

Document downloaded from the institutional repository of the University of Alcala: <u>https://ebuah.uah.es/dspace/</u>

This is a postprint version of the following published document:

Zapardiel, J.C. and Asín-Izquierdo, I. (2020) 'Conditional analysis of elite beach handball according to specific playing position through assessment with GPS', International journal of performance analysis in sport, 20(1), pp. 118–132. doi:10.1080/24748668.2020.1718458.

Available at https://doi.org/10.1080/24748668.2020.1718458.

© 2020 Cardiff Metropolitan University

(Article begins on next page)



This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

1	Title Page
2	Conditional analysis of elite beach handball according to specific playing position
3	through assessment with GPS
4	
5	Authors
6	Juan Carlos Zapardiel ^{1*} PhD; Iván Asín-Izquierdo ^{1*} MSc
7	*These authors contributed equally to this work
8	
9	Affiliations
10	1. Department of Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University
11	of Alcalá, Madrid, Spain
12	
13	Address for reprint requests / corresponding author:
14	Asín-Izquierdo, Iván
15	Department of Biomedical Sciences. Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences.
16	University of Alcalá, Madrid, Spain
17	Campus Científico-Tecnológico: Crta. de Madrid-Barcelona, Km. 33,600. Alcalá de Henares,
18	28871, Madrid, SPAIN
19	E-mail address: <u>ivanasizq@gmail.com</u> Telephone number: + 34 627526847
20	
21	Running heading: Conditional analysis of beach handball according to specific playing
22	position
23	
24	
25	

26 Abstract

Beach handball needs to continue to develop. For this reason, observational studies that analyze competitive demands are necessary. Therefore, our objective in this work was to carry out performance assessment of the beach handball players regarding specific playing positions during competition, without modifying the specific structure of the game. The study included 57 elite beach handball players. The results showed that significant differences were found in most of the variables studied when the specific playing positions were compared. Our work has led us to conclude that the assessment of the conditional demands of beach handball players in competition must be done considering the specific playing positions. Key words Sand, high competition, playing position, performance, beach handball, match.

51 Introduction

52 Beach handball is a relatively new sport that has achieved great growth and development in a 53 few years. The sport was created on the Island of Ponza (Italy) in 1992 (Pehrer, & Werkmeister, 54 2006) and in just twenty-six years it is already played on five continents, and constantly 55 expanding. A special scoring system in which spectacular goals, penalties and goalkeeper's 56 goals are awarded with two points, a playing field with rectangular areas, very ample 57 substitution areas and the tiebreaker set system, the shoot-out, make it a very attractive sport to 58 the spectator (Zapardiel, 2015).

59 This is a very demanding sport from a physical point of view mainly due to the rules of the 60 game and the game surface. This surface has to be made up of fine sand and must have a depth 61 of 40 cm (International Handball Federation, 2014). Each team is composed of four players 62 performing different functions both in the offensive and defensive game phase. In the offensive 63 phase, the participants are the specialist player (goalkeeper who leaves his goal), the wings and 64 the pivot. During the game, the wing can be replaced after the offensive phase or he can position 65 to defend (fixed wing). In turn, in the defensive phase, teams are usually made up of other players different from the ones taking part in the offensive phase because the regulations not 66 67 only allow an unlimited number of substitutions but also facilitate them making the substitution 68 area bigger. In this case, the defensive game is organised with the goalkeeper, the defense 69 centre, the defense right and the defense left.

Although beach handball is a little-studied sports specialty, the number of investigations has
recently increased in different fields (Bago, 2016; Bebetsos, 2012; Cruić, Vuleta, Bazzeo, &
Ohnjec, 2011; Lara, 2011; Morillo-Baro, 2016; Morillo-Baro, 2009; Morillo-Baro, &
Hernández-Mendo, 2015; Morillo-Baro, Reigal, & Hernández-Mendo, 2015; Pehrer, &
Werkmeister, 2006; Pueo, Jiménez-Olmedo, Penichet-Tomas, Ortega, & Espina, 2017;
Zapardiel, 2015; Zapardiel, Asín-Izquierdo, Moya, Lebrero, García, & Lozano, 2017;

Zapardiel, Lara, & Rodríguez, 2013). However, none of the investigations mentioned above has
had as main objective the conditional analysis of beach handball according to specific positions,
although there are big conditional differences depending on the post. San Pedro (2008) made a
performance assessment of the specialist player in beach handball but not of the rest of specific
positions.

81 The observation of the general conditional demands of beach handball has established 82 important requirements with a series of actions of constant high intensity (Pehrer and 83 Werkmeister, 2006). This series of actions, 6-7 s at high speed, has short recoveries, and almost 84 never homogeneous (Morillo-Baro, 2009), and they keep repeating during both 10-minute 85 halves of the match (International Handball Federation, 2014). Effort intensity during 86 competition ranges from vigorous to very vigorous during 70% of the playing time, taking the 87 heart rate as reference, which shows records that range between 80% and 83% of the maximum 88 heart rate when the ball is in play (Lara, 2011). In another study, where tests carried out on 89 beach sand with elite beach handball players (adapted Course-Navette and maximum speed 90 during 15 m), average values of blood lactate of 13.44 mmol/l were observed and anaerobic 91 glucolysis was determined as the main way of energy production in this sport (Bago, & Sáez, 92 2013).

Regarding game time, time-motion in beach handball players during competition has been
studied with GPS technology. An average active time during a 10-minute set resulted in 8.8
minutes and 9.3 minutes for male and female, respectively (Pueo et al., 2017). Other examples
of the time-motion measurement from a conditional assessment are beach tennis (Pérez, Prau,
& Santos, 2013), beach football (Castellano, & Casamichana, 2010) or handball (Michalsik, &
Aagaard, 2015; Wagner, Finkenzeller, Würth, & Duvillard, 2014).

Likewise, the distance covered by team sport players during competition has been studied, this
being one of the external load variables most used with GPS technology. Pueo et al. (2017)

determined that the distance travelled by high performance beach handball players during 10
minutes was 617 m for male and 559 m for female (Pueo et al., 2017). This distance has also
been measured in handball (Michalsik, & Aagaard, 2015; Póvoas, Seabra, Ascensão,
Magalhães, Soares, & Rebelo, 2012; Wagner, Finkenzeller, Würth, & Duvillard, 2014).

