

Intersegmental moment analysis characterizes the partial correspondence of jumping and jerking.

Cleather, Daniel J. and Goodwin, Jon E. and Bull, Anthony M. J. (2013) *Intersegmental moment analysis characterizes the partial correspondence of jumping and jerking*. Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research: , 27 (1). pp. 89-100. ISSN 1064-8011

Version: Post-print

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e31825037ee>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on OpenResearch Archive's data policy on reuse of materials please consult <http://research.smuc.ac.uk/policies.html>

Inter-segmental moment analysis characterises the partial correspondence of jumping and jerking

Daniel J Cleather^{1,2}, Jon E Goodwin¹ and Anthony MJ Bull²

¹ School of Human Sciences, St. Mary's University College, Twickenham, UK

² Department of Bioengineering, Imperial College London, London, UK

Jon Goodwin,
School of Human Sciences,
St. Mary's University College,
Waldegrave Road,
Twickenham.
TW1 4SX
UK
Tel: +44 208 2402312
Email: goodwinj@smuc.ac.uk

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

**Inter-segmental moment analysis characterises the partial correspondence of
jumping and jerking**

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to quantify internal joint moments of the lower limb during vertical jumping and the weightlifting jerk in order to improve awareness of the control strategies and correspondence between these activities, and to facilitate understanding of the likely transfer of training effects. Athletic males completed maximal unloaded vertical jumps ($n=12$) and explosive push jerks at 40 kg ($n=9$). Kinematic data were collected using optical motion tracking and kinetic data via a force plate, both at 200 Hz. Joint moments were calculated using a previously described biomechanical model of the right lower limb. Peak moment results highlighted that sagittal plane control strategies differed between jumping and jerking ($p<0.05$) with jerking being a knee dominant task in terms of peak moments as opposed to a more balanced knee and hip strategy in jumping and landing. Jumping and jerking exhibited proximal to distal joint involvement and landing was typically reversed. High variability was seen in non-sagittal moments at the hip and knee. Significant correlations were seen between jump height and hip and knee moments in jumping ($p<0.05$). Whilst hip and knee moments were correlated between jumping and jerking ($p<0.05$), joint moments in the jerk were not significantly correlated to jump height ($p>0.05$) possibly indicating a limit to the direct transferability of jerk performance to jumping. Ankle joint moments were poorly related to jump performance ($p>0.05$). Peak knee and hip moment generating capacity are important to vertical jump performance. The jerk appears to offer an effective strategy to overload joint moment generation in the knee relative to jumping. However, an absence of hip involvement would appear to make it a general, rather than specific, training modality in relation to jumping.

Keywords: musculoskeletal modelling, joint moments, weightlifting, jumping, correspondence

INTRODUCTION

Vertical jumping is a common assessment tool in strength and power programmes and frequently a primary marker used to describe general enhancements in leg extension force production capabilities. The jerk is a component of techniques taken from Olympic style weightlifting (OL) utilised with a view to enhance leg extension force production in time constrained stretch-shorten cycle conditions. Understanding the relationships between the mechanics of such training, monitoring and performance skills offers insight into the correspondence and likely transferability of adaptations between these skills and further to the effective selection of training and monitoring modalities within a programme.

There has been a plethora of studies exploring the biomechanics of vertical jumping^{1,4,18,28,33,39,40}, landing^{3,13,24,29,36,51} and Olympic weightlifting^{6,19,20,21,25,43}. These studies have used a range of techniques to evaluate the kinematics and kinetics of these activities. One technique in biomechanics is to reduce the description of the body to a series of linked rigid segments. Inverse dynamics techniques can then be used to calculate the inter-segmental forces and moments (moments refer to internal moments unless otherwise stated) expressed at each joint^{14,49}. It is common to make the assumption that the moments calculated in an inverse dynamics analysis represent the resultant muscle moments^{12,16}. In reality, the inter-segmental moments

are likely to be a result of the combination of both muscular forces and the restraint provided by the passive tissues ²⁷. In the sagittal plane it is likely that a large proportion of the observed moment is a result of muscular actions and thus a consideration of sagittal plane moments can be very useful in understanding performance. However, in the frontal and transverse plane it is likely that the passive structures provide a more significant proportion of the calculated moment, especially at the knee where the musculature is not well equipped to resist non-sagittal plane loading. An analysis of moments in 3 dimensions (3D) is therefore instructive in ascertaining the loading of passive tissues, and consequently frontal and transverse plane moments may be revealing as to the potential mechanisms of injury.

In contrast to the large number of studies that have employed inverse dynamics to study jumping and landing, there is a paucity studies that have used the technique to study OL ^{11,53}. Those studies that have employed inverse dynamics have not presented comprehensive details as to the inter-segmental moments calculated. The profiles of joint moments in these activities are therefore relatively unknown. Certainly there have been no studies that have compared joint moment production between jumping and OL, and thus the kinetic similarities and differences between the two activities in terms of joint moments has yet to be determined. Despite this, it is common for strength and conditioning coaches to contend that there is a high degree of mechanical similarity between the two exercises, and to use this observation as the basis of training choices.

