

Citation:

Emmonds, S and Till, K and Redgrave, J and Murrary, E and Turner, L and Robinson, C and Jones, B (2018) THE INFLUENCE OF AGE ON THE ANTHROPOMETRIC AND PER-FORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH LEVEL YOUTH FEMALE SOCCER PLAYERS. International journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 13 (5). pp. 779-786. ISSN 1747-9541 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954118757437

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record: https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/4656/

Document Version: Article (Accepted Version)

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please contact us and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

1	THE INFLUENCE OF AGE ON THE ANTHROPOMETRIC AND PERFORMANCE
2	CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH LEVEL YOUTH FEMALE SOCCER PLAYERS
3	
4	Emmonds, S; Till K; Redgrave, J; Murray, M; Turner, L; Robinson, C; Jones, B.
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 ABSTRACT
- 38

39 The purpose of this study was to evaluate the anthropometric and performance characteristics 40 of high level youth female soccer players by annual-age category (U10-U16). Data were 41 collected from 157 female soccer players (U16; *n*=46, U14; *n*=43, U12; *n*=38, U10; *n*=30), 42 recruited from three high level female soccer academies in England. Players completed 43 assessments of anthropometry (height and body mass), isometric mid-thigh pull strength 44 (IMTP), jump height (CM]), aerobic capacity (YYIRL1), change of direction (505-left/right), and 45 speed (10 and 30 m). Magnitude based-inferences were used to assess for practical significance 46 between consecutive age groups. Height (very likely - most likely), body mass (very likely - most 47 *likely*), absolute strength (*most likely*), jump height (*likely – very likely*), and distance on the 48 YYIRL1 (possibly – most likely) were greater in older players. Both speed and change of 49 direction time were *most likely* to *very likely* lower in older players. However, only *most likely* 50 *trivial-possibly trivial* differences were observed in relative strength between age groups. 51 Findings suggest that physical characteristics except for relative strength differentiate by age 52 categories. These findings provide comparative data and target reference data for such 53 populations and can be used by coaches and practitioners for player development purposes. 54 Practitioners should be aware that relative strength does not differ between age categories in 55 high level youth female soccer players. 56

57 Key words: soccer, youth, fitness, performance, anthropometry

59 **INTRODUCTION**

60

61 Soccer is an intermittent team sport, played worldwide at amateur to professional levels at all 62 ages¹. In recent years an increased popularity of female soccer has resulted in an increase in 63 participation and more opportunities to play soccer professionally in Europe and the United 64 States of America (USA)². During matches, elite female soccer players have been reported to 65 cover a total distance of ~10 km, with 1.53–1.68 km at high speeds (>15-16 km·h⁻¹)³. The 66 distance covered during high-intensity and sprinting activities are known to be the main 67 determinants between higher and lower standards of play with elite female players reported to 68 complete 28% more high speed running and 24% greater distance sprinting compared to non-69 elite level players⁴. Furthermore, it is the explosive actions such as sprinting, jumping, tackling 70 and change of direction (CoD) that appear to influence the outcome of games⁵. Such demands 71 necessitate that players demonstrate a high level of athleticism (i.e. speed, power, strength, 72 aerobic capacity). As such it is important that these physical qualities are developed through 73 structured and progressive strength and conditioning training, in conjunction with field based 74 technical/tactical sessions. Furthermore, the English Football Association (FA) have suggested 75 female soccer players require more 'athleticism' compared to current levels observed in order 76 to compete at an international level and coaches should look to develop athleticism in young 77 players⁶.

78

To support this growth and development of female soccer, the FA in England have created elite
Regional Talent Centre's (RTC's) for the identification and development of the next generation
of female soccer players, similar to the processes in the men's game (e.g., English Player
Performance Plan; EPPP;⁷). The RTC's operate within youth age categories (i.e., Under 10 [U10],
U12, U14 and U16), whereby girls are selected to train and compete to develop technical,
tactical, psychological and physical qualities, all paramount to soccer performance³. Within the
RTC's players regularly undertake fitness testing to monitor their physical development.

