1	Effect of Sampling Frequency on A Unilateral Isometric Hamstring Strength
2	Assessment Using Force Plates
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	Conflict of Interest Disclosure: None.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
10	
1/ 10	
10	
20	
20	
21	
23	
24	

27 Effect of sampling frequency on a unilateral isometric hamstring strength assessment28 using force plates

29 30

31 Abstract

32

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of sampling frequency on the 90-90 33 34 (90-degrees hip and knee flexion) isometric hamstring assessment. Thirty-three elite female 35 soccer players (age: 18.7 ± 3.7 years; height: 158.3 ± 5.9 cm; body mass: 62.8 ± 5.5 kg) 36 performed three unilateral trials on a single occasion of the 90-90 isometric hamstring 37 assessment. Force-time data was collected using force plates at 1000 Hz and down sampled to 500-, 250-, and 100 Hz. Peak force (N), force (N) at 100- and 200 ms and average rate of 38 39 force development (aRFD) (N/s) over a 100- and 200 ms epoch were calculated. A repeated 40 measures of analysis of variance and effect size was used to compare means. Excellent 41 absolute and good relative reliability was observed for peak force across all sampling 42 frequencies. Force at 100- and 200 ms and aRFD over 100 ms and 200 ms resulted poormoderate relative reliability and poor-excellent absolute reliability. No significant trivial 43 differences were observed for peak force between sampling frequencies (p>0.05, Cohen's d44 =0.02-0.12). A significant difference (p<0.001) was identified in 500, 250 and 100 Hz, with 45 46 small-moderate and small-large increases in force at set time points and aRFD, respectively, 47 in comparison to 1000 Hz (d = 0.21-2.00). Higher sampling frequencies (>500 Hz) reduces 48 the reliability of time dependent force characteristics, with minimal effect on peak force. Regular monitoring of peak force can be performed with higher sampling frequencies, but 49 50 lower sampling frequencies would be beneficial to collect reliable rapid-force generating 51 measures.

52

53

55	
56	
57	Key words: Isometric hamstring strength testing; force plate sampling frequency;
58	force plate reliability
59	
60	Word count: 3394
61	
62	
63	
64	
65	
66	
67	

69 INTRODUCTION

70 71

72 Hamstring strain injuries (HSI) remain one of the most common non-contact muscular strain 73 injuries occurring within team sports in comparison to all other muscle strain injuries [1-8]. 74 Male and female soccer players experience the highest rates of HSI incidence in comparison 75 to muscle strain injuries (4.99/1000 hours match play and 0.52/1000 hours training [9]) and they have been increasing at a rate of 6.7% between 2014/15-2021/22 seasons [9]. This is 76 77 reported to be related to the proposed primary mechanisms of HSI (i.e., kicking and high-speed 78 running) during match play and training [10, 11]. This was recently confirmed with 61% of all 79 HSIs occurring during running and sprinting movements within elite European soccer between 80 2001/2002 to 2021/2022 seasons [9], with 88% of hamstring injuries occurring during linear running tasks at median running velocity of 29.28 km·h⁻¹ (26.61-31.13 km·h⁻¹, interquartile 81 range (IQR)), equating to approximately 87.55% of maximal velocity (78.50-89.75%, IQR) 82 83 [12]. During high-speed running, the hamstrings are required to rapidly produce up to 10.5 84 N/kg in less than 0.10 s to resist the rapid knee extension during the terminal swing phase [13, 85 14], the point in the running gait cycle during high-speed running where most HSIs occur [10, 11]. Therefore, measures of both peak force and rapid force (such as rate of force development) 86 87 are able to help practitioners identify deficits in hamstring function that could place the athlete 88 at an elevated risk of injury, as not only is a high force required counteract the swinging shank 89 but it needs to be rapid as the duration to apply the force over is incredibly short.

90

91 Isometric hamstring strength assessments using force plates have been employed to identify 92 changes in strength due to fatigue and identify potential HSI injury risk [15-18]. A common 93 method of assessing isometric hamstring strength includes force plate technology, which can 94 collect data and provide instant feedback. There are several iterations but the most common

95 being 90° of hip and knee flexion (90-90°) due to ease of application [15-17, 19]. The single leg isometric assessments performed using force plates have been identified as sensitive 96 97 enough to monitor fatigue using various knee and hip configurations, with around a 11-24% decrease in isometric hamstring peak force generating capabilities following competitive match 98 99 play [15, 17], simulated match play [16], and following a standardised repeated sprint protocol [18]. However, as each study has used different methodologies the consensus between them 100 needs exploration. To date only one study has investigated rapid hamstring force development, 101 102 Bettariga et al., [18] have observed the effect of a repeated sprint protocol on rapid force, 103 finding average rate of force development (aRFD) to be sensitive to fatigue. While this 104 demonstrates the potential benefit of using aRFD to monitor hamstring fatigue, research has 105 not currently investigated how the methods to measure aRFD can be optimised.

