



Citation for published version:

Veith, S, Whalan, M, Williams, S, Colyer, S & Sampson, J 2021, 'Part 2 of the 11+ as an effective home-based exercise programme in elite academy football (soccer) players: A one-club matched-paired randomised controlled trial', *Science and Medicine in Football*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 339-346.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/24733938.2021.1874616>

DOI:

[10.1080/24733938.2021.1874616](https://doi.org/10.1080/24733938.2021.1874616)

Publication date:

2021

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Science and Medicine in Football* on [25/01/2021, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/24733938.2021.1874616>

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Title:** Part 2 of the 11+ as an effective home-based exercise programme in elite
2 academy football (soccer) players: a one-club matched-paired randomised
3 controlled trial

4 **Submission type:** Original research

5 **Authors:** Stella Veith^{1,2}
6 Matthew Whalan^{1,4}
7 Sean Williams³
8 Steffi L Colyer³
9 John A Sampson^{1,4}

10 **Institutions:** ¹Centre of Medical and Exercise Physiology, University of Wollongong,
11 Wollongong, Australia
12 ²Sydney Football Club, Sydney, Australia
13 ³Department of Health, University of Bath, Bath, UK
14 ⁴NSW Football Medicine Association, Australia

15 **Corresponding author:** Stella Veith
16 Centre of Medical and Exercise Physiology
17 School of Medicine
18 University of Wollongong
19 Northfields Avenue
20 Wollongong, NSW 2522
21 Australia
22 Tel: + 61 2 42252233
23 E-mail: stella.veith@hotmail.com
24

25 **Abstract word count:** 199

26 **Word count:** 3477

27 **Number of figures:** 4

28 **Number of tables:** 2

29

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 Although the 11+ is known to reduce injuries and improve performance in adolescent footballers, its
3 duration presents a notable barrier to implementation. Hence, this study investigated injury and
4 performance outcomes when 65 elite male academy footballers either performed Part 2 3x / week at
5 training (TG) or at home (HG). Time to stabilisation (TTS), eccentric hamstring strength (EH-S) and
6 countermovement jump height (CMJ-H) were collected four times during the 2019 football season.
7 Linear mixed-models were used to evaluate main and interaction effects of group and time.
8 Bonferroni post-hoc tests were used to account for multiple comparisons. Differences in time loss and
9 medical attention injuries were determined using a 2-tailed Z test for a comparison of rates. Relative
10 to baseline, EH-S (HG 4.3 kg, 95% CI 3 to 5.7, $p < 0.001$; TG 5.5 kg, 95% CI 4.3 to 6.6, $p < 0.001$) and
11 CMJ-H (HG 3.5 cm, 95% CI 2.2 to 4.7, $p < 0.001$; TG 3.2 cm, 95% CI 2.2 to 4.3, $p < 0.001$) increased, with
12 no difference between groups observed at the end of the season. All injury outcomes were similar.
13 Hence, rescheduling Part 2 did not affect performance or increased injury risks in academy footballers.

14

15 **Key Words**

16 Football, soccer, FIFA 11+, 11+, injury prevention, adolescence

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Around the time of peak height velocity, the risk of injury for an adolescent athlete may be increased.¹
3 ² Growth related gains in muscle volume and increased tendon stiffness³ occur while bone tissue and
4 growth plates are still vulnerable,⁴ hence intensified stress on tendon attachment areas can lead to
5 lower limb overuse injuries in adolescent footballers.⁵ The 11+, a warm-up programme consisting of
6 running-based (Part 1 and 3), strength, power and neuromuscular control exercises (Part 2), was
7 designed to reduce non-contact lower limb injuries in adult footballers⁶ and has also been proven
8 effective in players as young as 14 years, reducing lower limb injury by 48% and overuse injuries by
9 74%.⁷ Additionally, the 11+ exercises also improve power, agility and short-distance sprinting in
10 adolescent male footballers.^{8,9} Importantly, it is also evident that performing these exercises more
11 frequently improves physical adaptation¹⁰ at the same time as reducing injury rates and severity.^{11,12}
12 However, low programme compliance is frequently observed.^{11,13}

13 Common barriers to programme implementation and adoption include the time required to
14 complete the programme¹¹ and in professional youth football, this can be dependent on player
15 motivation, communication between coaching and medical staff, game and training schedules.¹⁴ A
16 potential option to overcome these barriers may be to explore alternative delivery methods of the
17 11+ which one study to date has examined.¹² In this study, moving Part 2 of the 11+ to the end of
18 training resulted in 35% higher compliance with similar reductions in injury rates, lower severity and
19 burden when compared to those completing the full programme before training.¹² It thus appears as
20 though the original structuring of the programme, that all parts are performed before training as a
21 'warm up', is not necessary to maintain programme efficacy. However, scheduling the exercises after
22 training does not actually impact the total time required for programme delivery and execution during
23 the course of a training session.

24 This study therefore investigates performance effects and injury rates of 'rescheduling' the
25 11+ by asking players to perform Part 2 at home and Parts 1 and 3 as a warm-up before training and

1 games. It was hypothesized that these players would show similar performance changes compared to
2 players performing all parts of the 11+ at training.