105 Another aspect measured in beach handball is the distance travelled in speed sections. Pueo et 106 al. (2017) observed that most of the distance covered in this sport oscillates between 0.5 y 13 107 km/h. In the case of beach football, almost half of the movement is done at speeds that ranging 108 between 0.1 and 0.4 km/h, and the rest of the movements between 0.4 and 13 km/h (Castellano, 109 & Casamichana, 2010). In the same line of observational study of the conditional demands of 110 beach handball, accelerations and decelerations (Pueo et al., 2017) as well as heart rate (Bago, 111 & Sáez, 2013; Lara, 2011; Pueo et al., 2017) have been measured. On the contrary, no beach 112 handball research assessing the physical condition in a global way has been found. However, it 113 has been found in other sports; in these cases, variables that relate load and time, a method to 114 quantify training load such as the training impulse (TRIMPs), a method to quantify the training 115 load in relation to heart rate and time with load intensity, or total player load have been used. 116 In all the studies related to conditional aspects of beach handball previously commented (Lara, 117 2011; Bago, & Saez, 2013; Pueo et al., 2017), beach soccer (Castellano, & Casamichana, 2010) 118 and in many others regarding handball (Corvino, Tessitore, Minganti, & Sibila, 2014; Corvino, 119 Vuleta, & Šibila, 2016; Dello-Iacono, Ardig, Meckel, & Padulo, 2016; Manchado, Tortosa-

Martínez, Vila, Ferragut, & Platen, 2013; Porostiaga, Pranados, Ibáñez, González-Badillo, & Izquierdo, 2006; Póvoas, at al., 2012), all players are assessed as a single group and not according to specific playing positions. In some cases, the game structure of the sport was modified in order to carry out the assessment (Pueo et al., 2017). Therefore, if our aim is to make an objective observation of the demands of the beach handball player, it must be done regarding specific playing positions and not modifying the structure of the game. Hence, our objective in this study is to carry out a conditional assessment of the beach handball player according to specific playing positions during competition using GPS technology and without modifying the structure of the game.

129 Materials and method

130 Sample

Twenty five male (mean age: 25.3 ± 4.8 yrs; body weight: 86.9 ± 9.5 kg; body height: 187.5 ± 7.4 cm) and thirty two female (mean age: 25.3 ± 4.8 yrs; body weight: 60.7 ± 3.8 kg; body height: 168 ± 3.8 cm) elite beach handball players were recruited for this study. All the players were observed during the pre-competition meetings prior to 2017 European Championship. They were also informed about the research protocol and they gave their written informed consent. The Ethics Committee at the University of Alcalá gave institutional approval to this study in accordance with the spirit of the Declaration of Helsinki.

138

 Table 1. Distribution of sample by sex, height, weight and age (±SD)

139 *Material*

140 To collect data, three receivers GPS (Global Positioning System) & GNSS (Global Navigation

Satellite System) OptimEye S5 Catapult Sport, 10Hz GPS, and inertial system were used: 3D Accelerometer 100Hz, 3D Pyroscope 100Hz, 3D magnetometer 10Hz. An automatically synchronized Polar system to monitor physiological data of heart rate was used. This tool is validated by research in a multitude of scientific studies (Johnston, Watsford, Kelly, Pine, & Spurrs, 2014; Luteberget, Holme, & Spencer, 2018; Nicolella, Torres-Ronda, Saylor, & Schelling, 2018).

147 Record sheets were used both for collecting individual data of players in each match and for 148 registering situational variables, as the result and playing times. All registers were collected by 149 just one researcher with over 25 years' experience in beach handball. In addition, all matches

150 were recorded with a SONY HDR-CX240 video camera to perform a subsequent review of	f the
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

151 recorded data.

152 Study variables

153 The variables used to assess the internal and external load at mechanical, neuromuscular,

- 154 cardiorespiratory and metabolic levels were (Edwards, 1993):
- Activity time: time in which the player exceeds the speed of 1 km/ h.
- *Total distance travelled:* metres travelled by a player.
- Velocity and velocity bands: player speed and time spent in each band previously assigned. Band 1: 1-5.9 km/h; band 2: 6-8.9 km/h; band 3: 9-11.9 km/h; band 4: 12-14.9 km/h; band 5: more than 15 km/h.
- *N accelerations and decelerations:* number of accelerations and decelerations measures
 by GPS.
- IMA ACCEL and IMA DECEL (>2.5 m/s): number of accelerations and decelerations
 higher than 2.5 m/s measured by accelerometer.
- *Total jump*: number of jumps made at any height measured by GPS.
- IMA Jump (>0.4 m): number of jumps higher than 40 centimeters measured by accelerometer.

167 • Beats per minute

- *TRIMPs*: assessment of workload intensity based on the relationship heart rate-activity
 time.
- Total Player Load (PL): assessment of load intensity through mathematical formula
 based on the data obtained by the accelerometer in all planes (Boyd, Ball, & Aughey,
 2011).
- *PL 1DUp%*: percentage of accelerations in the coronal plane over the total player load.
- *PL 1DFwd%*: percentage of accelerations in the sagittal plane over the total player load.
- *PL 1DSide%:* percentage of accelerations in the transverse plane over the total player
 load.
- 177 *Protocol*

Firstly, the technical staff of the selections was contacted to explain the research project and to
request the pertinent permission. Subsequently, the informed consent was sent to the players to
be signed.

Before the data collection, the players performed the relevant warm-up to play a beach handball match. During the warm-up, the players to whom the device was going to be placed were agreed with the selectors. They must be players who did not change their playing position during the 10 minutes of the measurement.

Five minutes before each game the chosen players were placed the heart rate bar, the vest and the device. After this and once the initial and individual situational data of the players were obtained, the exact time of start of the matches was noted. All variations in the scoreboard were recorded by time segments of two minutes. All games were recorded to certify the data collected. After finishing each game, the devices were removed. The matches were analysed separately.

191 Data were transferred every day to the Open Field tool of Catapult Sport for analysis.

192 Statistical analysis

193 Statistical analysis was carried out using SPSS software (version 22). A descriptive analysis of 194 the variables studied was carried out, using the Kolgomorov-Smirnov test to check normality. 195 Subsequently, the inferential analysis was carried out. The variables that followed normality 196 and that showed significance in the Levene test were studied with the Welch test; those that did 197 not show significance were studied with the ANOVA test. The variables that did not follow 198 normality were studied with the Kruskal-Wallis test. The Tukey test was used for the post hoc 199 tests of ANOVA; the test of Pames-Howell was used for the post hoc of Welch test; and the 200 Mann-Whitney U-test was used for the post hoc of Kruskal-Wallis test. A two-way ANOVA 201 (factor sex and position) was performed to compare differences in position between male and 202 female players and their interaction between these factors.

203 **Results**

The effects of sex and position on all variables are shown in Table 2. Significant position and interaction effects in distance, number accelerations, number decelerations, number of jumps, IMA jumps and total player load were found. The differences of these variables regarding the position can be attributed to the interaction of sexes.

208

Table 2. Effects of sex and position on all variables

209 Table 3 shows the activity time according to the specific playing position during a 10-minute 210 set (match set). In the general analysis regarding specific positions of women, statistically 211 significant differences were found (p < .001). In the detailed analysis, significant differences 212 were found between the fixed wing and the wing (p < .001), the defender (p = .004) and the 213 pivot (p = .001). In the general analysis between the specific positions of men, statistically 214 significant differences were found (p = .001). In the detailed analysis, statistically significant 215 differences were found between the pivot and the specialist (p = .028), the wing (p = .013), and 216 the fixed wing (p = .005), and between the fixed wing with the defender (p = .003).

217 On the other hand, in table 3, the distance travelled it is also showed according to the specific 218 playing position during a 10-minute set. In the general analysis between the specific positions 219 of women, statistically significant differences were found (p = .002). In the detailed analysis, 220 statistically significant differences were found between the fixed wing and wing (p = .001) and 221 the defender (p = .001). No significant differences were found between the specialist nor with 222 the wing (p = .414) nor with the pivot (p = .368), nor with the defender with the pivot (p = .368)223 .788). In the general analysis between the specific positions of men, statistically significant 224 differences were found (p = .000). In the detailed analysis, statistically significant differences 225 were found between the wing and the fixed wing (p = .016) and with the specialist (p = .010), 226 between the defender and the fixed wing (p = .004) and the pivot (p = .010). No significant 227 differences were found between the pivot and the wing (p = .114).

