



LJMU Research Online

Enright, K, Morton, JP, Iga, J and Drust, B

The effect of concurrent training organisation in youth elite soccer players

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/2660/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Enright, K, Morton, JP, Iga, J and Drust, B (2015) The effect of concurrent training organisation in youth elite soccer players. European Journal of Applied Physiology, 115 (11). pp. 2367-2381. ISSN 1439-6319

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

Title:

The effect of concurrent training organisation in youth elite soccer players

Running Title:

Concurrent training in elite soccer players

Authors:

Kevin Enright^{1,2,4}, James Morton², John Iga^{2,3,4}, Barry Drust².

Affiliations:

¹ Department of Health Sciences
Liverpool Hope University
Liverpool,
L16 9JD
UK

² Research Institute for Sport and Exercise Sciences,
Liverpool John Moores University,
Tom Reilly Building,
Byrom St Campus,
Liverpool,
L3 3AF,
UK

³ The Football Association
St. George's Park,
Newborough Road,
Needwood,
Burton upon Trent,
Staffordshire,
DE13 9PD,
UK

⁴ Medical and Exercise Science Department,
Wolverhampton Wanderers Football Club,
Wolverhampton,
United Kingdom

Address for correspondence:

Kevin Enright
Department of Health Sciences
Liverpool Hope University
Liverpool L16 9JD

Email: enrighk@hope.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study compared the adaptive responses to two concurrent training programmes frequently used in professional soccer. **Methods:** 15 youth soccer players (17.3 ± 1.6 yrs, $1.82 \text{ m} \pm 0.06 \text{ m}$, $77.0 \pm 7.3 \text{ kg}$; VO_2 peak, $62.0 \pm 4.7 \text{ ml}^{-1} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$) who compete in the English Premier League volunteered for this study. In addition to completing their habitual training practices, the participants were asked to alter the organisation concurrent-training by performing strength (S) training either prior to (S+E, $n = 8$) or after (E+S, $n = 7$) soccer-specific endurance training (E) 2 d wk^{-1} for 5 wk^{-1} . **Results:** With the exception of 30m sprint, IMVC PF, quadriceps strength ($60^{\circ} \cdot \text{s}^{-1 \text{ CON}}$, $180^{\circ} \cdot \text{s}^{-1 \text{ CON}}$, $120^{\circ} \cdot \text{s}^{-1 \text{ ECC}}$) pooled data revealed training effects across all other performances measures ($P < 0.05$). Whilst ANCOVA indicated no significant interaction effects for training condition, the difference between the means divided by the pooled standard deviation demonstrated large effect sizes in the E+S condition for in HBS 1-RM (S+E vs E+S; -0.54 (9.6%) vs -1.79 (19.6%)), AoP-M (-0.72 , (7.9%) vs -1.76 (14.4%)), SJ (-0.56 , (4.4%), vs -1.08 , (8.1%)), IMVC-LR; (-0.50 , (20.3%) vs -1.05 (27.3%)), isokinetic hamstring strength $60^{\circ} \cdot \text{s}^{-1 \text{ CON}}$ (-0.64 , (12.2%) vs -0.95 (19.2%)), $120^{\circ} \cdot \text{s}^{-1 \text{ ECC}}$ (-0.78 (27.9%) vs -1.55 (23.3%) and isokinetic quadriceps strength $180^{\circ} \cdot \text{s}^{-1 \text{ CON}}$ (-0.23 (2.5%) vs -1.52 (13.2%)). **Conclusion:** Results suggest the organisation of concurrent training, recovery time allocated between training bouts and the availability nutrition may be able to modulate small but clinically significant changes in physical performance parameters associated with match-play. This may have practical implications for practitioners who prescribe same day concurrent-training protocols.

INTRODUCTION

Elite athletes often combine maximal muscle strength and endurance training within the same training cycle. This training arrangement has been defined as ‘concurrent training’ (Fyfe et al., 2014). Previously, it has been documented that concurrent training can result in compromised muscle strength and (or) power capacity (for review see; Wilson et al., 2012). This ‘blunted’ response in strength-related adaptation has been referred to as the ‘interference phenomenon’ (Hickson, 1980). Over the past three decades authors have proposed a variety of hypothesis to explain this phenomenon. These include; an inability to adapt as a consequence of contrasting training intensities (Docherty and Sporer, 2000), an incompatible hormonal (Bell et al., 2000) and (or) molecular signalling environment (Atherton et al., 2005) the ‘sequence’ or ‘order’ of training (Chtaha et al., 2008), the recovery time between training bouts (Craig et al., 1991) and the frequency of aerobic-training (Wilson et al., 2012) resulting in ‘overtraining’ (Dudley and Fleck, 1987). These explanations can be ‘broadly grouped’ into two hypothesis; (1) interference is caused by acute peripheral fatigue and in the inability to effectively train at appropriate intensities to achieve the desired outcome (i.e. acute interference) and (2) interference is a consequence of molecular and (or) biological events blocking strength-related adaptation (i.e. chronic interference). Both of the above categories in part, can be influenced by the way the training stimulus is organised or arranged across the training week.

