Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk

RELIABILITY AND MEASUREMENT OF INTER-LIMB ASYMMETRIES IN 4 UNILATERAL JUMP TESTS IN ELITE YOUTH FEMALE SOCCER PLAYERS

AUTHORS:

Jermaine McCubbine [1] (MSc, ASCC), Anthony Turner [2] (PhD, ASCC, CSCS*D), Tom Dos'
Santos [3] (MSc) and Chris Bishop [2] (MSc, ASCC)

AFFILIATIONS:

1. Arsenal Football Club Training Ground, Bell Lane, London Colney, St. Albans, AL2
   1DR, UK

2. London Sport Institute, School of Science and Technology, Middlesex University,
   Greenlands Lane, Allianz Park, NW4 1RL, London, UK

3. Directorate of Sport, Exercise and Physiotherapy, University of Salford, Frederick
   Road, Salford, Greater Manchester M6 6PU, UK

CORRESPONDENCE:

Name: Chris Bishop

Email: C.Bishop@mdx.ac.uk

Address: As above for affiliation 1.

RELIABILITY AND MEASUREMENT OF INTER-LIMB ASYMMETRIES IN 4 UNILATERAL JUMP TESTS IN ELITE YOUTH FEMALE SOCCER PLAYERS

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to determine the within and between-session reliability, and inter-limb asymmetries, in four unilateral jump tests in elite youth female soccer players. Given the low plyometric training age and paucity of data for this population, this research study was warranted. **Methods:** Nineteen elite youth female soccer players (age: 10 ± 1.1 years; height: 141 ± 7.9 cm; body mass: 35 ± 7.1 kg) were recruited from an elite Tier 1 Regional Talent Centre of a professional soccer club. Tests included the single leg countermovement jump (SLCMJ), single leg hop, triple hop, and crossover hops for distance with reliability quantified via the coefficient of variation (CV), intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), and standard error of the measurement (SEM). Inter-limb asymmetries were also calculated. **Results:** Both test sessions resulted in excellent within-session reliability (ICC range = 0.81-0.99; SEM range = 0.11-0.49; and CV range = 2.6-6.0%). Between-session reliability was deemed good to excellent (ICC range = 0.72-0.99 and pooled CV = 2.7-5.7%). Asymmetries were deemed small across both test sessions with the highest value reported in the SLCMJ (6.12%). **Conclusion:** Results highlight that unilateral jump tests can be considered a reliable test protocol in elite youth female soccer players, which is important considering youth athletes likely do not have a vast plyometric training age. Furthermore, inter-limb differences appear small in the present sample which may also be explained by their limited training age, given that asymmetries have previously been highlighted to be a product of limb function over time.

Key Words: Lower extremity, single leg, youth athletes

INTRODUCTION

Physical performance testing is a common component for strength and conditioning practitioners to undertake, allowing athletes' fitness capabilities to be effectively monitored which in turn may aid the decision-making process during the design of training interventions. Numerous factors must be considered when selecting appropriate fitness tests to measure performance including: age, equipment, environment, time, training age, and the reliability of the test itself need to be determined in order to assess if a given protocol is to be included or excluded from a test battery (5). Test reliability is crucial as this will enable practitioners to determine if the chosen assessment produces consistent results; thus, allowing results to be interpreted with confidence (33).

Jump testing is a common mode of assessment as it provides a relatively quick and reliable method for assessing the explosive capabilities of athletes (20,22,34). Sports such as soccer, basketball and volleyball, have used bilateral countermovement jumps (CMJ), drop jumps (DJ), and squat jumps (SJ) to assess lower limb power (13,26,35). However, many team sport actions (such as jumping, changing direction, and sprinting) occur unilaterally; thus, this provides additional considerations for test protocols taking place on one leg (5,30). Furthermore, given the multi-planar nature of team sports (12), testing protocols should reflect this also so that they can be considered ecologically valid for the population in question. Consequently, a variety of unilateral jump tests exist that enable the aforementioned factors to be accounted for. However, owing to the high degree of movement variability associated with jump testing (17), and the heightened instability of testing unilaterally, assessing the reliability of these tests becomes even more important. The single leg countermovement jump (SLCMJ) and a variety of hop tests (single leg hop, triple hop, and crossover hop) have been commonly used in the literature. Typically, test-retest reliability of these tests appears strong with intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) values between 0.8-

