

Horizontal force production and multi-segment foot kinematics during the acceleration phase of bend sprinting

JUDSON, Laura, CHURCHILL, Sarah <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9542-3812>>, BARNES, Andrew <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8262-5132>>, STONE, Joseph <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9861-4443>>, BROOKES, Ian and WHEAT, Jonathan <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1107-6452>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/24629/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

JUDSON, Laura, CHURCHILL, Sarah, BARNES, Andrew, STONE, Joseph, BROOKES, Ian and WHEAT, Jonathan (2019). Horizontal force production and multi-segment foot kinematics during the acceleration phase of bend sprinting. *Scandinavian journal of medicine and science in sports*, 29 (10).

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

**HORIZONTAL FORCE PRODUCTION AND MULTI-SEGMENT FOOT
KINEMATICS DURING THE ACCELERATION PHASE OF BEND SPRINTING**

**Laura J. Judson^{a,b,1}, Sarah M. Churchill^a, Andrew Barnes^a, Joseph A. Stone^a, Ian G. A
Brookes^a, Jon Wheat^a**

**^{a)} Academy of Sport and Physical Activity, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield,
United Kingdom**

**^{b)} Centre for Sports Engineering Research, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield,
United Kingdom**

¹ Corresponding author:

Laura J. Judson

Dr Andrew Barnes

Centre for Sports Engineering Research

Academy of Sport and Physical Activity

Sheffield Hallam University

Collegiate Hall

SHEFFIELD, S10 2LW

Sheffield Hallam University

UNITED KINGDOM

SHEFFIELD, S10 2BP

Email: l.judson@shu.ac.uk

UNITED KINGDOM

Dr Sarah Churchill

Dr Joseph A. Stone

Academy of Sport and Physical Activity

Academy of Sport and Physical Activity

Collegiate Hall

Collegiate Hall

Sheffield Hallam University

Sheffield Hallam University

SHEFFIELD, S10 2BP

SHEFFIELD, S10 2BP

UNITED KINGDOM

UNITED KINGDOM

Ian G. A. Brookes

Academy of Sport and Physical Activity

Collegiate Hall

Sheffield Hallam University

SHEFFIELD, S10 2BP

UNITED KINGDOM

Professor Jon Wheat

Academy of Sport and Physical Activity

Collegiate Hall

Sheffield Hallam University

SHEFFIELD, S10 2BP

UNITED KINGDOM

1 **Abstract**

2 This paper investigated horizontal force production, foot kinematics and metatarsophalangeal
3 (MTP) joint push-off axis use during acceleration in bend (anti-clockwise) and straight-line
4 sprinting. It was hypothesised that bend sprinting would cause the left step push-off to occur
5 about the oblique axis, resulting in a decrease in propulsive force. Three-dimensional
6 kinematic and ground reaction force data were collected from nine participants during
7 sprinting on the bend (36.5 m radius) and straight. Anteroposterior force was reduced at 38-
8 44% of stance during bend sprinting compared with the straight. This coincided with an
9 increase in mediolateral force for the majority of the stance phase (3-96%) on the bend
10 compared with the straight. In addition, a lower propulsive impulse was reported on the bend
11 compared with the straight. Analysis of multi-segment foot kinematics provides insight into
12 the possible mechanisms behind these changes in force production. Mean mediolateral centre
13 of pressure position was more lateral in relation to the second metatarsal head in the left step
14 on the bend compared with the straight, indicating the oblique axis was used for push-off at
15 the MTP joint. Greater peak joint angles of the left foot were also reported, in particular, an
16 increase in left step midfoot eversion and internal ankle rotation. It is possible these changes
17 in joint kinematics are associated with the observed decrease in propulsive force. Therefore,
18 practitioners should seek to strengthen muscles such as tibialis posterior in frontal and sagittal
19 planes and ensure specificity of training which may aid in addressing these force reductions.

20 **Key words:** 200 m, three-dimensional, athletics, curve, impulse, SPM

21

22

23 **Introduction**

24 During maximal velocity treadmill sprinting, faster speeds are associated with higher
25 peak vertical forces¹. However, rather than solely producing greater peak forces, faster speeds
26 are more dependent on the ability to produce these forces rapidly, meaning the production of
27 high vertical force over a short contact time is crucial¹. During anti-clockwise bend sprinting,
28 left step contact times are longer than straight-line sprinting²⁻⁵. As forces are only produced
29 when the foot is in contact with the ground, it could be postulated that the associated ground
30 reaction forces are affected.

31 During maximal velocity bend sprinting, lower peak resultant and vertical forces have
32 been reported for the left step on the bend than the straight⁶. Additionally, inward forces were
33 greater on the bend than the straight, with the left limb producing a greater peak inward force
34 compared with the right on the bend⁶. This limb asymmetry in force production could hold
35 important insights in understanding bend sprinting performance. Furthermore, the maximal
36 velocity phase does not reflect the full requirements of a 200 m or 400 m race and
37 consideration of the acceleration phase bend sprinting is required.

38 Similar to maximum speed¹, straight-line acceleration performance is not simply
39 reliant upon the production of large forces, but rather producing greater horizontal force as a
40 proportion of the total amount of force applied^{7,8}. Thus, 'ratio of force' has been proposed as a
41 useful measure of performance during the acceleration phase of straight-line sprinting,
42 placing emphasis on the orientation of force rather than magnitude⁷⁻⁹. The necessity to
43 generate centripetal force during bend sprinting might also affect the magnitude of vertical
44 and anteroposterior forces, and thus ratio of force, however, this is yet to be investigated.
45 Therefore, ratio of force might provide important insight into performance changes between
46 bend and straight sprinting.