86 However, to date research examining the physical qualities of youth female players is limited. As 87 such it is difficult for practitioners working with this cohort to evaluate the physical 88 characteristics of players and develop physical development programmes for these players 89 accordingly. Taylor et al.⁸ explored the physical characteristics of youth female soccer players, 90 however the sample size was limited with only 2 age categories (U13 and U15) included and 9-91 10 participants per age group which are not representative of the current age group structuring 92 at the FA and therefore are limited. Povoas et al.⁹ investigated the development of aerobic 93 fitness in 9-16 year old trained Portuguese female soccer players, however different versions of 94 the Yo-Yo test were used at different age groups making comparisons difficult. The physical 95 characteristics of U12-U21 female soccer players from the USA have been investigated¹⁰ but the 96 testing battery did not include anthropometry, aerobic capacity or strength, which are 97 important considerations in the physical assessment and development of youth soccer 98 players¹¹. Furthermore, the training systems implemented in female soccer in Portugal and the 99 USA are different to the RTC's in England. Finally, with the increased professionalism within 100 female soccer (i.e., structured strength and conditioning), data presented by Vesocovi et al.¹⁰ 101 may not be reflective of the physical characteristics of current youth female players in England. 102 Therefore, the presentation of up to date sex specific physical characteristics of youth female 103 soccer players is necessary for use by strength and conditioning coaches to inform training 104 prescription design.

105

the purpose of the current study was to present the anthropometric and performance
characteristics of high level youth female soccer players aged 9-16 years in England. The
secondary purpose was to evaluate the differences in anthropometric and performance
characteristics between age categories (i.e., U10, U12, U14 and U16).

110

111 **METHODS**

113 Experimental Approach to the Problem

114 A cross-sectional study design was conducted to evaluate the anthropometric and performance 115 characteristics of high level youth female soccer players by age category. All participants 116 undertook an anthropometric and physical testing battery at the start of the 2016-2017 season 117 (i.e., September). Testing was conducted a minimum of 48 hours post competitive match play or 118 training at each respective RTC. The testing battery included assessments of anthropometry 119 (height and body mass), strength (isometric mid-thigh pull [IMTP]), lower body power 120 (countermovement jump [CMJ]), change of direction (505 test; left and right), speed (10 and 121 30m) and Yo-Yo intermittent recovery test level 1 (YYIRL1). The YYIRL1 was not conducted at 122 U10 as this was not current practice at the RTC's and not routinely part of the clubs testing 123 battery. With the exception of IMTP, the testing battery was consistent with the testing battery 124 players regularly undertake within the academies. A standardized warm-up, including jogging, 125 dynamic movements, and stretches was carried out before testing, followed by full instruction 126 and demonstrations of the assessments. The sprint, CoD and YYIRL1 tests were all carried out 127 on an indoor surface with players wearing trainers to ensure consistency in the surface and 128 conditions. All testing was undertaken by the lead researcher.

129

130 Subjects

131 One hundred and fifty seven female soccer players (U10, *n*=30; U12, *n*=38, U14, *n*=43, U16, 132 n=46) were recruited from three Tier 1 female soccer RTC's in England. All subjects were free 133 from injury at the time of the study. U10 and U12 groups trained twice per week and U14 and 134 U16 groups trained three times per week. Each age group had one competitive fixture per week 135 during the season. Prior to participation, institutional ethics approval and assent was provided 136 by players and their parents/guardians after being made aware of the benefits and risks of the 137 study. Age categories were defined by chronological age on the 1st September 2016, which 138 established their status for competition.

140 Procedures

141

142 Anthropometry

Participants standing height (cm) was recorded to the nearest 0.1cm using a 132 Seca Alpha
stadiometer (model 2251821009, Germany). Body mass (kg) was measured to the nearest 0.1kg
using calibrated Seca Alpha (model 770, Germany) scales.

