Jobe FW, Pink M, and Perry J. Baseball Batting: An Electromyographic
27 394 Study. *Clinical orthopaedics and related research* 292: 285-293, 1993.
28 395 32. Tanaka H, Costill DL, Thomas R, Fink WJ, and Widrick JJ. Dry-land resistance training
29 396 for competitive swimming. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 25: 952-959,
30 397 1993.
31 398 33. Tanaka H and Swensen T. Impact of resistance training on endurance performance.
32 399 *Sports medicine* 25: 191-200, 1998.
33 400 34. Yanai T. What causes the body to roll in front-crawl swimming? *J Appl Biomech* 17: 28-
34 401 42, 2001.
35 402 35. Yanai T. Stroke frequency in front crawl: its mechanical link to the fluid forces required
36 403 in non-propulsive directions. *Journal of Biomechanics* 36: 53-62, 2003.
37 404 36. Yanai T. Buoyancy is the primary source of generating bodyroll in front-crawl
38 405 swimming. *Journal of Biomechanics* 37: 605-612, 2004.
39 406 37. Young WB. Transfer of strength and power training to sports performance. *International*
40 407 *journal of sports physiology and performance* 1: 74-83, 2006.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 408
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

409 FIGURES

410 Figure 1. Time series with ensemble averages for hip roll, shoulder roll, and torso twist at sprint
411 pace and 400m pace. Dashed lines represent 95% confidence intervals calculated using the t -
412 value and standard error of the sample mean. Positive values indicate rotation to the swimmer's
413 left (i.e. in the anticlockwise direction when viewing the swimmer from behind) and negative
414 values indicate rotation to the swimmer's right (i.e. in the clockwise direction when viewing the
415 swimmer from behind). Swimmers began these SCs with the right hand. Time series for SCs
416 beginning with the left hand were similar to this figure.


417
418 Figure 2. Time series with ensemble averages for hip roll velocity, shoulder roll velocity, and
419 torso twist velocity at sprint pace and 400m pace. Dashed lines represent 95% confidence
420 intervals calculated using the t -value and standard error of the sample mean. Positive values
421 indicate rotation to the swimmer's left (i.e. in the anticlockwise direction when viewing the
422 swimmer from behind) and negative values indicate rotation to the swimmer's right (i.e. in the
423 clockwise direction when viewing the swimmer from behind). Swimmers began these SCs with
424 the right hand. Time series for SCs beginning with the left hand were similar to this figure.








% Stroke Cycle

% Stroke Cycle

Sprint Pace



400m Pace



% Stroke Cycle

% Stroke Cycle

L

R

L

R

L

R

- 1 Table 1. Stroke frequency, range of hip roll, range of shoulder roll, range of torso twist, average
- 2 absolute hip roll velocity, average absolute shoulder roll velocity, and average absolute torso
- 3 twist velocity at sprint pace and 400m pace.

	Sprint Pace		400m Pace		Effect Size (Cohen's <i>d</i>)	Power (<i>n</i> = 13)
	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI		
Stroke Frequency (stroke/s)	0.95**	0.04	0.70	0.04	3.73	1.0
Range of Hip Roll (°)	36.8**	3.1	49.9	5.6	-1.58	1.0
Range of Shoulder Roll (°)	97.7	3.1	101.6	5.9	-0.46	0.40
Range of Torso Twist (°)	78.1**	3.4	61.3	4.7	2.23	1.0
Average Absolute Hip Roll Velocity (°/s)	75.5*	7.1	69.1	7.9	0.52	0.66
Average Absolute Shoulder Roll Velocity (°/s)	190.7**	9.9	139.2	11.5	2.92	1.0
Average Absolute Torso Twist Velocity (°/s)	166.3**	10.0	96.9	8.2	4.13	1.0

- 4 Significantly different from 400m pace (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$).