The challenge of organising training for team sport athletes who require diverse fitness components (e.g. aerobic capacity, repeated sprint ability, maximal muscle strength and (or) explosive power) is great, particularly for the elite soccer player (Bangsbo et al. 2006). To be competitive, these athletes need high levels of aerobic and anaerobic capacity and the ability to be powerful in match-specific movements (e.g. jumping, tackling and accelerating) (Mhor et al. 2003; Wisloff et al. 2004). Furthermore, available training time for soccer players is

often limited owing to the competitive schedule where players play in excess of 40 games per season, with these matches often performed as frequently as 2-3 times per week during intense fixture period (Morgans et al. 2014). As such, these athletes routinely engage in concurrent training models where aerobic fitness is developed using high-intensity sport-specific conditioning games and drills (Little et al. 2006) whilst maximal muscle strength and explosive power is developed and maintained using high-load low-repetition strength training regimes (Wisloff et al. 1998; Hoff et al. 2004).

In applied sporting environments it is not always possible to isolate strength and endurance training on separate days. This is largely due to the competition schedule, restricted training time and other contextual barriers unique to this environment (e.g. large numbers of athletes, the availability of appropriate strength-training facilities and (or) equipment (unpublished observations). As a result, the habitual training practices of English professional soccer players can involve unsystematic training arrangements and (or) sessions performed within close proximity. Understanding the physiological responses to the concurrent-training practices typically used in applied environments may be important. This may lead to a better understanding of how to minimise the interference phenomenon and prescribe more effective training stimuli in this environment.

Relatively few training studies (Bell et al., 1988, Collins *et al.*, 1993, Gravelle *et al.*, 2000, Chtara *et al.*, 2005, Chtara *et al.*, 2008, Small et al., 2008, Valizadeh *et al.*, 2010, Small et al., 2010, McGawley et al. 2013) have investigated the effect of altering the order of same day concurrent training. Collectively, these studies have reported small but similar improvements in leg strength in both training conditions and concluded negligible effects of altering the concurrent-training sequence. However, the majority of the above studies have used 'untrained' participants. Although, one study used elite Swedish soccer players to investigate the effect of performing concurrent 'power-training' and 'high intensity interval

training' in opposing orders (McGawley et al. 2013). This study also found minimal effects of altering the concurrent training sequence. However, the training practices employed in this study were not indicative of the training practices typically seen within English premier league clubs (for example these teams do not routinely combine two 30 minute football and strength training sessions together or train in the evening ~19:00 hrs). To the authors knowledge no studies have investigated the effect of concurrent training sequence in English soccer players. As a result, little is known about habitual concurrent training practices within English academy soccer clubs or the effect of these training interventions. As a result, additional research is required to understand the effects of the concurrent training practices typically seen within this unique environment. This may offer a starting point from which future studies could be designed to improve the effectiveness of concurrent-training programmes in this environment.

With this in mind, the aim of the present study was to observe and compare the training responses to two concurrent-training scenarios previously observed at a professional football club in England (Enright, 2014). Given that long-term training adaptations can be considered the cumulative effects of acute alterations in physiological responses to training stimuli, it was hypothesised that the organisation of concurrent training could mediate training adaptations. To this end, we employed a design whereby two groups of athletes performed their habitual training practices for five weeks. Here, we modified the organisation of concurrent strength and football training on two of training days each week in line with what was typically observed in this environment (Figure 1). Group 1 performed strength (S) immediately followed by soccer-specific endurance training (E) (both within a 3-4 hour morning period) (S+E) (~08:45hrs and 10:30hrs respectively), whereas, Group 2 performed the same soccer-specific endurance training in the morning (~10:30hrs) followed by strength training in the early afternoon period (E+S) (~14:00hrs). Before and after the observation

period training responses were monitored using a range of muscle strength, power and morphology indices.

Keywords: Concurrent training, strength training, soccer, muscle architecture

Abbreviations:

Strength-Endurance scenario; S + E

Endurance-Strength scenario; E + S

HBS 1RM; Half Back Squat 1-RM

Isometric MVC Peak force; IMVC PF

Isometric MVC Loading Rate; IMVC LR

Concentric quadriceps (60deg/sec); Quad Con60

Concentric quadriceps (180degs/sec); Quad Con180

Eccentric quadriceps (120degs/sec) Quad Ecc120

Concentric hamstrings (60deg/sec); Ham Con60

Concentric hamstrings (180degs/sec); Ham Con180

Eccentric hamstrings (120degs/sec); Ham Ecc120

Squat Jump; SJ

Countermovement Jump; CMJ

Muscle thickness (Distal); MT-D

Muscle thickness (Mid); MT-M

Muscle thickness (proximal); MT-P

Angle of Pennation (Mid); AoP-M

Fascicule Length (Mid); FL-M.