228 Finally, in table 3, the distance travelled it is showed in each previously assigned speed section. 229 This has been compared by specific positions. In the general analysis of women, statistically 230 significant differences were observed in all the speed sections, except for the speed section 231 greater than 15 km / h (p <.01). In the detailed analysis, significant differences occur between 232 the fixed wing and the rest of the specific posts (p < .01). In the general analysis of men, 233 statistically significant differences were observed in the speed section between 1 and 6 km / h 234 (p < .05). In the detailed analysis, significant differences can be seen between the specialist, the 235 wing and the fixed wing (p < .01).

In the general analysis of the maximum speed of women, statistically significant differences were observed (p = .003). In the detailed analysis, significant differences were found between the wing and the specialist (p = .009) and the fixed wing (p = .007). In the general analysis of the maximum speed of men, statistically significant differences were observed (p < .001). In the detailed analysis, there are differences between the specialist and the wing (p = .014) and the pivot (p < .001); between the wing and the fixed wing (p = .003); and between the fixed wing and the pivot (p = .003).

Table 3. Activity time (±SD), distance travelled (±SD), distance covered in speed sections and maximum speed
 (±SD) in a 10-minute set regarding specific position

Table 4 shows the total number of accelerations and decelerations performed in a 10- minute set depending on the specific position and measurements with GPS system and IMA system (inertial system).

The general analysis of GPS measurements of women showed statistically significant differences (p < .001) in accelerations and decelerations. In the detailed analysis of the number of accelerations, there were differences between the fixed wing and the specialist (p < .001), the wing (p < .001), the defender (p = .026) and the pivot (p = .018). In the detailed analysis of the number of decelerations, the differences existed between the fixed wing and the specialist (p < .001), the specialist (p < .001), the defender (p = .001) and the pivot (p < .005). In men, the general < .001), the wing (p = .001), the defender (p = .001) and the pivot (p < .005). In men, the general 254 analysis showed statistically significant differences (p < .001) in the three variables. In the 255 detailed analysis of the number of accelerations, the differences existed between the specialist 256 and the wing (p = .008) and the pivot (p = .006); and between the fixed wing and the wing (p = .008)257 .002), the pivot (p = .002) and the defender (p = .033). In the decelerations, the differences 258 existed between the specialist and the fixed wing (p = .004), the defender (p = .022) and the 259 pivot (p = .002); and between the fixed wing and the wing (p = .001), the defender (p = .003) 260 and the pivot (p < .001). In the jumps, differences were only found between the fixed wing and 261 the pivot (p = .001).

262 In the analysis with IMA, women did not show statistically significant differences in any of the 263 variables. In men, the general analysis showed significant differences in the decelerations (p = 264 .022), in the accelerations to the left (p = .008) and to the right (p = .009), and in the jumps (p265 =. 001). In the detailed analysis of the decelerations, significant differences were found between 266 the fixed wing and the specialist (p = .032) and the wing (p = .035); however, in the 267 accelerations to the right and left, differences were only found between the specialist and the 268 pivot (p = .001). In the jumps, the significant differences existed between the fixed wing and 269 the specialist (p = .007), the wing (p = .009), and the pivot (p = .025).

Table 4. Total number of accelerations, decelerations and jumps (± SD) depending on the specific position
 measured by GPS and IMA

Regarding internal load variables, Table 5 shows heart rate data depending on the specific 272 273 playing position. In the general analysis between the specific positions of women, statistically 274 significant differences were found in the minimum pulsations (p = .000), in the maximum (p = .000) .016) and in the average (p = .004). In the detailed analysis of the minimum heart rate, 275 276 statistically significant differences were found between the specialist and the fixed wing (p 277 <.001), the defender (p = .012), and the pivot (p <.001); between the wing and the fixed wing 278 (p < .001) and the pivot (p = .017), and between the fixed wing and the defender (p = .005). In 279 the detailed analysis of the average heart rate, statistically significant differences were only

found between the wing and the fixed wing (p = .009). In the detailed analysis of the average heart maximum, differences were only found between the fixed wing (p = .005) and the specialist, and the wing (p = .007).

In the general analysis by heart rate zones (> 80%) of women according to the specific positions, significant differences were only found in the 80-90% area, observing significant differences between the fixed wing and the specialist (p < .001), the wing (p < .001), the defender (p < .001) and the pivot (p = .002).

In the general analysis between the specific positions of men, only statistically significant differences were found in the minimum pulsations (p = .014). Neither in the maximum pulsations (p = .091) nor in the mean of the pulsations (p = .092) were significant differences found. In the detailed analysis of the minimum pulsations, only statistically significant differences were found for the wing with the fixed wing (p = .015) and with the pivot (p = .023). In the general analysis by heart rate zones according to the specific positions of men, no significant differences were found.

Table 5. Beats per minute (±SD) according to gender based on specific position

294

295 Finally, to assess the competitive load in beach handball, Table 6 shows the TRIMPs and the 296 different data of Player Load in a 10-minute set depending on the specific position. In women, 297 in the general analysis, significant differences were found in all the variables except in the 298 Player Load 1DSide%. In the detailed analysis of the TRIMPs we found significant differences 299 of the fixed wing with the specialist (p = .006) and with the wing (p = .020). In the detailed 300 analysis of the Total Player Load we found significant differences of the fixed wing with the 301 rest of the specific posts (p <.001). In the detailed analysis of the Player Load 1DUp% we only 302 found significant differences between the wing and the pivot (p = .001). On the other hand, in 303 a detailed analysis of the Player Load 1DFwd% we found significant differences between the 304 pivot and the wing (p = .002) and with the defender (p = .035).

305 In men, in the general analysis, significant differences were found in the Total Player Load (p 306 <.001), in the Player Load 1DUp% (p <.001), in the Player Load 1DFwd% (p =.001) and in 307 the Player Load 1DSide% (p <.001). In the detailed analysis of Total Player Load we found 308 significant differences between the specialist with the wing (p < .001), with the defender (p = .001)309 .001) and with the pivot (p < .001); and between the fixed wing with the wing (p < .001), with 310 the defender (p = .001) and with the pivot (p < .001). In the detailed analysis of Player Load 311 1DUp% we found significant differences between wing and the rest of the specific positions (p 312 <.001). In the detailed analysis of the Player Load 1DFwd%, we found differences between the 313 pivot and the wing (p = .024) and the fixed wing (p = .026). Finally, in the detailed analysis of 314 the Player Load 1DSide% we found significant differences of the specialist with the wing (p 315 <.001) and with the pivot (p = .002); and of the wing with the fixed wing (p = .008), with the 316 defender (p = .020) and with the pivot (p = .001).

