This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Sprint performance and propulsion asymmetries on an ergometer in trained high- and low-point wheelchair rugby players

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13056>

PUBLISHER

Wiley

VERSION

AM (Accepted Manuscript)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Goosey-Tolfrey, Vicky, Riemer J. Vegter, Barry Mason, Thomas A.W. Paulson, John P. Lenton, Jan W. Van Der Scheer, and Lucas H.V. van der Woude. 2019. "Sprint Performance and Propulsion Asymmetries on an Ergometer in Trained High- and Low-point Wheelchair Rugby Players". figshare.
<https://hdl.handle.net/2134/28111>.

1 **Sprint performance and propulsion asymmetries on an ergometer in trained high- and**
2 **low-point wheelchair rugby players**

3

4 Victoria L Goosey-Tolfrey¹, Riemer J K Vegter^{2,3}, Barry S Mason¹, Thomas A W Paulson¹,
5 John P Lenton^{1,4}, Jan W van der Scheer¹ and Lucas H V van der Woude^{2,3}

6

7 ¹School for Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences, The Peter Harrison Centre for Disability
8 Sport, Loughborough University, United Kingdom.

9 ²University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Center for Human Movement
10 Sciences, the Netherlands.

11 ³University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Center for Rehabilitation, the
12 Netherlands.

13 ⁴GBCT Para-Cycling, British Cycling, National Cycling Centre, Stuart Street, Manchester,
14 United Kingdom.

15

16 Corresponding author:

17 V.L. Goosey-Tolfrey

18 Email: V.L.Tolfrey@lboro.ac.uk

19 Tel: +44 (0)1509 226386

20

21 Running Head: Asymmetries in wheelchair sprinting

22

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the propulsion asymmetries of wheelchair athletes whilst sprinting on an instrumented, dual-roller ergometer system. Eighteen experienced wheelchair rugby players (8 low-point (LP) (class ≤ 1.5) and 10 high-point (HP) (class ≥ 2.0)) performed a 15s sprint in their sports wheelchair on the instrumented ergometer. Asymmetry was defined as the difference in distance and power output (PO) between left and right sides when the best side reached 28m. Propulsion techniques were quantified based on torque and velocity data. HP players covered an average 3m further than the LP players ($P=0.002$) and achieved faster sprint times than LP players (6.95 ± 0.89 vs. 8.03 ± 0.68 s, $P=0.005$) and at the time the best player finished (5.96 s). Higher peak PO's (667 ± 108 vs. 357 ± 78 W, $P=0.0001$) and greater peak speeds were also evident for HP players (4.80 ± 0.71 vs. 4.09 ± 0.45 m·s⁻¹, $P=0.011$). Greater asymmetries were found in HP players for distance (1.86 ± 1.43 vs. 0.70 ± 0.65 m, $P=0.016$), absolute peak PO ($P=0.049$) and speed (0.35 ± 0.25 vs. 0.11 ± 0.10 m·s⁻¹, $P=0.009$). Although HP players had faster sprint times over 28m (achieved by a higher PO), high standard deviations show the heterogeneity within the two groups (e.g. some LP players were better than HP players). Quantification of asymmetries is not only important for classifiers but also for sports practitioners wishing to improve performance as they could be addressed through training and/or wheelchair configuration.

Keywords: Tetraplegic; wheelchair propulsion; dual-roller system; Paralympic sport; asymmetry

Introduction

Wheelchair rugby (WCR) is designed for individuals with both lower and upper limb impairments which includes players with a spinal cord injury (SCI) at the cervical region of the spinal cord (known as tetraplegia), cerebral palsy (CP), multiple amputations and neuromuscular disease (IWRF, 2016). Based on physical impairment, WCR players are classified into one of seven classification groups from 0.5 (most impaired) to 3.5 (least impaired) (IWRF, 2016) to minimise the impact of impairment on the outcomes of competition (Tweedy & Vanlandewijck, 2011). Our understanding of the sport to date is that high-point (class 2.0-3.5; HP) players are able to execute greater peak speeds compared to low-point (0.5-1.5; LP) players (Rhodes et al., 2015a; Rhodes et al., 2015b). Moreover, time spent performing high-speed activities have been noted to be greater in HP compared to LP players (Rhodes et al., 2015a). Consequently, sprint performance is a key aspect of WCR, since accelerating faster than your opponent is essential to be free to catch the ball; preferably in the end zone (Malone & Orr, 2010; van der Slikke et al., 2016).

