Organised chaos in late specialisation team sports: Weekly training loads of elite adolescent rugby union players participating with multiple teams

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to quantify the mean weekly training load (TL) of elite adolescent rugby union players participating in multiple teams, and examine the differences between playing positions. Twenty elite male adolescent rugby union players (17.4 ± 0.7 years) were recruited from a regional academy and categorised by playing position; forwards (n=10) and backs (n=10). Global positioning system and accelerometer microtechnology was used to quantify external TL, and session-rating of perceived exertion (sRPE) was used to quantify internal TL during all sessions throughout a 10-week in-season period. A total of 97 complete observations (5 ± 3 weeks per participant) were analysed, and differences between-positions were assessed using Cohen's *d* effect sizes (*ES*) and magnitude-based inferences. Mean weekly sRPE was 1217 ± 364 AU (between-subject coefficient of variation (CV) = 30%), with a total distance (TD) of 11629 ± 3445 m (CV= 30%), and PlayerLoad^{TM} (PL) of 1124 ± 330 AU (CV= 29%). Within-subject CV ranged between 5-78% for sRPE, 24-82% for TD, and 19-84% for PL. Mean TD (13063 ± 3933 vs. 10195 ± 2242 m), and PL (1246 ± 345 vs. 1002 ± 279 AU) were both *likely* greater for backs compared to forwards (moderate *ES*), however differences in sRPE were *unclear* (small *ES*). Although mean internal TLs and volumes were low, external TLs were higher than previously reported during pre-season and in-season periods in senior professional players. Additionally, the large between-subject and within-subject variation in weekly TL suggests players participate in a chaotic training system.

Keywords: Athlete Monitoring, Workload, Youth, Football

INTRODUCTION

The monitoring of training load has become increasingly popular with coaches and support staff due to its' relationships with performance, injury and illness (22). The quantification and management of training loads can be challenging, especially in late specialisation team sport athletes (30). This is due to the complexity of playing and training programmes (i.e., concurrent participation within multiple teams supervised by multiple coaches) (23,29). When athletes train with multiple teams at various training locations simultaneously, it is unlikely that practitioners can be present at every session to monitor training loads of their respective athletes. Recently, there has been a call for a coordinated and systematic approach for training load monitoring in adolescent athletes via the use of objective quantification tools such as global positioning systems (GPS) (2). The addition of a subjective global measure of training load (e.g., session-rating of perceived exertion (sRPE)) may also offer further insight into the internal training loads of these athletes, as a single measure (e.g., GPS only) may not adequately represent the complete demands of training (40). The use of sRPE can be used to provide a measure of global training load as it can be used across all modes of training, unlike GPS measures which are limited to field-based training (10). The quantification of the external (e.g., stimulus applied to the athlete; distance covered or weight lifted) and internal (e.g., individual response to the stimulus; heart rate or rating of perceived exertion (RPE)) training load would provide a more comprehensive insight into the overall demands of training (3,22).

In England, participation in rugby union is the highest in the world (17), although little is known about the training loads of adolescent rugby union players. In English rugby union, players participate with numerous teams (i.e., school, club, representative) supervised by multiple coaches concurrently, as players are not contracted to a single organisation until they finish school (e.g., post 18 years of age). Monitoring and understanding adolescent rugby union players' workloads are important to provide an evidence base, whereby training and match exposures can be manipulated to maximise positive training outcomes (e.g. athletic and skill development) and minimise negative effects (e.g. illness, injury, non-functional overreaching and overtraining) (7,21,24). In the absence of evidence evaluating the load players are exposed to, it would be difficult for practitioners and coaches to make informed decisions on whether players are participating in excessive or insufficient training.

Training volumes in English youth rugby union players has been shown to be higher in academy players (190 hours per season) compared to schoolboy players (72 hours per season), although no data were reported for mean weekly values (28). Sub-elite English adolescent rugby union players have been found to have median (interquartile range) weekly sRPE loads of 1014 (1016) AU (39), although values in players competing at a higher playing standard (e.g., academy) or at multiple playing standards are yet to be determined. A range of weekly training and match-play volumes of between 370-515 minutes have been reported in Australian adolescent rugby union players, depending on playing standard (23). However, the quantification of these values were obtained using self-reported weekly training diaries; a method which has recently been demonstrated to have a poor typical error of the estimate for recall of training duration (i.e., minutes; 30%) and intensity (i.e., RPE; 26%) (30). Although there are no objective data available on the accumulated weekly workloads in adolescent rugby union, during a typical field-based training session, under-18 players have been shown to cover distances of 2925-4176 m measured using GPS, with sRPE loads of 168-236 AU, depending on the playing standard (29). Despite information available on mean field-based session loads (29), the typical load accumulated within a week (including rugby-specific, strength and conditioning, and other organised and recreational activity loads) would provide a better indication of the overall training load in adolescent rugby union players.