317

Table 6. TRIMPs y Player Load (±SD) por sexo en función del puesto específico

318 **Discussion**

319 During the short history of beach handball, only research articles related to conditional demands 320 have been published, taking as a reference the means of the whole group. In no case have the 321 specific playing positions been taken into account. Our contribution to scientific knowledge has 322 been the conditional assessment of elite beach handball players according to specific positions. 323 With this article, we provide a series of data that should be the reference of the study of the 324 physical condition in the beach handball player. In most of the variables studied there have been 325 significant differences in both men and women. Therefore, the physical condition of the beach 326 handball player should be programmed in the most individualized way possible.

327 Currently, there is only one study that has assessed the conditional demands of beach handball 328 players with the GPS system (Pueo et al., 2017). In this article, the means of all the specific 329 positions were taken as a reference and although it will be the reference article of this 330 discussion, we will do it by comparing the means that we also found in our study. 331 Beach handball is a very particular sport in relation to activity time due to the continuous 332 substitutions of players that occur during a match. Pueo et al. (2017) found activity times of 8.8 333 minutes in men and of 9.3 in women in a ten-minute set. A great difference can be observed 334 with the data from our study where the highest average activity time was found in men with 6.1 335 minutes. The player who enjoys more activity time during a beach handball match is the one 336 who is not substituted, the fixed wing; in our study this player showed an activity time of 7.7 337 minutes, far from the average observed in the study by Pueo et al. (2017). The reason for this 338 difference is determined by the fact that players were not substituted during the match in Pueo 339 et al (2017). In other sports, we can observe the difference in this variable depending on the 340 play structure. In handball, the average active time in a 10-minute set is 8.9 minutes for men 341 and 8.4 for women (Michalsik, & Aagaard, 2015). In beach tennis, the average real playing 342 time over a 10-minute period is 2.1 minutes (Pérez, Prau, & Santos, 2013). What is really 343 remarkable about our study is that there are significant differences between several of the 344 specific playing positions; this has never been studied in beach handball before. In this sense, 345 we believe that if we want to make an objective assessment in this sport, valuations must always 346 be made regarding specific positions.

347 The distance travelled by team players during competition is one of the most widely used 348 external load variables with GPS technology. The sources consulted make a description of the 349 distances travelled and compare them with different sports, with sports played on different court 350 surfaces, with different assessment criteria and with assessment criteria that do not fit into the 351 game structure of the sport. Our proposal aimed at strictly respecting the game structure of 352 beach handball and, hence, the simple comparison of distances would not provide meaningful 353 data to the scientific field. Therefore, we carried out the comparison based on the activity time. 354 Under this premise, we can conclude that the studies by Pueo et al. (2017), Michalsik and 355 Aagaard (2015) and ours are very similar regarding the distance traveled by men in 1 minute of activity time, 70, 73 and 73 m·min⁻¹ respectively. In our study, women made 78 m·min⁻¹, 79 in Michalsik and Aagaard (2015) and 60 in Pueo et al. (2017). It should be noted that in the study by Michalsik and Aagaard (2015) the valued sport is handball that is practiced on a hard surface. On the same surface, beach soccer increases the distance travelled in 1 minute of activity time, 97.7 m·min⁻¹ (Castellano, & Casamichana, 2010). The explanation for this difference can be found in the dynamics of the beach soccer game in which long movement patterns without a ball are made in a larger field.

363 Another valued aspect in beach handball is the distance travelled in speed sections. Pueo et al. 364 (2017) observed that both men and women spent most of their active playing time between 365 walking and jogging. The same situation occurs in our study. Men are 56.8% of active time at 366 speeds between 1 and 6 km / h, and women 62.8% of active time. In beach soccer, there is the 367 highest activity time between these speeds, 70.1% in Castellano and Casamichana (2010), and 368 85.8% in Scarfone, Antonio, Carlo, Laura and Antonio (2015). Both in Pueo et al. (2017) and 369 in our study, beach handball players (men and women) are approximately 30% of the activity 370 time running. In beach soccer this time is reduced to 22% in Castellano and Casamichana (2010) 371 and 11.8% in Scarfone et al. (2015). In our study, men are running fast about 3% of their activity 372 time, as in Pueo et al. (2017), Castellano and Casamichana (2010) and Scarfone et al. (2015). 373 In the case of women, 2% both in Pueo et al. (2017) and in our study. As mentioned in previous 374 paragraphs, what is really remarkable is that in our study there are significant differences 375 between several of the specific playing positions. In both men and women, the fixed wing is 376 the player who is at speeds between 6 and 12 km/h most of the activity time. This data is 377 something that must be taken into account for individualized physical preparation. In our study, 378 the maximum speed was reached by the fixed wings in both men and women. The wings were 379 the ones with the lowest maximum speed, finding significant differences with the fixed wings 380 and the specialists. Women reached a maximum speed of 6.0 m/s and men of 7.1 m/s, a higher

381 speed than the data collected by Castellano and Casamichana (2010) in beach soccer players,
382 6.0 m/s.

383 The intensity of an activity can also be measured through the number of accelerations that occur 384 in this activity. In order to be able to compare with other sports that do not have the same 385 temporal structure as beach handball, we will adjust the number of accelerations to those 386 produced in one minute. Pueo et al. (2017) found that in a beach handball match there was an 387 average of 2.6 acc/min in men and 2.2 acc/min in women. In our study we found 18.4 acc/min 388 in men and 16.0 acc/min in women. When the accelerations were carried out above 2 m / s2, 389 the study by Pueo et al. (2017) showed 0.05 acc / min in women and 0.1 acc / min in men. In 390 our study, we found a higher number of accelerations, 0.24 acc / min in women and 0.44 acc / 391 min in men. The coincidence between both studies is found when we observe that in the two 392 studies accelerations above 2 m / s2 are twice as high in men as in women. In the study by 393 Pueo et al. (2017) the substitutions of players that are made in a beach handball match are not 394 made; for this reason, the observed differences can be justified since in the substitutions of 395 players there are accelerations and decelerations. We have not found any study of sports 396 accelerations that use the beach sand playing surface. In handball, Barbero, Pranda-Vera, 397 Calleja-González and Del Coso (2014) found 5.4 acc / min in men. In this study, the specific 398 playing positions were compared. In this sense, Barbero et al. (2014) did not find significant 399 differences in relation to the accelerations of the athletes. In our study of beach handball, we 400 did find significant differences between the different positions. This is justified by the different 401 playing structures of both sports.

402 Regarding the maximum heart rate, the results are lower than other studies of beach handball
403 (Pueo et al., 2017; Lara, 2011), as in other sports such as beach soccer where higher maximum
404 heart rate figures are found (Castellano, & Casamichana, 2010; Scarfone, et al., 2015). This
405 could be due to the fact that in our study the players made the frequent breaks that occur in the

406 official beach handball matches, something that differs from the rest of the studies because 407 either it was not considered in the studies of beach handball or the structure of game is different 408 in other sports. However, the average heart rate data are higher, although very similar to those 409 provided by other scientific studies in competition (Castellano, & Casamichana, 2010, 410 Scarfone, et al., 2015). Regarding the activity time in sections of heart rate percentage, we 411 obtained very similar times to those obtained in handball by Pueo et al. (2017), both in the 80-412 90% zone, and in the zone >90%); and inverse to those obtained in beach soccer (Castellano, 413 & Casamichana, 2010) with a large percentage of time in zone >90%.