Yet in-depth biomechanical analyses of sprint performances on court are difficult because instrumentation of the individually optimized wheelchair-user configuration requires high-end sensitive measurement techniques that might also alter an athlete's performance (Vanlandewijck et al. 2001; Mason et al. 2013). Therefore, instrumented dual-roller ergometers have been developed that allow measurement of power output (PO) in combination with acceleration, while importantly keeping the wheelchair-user combination unaltered (Devillard et al. 2001; Faupin et al., 2004). One clear difference with propelling on court however is the removal of a steering component while propelling on such a stationary device, allowing for differences in left-right performance without a consequent change in direction over ground.

Interestingly, the assumption of whether wheelchair propulsion is considered a symmetric bimanual task has recently resurfaced during conditions of daily manual wheelchair

69 propulsion while propelling at a low-intensity steady-state velocity (Vegter et al. 2013; Vegter
70 et al. 2014; Soltau et al., 2015; Chénier et al. 2017). Although for a balanced wheelchair user
71 combination the PO on average must be the same on both sides (i.e. symmetric) to propel in a
72 straight line, how this power production comes about can differ between the left and right side
73 and is almost never the same when comparing the left and right push cycle directly to each
74 other (i.e. asymmetric).

75 Inherent to some of the WCR players' health conditions, differences in strength and
76 coordination between the left and right side are expected (Soltau et al., 2015). Especially during
77 a sprint at maximal intensity in which case one approaches the biophysical limits of
78 performance including the bimanual motor control of this task. However, on court given the
79 constraints of straight-line propulsion these differences cannot be well assessed since the most
80 impaired arm inhibits the less impaired one to perform more power, which would result in a
81 turn. There has been a reinstated interest in the measurement of short-term power during
82 wheelchair propulsion with respect to resistive load (Hintzy et al., 2003), rear-wheel camber
83 (Faupin et al., 2004) and propulsion modality (Faupin et al., 2013) using instrumented dual-
84 roller wheelchair ergometers (Devillard et al., 2001). However, these aforementioned studies
85 have been limited to able-bodied female participants or wheelchair basketball players and have
86 not necessarily examined asymmetries in bimanual PO, or the different wheelchair user
87 interface of specialized sport chairs.

88 Despite the array of health conditions now eligible to play WCR only a few studies
89 have examined the dynamic responses of WCR propulsion with respect to the HP and LP
90 categories. For instance, some WCR players present an increased muscle tone or spasticity and
91 impaired co-ordination leading to muscle imbalance and reduced muscle power (Paulson &
92 Goosey-Tolfrey, 2017). As far as push symmetry is concerned, symmetrical and synchronous
93 pushing modes are associated with greater wheelchair velocity and PO, and a close relationship

94 has been shown to exist between upper arm coordination and technical efficiency (Faupin et
95 al., 2013; Qi et al., 2013). These aforementioned studies, confirm the importance of push
96 symmetry as a valuable performance indicator that has not been examined within the sport of
97 WCR. Moreover, it is unknown as to whether asymmetries are more prevalent in HP players
98 where there is potential for greater variation between arm scores than at the lower end of the
99 classification system. Subsequently, the motor-coordination and PO of the left and right arms
100 could be measured using the dual-roller wheelchair system. Therefore, the purpose of this study
101 was to examine the sprint performance of experienced WCR players and to determine whether
102 differences in asymmetries existed between HP or LP players.

103

104 **Materials and Methods**

105 **Participants**

106 Eighteen experienced WCR players (age 31 ± 6 yrs; body mass of 65.9 ± 14.0 kg) participated
107 in this study. Diagnoses of physical disabilities met the eligibility criteria to participate in
108 WCR: SCI of the cervical region (n=12), cerebral palsy (CP; n=2), amputation (AMP; n=1)
109 and les autres (LA; n=3). In line with current WCR literature (Altmann, 2017; Rhodes et al.
110 2015a, 2015b) subgroups comprising of athletes classed according to the IWRF (IWRF, 2016)
111 classifications as ≤ 1.5 (n=8) Low Point (LP) [6 SCI and 2 LA] and ≥ 2.0 (n=10) Mid-to-High
112 Point (HP) [6 SCI, 2 CP, 1 AMP and 1 LA; consisting of 8 Mid and 2 High Point players] were
113 formed.

114 Prerequisite for participation was prior experience in wheelchair sports and/or training
115 at a national sporting level for >10 hours per week in WCR for a minimum of 4 years. For this
116 reason, athletes had been advised on the optimisation of their WCR games chair (wheelchair-
117 user interface; including whether wheelchair straps and/or an abdominal binder was used) and
118 so had a reproducible acquired preference of arm movement frequency/ strategy for wheelchair

119 propulsion. Body mass was recorded to the nearest 0.1 kg using a seated balance scale (Seca
120 710, Hamburg, Germany). The study was approved by the University Research Ethics
121 Committee and all participants volunteered and provided written informed consent prior to
122 participation.

