

Title: Countermovement Jump Recovery in Professional Soccer Players Using an Inertial Sensor

Submission Style: Original Investigation

Authors: Malachy P. McHugh^{1,5}, Tom Clifford^{2,5}, Will Abbott^{3,4}, Susan Y. Kwiecien^{1,5}, Ian J. Kremenich¹, Joseph J. DeVita¹, Glyn Howatson^{5,6}

¹Nicholas Institute of Sports Medicine and Athletic Trauma, Lenox Hill Hospital, New York, NY; ²School of Biomedical Sciences, Newcastle University, United Kingdom;

³School of Sport and Service Management, Brighton University, UK;

⁴Brighton and Hove Albion F.C, American Express Elite Performance Centre, Lancing, UK;

⁵Department of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation, Northumbria University, Newcastle, United Kingdom;

⁶Water Research Group, School of Environmental Sciences and Development, Northwest University, Potchefstroom, South Africa.

Corresponding Author:

Malachy P McHugh Nicholas Institute of Sports Medicine and Athletic Trauma, Manhattan Eye Ear and Throat Hospital, 210 East 64 Street, New York, NY 10065, USA

PH: +1 212 434 2714, email: mchugh@nismat.org

Running head: Inertial sensor jump testing

Abstract word count: 249

Manuscript word count: 3987

Figures: 2

Tables: 2

1 ABSTRACT

2

3 *Purpose*

4 The purpose of this study was to assess the utility of an inertial sensor for assessing recovery in
5 professional soccer players.

6

7 *Methods*

8 In a randomized, crossover design, 11 professional soccer players wore shorts fitted with phase
9 change material (PCM) cooling packs or uncooled packs (control) for 3 h after a 90 minute
10 match. Countermovement jump (CMJ) performance was assessed simultaneously with an inertial
11 sensor and an optoelectric system, pre match, and 12, 36 and 60 h post match. Inertial sensor
12 metrics were flight height, jump height, low force, countermovement distance, force at low point,
13 rate of eccentric force development, peak propulsive force, maximum power, and peak landing
14 force. The only optoelectric metric was flight height. CMJ decrements, and effect of PCM
15 cooling were assessed with repeated measures ANOVA. Jump heights were also compared
16 between devices.

17

18 *Results*

19 For the inertial sensor data there were decrements in CMJ height on the days after matches
20 ($88\pm 10\%$ of baseline at 36 h $P=0.012$, effect size 1.2, for control condition) and accelerated
21 recovery with PCM cooling ($105\pm 15\%$ of baseline at 36 h, $P=0.018$ vs. control, effect size 1.1).
22 Flight heights were strongly correlated between devices ($r=0.905$, $P<0.001$) but inertial sensor
23 values were 1.8 ± 1.8 cm lower ($P=0.008$). Low force during countermovement was increased
24 ($P=0.031$) and landing force was decreased ($P=0.043$) after matches, but neither were affected by
25 the PCM cooling intervention. Other CMJ metrics were unchanged after matches.

26

27 *Conclusions*

28 This small portable inertial sensor provides a practical means of assessing recovery in soccer
29 players.

30

31 Key Words: muscle function, accelerometer, cryotherapy, phase change material, power

32

33

34 INTRODUCTION

35

36 Counter movement jump (CMJ) tests are commonly used to assess recovery of muscle
37 function following strenuous exercise. Impairments in CMJ have been demonstrated on the days
38 following various forms of exercise including drop jump protocols,¹⁻³ repeated sprint and
39 simulated field sport tests⁴⁻⁹ and soccer matches.¹⁰⁻¹¹ Traditionally, CMJ performance has been
40 measured using a vertical structure where athletes jump to touch incrementally separated pegs
41 with their out stretched arm.^{3,12} Since this test involves an asymmetric vertical reach with one
42 arm, alternative tests have been adopted to better isolate the actual jump performance, and
43 eliminate the reaching component. To this end, CMJ performance has been assessed using
44 contact mats^{4,8,11,13,14} or optoelectric systems^{1,5-7,9,10} that can accurately measure flight time, and
45 thereby calculate center of mass vertical displacement. These tests assume that the subjects land
46 with the same body alignment with which they took off.