146

147 Strength

148 The IMTP was performed on a portable force platform (AMTI, ACP, Watertown, MA) with a 149 sampling rate of 1,000 Hz, which is consistent with previous methodologies¹². Participants 150 performed the IMTP on a customized pull rack, using a self-selected position similar to that of 151 the second pull of a power clean, with a flat trunk position and their shoulders in line with the 152 bar¹¹. The self-selected position was preferred, as differences in knee and hip joint angles during 153 the IMTP have previously been shown to have no influence on kinetic variables¹³. Participants 154 were given two practice maximal trials prior to testing commencing. Participants were 155 instructed to pull as "fast and hard" as possible, and received loud, verbal encouragement¹². 156 157 Each participant completed two trials lasting 5 secs, with 5 mins rest between each trial. The 158 start of the IMTP was identified in the software using a 5 standard deviations (SD) gathered 159 from a 1 second standing noise period before the start of the pull. Previous literature has 160 suggested an onset threshold of 5 SD as it accounts for the signal noise during the weighing 161 period and therefore there is a greater certainty that the onset of contraction identifies a true 162 meaningful change in force¹¹. The highest peak force (PF) achieved over the 2 trials was

163 considered the participants 'best trial' and recorded for analysis. Relative PF was calculated

using the ratio scaling method (i.e. PF / body mass)¹⁴. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC)

and coefficient of variation (CV) for PF were *r*=0.933, CV=3.6%.

167 Lower Body Power

168 Lower body power was assessed using a CMJ. The CMJ were performed as described by Le Gall 169 et al.¹⁰, using a portable photoelectric cell system (Optojump; Microgate, Bolzano, Italy). This 170 equipment has been reported to be reliable (CV=6%) and valid for CMJ assessment compared 171 with a biomechanical force plate¹⁵. Jump height was calculated using the cell system software 172 (Optojump Next v1.7.9; Microgate). Participants completed 3 submaximal CMJ efforts prior to 173 testing commencing. The CMJ started from an upright position. When given a verbal command, 174 the subject made the downward countermovement to their preferred depth and then jumped as 175 high as possible. Subjects were allowed to use their arms during the swing phase of the jump^{5,11}, 176 and were required to maintain straight legs while airborne. The highest jump was selected for 177 analysis from the 3 repetitions completed with 2 mins recovery between jumps. ICC and CV's for 178 CMJ were *r*=0.957, CV=4.5%.

179

180 Change of Direction Speed

181 Change of direction (CoD) speed was assessed using the 505 test¹⁷. Timing gates (Brower 182 Timing Systems, IR Emit, USA) were placed 10m from the start point. The participants 183 accelerated from the start, through the timing gates, turning 180^o at the 15m mark and sprinted 184 back through the timing gates. Participants completed 3 alternate attempts of turning off each 185 foot, separated by a 2–3 mins rest period. Only attempts whereby the participant's foot crossed 186 the 15m mark were recorded. Times were recorded to the nearest 0.01 sec with the quickest of 187 the 3 attempts used. Data are presented as dominant (D) or non-dominant (ND) foot based on 188 preferred kicking foot. ICC and CV for the 505 test were *r*=0.99, CV=2.2%.

189

190 Speed

191 Sprint time was assessed over 10 and 30m using timing gates (Brower Timing Systems, IR Emit,

192 USA). Participants started 0.5m behind the initial timing gate and were instructed to set off in

their own time and run maximally past the 30m timing gate. Each subject had 3 attempts,

separated by a 3 min rest period. Times were recorded to the nearest 0.01 sec with the quickest
of the three attempts used for the 10m and 30m speed score. ICC and CV's for 10 and 30m sprint
time were *r*=0.76, CV=4.8% and *r*=0.78, CV=3.9%, respectively.

197

198 Aerobic Capacity

199 The YYIRL1 was used as a *proxy* measure of aerobic capacity, due to the validity of the test for 200 the assessment of soccer specific fitness¹⁶. The test consisted of repeated 20m shuttle runs at 201 progressively increasing speeds dictated by an audio bleep emitted from a CD player. Between 202 each shuttle there was a recovery period of 10 sec, involving walking around a marker placed 5 203 m behind the finishing line. Failure to achieve the shuttle run in time on two occasions resulted 204 in termination of the test. Total running distance, including the last missed shuttle was recorded 205 and reported. ICC and CV for the YYIRL1 test have been reported as *r*=0.98, CV=4.9%¹⁶.