74   0.98 (7,14,21,23,25,28,29,31). However, considerably less information exists about the

75   reliability of these tests for youth athletes (9,24), especially those competing at the highest

76   level in female youth soccer. Given that youth athletes likely have a lower plyometric

77   training age than adults, additional reliability data on this population is warranted.

78   An additional advantage of selecting unilateral variations of these jump tests is that they also

79   enable inter-limb asymmetries to be quantified. Recent literature has highlighted that

80   unilateral jump testing is a useful method for quantifying between-limb differences (3,4,5). In

81   addition, it has been suggested that assessing asymmetries from unilateral tests may be more

82   applicable than their bilateral counterparts because no contribution from the other limb is

83   present (2,5). This is compounded from research by Jordan et al. (17), who highlighted the

84   changing nature of asymmetries during different phases of bilateral jumping before take-off.

85   From a physical performance perspective, Maloney et al. (19) reported that inter-limb

86   differences in jump height were an important factor in explaining slower change of direction

87   times and additional negative associations between strength asymmetries and performance

88   have also been noted (4). When considering injury risk, asymmetries of 15% have historically

89   been suggested as a threshold to be mindful of (15,28). However, more recent research has

90   proposed that patients are four times more likely to re-rupture their anterior cruciate ligament

91   (ACL) if an asymmetry threshold of 10% is not met from hop testing as part of a return to

92   sport criteria (18). Thus, the presence of inter-limb differences may have implications on

93   physical performance and injury risk, indicating their quantification from unilateral jump

94   testing is warranted.

95   Therefore, the aims of the present study were to report within and between-session reliability

96   of four commonly used unilateral jump tests (SLCMJ, single leg hop, triple hop, and

97   crossover hop for distance) in elite youth female soccer players. In addition, inter-limb

98   differences were also quantified for all jump tests enabling the creation of a multi-directional

99   asymmetry profile for this population.

100

101   **METHODS**

102   **Subjects**

103   Nineteen elite youth female soccer players (age: 10 ± 1.1 years; height: 141 ± 7.9 cm; body

104   mass: 35 ± 7.1 kg), were recruited from a Tier 1 Regional Talent Centre (RTC) of a

105   professional soccer club. Subjects were considered elite as this particular level is the highest

106   standard of female youth club soccer in England. Players trained for at least 36 weeks per

107   year and were required to partake in a minimum of one hour of structured strength and

108   conditioning training per week. Emphasis at this age was placed on mastering fundamental

109   movement patterns, building strong foundations, enhancing technical competency, and

110   improving general motor control. All subjects were free from injury and any player who

111   presented an injury resulting in more than one week of missed training prior to testing was

112   excluded. Informed consent and PAR-Q forms were completed from all relevant

113   parent/guardians as all participants were under the age of 18. Ethical approval was granted

114   from the London Sports Institute ethics committee, Middlesex University.

115   **Procedures**

116   Participants were tested at the same time of day on three separate testing occasions, each

117   separated by seven days. Session one was used to familiarize all participants with the test

118   procedures, allowing them to practice each jump test as many times as they wanted. A

119   particular emphasis was placed on landing mechanics, owing to the increased demand of

120   having to land on one limb in the chosen tests. The next two sessions were used for official

121   testing and data collection. All participants were asked not to participate in any strenuous

122   exercise at least 24 hours prior to testing, and to ensure they wore the same footwear on each

123   occasion to negate the effects of different shoe design and support structures. Both testing

124   sessions took place on a third generation pitch, which subjects were used to training on twice