47 Performance during CMJ tests has also been assessed using inertial devices that measure
48 vertical acceleration.¹⁵⁻¹⁸ In addition to providing a measure of jump height, these devices can
49 derive other biomechanical metrics describing the jump performance, such as force, power,
50 velocity and center of mass position. Force data derived from inertial sensors has been shown to
51 agree well with simultaneously recorded force plate data.¹⁶ However, while jump heights derived
52 from inertial sensors correlate strongly with heights calculated from force plates, inertial devices
53 were shown to slightly underestimate jump height compared to force plate data.¹⁸ Furthermore,
54 inertial sensor derived CMJ heights were well correlated with optoelectric measurements but
55 provided slightly higher jump heights.¹⁸ Thus, practitioners are advised against using these
56 systems interchangeably.

57 Tests of CMJ performance have been used to assess recovery in numerous studies
58 examining interventions to accelerate exercise recovery; several studies used contact mats,^{4,8,13}
59 while other studies used an optoelectric system,¹ force plates,² or an inertial sensor.¹⁵ In the one
60 study using an inertial sensor, Bieuzen et al¹⁵ examined recovery in professional soccer players
61 in response to an exercise protocol involving a combination of countermovement jumps and
62 rowing exercise. However, CMJ performance had recovered within one hour of the exercise
63 intervention so it was not possible to assess the ability of the inertial sensor to detect differences
64 in recovery over time or between intervention and control.

65 Standardized performance tests are important for monitoring athletes over the course of a
66 season to assess training adaptations and recovery. To this end CMJ performance has become a
67 common recovery metric in soccer across a range of playing abilities, including professional,^{14,15}
68 semi-professional,^{4,9,10} college^{6,12,19} and youth players.^{11,18} The use of inertial sensors to assess
69 CMJ recovery in soccer players offers several advantages over other methods; inertial sensors
70 are small, portable, wearable devices that can provide metrics for different components of the
71 CMJ in addition to jump height. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to assess the utility of
72 an inertial sensor for examining recovery in professional soccer players. This dataset is part of a
73 larger study examining the effectiveness of a cryotherapy intervention on recovery in soccer
74 players.²⁰ The full data set has been published previously but the data from the inertial sensor
75 was not included because the software for analysis was still under development. The specific
76 goals of the present study were to determine: (1) if the inertial sensor was sufficiently sensitive to
77 detect decrements in jump height on the days following a professional soccer match, (2) if the
78 inertial sensor data agreed with the optoelectric data, (3) if the inertial sensor was able to detect
79 accelerated recovery of jump height with the cryotherapy intervention, and (4) if the additional

80 force, power, velocity, and position metrics from the inertial sensor provided useful information
81 on the biomechanics of CMJ impairment and recovery. It was hypothesized that the inertial
82 sensor would show impaired CMJ metrics following the soccer match, accelerated recovery with
83 the cryotherapy intervention, and good agreement with the optoelectric measurements.

86 METHODS

88 *Study Participants*

89 The study participants were 11 professional soccer players (age 19 ± 1 yrs, height
90 1.80 ± 0.57 m, mass 75.9 ± 7.2 kg, body fat $7.9\pm 1.3\%$) from the under-23 squad of a team playing
91 in the second tier of the English league. All participants gave written informed consent and the
92 study was approved by institution review board.

94 *Study Design*

95 The full experimental protocol has been described in detail in the larger study²⁰ and is
96 summarized here. This was a randomized crossover design examining the effectiveness of a
97 novel cryotherapy intervention on recovery on the days after a soccer match. For the cryotherapy
98 intervention, players wore shorts fitted with phase change material (PCM) cooling packs over the
99 quadriceps muscles. The PCM cooling packs maintained a temperature of 15°C during a 3 h
100 treatment. The control condition was room temperature PCM packs worn inside the same shorts.
101 Each player was randomized to wear the PCM cooling packs or the room temperature packs after
102 a match and received the opposite treatment after a subsequent match. Matches were selected
103 where the team had longer than a 3 h coach ride back to their team facility after the match. Thus,
104 compliance with the intervention could be confirmed by study personnel. The following tests
105 were administered on the days prior to the study matches and on each of the following three
106 mornings after the matches: muscle soreness assessment, CMJ, maximal isometric voluntary
107 contraction, and an adapted Brief Assessment of Mood (BAM+) questionnaire. The details of the
108 CMJ test are described here. All other test results have been reported previously.²⁰

110 *CMJ Test*

111 The CMJ performance was measured using two different instruments; an optoelectric
112 system (Optojump system, Bolzano, Italy) and an inertial sensor (BTS G-Sensor 2, Brooklyn,
113 NY). As described previously, participants started the movement standing upright with hands on
114 their hips and after a verbal cue, descended into a squat (countermovement) prior to performing a
115 maximal effort vertical jump. Participants performed three maximal efforts, separated by
116 approximately 60 s of standing recovery; the mean of the 3 jumps was used for analysis. During
117 testing the inertial sensor was placed in a pouch attached to a waistband strapped tightly to the
118 participants. The inertial sensor was aligned with the middle of the lumbar spine. The $70\times 40\times 18$
119 mm inertial sensor weighed 37 g and contained a triaxial accelerometer, gyroscope and
120 magnetometer. The signals were collected at 100 Hz via Bluetooth® connection.