Rugby union has two distinct positional groups, categorized based on their roles within a match; forwards and backs (15,33,34). To date, there are no data available on the differences in weekly training loads between forward and back playing positions in adolescent players, which have been previously shown to differ in senior professional training (6). Understanding position specific training loads can support the practitioner in (potentially) modifying loads for specific groups of players. During the in-season, senior professional backs have been shown to cover greater total distances compared to forwards, although no significant differences in mean weekly sRPE loads were found (6). A previous study in Australian adolescent rugby union players found no significant differences in mean training session demands between forwards and backs (25). Although, the authors acknowledged that because positional demands have been consistently observed in the senior game, a position-specific approach should be implemented in the adolescent game to adequately prepare players for progression in the sport (25).

As both insufficient and excessive workloads may negatively impact athletic development, injury risk, playing progression, and general wellbeing (1,21,24), a greater understanding of the accumulated training load within a training week would help coaches and practitioners to maximise athletic development and reduce the risk of negative training outcomes. Thus, the primary aim of this study was to quantify the mean weekly internal (i.e., sRPE) and external (i.e., GPS and accelerometer) training loads of elite adolescent rugby union players, participating within multiple environments, and the variability of these loads. A secondary aim of this study was to compare the mean weekly training loads between playing positions.

METHODS

Experimental Approach to the Problem

In the prospective cohort study design, each subject was monitored over a 10 week in-season period to quantify the mean weekly subjective and objective training loads, excluding match-play. Training load is a modifiable risk factor for injury (12), as it can be directly influenced by coaches, and thus only training loads were analysed in this study. Match-play loads in adolescent rugby union players are well established (14,33,34) but are not easily influenced by coaches (with the exception of selection and playing time), and therefore were excluded from the analyses. As weeks with multiple matches may reduce overall training volume and frequency, only single-match weeks with no missing data were included for analyses in this study. Training practices were not interfered with by the researchers at any time. Data were collected mid-season (October-December) to standardise observations for stage in the competitive season where players may be participating with school, club, regional academy and representative squads concurrently. A total of 97 complete weekly observations (5 ± 3 weeks per participant) were included in the final analyses.

Subjects

Twenty male elite adolescent rugby union players from a regional academy squad in England were recruited for this prospective study. Subjects also concurrently participated in training sessions and represented their respective independent schools, and amateur clubs. Subjects were categorised into two groups depending on their respective playing position; forwards (*n*=10; age, 17.4 ± 0.7 years; stature, 186.8 ± 6.5 cm; body mass, 96.0 ± 9.0 kg; maximal sprint velocity (Vmax), 8.2 ± 0.4 $m \cdot s^{-1}$), and backs (*n*=10; age, 17.3 ± 0.7 years; stature, 180.7 ± 5.5 cm; body mass, 83.1 ± 9.9 kg; Vmax, 8.7 ± 0.3 $m \cdot s^{-1}$). All subjects and parents provided written informed consent prior to participation and ethics approval was granted by the institutional research ethics committee.

Procedures

To quantify external training loads, each subject was provided with a microtechnology unit (Optimeye S5, Catapult Innovations, Melbourne, Australia) equipped with GPS and tri-axial accelerometer, and a tight fitting custom-made vest to allow the units to be placed on the upper back between the scapulae. All subjects wore the same microtechnology units throughout the data collection period. The validity and reliability of these units have been previously reported (4,38). The error of measurement (i.e., coefficient of variation (CV)) for 10 Hz GPS units have been reported as 8.3, 4.3, and 3.1% for velocities between 1-3, 3-5, and 5-8 $m \cdot s^{-1}$, respectively, with the between-unit reliability at the same velocities as 5.3, 3.5, and 2.0% (38). The accelerometers have also been shown to have an acceptable CV for within- (0.9-1.1%) and between-unit (1.0-1.1%) reliability (4). The mean ± standard deviation (SD) of satellites connected was 14.6 ± 0.7 and horizontal dilution of precision was 0.64 ± 0.08 during data collection. Prior to any observations, each subject completed a familiarisation session wearing the microtechnology unit and completed two 40 m sprints to measure Vmax. The Vmax value used in the final analysis was taken as the highest speed reached during either sprint effort in the familiarisation trial, or during any training session during the data collection period. To quantify locomotor loads, GPS metrics (total distance (TD), low speed activity distance (LSA; m <61% Vmax), high speed running distance (HSR; m ≥61% Vmax), very high speed running distance (VHSR; m ≥90% Vmax), and peak velocity (Vpeak)) (9) were recorded for all rugby training sessions. As backs are commonly reported as faster than forwards (13,18,35), and due to potential large within- and between-positional group differences in Vmax, individualised thresholds for running demands were used in this study. Tri-axial accelerometer measures (PlayerLoad™ (PL), and PLslow (PL <2 $m \cdot s^{-1}$)), representing accumulated accelerations in the anteroposterior, mediolateral and vertical planes, were recorded to quantify global and low-velocity physical loads, as these metrics have been related to collision-based activity in rugby union (37). At the end of each week, all recorded microtechnology data were downloaded to the manufacturer's software (Sprint 5.1.4, Catapult Innovations, Melbourne, Australia). Once downloaded, all data were cropped so that only training time (including warm-up and cool-down), as recorded by the daily training load questionnaires, were included.