125   weekly. Each test consisted of three trials on each limb with 60 seconds rest between trials,

126   and 2-minutes rest between tests, to enable full recovery (28). All tests were conducted in a

127   randomized, counter-balanced order, to negate any potential learning effects. Before

128   familiarization and testing sessions, all participants completed a standardized warm-up

129   protocol (Table 1), following the RAMP system as outlined by Jeffreys (16). This consisted

130   of dynamic exercises progressing from low intensity and generic movements to higher

131   intensity with more specific movement patterns. A 3-minute rest period was prescribed

132   between the completion of the warm up and commencement of the first test.

133

134   *** INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE ***

135

136   *Single leg countermovement jump (SLCMJ).* Subjects stood in an upright position, hands on

137   hips, with feet positioned hip width apart. One leg lifted off the floor to approximately mid

138   shin height of the standing leg. Subjects then squatted to a self-selected depth followed by a

139   quick upward vertical movement, jumping as high as possible. The jumping leg had to remain

140   fully extended and hands fixed to hips; any deviation from this resulted in a retrial after a 60-

141   second rest period. Jump height was calculated by the flight time method using the "My

142   Jump" iPhone application, which has been shown to be a reliable method for quantifying this

143   outcome measure (1).

144

145   *Single Hop (for distance).* Subjects begin by standing on a designated testing leg with hands

146 on hips and their toes behind the starting line. Subjects were then instructed to hop as far

147 forward as possible and land on the same leg (Figure 1). Upon landing, participants were

148 required to 'hold and stick' their position for two seconds. Failure to stick the landing

149 resulted in a void trial and a retrial after a 60-second rest. This was consistent across all trials

150 for all hop tests. The distance hopped from the starting line to the point where the subject's

151 landing heel hit in the final position was then recorded to the nearest centimeter using a

152 standard measuring tape (also used for all hop tests).

153 *Triple Hop (for distance).* Subjects begin by standing on the designated testing leg, hands on

154 hips with their toes behind the starting line. Subjects were instructed to take three maximal

155 hops forward, landing on the same leg throughout and holding and sticking the 3rd contact for

156 two seconds (Figure 1). The distance hopped from the starting line to the landing position of

157 the subjects' heel of the same limb was then measured and recorded to the nearest centimeter.

158

159 *Crossover Hop (for distance).* Subjects began by standing on the designated testing leg, with

160 their toes behind the starting line. If subjects were hopping with their right leg, they started

161 the test on the right side of the measuring tape and vice versa if they started on the left limb.

162 Subjects were instructed to take three consecutive maximal hops forward; each time crossing

163 over an area measuring 15 cm wide landing on the same leg throughout (Figure 1). As per

164 previous hop testing protocols, all subjects were required to stick the final landing for two

165 seconds. The distance hopped from the starting line to the point where the subject's heel hit

166 on completion of the third jump was measured and recorded to the nearest centimeter.

167

168 *** INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE ***

169

170

Statistical Analyses

All data was initially computed as means and standard deviations (SD) in Microsoft Excel™. The coefficient of variation (CV) and standard error of the measurement (SEM) were used to quantify absolute reliability, whilst the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) with absolute agreement quantified relative reliability. Interpretation of ICC values was in accordance with previous research where values > 0.75 are considered 'excellent', 0.4-0.75 are considered 'good', and anything < 0.4 is considered 'poor' (10), and CV's were deemed acceptable if < 10% (6). Both within and between-session reliability were calculated with the CV being quantified in Microsoft Excel™ and all other statistics computed in SPSS (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). In addition, the smallest worthwhile change (SWC) was calculated by multiplying the pooled SD by 0.2 (33), and then converted to a percentage. Finally, inter-limb asymmetries were calculated using the equation: (maximum value − minimum value)/maximum value x 100 which has been previously used in research for youth soccer athletes (27), and was quantified from an average of the three trials.