METHODS

Participants. Twenty professional male soccer players (academy level) from an English FA Premier League Club volunteered to participate in this study (mean \pm SD: age, 17 ± 2 years; stature, 1.82 ± 0.06 m; body mass, 77.0 ± 7.3 kg; VO_2 peak, 62.0 ± 4.7 ml⁻¹.kg⁻¹.min⁻¹). All participants had a minimum of 2 years strength training history and were familiar with the present strength training protocols. After receiving oral and written information concerning any possible risks associated with the training and testing protocols, all participants gave their written informed consent to participate in the study. The study conformed to the code of ethics of the World Medical Association and was approved by the Ethics Committee of Liverpool John Moores University.

Overview of Experimental Design. The participants completed 4 football training sessions, 2 strength training sessions and 1 competitive game per week for 5 weeks. On concurrent training days the players performed strength training before (S+E) or after (E+S) soccer-specific endurance training. During the week before and after the 5-week training block, participants were assessed for measures of muscle strength, power and muscle morphology.

The adherence to training in this study was $\geq 90\%$; this equated to ≥ 18 football training sessions, ≥ 9 strength training sessions and ≥ 4.5 games. Five players did not adhere to this

criteria. This was due to unavoidable contact injuries ($n = 2$) and a varied training schedule ($n = 3$) associated with playing for the clubs' under-21 team, and as such, data are presented hereafter for the 15 players who had 90% adherence to all aspects of training and competition (E+S, $n = 7$; S+E, $n = 8$).

Training Interventions. The observation phase was carried out in the first five weeks of the competitive season (August/September). During each week, all participants completed two technical and tactical soccer practices, two soccer-specific endurance training sessions (E), two strength training sessions (S) and one competitive game. Participants completed concurrent 'E' and 'S' training on Mondays and Thursdays (deliberately scheduled to follow rest days of Sunday and Wednesday). On concurrent training days those participants allocated to the 'S+E' group completed 'S' training at 0845 h \pm 15 min prior to 'E' at 1030 h. Participants in the 'E+S' group, participated in the same 'E' training session at 1030 h followed by 'S' training at 1400 h \pm 15min. On concurrent training days all participants completed the same football specific endurance-training session at 1030 h. An overview of the organisation of the S+E and E+S concurrent training scenarios is shown in Figure 1.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

Soccer-specific endurance training stimuli 'E' consisted of a dynamic warm up (~20 minutes), small-sided games (~25 minutes) and technical / tactical work (~50 minutes). For hydration purposes regular intervals were also provided throughout each 'E' training session. Small-sided games involved a 4 verses 4, possession format. Each game lasted 4 minutes and was performed at an intensity of ~85-95% HRmax. Between each game 3 min of active recovery was allocated. Games were performed on a 37m x 27m pitch (for more detail on this

game format and reliability statistics please refer to (Little & Williams 2007). Following a 10 minute rest interval the players participated in additional technical and tactical training. Additional technical and tactical aspect of the training programme was designed and delivered by the team coach, and involved a variety of soccer-specific drills and exercises. The mean duration of the entire session 'E' was 113 ± 21 min and players' average perceived exertion score using 'Borg's 1-10 rating of perceived exertion scale' (Siegl et al. 1984) was 7 ± 1 .

The strength training programme consisted of 4 sets of 6 maximal repetitions (85% of 1RM) of the following exercises: parallel back squat, dead-lift, stiff-leg dead-lift and front-lunge. Participants also completed 3 sets of 8 repetitions of the Nordic hamstring exercise. Before strength training the participants completed a 5-minute dynamic warm-up followed by a 'barbell warm-up' (3 x 10 repetitions; 20kg) using the same exercises used in the training intervention. An Accredited Strength-and-Conditioning Coach (ASCC) from the United Kingdom Strength-and-Conditioning Association (UKSCA) designed and supervised the strength training sessions (author 1). Training compliance and individual workout data (weight lifted, number of sets and repetitions completed), (for a more detailed view of the training load for each experimental group refer to table 1) was recorded for each participant for all sessions. Throughout the training period each participant was encouraged to increased their own workloads so that they were training at '100% of 6RM intensity' (~85% of 1RM). The mean duration of S was 40 ± 5 min and players' average perceived exertion score was 8 ± 1 . Prior to the observation period all athletes participated in a 'strength-training familiarisation phase' which took place during the 'pre-season'. Using a linear periodisation technique, all athletes participated in 2 strength-training session's wk^{-1} for 5 wk^{-1} . Strength training involved the same exercises as the observation period with the exception that players completed 3 sets of 8 repetitions (60-80% of estimated 1RM). To reduce the likelihood of the

familiarisation phase affecting our results participants completed alternating orders (i.e. E+S or S+E) throughout the familiarisation period.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Dietary Controls. On concurrent training days (Monday and Wednesday), a standardised breakfast was consumed at 0800 and 0900 h for S+E and E+S respectively (~540 kcal: 100 g carbohydrate, 15 g protein and 7 g fat). Following observation a players also consumed similar nutrient intake at the 1230 h meal time (~1000 kcal 140 g carbohydrate, 60 g protein and 25 g fat). Finally, all players consumed a standardised recovery shake upon completion of strength training so as to ensure nutrient provision prior to E at 1030 h (~220 kcal: 25 g protein, 13 g carbohydrate, 0.5 g fat, Multipower, UK). In this way, all players were provided with comparable total energy content for the hours in which the players were physically present at the soccer club, though the timing of nutrient intake varied between groups. Nonetheless this design represented two scenarios, which occurred often within the club depending on the training schedule and as such we consider our approach to have high ecological validity.