47 Bojsen-Moller¹⁰ observed the metatarsophalangeal joint (MTP) has two axes about
48 which the foot can push off: transverse and oblique. The transverse axis runs through the
49 heads of the first and second metatarsals (MTH1, MTH2), whereas the oblique axis runs
50 through the second to fifth metatarsal heads (MTH5)¹⁰. Push-off at higher walking speeds
51 uses the transverse axis, thus it is deemed more effective than the oblique axis at generating
52 propulsive force in the direction of progression¹⁰. Churchill, Trewartha, Bezodis, Salo⁶
53 purported the inward lean of athletes during bend sprinting might promote the use of the
54 oblique axis for the left ground contact (but the transverse axis for the right ground contact).
55 Therefore, it is probable athletes are less effective at generating propulsive force when using
56 the oblique axis, which has been suggested as a limiting factor in bend sprinting⁶. Indeed, the
57 MTP joint has been highlighted as making an important contribution to performance in
58 straight line sprinting^{11,12} and warrants investigation during bend sprinting.

59 If MTP joint push-off mechanics are influenced by sprinting on the bend, as a
60 consequence the more proximal ankle joint also employ different compensatory mechanisms,
61 as described by Bojsen-Moller¹⁰. Kinematic adaptations have been reported elsewhere in the
62 lower extremity, for example, both Alt, Heinrich, Funken, Potthast² and Churchill, Salo,
63 Trewartha³ reported an increase in peak left hip adduction on the bend compared with the
64 straight at submaximal² and maximal speeds³. Alt, Heinrich, Funken, Potthast² also reported
65 greater peak left ankle eversion during bend sprinting. During the stance phase in sprinting,
66 the foot is in a fixed position, thus motion at the foot and ankle is thought to pass proximally
67 as part of a closed kinematic chain to the tibia, fibula and femur¹³. Therefore, adaptations
68 occurring proximally in the kinematic chain during bend sprinting are likely associated with
69 adaptations at the foot. Furthermore, asymmetric differences in strength of the muscle groups
70 of the foot¹⁴ and high incidences of injuries to the foot¹⁵ have been reported in bend sprinting

71 athletes. Hence, better understanding the motion of the foot during bend sprinting might
72 provide insight for practitioners to aid injury prevention strategies.

73 In summary, force adaptations during the bend sprinting acceleration are likely and
74 might contribute towards a decrease in sprint performance. Furthermore, these changes could
75 be associated with kinematic adaptations of the foot and ankle. Therefore, this study aimed to
76 investigate horizontal force production, foot kinematics and MTP axis use during sprinting on
77 the bend compared with the straight. A secondary aim was to evaluate between limb
78 differences to identify the existence of any asymmetry during bend sprinting. It was
79 hypothesised the oblique axis would be used by the left foot for push-off during bend
80 sprinting, resulting in a decrease in propulsive force (and therefore sprint performance) in
81 comparison with the straight.

82 **Methods**

83 *Participants*

84 Following institutional ethical approval, nine male sprinters (mean age 22 ± 4 years;
85 body mass 71.48 ± 9.47 kg; stature 1.81 ± 0.06 m) volunteered to participate in this study. All
86 athletes were experienced bend sprinters (200 and/or 400 m) and the inclusion criteria
87 required a 200 m personal best of 23.5 s or faster (mean 22.70 ± 0.49 s, range 21.8 - 23.43 s)
88 to standardise ability with previous research (Alt, Heinrich, Funken, Potthast² 22.60 ± 0.33 s;
89 Churchill, Salo, Trewartha³ 22.15 ± 0.93 s). At the time of data collection, all athletes were
90 injury free and active in training. The study procedures were fully explained to participants
91 who subsequently provided written informed consent.

92

93

94 ***Experimental set-up***

95 The experimental set-up is demonstrated in figure 1. Kinematic data were collected
96 using a 15-camera optoelectronic motion capture system (13 x Raptor model and 2 x Eagle
97 model, Motion Analysis Corporation (MAC), Santa Rosa, CA, USA) sampling at 200 Hz. A
98 right-handed lab coordinate system was defined using a rigid L-frame with four markers at
99 known locations. Athletes ran primarily in the direction of the positive x -axis, where the
100 positive y -axis was directed vertically upwards and the positive z -axis was mediolateral,
101 pointing to the athletes' right. The calibration volume (7 m long, 3 m wide and 1.5 m high)
102 was located tangentially to the apex of the curve to record data through the 10 - 17 m section
103 of the 30 m sprints.

104 ***** Figure 1 near here *****

105 A modified Vicon Plug-in Gait (PiG) marker set (lower limb and trunk¹⁶) was used to
106 model the torso, pelvis, thighs, shanks and feet segments (toebox, forefoot, rearfoot). Retro-
107 reflective markers (12.7 mm) were placed on the following anatomical landmarks: lateral
108 malleolus, medial malleolus, shank (lower lateral 1/3), thigh (lower lateral 1/3 surface of the
109 thigh), lateral femoral epicondyle, medial femoral epicondyle, greater trochanter, posterior
110 superior iliac spine, anterior superior iliac spine, C7, T10, suprasternal notch, xiphoid
111 process. Shoe-mounted markers (posterior, medial and lateral calcaneus, 1st and 5th metatarsal
112 bases, MTH1, MTH2, MTH5 and head of the 2nd toe) were used to represent the movement
113 of the underlying structure of the foot. Further details of marker placement can be found in
114 Judson, Churchill, Barnes, Stone, Brookes, Wheat¹⁷.

115 Kinetic data were collected using a Kistler force plate (Model: 9287BA, 900 x 600
116 mm) sampling at 1000 Hz. The force plate was embedded into the track surface and covered

117 with a secured piece of synthetic track. The force platform was configured to produce a
118 rising(/falling) edge 5 V signal at the onset of data collection, which was sampled by the
119 motion capture system and used to temporally synchronise the kinematic and kinetic data.

120 ***Protocol***

121 Data were collected on a flat standard indoor track surface with a reconstructed bend
122 replicating lane 1 (radius 36.5 m) of a standard 400 m running track (IAAF, 2008). Straight-
123 line trials were completed on a 30 m section of straight track. The order of experimental
124 conditions were randomised to minimise order effects. Results from Morin, Slawinski, Dorel,
125 de Villareal, Couturier, Samozino, Brughelli, Rabita¹⁸ suggest the production of propulsive
126 impulse in the first 20 m determines acceleration performance. Thus, it was decided to limit
127 analysis to the 0 - 20 m section. Therefore, kinematic data were collected at 10-17 m within
128 the present study to enable comparison with previous research. Furthermore, only one study
129 has examined the acceleration phase of bend sprinting, analysing data at 12 m¹⁹, so the force
130 plate was located at approximately 12 m.