To quantify internal training loads, sRPE was calculated from a self-reported online daily training load questionnaire for all training activities, recently shown to be valid (typical error of the estimate = 4.3%) (30). Frequency, intensity, time and type of all training activities were recorded with a self-reported daily training load questionnaire (30). RPE was selected from a drop-down menu corresponding with the text descriptors from a modified Borg category ratio-10 scale (16). Training time was recorded to the nearest minute of duration, which was subsequently multiplied by the corresponding RPE weighting to provide sRPE values. Activity types were categorised as rugby training (e.g. rugby field training, individual and team skills training, and captain's runs), gym training (e.g. resistance training, prehabilitation, and rehabilitation sessions), and other training/activity (e.g. field and gym-based conditioning, other organised sport/exercise and recreational exercise/activities).

Statistical Analyses

Mean weekly training load were calculated from individual subject means from their respective weekly sessions to control for multiple and uneven observations (41). Descriptive statistics were used to present the mean, SD, minimum, maximum, range and CV of the overall group data. All data were log-transformed prior to effect size and magnitude-based inference (MBI) analyses to reduce bias associated with non-uniformity error. To assess the magnitude of between-position differences, Cohen's *d* effect sizes (*ES*) were calculated with threshold values set at <0.2 (*trivial*), 0.2-0.6 (*small*), 0.6-1.2 (*moderate*), 1.2-2.0 (*large*) and ≥2.0 (*very large*) (26). To assess for practical significance, MBI analysis was used with the threshold for a change to be considered practically important (the smallest practical difference; SPD) set at 0.2 x between subject SD, based on Cohen's *d ES* principle (26). The probability that the magnitude of difference was greater than the SPD was rated as 25-75%, *possibly*; 75-95%, *likely*; 95-99.5%, *very likely*; >99.5%, *almost certainly* (26). Where the 90% confidence interval (CI) crossed both the upper and lower boundaries of the SPD (*ES* ± 0.2), the magnitude of difference was described as *unclear* (26).

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the mean ± SD, minimum, maximum, and between-subject CV of weekly training volumes, internal, and external loads of adolescent rugby union players. Table 2 presents the individual range and within-subject CV of weekly training load measures.

***** INSERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE *****

***** INSERT TABLE 2 NEAR HERE *****

Figure 1 presents the mean ± SD and between-group differences (Cohen's *d* ES (90% CI); MBI) in mean weekly internal and external training loads between forwards and backs. Figure 2 presents the mean ± SD and between-group differences in mean weekly locomotor loads between forwards and backs.

***** INSERT FIGURE 1 NEAR HERE *****

***** INSERT FIGURE 2 NEAR HERE *****

There were *unclear* differences between forwards and backs for mean weekly PLslow (504 ± 160 vs. 580 ± 169 AU, respectively), training volume (301 ± 107 vs. 301 ± 80 min, respectively; *ES* = 0.0 [-0.6 to 0.6]) and sRPE (1186 ± 380 vs. 1249 ± 365 AU, respectively). Backs had *likely* greater total distance (13063 ± 3933 vs. 10195 ± 2242 m), LSA (12142 ± 3672 vs. 9694 ± 2215 m), VHSR (34 ± 51 vs. 5 ± 8 m) and PL (1246 ± 345 vs. 1002 ± 279 AU) compared to forwards. Backs also had *very likely* greater HSR (807 ± 387 vs. 482 ± 174 m), and *almost certainly* greater Vpeak (8.0 ± 0.3 vs. 7.1 ± 0.4 $m \cdot s^{-1}$; *ES* = 1.7 [1.1 to 2.3]) compared to forwards.