Although comparisons of joint moment profiles, either between athletic skills or between differing athletic groups are not common in the strength and conditioning

1 literature they can be illuminating when analysing performance and prescribing
2 training interventions^{26,46}. For instance, Vanezis and Lees⁴⁶ analysed the differences
3 in moment production between good and poor vertical jumpers. They found a non-
4 significant trend that the peak moments produced by the good jumpers were greater
5 than those of the poor jumpers. Equally, the good jumpers developed joint moments
6 more rapidly during jumping. The authors did not however, present details on the
7 correlation between peak moment production and jump height leaving the predictive
8 power of peak moments as to jump height unresolved. Nonetheless, such analysis
9 can be used to inform coaches as to the differing strategies adopted by athletes such
10 that their performance might be better understood and either replicated or altered. In
11 particular this might include understanding the differing emphasis athletes place on
12 the utilisation of joint moments at the hip, knee or ankle.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Equally, impulse generation across a range of propulsive and landing movements is
33 likely to be optimally created by different strategies of lower limb muscle and joint
34 involvement. Due to general issues of specificity of adaptation, the transfer of
35 adaptation benefits between different athletic tasks is likely to be limited by their
36 degree of mechanical correspondence; an idea longstanding in the coaching⁴⁸. It is
37 therefore informative for coaches to consider issues of mechanical similarity between
38 different movement tasks. Whilst the use of electromyography for this purpose has
39 been popular⁷ the application of inverse dynamics does not appear common in
40 coaching research literature. This incorporates consideration of both the relative
41 amplitudes of peak moments as well as their temporal arrangement in the moment
42 profile. Importantly an improvement in understanding from coaches of the way in
43 which constraining particular movements (such as demanding a near vertical line of
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

travel with body segments closely connected to a barbell) changes the pattern of moment production required by the athlete is likely to result in an enhanced ability to make appropriate exercise selection choices and movement modifications.

The purpose of this study was therefore to perform a 3D optimization based approach to the inverse dynamics analysis of vertical jumping, landing and jerking. The primary aim of the study was to provide a detailed description of the 3D moments experienced at the joints in the local coordinate frame for each of the activities using an optimisation approach ^{9,10}. A secondary aim was then to use these descriptions to facilitate a better understanding of the relationship between vertical jumping and jerking. Finally, a tertiary aim was to determine whether peak joint moments produced during jumping and jerking were predictive of vertical jump height.

METHODS

Experimental approach to the problem

To determine jump height and related jump moments subjects (n=12) completed uninstructed vertical jumps with arms isolated. To allow comparison to the jerk those with weightlifting experience (n=9) (classified as athletes who reported previously using jerks as part of the sports conditioning programme) also completed a series of weightlifting jerks in the same session following the jump trials in a repeated measures design. Activities were subject to kinetic and kinematic data collection to allow calculation of 3D moments at the ankle knee and hip.

Subjects

12 athletic males from varied sports (mean \pm SD age 27.1 ± 4.3 years; body mass 83.7 ± 9.9 kg) volunteered the study and were informed of the procedures and risks prior to providing written consent for participation. The study was approved by the institutional research ethics committee for XXXX University College. Nine of the volunteers had been previously familiarised with the weightlifting jerk through its utilisation as part of their sport training and only these subjects jerked in the study. The data therefore comprise jumps from all 12 subjects and push jerks from 9 of the subjects.

Procedures

Following a standardised dynamic warm-up (A skips, straight leg run, A run, walking lunge, sumo squat, backward walking lunge and vertical jumps) subjects completed 5 unloaded vertical jumps with the arms held on the hips, with the highest jump (determined from air time using standard classical mechanics) utilised for analysis. Nine of the subjects then also performed an explosive weightlifting push jerk with a load of 40 kg following a self selected number of practice repetitions. Recovery between all repetitions was self selected by subjects with an instruction to take full recovery.

18 retro-reflective markers were placed on anatomical landmarks^{44,45} defining the right lower limb and pelvis (Table 1) and kinematic data for the markers collected

using an 8 camera automated motion tracking system (Vicon MX System, Nexus 1.2 software, Vicon Motion Systems Ltd, Oxford, UK) and filtered using a 5th order Woltring filter ⁵⁰ with a low-pass cut-off frequency of 10Hz. Kinetic data were collected from the right lower limb using a portable force plate (Kistler Type 9286AA, Bioware 3.24 software, Kistler Instruments AG, Winterthur, Switzerland). All data were collected synchronously at 200Hz.

Table 1 here.

The musculoskeletal model consisting of a series of 4 linked rigid segments (foot, leg, thigh and pelvis) connected by ball and socket joints at the ankle, knee and hip and the inverse optimization process utilised to calculate joint moments in 3D was implemented in C++ using Microsoft Visual Studio (Professional Edition; Microsoft Corporation, 2005) and has been previously described ^{9,10}. Musculoskeletal geometry was based on cadaveric data ²³ and linearly scaled individually based on subject anthropometry. Patellar rotation through knee flexion range was calculated by spline interpolating the data of Nha and colleagues ³¹. The model was used to generate lines of action and moment arms for 163 muscle elements. Inter-segmental forces were calculated iteratively from the ground reaction forces and linear accelerations of segments based upon standard Newtonian mechanics ^{49,52}. Following this the moment part of the wrench equations of Dumas et al. ¹⁵ was used to formulate the rotational equations of motion incorporating an explicit description as to the effect of each muscle element. This represents an indeterminate problem involving 9 equations and 163 unknowns which was solved using optimization techniques and a cost function based on the imperative to minimise muscle stress ¹².

Finally, the internal joint moments were calculated by summing the individual moments created by each muscle element. The details as to the modelling approach are described in more detail elsewhere^{8,9,10}. All moments were calculated in the local coordinate frame of the proximal body segment of each joint and normalized by body mass.

