
Citation:

Whitehead, S and Till, K and Weaving, D and Jones, B (2018) Authors' Reply to Carling et al: Comment on: "The Use of Microtechnology to Quantify the Peak Match Demands of the Football Codes: A Systematic Review". Sports Medicine. ISSN 0112-1642 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-1028-8>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/5538/>

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.

Authors Reply to Carling et al. Comment on: “The Use of Microtechnology to Quantify the Peak Match Demands of the Football Codes: A Systematic Review.”

Sarah Whitehead^{1,2}, Kevin Till^{1,2,3}, Dan Weaving^{1,2} and Ben Jones^{1,2,3,4}

1 Institute for Sport, Physical Activity and Leisure, Leeds

Beckett University, Leeds LS6 3QS, UK

2 Leeds Rhinos Rugby League Club, Leeds, UK

3 Yorkshire Carnegie Rugby Union Club, Leeds, UK

4 The Rugby Football League, Leeds, UK

Corresponding author:

Sarah Whitehead

Institute of Sport, Physical Activity and Leisure

Leeds Beckett University

UK

Email: s.whitehead@leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank Carling et al. [1] for their constructive comments on our recent systematic review [2] and welcome the opportunity to address the points they raise. We agree that further debate and research is required in this area. We addressed a range of limitations to current research and suggested a range of future directions in our review [2], and we are glad that this has prompted further discussions in the area.

Firstly, Carling and colleagues [1] expressed their concerns that the restriction of the review [2] to microtechnology derived data omitted several studies in soccer (e.g., [3-7]). These studies were not included in our systematic review due to their use of optical tracking techniques as opposed to microtechnology devices, thus they did not meet the eligibility criteria of the review and were removed at the screening stage (see Figure 1 in [2]). We would firstly like to emphasis the title of our review: “The use of *microtechnology* to quantify...”, indicating the purpose of the review was to provide awareness of how microtechnology devices can be used in research and practice to quantify the peak demands of the football codes. This is further demonstrated by the primary aims of the review, which were “to: (1) determine the methodologies utilised to quantify the peak match demands within the football codes; (2) identify the GPS and MEMs variables reported for peak match demands”. The advancement in microtechnology units has led to increased popularity in their use amongst the football codes, particularly in the use of the micro-electrical mechanical systems (MEMs) derived variables, e.g., PlayerLoad™ (as used by two soccer studies included in the review [8,9]), which cannot be derived from optical tracking techniques.

The rationale for the exclusion of studies using optical tracking techniques was due to the low agreement between optical tracking and GPS technologies. Semi-automatic multiple-camera systems are reported to measure higher total distances covered, particularly at higher running speeds [10,11] (~24 to 37% greater compared to GPS technologies [11]), and significantly greater peak 5-minute periods of high intensity running (~247 vs 188 m for semi-automatic multiple-camera systems vs GPS devices respectively) [11], thus limiting the ability to integrate data between systems without calibration equations [10]. Therefore, it is likely that separate summaries would have been required to report both optical tracking and

microtechnology data within the same systematic review for each of the investigated variables. Whilst this could be achieved if the review was soccer specific, we feel that this would have diluted the data and conclusions within the systematic review when considering all the football codes. Furthermore, soccer is one of the few football codes that use optical tracking techniques, thus was not deemed an important focus when the review was targeted at all the football codes.

Secondly, the application and use of the peak demands or ‘worst case scenario’ of match-play in practice was questioned [1]. Although Carling and colleagues [1] propose some interesting points for discussion within the area, unfortunately we were unable to include information on the questions posed as this research has not yet been undertaken. We state in the discussion section that further information is required, such as additional concurrent physical (e.g., collisions in the rugby codes) and technical-tactical demands (e.g., during what passages/type of play are these demands occurring) to aid prescribing more code-specific drills. Additionally, the ability to provide more specific prescription recommendations in our systematic review is limited by the current lack of research on the dose-response of fatigue and training adaptations to peak demands specific training. Carling et al [1] also highlight the match-to-match variability of the peak high speed running activity in soccer [12], questioning the impact on prescription of training. We do acknowledge that variability does naturally exist and should be considered. By utilising the ranges in the peak demands often reported [13,14], players can be prepared for the highest peak demands that may be experienced during the season.

Further interesting points are raised by Carling et al [1] regarding the alignment of the peak demands with the technical-tactical demands, which we provided as a future research direction based upon timestamping microtechnology and video analysis data. Whilst we acknowledge that some areas of our review could have been expanded further we were constrained by the journal word count and tried to summarise areas for future research. The papers identified by Carling and colleagues (e.g., 15-18) provide further insight into understanding the physical and technical-tactical demands and we would like to thank Carling and colleagues for referring readers to these journals for developing a greater understanding in this area.