123 Wheelchair ergometer

124 All participants were tested in their own individualised WCR sports chair using a friction
125 braked instrumented wheelchair ergometer (VP100H TE, HEF Tecmachine®, Andrezieux-
126 Boutheon, France) which has been extensively detailed by Devillard et al. (2001) (Fig. 1). All
127 players wore their usual gloves (with adhesive), strapping and some an abdominal binder as
128 they would have when partaking in a competitive WCR game. Rear wheel tyre pressure was
129 standardised to player's self-selected pressure, rear-wheel camber ranged from 16-20° and
130 wheel size from 24-25 inches. Since testing involved players individually optimized
131 wheelchair-user combination, no individual adjustments relative to anthropometric measures
132 of the participants were made. The wheelchair ergometer system comprised of two pairs of
133 independent rollers and was equipped with two electromagnetic brakes (Type ZX,
134 Friedrichshafen, Germany), which has the capabilities to produce a braking torque of 0 Nm to
135 4 Nm, on both the left and right sides of the roller system. The roller system was calibrated
136 prior to testing as described by Faupin et al. (2013) and prior to testing each participant
137 performed a deceleration test to ensure equal resistance on each side of the rollers. The left and
138 right rollers were independently capable of real time measuring velocity, torque and the angle
139 of rotation at 100 Hz.

140 Testing protocol

141 After a familiarisation period of 5 min self-paced propulsion, determination of individual
142 residual torque (T_r) were completed during five short practice coast-down sprints. For this,
143 players completed four-five maximal pushes then leaned forward with their hands on their

144 knees until the wheels came to a complete stop. Full details of this procedure have been
145 described elsewhere (Faupin et al., 2013). In brief calculations of the individual Tr for both the
146 left and right rollers allowed adjustments to be made to ensure equal resistance were applied
147 on both sides. In line with current physiological assessments in our laboratory and Hutzler et
148 al. (1998), we kept the braking load to a Tr that was sport-specific and realistic to the
149 wheelchair-user interface of WCR (proportional to the mass of the participant and chair
150 combined which ranged 0.5-1.12 Nm). This was achieved by placing the rear wheels on the
151 centre of the rolling element of each roller and strapping the front castor wheels down securely.
152 Following a rest period of 3 min and some stretches, participants performed a 15s sprint from
153 a stationary start on the wheelchair ergometer. A 15s sprint was chosen to ensure that at least
154 28m which represents the playing court distance was covered by all participants. Verbal
155 encouragement was provided throughout the trial and pacing was not encouraged. Participants
156 did not receive any feedback about their propulsion technique and their trunk movements were
157 not restricted.

158 Custom written Matlab algorithms were used to analyse relevant biomechanical
159 parameters and all values were recorded separately for the two wheels (de Groot et al., 2017;
160 Vegter et al., 2013b). Torque and velocity data were low-pass filtered with a recursive second-
161 order Butterworth filter (cut-off frequency 10 Hz). The PO at each side was calculated from
162 the measured torque (M), wheel velocity (v_w) and wheel radius (r_w , 0.31 m):

163
$$\text{Power output} = M \cdot v_w \cdot r_w^{-1}$$

164 Timing parameters of the propulsion technique were determined from the torque signal.
165 Push time was defined as the time that the hand exerted a positive torque on the hand rim. Push
166 time and recovery time together represent the cycle time. The push time was also expressed as
167 a percentage of the cycle time. Frequency was defined as the number of complete pushes over
168 28m of the sprint divided by the time it took to reach 28m. The work per push cycle was

169 calculated as the power integrated over the wheel rotation angle. The contact angle was
170 calculated from the angular velocity and defined as the angle at the end of a push minus the
171 angle at the start. Furthermore, peak values of velocity ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) and PO (W) were calculated,
172 both over the entire sprint and over the first three cycles only. The acceleration was calculated
173 by taking the derivative of velocity, while the velocity signal was integrated for calculating the
174 distance. Asymmetry (m) was defined as the absolute difference between the distances (m)
175 covered left and right when the best side reached 28m (see Fig. 2 for an illustration and
176 parameters calculated). E.g. in addition, the absolute differences in peak PO (W) and peak
177 speed (m/s) between sides and their relative difference (% of the peak on the fastest side) were
178 used to further quantify the differences between sides.