121 The metrics derived from the inertial sensor are described according to the phase in
122 which they occurred, countermovement, propulsive, or landing phase (Fig. 1).
123 Countermovement Phase: The countermovement phase started with the initiation of the
124 countermovement to the lowest point of the countermovement, with both points identified from
125 the derived position data. The countermovement metrics that were examined were: (1) low point

126 (lowest position of center of mass during countermovement); (2) low force (lowest force during
127 initiation of countermovement); (3) force at low point (the force at the lowest point of the
128 countermovement); (4) rate of eccentric force development (the difference between low force
129 and force at low point, divided by the time interval).

130 Propulsive Phase: The propulsive phase started from the point of initiation of the upward
131 movement from low point, to the maximum height of the jump, with both points identified from
132 the derived position data. The propulsive metrics that were examined were: (1) flight height
133 (calculated from time in air based on the acceleration data); (2) jump height (flight height plus
134 difference between standing height and takeoff height); (3) peak propulsive force (the peak force
135 during the propulsive phase occurring prior to take off); (4) maximum power (calculated from
136 the product of the force and velocity data).

137 Landing Phase: Only one metric from the landing phase was examined; peak landing force,
138 defined as the peak force occurring after ground contact when landing from the jump. All inertial
139 sensor data were processed using G-Studio software (BTS Bioengineering, Brooklyn NY).

140

141 *Statistical Analyses*

142 A single factor (time) repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to
143 assess if the inertial sensor was sufficiently sensitive to detect impairments in jump height and
144 other jump metrics on the days following the matches (baseline, 12 h, 36 h, and 60 h post match).
145 Only the control data were included and analyses were performed on absolute numbers and on
146 values expressed as a percentage of baseline. Low force during the countermovement was
147 expressed as a percentage of body weight. Changes in low force were not assessed as a
148 percentage of baseline since some baseline values were very low, creating a non-normal
149 distribution for percent change. Bonferroni corrections were used for planned pairwise
150 comparisons (baseline versus 12 h, 36 h and 60 h).

151 Pearson product-moment correlations were used to assess relative reliability between
152 inertial sensor and optoelectric measurements with paired t-tests used to assess bias. These
153 assessments were made on baseline flight height averaged between the PCM cooling and control
154 conditions. Differences between devices in ability to detect decrements in CMJ flight height
155 were assessed using 2x3 repeated measures ANOVA (device: inertial sensor vs. optoelectric
156 measurement; time: 12 h, 36 h and 60 h post match). The primary statistic of interest was the
157 effect of device comparing percent decrement in flight height between devices.

158 Treatment (PCM cooling vs. control) by time repeated measures ANOVA were used to
159 assess if the inertial sensor was able to detect accelerated recovery of CMJ height, and other
160 jump metrics, with the cryotherapy intervention. The treatment by time analysis of CMJ height
161 from the optoelectric system has been reported previously and is also provided here for
162 comparison to inertial sensor results. Bonferroni corrections were used for planned pairwise
163 between treatment comparisons at each of the time intervals (baseline, 12 h, 36 h and 60 h for
164 absolute values, and 12 h, 36 h and 60 h for values expressed as a percentage of baseline).

165 All variables were tested for normality of distribution using the Shapiro-Wilk test.
166 Variables with non-normal distribution were analyzed with the Friedman test for time effects and
167 the Wilcoxon signed ranks test for pairwise comparisons. Additionally, within ANOVAs,
168 Greenhouse-Geisser corrections were applied for violations of sphericity. Effect sizes for time or
169 treatment effects were computed using Cohen's d_z statistic²¹ with the magnitude of effects
170 considered either small (0.20–0.49), medium (0.50–0.79) or large (>0.80). Statistical analyses
171 were performed using SPSS (v21 IBM, Armonk, NY).