106

107 As with any new method of assessment, the methods and processes selected for data analysis 108 need to be carefully considered for the assessments to be able to monitor a meaningful change. 109 The effect of sampling frequency of force plate data has been previously examined during the 110 isometric mid-thigh pull [20], demonstrating that sampling frequencies as low as 500 Hz can 111 be used to collect reliable and accurate peak force and time related force metrics. However, during the isometric mid-thigh pull, the entire system mass is on the force plate, making the 112 113 noise within the force signal very small relative to system mass (i.e., body mass). However, within the 90-90 isometric hamstring assessment the system mass is relatively small, with only 114 115 the shank and foot registered on the force plate, therefore an increased sampling frequency (e.g., common force plates use 1000 Hz), could have an exponential effect on the reliability 116 117 and accuracy of peak and time related force metrics. While this could have a large impact on results, it is yet to be explored within the literature. 118

120 Hence, the purpose of the present study was to determine the effect of sampling frequency on 121 the 90-90 isometric hamstring assessment, using a force plate, on peak force and time related force metrics. It was hypothesised that peak force would not be adversely affected with 122 123 increased sampling frequency, in contrast it was hypothesised that time related force metrics 124 (e.g., force at set time points and aRFD) would be decreased at increased sampling frequencies. It was also hypothesised that increased sampling frequencies would have reduced reliability in 125 126 comparison to lower sampling frequencies for time related force metrics, while having minimal 127 effect on peak force. These hypotheses are based previous observations using multi-joint 128 assessments of force with force plates [20].

129

130 METHODS

131

132 PARTICIPANTS

133 Thirty-three female elite soccer players from a single club volunteered to participate in the 134 study, all of whom had a minimum of 2-years resistance training experience (age: 18.7 ± 3.7 135 years; height: 158.3 ± 5.9 cm; body mass: 62.8 ± 5.5 kg). Written informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study and was obtained from the 136 137 parents where necessary for those under 18 years of age. Participants were required to have 138 had no hamstring related injuries for ≥ 6 months prior to taking part. Organizational consent 139 was acquired prior to approaching the participants. Ethical approval was granted by the 140 institutional ethics committee (University of Salford, HSR1819-037) in accordance with the 2013 declaration of Helsinki. An a priori sample size estimation was conducted, determining 141 142 that a minimum sample of 25 participants was required to achieve a minimum acceptable statistical power of 80%, with an α error probability of 0.05, a proposed large effect size of 1.2 143 144 for the repeated measures analysis of variance (RMANOVA) and a minimum correlation

between measures of 0.8. The sample size estimation was calculated using G*Power (Version
3.1, University of Deusseldorf, Germany) [21].

147

148 EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

An observational design was used to determine the effect of force plate sampling frequency on peak force and time specific force metrics obtained during the isometric hamstring strength assessment. Participants completed the tests prior to their normal training day. A familiarization session was carried out two days after a competitive fixture, following their recovery day, with the testing session completed three days after familiarization, allowing at least two days recovery prior to their next competitive fixture.

155

156 ISOMETRIC HAMSTRING TESTING PROTOCOLS

157 The 90-90 isometric assessments were measured using a force plate (Kistler Type 9286AA: 158 Kistler Instruments Inc, Amherst, NY, USA), collected using Kistler BioWare software. The force plate was placed upon a wooden plyometric box at an appropriate height for each 159 160 participant using a goniometer. This was determined by participants lying in a supine position with their knee at 90° of flexion, their heel resting on the box and their hip at an angle 161 appropriate to allow the lower shank to be parallel to the floor (i.e., 90°). (Figure 1) The test 162 163 was conducted unilaterally with the non-testing leg being relaxed and placed fully extended 164 next to the box and arms placed across the chest. Three submaximal trials increasing from 50% 165 to 75% and 90% effort were performed at the end of a standardised warm-up and used as 166 familiarization. Following which three maximal effort trials for each leg were executed with a 60 s rest period allowed between trials. The participants were instructed to drive their heel 167 down into the force platform for approximately 3–5 s, similar to methods used for the isometric 168 169 mid-thigh pull [22]. Participants were instructed to relax and be as still as possible, without initiating movement for at least one second before the instructions to pull, to permit the calculation of limb weight and associated force-time data including the onset of force production. Participants were required to repeat trials if their hips raised off the ground or if a countermovement was performed, the latter of which was detected through visual inspection of the force trace following each repetition.