Finally, we acknowledge the points made by Carling et al [1] regarding the use of multiple clubs. Whilst their rationale for why multiple club studies cannot be easily generalised is valid, it is anecdotal, and is dependent upon the research question, but again providing scope for further research. Furthermore, with appropriate statistical analysis some of the factors mentioned (e.g., physical and technical abilities) could be accounted for. Therefore, we still believe researchers should aim to collect multi-club data sets to enhance knowledge and understanding of match-play of sports and wider factors linked to performance.

We would again like to thank Carling et al [1] for their letter, as we feel that it poses interesting future original research questions. The exclusion of their work, was due to the specific purpose of our systematic review, which was clearly outlined and defined within our search criteria.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Funding

No sources of funding were used to assist in the preparation of this letter.

Conflict of Interest

Sarah Whitehead, Kevin Till, Dan Weaving and Ben Jones declare they have no conflicts of interest relevant to the content of this letter.

References

1. Carling C, McCall A, Harper D, Bradley P. Comment on: “The use of microtechnology to quantify the peak match demands of the football codes: a systematic review”. *Sports Med.* 2018
2. Whitehead S, Till K, Weaving D, Jones B. The use of microtechnology to quantify the peak match demands of the football codes: a systematic review. *Sports Med.* First online 7 August 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-0965-6>.
3. Bradley PS, Di Mascio M, Peart D, Olsen P, Sheldon B. High-intensity activity profiles of elite soccer players at different performance levels. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2010;24:2343-51
4. Di Mascio M, Bradley PS. Evaluation of the most intense high-intensity running period in English FA premier league soccer matches. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2013;27:909-15.
5. Fransson D, Krustup P, Mohr M. Running intensity fluctuations indicate temporary performance decrement in top-class football. *Sci Med Football.* 2017;1:10-17.
6. Mohr M, Krustup P, Andersson H, Kirkendal D, Bangsbo J. Match activities of elite women soccer players at different performance levels. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2008;22:341-9.
7. Mohr M, Krustup P, Bangsbo J. Match performance of high standard soccer players with special reference to development of fatigue. *J Sports Sci.* 2003;21:519-28.
8. Ramos GP, Nakamura FY, Pereira LA, Junior WB, Mahseredjian F, Wilke CF, et al. Movement patterns of a U-20 national women’s soccer team during competitive matches: influence of playing position and performance in the first half. *Int J Sports Med.* 2017;38(10):747–54.
9. Trewin J, Meylan C, Varley MC, Cronin J. The match-to-match variation of match-running in elite female soccer. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2018;21(2):196–201.
10. Buchheit M, Allen A, Poon TK, Modonutti M, Gregson W, Di Salvo V. Integrating different tracking systems in football: multiple camera semi-automatic system, local position measurement and GPS technologies. *J Sports Sci.* 2014;32:1844-57.
11. Randers M, Mujika I, Hewitt A, Santisteban J, Bischoff R, Solano R, Zubillaga A, Peltola E, Krustup P, Mohr M. Application of four different football match analysis systems: A comparative study. *J Sports Sci.* 2010;28:171-82.
12. Carling C, Bradley P, McCall A, Dupont G. Match-to-match variability in high-speed running activity in a professional soccer team. *J Sports Sci.* 2016;34:2215-23.
13. Read DB, Till K, Beasley G, Clarkson M, Heyworth R, Lee J, Weakley JJ, Phibbs PJ, Roe GA, Darrall-Jones J, Jones B. Maximum running intensities during English academy rugby union match-play. *Sci Med Football.* 2018;22:1-7.
14. Whitehead S, Till K, Weaving D, Dalton-Barron N, Ireton M, Jones B. The duration-specific peak average running speeds of European Super League Academy rugby league match-play. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2018.
15. Ade J, Fitzpatrick J, Bradley PS. High-intensity efforts in elite soccer matches and associated movement patterns, technical skills and tactical actions. Information for position-specific training drills. *J Sports Sci.* 2016;34:2205-14.
16. Bradley PS, Ade JD. Are current physical match performance metrics in elite soccer fit for purpose or is the adoption of an integrated approach needed? *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2018;13:656-64.
17. Bradley PS, Di Mascio M, Mohr M, Fransson D, Wells C, Moreira A, et al. Can modern trends in elite football match demands be translated into novel training and testing modes?

Aspetar Sports Med J. 2018;7;46-52.

18. Bradley PS, Evans M, Laws A, Ade JD. 'Context is King' when interpreting match physical performances. Football Medic & Scientist. 2018;24:42-45.