131 Participants completed their typical competition warm-up before performing a
132 maximum of six trials (three left, three right) at maximal effort for 30 m in each condition
133 (bend and straight). Starting blocks were used alongside an '*on your marks, set, go*' signal to
134 maintain the experimental representativeness of the protocol. For force data, a minimum of
135 one successful right and left step on the bend and one successful right and left step on the
136 straight were achieved within these trials. A successful trial was defined as contact being
137 made with the force plate without changes to running gait caused by 'targeting'. To achieve
138 this, one researcher modified the start location up to a maximum of one metre of the athletes
139 based upon warm-up trials. Therefore, force data were collected in the range of 11 - 13 m. To

140 further reduce the likelihood of targeting, participants were not informed of the force plate
141 location. Approximately eight minutes were allowed between trials to avoid the onset of
142 fatigue³. Participants wore their own sprint spikes for the testing session.

143 *Data processing*

144 Raw 3D marker coordinate data were analysed using Cortex software (version 5.3,
145 Motion Analysis Corporation, Santa Rosa, CA, USA). Automatic gap filling, using a cubic
146 spline, was performed. All gaps were <10 frames. A low-pass, fourth order recursive
147 Butterworth filter was applied to raw marker positions. Residual analysis was used to
148 determine the cut-off frequency (18 Hz). Visual 3D (version 6, C-Motion, Rockville, MD,
149 USA) was used to define and construct segments, local coordinate systems and joint centres.
150 Where possible, International Society of Biomechanics (ISB) guidelines^{20,21} were adhered to.
151 However, the joint coordinate system for the multi-segment foot was defined in accordance
152 with Cappozzo, Catani, Della Croce, Leardini²². For centre of mass (CoM) calculations,
153 body segment parameters were estimated from de Leva²³ and adjusted by 150 to 189 g
154 representing the mass of individual participants' spiked shoe according to manufacturer
155 specification. Previous work established using a lower limb and trunk model was appropriate
156 for whole body CoM calculations¹⁶. Kinetic data were analysed using Matlab (v2017a,
157 Mathworks, Natick, USA). Force data were filtered with a low-pass, fourth order recursive
158 Butterworth filter 150 Hz cut-off frequency, chosen with the use of residual analysis.

159 For force data, one successful trial per condition and per participant was analysed, as
160 was the case with Churchill, Trewartha, Bezodis, Salo⁶. Two participants were not able to
161 record force data for one condition, so their force data was removed from the analysis. For
162 kinematic data, a mean of three trials was calculated for both the left and right foot on the

163 bend and straight. *Touchdown* and *take-off events* were identified using the mean plus two
164 standard deviations of the last three seconds of vertical ground reaction force data (where
165 there was zero load on the force plate) as a threshold²⁴. For trials where force plate data were
166 not available, the mean plus two standard deviations of the vertical coordinates of MTH5 in
167 the static trial were used as a threshold for touchdown and take-off²⁴. All variables were
168 calculated separately for the left and right step. Left and right steps were defined by the foot
169 that initiated the step. *Absolute speed* was calculated using the first central difference
170 technique from the horizontal distance travelled by the CoM of the lower limb and trunk
171 model. *Contact time* was calculated at the time from touchdown to take-off.

172 For both bend and straight trials, horizontal forces in the global coordinate system
173 were transformed into an instantaneous, body-fixed reference system. The body-fixed system
174 was defined at each time point, oriented such that the *x*-axis pointed in the direction of the
175 instantaneous centre of mass velocity vector, the *y*-axis pointed vertically upwards and the *z*-
176 axis pointed to the participant's right²⁵ and expressed relative to body weight. Therefore,
177 anteroposterior force was defined as the *x*-component of external force in the body-fixed
178 coordinate system. Centre of mass data were upsampled from 200 to 1000 Hz using a cubic
179 spline to enable the rotation of forces. *Braking and propulsive impulses* were calculated from
180 absolute values and expressed relative to body mass. *Ratio of force* was calculated as the
181 mean ratio of force in the direction of forward progression (relative to the direction of travel
182 of the athlete's CoM) to resultant force during ground contact.

183 Adapted from Smith, Lake, Lees, Worsfold²⁶, *MTP push-off axis* was determined
184 using centre of pressure (CoP) data. CoP data were first aligned with a local foot coordinate
185 system. The mediolateral position of the CoP and MTH2 marker was then extracted during
186 the propulsive phase of stance for each condition. The distance of the CoP from the MTH2

187 was then calculated for each frame, followed by calculation of the mean CoP position during
188 the propulsive phase of stance and thus providing the *mean mediolateral CoP position*
189 *relative to MTH2*. For ease of interpretation, data for the left foot were multiplied by -1, so a
190 positive value indicated CoP was lateral to MTH2 and represented the oblique axis for both
191 the left and right foot. Consequently, a negative value represents the use of the transverse axis
192 (figure 2).

193 ***** Figure 2 near here *****

194 *Joint orientation angles* during the stance phase were defined as the distal segment
195 relative to the proximal segment, using the joint coordinate system convention²⁷. The analysis
196 focussed on frontal and transverse plane variables since previous bend sprinting research has
197 demonstrated that kinematic adaptations occur predominantly in the non-sagittal planes². The
198 following joint angles were chosen for analysis to allow assessment of the influence of foot
199 position on force production: midfoot inversion and eversion, ankle inversion and eversion,
200 ankle internal and external rotation. Values for the left limb were multiplied by -1 for ease of
201 interpretation. MTP angular velocity was included since Krell, Stefanyshyn¹¹ have shown a
202 relationship between sprint performance and higher maximal rates of MTP extension.

203 Minimum detectable difference (MDD) indicates the magnitude of change required to
204 be considered 'real'. Where the difference between conditions exceeds the MDD, it can be
205 considered a change due to experimental condition and not natural athlete variance or
206 protocol error. Therefore, peak angles and spatiotemporal variables were interpreted with
207 reference to the MDD evaluated in the bend sprinting, identified by Judson, Churchill,
208 Barnes, Stone, Brookes, Wheat¹⁷.