DISCUSSION

This is the first study to quantify the mean weekly internal and external training loads of elite adolescent rugby union players training across multiple playing environments (i.e. school, amateur club and regional academy). Overall, mean weekly training volumes and internal loads were low, however large between-subject and within-subject variation was observed, suggesting that workloads should be monitored and managed on an individual basis. Backs had substantially greater mean running (i.e., total distance, LSA, HSR, and VHSR) and physical loads (i.e., PL) compared to forwards, although the difference between groups for internal training loads and volumes were *unclear*. These findings demonstrate that the external training loads differ substantially between forward and back positional groups, which may have implications for the overall development of players due to the positional differences observed during match-play.

Weekly training volumes in this study (301 ± 92 min) were lower than previously reported in elite Australian adolescent rugby players (421 ± 211 min, including match-play) (23) and senior professional players (414 ± 210 min) (8), but greater than observed in sub-elite English adolescent players (188 ± 144 min) (39). Overall sRPE loads in this study (1217 ± 364 AU) were lower than previously reported in senior professional players (1522 ± 203 and 1581

± 317 AU, for early and late in-season, respectively) (12), but greater than sub-elite English adolescent players (median [interquartile range] = 1014 [1016] AU) (39). Interestingly, mean weekly in-season running loads were greater in this study (11629 ± 3445 m) compared to values previously reported in senior professional players during the in-season (professional forwards and backs = 7827 ± 954 and 9572 ± 1233 m, respectively) (6) and pre-season (professional forwards and backs = 9774 ± 1404 and 11585 ± 1810 m, respectively) (5) phases of competition, despite lower total training time. While it is beyond the scope of this study to determine the appropriateness of these specific running loads, exposure to higher weekly running loads than those observed during the pre-season in senior professional players would appear excessive, and may be an example of unnecessary workload exposure in players participating with multiple teams. The effect of these high in-season running loads on subsequent match-play performance and/or injury risk should be investigated in future research.

The between-subject (Table 1) and within-subject (Table 2) variability of these data would suggest that there is a lack of a "typical" weekly training structure for the majority of these players. Large between-subject variability of training loads has been previously reported in a cohort of sub-elite English rugby union players (range = 195-4888 AU), suggesting that weekly training loads may differ substantially between players (39). Additionally, the large within-subject variability appears beyond what would be advocated within a well organised training programme (19,20). For example, the subject "Forward 2" had a weekly total distance ranging from 6382 to 26253 m (CV = 75%), PL ranging from 682 to 2773 AU (CV = 75%), and sRPE ranging from 300 to 1725 AU (CV = 78%). The accumulation of high weekly running distances within the training week (e.g., 26253 m), which are more than six times the total distance covered by under-18 schools forwards during match-play (4232 ± 985 m) (34), may be placing the player at substantial risk of injury, if the player is not adequately prepared for those high loads. As recent studies have suggested, it is not simply high weekly (i.e., acute) training loads which are related to injury risk, but rather rapid spikes or dips in acute loads in relation to chronic loads (e.g., accumulated over the previous 28 days), known as the acute:chronic workload ratio (19,20). Therefore, the large within-subject variability of weekly training loads in these players is of concern. Due to methodological and logistical issues (e.g., participant recording failure and equipment malfunction), it was not possible to collect continuous weekly observations which could have been used to calculate acute:chronic workload ratios or exponentially weighted moving averages (19,43). Future research should aim to assess the week-to-week changes in acute internal and external loads of adolescent rugby union players relative to chronic loads (42).

There were *unclear* differences between forwards and backs for mean weekly training internal loads and volumes (as well as for rugby, gym, and CON/Other training modes), which may need to be investigated further with a larger sample size. However the substantial differences in mean weekly external training loads (excluding PLslow) reflect their position-specific activity patterns observed during match-play (14,33,34). Backs covered substantially greater total distances (13063 ± 3933 vs. 10195 ± 2242 m), LSA (12142 ± 3672 vs. 9694 ± 2215 m), HSR (807 ± 387 vs. 482 ± 174 m), and VHSR (34 ± 51 vs. 5 ± 8 m) compared to forwards. Direct comparisons cannot be made to previous literature regarding the distribution of running loads into LSA, HSR and VHSR due to the use of individualised thresholds, however this approach is a strength of the current study. Previous research in senior professional players found that backs completed greater distances at arbitrary thresholds of high speed (5.6-7.5 $m \cdot s^{-1}$) and very high speed (>7.5 $m \cdot s^{-1}$) bands compared to forwards (5,6). Since backs generally have a greater Vmax than forwards (13), it may be expected that backs would cover greater distances above arbitrary thresholds, as the corresponding running intensities would be relatively easier compared to their slower teammates. In the current study, backs had a higher Vmax compared to forwards and reached *almost certainly* greater absolute Vpeak (8.0 ± 0.3 vs. 7.1 ± 0.4 $m \cdot s^{-1}$) during their training week. Thus, individualised velocity thresholds may be more appropriate for training monitoring purposes as it allows analysis of movement demands specific to an player's own capacity rather than an arbitrary group boundary (35). Of note, both groups were exposed to limited distances at VHSR, with six subjects not reaching the threshold at any time during this observational period. Although speed development may be a greater priority in the pre-season, regular exposures to VHSR should also be planned during the in-season to reduce the risk of injury associated with this type of activity when under-prepared (27).