175



176

- 177 Figure 1. Visual representation of the 90:90 isometric hamstring assessment.
- 178

179 DATA ANALYSIS

180 Raw force-time data for each trial was analysed using a customized Microsoft Excel
181 spreadsheet version 2019 (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, USA), force-time data was initially
182 collected at 1000 Hz and during the analysis process was down sampled to 500-, 250-, and 100
183 Hz, based off previous work on multi-joint assessments [20]. Peak force (N), force at 100- and

200 ms (N) and aRFD (N/s) from onset over a 100- and 200 ms epoch were calculated from 184 185 the absolute force values for each trial. Peak force was selected as this is the most common metric reported for isometric hamstring assessments, while measures of rapid force were 186 187 observed due to the specificity of rapid force requirements to HSI incidence and was included in recent research [18]. Onset of force was identified as 5 standard deviations (SD) from the 188 one second quiet period, based off previous work on multi-joint assessments [23]. The mean 189 190 values (peak force (N), force at 100- and 200 ms (N) and aRFD (N/s) from onset over a 100-191 and 200 ms epoch) of the three trials for each limb was taken and averaged (combined left and 192 right limbs) and used for further analysis.

193

194 STATISTICAL ANALYSES

195 All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS for Windows version 26 (IBM SPSS Inc, 196 Chicago, IL). Data is presented as the mean \pm SD, with normality verified using the Shapiro-197 Wilk's test (p > 0.05). An *a priori* alpha level was set at <0.05. Within session absolute 198 reliability was calculated using coefficient of variance (CV%) based off the sample SD and 95% CI, interpreted as <5.00%, 5.00-9.99%, 10.00-14.99% and >15% as excellent, good, 199 200 moderate, and poor, respectively as the upper 95% CI can be thought of upper error interval. Within session relative reliability was assessed using two-way absolute agreement (3,1) 201 202 intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) [24-27]. ICC values were interpreted based on the 203 lower bound CI (ICC; poor <0.49, moderate 0.50–0.74, good 0.75–0.89 and excellent >0.90) 204 as suggested by Koo & Li [27].

205

A series of repeated measures analyses of variance (RMANOVA) were conducted using SPSS (Version 25; SPSS Inc, IBM, Chicago, II, USA) to determine if there were significant differences in the Peak force, force at 100- and 200 ms and aRFD over a 100 ms and 200 ms,

between sampling frequencies of 1000, 500, 250 and 100 Hz for each variable independently. Post-hoc Bonferroni pairwise comparisons were used to identify if and where any differences in kinetic variables occurred. The magnitude of differences between sampling frequencies for each variable was also calculated using Cohen's *d* effect sizes and interpreted based on the recommendations of Hopkins [28] <0.20 = trivial and 0.20 - 0.59 = small, 0.60 - 1.19 = moderate and \geq 1.20 = large.

215

216 **RESULTS**

Excellent absolute and good relative reliability was observed for peak force across all sampling frequencies (Table 1, Figure 2 &3). Force at 100- and 200 ms and aRFD over 100 ms and 200 ms resulted in mixed relative reliability (Poor to moderate [Table 1, Figure 2]), and absolute reliability (Poor to excellent [Table 1, Figure 3]) with a general trend of increasing absolute and relative reliability with decreased sampling frequency (e.g., good to excellent absolute reliability and moderate relative reliability at 250 Hz and 100 Hz [Table 1, Figure 2 &3]).

- 223
- 224

225

- 226
- 227
- 228
- 229
- 230

231

232



Figure 3. Visual representation of the absolute reliability (CV%) and interpretation for

258 all variables.