Statistical analyses

Data are presented as mean \pm SDs. 2 X 2 analysis of variance (joint x activity), with post hoc t-tests, was used to assess the hypothesis that there would be differences in peak sagittal joint moments between the jump and jerk. The hip:knee ratio in the jump and jerk were compared, to support coaches interpretation of interactions, with paired t-tests. Non sagittal plane moments are presented descriptively. Pearson correlation was used to consider relationships between jump performances and joint moments in the jump and the jerk. Pearson correlation was also used to consider relationships between the joint moments presented during the jerk and jump. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ was set a priori. Data for subjects who only jumped were excluded from statistical analyses that related to the jerk. They were included in correlations between jump height and moments during jumping and also in the characterisation of different jump patterns

RESULTS

Peak (and 95% likely range for the difference) sagittal plane moments observed during jumping, landing and jerking are shown along with hip:knee ratios in Table 2.

Sagittal plane joint extension moments are represented for the hip, knee and ankle by negative, positive and negative values respectively. Analysis of variance revealed significant main effects for activity ($F(2,16)=49.20$, $p<0.05$) and joint ($F(2,16)=340.83$, $p<0.05$). The sphericity assumption was violated for the interaction, however Greenhouse-Geisser corrected statistic still highlighted a significant interaction ($F(2.18,17.42)=6.16$, $p<0.05$). Post hoc analysis highlighted no differences in the moments generated at the ankle across the three tasks ($p>0.05$). Knee moments generated during the jerk were higher than those in both the jump and land ($p<0.05$). At the hip all three activities differed from one another with the jump generating the highest and the jerk the lowest hip moments ($p<0.05$). Hip:knee ratios were different ($p<0.05$) between all three tasks with jumping being typically the most balanced and landing and then jerking seeing respectively lower ratios and therein hip involvement.

Table 2 here.

Single subject example profiles (selected qualitatively as being the most typical in pattern) are presented as opposed to ensemble averages as variability in the frontal and transverse planes, along with different jumping styles being evident, meant that ensemble average profiles lost the capacity to describe any movement strategy evident in the population. Figure 1 presents a typical sagittal plane moment curve for a jump and landing and Figure 2 presents a jerk trial for the same subject. In jumping peak hip moment was achieved prior to peak knee moment, which in turn was followed by peak ankle moment. Similarly, during jerking peak knee moment was achieved prior to peak ankle moment. This ordering of moments in the jump and

1 jerk, evaluated qualitatively, was consistent for all subjects. There was less hip
2 involvement in jerking ($p<0.05$), and the timing of peak hip moment was less
3 consistent in relation to the peak knee moment. During landing, the reverse sequence
4 of peak moment development was observed with peak ankle moment occurring prior
5 to peak knee, and then hip moment. There was some variation in the hip moment
6 developed during landing as two subjects developed very little hip moment, whereas
7 the majority developed a large hip moment in effect replicating the jump takeoff in
8 reverse.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 *Figure 1 here*
23
24
25
26

27
28 *Figure 2 here*
29
30
31
32

33 Three jump strategies were described in the group. Where subjects hip:knee ratio
34 exceeded 1.1 (hip torque 10% higher than knee torque) jumpers were classed as hip
35 dominant. Vice versa where the ratio dropped below 0.9 jumpers were classified as
36 knee dominant. Ratios between 0.9 and 1.1 were classed as balanced. 3 athletes were
37 hip dominant, 4 were balanced and 5 were knee dominant. Figures 3, 4 and 5
38 highlight example profiles knee, hip, and balanced jumpers respectively.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 *Figure 3 here*
53
54
55
56

57
58 *Figure 4 here*
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 5 here

Tables 2 and 3 present the mean peak frontal and transverse plane moments observed during the three activities. Figure 6 presents the frontal and Figure 7 the transverse plane moments for an example subject during jumping and landing. Figure 8 presents the frontal and Figure 9 the transverse plane moments for the same subject during jerking. Positive frontal plane moments represent adduction moments in a proximal frame and positive transverse plane moments represent internal rotation in a proximal frame.

There was a wide degree of variation in the non-sagittal plane moments observed during jumping and landing. The most consistent pattern evident was that the ankle joint experienced an inversion moment throughout jumping and landing for all subjects. The ankle joint was generally subjected to an internal rotation moment, although for most subjects there was a brief external rotation moment immediately prior to takeoff, and some subjects experienced an external rotation moment at the point of landing. The majority of subjects experienced principally knee abduction during jumping with a brief adduction loading just before takeoff. During landing there was a high degree of variation in adduction and abduction loading of the knee. Similarly the internal/external rotation moment at the knee was highly variable during both takeoff and landing, and in particular it was not uncommon for the knee to experience rotation moments in both directions during takeoff. There was a trend to experience adduction followed by abduction moments at the hip during takeoff, with some subjects then experiencing a further adduction moment just before takeoff. The rotation moment at the hip tended to rapidly switch from internal to external

multiple times during takeoff. There was a high degree of variability in both the adduction/abduction and internal/external rotation moments experienced during landing although around half the cohort experienced a consistent pattern of adduction loading at landing.

During jerking the non-sagittal plane moments at the ankle were similar to those displayed during jumping. All subjects experienced inversion coupled with internal rotation moments at the ankle, with some subjects experiencing external rotation at the ankle at the point of take-off. The knee tended towards abduction loading although this pattern was not clear, whereas the rotation loading was highly variable. Frontal plane loading at the hip was variable, whereas in the transverse plane most subjects experienced some external rotation loading.