The use of accelerometer metrics, such as PL and PLslow, have been previously related to collision-based activity in adolescent rugby union players (37), although values of mean weekly PL values for training are currently unavailable in the adolescent or senior game. Backs had *likely* greater total weekly PL than forwards (1246 ± 345 vs. 1002 ± 279 AU), which may be expected due to its previously reported nearly perfect relationship with total distance (37), and because backs frequently engage in more high velocity accelerations and sprint efforts (6,31). Differences in PLslow between forwards and backs (504 ± 160 vs. 580 ± 169 AU) were *unclear*; a metric which has previously been shown to have a strong relationship with collision activity in rugby match-play (37). This may be a result of the lack of full-contact collisions in training compared to matches (36). Although PLslow may offer a proxy measure of collision frequency, the quantification of additional static exertion activities frequently performed by forwards remains challenging (e.g. pushing in scrums and mauls, lifting in line-outs and work at the ruck) (32), and may explain some of the disparity between external and internal training loads in the forwards group. However, individual characteristics will also influence the internal response to the training stimulus and consequently affect external:internal load ratios.

It is important to note that the current study excludes matches, and includes training data only. Match-play loads will further add to the weekly workloads of these players, and the inclusion of multiple games within a training week may lead to further within-subject variability of workloads. Longitudinal research is required, including match-play loads, to fully understand the week-to-week variation in total weekly workloads. As these players participate with multiple teams concurrently, a consensus between support staff must be agreed upon as to whom is responsible for monitoring workloads in these players. Coaching and support staff from regional academies, amateur clubs and schools need to communicate and work together for a coordinated and systematic approach to monitoring adolescent rugby union players to be effective. The use of sRPE may allow simple and accurate remote training load quantification for athletes training in multiple venues, which may be advantageous when expensive technology (e.g., GPS) may not be available (10). Objective measures such as heart rate, blood lactate concentration and GPS measures have been highly correlated to sRPE (11,16). Furthermore, remote collection of sRPE has recently been validated using a self-reported online questionnaire 24 hours post-exercise in an adolescent athlete population (30). Thus, sRPE is an available tool for researchers and practitioners to monitor the global training load of youth athletes training and competing in a complex system. However, if used in isolation, the limitations of this measure should be considered, as two similar sRPE values may be attributed to very different external loads. For a comprehensive analysis of training load a combination of internal and external load measures should ideally be used.

In conclusion, mean weekly internal training loads of elite English adolescent rugby union players were greater than previously reported in sub-elite adolescent players, but lower than senior professional players, despite mean weekly running loads being higher in this study compared to pre-season and in-season values in senior professionals. The large between-subject and within-subject variability in weekly training loads suggest there is a lack of regular training load highlighting the need for appropriate management of these players' workloads, despite them all being within the same elite programme (i.e., regional academy). The range of values observed suggests that during some weeks these players are exposed to inadequate or excessive training loads. There were substantial differences between forwards and backs for mean weekly external training loads, with backs having greater weekly total distance, LSA, HSR, VHSR, and PL, supporting the use of a position-specific training approach in elite adolescent rugby union players. Future longitudinal research is required to investigate the week-to-week variation, and acute:chronic training loads in adolescent rugby union players, as they may have implications for both athletic development and injury prevention.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Coaches working with athletes participating in late specialisation sports should be aware of the high mean weekly running loads, which are likely accumulated from an exposure to various teams. Within adolescent rugby union training, when a player's time is *shared* between environments, coaches should prioritise the needs of the player, given their exposure to other programmes. Within this study, it appears the running volume was greater than expected. Given that the weekly training loads were highly variable, likely due to the participation with multiple teams, practitioners working with this cohort should work together to manage the overall load the player is exposed to, reducing the risk of spikes in training load, which are associated with injury. Training loads, including rugby-specific, as well as strength and conditioning loads, should be planned and periodised to avoid such high variability. As such, respective coaches and support staff should coordinate to agree on appropriate training and match load exposures based on individual-specific monitoring data to maximise positive training outcomes and minimise potential negative effects.