Table 1 – Within-session reliability measures for kinetic variables during the 90-90 isometric hamstring assessment across sampling frequencies									
	1000 Hz		500 Hz		250 Hz		100 Hz		
Kinetic variable	ICC (95% CI) Interpretation	CV% (95% CI) Interpretation							
Peak Force	0.90 (0.83-0.94) Good	1.93 (1.71-2.16) Excellent	0.86 (0.76-0.92) Good	1.68 (1.51-1.84) Excellent	0.86 (0.76-0.94) Good	2.03 (1.78-2.28) Excellent	0.88 (0.76-0.93) Good	1.99 (1.75-2.23) Excellent	
Force 100 ms	0.64 (0.46-0.79) Poor	7.39 (5.61-9.17) Good	0.68 (0.51-0.91) Moderate	5.46 (4.15-6.78) Good	0.73 (0.55-0.78) Moderate	4.41 (3.34-5.47) Good	0.83 (0.65-0.88) Moderate	3.52 (2.67-4.37) Excellent	
Force 200 ms	0.69 (0.53-0.82) Moderate	6.56 (4.98-8.14) Good	0.72 (0.57-0.83) Moderate	5.05 (3.83-6.27) Good	0.74 (0.60-0.85) Moderate	3.58 (2.72-4.45) Excellent	0.84 (0.69-0.95) Moderate	3.34 (2.54-4.15) Excellent	
aRFD 100 ms	0.58 (0.42-0.72) Poor	11.69 (8.87-14.51) Moderate	0.65 (0.47-0.80) Poor	7.46 (6.15-8.78) Good	0.68 (0.50-0.83) Moderate	4.91 (3.84-5.97) Good	0.72 (0.56-0.84) Moderate	4.62 (4.01-5.22) Good	
aRFD 200 ms	0.63 (0.50-0.78) Moderate	12.45 (9.44-15.45) Poor	0.66 (0.50-0.78) Moderate	9.37 (7.11-11.63) Moderate	0.70 (0.54-0.80) Moderate	6.59 (5.00-8.18) Good	0.75 (0.60-0.87) Moderate	3.99 (3.19-4.80) Excellent	
ICC = intraclass correlation coefficient, CV% = coefficient of variation percentage, CI = confidence interval, aRFD100 ms = average rate of force									

over 100 ms, aRFD200 ms = average rate of force development over 200 ms

Table 2 – Mean (standard deviation) of kinetic variables and paired differences in kinetic variables for the 90-90 isometric hamstring assessment across sampling frequencies.									
		1000 Hz	500 Hz		250 Hz		100 Hz		
Kinetic variable	Mean (SD)	Paired differences (p) and magnitude (d)	Mean (SD)	Paired differences (p) and magnitude (d)	Mean (SD)	Paired differences (p) and magnitude (d)	Mean (SD)	Paired differences (p) and magnitude (d)	
Peak Force (N)	214.48 (2.03)	500 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.779 <i>d</i> =-0.03 250 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.880 <i>d</i> =0.02 100 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.277 <i>d</i> =-0.08	214.57 (3.17)	250 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.532 <i>d</i> =0.04 100 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.319 <i>d</i> =-0.11	214.41 (4.36)	100 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.271 <i>d</i> =-0.12	215.25 (3.30)	_	
Force 100 ms (N)	121.48 (9.76)	500 Hz: p=0.180 d =-0.32 250 Hz: p=0.109 d =-0.54 100 Hz: p<0.001 d =-1.03	124.64 (9.82)	250 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.090 <i>d</i> =-0.21 100 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-0.66	126.58 (8.88)	100 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.072 <i>d</i> =-0.47	130.41 (7.44)	_	
Force 200 ms (N)	147.30 (11.46)	500 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.065 <i>d</i> =-0.45 250 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.044 <i>d</i> =-0.97 100 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-1.09	151.64 (7.49)	250 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.055 <i>d</i> =-0.67 100 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-0.83	155.92 (5.04)	100 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.210 <i>d</i> =-0.22	157.09 (5.49)	-	
aRFD 100 ms (N/s)	1127.50 (81.64)	500 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.108 <i>d</i> =-0.38 250 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-1.39 100 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-2.00	1158.12 (78.92)	250 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-1.02 100 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-1.64	1236.64 (74.47)	100 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.024 <i>d</i> =-0.64	1284.04 (74.60)	-	
aRFD 200 ms (N/s)	736.50 (76.63)	500 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.117 <i>d</i> =-0.43 250 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-0.72 100 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-1.16	768.66 (72.03)	250 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.227 <i>d</i> =-0.29 100 Hz: <i>p</i> <0.001 <i>d</i> =-0.74	789.61 (70.41)	100 Hz: <i>p</i> =0.033 <i>d</i> =-0.44	820.46 (67.44)	-	

SD = standard deviation, N = Newton, aRFD100ms = average rate of force development over 100 ms, aRFD200ms = average rate of force development over 200 ms

1 The results of the RMANOVA revealed no significant differences (p>0.05), with no 2 meaningful changes in peak force between sampling frequencies (Cohen's d = 0.02 - 0.12 [Table 3 2]). In contrast, the results of the RMANOVA demonstrated a significant difference (p < 0.001) 4 in force observed 100 and 200 ms between sampling frequencies. Pairwise comparisons 5 revealed 500, 250 and 100 Hz resulted in small-moderate increases in force at 100 and 200 ms 6 in comparison to 1000 Hz (d = 0.21-1.09), with 100 Hz resulting in the greatest mean force at 7 both time points for the three trials (Table 2). Similarly, the results of the RMANOVA also 8 demonstrated a significant difference (p < 0.001) in aRFD at 100 and 200 ms between sampling 9 frequencies. Pairwise comparisons revealed 500, 250 and 100 Hz resulted in small-large increases in aRFD to 100 and 200 ms in comparison to 1000 Hz (d = 0.29-2.00), with 100 Hz 10 11 resulting in the greatest aRFD across both time points (Table 2).