172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217

RESULTS

Match Details

There were no significant differences in playing demands between PCM cooling matches and control matches. Average playing time was 81 ± 18 min for the matches after which players received PCM versus 83 ± 11 min for control matches. Other match demand metrics did not differ between treatments (PCM vs. control: total distance ran 9414 ± 2142 m vs. 9742 ± 1365 m; sprint distance 330 ± 129 m vs. 339 ± 85 m).

Inertial Sensor CMJ Flight Height and Jump Height

Flight height (time effect $P=0.018$) and jump height (time effect $P=0.007$) were decreased on the days after the matches (Table 1). Similar effects were evident when heights were expressed as a percentage of baseline (Time effects: flight height $P=0.028$, jump height $P=0.006$, Table 1). Greatest decrements were evident 36 h post match for flight height (88% of baseline, $P=0.012$ for post hoc pairwise comparison) and 12 h post match for jump height (90% of baseline, $P=0.006$ for post hoc pairwise comparison).

Comparison Between Inertial Sensor and Optoelectric System

Inertial sensor and optoelectric CMJ flight heights were strongly positively correlated ($r=0.905$, $P<0.001$), but there was significant bias, with inertial sensor values 1.8 ± 1.8 cm lower than optoelectric values ($P=0.008$).

Optoelectric measurement of CMJ flight height was decreased on the days after the match (time effect $P=0.035$ for absolute and relative values). Flight height was $93 \pm 8\%$ of baseline at 36 h ($P=0.027$ for post hoc pairwise comparison, effect size 1.0). Decrements in CMJ flight height were greater with the inertial sensor compared with the optoelectric system (inertial sensor averaged $90 \pm 3\%$ of baseline across measurements at 12, 36, and 60 h versus $95 \pm 2\%$ for the optoelectric device, effect of device $P=0.047$, device by time $P=0.22$). This effect was most pronounced at 60 h ($91 \pm 12\%$ vs. $99 \pm 11\%$, $P=0.045$ for post hoc pairwise comparison).

Effect of PCM Cooling Intervention on CMJ Height

The inertial sensor showed accelerated recovery of absolute jump heights with PCM cooling versus control (treatment by time $P=0.027$, Fig. 2A) but there were no significant effects for absolute flight heights (treatment effect $P=0.072$, treatment by time $P=0.054$). When expressed as a percentage of baseline, flight heights and jump heights were both better for PCM cooling versus control (flight height: treatment effect $P=0.007$, treatment by time $P=0.061$, Table 2; jump height: treatment effect $P=0.035$, treatment by time $P=0.013$, Fig. 2B). With the optoelectric system the effect of PCM cooling on flight height was similar to that observed with the inertial sensor (absolute flight height: treatment effect $P=0.037$, treatment by time $P=0.103$; relative flight height: treatment effect $P=0.064$, treatment by time $P=0.095$, Table 2).

Countermovement, Propulsive and Landing Phase Metrics

Countermovement Phase: Low point (time effect $P=0.427$) and force at low point (time effect $P=0.497$) did not differ from baseline on the days after the match. However, low force was elevated on the days after the match (time effect $P=0.031$); at baseline, low force was 18% of

218 body weight compared with 30% at 12 h ($P=0.393$ for post hoc pairwise comparison, effect size
219 0.5), 39% at 36 h ($P=0.051$ for post hoc pairwise comparison, effect size 0.9) and 32% ($P=0.096$
220 for post hoc pairwise comparison, effect size 0.8) at 60 h post match. Additionally, low force was
221 negatively correlated with flight height at baseline ($r=-0.81$, $P=0.003$), 12 h ($r=-0.96$, $P<0.001$),
222 36 h ($r=-0.64$, $P=0.04$) and 60 h ($r=-0.62$, $P=0.04$) indicating that the magnitude of unweighting
223 during the initiation of the countermovement improved jump height. Eccentric rate of force
224 development was not normally distributed and there was no significant effect of time using the
225 Friedman test ($P=0.263$).

226 Propulsive Phase: Peak propulsive force (time effect $P=0.98$) and maximum power (time
227 effect $P=0.199$) were not different from baseline on the days after the match.

228 Landing Phase: Peak landing force was decreased on the days after the match (time
229 effects: $P=0.040$ for absolute values, $P=0.043$ for values relative to baseline). Landing force was
230 99% of baseline at 12 h ($P=0.999$ for post hoc pairwise comparison), 89% of baseline at 36 h
231 ($P=0.039$ for post hoc pairwise comparison) and 98% of baseline at 60 h ($P=0.126$ for post hoc
232 pairwise comparison).