REFERENCES

1. Bergeron, MF, Mountjoy, M, Armstrong, N, Chia, M, Cote, J, Emery, CA, et al. International Olympic Committee consensus statement on youth athletic development. *Br J Sports Med* 49: 843–851, 2015.
2. Booth, M, Orr, R, and Cobley, SP. Call for coordinated and systematic training load measurement (and progression) in athlete development: a conceptual model with practical steps. *Br J Sports Med*, 2016. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096358.
3. Borresen, J and Lambert, MI. The Quantification of Training Load, the Training Response and Effect on Performance. *Sport Med* 39: 779–795, 2009.
4. Boyd, LJ, Ball, K, and Aughey, RJ. Quantifying external load in australian football matches and training using accelerometers. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 8: 44–51, 2013.
5. Bradley, WJ, Cavanagh, BP, Douglas, W, Donovan, TF, Morton, JP, and Close, GL. Quantification of Training Load, Energy Intake, and Physiological Adaptations During a Rugby Preseason. *J Strength Cond Res* 29: 534–544, 2015.
6. Bradley, WJ, Cavanagh, BP, Douglas, W, Donovan, TF, Twist, C, Morton, JP, et al. Energy intake and expenditure assessed "in-season" in an elite European rugby union squad. *Eur J Sport Sci* 15: 469–479, 2015.
7. Brink, MS, Visscher, C, Coutts, AJ, and Lemmink, KAPM. Changes in perceived stress and recovery in overreached young elite soccer players. *Scand J Med Sci Sport* 22: 285–292, 2012.
8. Brooks, JHM, Fuller, CW, Kemp, SPT, and Reddin, DB. An assessment of training volume in professional rugby union and its impact on the incidence, severity, and nature of match and training injuries. *J Sports Sci* 26: 863–873, 2008.
9. Buchheit, M, Mendez-Villanueva, A, Simpson, BM, and Bourdon, PC. Repeated-

sprint sequences during youth soccer matches. *Int J Sports Med* 31: 709–716, 2010.

10. Comyns, T and Flanagan, EP. Applications of the session rating of perceived exertion system in professional rugby union. *Strength Cond J* 35: 78–85, 2013.

11. Coutts, AJ, Rampinini, E, Marcora, SM, Castagna, C, and Impellizzeri, FM. Heart rate and blood lactate correlates of perceived exertion during small-sided soccer games. *J Sci Med Sport* 12: 79–84, 2009.

12. Cross, MJ, Williams, S, Trewartha, G, Kemp, SPT, and Stokes, KA. The Influence of In-Season Training Loads on Injury Risk in Professional Rugby Union. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 11: 350–355, 2016.

13. Darrall-Jones, JD, Jones, B, and Till, K. Anthropometric, sprint, and high-intensity running profiles of English academy rugby union players by position. *J Strength Cond Res* 30: 1348–1358, 2015.

14. Deutsch, MU, Maw, GJ, Jenkins, DG, and Reaburn, P. Heart rate, blood lactate and kinematic data of elite colts (under-19) rugby union players during competition. *J Sports Sci* 16: 561–570, 1998.

15. Duthie, GM, Pyne, DB, and Hooper, SL. Applied physiology and game analysis of rugby union. *Sport Med* 33: 973–991, 2003.

16. Foster, C, Florhaug, J, Franklin, J, Gottschall, L, Hrovatin, L, Parker, S, et al. A new approach to monitoring exercise training. *J Strength Cond Res* 15: 109–15, 2001.

17. Freitag, A, Kirkwood, G, and Pollock, AM. Rugby injury surveillance and prevention programmes: are they effective? *Br Med J* 350: h1587, 2015.

18. Gabbett, TJ. Use of Relative Speed Zones Increases the High-Speed Running Performed in Team Sport Match Play. *J Strength Cond Res* 29: 3353–3359, 2015.

19. Gabbett, TJ. The training-injury prevention paradox: should athletes be training smarter and harder? *Br J Sports Med* 50: 273-280, 2016.

20. Gabbett, TJ, Hulin, BT, Blanch, P, and Whiteley, R. High training workloads alone do not cause sports injuries: how you get there is the real issue. *Br J Sports Med* 50: 444-445,2016.