12

13 **DISCUSSION**

14 The aim of the present study was to determine the effect of sampling frequency on the 90-90 15 isometric hamstring assessment using force plates on peak and time related force metrics and 16 their respective reliability. We hope this information can refine the methods used when 17 researchers and practitioners are collecting isometric hamstring data. In agreement with our 18 hypotheses, peak force was not adversely affected with increased sampling frequency, as there 19 were trivial, non-significant differences between all sampling frequencies and similar absolute 20 and relative reliability values observed. Absolute and relative reliability of time-dependent 21 variables (e.g., force at set time points and aRFD) seem to improve at lower sampling frequencies, although some of the improvements in both absolute and relative reliability seem 22 23 to be marginal. Despite this, the resulting reliability for sampling at 100 Hz still showed moderate to good relative and good to excellent absolute reliability in time-dependent 24 25 variables, thus suggesting that sampling at lower frequencies could still provide a reliable

measure of time-dependent force variables in the 90-90 isometric hamstring strength
assessment. Moreover, there were meaningful mean differences between lower sampling
frequencies (100 and 250 Hz) and higher sampling frequencies (500 and 1000 Hz).

29

30 The current study highlights there may be improved absolute and relative reliability when 31 measuring aRFD at lower sampling frequencies. All ICC and CV% variables improved from 1000Hz to 100Hz, highlighting the potential benefit of measuring isometric hamstring strength 32 33 at a lower sampling frequency. The use of lower sampling frequencies may also be useful given 34 reliability of peak force measures was not sacrificed. However, only one study has previously evaluated the reliability of aRFD on the same test, Bettariga et al., [18] reported similar within 35 36 session reliability to determine if the measures can be used to assess change for peak force that 37 was identified within the present study. However, aRFD measures within the present study 38 identified improved absolute reliability with worse relative reliability than those reported by 39 Bettariga et al., [18]. Bettariga et al., [18] used a force plate sampling at 1000 Hz, which could explain the poor absolute and moderate relative reliability values presented, as per the results 40 41 of the present study lower sampling frequencies improved by absolute and relative reliability 42 for rapid force generating metrics. It is worth noting that force at set points within the 90-90 isometric hamstring assessment presents greater absolute and relative reliability than aRFD 43 44 across all sampling frequencies, this is consistent with observations in multi-joint force plate 45 assessments. Isometric mid-thigh pull measures of aRFD demonstrate lower reliability than 46 force set time points [23, 29]. It is also worth noting that during isometric assessments if force 47 has changed at a set time point, RFD over the same epoch will also have changed to a similar magnitude. The results of the present study could therefore suggest force at set time-points 48 within the 90-90 isometric hamstring assessment being more appropriate than aRFD, with 49

improved reliability and the ability to infer changes in RFD based of changes in force at settime-points.

52 The present study highlights that sampling frequency does influence the force-time measures 53 during the 90-90 isometric hamstring assessment. Contrastingly, as previously identified, 54 sampling frequency has minimal effect on the isometric mid-thigh pull [20], where the authors 55 concluded that sampling frequencies as low as 500 Hz can be used to collect reliable and accurate peak and time related force metrics. One explanation for the contrasting findings of 56 57 the present study lies in the difference in system weight between the isometric mid-thigh pull 58 and the 90-90 isometric hamstring assessment, where the system weight of the isometric mid-59 thigh pull includes entire body mass (aiming to avoid any pre-tension). The 90-90 isometric 60 hamstring assessment only includes shank and foot mass which accounts for only 6.18% of 61 body mass [30]. Therefore, higher sampling frequencies could be impacting the force onset thresholds based off the methods used within the present study, although these are the same to 62 63 what was used for the isometric mid-thigh pull [20], the lower system mass makes accurate 64 onset identification difficult (Figure 4). Nyquist's sampling theorem states, to ensure none of 65 the original signal is lost during the sampling process and to prevent aliasing, a sampling 66 frequency of double the highest frequency contained in the signal is necessary [31]. Although this was reported to potentially lose the original signal (i.e., peak values) which has not been 67 68 identified within the present study, the increased sampling frequency does impact the accurate identification of the onset of force production negatively impacting upon time related metrics 69 70 as reported in the present study.