Testing Procedures. A battery of assessments designed to measure muscle strength (peak isokinetic force of the dominant quadriceps and hamstring muscle groups, maximal isometric voluntary contraction (MIVC) for the quadriceps and 1-repetition maximum (1-RM) for the half-back squat exercise, power (MIVC rate of force development, vertical jump height, the 10 and 30 m sprinting time) and muscle morphology were administered before and after the training intervention. Muscle morphology variables included muscle thickness and muscle

architecture (fascicle angle of pennation and fascicle length) of the dominant thigh. Due to the nature of this study, testing physical assessments took place one week prior to and following the intervention period and was completed around the habitual training and competition practices at the club. The schedule of testing is described in figure 2 and was as follows; muscle architecture and body composition were measured 0900 – 1100 h on day 1 (Monday). On day 2 (Tuesday) following two consecutive days of rest vertical jump height, (0900 h) sprint speed (1000 h) and 1RM squat strength (1200 h) was measured respectively. Following a recovery day isometric and isokinetic leg strength were measured (testing day 3 Thursday). To minimise ‘time-of-day effects’ testing times were matched on each testing occasion.

INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE

All players had previously been familiarised with the performance tests (at the beginning of the pre-season period). Following familiarisation, a test re-test reliability investigation was carried out. Here, testing was performed 5-7 days apart and followed the same organisation as described in figure 2. Subsequent analysis revealed coefficient of variation (CV) from 1.6 % to 12.4 % ($n = 17$). The highest variability occurred in eccentric hamstring contractions (isokinetic) whilst the lowest variability was observed in the half back squat exercise.

Muscle architecture and muscle thickness. Landmarks were placed at 30% (proximal), 50% (mid) and 70% (distal) between the lateral femoral condyle and the greater trochanter (Kanehisa et al. 2003). Participants were then seated on the edge of a seat with hips and knees at right angles. Using a high resolution B-mode ultrasound scanner (12 MHz) (LOGIQ-e, Fairfield, Connecticut, U.S), images were taken at the designated landmark. To aid acoustic

coupling during measurement, acoustic gel was placed over the probe head (40mm linear-array transducer). Three sagittal images at each location were saved for analysis. Images were digitally analysed using built in 'LOGIQ-e software' to determine whole muscle thickness (WMT) (mid and distal locations), fascicle length (FL), and fascicle angle of pennation (AoP) (mid location). For information regarding the validity of the ultra-sound method to describe the muscle architecture characterises of human skeletal muscle please refer to Kellis et al., (2009).

Vertical jump-height, sprinting speed and back-squat strength. Following a recovery day, vertical jump height, 10 and 30 metre sprint time and 1-repetition maximum in the half back-squat exercise were assessed. Vertical jump height was measured using a jump mat (FLSelectronics, Cookstown, Northern Ireland). Participants were instructed to complete three maximal efforts in both the squat jump (SJ) and the countermovement jump (CMJ). Participants stood with feet shoulder width apart with their hands placed on their hips throughout each movement. A three minute recovery period was allocated between each effort. The highest CMJ and SJ was recorded for analysis. Following a recovery period of 30 minutes, participants completed three maximal 30-metre sprints on an outdoor grass surface. Between each sprint participants were allowed a three minute recovery period (Ambrosoli et al. 1970). The fastest 10 and 30 metre sprint time was recorded for analysis. The half back-squat 1-RM was assessed using free-weights and a squatting rack (Ivanko, San Pedro, California, U.S). Participants performed back-squat specific warm-up repetitions of around 50%, 70%, 80% and 90% of a previous 1-RM score. This was followed by a series of maximal repetitions, separated by 3-5 minute rest periods. The maximum weight in kilograms lifted for a single repetition was recorded for analysis (knee angle of 90 degree between the participants' femur and tibia).

Isokinetic and Isometric set-up. Measurements of isokinetic strength were assessed using an isokinetic dynamometer (Kin.com, Harrison Tennessee, U.S.). The initial setup involved aligning the rotational axis of the dynamometer with the posterior aspect of the participants' lateral femoral condyle. At this position, the lever arm length, dynamometer height and seat position was recorded and replicated. To minimise underestimation of knee extensor peak torque and overestimation of knee flexor peak torque, gravitational torque of the 'limb-lever system' was directly measured at 14 degrees of knee flexion on each testing occasion (Morton et al. 2005).

Quadriceps Maximal Isometric Voluntary Contraction (MIVC), Isometric Loading Rate (ILR). In order to ensure each contraction was isometric, all participants were required to preload the force cell (~80 Newton's) in an upward direction for a period of three seconds prior to each repetition. Participants completed five maximal efforts with two minutes between contractions. Peak isometric force (N) and the repetition with the steepest gradient were recorded. The isometric loading rate (ILR) (rate of change) was calculated using the equation described by Woodard et al. 1999.