209

210 ***Statistical analysis***

211 Normal distribution of the data for each variable was confirmed by the Shapiro-Wilk
212 normality test ($P > 0.05$).

213 For discrete variables, two way repeated measures ANOVAs were performed where
214 condition (bend vs. straight) x limb (left vs. right) were analysed ($P > 0.05$). Due to a small
215 sample size, the study may be statistically underpowered and so the chance of detecting a true
216 effect was reduced. Therefore results were also interpreted using Hedges' g , which includes a
217 correction for small sample sizes. Cohen²⁸ guidelines were used for the interpretation of
218 effect size, where $d < 0.20$ represents a trivial difference, $0.20 \geq 0.50$ indicating a small
219 difference, $0.50 \geq 0.80$ a moderate difference and ≥ 0.80 a large difference between means.

220 Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM²⁹) was used to statistically compare force
221 production across the entire stance phase between conditions. Force data were first
222 normalised to 101 data points, representing 0-100% of the stance phase. An SPM repeated
223 measures two way ANOVA was then performed separately at each of the 101 time points
224 resulting in the output of a statistical parametric map (SPM{F}). If SPM{F} exceeded the
225 critical threshold, forces at these specific nodes could be considered different. A collection of
226 consecutive nodes exceeding the threshold and considered significant is termed a 'supra-
227 threshold cluster'. Following methods used by Colyer, Nagahara, Salo³⁰, clusters of fewer
228 than five nodes were considered unlikely to be meaningful. SPM analyses were implemented
229 using open source SPM code (SPM1D open-source package, spm1d.org) in MATLAB
230 (v2017a, Mathworks, Natick, USA).

231 **Results**

232 **Performance descriptors**

233 There was a 2% reduction in absolute speed on the bend compared with the straight
234 for the left step ($g = 0.52$, Table 1). During bend sprinting, absolute speed was faster during
235 the right step than the left step ($g = 0.48$, Table 1). However, there was no significant main
236 effect for condition, $F_{(1, 8)} = 0.574$, $P = 0.47$ or limb $F_{(1, 8)} = 2.994$, $P = 0.122$. For contact
237 time, there was a significant main effect for condition, $F_{(1, 8)} = 6.111$, $P = 0.039$ ($g = 1.50$ left
238 step; 0.27 right step), with contact being longer on the bend than straight. A significant
239 condition x limb interaction was also reported, $F_{(1, 8)} = 7.801$, $P = 0.023$ showing the increase
240 in contact time on the bend was greater in the left step compared with the right step ($d =$
241 0.56).

242 *** **Table 1 near here** ***

243 **Anteroposterior, mediolateral force and ratio of force**

244 The profiles of anteroposterior force signals during straight-line and bend sprinting
245 were similar for the majority of the stance phase (Figure 3). However, one supra-threshold
246 cluster (37-44%) exceeded the critical threshold of $F = 17.238$ for the main effect of
247 condition, where anteroposterior force was lower on the bend compared with the straight in
248 both the left and right steps. The probability that a supra-threshold cluster of this size would
249 be observed in repeated random samplings was $P < 0.001$.

250 One supra-threshold cluster exceeded the critical threshold ($F = 15.309$) for main
251 effect of condition when comparing mediolateral force on the bend and straight (3-96%, $P <$
252 0.001). This was due to an increase in mediolateral force production across the majority of
253 the stance phase on the bend (see Figure 4). There was also a significant main effect for limb,
254 with two supra-threshold clusters found at 1-12% and 75-100% of stance. At 1-12%,

255 mediolateral force was greater in the right step than left, whilst at 75-100% of stance, the left
256 step was greater than the right.

257 ***** Figure 3 near here *****

258 ***** Figure 4 near here *****

259 There was a main effect for condition on propulsive impulse $F_{(1,6)} = 8.53$, $P = 0.02$ (g
260 $= 0.93$ left step; 0.78 right step, Table 2), with the straight resulting in a greater propulsive
261 impulse than the bend. However, there was no condition x limb interaction, $F_{(1,6)} = 0.708$, P
262 $= 0.433$. For braking impulse, a 27% increase with large effect size ($g = 1.29$, Table 2) was
263 reported in the left step on the bend relative to the straight. However, the main effect for
264 condition was not significant, $F_{(1,6)} = 6.272$, $P = 0.05$. For mean ratio of force there was a
265 significant main effect for condition, $F_{(1,6)} = 11.647$, $P = 0.014$ ($g = 1.72$ left step; 1.16 right
266 step, Table 2), with the straight resulting in a higher mean ratio of force than the bend. There
267 was no condition x limb interaction for mean ratio of force ($F_{(1,6)} = 2.628$, $P = 0.156$).

268 ***** Table 2 near here *****

269

270 **MTP push-off axis and multi-segment foot kinematics**

271 There was a significant condition x limb interaction for COP position, $F_{(1,6)} =$
272 127.878 , $P < 0.001$. The mean mediolateral COP position was more lateral in the left step on
273 the bend compared with the straight (Figure 5). This indicates the oblique axis was in use
274 during the left step on the bend, while the transverse axis was used for all other conditions.

275 *****Figure 5 near here*****

276 There was a significant condition x limb interaction for peak ankle internal rotation,
277 $F_{(1, 8)} = 17.091, P = 0.003$. Left step peak ankle internal rotation was greater on the bend,
278 compared with the straight ($g = 1.70$) and the right step on the bend ($g = 1.95$). Left step peak
279 ankle eversion was 55% greater on the bend than straight ($g = 0.88$), however, no significant
280 main effect for condition was reported, $F_{(1, 8)} = 1.247, P = 0.297$. For peak ankle inversion,
281 there was a significant condition x limb interaction, $F_{(1, 8)} = 12.707, P = 0.007$, due to a
282 decrease in left step peak ankle inversion on the bend compared with the straight. For peak
283 midfoot eversion, there was a significant condition x limb interaction ($F = 11.768, P = 0.009$)
284 due to an increase in the left step on the bend compared with the straight ($g = 0.79$), and a
285 decrease in the right step on the bend compared with the straight ($g = 0.72$). A significant
286 main effect for limb in peak midfoot eversion ($F_{(1, 8)} = 9.166, P = 0.016, g = 1.73$) was also
287 reported.