179

180 Statistical analyses

181 The Statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 22; Chicago, IL, USA) was used
182 for all statistical analyses. Means and standard deviations were computed for all variables and
183 the average of the left and right side were used to compare between HP and LP players. The
184 Shapiro-Wilk test showed that all outcomes were normally distributed. T-tests (unpaired) were
185 used to compare the classification groups on relevant parameters. Statistical significance was
186 set at $P < 0.05$. Effect sizes were calculated according to the mean differences between groups
187 (LP and HP) and the pooled standard deviations of these differences, adjusted for unequal
188 groups. The magnitude of the effects were defined as trivial (<0.2), small (0.2-0.6), moderate
189 (0.6-1.2), large (1.2-2.0) and very large (>2.0) based on previous guidelines (Batterham &
190 Hopkins, 2006). 90% confidence intervals (90% CI) were also calculated to determine the
191 range within which the true effect sizes existed.

192 Results

193 Age and body mass distribution were similar in both groups (31 ± 6 vs. 31 ± 6 yrs; 67.0 ± 13.4
194 vs. 64.6 ± 15 kg for HP and LP respectively), also there was no significant difference in rolling
195 resistance between groups (0.93 ± 0.13 vs. 0.83 ± 0.28 Nm, $P=0.22$ for HP and LP
196 respectively). On average HP players were quicker over 28m ($P=0.005$) and reached higher
197 peak speeds PO's over the whole sprint and after the first 3 pushes ($P \leq 0.011$) than LP players
198 (Table 1). At the time the quickest player finished, HP players had covered a greater distance
199 (22.9 ± 3.2 vs. 18.9 ± 1.8 m, $P=0.002$) (Fig. 3a) than LP players. Differences were noted
200 between the two groups in propulsion technique when an all-out effort 15s sprint was
201 performed. During these sprints, it was shown that there was a significantly higher push
202 frequency ($P=0.014$) and work/push ($P=0.038$) and a lower percentage push time ($P=0.009$)
203 for the HP players. In contrast, no differences in contact angle were found between groups
204 (Table 1). The differences in propulsion technique when sprinting between the two players (HP
205 and LP) are clearly shown in Fig. 4.

206 High-point players also demonstrated greater asymmetries (distances travelled (m)
207 between the left and right sides ($P=0.016$); see Fig. 3b), with a better symmetry evident for LP
208 players. High-point players also demonstrated greater asymmetries in absolute peak PO ($P =$
209 0.049), peak speed ($P = 0.009$) and peak speed after 3 cycles ($P = 0.046$). Although in relative
210 terms (% of peak) these were only greater for peak speed ($P = 0.009$). High-point players
211 registered faster sprint times over 28m (achieved as noted earlier by a higher PO leading to
212 higher acceleration and consequently higher top speeds). Yet, high standard deviations show
213 the heterogeneity within the two groups (e.g., some LP players were faster than HP players)
214 (Fig. 3a).

215 Discussion

216 The aim of this research was to utilise a dual-roller ergometer system to assess the sprint
217 performance and propulsion asymmetries of WCR players in their individually optimized

sports wheelchair set-up. Given that acceleration of the wheelchair is considered to be one of the most important aspects of WCR game play (Malone & Orr, 2010), then it is important to determine sprint performance differences between players. The peak speeds achieved after 3 pushes (3.76 ± 0.47 and $3.20 \pm 0.30 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$; HP and LP respectively) were similar to those values reported during International wheelchair game play of similar IWRF classes (Rhodes et al., 2015a; Rhodes et al., 2015b), demonstrating the trained status and experience of the present sample. As expected, HP players achieved ~15% faster sprint times over 28 m than LP players (4.80 ± 0.71 and $4.09 \pm 0.45 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$), which were achieved by a higher peak PO (667 ± 108 vs. $357 \pm 78 \text{ W}$), leading to higher acceleration and consequently higher top speeds. Yet, high standard deviations demonstrate the heterogeneity within the two groups and some LP players were faster than HP players. Training status and technical experience (Rhodes et al., 2015a), wheelchair configuration (e.g., wheel size, and/or camber) (Mason et al., 2013) to the functional abilities of the WCR player and total mass of the wheelchair-user combination (e.g., differences in rolling resistance and internal friction) were likely to have contributed to these differences in sprint performance. It is difficult to compare these values to other studies due to limited data on WCR players and also the fact that other wheelchair ergometer studies have restricted the maximal velocity to $\leq 3 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. That said, to the authors' knowledge this is the only study that has examined the sprint performance on a dual-roller ergometer of highly trained athletes who are eligible to compete in WCR.