206

207 Statistical Analyses

208 Data are presented as mean ± SD by annual-age category, with comparisons made between 209 consecutive age groups (e.g., U10 vs. U12). All data were log transformed to reduce bias as a 210 result of non-uniformity error. Magnitude based-inferences were used to assess for practical 211 significance¹⁸. The threshold for a difference to be considered practically important (the 212 smallest worthwhile difference; SWD) was set at 0.2 x between subject SD for the comparison 213 groups, based on Cohen's d effect size (ES) principle. The probability that the magnitude of 214 difference was greater than the SWD was rated as <0.5%, *almost certainly not*; 0.5-5%, *very* 215 unlikely; 5-25%, unlikely; 25-75%, possibly; 75-95%, likely; 95-99.5%, very likely; >99.5%, almost 216 certainly (16). Where the 90% Confidence Interval (CI) crossed both the upper and lower 217 boundaries of the SWD (ES±0.2), the magnitude of difference was described as unclear¹⁸. 218

219 **RESULTS**

221	The performance characteristics of elite youth female soccer players by annual age category and
222	standardized differences between consecutive age groups are presented in Table 1.
223	
224	***Insert Table 1 here***
225	
226	Height and body mass were <i>most likely</i> to <i>very likely</i> greater in each successive older age groups.
227	Peak force was most likely greater for older age groups, however relative PF was possibly to
228	most likely trivial between consecutive age groups. Differences in CMJ height were likely to very
229	likely greater in older players. YYIRL1 was most likely to possibly greater in older players. Both
230	10 and 30 m sprint times were <i>most likely</i> to <i>very likely</i> lower in older players between U10-U12
231	and U14-16, and <i>possibly</i> lower between U12-U14. 505 CoD was very likely to very likely lower in
232	older age groups.
233	
234	DISCUSSION
235	
236	This is the first study to present the anthropometric and performance characteristics of youth
237	female soccer players in England. The findings from this research provide novel reference data
238	for high level youth female soccer players, aged 9-16 years and suggest that height, body mass,
239	absolute strength, lower body power, CoD and speed improved in older youth female soccer
240	players, although no differences for relative strength were observed. The findings of this study
241	can be used for both player development purposes and to inform the design of individual
242	specific strength and conditioning programmes for youth female soccer players.
243	
244	This study showed that the mean height and body mass of players in this study were smaller
245	and lighter than that reported for female Portuguese players at 9-11 years (Age 9.7±0.7 yrs.,
246	Height: 141.0±5.3 cm, body mass: 36.1±6.8 kg), 12-13 years (Age: 12.5±0.9 yrs., Height:
247	155.7±6.4 cm, body mass: 55.2±14.0 kg) and 14-16 years (Age: 14.8±0.8 yrs., Height: 164.6±7.6

cm, body mass: 57.5±8.5 kg⁹). Anthropometric characteristics were greater in older players,
with a similar likelihood of difference demonstrated between each consecutive age group for
height and body mass. Differences in height and body mass are associated with increased
maturity with increasing chronological age, along with the biological, morphological, hormonal
and neurological changes that occur during this period of development²¹.

253

254 The strength data presented in this study is the first in either male or female youth soccer 255 players, assessed via an IMTP. The IMTP was used rather than a three or five repetition 256 maximum, which has been used in previous research with older players¹³, as it offers a safe and 257 reliable strength assessment when working with young athletes and has a strong correlation 258 with dynamic performance²². Peak force was greater in older age groups, however relative PF 259 demonstrated only *possibly* to *most likely trivial* differences between age categories. The greater 260 absolute strength in older players is likely two-fold, attributed to biological changes including 261 increased body mass with age^{23} and an increased exposure to a structured strength and 262 conditioning programme, with older players undertaking two structured strength and 263 conditioning session per week. The limited difference in relative strength is important for 264 practitioners, whom should acknowledge that relative strength does not increase with age. 265 Changes in strength are likely a consequence of body mass increases with age. Although 266 relative strength did not differentiate between age categories, specific training interventions 267 may be warranted in this cohort. Strength is important for injury prevention, and soccer 268 performance, given the known relationship with anterior-cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries in 269 female athletes²⁴ and explosive activities²⁵. There is limited contact time within an RTC, and 270 strength and conditioning training is still a relatively new in youth female soccer²⁵.