3

4 **MATERIALS and METHODS**

5 **Study Design and Participant Recruitment**

6 The study was designed as a matched-paired randomised controlled trial and the reporting follows
7 the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) statement when applicable¹⁵. Participants
8 were recruited following convenience sampling in November 2018. Eligible participants were players
9 between the ages of 12 and 16, registered to play for the same football club during the 2019 season.
10 Based on previous literature, the between-group effect size calculation was expected to show a
11 moderate to large effect ($d \geq 0.5$) between each testing session for the primary outcome measures
12 (physical performance) when a minimum of 16 participants were allocated to each group.¹⁶ It was
13 expected that the number of injuries would only be sufficient to detect strong associations ($d \geq 0.8$),¹⁷
14 therefore injury rates were only included as secondary outcome measure.

15 65 elite male academy football players (13.9 y, SD 1.2; 163.1 cm, SD 12.6; 52.2 kg, SD 11.4)
16 from the U13 (n = 23), U14 (n=18), U15 (n=12) and U16 (n=12) teams volunteered to participate and
17 all players and their parents/guardians provided signed informed consent. The University Ethics
18 Committee approved the project (2018/445) which took place at the football club's training centre in
19 Sydney, Australia.

20 Players were stratified according to age, known previous injury history (severity and type of
21 time-loss injuries) and baseline hamstring strength. Matched pairs were then assigned to a training
22 group (TG) or home group (HG) (Figure 1) using a computer-generated random number generation.
23 The researchers, intervention deliverers and participants were not blinded. The TG (n=32, 13.9 y, SD
24 1.2; 163.5 cm, SD 12.2; 52.4 kg, SD 11) performed Part 2 of the 11+ at the end of training ($3 \times /$ week),¹²

1 the HG (n=33, 13.9 y, SD 1.2; 162.8 cm, SD 13.2; 51.9 kg, SD 11.9) completed Part 2 at home (3 × /
2 week). Both groups performed Part 1 and 3 before training (3 × / week) and games (1 × / week). The
3 TG Part 2 exercise compliance was not monitored but was considered a normal component of the
4 training session for these players. The HG completed a weekly online survey (via SurveyMonkey) to
5 document the frequency and completion rate of exercises performed. If exercises were missed,
6 players were asked: “Did you experience any issues with the exercises?”, “Which exercises did you
7 leave out?” and “How many times did you miss these exercises out?”.

8

9

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

10

11

12 **11+ implementation**

13 Figure 2 outlines the experimental design. As the exercises in Part 2 progress from Level 1 to Level 3,
14 within each level there is a prescription range for certain exercises, for example 3 to 5 repetitions or
15 20 to 30 seconds. In this study, ‘Beginner’ refers to when the lower number of repetitions and duration
16 (e.g., 3 repetitions and 20 seconds) are performed and refers to ‘Advanced’ when a higher number of
17 repetitions and time period was prescribed (e.g., 5 repetitions and 30 seconds) (Table 1,
18 supplementary material). All players were familiarised with the 11+ exercises, performing Parts 1 and
19 3 before training and Part 2 (Level 1: Advanced) after training during the nine-week pre-season, which
20 included a three-week break (weeks 6 – 8) from club football due to a scheduled Christmas break. In
21 week 10, all players were familiarised with Level 2 (Beginner) and performed the exercises after
22 training. From week 11, players were assigned to HG or TG for the remainder of the season (33 weeks).
23 During the first week of each phase of exercise progression, Level 2 (Advanced) and Level 3 (Beginner),
24 the exercises were completed by both groups for one week at training to ensure familiarisation and
25 correct technique. Then, for the remaining 9 – 11 weeks of each phase, players performed Part 2
26 within their designated group. Six sports and exercise science students were instructed and trained to

1 familiarise all players and to deliver the 11+ to the TG group throughout the season. All players were
2 considered ready to progress to the next level at each stage following assessment by the lead
3 researcher, a member of the medical team (SV). The Copenhagen exercise was added at the request
4 of the club's medical staff to Part 2 of the 11+ as an eccentric hip adduction strengthening exercise
5 from week 1 and was included in Part 2 for both HG and TG¹⁶. Baseline testing took place at the end
6 of week 9, testing in weeks 23, 35 and 45 was performed on the first training day of the week.

7

8

INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE

9

10 **Performance data collection**

11 The countermovement jump and time to stabilisation tests selected in this study have been used in
12 previous research evaluating 11+ effectiveness on jump performance⁹ and balance¹⁸. Investigating
13 knee flexor strength with the eccentric hamstring strength test was chosen as the 11+ includes the
14 Nordic Hamstring exercise which has been shown to improve strength and sprint performance in
15 footballers¹⁹⁻²¹. The tests used in this study have all been shown to be reliable.²²⁻²⁴

16 First, standing height (Charder stadiometer, HM 200P, Taiwan) and body mass (Polar Balance Scales,
17 1G, Finland) were recorded to the nearest 0.1 cm and 0.1 kg, respectively. Leg length was measured
18 to the nearest 0.1 cm with a dressmakers tape from the ASIS to the medial malleolus of the tibia of
19 the preferred kicking leg.²³ A five-minute warm-up on a stationary bike was then performed at a self-
20 selected moderate intensity before completing the following tests in order.