As described earlier, competitive WCR game play allows players with tetraplegia, CP, multiple amputations and neuromuscular disease to compete together (IWRF, 2016). Previous work has shown asymmetries in the daily propulsion patterns of individuals with tetraplegia (Stephens & Engsberg, 2010). The current study involved dynamic bouts of exercise (~10 s) under conditions very different to those found during daily wheelchair ambulation. Not only do the wheelchair configurations of a sports vs. daily wheelchair differ (e.g., increased camber

and wheel size), but during WCR sports propulsion the site of force transfer can occur at the wheel (e.g. tire) as opposed the hand-rim (Mason et al., 2009). To compensate for lack of hand function/grip, WCR players wear gloves and apply an adhesive to assist with this coupling and decoupling of the hand to the tire when applying forces on the wheels (Mason et al., 2009). All players in this study wore bespoke individualised gloves. As we investigated two distinct groupings of IWRf classifications, it is important to note that previous research has suggested that HP players tend to push the wheelchair with the palmar side of their hand, whereas LP players frequently switched to a backhanded technique and contact the hand-rims with the dorsal side of their hand (Mason et al., 2009). Asymmetries in propulsion parameters were observed and were exacerbated in HP players, possibly due to the greater upper extremity demands clearly evident by higher PO's in this group. Because WCR performance is related to both trunk and arm impairment (Altmann et al., 2017), further work is warranted to examine these asymmetries at an individual level using more detailed classification scores which are attainable via the classification process.

Quantification of these asymmetries is important, since addressing them through physical training, pre-habilitation exercises and/or wheelchair configuration could lead to better performance (Roeleveld et al., 1994; Requejo et al., 2008). Wheelchair fitting and configuration can have a significant effect on the mobility performance of wheelchair games players (Mason et al., 2013) and typically LP players who have reduced trunk function prefer a more posterior seat position (Haydon et al., 2016) to try to maximise their capabilities for greater acceleration. Whilst it was beyond the scope of this study to consider the individual's anthropometrics and wheelchair configurations, it was of interest to note that higher velocity combinations (i.e., shorter push and cycle times) were evident in the HP group. Moreover, after the first 3 pushes asymmetries were greater in HP in peak speed and even when these asymmetries were relative based on peak speed, they were still significantly greater in HP. That

268 said, the side-to-side differences in PO warrants future study with respect to whether this
269 occurred at the start of the sprint (e.g., problems with hand-to-tire coupling) or towards the end
270 of the sprint (e.g., fatigue effects); whether the symmetry noted was due to the type of health
271 condition (e.g., SCI vs. non-SCI) and/or whether there was asymmetric dynamic loading of the
272 rollers. Nevertheless, the results of this study highlight the need to gather information on
273 bilateral symmetry particularly if there are issues with secondary injury or pain (Stephens &
274 Engsberg, 2010; Soltau et al., 2015). It is also unknown at present whether WCR players would
275 be at a higher risk of shoulder pain from these side-to-side asymmetries on the court or even
276 whether these asymmetries exist during daily ambulation in day-chair wheelchair-user
277 combinations. Consequently, these results are of interest to strength and conditioning
278 practitioners as training regimes must address these side-to-side asymmetries alongside the
279 tailored programmes that are often prescribed to develop the posterior muscle groups.

280 This work fills an important gap in the literature. A methodology for the assessment of
281 push symmetry in wheelchair propulsion was developed. Yet by conducting the study we note
282 that the asymmetries may have been related to a difference in arm scores between sides, which
283 unfortunately was information unavailable at the time but has become a recent topic of interest
284 by classifiers. From our practical experience differences between arms becomes more evident
285 higher up the classification spectrum and could be the focus of future work within WCR.

286 While over-ground pushing is the most ecologically valid method (van der Slikke et al.,
287 2015), this research comprised of the wheelchair-user combination with rolling resistances that
288 allowed the wheelchair velocities that would be achieved on a WCR court to be reproduced on
289 the dual-roller system. The use of a wheelchair ergometer does provide a controlled
290 environment for data collection. The PO profiles were indicative for high performance WCR
291 players, yet we must appreciate the many limitations of using a wheelchair ergometer vs. over-
292 ground propulsion or treadmill exercise (Vanlandewijck et al., 2001; Mason et al., 2014). That

293 said, the use of the instrumented dual-roller ergometer highlights that asymmetries do exist;
294 and these data could become useful to assist with our understanding to support both classifiers
295 as well as the strength and conditioning practitioners guidance given to WCR players.