233 There was no effect of PCM treatment on these countermovement, propulsive or landing
234 phase metrics (treatment by time effects: low point $P=0.518$; force at low point $P=0.293$; low
235 force $P=0.254$; eccentric force development $P=0.220$; peak propulsive force $P=0.781$; maximum
236 power $P=0.388$; peak landing force $P=0.965$).

237

238

239 DISCUSSION

240

241 With respect to the specific goals of the study: (1) the inertial sensor was sufficiently
242 sensitive to detect decrements in jump height on the days following a professional soccer match;
243 (2) the inertial sensor data correlated strongly with the optoelectric data but recorded
244 significantly lower flight heights; (3) the inertial sensor was able to detect accelerated recovery
245 of jump height with the cryotherapy intervention; and (4) the additional force, power, velocity,
246 and position metrics from the inertial sensor provided limited information on the biomechanics
247 of CMJ impairment and recovery. Each of these goals is discussed in detail in the following four
248 sections.

249

250 *Inertial Sensor Detection of Impairments in CMJ on the Days After a Soccer Match*

251 Marked impairments in both flight height and jump height were apparent on the days
252 after the soccer match. However, lowest flight height was apparent at 36 h (88% of baseline) but
253 the lowest jump height occurred earlier (90% of baseline at 12 h). Additionally, by 60 h post
254 game jump height had fully recovered (102% of baseline) while flight height was still impaired
255 (91% of baseline). To put these results in context it is important to understand the difference
256 between flight height and jump height. Flight height is the maximum vertical displacement of
257 center of mass while the body is off the ground. Jump height is flight height plus the difference
258 between standing height and take-off height. Differentiating the two using inertial sensor data is
259 non-trivial. Biomechanically the difference between flight height and jump height represents the
260 sequential thrust of hip extension, knee extension and plantarflexion prior to take off. The actual
261 differences between flight height and jump height were 11.9 ± 1.6 cm at baseline, 9.6 ± 1.6 cm at
262 12 h, 12.9 ± 1.0 cm at 36 h, and 16.1 ± 1.5 cm at 60 h (time effect $P=0.005$). It is not clear whether
263 these numbers represent actual changes in jump mechanics or are systematic errors in

264 accelerometer data processing. Regardless, from a practical perspective the flight height data
265 seems to be more sensitive than jump height for measuring performance impairment.

266

267 *Inertial Sensor Versus Optoelectric System*

268 Flight heights measured by inertial sensor were shown to be strongly correlated with
269 optoelectric values, but the inertial sensor heights were on average 1.8 cm lower. This
270 represents a 5% underestimate of flight height compared with optoelectric values. Using a
271 different inertial sensor than that used here, Lesinski et al¹⁸ also showed that inertial sensor
272 heights were strongly correlated with optoelectric values in measurements made on youth female
273 soccer players. However, they found that the inertial sensor flight heights were on average 0.55
274 cm higher than optoelectric values. Importantly, CMJ height calculated from force plate data,
275 was 1.21 cm higher than optoelectric values and 0.66 cm higher than inertial sensor values.
276 Differences in hardware and software between inertial sensor devices likely means that absolute
277 values cannot be compared directly. Furthermore, comparisons between CMJ heights derived
278 from different technologies is not advised.

279 Both devices showed significant decrements in CMJ after the soccer matches, with
280 similarly large effect sizes at 36 h (optoelectric 93±12%, effect size 1.0 vs. inertial sensor
281 88%±10%, effect size 1.1). However, overall, greater decrements were evident with the initial
282 sensor versus the optoelectric system. Based on the effect sizes reported in Table 1 for the
283 inertial sensor a 6-8% decline in flight or jump height represents a moderate effect and an
284 impairment of more than 8% represents a large effect. The decrements in post-match optoelectric
285 flight height (96% at 12 h, 93% at 36 h, 99% at 60 h) are comparable to other studies using the
286 same optoelectric system; 96% at 24 h, 98% at 48 h, 100% at 72 h after a soccer match,¹⁰ and
287 95% at 24 h, 95% at 48 h, 96% at 72 h after a simulated soccer match.⁹ Higher values for post-
288 match decrements in CMJ height were reported for elite under-21 soccer players when CMJ was
289 assessed using contact mats (88% at 24 h, 95% at 48 h, 97% at 72 h).¹¹ Together these data
290 indicate that the optoelectric system might be less sensitive to detecting decrements in CMJ
291 compared with other techniques. However, these four studies differed in standard of play
292 (professional – current study, semi-professional,^{9,10} elite youth¹¹) and may have differed in match
293 intensity. Thus, it is not possible to definitively attribute differences in CMJ decrements to the
294 different technologies used in the respective studies.