21 Time to stabilisation (balance)

22 Time to stabilisation (TTS) was assessed using a 1000 Hz piezoelectric force platform (Kistler
23 Instruments Pty Ltd, portable platform 9260AA6, Australia). Players were instructed to stand in a
24 neutral position with hands on hips and toes touching a marked line set to a distance equal to the

1 player's leg length from the centre of the force platform.²³ The player was instructed to jump from a
2 double leg stance onto the centre of the force platform, land on a single limb and maintain this
3 position for 15 seconds. Players performed the test twice on each (alternating) leg. The force platforms
4 software (BioWare, version 5.3.2.9) recorded the antero-posterior, medial-lateral and vertical ground
5 reaction force. Time to stabilisation was calculated using a custom-written Matlab script (R2019b),
6 which computed the time taken from ground contact (when vertical force first exceeded 10 N) to the
7 first point when the vertical force component reached and stayed within 5% of the player's body
8 weight for one second.²⁵

9 Countermovement jump height (lower limb power)

10 Players were asked to stand in the middle of a jump mat (Smart Jump, Fusion Sport, Australia) in a
11 neutral position with hands on hips throughout the test, then instructed to squat to a self-selected
12 depth, jump as high as possible, extending the knees in the air before landing.²⁶ Each player was
13 permitted as many trial sub-maximal attempts as desired. Jump height (cm) was recorded during two
14 maximal trials separated by two minutes of rest.²⁶ During test 1, countermovement jump height (CMJ-
15 H) could not be measured due to technical issues, however players performed the jumps to maintain
16 similar physical demands across all testing sessions.

17 Eccentric hamstring strength (strength)

18 Eccentric hamstring strength (EH-S) was assessed using fixed frame dynamometry (KangaTech, MFC
19 05178234/5, 2016, Australia). Participants were instructed to kneel on the device's padded board in
20 an upright position with ankle braces positioned proximal to the lateral malleolus and lower the upper
21 body slowly forward whilst maintaining the hip and back in line with the shoulders. Once the
22 movement could not be controlled, the player dropped the upper body and hips onto the padded
23 board, using the hands to break the fall.²⁷ After a warm-up of three sub-maximal efforts and

1 subsequent one-minute rest, two maximal efforts with two minutes rest between each effort were
2 performed. Force output was recorded in kg.

3

4 **Height and body mass data collection**

5 Standing height and body mass were collected before training once / month to calculate monthly
6 height (rate of growth, ROG) and weight gains (rate of body mass, ROB).

7

8 **Injury data collection**

9 The club's academy physiotherapist and chief investigator (SV) recorded injuries and individual
10 training and match exposure during pre- and in-season (week 1 – week 44). Time-loss (TL) injuries
11 were defined as “an injury that results in a player being *unable* to take a *full* part in future football
12 training or match play” and collected according to the Football Consensus Statement.²⁸ Medical
13 attention (MA) injuries defined as ‘any physical complaint reported to the academy physiotherapist
14 requiring medical attention while allowing the player to *continue full* training or match play’, were also
15 recorded with the reporting date of injury set as day-1 and final day as the date of the first complaint-
16 free session.²⁹

17

18 **Statistical Analysis**

19 A Shapiro Wilk test (*R*, version 3.6.2, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria; *stats*
20 package) was performed to check for normality. Height and body mass over time were compared
21 between groups using linear mixed-models and Bonferroni multiple comparisons tests (*lme4*
22 package³⁰). Linear mixed models evaluated main and interaction effects of group and time for EH-S,
23 CMJ-H and TTS by including test number and group as fixed effects and player as random effects. ROG

1 and ROB were included as covariates in separate models (due to collinearity issues between these
2 variables) to assess and correct for performance changes due to progress in height or body mass.³¹
3 These covariates were retained in the model when statistical significance and an improved model fit
4 (R^2) was observed. Bonferroni post-hoc tests were applied to account for multiple comparisons where
5 significance was observed. TL injury burden was calculated as the number of days lost per 1000 hours
6 of exposure.³² The number of days impacted by a MA injury were calculated per player and averaged
7 per group. Injury incidence was calculated as the total (TL + MA) number of all injuries / total (training
8 + match) football exposure (h) x 1000 h. Between group differences in injury incidence, burden and
9 days affected by MA injury were examined using a 2-tailed Z test (*DescTools* package) for a comparison
10 of rates. Significance was set at $p < 0.05$ and data are described as mean with 95% confidence interval
11 (CI).

12

13 RESULTS

14 All data except age was normally distributed. No between groups differences were observed in age,
15 height and mass at baseline. Height ($p < 0.001$) and body mass ($p < 0.001$) increased in both groups
16 over the season with no difference in ROG or ROB between groups at any time (Table 1).