Isokinetic strength measurements. Isokinetic measurements involved bidirectional movements of the knee at 60, 120 and 180° · s⁻¹ and was performed throughout 90° to 10° of knee extension & flexion (0° is full extension). Slower angular velocity actions were performed before higher velocity tests to promote learning effects and reduce the risk of an injury. During each maximal repetition, the participants were instructed to hold the side of the seat whilst pushing as hard and as fast as they could. Standardised visual feedback using on screen graphs and verbal encouragement (Figoni et al. 1984) was given throughout each test. To avoid any unwanted involvement from other muscle groups, stabilisation straps were placed across the trunk, pelvis and the engaged leg. Participants performed between three and five maximal efforts at each speed. A rest period of 30 seconds was allocated between

consecutive bidirectional movements and three minutes between each angular velocity. The highest peak torque was recorded for analysis. Subsequent data was used to calculate the functional $\text{HAMSTRINGS}_{\text{ECCENTRIC}} : \text{QUADRICEPTS}_{\text{CONCENTRIC}} (\text{H}_{\text{ECC}}:\text{Q}_{\text{CON}})$ at $60^{\circ}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ and $180^{\circ}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (Iga et al. 2009).

Statistical analysis. The software package SPSS (Version 17.0 SPSS inc. Chicago, IL) was used for statistical analysis. A repeated measures two-way General Linear Model where the within factor was time (i.e. pre-training versus post-training) and between factor was group (i.e. E+S versus S+E) was used to examine the effects of training sequence on changes in muscle strength, power and morphology. Where there were significant main effects, Tukey's post-hoc tests were used to locate specific differences. Data were also assessed for clinical significance using the magnitudes of change approach (Hopkins et al., 2009). Effect sizes (ES) were calculated as the difference between the means divided by the pooled standard deviation, with values of 0.2, 0.5, and above 0.8 considered to represent small, medium, and large differences, respectively (Cohen, 1988). The smallest worthwhile change was calculated as 0.2 multiplied by the between-subject standard deviation, based = on Cohen ES principle (Hopkins et al., 2009). All data in text are presented as means \pm SD and $P \leq 0.05$ is indicative of statistical significance.

RESULTS

Muscle Strength. Changes in muscle strength related parameters are shown in Table 2. There were significant effects of time (i. e., pre- to post-training) for all of the measured variables ($p < 0.05$) with the exception of IMVC PF, quadriceps strength ($60^\circ \cdot s^{-1 \text{ CON}}$, $180^\circ \cdot s^{-1 \text{ CON}}$, $120^\circ \cdot s^{-1 \text{ ECC}}$). Training increased half back squat strength in both groups ($P < 0.01$) where the magnitude of increase was greater in the E+S condition (19.1%) compared with S+E (10.3%) arrangement. Moderate and large effect size for the S+E and E+S conditions respectively (effect size S+E; -0.54; E+S; -1.79). Although training induced increases in isometric peak MVC force ($P=0.391$), eccentric torque of the quadriceps at 120° ($P=0.11$) and concentric torque of the quadriceps at 60° and 180° ($P=0.25$; $P=0.16$), none of these parameters reached statistical significance. Additionally, the ratio of peak eccentric hamstring and quadriceps concentric torque at $60^\circ/s$ ($P=0.15$) and $180^\circ/s$ ($P=0.23$) also did not significantly change with training. Training induced significant increases in isometric loading rate ($P=0.02$) with moderate and large effects sizes for S+E and E+S conditions respectively (-0.5 vs. -1.05), improvements in concentric torque of the hamstrings at $60^\circ/s$ at $180^\circ/s$ ($P=0.01$ and 0.03 , respectively (effect size S+E; -0.03; E+S; large -1.87), concentric torque of the quadriceps at $180^\circ/s$ ($P=0.02$) (effect size S+E; moderate -0.23; E+S; large -1.52), eccentric torque of the hamstrings at $120^\circ/s$ ($P=0.001$) (effect size S+E; moderate -0.78; E+S; large -1.55), the ratio of concentric hamstrings to quadriceps torque at $60^\circ/s$ ($P=0.01$) and the ratio of the concentric torque of the hamstrings at $60^\circ/s$ to eccentric torque of the quadriceps at $120^\circ/s$ ($P=0.05$). Whilst magnitude of change in the aforementioned parameters was, comparable between E+S and S+E conditions ($P>0.05$ for all variables) differences in effect sizes for condition were observed. Relative changes and qualitative outcomes resulting from the within-group analysis are presented in Figure 3.

INSERT TABLE 2, AND FIGURE 3

Muscle Power. There were significant effects of time in 10 m sprint time ($P=0.02$) (see Table 3), ANCOVA indicated no effect of training organisation on 10 or 30 m sprint time ($P=0.09$; S+E; 0; vs E+S; -0.25). Squat jump also significantly improved with training ($P<0.01$) whilst no difference was evident between groups ($P=0.84$) a large effect size was observed for the E+S condition (effect size S+E; moderate -0.56, E+S; large -1.08). CMJ did not change following training ($P=0.53$) (effect size; S+E; none 0; E+S; moderate -0.29).