271

Countermovement jump height was greater for older age groups However, CMJ height was less
than previously observed in female soccer players (Junior [17.3 years] 33.1±3.2 cm and Senior
[23.4 years] 38.8±4.8 cm⁵).. Given body mass and CMJ height were greater in older groups, this

would suggest an exponential increase in power output with increasing age. Previous literature
has also reported improvements in vertical jump performance until 15-16 years in youth female
soccer players¹⁰, likely due to growth-related changes in both leg length and muscle mass²⁸ and
hormonal, muscular, and mechanical factors caused by the onset of puberty²⁹.

279

280 U16 players in the current study were quicker than 15-19 year old elite Australian female 281 soccer players (U16: 2.53 ± 0.09 vs. 2.64 ± 0.09 s) on the 505 test³¹. CoD ability improved by age, 282 with the greatest changes occurring between U12-U14. This is consistent with youth American 283 female soccer players on the Illinois agility test, where large changes between 12–13 years were 284 observed, followed by modest improvements between 15-16 years¹⁰. The underpinning 285 mechanisms to explain such development in CoD are likely via nervous system development, 286 governed by improvements in intra-muscular and inter-muscular coordination and general 287 motor control improvement that children and adolescents experience between such 288 chronological ages²¹. Warms ups prior to training may provide a good opportunity to develop 289 CoD technique with supplementary strength training in the gym, further improving CoD ability.

290

291 Sprint times for U16 players in this study were quicker than observed in 15 to 19 year old elite 292 Australian (U16: 1.96 ± 0.14 vs. 10m; $2.01 \pm 0.08s^{31}$) players but slower than that reported for 293 18 to 20 years university female soccer players (10m 1.92 \pm 0.13; 30m 4.78 \pm 0.22s³²). Speed 294 has been suggested to develop to a similar magnitude in both male and females up until the age 295 of 12 years⁸. Differences between younger male and female players may therefore be due to 296 training exposure, or differences of expertise between the two training environments. 297 Furthermore, speed development by age is based on population data³³, whereby the data 298 discussed within this study is from trained soccer players that are selected (e.g., identified and 299 invited to join the respective club). As such, deviations around mean population data may 300 explain why male athletes are quicker than female athletes, if indeed females as a population

are more homogenous than males. This again may have implications for mixed-sex soccer inEngland up to the age of U16.

303

304 Both 10 and 30m speed were quicker in older players. The greatest changes in speed were 305 observed from U10-U12 (both 10 and 30m), which is likely due to very large increases in height 306 and therefore stride length, as well as central nervous system adaptation that occur around this 307 age³⁴. Literature specific to adult athletes has suggested, sprinting ability over short (10m) and 308 longer distances (30m) is considered to require separate and specific biomechanical and 309 neuromuscular qualities and therefore training techniques^{35, 36}. However, findings from this 310 study suggest that indices of acceleration and maximal running speed in young soccer players 311 might share common factors, which is consistent with findings in previous literature for female 312 youth athletes³⁸ and suggests that both acceleration and maximal sprint speed can be developed 313 using the same training variables in youth soccer players. Given the time restraints within a 314 soccer academy, warm ups prior to field based sessions may provide a good opportunity to 315 work on acceleration and maximum running speed in youth soccer players.