17

18

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

19

20 CMJ-H improvements were observed relative to baseline at test 3 (HG 3.5 cm, CI 2.2 to 4.7, $p < 0.001$;
21 TG 3.2 cm, CI 2.2 to 4.3, $p < 0.001$) and between test 2 and 3 (HG 3.1 cm, CI 1.8 to 4.3, $p < 0.001$; TG
22 2.3 cm, CI 1.3 to 3.4, $p = 0.001$) (Figure 3). No between-group differences were observed. ROG
23 impacted upon the statistical model assessing EH-S ($p = 0.016$) and was therefore included as a
24 covariate in the analysis. Relative to baseline, EH-S gains were observed at test 1 (HG 2.5 kg, CI 1.4 to

1 3.6, $p = 0.001$; TG 4.1 kg, CI 3 to 5.2, $p < 0.001$), test 2 (HG 3.8 kg, CI 2.7 to 4.9, $p < 0.001$; TG 5.2 kg, CI
2 4 to 6.3, $p < 0.001$) and test 3 (HG 4.3 kg, CI 3 to 5.7, $p < 0.001$; TG 5.5 kg, CI 4.3 to 6.6, $p < 0.001$)
3 (Figure 4). A significant group \times time interaction was evident at test 1 (1.6 kg, CI 0.1 to 3.2, $p = 0.036$),
4 and a significant increase between tests 1 and 3 was observed only in the HG (1.9 kg, CI 0.5 to 3.3, $p =$
5 0.044). No significant change was observed in TTS at any time.

6

7

INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE

8

INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE

9

10 Injury incidence, injury burden and days affected by MA injury were similar in TG and HG (Table 2)
11 with no statistical difference between groups. HG dose exposures were reported as 2.8 (CI 2.7 to 2.9)
12 \times / week, with all exercises performed 87% of the time. Having no partner (48.9%) and injury /
13 soreness / sickness (44.7%) were reported as the main reasons for not fully completing the
14 programme. Copenhagen and hamstring exercises were reported as most often 'missed' (29% and
15 28% respectively). (Compliance data can be found in Table 2 of the supplementary material.)

16

17

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

18

19 **DISCUSSION**

20 For the first time, the present study provides evidence to show that male elite academy footballers
21 can complete Part 2 of the 11+ programme outside of the training environment without compromising
22 important physical performance adaptations for eccentric hamstring strength and lower limb power.

1 Specifically, EH-S and CMJ-H improved regardless of performing Part 2 at home or supervised at
2 training. Although the data can only be considered preliminary due to the low number of injuries
3 observed, the results suggest that rescheduling Part 2 does not increase injury risks, as no difference
4 in injury incidence or burden was observed between groups.

5

6 **Eccentric hamstring strength**

7 EH-S increased significantly in both groups over the course of the season, with the greatest
8 improvements in EH-S observed in the first 13 weeks of the experimental intervention. Herein, ROG
9 and ROB were examined and included where significance was observed in between group analysis to
10 normalise for changes in growth or body mass.^{8, 33} However, in contrast to previous research
11 highlighting EH-S gains in youth footballers almost exclusively within the first four to six weeks of
12 Nordic hamstring training,^{19, 34} the gains observed in this study occurred after a nine week
13 familiarisation period. The progressive increase in exercise loading over the whole season in the
14 current study compared to a four week period¹⁹ may thus have continued to stimulate neural
15 adaptations in subjects accustomed to exercise³⁵ and structural adaptations such as increases in the
16 muscle's physiological cross-sectional area and fascicle length.^{36, 37} Interestingly, the EH-S gains
17 observed in the TG were greater than the HG during the initial 13 weeks of the intervention. It is
18 possible that the HG may have increased hamstring strength via greater structural adaptation due to
19 additional metabolic fatigue and increased mechanical tension when completing the eccentric
20 hamstring exercise directly after football training.³⁸ The HG however showed a significant increase in
21 strength from test 1 to test 3 (1.9 kg in the HG compared to 1.4 kg in the TG) such that the total EH-S
22 gain between groups was similar over the course of the season. This suggests that during the initial
23 phase of a season, the 11+ hamstring exercise could be performed after training and then transitioned
24 to be completed at home to maximise strength gains, which has been associated with reduced injury
25 risk.³⁹

1

2 **Countermovement jump height**

3 Increases in CMJ-H were not evident in the current study until the final testing session (week 45),
4 however the overall improvements were similar to previous reports in youths performing the 11+
5 throughout a football season.⁸ It is possible that neural adaptations during the familiarisation period
6 prior to baseline testing may have occurred, dampening any of the measured effects during the initial
7 part of the season. This cannot be confirmed, though, as no pre-familiarisation testing took place. Of
8 note, lateral jumps (Part 2, Level 2) performed between baseline testing and test 2 likely did not induce
9 specific adaptations measured by the countermovement jump test,⁴⁰ compared to box jumps (Part 2,
10 Level 3), which were performed between testing sessions 2 and 3.⁴¹ Our results may therefore
11 question whether the 11+ jumping exercises may need to be changed if the aim is to improve vertical
12 lower limb power. Lateral jumps may be better suited as a balance exercise progression as the impact
13 on reducing injuries due to improved knee stability during single-leg landing,⁴² especially during
14 physical maturation,⁴³ should not be disregarded.