RESULTS

Within-session reliability for the first testing session was excellent (Table 2: ICC range = 0.82-0.99; SEM range = 0.11-0.42; and CV range = 2.6-6.0%). Within-session reliability for testing session two was also excellent (Table 3: ICC range = 0.81-0.99; SEM range = 0.16-0.49; and CV range = 2.8-5.4%). Between-session reliability for all hop tests was good to excellent (Table 4: ICC range = 0.72-0.99; pooled CV range = 2.7-5.7%; and SWC range = 2.35-5.95%). Inter-limb differences were ≤ 6.12% during both sessions for all tests (Tables 2 and 3).

*** INSERT TABLES 2-4 ABOUT HERE ***

196

DISCUSSION

The aims of the present study were to determine within and between-session reliability, and quantify inter-limb asymmetries from four unilateral jump tests in in elite youth female soccer players. Given the paucity of data about both reliability and asymmetries in this population, this research study was warranted.

Tables 2 and 3 highlight within-session reliability data for both data collection sessions. Cormack et al. (6) suggest that acceptable typical error (CV) values should fall below 10% and with the highest CV value of 6.0% reported across both sessions; within-session reliability was good to excellent. In general, the SLCMJ provided the smallest typical error (2.6-3.5%) and the crossover hop the largest (3.6-6.0%). Although anecdotal, when the repeated nature of the crossover hop is combined with the inclusion of some lateral movement, it is unsurprising that larger variability is seen within this test. However, all values are still deemed to be acceptable. A similar trend is followed when interpreting results from the ICC with the reliability of the SLCMJ near perfect (0.99). In contrast, the crossover hop showed ICC values of 0.82-0.83 on the right limb; however, reliability was notably better on the left side (0.93-0.94). Regardless, with results being interpreted in line with suggestions by Fleiss, (10), all values are still considered excellent.

Table 4 portrays between-session reliability results, highlighting that all jump tests had good to excellent levels of reliability when using the ICC (0.72-0.96). The single leg hop was shown to be one of the least reliable test between testing sessions (ICC = 0.72-0.76), perhaps indicating that there may have been a slightly larger learning effect compared to the other protocols. However, it should be acknowledged that the only value considered 'good' was close to the 0.75 threshold needed to be classed as 'excellent'. Pooled CV values followed a similar trend to the within-session results with the SLCMJ showing the greatest consistency

221 (2.7-3.2%) and the crossover hop showing the greatest variability (4.0-5.7%). However, all

222 results should be interpreted with confidence which is important for this age group given their

223 lack of experience with plyometric training. Furthermore, any recorded data from such tests

224 can be used to monitor progress over time (33) or as outcome measures to assess the

225 effectiveness of targeted training interventions (3).

226 Tables 2 and 3 also show inter-limb asymmetry data with results highlighting small between-

227 limb differences for all tests (≤ 6.12%). Despite these small values, the SLCMJ would appear

228 to demonstrate notably larger asymmetries (5.10-6.12%) than any of the horizontal hop tests

229 (0.24-2.02%). When interpreting asymmetry data, it is essential to understand that an inter-

230 limb difference can only be classified as 'real' if the value is greater than the intra-limb

231 variability (8), which in the present study is represented by the typical error (CV). The only

232 test to exhibit real asymmetries was the SLCMJ whereas between-limb differences in all

233 other tests can be considered as natural variability during the testing process (3).

234 Asymmetries have been suggested as being a by-product of repeated sporting actions that

235 occur over time (11), and with a young population tested in the present study, it is possible

236 that their training age was too low to impact any limb dominance issues, manifested during

237 horizontal jump testing. Furthermore, although the SLCMJ highlighted real side-to-side

238 differences, the values can still be considered small with asymmetry and injury literature

239 suggesting values between 10-15% as being thresholds to be aware of (15,18,28). From a

240 longitudinal perspective, practitioners should continue to monitor inter-limb asymmetries to

241 ensure that these values and the natural variability during testing remain small (3,5). In

242 addition, a sport such as soccer is characterised by limb dominance (12), so increased

243 exposure to playing and training time may be a potential cause to increase inter-limb

244 differences if they are not monitored closely and programmes manipulated accordingly.