295

296 *Effect of PCM Cooling Intervention of CMJ Recovery*

297 We have previously reported that the PCM cooling intervention accelerated recovery of
298 strength and soreness, but recovery of optoelectric CMJ height was not significantly
299 accelerated.²¹ The relative changes in optoelectric CMJ height that were reported in that study
300 are also included here for the purposes of comparison to inertial sensor data (Table 2). The
301 absolute changes in optoelectric CMJ height were not previously reported.

302 The benefits of PCM cooling on CMJ recovery were more apparent with the inertial
303 sensor data than the optoelectric data (Table 2). The inertial sensor data showed a marked benefit
304 of PCM cooling for relative flight height, with large effect sizes at 36 h and 60 h. A benefit of
305 PCM cooling was demonstrated for both relative and absolute jump heights (Fig. 2). By
306 comparison, the benefits of PCM cooling on CMJ recovery were less clear with the optoelectric
307 data (Table 2). Since PCM cooling is a novel recovery intervention it is not possible to compare
308 CMJ recovery metrics to other PCM cooling studies. The best comparison to PCM cooling
309 would be cold water immersion. Two systematic reviews^{22,23} concluded that, from limited data,

310 cold water immersion may be beneficial in accelerating CMJ recovery. The current PCM cooling
311 data are consistent with that conclusion.

312

313 *Inertial Sensor Additional Biomechanical Metrics*

314 In general, the additional CMJ biomechanical metrics generated from the inertial sensor
315 did not show obvious changes on the days following the soccer matches, nor were there changes
316 in recovery associated with the PCM cooling intervention. While one would assume that
317 decrements in power, force, or rate of force development would be apparent when CMJ height is
318 impaired, such studies have not been performed in soccer players during recovery from a match.
319 It is noteworthy that low force and landing force differed from baseline on the days after the
320 soccer matches.

321 The increase in low force on the days after the match indicates that the players did not
322 unweight themselves as much during the initiation of the countermovement. In Figure 1 the nadir
323 in acceleration at approximately 0.3 s shows this subject unweighting himself at the initiation of
324 the countermovement. For this subject, the low force amounted to 11% of his body weight (force
325 data not shown). The average low force for baseline jumps in the control condition was 18%,
326 increasing to 30-39% on subsequent days. Importantly, low force was negatively correlated with
327 flight height, indicating that the more a player unweighted himself at the initiation of the jump
328 the better his vertical jump was. Thus, the higher values for low force on the days after the soccer
329 matches may represent increased leg stiffness due to muscle damage. However, since there was
330 no indication of improvement in low force with the PCM cooling intervention, it is unclear the
331 extent to which this metric may have been a mechanism for the impaired performance.

332 In contrast to the increase in low force, landing force was decreased on the days after the
333 soccer match. This could reflect decreased eccentric strength. It is noteworthy that peak changes
334 in low force, landing force and flight height occurred at the same time, 36 h post match.
335 However, the PCM cooling intervention did not impact landing force or low force, despite
336 improving CMJ height. The acute effects of fatigue on jump landing forces have been examined
337 in several studies but there is no consensus on whether muscle fatigue increases or decreases
338 landing forces.²⁴ The effects of prior exercise, such as a soccer game on landing forces on
339 subsequent days has not been examined previously.

340

341 *Practical Applications, Limitations and Future Directions*

342 Testing professional athletes during the rigors of a long competitive season may not be
343 the best environment in which to assess the utility of a new CMJ testing device. A field study
344 using professional athletes provides less control than one would have in a laboratory-based study
345 using less high demand participants. This potential sacrifice of experimental control is offset by
346 the greater ecological validity of the findings for practitioners working in high demand elite
347 sports. Future studies should test CMJ metrics derived from this inertial sensor against kinetic
348 and kinematic data from high speed cameras and force plates. Additionally, future studies should
349 establish the day-to-day variability in jump metrics with this inertial sensor, in a controlled
350 setting without an exercise intervention that systematically affects jump performance. Finally,
351 since inertial sensor measurements of impairments in jump performance differed between flight
352 height and jump height, future work, using high speed motion capture with ground reaction
353 forces, is needed to examine whether this was due to a change in jumping mechanics or an error
354 in inertial sensor data processing.