The continuous substitutions taking place in official beach handball matches give the assessments made using GPS devices very special features. In spite of this, in the data collection of this study we wanted to reflect all the substitutions that occurred during an official match. Our decision was made based on reflecting everything that takes place in this type of matches as accurately as possible. To provide a more complete assessment of the internal load that occurs in a beach handball match, the variables TRIMPs and Player Load were also collected and analyzed.

In most of the variables studied in our work, significant differences were found between the different specific positions of beach handball, so we believe that it is necessary to make this type of assessment following this line, if we want it to be objective. It has already been done in other sports (Barbero et al., 2014; Dellal, Wong, Moalla, & Chamari, 2010; Di Salvo, Baron, Tschan, Montero, Bachl, & Pigozzi, 2007; Miñano, 2015; Zubillaga, Porospe, Hernandez, & Blanco, 2009) and the significance is marked by the structure of the sport and the type of variable studied.

428 Conclusions

Given the quality of the sample, we can ensure that the data obtained correctly represent theconditional information and competition profile of professional beach handball players. There

are significant differences in the conditional data of competition in beach handball players
according to sex; in addition, significant differences can be observed depending on the playing
position, both in men and women. Given the novelty of this research study, new studies of a
similar profile are necessary to determine the conditional structure and physiological response
of the beach handball player in competition, giving solidity to the data provided in this scientific
study.

437 *Practical applications*

This study has shown differences in the conditional assessment of the specific positions of elite beach handball players. This makes us understand that not all beach handball players have the same conditional needs to compete. Therefore, the conditional training of elite beach handball players should be focused on the development of physical abilities individually. This could lead to better performance of the athlete's energy system.

443 Lines for investigation

After observing the results obtained in this research project and verifying that scarce research of this type can be found in beach handball, it would be interesting to carry out more research in this aspect with the objective of establishing a foundation and being able to confirm a conditional profile of the professional beach handball player.

From that point, it will be interesting to assess the variation of the athlete's results in terms of different contextual and situational elements, such as model of game, rival, competition, result, etc. also being able to observe the data at different moments of the competition, as well as to determine all this in the different levels of performance of the beach handball player.

452

453 Acknowledgments

454 The authors have no acknowledgments to declare.

455 Declaration of interest statement

456 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

457

458 **References**

- 459 Bago, P. (2016). Efectos del entrenamiento pliométrico en arena seca sobre las variables
- 460 *determinantes del rendimiento en jugadores de balonmano playa.* (Doctoral Thesis).
- 461 Universidad Pablo Olavide, Sevilla, Andalucía.
- Bago, P., & Sáez, S. (2013). Effects of a multistage shuttle run 15 meters test on heart rate,
 lactate and rating of perceived exertion in beach handball players. *XVIII Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science*, Barcelona, España.
- Barbero, J.C., Pranda-Vera, J., Calleja-González, J., & Del Coso, J. (2014). Physical and
 physiological demands of elite team handball players. *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport, 14*(13), 921–933.
- 468 Bebetsos, P. (2012). *Beach handball from A to Z*. Basel: International Handball Federation.
- 469 Boyd, L. J., Ball, K., & Aughey, R. J. (2011). The reliability of MinimaxX accelerometers for
- 470 measuring physical activity in Australian football. *International Journal of Sports*471 *Physiology and Performance*, 6(3), 311-321.
- 472 Castellano, J., & Casamichana, D., (2010). Heart rate and motion analysis by GPS in beach
 473 soccer. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 9(1), 98–103.
- 474 Corvino, M., Tessitore, A., Minganti, C. and Sibila, M. (2014). Effect of court dimensions on
 475 players' external and internal load during small-sided handball games. *Journal of Sports*476 *Science and Medicine*, *13*(2), 297–303.
- 477 Corvino, M., Vuleta, D., & Šibila, M., (2016). Analysis of Load and Players Effort in 4vs4
 478 Small-Sided Handball Pames in Relation To Court Dimensions. *Kineziologija*, 48(2),
- 479 26–27.

- 480 Cruić, I., Vuleta, D., Bazzeo, M., & Ohnjec, K. (2011). Situational efficiency of teams in female
 481 part of tournament in the world beach handball championship in Cadiz. *Proceedings 6th*482 *International Scientific Conference on Kinesiology*, Opatija, Croatia, pp. 524–528.
- Dellal, A., Wong, D., Moalla, W., & Chamari, K. (2010). Physical and technical activity of
 soccer players in the French First League with special reference to their playing
 position. *International Sportmed Journal*, *11*(2), 278-290.
- 486 Dello-Iacono, A., Ardig, L.P., Meckel, Y., & Padulo, J. (2016). Effect of Small-Sided Pames
 487 and Repeated Shuffle Sprint Training on Physical Performance in Elite Handball
 488 Players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, *30*(3), 830–840.
- 489 Di Salvo, V., Baron, R., Tschan, H., Montero, F. J., Bachl, N., & Pigozzi, F. (2007).
- 490 Performance characteristics according to playing position in elite soccer. *International*491 *Journal of Sports Medicine*, 28(3), 222-227.
- 492 Edwards, S. (1993). *The heart rate monitor book*. New York: Polar CIC Inc.
- 493 International Handball Federation. (2014). *Rules of the game*. IHF: Basilea. Retrieved from
 494 <u>www.ihf.com</u>
- Johnston, R.J., Watsford, M.L., Kelly, S.J., Pine, M.J., & Spurrs, R.W. (2014). Validity and
 interunit reliability of 10 Hz and 15 Hz GPS units for assessing athlete movement
 demands. *J Strength Cond Res*, 28(6):1649-55.
- 498 Lara, D. (2011). La respuesta cardiaca durante la competición de balonmano playa femenino.
 499 *Apunts Medicina De L'Esport, 46*(171), 131-136.
- Luteberget, L.S., Holme, B.R., & Spencer, M. (2018). Reliability of Wearable Inertial
 Measurement Units to Measure Physical Activity in Team Handball. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform, 13*(4):467-473.

503	Manchado, C., Tortosa-martínez, J., Vila, H., Ferragut, C., & Platen, P. (2013). Performance
504	Factors in Women's Team Handball. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research,
505	27(6), 1708–1719.

- 506 Michalsik, L. B., & Aagaard, P. (2015). Physical demands in elite team handball: comparisons
 507 between male and female players. *The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*,
 508 55(9), 878–891.
- 509 Miñano, F.J. (2015). Análisis de la actividad física competitiva en jugadores de fútbol de un
 510 equipo de excelencia. (Doctoral Thesis). Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid,
 511 España.
- Morillo-Baro, J. P., & Hernández-Mendo, A. (2015). Análisis de la calidad del dato de un
 instrumento para la observación del ataque en balonmano playa. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología del Ejercicio y el Deporte, 10*(1), 15-22.