Table 3 here

Table 4 here

Figure 6 here

Figure 7 here

Figure 8 here

Figure 9 here

Figure 10 presents the correlation between peak ankle, knee and hip moments and vertical jump height. It is clear that there was no correlation between jump height and peak ankle moment ($p>0.05$). In contrast there were moderately-strong positive correlations between jump height and peak knee and hip moments which were significant ($p<0.05$). There was no correlation between peak moments during jerking and jump height ($p>0.05$). There was a significant and strong positive correlation between peak knee and hip moments between jumping and jerking ($p<0.05$).

Figure 10 here

DISCUSSION

In this study the inter-segmental moments produced during vertical jumping and the weightlifting jerk were evaluated. The mean sagittal plane moments during vertical jumping were found to be consistent with previous research^{26,46,47}. For instance, Vanezis and Lees computed the peak moments produced by the combined action of both legs in vertical jumping, and found that good jumpers produced peak moments at the ankle, knee and hip of 3.06 Nm/kg, 3.40 Nm/kg and 3.50 Nm/kg respectively, whereas poorer jumpers produced moments of 2.75 Nm/kg, 3.13 Nm/kg and 3.09 Nm/kg respectively. In this study, the peak moments for the right limb alone were calculated, however if these figures are doubled the values for ankle, knee and hip are 3.13 Nm/kg, 3.29 Nm/kg and 3.12 Nm/kg respectively. These values are in close

1 agreement with those produced by the jumpers in the Vanezis and Lees study.
2
3 Further, a visual inspection of the timing of peak moments, showed a proximal to
4
5 distal pattern in all cases. This was replicated during jerking, whereas during landing
6
7 it was reversed. Bobbert and colleagues ⁴ have argued that a proximal to distal
8
9 recruitment strategy allows the attainment of maximum vertical jump height by
10
11 preventing a premature takeoff during vertical jumping. The pattern of rotations
12
13 facilitates the joints of the lower limb to extend maximally, allowing the ankle, knee
14
15 and hip to perform the greatest amount of work. It seems likely that during jerking
16
17 the same proximal to distal recruitment strategy allows the torso segment to impart
18
19 the greatest velocity to the bar prior to lift off from the shoulders. . This similarity in
20
21 extension sequencing in the jump and jerk likely also serves to allow effective energy
22
23 transfer from proximal to distal joints and is common to other tasks such as running
24
25
26
27
28
29 ³⁷. Such commonality of the extension strategy for the lower limb increases the
30
31 likelihood of transfer of performance gains across tasks.
32
33
34
35
36

37 The correlation analysis revealed a moderately-strong and significant positive
38
39 correlation between vertical jump height and jump peak knee and hip moments.
40
41 There have been a number of studies that demonstrated a relationship between
42
43 muscular strength and jump performance ^{32,35,38,41}. The findings of this study suggest
44
45 one mechanism by which this relationship could be mediated, as athletes with higher
46
47 levels of muscular strength would be expected to be capable of expressing higher
48
49 peak hip and knee moments. In contrast the relationships between jump height and
50
51 jump ankle moments and all jerk moments were substantially weaker and not
52
53 statistically significant here. The weak relationship between ankle moments and
54
55 jumping is in agreement with previous work and is intuitive if the primary input via
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 the ankle is late and restricted to providing the final thrust when the majority of
2 velocity creation is complete ⁴. More importantly to coaches the meagre relationships
3 apparent between jerking and jump performance illustrate the limited influence of
4 jerk performance in a group that is homogenous on jump performance but
5 heterogeneous technically. Coaches therefore need to consider carefully when
6 selecting an exercise such as jerking for performance enhancement, precisely what
7 adaptation is likely to be promoted and how is it proposed this will transfer to, for
8 example, jumping performance for a specific athlete.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In contrast, there was a strong and significant correlation between the peak knee and
23 hip moments achieved in jumping and jerking. This seems intuitive considering the
24 strongest athletes are likely to be able to produce higher moments in both test
25 conditions providing they can demonstrate competent levels of skill in each task. It
26 is interesting to note that the weights jerked in this study were sub maximal whereas
27 the jumps were maximal. It may be that the relationship between knee and hip
28 moments becomes stronger as the weights jerked approach maximal loads. Equally
29 the strength of the relationship may fall since athletes were still exerting maximal
30 effort on those sub maximal loads, and as load increases the force-time
31 characteristics of the jerk skill progress further away from jumping and the
32 correspondence between the two skills may well fall. This point requires further
33 investigation. Nevertheless the results of this study suggest that those subjects who
34 are capable of expressing for example higher knee joint moments are able to express
35 these knee joint moments during both jumping and jerking. The ability to express
36 high knee joint moments is therefore at least in some part independent of the skill
37 performed and represents a characteristic of transferability.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Rousanoglou and colleagues ³⁸ found that measures of knee extensor strength
2 correlated to jump height in volleyball players but not with track and field jumpers.
3
4 Their work supports a proposition that different groups of athletes select different
5 movement strategies to perform maximal height vertical jumps and that as such
6 different strength adaptations might be required to further enhance performance. In
7
8 the present study, the cohort of jumpers considered was a heterogeneous group in
9
10 which both peak knee and hip moment was correlated with jump height. It may be
11
12 that in ‘knee dominant’ jumpers there is a stronger relationship between peak knee
13
14 moment and jump height and vice versa. If such a relationship could be established
15
16 this would potentially provide an explanation as to the findings of Rousanoglou and
17
18 co-workers. The track and field jumpers may select a more hip dominant strategy
19
20 and thus their performance may be more correlated with peak hip moment
21
22 production more so than peak knee moment. Conversely, the volleyball players may
23
24 be more knee dominant, and thus their performance may be more strongly influenced
25
26 by their ability to produce peak knee moments. This may be in part due to the
27
28 relative differences in horizontal components of motion between these sports and
29
30 points further to the importance of more fully understanding the correspondence
31
32 between skills and likely transferability of strength qualities. Further it raises
33
34 potential questions as to whether a knee dominant jumper’s performance would
35
36 benefit most from increases in hip moment or alternately further increases in knee
37
38 moment capability.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 In common with previous research ⁴⁶, a variation in jumping strategy was identified
55
56 here. Subjects selected a knee dominant, hip dominant or more balanced movement
57
58 strategy although taken as a cohort the production of hip moment was greater than
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