288 A significant condition x limb interaction was reported for peak midfoot inversion, $F_{(1, 8)} = 6.238, P = 0.037$, due to an increase in right step peak midfoot inversion on the bend
289 relative to the straight and the left step on the bend ($g = 0.90$). There was no significant
290 condition x limb interaction for MTP angular velocity ($F_{(1, 8)} = 1.672, P = 0.232$), however a
291 moderate effect size between the left step on the bend and straight was reported ($g = 0.50$).

293 ***** Table 3 near here *****

294 **Discussion and Implications**

295 The aim of this research was to investigate horizontal force production, foot
296 kinematics and MTP joint axis use during sprinting in the acceleration phase on the bend
297 compared to the straight. The left foot was found to use the oblique axis for push-off at the
298 MTP joint. This coincided with a decrease in anteroposterior force and propulsive impulse

299 and an increase in peak eversion of the midfoot and ankle. These findings support the study's
300 hypothesis. Moreover, although non-statistically significant, a small (2%, $g = 0.52$) reduction
301 in left step absolute speed on the bend compared with the straight was observed. The decrease
302 in absolute speed is lower than the 4.7% reduction reported by Churchill, Salo, Trewartha³
303 during maximal speed, suggesting the effect of the bend during the acceleration phase
304 accumulates and results in a greater loss of speed during the later maximal speed phase.

305 A decrease in propulsive force on the bend compared with the straight was observed,
306 with the supra-threshold cluster occurring at 37-44% of the stance phase. Colyer, Nagahara,
307 Salo³⁰ found better performances in straight-line sprinting were associated with the
308 production of high amounts of propulsive force during the mid-late propulsive phase of the
309 eighth step (55-85% of stance). As the sprint distance increased, these associations occurred
310 earlier in the stance phase (nineteenth step: 19 - 64% of stance³⁰). Therefore it is reasonable
311 to assume that associations with sprint performance and propulsive force at the tenth or
312 eleventh step as measured in the present study will occur earlier in the stance phase than the
313 55-85% reported by Colyer, Nagahara, Salo³⁰ at the eighth step. Thus, the results of the
314 present study suggest the ability to produce propulsive force is reduced on the bend and
315 occurs at a crucial time point during the stance phase which might impact upon acceleration
316 performance.

317 In addition to the reduction in propulsive force, there was a decrease in propulsive
318 impulse, particularly during the left step where a large effect size was found ($g = 0.93$). Right
319 step propulsive impulse was also reduced on the bend compared to the straight. However, the
320 moderate effect size suggests this was not to the same extent (propulsive impulse $g = 0.78$).
321 Morin, Slawinski, Dorel, de Villareal, Couturier, Samozino, Brughelli, Rabita¹⁸ discussed

322 how acceleration capability in faster sprinters was characterised by 'pushing more' but not
323 necessarily 'braking less'. This concept suggests producing higher propulsive impulse is of
324 greater importance than producing lower braking impulse, particularly in the first twenty
325 metres of acceleration. This is supported by Colyer, Nagahara, Salo³⁰ who observed a
326 positive association between better performances and higher amounts of anteroposterior force
327 during the mid-late propulsion phase of stance. During bend sprinting, the ability to produce
328 propulsive impulse was restricted, and although a significant effect was not reported for
329 braking impulse, large effect sizes were observed when comparing left step on the bend and
330 straight ($g = 1.29$). This suggests a greater braking impulse was experienced in the left step
331 on the bend in comparison to the straight. Unlike Morin, Slawinski, Dorel, de Villareal,
332 Couturier, Samozino, Brughelli, Rabita¹⁸, acceleration performance during bend sprinting is
333 characterised by 'pushing less' and 'braking more' than the straight, particularly with the left
334 foot. Therefore, propulsive force production of the left foot may be a limiting factor for
335 acceleration performance on the bend.

336 However, these reductions in propulsive force observed during bend sprinting are a
337 necessary consequence of the additional requirement to produce centripetal force. In order to
338 achieve this requirement, and stay in the correct lane, mediolateral force was greater on the
339 bend compared to the straight for the majority (3-96%) of the stance phase. Whilst necessary
340 for bend sprinting, it is possible the introduction of mediolateral force is a contributing factor
341 for the decrease in ratio of force found during bend sprinting. In addition, use of SPM
342 revealed mediolateral force during bend sprinting was greater in the right step compared to
343 the left during 1-12% of the stance phase, whereas later in stance (75-100%), mediolateral
344 force was greater in the left step than right, thus further establishing the left foot as fulfilling a
345 different role to the right foot during bend sprinting. These asymmetries demonstrate the

346 benefit of SPM analysis which has provided insight that may have been lost with the analysis
347 of discrete values.

348 In comparison with straight-line sprinting, bend sprinting elicited an 11% and 22%
349 decrease in mean ratio of force for the left and right steps, respectively. A higher ratio of
350 force has been associated with better acceleration performance⁹. This reinforces the notion
351 that athletes apply propulsive force less effectively during bend sprinting and therefore the
352 generation and orientation of force appear a limiting factor to acceleration performance on
353 the bend when compared with straight-line sprinting. It appears this may be due to the
354 combination of a reduction in propulsive force and an essential increase in mediolateral force.
355 Whilst the right step experienced a decrease in ratio of force on the bend, right step ratio of
356 force was 8% greater than the left step on the bend ($g = 0.88$). Thus, there appear to be
357 asymmetries in force production of the left and right limb during bend sprinting, with the
358 right being more effective at propulsive force production.

359 Ratio of force analysis provides an overview of force orientation and a reduction was
360 reported in both left and right steps on the bend compared with the straight. This finding is
361 reinforced when considering impulse, which as the product of force and time acts as a metric
362 to evaluate force application. Reductions in the magnitude of force despite longer contact
363 times resulted in a decrease in propulsive impulse that was greater in the left step. Therefore,
364 it appears the decrease in acceleration performance at approximately 12 m is largely due to
365 changes in left step force orientation and application.