72

Figure 4. Example force-time traces at (A) 1000-, (B) 500-, (C) 250- and (D) 100 Hz for the 90:90
isometric hamstring assessment highlighting the effect of over sampling.

The results of this study highlight that a higher sampling frequency has a negative impact on 76 77 the collection of rapid force generation measures during the 90-90 isometric hamstring 78 assessment. Impacting both reliability and the values observed for rapid force, while having 79 minimal effect on peak force generating capabilities. Based on the current literature peak force 80 and rapid force generating measures (aRFD) showed similar capacity to identify neuromuscular fatigue using isometric hamstring assessments using force plates (including the 81 82 90-90 isometric test) which have been found to be sensitive enough to detect fatigue with 11-83 24% decreases peak force identified [15-18]. Bettariga et al., [18] has demonstrated aRFD has a similar degree of sensitivity to fatigue as peak force, however based on the findings of the 84 85 current study results may vary if a lower sampling frequency is used. This warrants further investigation to the sensitivity of rapid force generating measures at varying sampling 86 frequencies. Research is also necessary to identify how much the decreases observed in peak 87 force under fatigue can explain any associated decreases in rapid force generating measures. 88 89 This may be possible by reporting the change in peak force in addition to the change in time

90 related variables (e.g., force at specific time-point, or RFD over specific epochs) as a 91 percentage of peak force [32-34]. Moreover, further work is required to establish the practical 92 implications of reduced isometric hamstring force assessed using force plates as a result of 93 fatigue, such as any relationship with HSI incidence which is current missing within the 94 literature.

95

96 This study is not without its limitations. Firstly, the sample was on female soccer players who 97 would arguably have reduced skeletal muscle mass than other population which could be exaggerating the issue with oversampling and reduced accuracy of the onset methodology. 98 99 However, despite the homogeneity within the sample (sex, age, sport and playing level) they all had familiarity with the testing procedures with >2 years resistance training experience. 100 101 Secondly, only a single method of onset identification was used specifically onset of force was 102 identified as 5 SD from the one second quiet period, which is based on the recommendations 103 on the isometric mid-thigh pull when aiming to observe time specific force values [23]. To date 104 no study has identified the onset threshold used when performing the 90-90 isometric 105 hamstring assessment [15-19]. Therefore, further investigation is required to determine the 106 most accurate and reliable method of determining force onset within the 90-90 isometric 107 hamstring assessment and other isometric hamstring assessments using force plates, including standing 90° of hip flexion and 20° of knee flexion (90-20) assessment and the 30° of hip and 108 109 knee flexion (30-30) assessment where these results will likely transfer over.

110

111

112 CONCLUSIONS

113 Overall, the results of this study demonstrate that a higher sampling frequency reduces the 114 reliability of time dependent force characteristics during the 90-90 isometric hamstring

assessment, while having minimal effect on the peak force observed. Good-excellent absolute 115 and relative reliability was observed for peak force across all sampling frequencies, while 116 117 rapid-force generating characteristics displayed poor-excellent absolute and relative reliability 118 with improved reliability typically observed as lower sampling frequencies (100-250 Hz). 119 Therefore, if practitioners and scientists are only observing measures of peak force then any 120 sampling frequency can be utilised, but lower sampling frequencies would be beneficial if 121 practitioners and scientists want to collect more reliable rapid-force generating measures (force 122 values at 100 and 200 ms and aRFD up to 100 and 200 ms). Practitioners and researchers 123 should look to down sample data collected on 90-90 isometric hamstring assessment if wanting 124 to monitor rapid force production characteristics. It is also likely these findings transfer over 125 to other assessments including the 90-20 and 30-30 isometric hamstring assessments, but 126 further investigation is required. However, as more commercially available wireless force plate 127 devices with automatic analysis software enter the sports-technology market, developers 128 should look to add options to reduce the sampling frequency to allow for the accurate and 129 reliable collection of time related force generating measures or allow for raw data to be 130 exported for further analysis (i.e. down sampling), although further investigation is required to 131 determine the importance of rapid-force generating measures in monitoring and tracking 132 athletic performance over and above peak force alone.

133

134 Data availability: Data will be made available on reasonable request.135

- Funding: The authors declare that no funds, grants, or other support were received during the preparation of this manuscript.
- 139

140 Competing Interests: The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.141

142 **References:**

143

Brooks JH, Fuller CW, Kemp SP, Reddin DB. Incidence, risk, and prevention of
 hamstring muscle injuries in professional rugby union. Am J Sports Med. 2006
 Aug;34(8):1297-306.