355

356 *Conclusions*

357 The inertial sensor was sensitive to detecting impairments in CMJ and in demonstrating
358 accelerated recovery in CMJ in professional soccer players. This small portable device can
359 provide a practical means of collecting objective recovery data in repeated sprint sports, like
360 soccer. Finally, improvements in inertial sensor recorded CMJ performance with PCM cooling
361 reaffirms the accelerated recovery provided by this novel cryotherapy intervention.

REFERENCES

1. Clifford T, Bell O, West DJ, Howatson G, Stevenson EJ. The effects of beetroot juice supplementation on indices of muscle damage following eccentric exercise. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2016 Feb;116(2):353-62.
2. Hill J, Howatson G, van Someren K, Gaze D, Legg H, Lineham J, Pedlar C. The Effects of Compression-Garment Pressure on Recovery After Strenuous Exercise. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*. 2017 Sep;12(8):1078-1084.
3. Howatson G, Hoad M, Goodall S, Tallent J, Bell PG, French DN. Exercise-induced muscle damage is reduced in resistance-trained males by branched chain amino acids: a randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled study. *J Int Soc Sports Nutr*. 2012 Jul 12;9:20.
4. Bell PG, Stevenson E, Davison GW, Howatson G. The Effects of Montmorency Tart Cherry Concentrate Supplementation on Recovery Following Prolonged, Intermittent Exercise. *Nutrients*. 2016 Jul 22;8(7).
5. Brown MA, Howatson G, Keane KM, Stevenson EJ. Adaptation to Damaging Dance and Repeated-Sprint Activity in Women. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2016 Sep;30(9):2574-81.
6. Harper LD, Hunter R, Parker P, Goodall S, Thomas K, Howatson G, West DJ, Stevenson E, Russell M. Test-Retest Reliability of Physiological and Performance Responses to 120 Minutes of Simulated Soccer Match Play. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2016 Nov;30(11):3178-3186.
7. Keane KM, Salicki R, Goodall S, Thomas K, Howatson G. Muscle Damage Response in Female Collegiate Athletes After Repeated Sprint Activity. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2015 Oct;29(10):2802-7.
8. Leeder JD, van Someren KA, Bell PG, Spence JR, Jewell AP, Gaze D, Howatson G. Effects of seated and standing cold water immersion on recovery from repeated sprinting. *J Sports Sci*. 2015;33(15):1544-52.
9. Thomas K, Dent J, Howatson G, Goodall S. Etiology and Recovery of Neuromuscular Fatigue after Simulated Soccer Match Play. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2017 May;49(5):955-964.
10. Brownstein CG, Dent JP, Parker P, Hicks KM, Howatson G, Goodall S, Thomas K. Etiology and Recovery of Neuromuscular Fatigue following Competitive Soccer Match-Play. *Front Physiol*. 2017 Oct 25;8:831.
11. Fatouros IG, Chatzinikolaou A, Douroudos II, Nikolaidis MG, Kyparos A, Margonis K, Michailidis Y, Vantarakis A, Taxildaris K, Katrabasas I, Mandalidis D, Kouretas D, Jamurtas AZ. Time-course of changes in oxidative stress and antioxidant status responses following a soccer game. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2010 Dec;24(12):3278-86.
12. Rupp KA, Selkow NM, Parente WR, Ingersoll CD, Weltman AL, Saliba SA. The effect of cold water immersion on 48-hour performance testing in collegiate soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2012 Aug;26(8):2043-50.
13. Howatson G, Hough P, Pattison J, Hill JA, Blagrove R, Glaister M, Thompson KG. Trekking poles reduce exercise-induced muscle injury during mountain walking. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2011 Jan;43(1):140-5.
14. Meister S, Faude O, Ammann T, Schnittker R, Meyer T. Indicators for high physical strain and overload in elite football players. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2013 Mar;23(2):156-63.