366 A mechanism behind the reported changes in force production during bend sprinting
367 might be the use of different MTP joint push-off axes. Results showed that left step mean
368 mediolateral COP position was more lateral on the bend than the straight, suggesting the

369 oblique axis is used to push-off with the left step during bend sprinting, supporting the
370 hypothesis put forward by Churchill, Trewartha, Bezodis, Salo⁶. The oblique axis is
371 considered less effective for push-off at high speeds¹⁰. However, during bend sprinting,
372 oblique axis use seems a necessary adaptation (dictated by the need to produce centripetal
373 force and change in the segmental arrangement of the lower limb) required to enable the
374 change of direction. The mean mediolateral COP position for the right step on the bend was
375 more medial than the straight, thus transverse axis was in use. This reinforces the notion that
376 the right step and left steps perform different functions during bend sprinting. Furthermore,
377 results suggest there may be a decrease in MTP joint angular velocity during the left step on
378 the bend compared to the straight. Krell, Stefanyshyn¹¹ established that faster male sprinters
379 elicited higher maximal rates of MTP extension. Therefore, decreased MTP joint angular
380 velocity might contribute to the decrease in sprint performance found on the bend. Further
381 research is required to strengthen this conclusion.

382 Bend sprinting also induced kinematic adaptations in the multi-segment foot. In
383 particular, there was an increased left step peak midfoot eversion combined with increased
384 left step peak internal ankle rotation on the bend compared to the straight. Although there was
385 no significant main effect, a large effect size suggests a trend towards an increase in left step
386 peak ankle eversion angle ($g = 0.88$). Eversion occurs during the first 15% of stance due to
387 the eccentric contraction of invertors such as tibialis posterior and anterior¹³. As bi-planar
388 muscles, whilst they are predominantly invertors they also have a role to play in
389 plantarflexion of the foot and ankle³¹. Simulations³² and later experimental data³³ suggested
390 kinetics of the ankle joint play a dominant role in the acceleration of the centre of mass
391 during the stance phases of early acceleration in straight-line sprinting. Therefore, as
392 previously supposed by Chang, Kram³⁴, a joints capacity to contribute to the production of

393 propulsive forces in the sagittal plane may be restricted by the frontal and transverse plane
394 adaptations reported. It appears the increased left step eversion and ankle internal rotation
395 place the foot in a disadvantageous position, compromising the ability to produce propulsive
396 force.

397 Hamill, Murphy, Sussman³⁵ theorised the left limb would most likely suffer injuries
398 such as plantar fasciitis or post-tibialis tendonitis as a consequence of bend running and
399 repeated exposure to stress in the frontal and transverse planes. The results of the current
400 study support these possible injury aetiologies. Repetitive loading and excessive eversion are
401 considered a risk factor for plantar fasciitis³⁶. The increased eversion of the left midfoot and
402 ankle found during bend sprinting may place additional stress on tibialis anterior which
403 provides a 'stirrup' for the arch under the foot³¹ and may, therefore be a contributing factor in
404 the onset of plantar fasciitis.

405 It is acknowledged the use of shoe-mounted markers to represent movement of the
406 underlying bones of the foot could be associated with some inaccuracies of joint kinematics,
407 as observed by Sinclair³⁷ during running. However, sprint spikes tend to have a tight fit
408 which helped minimise this risk. Furthermore, this approach ensured a more representative
409 experimental design (see Pinder, Davids, Renshaw, Araujo³⁸) in comparison to other options
410 such as bone-mounted markers. Whilst cutting holes in shoes enables skin-mounted markers,
411 this compromises the integrity of the shoe and prevents athletes from wearing their own
412 spikes. In addition, although in line with previous bend sprinting literature^{2,3,6}, the sample
413 size is small. Therefore, as Knudson³⁹ suggest, replication studies are encouraged to further
414 advance our findings.

415

416 **Perspectives**

417 The results demonstrate a reduction in the ability to produce anteroposterior force
418 during bend sprinting. There was also an increase in mediolateral force, resulting in a lower
419 average ratio of force, suggesting athletes apply force less effectively during bend sprinting.
420 In the left step, the oblique axis was used for push-off at the MTP joint, combined with
421 increased midfoot eversion and ankle internal rotation. Therefore, it appears athletes are
422 restricted by their ability to produce force in the non-sagittal planes due to a complex
423 interaction of adaptations at the joints of the ankle and foot. Practitioners should, therefore,
424 seek to strengthen muscles in frontal and sagittal planes which may aid in addressing these
425 reductions. In addition, as highlighted by Churchill, Salo, Trewartha³; Churchill, Trewartha,
426 Salo⁴⁰, undertaking sprint training on the bend to ensure specificity, is essential. Finally, it is
427 possible that repeated stress in these planes may be a precursor to injury. Thus, strengthening
428 muscles, such as the tibialis posterior and tibialis anterior may have implications for injury
429 prevention as well as performance improvements.

430
431 **References**

- 432
- 433 1. Weyand P, Sandell R, Prime D, Bundle M. The biological limits to running speed are
434 imposed from the ground up. *Journal of Applied Physiology*. 2010;108(4):950-961.
 - 435 2. Alt T, Heinrich K, Funken J, Potthast W. Lower extremity kinematics of athletics
436 curve sprinting. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2015;33(6):552-560.
 - 437 3. Churchill SM, Salo AI, Trewartha G. The effect of the bend on technique and
438 performance during maximal effort sprinting. *Sports Biomechanics*. 2015;14(1):106-
439 121.
 - 440 4. Ishimura K, Sakurai S. Comparison of inside contact phase and outside contact phase
441 in curved sprinting. Paper presented at: 28th Conference of the International Society
442 of Biomechanics in Sports (ISBS); 2010, 2010; Marquette, Michigan, USA.
 - 443 5. Ishimura K, Tsukada T, Sakurai S. Relationship between sprint performance and
444 stride parameters in curved sprinting. Paper presented at: 31st Conference of the
445 International Society of Biomechanics in Sports (ISBS); 2013, 2013; Taipei, Taiwan.