147 2. D'Alonzo BA, Bretzin AC, Chandran A, Boltz AJ, Robison HJ, Collins CL, et al. Epidemiology of Injuries in National Collegiate Athletic Association Men's Lacrosse: 2014-148 2015 Through 2018-2019. J Athl Train. 2021 Jul 1;56(7):758-65. 149 Ekstrand J, Hagglund M, Walden M. Epidemiology of muscle injuries in professional 150 3. 151 football (soccer). Am J Sports Med. 2011 Jun;39(6):1226-32. Ekstrand J, Walden M, Hagglund M. Hamstring injuries have increased by 4% 152 4. annually in men's professional football, since 2001: a 13-year longitudinal analysis of the 153 UEFA Elite Club injury study. Br J Sports Med. 2016 Jun;50(12):731-7. 154 Malone S, Owen A, Mendes B, Hughes B, Collins K, Gabbett TJ. High-speed running 155 5. and sprinting as an injury risk factor in soccer: Can well-developed physical qualities reduce 156 the risk? J Sci Med Sport. 2018 Mar;21(3):257-62. 157 Panagodage Perera NK, Kountouris A, Kemp JL, Joseph C, Finch CF. The incidence, 158 6. prevalence, nature, severity and mechanisms of injury in elite female cricketers: A 159 160 prospective cohort study. J Sci Med Sport. 2019 May 25. 161 7. Read PJ, Oliver JL, De Ste Croix MBA, Myer GD, Lloyd RS. An audit of injuries in six english professional soccer academies. J Sports Sci. 2018 Jul;36(13):1542-8. 162 163 8. Roe M, Murphy JC, Gissane C, Blake C. Hamstring injuries in elite Gaelic football: An 8-year investigation to identify injury rates, time-loss patterns and players at increased 164 risk. British Journal of Sports Medicine. 2018;52:982-8. 165 166 9. Ekstrand J, Bengtsson H, Waldén M, Davison M, Khan KM, Hägglund M. Hamstring injury rates have increased during recent seasons and now constitute 24% of all injuries in 167 men's professional football: the UEFA Elite Club Injury Study from 2001/02 to 2021/22. 168 169 British Journal of Sports Medicine. 2023;57(5):292-8. 170 Opar, Williams, Shield. Hamstring strain injuries: factors that lead to injury and re-10. injury. Sports Med. 2012 Mar 1;42(3):209-26. 171 Danielsson A, Hovarth A, Senorski C, Alentorn-Geli E, Garrett WE, Cugat R, et al. 172 11. The Mechanism of Hamstring Injuries - a systematic review. BMC Musculoskelet Disorders. 173 174 2020;21(641):1-21. 175 Aiello F, Di Claudio C, Fanchini M, Impellizzeri FM, McCall A, Sharp C, et al. Do 12. non-contact injuries occur during high-speed running in elite football? Preliminary results 176 from a novel GPS and video-based method. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport. 177 178 2023:xxx:xxx. 179 13. Nagano, Higashihara, Edama. Change in muscle thickness under contracting conditions following return to sports after a hamstring muscle strain injury - A pilot study. 180 Asia-Pacific Journal of Sports Medicine, Arthroscopy, Rehabilitation and Technology. 181 182 2015;2:63-7. 14. 183 Chumanov ES, Heiderscheit BC, Thelen DG. Hamstring musculotendon dynamics during stance and swing phases of high-speed running. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2011 184 185 Mar;43(3):525-32. Constantine E, Taberner M, Richter C, Willett M, Cohen DD. Isometric Posterior 186 15. 187 Chain Peak Force Recovery Response Following Match-Play in Elite Youth Soccer Players: 188 Associations with Relative Posterior Chain Strength. Sports. 2019;7(218):1-12. Matinlauri A, Alcaraz PE, Freitas TT, Mendiguchia J, Abedin-Maghanaki A, Castillo 189 16. 190 A, et al. A comparison of the isometric force fatigue- recovery profile in two posterior chain lower limb tests following simulated soccer competition. PLos ONE. 2019;14(5):1-16. 191 McCall A, Nedelec M, Carling C, Le Gall F, Berthoin S, Dupont G. Reliability and 192 17. 193 sensitivity of a simple isometric posterior lower limb muscle test in professional football 194 players. Journal of Sports Sciences. 2015.

- 18. Bettariga F, Bishop C, Martorelli L, Turner A, Lazzarini SG, Algeri C, et al. Acute
 Effects of a Fatiguing Protocol on Peak Force and Rate of Force Development of the
- Hamstring Muscles in Soccer Players. Journal of Science in Sport and Exercise. 2023.