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Muscle Morphology Variables. Changes in muscle architecture before and after training are displayed in Table 3. No group interactions were observed following training; whole muscle thickness at either distal ($P=0.15$), mid ($P=0.33$) or proximal location ($P=0.43$) or fascicle length ($P=0.08$) with training. Although not significant, an 8.8% increase in muscle thickness was observed following training in the E+S experimental group at the distal location (effect size S+E; moderate -0.32; E+S; moderate -0.67). Fascicle angle of pennation increased in both groups ($P=0.02$) and (S+E; 7.9%, E+S; 14.3%) a large effect size was revealed in the E+S condition (effect size S+E; moderate -0.72; E+S; large -1.76).

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

DISCUSSION

Using an 'ecologically valid' study design we compared the training responses to two 'typical' 'concurrent-training scenarios' used in an applied environment. Our data suggest that supplementing the habitual training practices of elite soccer players with strength training can increase muscle strength and power related variables regardless of the 'acute organisation' of concurrent-training and nutrition. Although not all significant, pronounced changes and larger

'effect sizes' were observed in a range of variables in the E+S training scenario (1-RM half back squat, a range of isokinetic assessments, isometric rate of force development and fascicule angle of pennation). This suggest that the concurrent training sequence, in association with the recovery duration between training bouts and the nutrient availability may be able to modulate small but clinically significant changes in physical performance parameters associated with match-play. This may have practical implications for elite soccer players who routinely perform concurrent strength and endurance training on the same day.

The additional recovery period allocated in the E+S allowed the participants to consume a meal between training bouts which may have helped to modulate the resultant training adaptations. The S+E group had a 30 - 45 minute recovery period between training bouts, whereas, participants in the E+S training group had 120 minutes between bouts (figure 1). Completing two intense training exercise bouts within relatively close succession may have created considerable metabolic stress (Wojtaszewski et al. 2000). Therefore, the additional availability of key nutrients (e.g. protein and carbohydrate) before, and after each training bout in the E+S condition may have helped to mitigate any additional 'metabolic stress' and subsequently promoted adaptation. Indeed, consuming protein and carbohydrate around intense training bouts can serve as a powerful modulator of many intramuscular signalling and metabolic events necessary for adaptation (Philips et al. 2012; Jukendrup, 2014). The S+E group consumed 15 grams of protein prior to strength training, 25 grams of protein between 'S' and 'E' training bouts and 60 grams of protein following endurance training. Whereas, the E+S training group consumed 60 grams of protein before strength training and 25 grams of protein immediately after strength training. Since protein synthesis and degradation are dependent on the presence of amino acids, the timing and quantity of protein sources consumed by the E+S group may also help to explain the differences observed in muscle

thickness (S+E -1% vs E+S 8.8%; Effect size; -0.32 vs -0.67) and fascicle angle of pennation S+E 7.9% vs E+S 14.3%; effect size S+E;-0.72, vs E+S; -1.76) following training. The timing and quantity of carbohydrate sources available to each group may also help to explain our data. The S+E group consumed 100 grams of carbohydrate before completing consecutive strength and endurance training sessions. Following soccer-specific endurance training the group then consumed approximately 140g of carbohydrate whereas, the E+S group consumed 100g of carbohydrate before endurance training and a further 140 grams of carbohydrate prior to completing the afternoon strength training session. As muscle glycogen is likely to have been the principle substrate used during the present endurance (high-intensity intermittent small sided games) (Saltin, 1973) and strength training protocols (high-load, low-repetition) (Haff et al. 2003), the additional carbohydrate consumed by the E+S group before strength training may have facilitated adaptation (Tesch et al. 1986). Indeed, previous research has substantiated that carbohydrate supplementation can negate the effects of acute peripheral fatigue during a strength training bout (Haff et al. 2003). Moreover, carbohydrate availability influences the rate of skeletal muscle and whole body protein synthesis, degradation and net balance during prolonged exercise in humans (Howarth et al., 2010). Whereas, completing strength training in the face of low muscle glycogen stores can have a negative impact on training performance and adaptation (Churchley et al. 2007; Creer et al. 2005). Thus, it would seem plausible to suggest that those who performed strength training prior to endurance training (S+E) did not consume enough carbohydrate at the 'breakfast meal' (i.e. prior to multiple training bouts). This lack of carbohydrate availability before two training sessions may have exacerbated the training stress and blunted the adaptive response to the strength training stimulus. It is therefore possible to suggest that the availability of carbohydrate and protein before and after training in each training group may have modulated underlying metabolic processes which either promoted and (or) attenuated adaptations between groups.