515 Morillo-Baro, J.P. (2009). *Balonmano Playa*. Sevilla: Wanceulen.

516 Morillo-Baro, J.P. (2016). Análisis observacional del ataque posicional en balonmano playa y

- 517 perfil psicosocial del jugador. (Doctoral Thesis). Universidad de Málaga, Málaga,
 518 Andalucía.
- Morillo-Baro, J.P., Reigal, R.E., & Hernández-Mendo, A. (2015). Análisis del ataque
 posicional de balonmano playa masculino y femenino mediante coordenadas polares.
- 521 *Revista Internacional de Ciencias del Deporte, 11*(41), 226-224.
- Nicolella, D.P., Torres-Ronda, L., Saylor, K.J., & Schelling, X. (2018). Validity and reliability
 of an accelerometer-based player tracking device. *PLoS One*, *13*(2), e0191823.
- 524 Pehrer, A., & Werkmeister, N. (2006). *Beach-Handball. Der Neue Sommersport*. Pöppingen:
 525 PA.

- 526 Pérez, J.A., Prau, D., & Santos, D. (2013). Performance analysis through the use of temporal
 527 activity patterns of elite players in beach tennis. *Journal of Human Sport and*528 *Exercise*, 8(3), S694-S701.
- 529 Porostiaga, S.M., Pranados, C., Ibáñez, J., González-Badillo, J.J., & Izquierdo, M. (2006).
 530 Effects of an entire season on physical fitness changes in elite male handball players.
 531 *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 38(2), 357–366.
- Póvoas, S.C.A., Seabra, A.F.T., Ascensão, A.M.R., Magalhães, J., Soares, J.M.C., & Rebelo,
 A.N.C. (2012). Physical and physiological demands of elite team handball. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 26(12), 3366–3376.
- 535 Pueo, B., Jimenez-Olmedo, J.M., Penichet-Tomas, A., Ortega, M., & Espina, J.J. (2017).
- Analysis of time-motion and heart rate in elite male and female beach handball. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, *16*(4), 450–458.
- San Pedro, J. M. (2008). Estudio monográfico del segundo portero de ataque en campeonato
 del mundo de balonmano playa Cádiz 2008. *Revista digital efdeportes*, *13*(*126*).
- Scarfone, R., Antonio, T., Carlo, M., Laura, C., & Antonio, A. (2015). Match analysis heartrate and CMJ of beach soccer players during amateur competition. *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport*, 15(1), 241–253.
- 543 Wagner, H., Finkenzeller, T., Würth, S., & Von Duvillard, S.P. (2014). Individual and team
 544 performance in team-handball: A review. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*,
 545 *13*(4), 808–816.
- 546 Zapardiel, J.C. (2015). Valoración isocinética de los músculos rotadores del complejo articular
 547 del hombro en jugadores de balonmano playa. (Doctoral Thesis). Alcalá de Henares,
 548 Madrid, España.

- 549 Zapardiel, J.C., Asín-Izquierdo, I., Moya, I., Lebrero, C., Parcía, D., & Lozano, D. (2017).
- Assessment of the satisfaction degree of beach handball practice in students of sports
 sciences. *EHF Scientific Conference*, Vienna, Austria.
- Zapardiel, J.C., Lara, D., & Rodríguez, M. L. (2013). Beach handball to improve jumping
 power. *EHF Scientific Conference*, Vienna, Austria.
- 554 Zubillaga, A., Porospe, P., Hernandez, A., & Blanco, A. (2009). *Comparative analysis of the*
- *high-intensity activity of soccer players in top level competition*. London: Routledge.

Table 1. Distribution of sample by sex, height, weight and age $(\pm SD)$

	Height (cm)	Weight (kg)	Age (years)
Female (n=32)	168.00 (3.86)	60.78 (3.87)	25,38 (4.82)
Male (n=25)	187.52 (7.48)	86.96 (9.53)	25.40 (3.26)

Table 2. Effects of sex and position on all variables

	Sex		Position		Interaction	
	F	р	F	р	F	р
Activity Time	14.2	.001	13.0	.000	3.8	.110
Distance	11.8	.001	19.8	.000	9.8	.000
N Accelerations	6.5	.014	14.1	.000	4.5	.003
N Decelerations	5.6	.022	14.1	.000	5.0	.002
IMA ACCEL(>2.5m/s)	2.0	.161	2.3	.072	.3	.828
IMA DECEL(>2.5m/s)	5.2	.026	4.9	.002	1.4	.219
N Jumps	20.5	.000	.8	.513	3.8	.009
IMA Jumps (>0.4m)	22.9	.000	10.9	.000	8.3	.000
Average Beats Per Minute	1.3	.256	5.1	.002	2.0	.107
TRIMPs	2.5	.115	9.1	.000	1.5	.202
Total Player Load	4.0	.045	27.9	.000	6.6	.000

N. accelerations: number of accelerations measured by PPS, N. decelerations: number of decelerations measured by PPS, IMA ACCEL(>2.5m/s): number of accelerations > 2.5 m/s measured by IMA, IMA DECEL(>2.5m/s): number of decelerations > 2.5 m/s measured by IMA, N Jumps: number of jumps measured by IMA, TRIMPs: assessment of workload intensity based on the relationship heart rate-activity time, Total Player Load: assessment of load intensity through mathematical formula based on the data obtained by the accelerometer in all planes

Table 3. Activity time (±SD), distance travelled (±SD), distance covered in speed sections and maximum speed

(+	SD) in a	10-minute	set regarding	specific	position
<u>(</u> -		10 1111000	Sec regarding	speenie	pobleon

						-	·
	SP	S (n=8)	W (n=6)	FW (n=7)	P (n=4)	D (n=7)	<i>X</i> (n=32)
	AT (min)	5.3 (2,1)	2.9 (1.1)	7.7 (1.3)	3.0 (1.7)	4.2 (1.0)	4.8 (2.3)
	Distance (m)	317.8(100.3)	292.7 (29.2)	630.1 (66.8)	286.7 (7.1)	282.1 (102.7)	369.7 (158.4)
	Distance (m) 1-6 km/h	168.8 (55.5)	139.0 (59.7)	370.0 (23.5)	256.7 (9.3)	177.5 (71.2)	220.1 (99.8)
F	Distance (m) 6-9 km/h	67.4 (25.6)	62.9 (16.4)	136.4 (34.1)	14.6 (17.2)	56.3 (21.9)	72.6 (44.4)
Ľ	Distance (m) 9-12 km/h	31.1 (17.3)	23.9 (4.9)	71.0 (39.0)	1.8 (3.6)	17.0 (9.9)	31.7 (30.1)
	Distance (m) 12-15 km/h	13.1 (11.5)	23.5 (16.3)	13.2 (10.4)	.0 (.0)	1.0 (1.5)	10.8 (12.8)
	Distance (m) +15 km/h	1.6 (1.7)	2.3 (2.5)	1.6 (2.6)	.0 (.0)	1.3 (1.5)	1.2 (1.9)
	Maximum speed (m/s)	5.7 (1.0)	3.9 (0.5)	6.6 (1.0)	4.6 (0.1)	4.6 (1.0)	5.1 (0.1)
	SP	S (n=6)	W (n=4)	FW (n=5)	P (n=4)	D (n=6)	\overline{X} (n=25)
	AT (min)	6.7 (0.4)	7.1 (1.8)	7.6 (0.9)	4.3 (0.4)	4.8 (0.4)	6.1 (1.5)
	Distance (m)	607.6(103.2)	310.8 (19.5)	597.3 (86.3)	284.1 (6.7)	354.8 (25.5)	445.6 (156.3)
	Distance (m) 1-6 km/h	412.6 (121.9)	141.7 (67.8)	354.1 (85.9)	256.3 (30.1)	237.7 (65.5)	290.6 (122.2)
м	Distance (m) 6-9 km/h	88.7 (59.2)	49.2 (±9.9)	104.0 (50.8)	16.4 (19.7)	58.0 (40.6)	66.5 (49.6)
IVI	Distance (m) 9-12 km/h	55.8 (54.0)	21.4 (8.1)	74.0 (43.9)	4.9 (9.8)	58.0 (40.6)	38.0 (40.6)
	Distance (m) 12-15 km/h	9.0 (12.6)	15.0 (14.0)	21.2 (13.1)	1.5 (2.7)	.0 (.0)	9.1 (12.3)
	Distance (m) +15 km/h	.0 (.0)	2.3 (2.6)	2.5 (5.1)	.0 (.0)	.0 (.0)	.8 (2.5)
	Maximum speed (m/s)	6.5 (0.3)	3.6 (0,7)	7.1 (0.6)	4.7 (0.2)	5.7 (0.7)	5.7 (1.2)