15. Bieuzen F, Pournot H, Roulland R, Hausswirth C. Recovery after high-intensity intermittent exercise in elite soccer players using VEINOPLUS sport technology for blood-flow stimulation. *J Athl Train*. 2012 Sep-Oct;47(5):498-506.
16. Setuain I, Martinikorena J, Gonzalez-Izal M, Martinez-Ramirez A, Gómez M, Alfaro-Adrián J, Izquierdo M. Vertical jumping biomechanical evaluation through the use of an inertial sensor-based technology. *J Sports Sci*. 2016;34(9):843-51.
17. Setuain I, Millor N, González-Izal M, Gorostiaga EM, Gómez M, Alfaro-Adrián J, Maffiuletti NA, Izquierdo M. Biomechanical jumping differences among elite female handball players with and without previous anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a novel inertial sensor unit study. *Sports Biomech*. 2015 Sep;14(3):323-39.
18. Lesinski M, Muehlbauer T, Granacher U. Concurrent validity of the Gyko inertial sensor system for the assessment of vertical jump height in female sub-elite youth soccer players. *BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil*. 2016 Nov 11;8:35.
19. Cone JR, Berry NT, Goldfarb AH, Henson RA, Schmitz RJ, Wideman L, Shultz SJ. Effects of an individualized soccer match simulation on vertical stiffness and impedance. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2012 Aug;26(8):2027-36.
20. Clifford T, Abbott W, Kwiecien SY, Howatson G, McHugh MP. Cryotherapy Re-Invented: Application of Phase Change Material for Recovery in Elite Soccer. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*. 2017 Sep 5:1-21.
21. Lakens D. Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Front Psychol*. 2013 Nov 26;4:863.
22. Bleakley CM, McDonough S, Gardner E, Baxter GD, Hopkins JT, Davison GW. Cold-water immersion (cryotherapy) for preventing and treating muscle soreness after exercise. *Cochrane Database Syst*. 2012;15;(2):CD008262.
23. Leeder J, Gissane C, van Someren KA, Gregson W, Howatson G. Cold water immersion and recovery from strenuous exercise: A meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2012;46(4):233-240.
24. Zadpoor AA, Nikooyan AA. The effects of lower extremity muscle fatigue on the vertical ground reaction force: a meta-analysis. *Proc Inst Mech Eng H*. 2012 Aug 226(8):579-88.




Figure 1: Position, velocity and acceleration recording during a baseline CMJ from a sample player. The inertial sensor measured acceleration, from which position and velocity were derived. The shaded area to the left indicates the countermovement phase, starting at the initiation of the countermovement and ending at the lowest position. The shaded area to the right indicates the landing phase, starting from the highest position (jump height) and ending when the subject returns to standing upright position. On the position graph, jump height is indicated by the horizontal line from the apex in position. Flight height is jump height minus position when the subject left the ground, indicated by the lower horizontal dashed line on the position graph. Acceleration equals 0 at peak velocity and equals -9.81 m s^{-2} at the point of take-off. Baseline force (N) is body mass $\times 9.81$ and thereafter was the product of acceleration. Power was the product of force and velocity force and power not shown in this figure).




Figure 2: Effect of PCM cooling intervention on absolute (A) and relative (B) changes in jump height. Absolute jump height: treatment effect $P=0.020$, treatment by time $P=0.027$. Relative jump height: treatment effect $P=0.035$, treatment by time $P=0.013$. * higher jump height with PCM cooling treatment versus control $P<0.05$. Mean \pm SE displayed.

Table 1: Inertial sensor CMJ flight height and jump height before and after soccer match in control condition.

	Flight Height			Jump Height		
	cm	% baseline	Effect Size	cm	% baseline	Effect Size
Baseline	35.1±5.0	100%	vs. baseline	47.0±6.6	100%	vs. baseline
12 h	32.4±6.7	92±13%	0.6	41.9±6.0*	90±9%*	1.1
36 h	30.7±3.7*	88±10%*	1.1	43.6±4.5	94±10%	0.7
60 h	31.5±4.2	91±12%	0.8	47.6±6.8	102±15%	0.1
Effect of Time	P=0.018	P=0.028		P=0.007	P=0.006	

Effect of time is P value for ANOVA; *P<0.05 different from baseline; effect size is Cohen's d_z calculated from differences in absolute height from baseline. Mean±SD reported.

Table 2: Effects of PCM cooling on recovery of flight height for inertial sensor and optoelectric measurements.

	Inertial Sensor			Optoelectric System		
	PCM	Control	Effect Size	PCM	Control	Effect Size
Baseline	100%	100%		100%	100%	
12 h	102±13%	92±13%	0.4	99±5%	96±7%	0.3
36 h	105±15%*	88±10%	1.1	102±7%	93±8%	0.8
60 h	103±10%*	91±12%	0.9	107±14%	99±11%	0.4
Treatment Effect	P=0.007			P=0.064		
Treatment x Time	P=0.061			P=0.095		

*P<0.05 different from control; effect size is Cohen's d_z calculated from differences in relative height between treatments. Mean±SD reported.