15

16 **Time to stabilisation**

17 No improvement in knee and ankle stability during single-leg landing assessed via TTS⁴⁴ were observed
18 in TG or HG. Neurological development, changes in the proprioceptive system and physical growth
19 due to maturation might have influenced the results found in this study.⁴⁵ Previously, balance
20 improvements have been observed in similar aged football players following injury prevention
21 programmes.⁴⁶ However, with regards to balance performance, a larger cohort of elite players
22 performing the 11+ regularly has not been investigated to date. Therefore, it may be considered that
23 the 11+ exercises may be insufficient to improve balance in elite adolescent players, and that more

1 advanced exercises may be required.¹⁴ Future research including more tests investigating the effects
2 of the 11+ exercises on balance is required.

3

4 **Strengths and limitations**

5 A key feature of this intervention's success is likely a consequence of the high compliance rate of the
6 HG which was close to 3 × / week with individual exercises only missed 13% of the time. Moreover,
7 assessments of strength, power and balance were included to draw conclusions on programme
8 effectiveness,²²⁻²⁴ given that the number of injuries alone were considered insufficient.¹⁷ Similar injury
9 rates likely reflect the comparable improvements observed across the exercise assessments in HG and
10 TG, however further research is required to investigate the true injury reduction effects in elite
11 adolescent footballers when Part 2 of the 11+ is performed at home. As no control group was included,
12 this research cannot confirm an injury reduction effect per se, and no clear conclusions can be drawn
13 on the magnitude of change regarding any performance outcome. Additionally, TG players were
14 instructed not to perform additional 11+ exercises at home, however this was not monitored and
15 cannot be excluded. Moreover, no intra-subject reliability testing was performed, and no testing was
16 performed prior to baseline testing. But whilst any differences between groups at this stage may have
17 been attenuated by the extended familiarisation period, the three-week break (weeks 6 – 8) likely
18 minimised these effects.⁴⁷ Furthermore, peak height velocity estimates may have been more
19 appropriate as covariates than ROG or ROB, however there were insufficient seated height
20 measurements in the data set. Finally, exercise exposure of the TG was not collected on an individual
21 player level to provide better comparison to the HG due to time restrictions. The trial protocol was
22 not pre-registered but can be accessed via the ethics application (2018/445) approved by the UOW &
23 ISLHD Health and Medical Human Research Ethics Committee. No harms or unintended effects were
24 reported.

25

1 **Practical implications**

2 Although the 11+ has shown to increase performance parameters^{8, 9} and decrease injuries⁷ in
3 adolescent footballers, time availability at training remains one of the major barriers to programme
4 implementation.¹¹ This study shows that rescheduling Part 2 of the 11+ programme outside of the
5 training environment elicits similar performance improvements without effecting injury rates
6 negatively and can therefore be recommended in adolescent male elite footballers to maintain player
7 availability and participation in training and games. Such rescheduling directly reduces the time
8 required to complete a season-long injury reduction programme at training and may increase
9 programme adoption.

10

11 **Acknowledgements**

12 The authors would like to thank all UOW students and Sydney FC staff involved in project planning,
13 implementation and data collection. We also thank all players and parents at Sydney FC for their
14 participation and time. SV received a joint scholarship by Sydney FC and the University of Wollongong.