F: female, M: male, PP: playing position, AT: activity time, S: specialist, W: wing, FW: fixed wing, P: pivot, D: defender, \overline{X} : sample average

 Table 4. Total number of accelerations, decelerations and jumps (±SD) depending on the specific position

 measured by GPS and IMA

_	PP	S (n=8)	W (n=6)	FW (n=7)	P (n=4)	D (n=7)	\overline{X} (n=32)
_	N Accelerations	151.6 (41.8)	146.0 (67.9)	233.1 (20.7)	144.0 (23.5)	160.7 (41.4)	169.4 (52.5)
_	N Decelerations	132.0 (38.5)	128.0 (57.3)	230.4 (21.6)	133.7 (14.4)	137.7 (46.4)	154.2 (55.3)
F	IMA ACCEL(>2.5m/s)	2.1 (2.7)	3.5 (2.5)	3.1 (4.9)	3.2 (1.5)	.7 (1.2)	2.4 (2.9)
	IMA DECEL(>2.5m/s)	1.2 (1.5)	2.6 (1.8)	2.8 (2.8)	2.7 (1.8)	2.1 (2.1)	2.2 (2.0)
_	IMA COD L (>2.5m/s)	1.8 (2.1)	2.6 (1.8)	4.4 (5.7)	2.5 (1.2)	2.2 (2.6)	2.7 (3.2)
_	IMA COD R (>2.5m/s)	1.7 (1.9)	2.6 (1.8)	5.1 (5.1)	3.5 (.9)	2.2 (3.3)	3.0 (3.2)
	N Jumps	1.3 (1.7)	3.6 (2.9)	3.1 (3.2)	3.5 (.5)	1.8 (2.3)	2.5 (2.4)
	IMA Jumps (>0.4m)	.0 (.0)	.0 (.0)	.4 (.7)	1.0 (.0)	.2 (.7)	.2 (.5)
	• • • •						
	PP	S (n=6)	W (n=4)	FW (n=5)	P (n=4)	D (n=6)	\overline{X} (n=25)
-	PP N Accelerations	S (n=6) 235.5 (41.1)	W (n=4) 146.0 (71.5)	FW (n=5) 254.0 (12.9)	P (n=4) 144.0 (32.5)	D (n=6) 184.6 (15.8)	X (n=25) 198.0 (55.3)
-	PP N Accelerations N Decelerations	S (n=6) 235.5 (41.1) 223.8 (44.4)	W (n=4) 146.0 (71.5) 132.5 (60.0)	FW (n=5) 254.0 (12.9) 244.4 (21.1)	P (n=4) 144.0 (32.5) 126.0 (18.4)	D (n=6) 184.6 (15.8) 157.1 (12.6)	$\overline{X} (n=25)$ 198.0 (55.3) 181.6 (57.4)
M	PP N Accelerations N Decelerations IMA ACCEL(>2.5m/s)	S (n=6) 235.5 (41.1) 223.8 (44.4) 5.1 (2.4)	W (n=4) 146.0 (71.5) 132.5 (60.0) 3.7 (2.0)	FW (n=5) 254.0 (12.9) 244.4 (21.1) 5.2 (2.5)	P (n=4) 144.0 (32.5) 126.0 (18.4) 3.7 (1.1)	D (n=6) 184.6 (15.8) 157.1 (12.6) 3.8 (1.7)	\$\overline{X}\$ (n=25) 198.0 (55.3) 181.6 (57.4) 4.4 (2.0)
- M-	PP N Accelerations N Decelerations IMA ACCEL(>2.5m/s) IMA DECEL(>2.5m/s)	S (n=6) 235.5 (41.1) 223.8 (44.4) 5.1 (2.4) 2.0 (1.0)	W (n=4) 146.0 (71.5) 132.5 (60.0) 3.7 (2.0) 2.5 (1.7)	FW (n=5) 254.0 (12.9) 244.4 (21.1) 5.2 (2.5) 11.2 (4.2)	P (n=4) 144.0 (32.5) 126.0 (18.4) 3.7 (1.1) 2.7 (0.5)	D (n=6) 184.6 (15.8) 157.1 (12.6) 3.8 (1.7) 3.6 (2.3)	$\overline{X} (n=25)$ 198.0 (55.3) 181.6 (57.4) 4.4 (2.0) 4.4 (4.1)
	PP N Accelerations N Decelerations IMA ACCEL(>2.5m/s) IMA DECEL(>2.5m/s) IMA COD L (>2.5m/s)	S (n=6) 235.5 (41.1) 223.8 (44.4) 5.1 (2.4) 2.0 (1.0) 6.6 (2.1)	W (n=4) 146.0 (71.5) 132.5 (60.0) 3.7 (2.0) 2.5 (1.7) 2.2 (2.0)	FW (n=5) 254.0 (12.9) 244.4 (21.1) 5.2 (2.5) 11.2 (4.2) 6.6 (3.7)	P (n=4) 144.0 (32.5) 126.0 (18.4) 3.7 (1.1) 2.7 (0.5) 2.2 (.5)	D (n=6) 184.6 (15.8) 157.1 (12.6) 3.8 (1.7) 3.6 (2.3) 4.1 (1.4)	$\overline{X} (n=25)$ 198.0 (55.3) 181.6 (57.4) 4.4 (2.0) 4.4 (4.1) 4.6 (2.8)
	PP N Accelerations N Decelerations IMA ACCEL(>2.5m/s) IMA DECEL(>2.5m/s) IMA COD L (>2.5m/s) IMA COD R (>2.5m/s)	S (n=6) 235.5 (41.1) 223.8 (44.4) 5.1 (2.4) 2.0 (1.0) 6.6 (2.1) 6.1 (1.1)	W (n=4) 146.0 (71.5) 132.5 (60.0) 3.7 (2.0) 2.5 (1.7) 2.2 (2.0) 2.5 (1.7)	FW (n=5) 254.0 (12.9) 244.4 (21.1) 5.2 (2.5) 11.2 (4.2) 6.6 (3.7) 6.6 (2.6)	P (n=4) 144.0 (32.5) 126.0 (18.4) 3.7 (1.1) 2.7 (0.5) 2.2 (.5) 3.7 (.9)	D (n=6) 184.6 (15.8) 157.1 (12.6) 3.8 (1.7) 3.6 (2.3) 4.1 (1.4) 5.0 (0.8)	$\overline{X} (n=25)$ 198.0 (55.3) 181.6 (57.4) 4.4 (2.0) 4.4 (4.1) 4.6 (2.8) 5.0 (2.0)
M-	PP N Accelerations N Decelerations IMA ACCEL(>2.5m/s) IMA DECEL(>2.5m/s) IMA COD L (>2.5m/s) IMA COD R (>2.5m/s) N Jumps	S (n=6) 235.5 (41.1) 223.8 (44.4) 5.1 (2.4) 2.0 (1.0) 6.6 (2.1) 6.1 (1.1) 7.1 (2.2)	W (n=4) 146.0 (71.5) 132.5 (60.0) 3.7 (2.0) 2.5 (1.7) 2.2 (2.0) 2.5 (1.7) 3.2 (3.2)	FW (n=5) 254.0 (12.9) 244.4 (21.1) 5.2 (2.5) 11.2 (4.2) 6.6 (3.7) 6.6 (2.6) 7.0 (.7)	P (n=4) 144.0 (32.5) 126.0 (18.4) 3.7 (1.1) 2.7 (0.5) 2.2 (.5) 3.7 (.9) 3.7 (.5)	D (n=6) 184.6 (15.8) 157.1 (12.6) 3.8 (1.7) 3.6 (2.3) 4.1 (1.4) 5.0 (0.8) 6.3 (1.9)	$\overline{X} (n=25)$ 198.0 (55.3) 181.6 (57.4) 4.4 (2.0) 4.4 (4.1) 4.6 (2.8) 5.0 (2.0) 5.7 (2.4)