296 Perspectives

297 The instrumented dual-roller ergometer enabled left and right asymmetries to be identified in
298 experienced WCR players. The use of a 15s sprint seemed to be useful for the measurement of
299 28 m which is the length of a WCR court. As expected, HP players displayed faster sprint
300 times, reached higher peak speeds and peak PO's than LP players. That said, the HP players
301 did not necessarily use a technique with fewer pushes to cover the 28m. Our results support the
302 assumption that asymmetry exists when propelling under strenuous sport-like conditions and
303 these were evident in the HP group that comprised of players with SCI and other health
304 conditions. Quantification of these asymmetries are important not only for the classifier, but
305 for the sports practitioner wishing to improve performance as they could be addressed through
306 training and/or wheelchair configuration.

307 Acknowledgements

308 The authors would like to thank all the participants for taking part in the study and The Peter
309 Harrison Centre for Disability Sport for their support.

310 Conflicts of interest

311 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

312

References

1. Altmann VC, Groen BE, Hart AL, Vanlandewijck YC, van Limbeek J. The impact of trunk impairment on performance-determining activities in wheelchair rugby. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2017; 27(9):1005-1014.
2. Batterham AM, Hopkins WG. Making meaningful inferences about magnitudes. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 2006; 1(1):50-57.
3. Chénier F, Malbequi J, Gagnon DH. Proposing a new index to quantify instantaneous symmetry during manual wheelchair propulsion. *J Biomech* 2017; 25:137-141.
4. de Groot S, Bos F, Koopman J, Hoekstra AE, Vegter RJK. Effect of holding a racket on propulsion technique of wheelchair tennis players. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2017; 27(9):918-924.
5. Devillard X, Calmels P, Sauvignet B, Denis C, Simard C, Gautheron V. Validation of a new ergometer adapted for all types of manual wheelchairs. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2001; 85:479-85.
6. Faupin A, Borel B, Meyer C, Gorce P, Watelain E. Effects of synchronous versus asynchronous mode of propulsion on wheelchair basketball sprinting. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol* 2013; 8(6):496-501.
7. Faupin A, Campilo P, Weissland T, Gorce P, Thevenon A. The effects of rear-wheel camber on the mechanical parameters produced during the wheelchair sprinting of handibasketball athletes. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2004;41(3B):421-428.
8. Goosey-Tolfrey VL, Leicht C, Lenton J, Diaper N, Mason B. The BASES Expert Statement on Assessment of Exercise Performance in Athletes with a Spinal Cord Injury. *The Sport and Exercise Scientist* 2003a; 37:8-9.
9. Goosey-Tolfrey VL, Leicht C. Field based testing of wheelchair athletes. *Sports Med* 2003b; 43(2):77-91.

- 338 10. Goosey-Tolfrey VL, Moss AD. The velocity characteristics of wheelchair tennis players
339 with and without the use of racquets. *APAQ* 2005; 22: 291-301.
- 340 11. Haydon DS, Pinder RA, Grimshaw PN, Robertson WSP. Elite wheelchair rugby: a
341 quantitative analysis of chair configuration in Australia. *Sports Eng* 2016; 19:177.
- 342 12. Hintzy F, Tordi N, Predine E, Rouillon JD, Belli A. Force-velocity characteristics of upper
343 limb extension during maximal wheelchair sprinting performed by healthy able-bodied
344 females. *J Sports Sci* 2003; 21(11):921-926.
- 345 13. Hutzler Y. Anaerobic fitness testing of wheelchair users. *Sports Med* 1998;25(2):101-113.
- 346 14. International Wheelchair Rugby Federation (IWRF). Retrieved April 1, 2016, from
347 <http://www.iwrf.com>.
- 348 15. Janssen TW, van Oers CA, Hollander AP, Veeger HE, van der Woude LH. Isometric
349 strength, sprint power, and aerobic power in individuals with a spinal cord injury. *Med Sci*
350 *Sports Exerc* 1993; 25(7):863-870.
- 351 16. Malone L, Orr K. Wheelchair Rugby. In Goosey-Tolfrey V. (Ed.) *Wheelchair Sport*.
352 Human Kinetics 2010: pp. 151-166.
- 353 17. Mason B, van der Woude LHV, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. The influence of glove type on
354 mobility performance for wheelchair rugby players. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2009; 88 (7):
355 559-570.
- 356 18. Mason B, van der Woude LH, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. The ergonomics of wheelchair
357 configuration for optimal performance in the wheelchair court sports. *Sports Med* 2013;
358 43(1):23-38.
- 359 19. Mason BS, Lenton JP, Leicht CA, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. A physiological and
360 biomechanical comparison of over-ground, treadmill and ergometer wheelchair
361 propulsion. *J of Sports Sci* 2014;32(1):78-91.