198 19. Cuthbert M, Comfort P, Ripley N, McMahon JJ, Evans M, Bishop C. Unilateral vs.
199 bilateral hamstring strength assessments: comparing reliability and inter-limb asymmetries in
200 female soccer players. Journal of Sports Sciences. 2021;39(13):1481-8.

20. Dos'Santos T, Jones PA, Kelly J, McMahon JJ, Comfort P, Thomas C. Effect of
202 Sampling Frequency on Isometric Midthigh-Pull Kinetics. International Journal of Sports
203 Physiology and Performance. 2019 Mar;14(4):525-30.

- 204 21. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang AG, Buchner A. G*Power 3: a flexible statistical power
 205 analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. Behav Res Methods.
 206 2007 May;39(2):175-91.
- 207 22. Comfort P, Dos'Santos T, Beckham GK, Stone M, Guppy S, Haff G. Standardization
 208 and Methodological Considerations for the Isometric Midthigh Pull. Strength and
 209 Conditioning Journal. 2019;41(2):1.

23. Dos'Santos T, Jones PA, Comfort P, Thomas C. Effect of Different Onset Thresholds
on Isometric Midthigh Pull Force-Time Variables. J Strength Cond Res. 2017

- 212 Dec;31(12):3463-73.
- 213 24. Shrout PE, Fleiss JL. Intraclass Correlations: Uses in Assessing Rater Reliability.
- 214 Psychological Bulletin. 1979;86(2):420-8.
- 215 25. McGraw KO, Wong SP. Forming Inferences About Some Intraclass Correlation
 216 Coefficients. Psychological Methods. 1996;1(1):30-46.
- 217 26. Kottner J, Audige L, Broson S, Donner A, Gajewski BJ, Hrobjartsson A, et al.

Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS) were proposed.
International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2011;28:661-71.

- 220 27. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation
 221 Coefficients for Reliability Research. Journal of Chiropratic Mediint. 2016;15:166-3.
- 222 28. Hopkins W. A scale of magnitudes for effect statistics. A new view of statistics. 2002.
- 223 29. Guppy S, Yosuke K, Brady CJ, Connolly S, Comfort P, Haff GG. The Reliability and
 224 Magnitude of Time-Dependent Force-Time Characteristics During the Isometric Midthigh
- Pull Are Affected by Both Testing Protocol and Analysis Choices. Journal of Strength and
 conditioning research. 2022;36(5):1191-9.
- 30. Plagenhoef S, Gaynor Evans F, Abdelnour T. Anatomical Data for Analyzing Human
 Motion. Res Q Exerc Sport. 1983;54(2):169-78.
- 31. Nyquist H. Certain topics in telegraph transmission theory. Transations of the
 American institure of Electrical Engineering. 1928;47(2):617-44.
- 231 32. Aagaard P, Simonsen EB, Andersen JL, Magnusson P, Dyhre-Poulsen P. Increased
- rate of force development and neural drive of human skeletal muscle following resistance
 training. Journal of Applied Physiology. 2002;93:1318-26.
- 33. Andersen JL, Aagaard P. Effects of strength training on muscle fiber types and
 size;consequences for athletes training for high-intensity sport. Scandinavian Journal of
 Medicine and Science in Sports. 2010;20(Suppl. 2):32-8.
- 34. Tillin NA, Jimenez-Reyes P, Pain MTG, Folland J. Neuromuscular Performance of
 Explosive Power Athletes versus Untrained Individuals. Medicine & Science in Sports &
 Exercise. 2010;42(4):781-90.
- 240
- 241
- 242
- 243
- 244

- **266 Tables Captions**
- 267

Table 1 – Within-session reliability measures for kinetic variables during the 90:90
 isometric hamstring assessment across sampling frequencies

- 270
 271 Table 2 Mean (standard deviation) of kinetic variables and paired differences in
- kinetic variables for the 90:90 isometric hamstring assessment across samplingfrequencies.
- 275 frequenci 274
- 274
- 276 Figure Captions
- 277 Figure 1. Visual representation of the 90:90 isometric hamstring assessment.
- Figure 2. Visual representation of the relative reliability (ICC) and interpretation for all
 variables.
- Figure 3. Visual representation of the absolute reliability (CV%) and interpretation for
- 281 all variables.
- 282 Figure 4. Example force-time traces at (A) 1000-, (B) 500-, (C) 250- and (D) 100 Hz for the 90:90
- 283 isometric hamstring assessment highlighting the effect of over sampling.
- 284
- 285