- 446 6. Churchill SM, Trewartha G, Bezodis I, Salo AI. Force production during maximal
447 effort bend sprinting: Theory vs reality. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science*
448 *in Sports*. 2016;26(10):1171-1179.
- 449 7. Morin JB, Bourdin M, Edouard P, Peyrot N, Samozino P, Lacour JR. Mechanical
450 determinants of 100-m sprint running performance. *European Journal of Applied*
451 *Physiology*. 2012;112(11):3921-3930.
- 452 8. Rabita G, Dorel S, Slawinski J, et al. Sprint mechanics in world-class athletes: a new
453 insight into the limits of human locomotion. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine &*
454 *Science in Sports*. 2015;25(5):583-594.
- 455 9. Morin JB, Edouard P, Samozino P. Technical ability of force application as a
456 determinant factor of sprint performance. *Medicine & Science in Sport & Exercise*.
457 2011;43(9):1680-1688.
- 458 10. Bojsen-Moller F. Calcaneocuboid joint and stability of the longitudinal arch of the
459 foot at high and low gear push off. *Journal of Anatomy*. 1979;129(1):165-176.
- 460 11. Krell JB, Stefanyshyn DJ. The relationship between extension of the
461 metatarsophalangeal joint and sprint time for 100 m Olympic athletes. *Journal of*
462 *Sports Sciences*. 2006;24(2):175-180.
- 463 12. Smith G, Lake M, Lees A. Metatarsophalangeal joint function during sprinting: a
464 comparison of barefoot and sprint spike shod foot conditions. *Journal of Applied*
465 *Biomechanics*. 2014;30(2):206-212.
- 466 13. Chan CW, Rudins A. Foot biomechanics during walking and running. *Mayo Clinic*
467 *proceedings*. 1994;69(5):448-461.
- 468 14. Beukeboom C, Birmingham TB, Forwell L, Ohrling D. Asymmetrical strength
469 changes and injuries in athletes training on a small radius curve indoor track. *Clinical*
470 *journal of sport medicine : official journal of the Canadian Academy of Sport*
471 *Medicine*. 2000;10(4):245-250.
- 472 15. Pollock N, Dijkstra P, Calder J, Chakraverty R. Plantaris injuries in elite UK track and
473 field athletes over a 4-year period: a retrospective cohort study. *Knee Surgery, Sports*
474 *Traumatology, Arthroscopy*. 2016;24(7):2287-2292.
- 475 16. Judson LJ, Churchill SM, Barnes A, Stone JA, Wheat J. Simplified marker sets for the
476 calculation of centre of mass duration during bend sprinting. Paper presented at: 36th
477 Conference of the International Society of Biomechanics in Sports (ISBS)2017;
478 Cologne, Germany.
- 479 17. Judson LJ, Churchill SM, Barnes A, Stone JA, Brookes I, Wheat J. Measurement of
480 bend sprinting kinematics with three-dimensional motion capture: a test-retest
481 reliability study. *Sports Biomechanics*. 2018.
- 482 18. Morin JB, Slawinski J, Dorel S, et al. Acceleration capability in elite sprinters and
483 ground impulse: Push more, brake less? *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2015;48(12):3149-
484 3154.
- 485 19. Stoner L, Ben-Sira D. Sprinting on the curve. *Science in Athletics*. 1979:167-173.
- 486 20. Wu G, Siegler S, Allard P, et al. ISB recommendation on definitions of joint
487 coordinate system of various joints for the reporting of human joint motion—part I:
488 ankle, hip, and spine. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2002;35(4):543-548.
- 489 21. Wu G, Van der Helm FC, Veeger HD, et al. ISB recommendation on definitions of
490 joint coordinate systems of various joints for the reporting of human joint motion—
491 Part II: shoulder, elbow, wrist and hand. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2005;38(5):981-
492 992.

- 493 22. Cappozzo A, Catani F, Della Croce U, Leardini A. Position and orientation in space
494 of bones during movement: anatomical frame definition and determination. *Clinical*
495 *Biomechanics*. 1995;10(4):171-178.
- 496 23. de Leva P. Adjustments to Zatsiorsky-Seluyanov's segment inertia parameters.
497 *Journal of Biomechanics*. 1996;29(9):1223-1230.
- 498 24. Bezodis I, Thomson A, Gittoes M, Kerwin D. Identification of instants of touchdown
499 and take-off in sprint running using an automatic motion analysis system. Paper
500 presented at: ISBS-Conference Proceedings Archive2007.
- 501 25. Glaister BC, Orendurff MS, Schoen JA, Klute GK. Rotating horizontal ground
502 reaction forces to the body path of progression. *Journal of Biomechanics*.
503 2007;40(15):3527-3532.
- 504 26. Smith G, Lake M, Lees A, Worsfold P. Measurement procedures affect the
505 interpretation of metatarsophalangeal joint function during accelerated sprinting.
506 *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2012;30(14):1521-1527.
- 507 27. Cole GK, Nigg BM, Ronsky JL, Yeadon MR. Application of the joint coordinate
508 system to three-dimensional joint attitude and movement representation: a
509 standardization proposal. *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering*. 1993;115(4a):344-
510 349.
- 511 28. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ:
512 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
- 513 29. Friston KJ, Ashburner JT, Kiebel SJ, Nichols TE, Penny WD. *Statistical Parametric*
514 *Mapping: The Analysis of Functional Brain Images*. Amsterdam: Elsevier/Academic
515 Press; 2007.
- 516 30. Colyer SL, Nagahara R, Salo A. Kinetic demands of sprinting shift across the
517 acceleration phase: novel analysis of entire force waveforms *Scandinavian Journal of*
518 *Medicine & Science in Sports* 2018;28(7):1874-1792.
- 519 31. Palastanga N, Field D, Soames R. *Anatomy and human movement: Structure and*
520 *function*. Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier; 2006.
- 521 32. Debaere S, Delecluse C, Aerenhouts D, Hagman F, Jonkers I. Control of propulsion
522 and body lift during the first two stances of sprint running: a simulation study.
523 *Journal of Sports Science*. 2015;33(19):2016-2024.
- 524 33. Brazil A, Exell T, Wilson C, Willwacher S, Bezodis I, Irwin G. Lower limb joint
525 kinetics in the starting blocks and first stance in athletic sprinting. *Journal of Sports*
526 *Sciences*. 2017;35(16):1629-1635.
- 527 34. Chang YH, Kram R. Limitations to maximum running speed on flat curves. *The*
528 *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 2007;210(6):971-982.
- 529 35. Hamill J, Murphy M, Sussman D. The Effects of Track Turns on Lower Extremity
530 Function. *International Journal of Sport Biomechanics*. 1987;3(3):276-286.
- 531 36. Beeson P. Plantar fasciopathy: revisiting the risk factors. *Foot and ankle surgery :*
532 *official journal of the European Society of Foot and Ankle Surgeons*. 2014;20(3):160-
533 165.
- 534 37. Sinclair J, Taylor, P., Hebron, J., Chockalingam, N. Differences in multi-segment foot
535 kinematics measured using skin and shoe mounted markers. *The Foot and Ankle*
536 *Online Journal*. 2014;7(2).
- 537 38. Pinder RA, Davids K, Renshaw I, Araujo D. Representative learning design and
538 functionality of research and practice in sport. *Journal of sport & exercise*
539 *psychology*. 2011;33(1):146-155.