In addition to the availability of key nutrients, discrepancies in recovery period and training sequence between groups may have also affected the participant's ability to generate force during the respective training bouts (i.e. acute fatigue). Indeed, reductions in muscle force have been observed following an acute bout of sub-maximal and high-intensity intermittent aerobic-exercise, (Carroll et al., 1998, Leveritt and Abernethy, 1999, Lepers et al., 2000). Localised muscle inhibition is pronounced following high-intensity muscular contraction and typically lasts between 6 and 48 hours following aerobic- exercise (Fitts, 1994, Lepers et al., 2000). Reductions in force capacity following an acute bout of exercise has been attributed to central (e.g. central nervous system fatigue) (McCarthy et al., 2002) and (or) peripheral mechanisms (e.g. depletion of muscle glycogen) (Haff et al., 2003). Therefore, considering that muscle glycogen may have been compromised this may have had an effect upon peripheral fatigue during secondary training bouts. Considering that higher 'resistance-training' volume load (expressed as reps · sets · weight lifted) typically results in greater increases in strength when compared to low and moderate volumes (Hanssen et al., 2012). This may have had implication for the participants in the E+S exercise condition. Analysis of training load data revealed that the total 'pitch-based' training and match volume was also similar, but differences in strength-training 'volume load' were apparent (S+E; 13443 ± 2485 , E+S; 12341 ± 1574). The S+E group completed significantly higher 'volume load' thus suggesting that the E+S group experienced some form of peripheral fatigue during the strength component of the training programme. It is therefore likely that training load factors may account of the changes observed in the present study. Given that the E+S group outperformed the S+E in the follow-up strength assessments, it may be hypothesised that the additional strength training stimulus in the S+E may have led to over-reaching or overtraining in the subsequent testing phase. Although, without control groups performing strength exercise at the same time-of-day (i.e. 8.45 and 14:00 hrs) it cannot be elucidated if the

‘proximity of training’ (i.e. the recovery period between training bouts) or the ‘exercise sequence’ has caused acute interference in strength related adaptations and or created athletes to become over-reached observed in this study. Carefully controlled studies investigating the acute and chronic effects of these two exercise and nutritional arrangements are therefore warranted.

Whilst neurological improvements, have traditionally been regarded as sole mediator of early improvements when strength training, recent evidence suggest alterations in the architectural characteristics of the muscle can also contribute to early strength improvement (Blazevich et al., 2006). In the present study demonstrate time effects for isometric loading rate (IMVC-LR) (a surrogate measure for neural adaptation), fascicule angle of pennation (AoP-M) and muscle thickness (MT-D). Although there were no statistical differences between groups, there were moderate and large effects observed between groups. The IMVC-LR increased by 20% and 27% in the S+E and E+S groups respectively (Effect size S+E; -0.5, vs E+S; -1.76). Whereas the AoP-M increased by 7.9% and 14.3% in the S+E and E+S groups (Effect size S+E; -0.72, vs E+S; -1.76). The vastus lateralis fascicule angle of pennation has previously been shown to adapt rapidly to intense resistance-training interventions. For example Blazevich and colleagues (2003) have observed a 15% increase in fascicule angle of pennation occurring following 10 concurrent strength and sports-specific training sessions in games players. Like the present study, this increase in pennation also correlated with improvements in strength. Although, the changes in fascicle angles of subjects in the present study are less than that of individuals who have completed resistance only training programmes. Previously authors have observed a 29% increase in the triceps brachii (Kawakami et al., 1995) and the 34% increase in the vastus lateralis angle after training (Aagaard et al., 2001). The attenuated changes in the present study may be attributed to the nature of the contrasting forms of

muscular contraction during this study the organisation of training and or the length of the training period. Increased fascicle angle of pennation has previously been correlated to faster sprinting times in elite athletes (Abe et al., 1999; Kumagai et al., 2000). Although not a confirmatory finding, the between group difference in fascicle angle of pennation may offer some mechanistic explanation for the between group changes in muscle strength and sprinting speed observed following training. If correct, this relationship provides a unique observation that fascicle angle may become altered through modifying the organisation of concurrent training. However, it is acknowledged that whilst the type of muscular contraction can influence the way in which the fascicle adapts (Blazevich et al., 2007) this theory is speculative. Little is known about the way in which the fascicle responds to concurrent training interventions, particularly in the applied environment where there are so many confounding factors. Furthermore, not much data exist concerning the effects of nutritional interventions on fascicle remodelling. It is possible that the unique intramuscular signalling and (or) biological responses to exercise and nutritional arrangements caused the fascicle to remodel independently in each training group. Recent data suggest that when concurrent training is performed on the same day, the order and recovery time between endurance and strength training can influence the acute intramuscular signalling responses (Coffey et al., 2009, Lundberg et al. 2012; Lundberg et al. 2013). It could be suggested that the 'order' of training bouts in the S+E condition may have blocked the 'anabolic' 'mTOR signalling axis'. This may have been blocked via the AMPK/ SIRT-1 pathway (Kim et al. 2013) thereby limiting the activation of signalling cascades that promote strength related adaptive changes. Conversely, the 'anabolic' biological and intramuscular systems may have been up regulated for an extended period throughout the evening/night in the E+S condition (MacKenzie et al. 2009). This additional 'mTOR activation time' following each strength training bout compared to the S+E condition may help explain why those in the E+S group outperformed

their counterparts following the intervention period in a number of our outcome tests. Although, it is acknowledged that the signalling cascades responsible for fascicule remodelling are also unclear and therefore require further study. Furthermore the time course and ratio of neural and architectural adaptations during early phase resistance training programmes is not well understood. More research is required to investigate the relative contribution of neural and morphological adaptations to both isolated strength and concurrent training programmes. Due to the complex nature of these adaptations, future investigations may require multiple intramuscular and biological measurements collected in well-controlled environments.