PP: playing position, F: female, M: male, S: specialist, W: wing, FW: fixed wing, P: pivot, D: defender, \overline{X} : sample average, N. accelerations: number of accelerations measured by PPS, NA ACCEL(>2.5m/s): number of accelerations > 2.5 m/s measured by IMA, IMA DECEL(>2.5m/s): number of accelerations to the left >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, IMA COD L (>2.5m/s): number of accelerations to the left >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, IMA COD R (>2.5m/s): number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA, NJ umps: number of accelerations to the right >2.5 m/s measured by IMA (NJ umps) = 0.4 m/s measure

	PP	S (n=8)	W (n=6)	FW (n=7)	P (n=4)	D (n=7)	\overline{X} (n=32)
	Minimum (bpm)	96.3 (9.4)	108.7 (15.1)	147.4 (14.7)	137.5 (6.4)	120.2 (16.1)	120.2 (22.9)
	Maximun (bpm)	164.1(15.2)	147.8 (17.2)	174.9 (7.6)	160.1 (10.8)	168.8 (15.1)	163.9 (15.5)
F	Average (bpm)	134.3 (14.5)	133.1 (18.7)	163.6 (10.9)	151.3 (12.7)	144.1 (17.4)	144.7 (18.1)
	80-90% (min)	1.7 (1.2)	2.1 (2.0)	7.4 (1.8)	3.2 (0.3)	3.2 (1.5)	3.6 (2.6)
	>90% (min)	.26 (.31)	.01 (.03)	.62 (.81)	.02 (.05)	.74 (.10)	.37 (.66)
	PP	S (n=6)	W (n=4)	FW (n=5)	P (n=4)	D (n=6)	\overline{X} (n=25)
	Minimum (bpm)	129.4 (11.8)	114.3 (5.1)	137.1 (11.3)	136.9 (5.7)	125.9 (10.2)	128.9 (11.7)
	Maximun (bpm)	169.1 (7.3)	154.3 (10.1)	171.8 (11.3)	160.3 (1.5)	162.9 (12.7)	164.4 (10.8)
Μ	Average (bpm)	153.6 (10.4)	139.2 (9.3)	155.4 (10.9)	151.1 (5.5)	146.8 (7.9)	149.6 (9.9)
	80-90% (min)	4.8 (2.5)	2.2 (2.4)	5.5 (3.8)	3.1 (0.9)	2.1 (2.0)	3.6 (2.7)
	>90% (min)	.14 (.22)	.15 (.31)	.12 (.17)	.00. 00.	.10 (.26)	.11 (.21)

Table 5. Beats per minute $(\pm SD)$ according to gender based on specific position

PP: playing position, F: female, M: male, S: specialist, W: wing, FW: fixed wing, P: pivot, D: defender: \overline{X} : sample, average, BPM: beats per minute

	PP	S (n=8)	W (n=6)	FW (n=7)	P (n=4)	D (n=7)	\overline{X} (n=32)
	TRIMPs	23.5 (8.0)	18.8 (10.1)	38.7 (4.6)	33.8 (2.1)	28.9 (9.7)	28.4 (10.2)
-	Total PL	36.3 (10.3)	33.6 (6.4)	71.6 (10.9)	30.5 (3.3)	40.7 (15.3)	43.8 (18.2
F	PL 1DUp%	41.2 (3.2)	38.9 (.4)	42.9 (3.3)	43.3 (.9)	38.6 (2.0)	40.8 (3.0)
-	PL 1DFwd%	27.5 (2.2)	28.0 (.5)	27.0 (2.5)	25.5 (.5)	29.7 (2.8)	27.7 (2.3)
-	PL 1DSide%	31.1 (1.8)	32.7 (.6)	30.0 (1.2)	31.1 (.3)	31.5 (2.2)	31.2 (1.7)
	РР	S (n=6)	W (n=4)	FW (n=5)	P (n=4)	D (n=6)	\overline{X} (n=25)
	TRIMPs	36.2 (6.3)	18.9 (11.8)	38.6 (9.6)	34.0 (2.2)	33.0 (4.9)	32.8 (9.4)
-	Total PL	66.0 (13.0)	32.3 (6.6)	67.2 (6.1)	30.3 (1.9)	43.5 (6.2)	49.7 (17.5
M	PL 1DUp%	44.1 (1.0)	38.7 (.8)	42.9 (1.0)	43.3 (.4)	43.0 (.7)	42.6 (1.9)
-	PL 1DFwd%	27.3 (1.7)	27.9 (.7)	27.9 (1.0)	25.5 (.5)	26.8 (1.9)	27.1 (1.5)
-	PL 1DSide%	28.5 (.7)	33.1 (.3)	29.1 (1.2)	30.9 (.1)	30.1 (1.4)	30.1 (1.8)
playing playin	position, F: female, M: male, heart rate-activity time, Total F ons in the coronal plane over the tress plane over the total player	, S: specialist, W: wing, I PL: assessment of load inter e total player load, PL 1DF	W: fixed wing, P: pivo nsity through mathematic wd%: percentage of acce	t, D: defender, \overline{X} : samp cal formula based on the elerations in the sagittal p	ble, average, TRIMPs: data obtained by the ac- lane over the total play	assessment of workloa celerometer in all planes er load, PL 1DSide%: pe	d intensity based o , PL 1DUp%: perce prcentage of acceler

Table 6. TRIMPs y Player Load (±SD) por sexo en función del puesto específico