that of knee moment. In contrast, the mean moments produced upon landing favoured the production of knee moment but still two different landing strategies were observed in this study. Most subjects developed peak moments in a similar but reversed pattern to takeoff, using both the hip and knee joints, whereas two subjects relied heavily upon the development of knee joint moment to absorb the landing forces. These two subjects were also knee dominant jumpers, which may represent a consistent preferential recruitment of the knee over the hip. Cohort size restricted further correlational analysis of these subgroups which might inform a stronger characterisation of hip and knee dominant jumpers. Wider investigation is needed to determine what characteristics might cause athletes to select a particular joint dominant strategy, whether this is optimal for performance outcome and importantly whether this increases risk of injury at the same joint, particularly in the case of the knee. It may also be important to understand if these strategies transfer to other movements and further investigation to characterise movement strategy preference is necessary in jumping and other sports skills.

Comparative analysis of jumping and jerking reveals that the ankle joint appears to serve a similar function during the two activities, that of providing the final thrust, and that the magnitude of this contribution is the same in the two activities. Equally, during landing the moment produced at the ankle is similar. In contrast, the knee and hip are used very differently in jumping and jerking. Jerking is a knee dominant activity with a much greater emphasis on knee moment development as demonstrated in the substantially higher knee:hip moment ratios demonstrated, whereas jumping represents a much more balanced recruitment of knee and hip averaged across the cohort. This variation in movement strategy is likely linked to the restriction of trunk

1 motion enforced with the use of the barbell in the jerk. The apparent disassociation
2 in the relative magnitude of contribution of hip and knee moments further points to
3 the generality of jerking in relation to jumping tasks. Whilst this, in conjunction with
4 previously described correlations, might lead to a conclusion that jerking lacks
5 potential to transfer to jumping it should be considered that only 40kg was lifted in
6 the jerk trials. Assuming larger jerk loads would further increase knee moments, then
7 jerking would appear to offer an effective strategy to provide overload for peak knee
8 moment generation and would also likely offer greater correspondence to tasks
9 which are similarly dominated by knee function or have benefit where athletes are
10 perceived to be lacking in torque capability at the knee such as to say the knee
11 represents a 'weak link'. Jump squatting, or likewise any training activity where
12 trunk motion is similarly constrained, might be subject to a similar "disconnect" from
13 free jumping and requires further investigation.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 The non-sagittal plane moments reported in this study also show agreement with
36 previous work ^{2,22}. The ankle experienced a consistent pattern of inversion and
37 internal rotation loading in all three activities in this study which suggests both that
38 the ankle joint is utilized in a fairly consistent pattern in the studied activities and that
39 non-sagittal plane moments are well controlled at the ankle. In contrast, the non-
40 sagittal plane moments experienced at the hip and knee were much more variable.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 The mechanism of injury to the knee during non-contact landings is generally due to
50 a multiplane loading at the knee, often at small knee flexion angles, when a large
51 extensor moment is coupled with either frontal or transverse plane loading ^{17,30,42}.
52
53
54
55
56
57 Thus knee injuries during landing may be due in a large part to the development of
58 non-sagittal plane moments, especially unanticipated moments. Both the hip and
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 knee exhibited variability in the joint moments observed during landing. The hip
2 joint is structurally a very stable joint and is more likely to be able to withstand
3 variability in loading. In contrast, a potential explanation for the high incidence of
4 non-contact knee injuries during jumping ¹⁶ could be the variability of moments in
5 this relatively unstable joint.
6
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14
15 In this study, two contrasting landing styles were observed as discussed earlier. It
16 could be argued that the balanced landing strategy that equally recruited the knee and
17 hip represents the safest option, as the development of extensor moment is evenly
18 distributed between the hip and knee. However, no significant correlations were
19 found between the magnitudes of the sagittal plane knee moments and the non-
20 sagittal plane moments (not presented). That said the abduction moment correlation
21 of 0.53 (95% likely range -0.06 to 0.85; $p=0.07$) would suggest that a meaningful
22 positive relationship is might exist between these variables. Thus although the knee
23 may be more heavily loaded in the sagittal plane by a knee dominant landing
24 strategy, further investigation is necessary to elucidate the potential for this style to
25 result in increased non-sagittal plane loading. This relationship should be explored
26 further particularly in populations known to be at higher risk of knee injury such as
27 females ^{5,34} using designs with higher statistical power than was achieved here.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 This study provides further evidence as to the utility of inverse dynamics analysis in
51 understanding movement correspondence. The existence of distinct jumping
52 strategies (knee or hip dominant) has been reinforced and the constraint of vertical
53 bar motion in the jerk shown to result in the activity being clearly knee dominant.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Despite the direct relationship between jerk moments and jump performance being
61
62
63
64
65

weak an avenue for correspondence is highlighted in the relationship between hip and knee peak moments in the jump and jerk. Sagittal plane control has been shown to be variable and the implications of this for injury risk along with the potential to reduce variability needs consideration. Future research should attempt to further describe variations in jumping and landing strategies, whether these strategies transfer across a wider set of sports skills and their impact on non-sagittal plane moments. Additionally the causes of jumping strategy variability require investigation along with the implications for training interventions centred at reinforcing or changing athletes existing strategy through general strength, flexibility or technical training. Equally the understanding of the characteristics of OL activities could be further improved and the relationship between weightlifting and jumping, as well as other fundamental sports skills, clarified.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