- 362 20. Mason BS, Rhodes J, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Validity and reliability of an inertial sensor for
363 wheelchair court sports performance. *J of Appl Biomech* 2014;30(2): 326-331.
- 364 21. Paulson TA, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Current perspectives on profiling and enhancing
365 wheelchair court-sport performance. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 2017; 12(3): 275-286.
- 366 22. Perrat B, Smith M, Rhodes J, Mason B, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Quality assessment of an
367 UWB positioning system for indoor wheelchair court sports. *J Sports Engineering and*
368 *Technology* 2015; 229(2): 81-91.
- 369 23. Qi L, Wakeling J, Grange S, and Ferguson-Pell M. Coordination patterns of shoulder
370 muscles during level-ground and incline wheelchair propulsion. *J of Rehabil Res Dev.*
371 2013; 50(5): 651-662.
- 372 24. Requejo P, Mulroy SJ, Haubert LL, Perry J. Evidence-based strategies to preserve shoulder
373 function in manual wheelchair users with spinal cord injury. *Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil*
374 2008;13(4):86-119.
- 375 25. Rhodes J, Mason B, Perrat B, Smith M, Goosey-Tolfrey V. The validity and reliability of
376 a novel indoor player tracking system for use within wheelchair court sports. *J of Sports*
377 *Sci* 2014; 32(17) 1639-1649.
- 378 26. Rhodes J, Mason BS, Malone LA, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Effect of team rank and player
379 classification on activity profiles of elite wheelchair rugby players. *J of Sports Sci* 2015a:
380 33(19), 2070-2078.
- 381 27. Rhodes J, Mason BS, Perrat B, Smith MJ, Malone LA, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Activity
382 profiles of elite wheelchair rugby players during competition. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*
383 2015b; 10(3), 318-324.
- 384 28. Roeleveld K, Lute E, Veeger D, Gwinn T, van der Woude L. Power output and technique
385 of wheelchair athletes. *APAQ* 1994; 11, 71-85.

- 386 29. Sarro KJ, Misuta MS, Burkett B, Malone LA, Barros RM. Tracking of wheelchair rugby
387 players in the 2008 Demolition Derby trial. *J Sports Sci* 2010; 28(2):193-200.
- 388 30. Sindall P, Lenton JP, Cooper RA, Tolfrey K, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Data logger device
389 applicability for wheelchair tennis court-movement. *J of Sports Sci* 2015; 33(5):527-533.
- 390 31. Soltau SL, Slowik JS, Requejo PS, Mulroy SJ, Neptune RR. An investigation of bilateral
391 symmetry during manual wheelchair propulsion. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol* 2015; 3:86.
- 392 32. Stephens CL, Engsberg JR. Comparison of overground and treadmill propulsion patterns
393 of manual wheelchair users with tetraplegia. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol* 2010;5, 420-
394 427.
- 395 33. Tweedy SM, Vanlandewijck YC. International Paralympic Committee position stand –
396 background and scientific principles of classification in Paralympic Sport. *Br J Sports Med*
397 2011; 45(4): 259-69.
- 398 34. van der Slikke RM, Berger MA, Bregman DJ, Veeger HE. Opportunities for measuring
399 wheelchair kinematics in match settings; reliability of a three inertial sensor configuration.
400 *J Biomech* 2015; 48(12): 3398-3405.
- 401 35. van der Slikke, RM, Berger MA, Bregman D, Veeger, D. Push characteristics in
402 wheelchair court sprinting. *Procedia Eng* 2016 147: 730-734.
- 403 36. van der Woude LH, Bakker WH, Elkhuisen JW, Veeger, HE, Gwinn T. Propulsion
404 technique and anaerobic work capacity in elite wheelchair athletes: cross-sectional analysis.
405 *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 1998; 77(3):222-234.
- 406 37. Vanlandewijck Y, Theisen D, Daly D. Wheelchair propulsion biomechanics: implications
407 for wheelchair sports. *Sports Med* 2001; 31(5):339-367.
- 408 38. Veeger HE, Lute EMC, Roeleveld, K, van der Woude LH. Differences in performance
409 between trained and untrained subjects during a 30-s sprint test in a wheelchair ergometer.
410 *Eur J Appl Physiol* 1992; 64:158-164.