- 540 39. Knudson D. Confidence crisis of results in biomechanics research. *Sports*
541 *Biomechanics*. 2017;16(4):425-433.
- 542 40. Churchill SM, Trewartha G, Salo AIT. Bend sprinting performance: new insights into
543 the effect of running lane. *Sports Biomechanics*. 2018:1-11.

544

Table 1 Group mean values (\pm standard deviation) and effect sizes (% difference) for performance measures of the left and right step.

	Straight		Bend		Effect size (g) (% difference)			
	Left	Right	Left	Right	Left vs right straight	Left vs right bend	Straight vs bend left	Straight vs bend right
Absolute speed (m/s)	7.96 \pm 0.23	8.00 \pm 0.20	7.81 \pm 0.30	7.89 \pm 0.34	0.12 (0%)	0.48 (2%)	0.52 (2%)	0.05 (0%)
Contact time (s)	0.107 \pm 0.007	0.111 \pm 0.012	0.119 \pm 0.007	0.114 \pm 0.008	0.34 (4%)	0.57 (4%)	1.50 (11%)	0.27 (3%)

Table 2 Group mean values (\pm standard deviation), effect sizes (% difference) for anteroposterior force variables of the left and right step.

	Straight		Bend		Effect size (g) (% difference)			
	Left	Right	Left	Right	Left vs. right straight	Left vs. right bend	Straight vs. bend left	Straight vs. bend right
Relative braking impulse (m/s)	-0.08 \pm 0.02	-0.09 \pm 0.03	-0.11 \pm 0.01	-0.10 \pm 0.03	0.15 (6%)	0.27 (7%)	1.29 (27%)	0.37 (15%)
Relative propulsive impulse (m/s)	0.59 \pm 0.06	0.65 \pm 0.12	0.55 \pm 0.06	0.58 \pm 0.06	0.65 (10%)	0.45 (5%)	0.93 (7%)	0.78 (12%)
Mean ratio of force (%)	19.13 \pm 1.30	23.50 \pm 5.52	16.94 \pm 1.12	18.44 \pm 2.03	1.03 (19%)	0.88 (8%)	1.72 (11%)	1.16 (22%)

Table 3 Group mean values (\pm standard deviation) and effect sizes (% difference) for centre of pressure and midfoot kinematics of the left and right step.

Peak angle (°)	Straight		Bend		Effect size (g) (% difference)			
	Left	Right	Left	Right	Left vs right straight	Left vs right bend	Straight vs bend left	Straight vs bend right
Midfoot inversion	-7 \pm 5	-7 \pm 5	-5 \pm 4	-12 \pm 4	0.03 (6%)	1.48 (63%)	0.30 (41%)	0.90 (69%)
Midfoot eversion	0.3 \pm 5	-0.3 \pm 5	4 \pm 3	-4 \pm 4	0.13 (209%)	1.73 (184%)	0.79 (956%)	0.72 (1271%)
Ankle inversion	14 \pm 9	10 \pm 9	11 \pm 9	12 \pm 9	0.34 (48%)	0.06 (6%)	0.22 (33%)	0.19 (16%)
Ankle eversion	-2 \pm 9	-4 \pm 10	-5 \pm 9	-3 \pm 10	0.15 (36%)	0.12 (23%)	0.88 (55%)	0.02 (8%)
Ankle internal rotation	2 \pm 4	3 \pm 5	12 \pm 7	1 \pm 7	0.25 (44%)	1.95 (562%)	1.70 (346%)	0.46 (108%)
Ankle external rotation	-10 \pm 5	-10 \pm 3	-5 \pm 5	-9 \pm 5	0.13 (9%)	0.85 (42%)	0.95 (50%)	0.20 (6%)
MTP angular velocity (°/s)	776 \pm 239	732 \pm 120	694 \pm 168	704 \pm 176	0.25 (6%)	0.06 (2%)	0.50 (11%)	0.15 (4%)

Figure 1: Plan view of experimental set-up (not to scale).

Figure 2: Right foot representation of the transverse (solid line **—**) and oblique (dashed line - - -) axes of the foot. Where T2 represents marker at the second toe and MTH1, 2 and 5 the first, second and fifth metatarsal heads, respectively.

Figure 3: Group mean anteroposterior force for the left (red) and right (black) steps on the bend (dashed line - - -) and straight (solid line **—**). Shaded areas represent supra-threshold clusters indicating a significant main effect for condition.

Figure 4: Group mean mediolateral force for the left (red) and right (black) steps on the bend (dashed line - - -) and straight (solid line **—**). Shaded areas represent supra-threshold clusters indicating a significant main effect for condition (left figure) and limb (right figure). A negative force represents inward force on the bend and lateral force on the straight.

Figure 5: Mean mediolateral centre of pressure position relative to second metatarsal head during the propulsive phase.