The results of this study suggest that in order to improve vertical jump performance a key consideration should be to improve an athlete's ability to produce both peak knee and hip moments during the jump. Coaches should be aware that their athletes may select to jump and land with hip or knee dominant strategies and understand that an athlete's particular movement strategy may be a function of their relative strengths and weaknesses, and predicate the type of training that has potential for improving their performance, either through an approach to change this strategy (by enhancing hip moment capabilities in a knee dominant jumper) or to reinforce it (by increasing knee moment capabilities in a knee dominant jumper). Finally this study indicates that the jerk exercise can be classified as knee dominant and may be effective in

overloading and therein increasing an athlete's ability to generate peak knee moments more so than ankle or hip, although it is unable to substantiate whether this will in turn lead directly to increases in vertical jump height.

Acknowledgements

The authors have no conflict of interests nor received funding from any external agency for this project. The authors would like to thank Hayley Legg for her assistance with data collection during this study.

References

1. Anderson, F.C. and M.G. Pandy. A dynamic optimization solution for vertical jumping in three dimensions. *Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomechanical Engineering*. 2: 201-231. 1999.
2. Bisseling, R.W., A.L. Hof, and S.W. Bredeweg. Are the take-off and landing phase dynamics of the volleyball spike jump related to patellar tendinopathy? *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 42: 483-489. 2008.
3. Blackburn, J.T. and D.A. Padua. Influence of trunk flexion on hip and knee joint kinematics during a controlled drop landing. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 23: 313-319. 2008.
4. Bobbert, M.F. and A.J. van Soest. Why do people jump the way they do? *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*. 29: 95-102. 2001.
5. Borowski, L.A., E.E. Yard, S.K. Fields, and R.D. Comstock. The epidemiology of US high school basketball injuries, 2005-2007. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*. 36: 2328-2336. 2008.
6. Campos, J., P. Poletaev, A. Cuesta, C. Pablos and V. Carratala. Kinematical analysis of the snatch in elite male junior weightlifters of different weight categories. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 20: 843-850. 2006.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 7. Clarys, J.P. Electromyography in sports and occupational settings: an update
8
9 of its limits and possibilities. *Ergonomics*. 43:1750-62. 2000.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
8. Cleather, D.J. and A.M.J. Bull. Lower extremity musculoskeletal geometry
effects the calculation of patellofemoral forces in vertical jumping and
weightlifting. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers
Part H - Journal of Engineering in Medicine*. 224: 1073-83. 2010.
9. Cleather, D.J., J.E. Goodwin and A.M.J. Bull. An optimization approach to
inverse dynamics provides insight as to the function of the biarticular
muscle during vertical jumping. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*.
39: 147-60. 2011.
10. Cleather, D.J., J.E. Goodwin and A.M.J. Bull. Erratum to: An optimization
approach to inverse dynamics provides insight as to the function of
the biarticular muscle during vertical jumping. *Annals of Biomedical
Engineering*. 39: 2476-8. 2011.
11. Collins, J.J. Antagonistic-synergistic muscle action at the knee during
competitive weightlifting. *Medical and Biological Engineering and
Computing*. 32: 168-174. 1994.
12. Crowninshield, R.D. and R.A. Brand. A physiologically based criterion of
muscle force prediction in locomotion. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 14:
793-801. 1981.

13. Decker, M.J., M.R. Torry, D.J. Wyland, W.I. Sterett and J.R. Steadman.
Gender differences in lower extremity kinematics, kinetics and energy
absorption during landing. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 18: 662-669. 2003.
14. Dumas, R. A 3D Generic Inverse Dynamic Method using Wrench Notation
and Quaternion Algebra. *Computer methods in biomechanics and
biomedical engineering*. 7: 159-166. 2004.
15. Dumas, R., R. Aissaoui and J.A. de Guise. A 3D generic inverse dynamic
method using wrench notation and quaternion algebra. *Computer
methods in biomechanics and biomedical engineering*. 7: 159-166.
2004.
16. Erdemir, A., S. McLean, W. Herzog and A.J. van den Bogert. Model-based
estimation of muscle forces exerted during movements. *Clinical
Biomechanics*. 22: 131-154. 2007.
17. Ferretti, A., P. Papandrea, F. Conteduca and P.P. Mariani. Knee ligament
injuries in volleyball players. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*.
20: 203-207. 1992.
18. Fukashiro, S. and P.V. Komi. Joint Moment and Mechanical Power Flow of
the Lower-Limb During Vertical Jump. *International Journal of
Sports Medicine*. 8: 15-21. 1987.