316

317 The YYIRL1 distance achieved by players in this study was less than observed in Portuguese 318 trained female soccer players of a similar age (U12: 635 ± 241 m vs. U9 to U11 Portuguese 319 players; 705±316m, U14: 886 ± 334 m vs. U12 to U13 Portuguese players; 1214±487m, Povoas 320 et al.⁹). Unfortunately, Povoas et al.⁹ evaluated the aerobic capacity in U14 to U16 players using 321 the YYIRL2, thus comparisons with the U14 and U16 players in this study are not possible. 322 YYIRL1 distance for youth male soccer players (U11; 802±259m and U13; 1199±358m, Deprez 323 et al.²⁷) was greater than observed in the female players, which may have implications for 324 mixed-sex soccer, which occurs in England up to the age of U16. Mean distance covered on the 325 YYIRL1 for U16 players was 959±299m, which is less than that previously reported for elite 326 senior female players (1224-1379m^{5, 20}). Speculatively this is likely to be even higher now given 327 the increased professionalism of the women's game over the last 10 years.

328

329 Older players achieved greater scores in the YYIRL1. The greater difference between U12-U14 330 compared to U14-U16 demonstrates different development trajectories between specific age 331 groups. Developments in aerobic capacity from U12-U14 are likely associated with maturational 332 increases in peak oxygen uptake, which is associated with the attainment of peak height 333 velocity²⁹. Furthermore, there is an increased training and match exposure for older players, 334 whereby match duration is increased from 60 mins (U12) to 80 mins (U14). With an increase in 335 match intensity with age previously reported in male youth soccer players³⁹ this would likely 336 result in enhanced physiological adaptation beyond normal growth and development. Older 337 players also undertake an additional 90-minute pitch based soccer session per week, which 338 included specific aerobic development drills, as well as an additional gym based strength and 339 conditioning work, which may further contribute to the development of more advanced 340 physical qualities.

341

342 Given the biological differences in players that likely exist within an annual age category, a 343 limitation of this study was that maturation status was not considered. Future research should 344 look to explore the influence of maturation status on the physical characteristics of youth 345 female soccer players. However, the current structure within the RTC's is based on 346 chronological age (i.e., U10, U12, U14, U16), therefore despite biological differences within an 347 age group, the current data provides normative standards for fitness qualities regularly tested 348 within an academy structure. A second limitation of this study was that it was not possible to 349 obtain training age data of the participants. Therefore, future research should also look to 350 consider the influence of how many years a participant has been within a structured training 351 environment on the physical development of players.

352

353 CONCLUSION

This study provides anthropometric and performance characteristics comparative data for 9-16
year old high level female soccer players. Findings demonstrate that anthropometric and
performance characteristics develop with increasing age except for relative strength in this
cohort. Athletic development of players in addition to technical/tactical development of should
be a key focus of training with appropriate strength and conditioning sessions incorporated in
to the weekly training structure to develop the athleticism of players.

361

362

363 **PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

364

365 The overall athletic development of female soccer players should be a long-term priority for 366 coaches working with this cohort. The development of good movement qualities³⁸, alongside 367 strength should form the basis of the physical conditioning programme. Aerobic fitness has 368 been shown to discriminate between elite and sub-elite senior female soccer players²⁰. Given 369 the strong relationship between high-intensity running in match-play and performance on the 370 YYIRL1²⁰, it is important that the development of the aerobic capacity of players is strategically 371 planned within the training structure. The concurrent development of the aforementioned 372 performance qualities, within a limited contact time environment can be achieved by 373 prescribing specific strength training sessions, and using warm ups prior to training to develop 374 physical qualities, such as speed and CoD ability. Manipulation of small-sided games combined 375 with short duration intermittent high-intensity running drills may provide an efficient training 376 stimulus to develop the aerobic system whilst concurrently developing technical/tactical skills 377 within the same session³⁹.