21. Gabbett, TJ, Whyte, DG, Hartwig, TB, Wescombe, H, and Naughton, GA. The relationship between workloads, physical performance, injury and illness in adolescent male football players. *Sport Med* 44: 989–1003, 2014.

22. Halson, SL. Monitoring Training Load to Understand Fatigue in Athletes. *Sport Med* 44: 139–147, 2014.

23. Hartwig, TB, Naughton, GA, and Searl, J. Defining the volume and intensity of sport participation in adolescent rugby union players. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 3: 94–106, 2008.

24. Hartwig, TB, Naughton, GA, and Searl, J. Load, stress, and recovery in adolescent rugby union players during a competitive season. *J Sports Sci* 27: 1087–1094, 2009.

25. Hartwig, TB, Naughton, GA, and Searl, J. Motion Analyses of Adolescent Rugby Union Players: A Comparison of Training and Game Demands. *J Strength Cond Res* 25: 966–972, 2011.

26. Hopkins, WG, Marshall, SW, Batterham, AM, and Hanin, J. Progressive statistics for studies in sports medicine and exercise science. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 41: 3–12, 2009.

27. Malone, S, Roe, M, Doran, DA, Gabbett, TJ, and Collins, KD. High chronic training loads and exposure to bouts of maximal velocity running reduce injury risk in elite Gaelic football. *J Sci Med Sport*, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2016.08.005.

28. Palmer-Green, DS, Stokes, KA, Fuller, CW, England, M, Kemp, SPT, and Trewartha, G. Training Activities and Injuries in English Youth Academy and Schools Rugby Union. *Am J Sports Med* 43: 475–481, 2014.

29. Phibbs, PJ, Jones, B, Roe, GA, Read, DB, Darrall-Jones, J, Weakley, JJ, et al. We

know they train, but what do they do? Implications for coaches working with adolescent rugby union players. *Int J Sport Sci Coach*, 2017. doi: 10.1177/1747954117694734.

30. Phibbs, PJ, Roe, G, Jones, B, Read, D, Weakley, J, Darrall-Jones, J, et al. Validity of daily and weekly self-reported training load measures in adolescent athletes. *J Strength Cond Res*, 2016. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001708.

31. Portillo, J, Abian, P, Navia, JA, Sanchez, M, and Abian-Vicen, J. Movement patterns in under-19 rugby union players: Evaluation of physical demands by playing position. *Int J Perform Anal Sport* 14: 934–945, 2014.

32. Quarrie, KL, Raftery, M, Blackie, J, Cook, CJ, Fuller, CW, Gabbett, TJ, et al. Managing player load in professional rugby union: a review of current knowledge and practices. *Br J Sports Med* 51: 421–427, 2017.

33. Read, D, Jones, B, Phibbs, PJ, Roe, G, Darrall-Jones, JD, Weakley, J, et al. Physical demands of representative match play in adolescent rugby union. *J Strength Cond Res*, 2016. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001600.

34. Read, D, Weaving, D, Phibbs, PJ, Darrall-Jones, JD, Roe, G, Weakley, J, et al. Movement and physical demands of school and university rugby union match-play in England. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med* , 2016. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-000147.

35. Reardon, C, Tobin, DP, and Delahunt, E. Application of individualized speed thresholds to interpret position specific running demands in elite professional rugby union: A GPS Study. *PLoS One* 10: 1–12, 2015.

36. Roe, G, Darrall-Jones, JD, Till, K, Phibbs, PJ, Read, D, Weakley, JJS, et al. The effect of physical contact on changes in fatigue markers following rugby union field-based training. *Eur J Sport Sci*, 2017. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2017.1287960.

37. Roe, G, Halkier, M, Beggs, C, Till, K, and Jones, B. The Use of Accelerometers to Quantify Collisions and Running Demands of Rugby Union Match-Play. *Int J Perform Anal Sport* 16: 590–601, 2016.

38. Varley, MC, Fairweather, IH, and Aughey, RJ. Validity and reliability of GPS for measuring instantaneous velocity during acceleration, deceleration, and constant motion. *J Sports Sci* 30: 121–127, 2012.

39. Weakley, JJS, Till, K, Darrall-Jones, J, Roe, GAB, Phibbs, PJ, Read, D, et al. Strength and Conditioning Practices in Adolescent Rugby Players: Relationship with Changes in Physical Qualities. *J Strength Cond Res*, 2017. doi: 10.1519/JSC0000000000001828.

40. Weaving, D, Marshall, P, Earle, K, Nevill, AM, and Abt, G. Combining Internal - and External -Training - Load Measures in Professional Rugby League. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 9: 905–912, 2014.