19. Garhammer, J. A review of power output studies of olympic and
powerlifting: Methodology, performance prediction, and evaluation
tests. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 7: 76-89. 1993.
20. Garhammer, J. and R. Gregor. Propulsion forces as a function of intensity for
weightlifting and vertical jumping. *Journal of Applied Sport Science
Research*. 6: 129-134. 1992.
21. Gourgoulis, V., N. Aggeloussis, V. Kalivas, P. Antoniou and G. Mavromatis.
Snatch lift kinematics and bar energetics in male adolescent and adult
weightlifters. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*. 44:
126-131. 2004.
22. Hass, C.J., E.A. Schick, M.D. Tillman, J.W. Chow, D. Brunt and J.H.
Cauraugh. Knee biomechanics during landings: Comparison of pre-
and postpubescent females. *Medicine and science in sports and
exercise*. 37: 100-107. 2005.
23. Horsman, M.D., H.F.J.M. Koopman, F.C.T. van der Helm, L. Poliacu Prose
and H.E.K. Veeger. Morphological muscle and joint parameters for
musculoskeletal modelling of the lower extremity. *Clinical
Biomechanics*. 22: 239-247. 2007.
24. Kernozek, T.W. and R.J. Ragan. Estimation of anterior cruciate ligament
tension from inverse dynamics data and electromyography in females
during drop landing. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 23: 1279-1286. 2008.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
25. Lauder, M.A. and J.P. Lake. Biomechanical comparison of unilateral and bilateral power snatch lifts. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 22: 653-660. 2008.
26. Lees, A., J. Vanrenterghem and D. de Clercq. The maximal and submaximal vertical jump: Implications for strength and conditioning. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 18: 787-791. 2004.
27. Li, G., K.R. Kaufman, E.Y.S. Chao and H.E. Rubash. Prediction of antagonistic muscle forces using inverse dynamic optimization during flexion/extension of the knee. *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering*. 121: 316-322. 1999.
28. Luhtanen, P. and P.V. Komi. Segmental Contribution to Forces in Vertical Jump. *European Journal of Applied Physiology and Occupational Physiology*. 38: 181-188. 1978.
29. McNitt-Gray, J.L. Kinetics of the Lower-Extremities During Drop Landings from 3 Heights. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 26: 1037-1046. 1993.
30. Meyer, E.G. and R.C. Haut. Anterior cruciate ligament injury induced by internal tibial torsion or tibiofemoral compression. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 41: 3377-3383. 2008.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
31. Nha, K.W., R. Papannagari, T.J. Gill, S.K Van de Velde, A.A. Freiberg, H.E. Rubash and G. Li. In vivo patellar tracking: Clinical motions and patellofemoral indices. *Journal of Orthopaedic Research*. 26: 1067-1074. 2008.
32. Nuzzo, J.L., J.M. McBride, P. Cormie and G.O. McCaulley. Relationship between countermovement jump performance and multijoint isometric and dynamic tests of strength. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 22: 699-707. 2008.
33. Pandy, M.G. and F.E Zajac. Optimal muscular coordination strategies for jumping. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 24: 1-10. 1991.
34. Parkkari, J., K. Pasanen, V.M Mattila, P. Kannus and A. Rimpela. The risk for a cruciate ligament injury of the knee in adolescents and young adults: A population-based cohort study of 46500 people with a 9 year follow-up. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 42: 422-426. 2008.
35. Peterson, M.D., B.A. Alvar and M.R. Rhea. The contribution of maximal force production to explosive movement young collegiate athletes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 20: 867-873. 2006.
36. Pflum, M.A., K.B. Shelburne, M.R. Torrey, M.J. Decker and M.G. Pandy. Model prediction of anterior cruciate ligament force during drop-landings. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*. 36: 1949-1958. 2004.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
37. Prilutsky, B.I and V.M. Zatsiorsky. Tendon action of two-joint muscles:
transfer of mechanical energy between joints during jumping, landing
and running. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 27: 25-34. 1994.
38. Rousanoglou, EN, G.V. Georgiadis, and K.D. Boudolos. Muscular strength
and jumping performance relationships in young women athletes.
Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research. 22: 1375-1378. 2008.
39. Schenau, G.J.V., M.F. Bobbert, and A. deHaan. Does elastic energy enhance
work and efficiency in the stretch-shortening cycle? *Journal of*
Applied Biomechanics. 13: 389-415. 1997.
40. T.C. Sell, C.M. Ferris, J.P Abt, Y.S. Tsai, J.B. Myers, F.H. Fu, and S.M.
Lephart. Predictors of proximal tibia anterior shear force during a
vertical stop-jump. *Journal of Orthopaedic Research*. 25: 1589-1597.
2007.
41. Sheppard, J.M., J.B. Cronin, T.J. Gabbett, M.R. McGuigan, N. Etxebarria,
and R.U. Newton. Relative importance of strength, power, and
anthropometric measures to jump performance of elite volleyball
players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 22: 758-765.
2008.
42. Shimokochi, Y. and S.J. Shultz. Mechanisms of noncontact anterior cruciate
ligament injury. *Journal of Athletic Training*. 43: 396-408. 2008.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
43. Souza, A.L. and S.D Shimada. Biomechanical analysis of the knee during the power clean. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 16: 290-297. 2002.
44. Van Sint Jan, S. Skeletal landmark definitions: Guidelines for accurate and reproducible palpation. University of Brussels, Department of Anatomy (www.Ulb.Ac.Be/~Anatemb). 2005.
45. Van Sint Jan, S. and U.D. Croce, Identifying the location of human skeletal landmarks: Why standardized definitions are necessary - a proposal. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 20: 659-660. 2005.
46. Vanezis, A and A. Lees, A biomechanical analysis of good and poor performers of the vertical jump. *Ergonomics*. 48: 1594-1603 2005.
47. Vanrenterghem, J., A. Lees, M. Lenoir, P. Aerts, and D. de Clercq, Performing the vertical jump: Movement adaptations for submaximal jumping. *Human movement science*. 22: 713-727. 2004.
48. Verkhoshansky, Y.V. *Special Strength Training*. Michigan: Ultimate Athlete Concepts, 2006.
49. Winter, D.A. *Biomechanics and Motor Control of Human Movement*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2005.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
50. Woltring, H.J. A Fortran package for generalized, cross-validatory spline smoothing and differentiation. *Advances in Engineering Software*. 8: 104-113. 1986.
51. Yeow, CH, Lee, PVS, and Goh, JCH. Effect of landing height on frontal plane kinematics, kinetics and energy dissipation at lower extremity joints. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 42:1967-1973. 2009.
52. Zatsiorsky, VM. Kinetics of Human Motion. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics: 2002.
53. Zernicke, R.F., J. Garhammer, and F.W. Jobe. Human patellar-tendon rupture. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery-American*. 59:179-183. 1977.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Sagittal plane moments during vertical jumping and landing (Subject 3).
Extension moments are negative at the hip, positive at the knee and negative at the ankle.