15

16 **Disclosure Statement**

17 No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

18

1 References

- 2 1. Johnson DM, Williams S, Bradley B, Sayer S, Murray Fisher J, Cumming S. Growing pains:
3 Maturity associated variation in injury risk in academy football. *Eur J Sport Sci.* 2020;20(4):544-552.
4 doi:10.1080/17461391.2019.1633416
- 5 2. Bult HJ, Barendrecht M, Tak IJR. Injury risk and injury burden are related to age group and
6 peak height velocity among talented male youth soccer players. *Orthop J Sports Med.*
7 2018;6(12):2325967118811042. doi:10.1177/2325967118811042
- 8 3. Radnor JM, Oliver JL, Waugh CM, Myer GD, Moore IS, Lloyd RS. The influence of growth and
9 maturation on stretch-shortening cycle function in youth. *Sports Med.* 2018;48(1):57-71.
10 doi:10.1007/s40279-017-0785-0
- 11 4. Caine D, DiFiori J, Maffulli N. Physeal injuries in children's and youth sports: reasons for
12 concern? *Br J Sports Med.* 2006;40(9):749-60. doi:10.1136/bjism.2005.017822
- 13 5. Rathleff MS, Winiarski L, Krommes K, et al. Pain, sports participation, and physical function in
14 adolescents with patellofemoral pain and Osgood-Schlatter disease: a matched cross-sectional
15 study. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2020;50(3):149-157. doi:10.2519/jospt.2020.8770
- 16 6. Thorborg K, Krommes KK, Esteve E, Clausen MB, Bartels EM, Rathleff MS. Effect of specific
17 exercise-based football injury prevention programmes on the overall injury rate in football: a
18 systematic review and meta-analysis of the FIFA 11 and 11+ programmes. *Br J Sports Med.*
19 2017;51(7):562-571. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2016-097066
- 20 7. Owoeye OB, Akinbo SR, Tella BA, Olawale OA. Efficacy of the FIFA 11+ warm-up programme
21 in male youth football: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *J Sports Sci Med.* 2014;13(2):321-8.
- 22 8. Zarei M, Abbasi H, Daneshjoo A, et al. Long-term effects of the 11+ warm-up injury
23 prevention programme on physical performance in adolescent male football players: a cluster-
24 randomised controlled trial. *J Sports Sci.* 2018;36(21):2447-2454.
25 doi:10.1080/02640414.2018.1462001
- 26 9. Akbari H, Sahebozamani M, Daneshjoo A, Amiri-Khorasani M. Effect of the FIFA 11+
27 programme on vertical jump performance in elite male youth soccer players. *Monten J Sports Sci*
28 *Med.* 2018;7(2)doi:10.26773/mjssm.180903
- 29 10. Steffen K, Emery CA, Romiti M, et al. High adherence to a neuromuscular injury prevention
30 programme (FIFA 11+) improves functional balance and reduces injury risk in Canadian youth female
31 football players: a cluster randomised trial. *Br J Sports Med.* 2013;47(12):794-802.
32 doi:10.1136/bjsports-2012-091886
- 33 11. Silvers-Granelli HJ, Bizzini M, Arundale A, Mandelbaum BR, Snyder-Mackler L. Higher
34 compliance to a neuromuscular injury prevention program improves overall injury rate in male
35 football players. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2018;26(7):1975-1983. doi:10.1007/s00167-
36 018-4895-5
- 37 12. Whalan M, Lovell R, Steele JR, Sampson JA. Rescheduling Part 2 of the 11+ reduces injury
38 burden and increases compliance in semi-professional football. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.*
39 2019;29(12):1941-1951. doi:10.1111/sms.13532
- 40 13. O'Brien J, Young W, Finch CF. The use and modification of injury prevention exercises by
41 professional youth soccer teams. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2017;27(11):1337-1346.
42 doi:10.1111/sms.12756
- 43 14. O'Brien J, Young W, Finch CF. The delivery of injury prevention exercise programmes in
44 professional youth soccer: Comparison to the FIFA 11. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2017;20(1):26-31.
45 doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2016.05.007
- 46 15. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting
47 parallel group randomized trials. *Ann Intern Med.* 2010;152(11):726-732. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-
48 152-11-201006010-00232

- 1 16. Haroy J, Thorborg K, Serner A, et al. Including the Copenhagen adduction exercise in the FIFA
2 11+ provides missing eccentric hip adduction strength effect in male soccer players: a randomized
3 controlled trial. *Am J Sports Med.* 2017;45(13):3052-3059. doi:10.1177/0363546517720194
- 4 17. Bahr R, Holme I. Risk factors for sports injuries - a methodological approach. *Br J Sports Med.*
5 2003;37(5):384-92. doi:10.1136/bjism.37.5.384
- 6 18. Impellizzeri FM, Bizzini M, Dvorak J, Pellegrini B, Schena F, Junge A. Physiological and
7 performance responses to the FIFA 11+ (part 2): a randomised controlled trial on the training effects.
8 *J Sports Sci.* 2013;31(13):1491-502. doi:10.1080/02640414.2013.802926
- 9 19. Freeman BW, Young WB, Talpey SW, Smyth AM, Pane CL, Carlon TA. The effects of sprint
10 training and the Nordic hamstring exercise on eccentric hamstring strength and sprint performance
11 in adolescent athletes. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness.* 2018;59(7)
- 12 20. Ishoi L, Holmich P, Aagaard P, Thorborg K, Bandholm T, Serner A. Effects of the Nordic
13 Hamstring exercise on sprint capacity in male football players: a randomized controlled trial. *J Sports*
14 *Sci.* 2018;36(14):1663-1672. doi:10.1080/02640414.2017.1409609
- 15 21. Krommes K, Petersen J, Nielsen MB, Aagaard P, Holmich P, Thorborg K. Sprint and jump
16 performance in elite male soccer players following a 10-week Nordic hamstring exercise protocol: a
17 randomised pilot study. *BMC Res Notes.* 2017;10(1):669. doi:10.1186/s13104-017-2986-x
- 18 22. Christou M, Smilios I, Sotiropoulos K, Volaklis K, Piliandis T, Tokmakidis SP. Effects of
19 resistance training on the physical capacities of adolescent soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res.*
20 2006;20(4):783-91. doi:10.1519/R-17254.1
- 21 23. Gribble PA, Mitterholzer J, Myers AN. Normalizing considerations for time to stabilization
22 assessment. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2012;15(2):159-63. doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2011.07.012
- 23 24. Fernandes JFT, Moran J, Clarke H, Drury B. The influence of maturation on the reliability of
24 the Nordic hamstring exercise in male youth footballers. *Transl Sports Med.* 2019;3(2):148-153.
25 doi:10.1002/tsm2.124
- 26 25. Ebben WP, VanderZanden T, Wurm BJ, Petushek EJ. Evaluating plyometric exercises using
27 time to stabilization. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2010;24(2)(ProQuest Central):300.
- 28 26. Lovell R, Whalan M, Marshall PWM, Sampson JA, Siegler JC, Buchheit M. Scheduling of
29 eccentric lower limb injury prevention exercises during the soccer micro-cycle: Which day of the
30 week? *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2018;28(10):2216-2225. doi:10.1111/sms.13226
- 31 27. Presland JD, Timmins RG, Bourne MN, Williams MD, Opar DA. The effect of Nordic hamstring
32 exercise training volume on biceps femoris long head architectural adaptation. *Scand J Med Sci*
33 *Sports.* 2018;28(7):1775-1783. doi:10.1111/sms.13085
- 34 28. Fuller CW, Ekstrand J, Junge A, et al. Consensus statement on injury definitions and data
35 collection procedures in studies of football (soccer) injuries. *Br J Sports Med.* Mar 2006;40(3):193-
36 201. doi:10.1136/bjism.2005.025270
- 37 29. Clarsen B, Bahr R. Matching the choice of injury/illness definition to study setting, purpose
38 and design: one size does not fit all! *Br J Sports Med.* 2014;48(7):510-2. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2013-
39 093297
- 40 30. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J*
41 *Stat Softw.* 2015;67(1)doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01
- 42 31. Dupre T, Lysdal FG, Funken J, et al. Groin injuries in soccer: investigating the effect of age on
43 adductor muscle forces. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2020;52(6):1330-1337.
44 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000002243
- 45 32. Bahr R, Clarsen B, Ekstrand J. Why we should focus on the burden of injuries and illnesses,
46 not just their incidence. *Br J Sports Med.* 2018;52(16)
- 47 33. Rossler R, Donath L, Bizzini M, Faude O. A new injury prevention programme for children's
48 football - FIFA 11+ Kids - can improve motor performance: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *J*
49 *Sports Sci.* 2016;34(6):549-56. doi:10.1080/02640414.2015.1099715