41. Wilkinson, M and Akenhead, R. Violation of statistical assumptions in a recent publication? Int. J. Sports Med. 34: 281, 2013.

42. Williams, S, Trewartha, G, Cross, MJ, Kemp, SPT, and Stokes, KA. Monitoring What Matters: A Systematic Process for Selecting Training Load Measures. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*, 2016. doi: 10.1123/ijspp.2016-0337.

43. Williams, S, West, S, Cross, MJ, and Stokes, KA. Better way to determine the acute: chronic workload ratio? *Br J Sports Med*, 2016. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2106-096589.

Table 1. Descriptive data of weekly training volumes, internal and external training loads.

	Mean ± SD	Minimum	Maximum	Between-Subject CV
Rugby Time (min)	214 ± 64	141	368	30%
Gym Time (min)	72 ± 44	25	210	60%
Other Time (min)	15 ± 20	0	63	135%
Total Time (min)	301 ± 92	200	578	31%
Rugby sRPE (AU)	845 ± 263	570	1521	31%
Gym sRPE (AU)	315 ± 180	118	855	57%
Other sRPE (AU)	55 ± 74	0	320	133%
Total sRPE (AU)	1217 ± 364	769	2123	30%
Total Distance (m)	11629 ± 3445	7805	21801	30%
LSA Distance (m)	10918 ± 3208	7469	20489	29%
HSR Distance (m)	644 ± 336	151	1380	52%
VHSR Distance (m)	20 ± 38	0	168	194%
PlayerLoad (AU)	1124 ± 330	683	1999	29%
PlayerLoad Slow (AU)	542 ± 165	307	971	30%

Table 2. Individual range (and within-subject CV) of weekly training load variables.

	Total Distance (m)	PlayerLoad (AU)	Total sRPE (AU)
Forward 1	6069-10582 (24%)	583-923 (19%)	1040-1725 (25%)
Forward 2	6382-26253 (75%)	682-2773 (75%)	300-1725 (78%)
Forward 3	6438-13322 (49%)	639-1357 (51%)	1400-1515 (6%)
Forward 4	6370-19292 (40%)	758-2079 (41%)	1650-2595 (26%)
Forward 5	6227-19951 (44%)	588-2087 (50%)	870-1500 (20%)
Forward 6	6179-16185 (40%)	594-1438 (35%)	760-1380 (21%)
Forward 7	3799-13540 (39%)	358-1278 (39%)	280-1360 (39%)
Forward 8	6402-12282 (49%)	719-995 (23%)	970-1070 (7%)
Forward 9	3291-12318 (82%)	279-1086 (84%)	465-1165 (65%)
Forward 10	6451-17124 (29%)	710-1740 (27%)	810-1527 (25%)
Back 1	7911-16449 (31%)	787-1494 (25%)	835-1590 (25%)
Back 2	4191-12111 (46%)	357-1092 (49%)	225-1330 (66%)
Back 3	5737-20025 (34%)	523-1784 (33%)	755-1450 (28%)
Back 4	6582-20019 (71%)	555-1969 (79%)	1405-1675 (12%)
Back 5	8071-11384 (24%)	766-1140 (28%)	1155-1595 (23%)
Back 6	3241-17822 (50%)	358-1841 (50%)	390-1875 (45%)
Back 7	7781-21391 (39%)	829-2230 (38%)	670-1725 (38%)
Back 8	12651-27968 (26%)	1125-2648 (28%)	1740-2600 (18%)
Back 9	11286-19981 (24%)	922-1672 (24%)	905-2010 (37%)
Back 10	6755-14492 (51%)	693-1513 (53%)	1035-1115 (5%)


A
Backs *Likely* ↑ (ES = 1.0 [0.2 to 1.8])
Total Distance (m)
25000
20000
15000
10000
5000
0
Forwards
Backs
B
Backs *Likely* ↑ (ES = 0.7 [0.0 to 1.5])
PlayerLoad (AU)
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
Forwards
Backs
C
Unclear (ES = 0.2 [-0.5 to 0.9])
sRPE (AU)
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
Forwards
Backs


A
Backs *Likely* ↑ (ES = 0.9 [0.1 to 1.7])
LSA Distance (m)
25000
20000
15000
10000
5000
0
Forwards
Backs
B
Backs *Very Likely* ↑ (ES = 1.0 [0.3 to 1.7])
HSR Distance (m)
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
Forwards
Backs
C
Backs *Likely* ↑ (ES = 0.6 [-0.1 to 1.4])
VHSR Distance (m)
250
200
150
100
50
0
Forwards
Backs