245 Given recent literature highlighted that larger asymmetries may be detrimental to

246 performance (4), it is likely that monitoring asymmetries from a young age is a worthwhile

247 process for practitioners.

248

249 **PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

250 The results from the present study highlight that unilateral jump tests are a reliable testing

251 protocol for elite youth female soccer athletes, which is useful information given the lack of

252 data in this population and their associated reduced plyometric training age. Inter-limb

253 asymmetries appear small in this population which may be a by-product of a lower training

254 age compared to adults. Practitioners can use this information to confidently incorporate

255 unilateral jump testing with youth female athletes. However, it is still suggested that

256 practitioners employ similar methods to quantify reliability data for their own athletes given

257 test consistency may vary between populations. A final note of consideration is that if only

258 one test was selected (due to time-constraints for example); the SLCMJ may be considered as

259 the preferred choice for practitioners due to its ability to expose greater inter-limb

260 asymmetries and stronger reliability than the horizontal hop tests.

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

REFERENCES

1. Balsalobre-Fernandez C, Tejero-Gonzalez CM, Del Campo- Vecino J, and Bavaresco N. The concurrent validity and reliability of a low-cost, high-speed camera-based method for measuring the flight time of vertical jumps. **J Strength Cond Res** 28: 528–533, 2014.

2. Benjanuvatra N, Lay BS, Alderson JA and Blanksby BA. Comparison of ground reaction force asymmetry in one- and two-legged countermovement jumps. **J Strength Cond Res** 27: 2700-2707, 2013.

3. Bishop C, Read P, Chavda S, and Turner, A. 2016. Asymmetries of the lower limb: the calculation conundrum in strength training and conditioning. **Strength Cond J** 38: 27-32, 2016.

4. Bishop C, Turner A, and Read P. Effects of inter-limb asymmetries on physical and sports performance: A systematic review. **J Sports Sci** Published ahead of print. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2017.1361894.

5. Bishop C, Turner A, Jarvis P, Chavda S, and Read P. Considerations for selecting field-based strength and power fitness tests to measure asymmetries. **J Strength Cond Res** 31: 2635-2644, 2017.

6. Cormack S, Newton R, McGuigan M, and Doyle T. Reliability of measures obtained during single and repeated countermovement jumps. **Int J Sports Phys Perf** 3: 131-144, 2008.

7. Dos'Santos T, Thomas C, Jones P, and Comfort P. Asymmetries in single and triple hop are not detrimental to change of direction speed. **J Trainology** 6: 35-41, 2017.

8. Exell T, Gittoes M, Irwin G, and Kerwin D. 2012. Gait asymmetry: Composite scores for mechanical analyses of sprint running. **J Biomechanics** 45: 1108-1111, 2012.

9. Fernandez-Santos J, Ruiz J, Cohen D, Gonzalez-Montesinos J, and Castro-Piñero J.

296   2015. Reliability and validity of tests to assess lower-body muscular power in
297   children. **J Strength Cond Res** 29: 2277-2285, 2015.

298 10. Fleiss J. 1999. Reliability of measurement. The Design and Analysis of Clinical
299   Experiments. Toronto, John Wiley and Son 1986;1-32.

300 11. Hart N, Nimphius S, Weber J, Spiteri T, Rantalainen T, Dobbin M, and Newton R.
301   Musculoskeletal asymmetry in football athletes: a product of limb function over
302   time. **Med Sci Sports Exer** 48: 1379-1387, 2016.

303 12. Hewit J, Cronin J, and Hume P. Multidirectional leg asymmetry assessment in sport.
304   **Strength Cond J** 34: 82–86, 2012.

305 13. Hoff J, and Helgerud J. Endurance and strength training for soccer players:
306   Physiological considerations. **Sports Med** 34: 165–180, 2004.