- 411 39. Veeger HE, van der Woude LH, Rozendal RH. A computerized wheelchair ergometer.
412 Results of a comparison study. *Scand J Rehabil Med* 1992; 24(1), 17-23.
- 413 40. Vegter R, de Groot S, Lamothe C, Veeger D, van der Woude L. Initial skill acquisition of
414 handrim wheelchair propulsion: a new perspective. *IEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*
415 2014; 22, 104-113.
- 416 41. Vegter R, Lamothe CJ, de Groot S, Veeger DH, van der Woude LH. Variability in bimanual
417 wheelchair propulsion: consistency of two instrumented wheels during handrim
418 wheelchair propulsion on a motor driven treadmill. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2013; 10(1): 9.

419 **Figure Captions**

420 Figure 1. Experimental set-up.

426 Figure 2. Typical example of the pushes across time of the left and right side during the sprint
427 of a high-point (HP) player (left graph) and a sprint of a low-point (LP) player (right graph)
428 and corresponding distances covered.

429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449

Typical example of asymmetric Highpoint player

Typical example of symmetric Lowpoint player

450 Figure 3. a) Individual distances covered by the wheelchair rugby players at the time the best
451 player finished the 28 m sprint; b) An illustration of the asymmetries which was defined as the
452 difference between the distances achieved left and right when the best side reached 28m.

453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474

475

476 Figure 4: Typical example of the propulsion technique of the left and right side during the
477 sprint of a high-point (HP) player (upper graph) and a sprint of a low-point (LP) player (lower
478 graph).

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

Tables

Table 1. Mean (standard deviation) of the propulsion technique variables (averaged left and right) and asymmetries between sides for the different groups (HP and LP) of elite WCR players

	HP	LP	P	Effect size (± 90%CI)	Qualitative outcome
Grouped data:					
Frequency (Hz)	2.56 (0.31)	2.20 (0.22)	*	1.30 (0.46 to 2.14)	Large
Push time (%)	33.2 (3.0)	38.1 (4.4)	**	1.35 (0.50 to 2.19)	Large
Contact angle (°)	95.8 (19.2)	109.0 (16.6)	N.S	0.73 (-0.06 to 1.52)	Moderate
Work/push (J)	19.5 (5.2)	15.1 (2.3)	*	1.04 (0.22 to 1.85)	Moderate
28 m sprint time (s)	6.95 (0.89)	8.03 (0.68)	**	1.33 (0.49 to 2.18)	Large
Peak speed (m/s)	4.80 (0.71)	4.09 (0.45)	*	1.15 (0.33 to 1.98)	Moderate
Peak speed after 3 cycles (m/s)	3.76 (0.47)	3.20 (0.30)	**	1.37 (0.52 to 2.22)	Large
Peak power (W)	667 (108)	357 (78)	**	3.20 (2.60 to 4.35)	Very large
Peak power after 3 cycles (W)	632 (103)	343 (67)	**	3.21 (2.07 to 4.36)	Very large
Asymmetries:					
Distance (m)	1.86 (1.43)	0.70 (0.65)	*	0.99 (0.18 to 1.80)	Moderate
Peak speed (m/s)	0.35 (0.25)	0.11 (0.10)	**	1.21 (0.36 to 2.06)	Large
Relative peak speed (%)	7.2 (5.0)	2.5 (2.2)	**	1.17 (0.33 to 2.01)	Moderate
Peak speed after 3 cycles (m/s)	0.23	0.13	*	1.04	Moderate

	<u>(0.10)</u>	<u>(0.09)</u>		<u>(0.21 to 1.88)</u>	
<u>Relative peak speed after 3</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>N.S</u>	<u>0.73</u>	<u>Moderate</u>
<u>cycles (%)</u>	<u>(2.5)</u>	<u>(2.4)</u>		<u>(-0.07 to 1.54)</u>	
<u>Peak power (W)</u>	<u>32.6</u>	<u>17.9</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>0.78</u>	<u>Moderate</u>
	<u>(24.2)</u>	<u>(8.2)</u>		<u>(-0.03 to 1.59)</u>	
<u>Relative peak power (%)</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>N.S</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>Trivial</u>
	<u>(6.7)</u>	<u>(4.4)</u>		<u>(-0.75 to 0.82)</u>	
<u>Peak power after 3 cycles (W)</u>	<u>27.6</u>	<u>14.8</u>	<u>N.S</u>	<u>0.86</u>	<u>Moderate</u>
	<u>(17.5)</u>	<u>(10.8)</u>		<u>(0.04 to 1.67)</u>	
<u>Relative peak power after 3</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>N.S</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Trivial</u>
<u>cycles (%)</u>	<u>(5.4)</u>	<u>(6.2)</u>		<u>(-0.78 to 0.78)</u>	

Note. * = $P < 0.05$, ** = $P < 0.01$ and N.S = non-significant difference ($P > 0.05$)