Figure 2. Sagittal plane moments during jerking (Subject 3).

Figure 3. Sagittal plane moments during vertical jumping and landing for a knee dominant jumper (Subject 5).

Figure 4. Sagittal plane moments during vertical jumping and landing for a hip dominant jumper (Subject 10).

Figure 5. Sagittal plane moments during vertical jumping and landing for a balanced jumper (Subject 12).

Figure 6. Frontal plane moments during jumping and landing (Subject 3).

Figure 7. Transverse plane moments during jumping and landing (Subject 3).

Figure 8. Frontal plane moments during jerking (Subject 3).

Figure 9. Transverse plane moments during jerking (Subject 3).

Figure 10. Correlations (Pearson's r and 95% likely range) between jump height and peak joint moments for the jump and jerk. (* $p < 0.05$)

Table Legends

Table 1. Retroreflective marker locations for kinematic data capture

Table 2. Peak normalized sagittal plane moments (Nm/kg) for the ankle, knee and hip during jumping, landing and jerking and hip:knee peak torque ratio (%) along with differences and 95% likely range for the difference. * = $p < 0.05$

Table 3. Mean peak frontal plane moments (Nm/kg) during jumping, landing and jerking. * indicates mean peak ankle moment was not an eversion moment – minimum inversion moment is presented instead.

Table 4. Mean peak transverse plane moments (Nm/kg) during jumping, landing and jerking.

Figure 1

(all legends are presented at the end of the manuscript)




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9




Figure 10




Table 1

Location

Right anterior superior iliac spine

Left anterior superior iliac spine

Right posterior superior iliac spine

Left posterior superior iliac spine

Lateral femoral epicondyle

Medial femoral epicondyle

3 non-colinear markers placed on a rigid plastic plate attached
to the mid thigh

Apex of the lateral malleolus

Apex of the medial malleolus

3 non-colinear markers placed on the anterior tibial shaft

Posterior aspect of calcaneus

Tuberosity of the fifth metatarsal

Head of the second metatarsal

Additional marker placed on top of the foot

Table 2

	Ankle		Knee		Hip		Hip:Knee Ratio	
Jump	-1.56	0.16	1.65	0.21	-1.56	0.21	96.02	16.21
Land	-1.59	0.34	1.75	0.51	-1.05	0.43	70.44	46.46
Jerk	-1.48	0.35	2.34	0.46	-0.61	0.48	25.99	17.52
Jump to land difference	0.03 (-0.18 to 0.24)		-0.10 (-0.37 to 0.17)		-0.52 * (-0.74 to -0.29)		25.58 * (3.95 to 47.21)	
Jump to jerk difference	-0.09 (-0.35 to 0.17)		-0.72 * (-0.98 to -0.46)		-0.99 * (-1.26 to -0.72)		73.71 * (60.46 to 86.97)	
Land to jerk difference	-0.07 (-0.46 to 0.32)		-0.60 * (-0.95 to -0.25)		-0.50 * (-0.80 to -0.21)		50.51 * (21.34 to 79.7)	

Table 3

	Ankle		Knee		Hip	
	Inversion	Eversion	Adduction	Abduction	Adduction	Abduction
Jump	0.49 <i>0.17</i>	0.03 <i>0.09</i>	0.33 <i>0.13</i>	0.34 <i>0.18</i>	0.48 <i>0.31</i>	0.36 <i>0.17</i>
Land	0.61 <i>0.23</i>	0.01 <i>0.10</i>	0.48 <i>0.14</i>	0.35 <i>0.37</i>	0.49 <i>0.24</i>	0.37 <i>0.34</i>
Jerk	0.57 <i>0.14</i>	0.05* <i>0.03</i>	0.21 <i>0.10</i>	0.29 <i>0.17</i>	0.29 <i>0.21</i>	0.40 <i>0.23</i>

Table 4

	Ankle		Knee		Hip	
	Int Rot	Ext Rot	Int Rot	Ext Rot	Int Rot	Ext Rot
Jump	0.12 <i>0.07</i>	0.09 <i>0.08</i>	0.17 <i>0.12</i>	0.10 <i>0.09</i>	0.35 <i>0.24</i>	0.30 <i>0.14</i>
Land	0.23 <i>0.09</i>	0.08 <i>0.13</i>	0.14 <i>0.10</i>	0.10 <i>0.05</i>	0.25 <i>0.15</i>	0.24 <i>0.17</i>
Jerk	0.12 <i>0.07</i>	0.06 <i>0.05</i>	0.14 <i>0.09</i>	0.7 <i>0.7</i>	0.07 <i>0.06</i>	0.21 <i>0.14</i>