307 14. Hooper M, Goh C, Wentorth A, Chan K, Chau W, Wotton J, Strauss R, and Boyle.
308   Test re-test reliability of knee rating scales and functional hop tests one year
309   following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. **Phys Ther Sport** 3: 10-18, 2002.

310 15. Impellizzeri FM, Rampinini E, Maffiuletti N and Marcora SM. A vertical jump force
311   test for assessing bilateral strength asymmetry in athletes. **Med Sci Sports Ex** 39:
312   2044-2050, 2007.

313 16. Jeffreys I. Warm-up revisited: The ramp method of optimizing warm-ups. **Prof**
314   **Strength Cond J** 6: 12-18, 2007.

315 17. Jordan M, Aagaard P, and Herzog W. Lower limb asymmetry in mechanical muscle
316   function: A comparison between ski racers with and without ACL reconstruction.
317   **Scand J Med Sci Sports** doi: 10.1111/sms.12314.

318 18. Kryitsis P, Bahr R, Landreau P, Miladi R, and Witvrouw E. Likelihood of ACL graft
319   rupture: Not meeting six clinical discharge criteria before return to sport is associated
320   with a four times greater risk of rupture. **Brit J Sports Med** 50: 946-951, 2016.

321   19. Maloney S, Richards J, Nixon D, Harvey L, and Fletcher I. Do stiffness and

322   asymmetries predict change of direction performance? **J Sports Sci** 35: 547-556,

323   2017.

324   20. Markovic G, Dizdar D, Jukic I, and Cardinale M. Reliability and factorial validity of

325   squat and countermovement jump tests. **J Strength Cond Res** 18: 551–555, 2004.

326   21. Maulder P, and Cronin J. Horizontal and vertical jump assessment: reliability,

327   symmetry, discriminative and predictive ability. **Phys Ther Sport** 6: 74-82, 2005.

328   22. McMaster D, Gill N, Cronin J, and McGuigan M. A brief review of strength and

329   ballistic assessment methodologies in sport. **Sports Med** 44: 603–623, 2014.

330   23. Meylan C, McMaster T, Cronin J, Mohammed I, and Rogers C. Single leg lateral,

331   horizontal and vertical jump assessment: reliability, interrelationships, and ability to

332   predict sprint and change of direction performance. **J Strength Cond Res** 23: 1140-

333   1147, 2009.

334   24. Meylan C, Cronin J, Oliver J, Hughes M, and McMaster D. 2012. The reliability of

335   jump kinematics and kinetics in children of different maturity status. **J Strength

336   Cond Res** 26: 1015-1026, 2012.

337   25. Munro A, and Herrington L. Between-session reliability of four hop tests and the

338   agility t-test. **J Strength Cond Res** 25: 1470-1477, 2011.

339   26. Ostojic S, Mazic S, and Dikic N. Profiling in basketball: Physical and physiological

340   characteristics of elite players. **J Strength Cond Res** 20: 740–744, 2006.

341   27. Read P, Oliver J, Myer G, De Ste Croix M, and Lloyd R. The Effects of Maturation

342   on Measures of Asymmetry During Neuromuscular Control Tests in Elite Male Youth

343   Soccer Players. **Pediatric Exer Sci** 44: 1-23, 2017.

344   28. Reid A, Birmingham B, Starford P, Alcock K. Hop testing provides a reliable and
345   valid outcome measure during rehabilitation after anterior cruciate ligament injury.
346   **Phys Ther** 87: 337–349, 2007.

347   29. Ross M, Langford B, and Whelan J. Test re-test reliability of 4 single leg horizontal
348   hop tests. **J Strength Cond Res** 16: 617-622, 2002.

349   30. Stolberg M, Sharp A, Comtois A, Lloyd R, Oliver J, and Cronin J. Triple and
350   Quintuple Hops: Utility, Reliability, Asymmetry, and Relationship to Performance.
351   **Strength Cond J** 38: 18-25, 2016.