378

Given that athletes within an elite environment do not likely strive to be average (i.e.,
 comparison to mean data), assessing physical performance in comparison to benchmark
 percentile data may provide a more useful assessment value⁴⁰. Therefore Table 2 presents

382	the testing data for each annual age group by percentiles. It is recommended that such data
383	should be used by coaches working with youth players to evaluate player physical
384	development
385	
386	***Insert Table 2 here***
387	
388	
389	
390	
391	
392	
393	
394	
395	
396	
397	
398	
399	
400	
401	
402	
403	
404	
405	
406	
407	
408	

409	REFE	REFERENCES				
410 411	1.	Stølen T, Chamari K, Castagna C, et al. Physiology of soccer. J Sports Med 2005; 35: 501-				
412		536.				
413	2.	Wright MD. Neuromuscular training in girl's football—The challenge of applying				
414		evidence based practice in an FA center of excellence. <i>J Sports Sci</i> 2014; 32: 93–100.				
415	3.	Datson N, Hulton A, Andersson H, et al. Applied physiology of female soccer: an update. J				
416		Sports Med 2014; 44: 1225-1240.				
417	4.	Mohr M, Krustrup P, Andersson H, et al. Match activities of elite women soccer players at				
418		different performance levels. J Strength Cond Res 2008; 22: 341-349.				
419	5.	Mujika I, Santisteban J, Impellizzeri FM, et al. Fitness determinants of success in men's				
420		and women's football. J Sports Sci 2009; 27: 107–114.				
421	6.	Campbell S. English female footballers 'need more athleticism' says FA's Baroness				
422		Campbell. 2017. Retrieved from: <u>http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/football/39285007</u>				
423	7.	Noon MR, James RS, Clarke ND, et al. Perceptions of well-being and physical				
424		performance in English elite youth footballers across a season. <i>J Sports Sci</i> 2015; 33:				
425		2106-2115.				
426	8.	Taylor J, Portas M, Wright MD, et al. Within-season variation of fitness in elite youth				
427		female soccer players. J Athl Enhanc 2013.				
428	9.	Póvoas SC, Castagna C, Soares JMDC, et al. Reliability and Construct Validity of Yo-Yo				
429		Tests in Untrained and Soccer-Trained Schoolgirls Aged 9–16. Pediatr Exerc Sci 2016;				
430		28: 321-330.				
431	10	. Vescovi JD, Rupf R, Brown TD, et al. Physical performance characteristics of high-level				
432		female soccer players 12–21 years of age. Scand J Med Sci Sports 2011; 21:670–678.				
433	11	. Le Gall F, Carling C, Williams AM, et al. Anthropometric and fitness characteristics of				
434		international, professional and amateur male graduate soccer players from an elite				
435		youth academy. <i>J Sci Med Sport</i> 2010; 13: 90–95.				

436	12.	Dos'Santos T, Jones PA, Comfort P, et al. Effect of Different Onset Thresholds on
437		Isometric Mid-Thigh Pull Force-Time Variables. J Strength Cond Res 2017.
438	13.	Comfort P, Stewart A, Bloom L, et al. Relationships between strength, sprint, and jump
439		performance in well-trained youth soccer players. J Strength Cond Res 2014; 28: 173-
440		177.
441	14.	Jacobson BH. A comparison of absolute, ratio and allometric scaling methods for
442		normalizing strength in elite American football players. <i>J Athl Enhanc</i> . 2013.
443	15.	Glatthorn JF, Gouge S, Nussbaumer S, et al. Validity and reliability of Optojump
444		photoelectric cells for estimating vertical jump height. J Strength Cond Res 2011; 25:
445		556-560.
446	16.	Krustrup P, Mohr M, Amstrup T, et al. The yo-yo intermittent recovery test:
447		physiological response, reliability, and validity. J Med Sci Sports Exerc 2003; 35: 697-705.
448	17.	Nimphius S, McGuigan MR, and Newton RU. Relationship between strength, speed, and
449		change of direction performance of female softball players. J Strength Cond Res 2010; 24:
450		885-895.
451	18.	Hopkins W, Marshall S, Batterham A, et al. Progressive statistics for studies in sports
452		medicine and exercise science. J Med Sci Sport Exerc 2009; 41: 3.
453	19.	Emmonds S, Till K, Jones B et al. Anthropometric, speed and endurance characteristics of
454		English academy soccer players: Do they influence obtaining a professional contract at
455		18 years of age? Int J Sports Sci Coach 2016; 11:.212-218.
456	20.	Krustrup P, Mohr M, Ellingsgaard H, et al. Physical demands during an elite female
457		soccer game: importance of training status. J Med Sci Sports Exerc 2005; 37:1242–1248.
458	21.	Ford P, De Ste Croix M, Lloyd R, et al. The long-term athlete development model:
459		Physiological evidence and application. <i>J Sports Sci</i> 2011; 29: 389-402.
460	22.	McGuigan MR, Newton MJ, Winchester JB, et al. Relationship between isometric and
461		dynamic strength in recreationally trained men. J Strength Cond Res 2010; 24: 2570–
462		2573.