- 1 34. Lacombe M, Avrillon S, Cholley Y, Simpson BM, Guilhem G, Buchheit M. Hamstring eccentric
2 strengthening program: Does training volume matter? *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*. 2019;1-27.
3 doi:10.1123/ijsp.2018-0947
- 4 35. Sampson JA, McAndrew D, Donohoe A, Jenkins A, Groeller H. The effect of a familiarisation
5 period on subsequent strength gain. *J Sports Sci*. 2013;31(2):204-11.
6 doi:10.1080/02640414.2012.725134
- 7 36. Legerlotz K, Marzilger R, Bohm S, Arampatzis A. Physiological adaptations following
8 resistance training in youth athletes - a narrative review. *Pediatr Exerc Sci*. 2016;28(4):501-520.
9 doi:10.1123/pes.2016-0023
- 10 37. Cuthbert M, Ripley N, McMahon JJ, Evans M, Haff GG, Comfort P. The effect of Nordic
11 hamstring exercise intervention volume on eccentric strength and muscle architecture adaptations:
12 a systematic review and meta-analyses. *Sports Med*. 2020;50(1):83-99. doi:10.1007/s40279-019-
13 01178-7
- 14 38. Lovell R, Knox M, Weston M, Siegler JC, Brennan S, Marshall PWM. Hamstring injury
15 prevention in soccer: Before or after training? *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2018;28(2):658-666.
16 doi:10.1111/sms.12925
- 17 39. Lauersen JB, Andersen TE, Andersen LB. Strength training as superior, dose-dependent and
18 safe prevention of acute and overuse sports injuries: a systematic review, qualitative analysis and
19 meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2018;52(24):1557-1563. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099078
- 20 40. Meylan CM, Nosaka K, Green J, Cronin JB. Temporal and kinetic analysis of unilateral
21 jumping in the vertical, horizontal, and lateral directions. *J Sports Sci*. 2010;28(5):545-54.
22 doi:10.1080/02640411003628048
- 23 41. Hewitt JK, Cronin JB, Hume PA. Asymmetry in multi-directional jumping tasks. *Phys Ther*
24 *Sport*. 2012;13(4):238-42. doi:10.1016/j.ptsp.2011.12.003
- 25 42. Petushek EJ, Sugimoto D, Stoolmiller M, Smith G, Myer GD. Evidence-based best-practice
26 guidelines for preventing anterior cruciate ligament injuries in young female athletes: a systematic
27 review and meta-analysis. *Am J Sports Med*. 2019;47(7):1744-1753. doi:10.1177/0363546518782460
- 28 43. Read PJ, Oliver JL, Myer GD, De Ste Croix MBA, Belshaw A, Lloyd RS. Altered landing
29 mechanics are shown by male youth soccer players at different stages of maturation. *Phys Ther*
30 *Sport*. 2018;33:48-53. doi:10.1016/j.ptsp.2018.07.001
- 31 44. Gribble PA, Robinson RH. Alterations in knee kinematics and dynamic stability associated
32 with chronic ankle instability. *J Athl Train*. 2009;44(4):350-5. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-44.4.350
- 33 45. Ricotti L. Static and dynamic balance in young athletes. *J Hum Sport Exerc*. 2011;6(4):616-
34 628. doi:10.4100/jhse.2011.64.05
- 35 46. Faude O, Rössler R, Petushek EJ, Roth R, Zahner L, Donath L. Neuromuscular adaptations to
36 multimodal injury prevention programs in youth sports: a systematic review with meta-analysis of
37 randomized controlled trials. *Front Physiol*. 2017;8:791. doi:10.3389/fphys.2017.00791
- 38 47. Hakkinen K, Komi PV, Alen M. Effect of explosive type strength training on isometric force-
39 and relaxation-time, electromyographic and muscle fibre characteristics of leg extensor muscles.
40 *Acta Physiol Scand*. 1985;125(4):587-600. doi:10.1111/j.1748-1716.1985.tb07759.x