352   31. Thomas C, Dos Santos T, Comfort P, and Jones AJ. Between session reliability of
353   common strength and power- related measures in adolescent athletes. **Sports** 5: 5-15,
354   2017.

355   32. Thomas J, Nelson J, and Silverman S. Research methods in physical activity. 3rd
356   Edition, Champaign, Illinois. Human Kinetics, 2005.

357   33. Turner A, Brazier J, Bishop C, Chavda S, Cree J, and Read P. Data analysis for
358   strength and conditioning coaches: Using excel to analyze reliability, differences, and
359   relationships. **Strength Cond J** 37: 76-83, 2015.

360   34. Young, W. Laboratory strength assessment of athletes. **New Study Athletics** 10: 88–
361   96, 1995.

362   35. Ziv G, and Lidor R. Physical attributes, physiological characteristics, on-court
363   performances and nutritional strategies of female and male basketball players. **Sports**
364   **Med** 39: 547–568, 2009.

365

366

367

368

369   Table 1: Standardized warm up protocol followed prior to testing

Phase	Exercise or Drill	Prescription
Raise heart rate	Light jogging – forward, backwards, side shuffles	5 minutes
Activate and Mobilize	Mini-band lateral shuffle	1 x 8 each side
	Floor glute bridges	1 x 8
	Quadruped thoracic spine extension	1 x 6 each side
	Bodyweight squats	1 x 10
	Multi-planar lunge circuit	1 x 6 each side
	Single leg squat	1 x 5 each side
Potentiate	Single leg hop and stick	1 x 2 each side
	Triple hop (stick final landing)	1 x 2 each side
	Crossover hop (stick final landing)	1 x 2 each side
	Single leg countermovement jump	1 x 2 each side

370

371

372
373
374   Single Leg Hop   Triple Hop   Crossover Hop
375
376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385   Figure 1: Schematic of horizontal hop tests showing number and direction of hops

386

Table 2: Mean data (cm) ± standard deviations (SD) for each trial during test session 1, inclusive of within-session reliability data and asymmetry values (calculated from mean scores).

Test	Trial 1 (SD)	Trial 2 (SD)	Trial 3 (SD)	CV (%)	SEM (cm)	ICC (95% CI)	Mean Scores	Asymmetry (%)
SLH (R)	114 ± 18.7	114 ± 17.3	115 ± 18	4.4	0.33	0.89 (0.79-0.95)	119.2 ± 17.4	1.16 ± 1.80
SLH (L)	116 ± 13.7	115 ± 15.3	117 ± 14.4	3.8	0.37	0.87 (0.74-0.94)	120.6 ± 14.8	
TH (R)	367 ± 56.9	370 ± 49.2	364 ± 48.2	3.0	0.25	0.94 (0.88-0.97)	377.4 ± 52.1	0.24 ± 3.32
TH (L)	360 ± 48.4	364 ± 46.1	372 ± 46.1	3.6	0.33	0.89 (0.79-0.95)	378.3 ± 47.4	
CH (R)	298 ± 54.3	299 ± 43.9	306 ± 53	6.0	0.42	0.82 (0.67-0.92)	319.6 ± 54.4	2.02 ± 3.54
CH (L)	308 ± 55.8	315 ± 61.3	315 ± 62.9	4.3	0.26	0.93 (0.86-0.92)	326.2 ± 59.4	
SLCMJ (R)	9.5 ± 2.6	9.5 ± 2.4	9.6 ± 2.5	2.6	0.11	0.99 (0.98-0.99)	9.8 ± 2.6	5.10 ± 0.14
SLCMJ (L)	9.2 ± 2.8	9.0 ± 2.8	9.0 ± 2.7	3.0	0.11	0.99 (0.97-0.99)	9.3 ± 2.8	

R = Right leg, L = left leg, CV = Coefficient of variation, SEM = Standard error of the measurement, ICC = Intraclass correlation coefficient, CI = confidence intervals, SA = Symmetry angle, SLH = Single leg hop, TH = Triple hop, CH = Crossover hop, SLCMJ = Single leg countermovement jump

Table 3: Mean data (cm) ± standard deviations (SD) for each trial during test session 2, inclusive of within-session reliability data and asymmetry values (calculated from mean scores).