- 463 23. Armstrong N, and van Mechelen, W. Paediatric Exercise Science and Medicine: Oxford
 464 University Press, 2008.
- 465 24. Sugimoto D, Myer GD, Foss KDB, et al. Specific exercise effects of preventive
- 466 neuromuscular training intervention on anterior cruciate ligament injury risk reduction
- in young females: Meta-analysis and subgroup analysis. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med* 2015;
- 468 49: 282–289.
- 469 25. Suchomel TJ, Nimphius S and Stone, MH. The importance of muscular strength in athletic
 470 performance. *J Sports Med* 2016; 46:1419-1449.
- 471 26. Wright MD and Laas MM. Strength training and metabolic conditioning for female youth
 472 and adolescent soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res* 2016; 38: 96-104.
- 473 27. Deprez D, Fransen J, Boone J, et al. Characteristics of high-level youth soccer players:
 474 variation by playing position. *J Sports Sci* 2015; 33:243-254.
- 475 28. Butterfield SA, Lehnhard R, Lee J, et al. Growth rates in running speed and vertical
 476 jumping by boys and girls ages 11–13. *Percept Mot Skills* 2004; 99: 225–234.
- 477 29. Malina RM, Bouchard C and Bar-Or O. Growth, maturation, and physical activity.
- 478 Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2004.
- 30. Harley JA, Barnes CA, Portas M, et al. Motion analysis of match-play in elite U12 to U16
 age-group soccer players. *J Sports Sci* 2010; 28: 1391-1397.
- 481 31. Hoare DG and Warr CR. Talent identification and women's soccer: An Australian
 482 experience. *J Sports Sci* 2000; 18: 751–758.
- 483 32. McFarland IT, Dawes JJ, Elder CL, et al. Relationship of two vertical jumping tests to
- 484 sprint and change of direction speed among male and female collegiate soccer
 485 players. *Sports* 2016; 4: 11.
- 486 33. Oliver JL, Meyers RW, Lloyd RS, et al. Enhancing power and speed in youth: New
- 487 Insights: International Convention of Science, Education and Medicine in Sport, Glasgow,
- 488 Scotland, Routledge Online Studies 2012; 64–65.

- 489 34. Schepens B, Willems P and Cavagna, GA. The mechanics of running in children. *J Physiol*490 1998; 50:927–940.
- 491 35. Harris NK, Cronin JB, Hopkins W, et al. Relationship between sprint times and the
- 492 strength/power outputs of a machine squat jump. *J Strength Cond Res* 2008; 22: 691–
 493 698.
- 494 36. Little T and Williams AG. Specificity of acceleration, maximum speed, and agility in
 495 professional soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res* 2005; 19:76–78.
- 496 37. Vescovi JD and McGuigan MR. Relationship between sprinting, agility and jump ability in
 497 female athletes. *J Sport Sci 2008; 26: 97-107.*
- 498 38. Lloyd RS, Faigenbaum AD, Stone MH, et al. Position statement on youth resistance
- training: the 2014 International Consensus. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med* 2013.
- 500 39. Dellal A, Jannault R, Lopez-Segovia M, et al. Influence of the numbers of players in the
- heart rate responses of youth soccer players within 2 vs. 2, 3 vs. 3 and 4 vs. 4 smallsided games. *J Hum Kinet* 2011; 28: 107-114.
- 503 40. Jones B, Till K, Manley A, et al. A multidisciplinary approach to the profiling and
- interpretation of fitness testing data: a case study example. *J Aus Strength Cond* 2017;
- 505 31-36.
- 506
- 507