41

42

1 **STATEMENTS**

2 **Data availability statement**

3 Data are available from the authors upon reasonable request.

4

5 **Funding**

6 This work was supported by a matching scholarship between Sydney FC and the University of

7 Wollongong (Grant Reference Number: 3408923).

8

9 **ORCID iDs**

10	Stella Veith	Orcid.org/0000-0002-0094-2191
11	Matthew Whalan	Orcid.org/0000-0003-1532-7877
12	Sean Williams	Orcid.org/0000-0003-1460-0085
13	Steffi Colyer	Orcid.org/0000-0002-4973-6591
14	John Sampson	Orcid.org/0000-0002-6800-7757
15		

1 **TABLES**

2 **Table 1:**

3

4 Table 1: Height and body mass changes of players in the home group (HG) and training group (TG).

Time period	All (n = 65)	HG (n = 32)	TG (n = 33)
	Height (cm) Mean (95% CI)	Rate of growth (cm) Mean (95% CI)	
Nov – Jan	162.88 (159.73 to 166.02)	1.21 (0.96 to 1.45)	1.13 (0.88 to 1.38)
Jan – Apr	164.65 (161.57 to 167.73) *	1.78 (1.46 to 2.11)	1.58 (1.23 to 1.93)
Apr – Jul	166.40 (163.28 to 169.51) **	1.68 (1.38 to 1.99)	1.85 (1.57 to 2.12)
Jul – Sept	165.25 (161.79 to 168.70) **	0.73 (0.47 to 0.98)	0.67 (0.36 to 0.98)
	Body mass (kg) Mean (95% CI)	Rate of body mass (kg) Mean (95% CI)	
Nov – Jan	51.88 (49.05 to 54.70)	1.57 (1.01 to 2.13)	1.17 (0.81 to 1.54)
Jan – Apr	53.68 (50.75 to 56.60) *	1.68 (1.11 to 2.26)	1.12 (0.59 to 1.64)
Apr – Jul	55.29 (52.35 to 58.23) **	1.59 (1.08 to 2.11)	1.51 (0.93 to 2.08)
Jul – Sept	54.26 (50.62 to 57.90) **	0.92 (0.47 to 1.36)	1.11 (0.62 to 1.6)

5 * significant difference to Nov-Jan. ** significant difference to Nov-Jan and Jan-Apr.

6

7

8

1 **Table 2:**

2

3 Table 2: Time-loss (TL) and medical attention (MA) injuries collected in home (HG) and training groups
4 (TG) from November 2018 until September 2019.


Variable	HG (n = 33)	TG (n = 33)
No. of all TL + MA injuries	63	76
TL + MA Injury Incidence (95% CI)	13 (10.1 to 16.6)	15.6 (12.1 to 16.9)
No. of TL injuries (% of all injuries)	50 (79.4)	54 (71)
TL Injury burden (95% CI)	184.6 (172.9 to 197)	166.2 (155.2 to 178.1)
No. MA injuries (% of all injuries)	13 (20.6)	22 (29)
Mean days with MA injury (95% CI)	4.6 (0.5 to 8.6)	5.00 (1.6 to 8.4)

5

1 **FIGURES**

2 **Figure 1:**


3



4

5

1 **Figure 2:**




2

3

1 **Figure 3:**

2




3

4

1 **Figure 4:**

2



3

4

5

1 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

2 Figure 1: Diagram of the flow of participants in the study according to the Consolidated Standards of
3 Reporting Trials (CONSORT).

4 Figure 2: Timeline for the progression and delivery of 11+ exercises for the home group (HG) and
5 training group (TG). 'Level' refers to the difficulty level of Part 2 of the 11+. Adv = advanced. Beg =
6 Beginner. F = Familiarisation week.

7 Figure 3: Countermovement jump height recorded in home (HG, black lines and circles) and training
8 (TG, grey lines and triangles) groups. * significant difference to Baseline test. # significant difference
9 to Test 2.

10 Figure 4: Eccentric hamstring strength gains, controlled for rate of growth (ROG) in home (HG, black
11 lines and circles) and training (TG, grey lines and triangles) groups. * significant difference to Baseline
12 test. # significant difference to Test 1. { significant group × time interaction versus baseline.

13