Test	Trial 1 (SD)	Trial 2 (SD)	Trial 3 (SD)	CV (%)	SEM (cm)	ICC (95% CI)	Mean Scores	Asymmetry (%)
SLH (R)	118 ± 15.2	118 ± 13.4	116 ± 15.4	3.9	0.35	0.88 (0.76-0.95)	121.5 ± 14.3	0.82 ± 2.12
SLH (L)	116 ± 13.5	117 ± 11.4	115 ± 12.8	4.1	0.44	0.81 (0.64-0.91)	120.5 ± 11.3	
TH (R)	376 ± 42.5	372 ± 46.6	367 ± 40.8	3.6	0.35	0.88 (0.76-0.95)	381.4 ± 45.5	0.81 ± 2.62
TH (L)	366 ± 51.2	366 v 47.4	370 ± 44.0	3.3	0.49	0.92 (0.83-0.96)	378.3 ± 49.2	
CH (R)	308 ± 40.5	315 ± 47.1	315 ± 52.0	5.4	0.23	0.83 (0.69-0.93)	329.4 ± 44.6	0.33 ± 4.45
CH (L)	316 ± 54.4	315 ± 57.3	319 ± 54.4	3.6	0.19	0.94 (0.88-0.98)	328.3 ± 50.9	
SLCMJ (R)	9.5 ± 2.6	9.5 ± 2.5	9.6 ± 2.4	2.8	0.27	0.99 (0.97-0.99)	9.8 ± 2.5	6.12 ± 0.14
SLCMJ (L)	9.1 ± 2.7	8.8 ± 2.7	8.9 ± 2.8	3.5	0.16	0.99 (0.97-0.99)	9.2 ± 2.7	

R = Right leg, L = left leg, CV = Coefficient of variation, SEM = Standard error of the measurement, ICC = Intraclass correlation coefficient, CI = confidence intervals, SA = Symmetry angle, SLH = Single leg hop, TH = Triple hop, CH = Crossover hop, SLCMJ = Single leg countermovement jump

Table 4: Best scores for test sessions 1 and 2 ± standard deviations (SD), pooled coefficient of variation (CV) data, between-session intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) data, and the smallest worthwhile change (SWC).

Test	Best Scores (SD) Session 1	Best Scores (SD) Session 2	Pooled CV (%)	ICC (95% CI)	SWC (%)
SLH (R)	119.2 ± 17.4	121.5 ± 14.3	4.1	0.76 (0.48-0.89)	2.63
SLH (L)	120.6 ± 14.8	119.4 ± 13.4	4.0	0.72 (0.40-0.88)	2.35
TH (R)	377.4 ± 52.1	381.4 ± 45.5	3.3	0.87 (0.71-0.95)	2.57
TH (L)	378.3 ± 45.0	378.3 ± 49.2	3.5	0.85 (0.65-0.94)	2.49
CH (R)	319.6 ± 54.4	329.4 ± 44.6	5.7	0.79 (0.54-0.91)	3.05
CH (L)	326.2 ± 60.4	328.3 ± 56.9	4.0	0.84 (0.64-0.94)	3.58
SLCMJ (R)	9.8 ± 2.6	9.8 ± 2.5	2.7	0.99 (0.98-0.99)	5.20
SLCMJ (L)	9.3 ± 2.8	9.2 ± 2.7	3.2	0.99 (0.98-0.99)	5.95

R = Right leg, L = left leg, SLH = Single leg hop, TH = Triple hop, CH = Crossover hop, SLCMJ = Single leg countermovement jump