Limitations. The authors acknowledge there are limitations to this study. Ideally, a randomised crossover controlled trial would have been utilised as observations of the adaptations to isolated strength and soccer-specific endurance training would have allowed comprehensive comparisons between each training intervention. However, due to the nature of the population and the relatively small sample size (i.e. 20 youth elite professional soccer players) it was unfeasible to have multiple experimental training groups or individuals performing isolated strength training.

Experimental groups were matched (height and weight 1RM squat strength and Vo2Max) at the start of the intervention period. However, unavoidable contact injuries (n = 2) and a varied training schedule (n = 3) associated with playing for the clubs' under-21 team subsequently created disproportionate characteristics between groups. Whilst there were no statistical differences between the groups at 'pre-training', we acknowledge that this difference may have affected the training response between groups and is therefore a limitation of the present study.

It also must be acknowledged that the present study design does not allow us to determine if it is the concurrent training sequence or if the recovery period between exercise bouts that is the mediating factor that could explain the differences observed between groups. Therefore, the discrepancy in recovery duration between experimental conditions is a limitation of this study. In addition, due to the nature of the training intervention (i.e. small-sided games) we were unable to control the aerobic stimulus between groups. Whilst there were no statistical differences in RPE training load, there were slight differences in heart-rate data. Our data show that the E+S group may have achieved higher intensities during the endurance component of the training intervention. This may have been due to the fact that they did not have a strength-training session immediately prior to football training, however, this conclusion is not clear without a control group completing only endurance exercise. The discrepancy in 'training intensity' could have caused interference and distorted the present findings (Wilson et al., 2014). Future research investigating the effects of concurrent training sequence in elite soccer players should aim to standardise the recovery time between training bouts and the aerobic training intensity. This approach would allow for more accurate interpretation of the mediating factors that may exacerbate the 'interference phenomenon'. Despite these limitations the study still has a number of strengths. For example, the majority of concurrent training studies investigating the effects of training organisation have used untrained participants (Hawley et al. 2009) and incorporated training practices not representative of 'real world' practice in the English soccer leagues (Baar, 2014). Therefore we believe this design has high levels of ecological validity and may offer a starting point to suggest practical applications to soccer coaches, strength-and-conditioning practitioners and applied physiologists in elite soccer in England.

In summary, results suggest the organisation of concurrent training, recovery time allocated between training bouts and the availability nutrition may modulate small but

clinically significant changes in physical performance parameters associated with match-play. It is possible that performing soccer-specific endurance training and strength training within close proximity may attenuate adaptive responses following a concurrent training programme. Alternatively, separating training bouts and providing adequate nutritional intake may promote adaptations. This could be a consequence of the molecular and (or) biological responses to each concurrent training scenario. Although it is acknowledged that there are a number of confounding factors which may account for the present findings. Therefore, additional research is required to investigate the acute and chronic responses to the concurrent training programmes carried out by elite athletes in the applied setting. Understanding how athletes respond to habitual training practices could have practical implications for minimising the interference phenomenon.

Acknowledgements

This project was internally funded by the Wolverhampton Wanderers Football Club, England.

The authors have no conflict of interest.

References

- Aagaard P, Andersen JL, Dyhre-Poulsen P, Leffers AM, Wagner A, Magnusson SP, Halkjaer-Kristensen J, and Simonsen EB** (2001). A mechanism for increased contractile strength of human pennate muscle in response to strength training: changes in muscle architecture. *Journal of Physiology-London* 534(2):613-23
- Abe, T., K. Kumagai, And W. F. Brechue** (1999). Muscle fascicle length is greater in sprinters than long-distance runners (Abstract). *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 31(Suppl. 5):S328
- Ambrosoli G, and Cerretelli P** (1970). The yield of resynthesis of high-energy phosphates (ATP + PC) in the course of anaerobic restoration. *Boll Soc Ital Biol Sper* 4 (15): 667-8
- Atherton, P. J., Babraj, J., Smith, K., Singh, J., Rennie, M. J. & Wackerhage, H.** (2005). Selective Activation of AMPK-Pgc-1alpha Or Pkb-Tsc2-MTOR Signaling Can Explain

Specific Adaptive Responses To Endurance Or Resistance-Training-Like Electrical Muscle Stimulation. *Faseb J*, 19, 786-8

Baar K, Esser K. (1999) Phosphorylation of p70(S6k) correlates with increased skeletal muscle mass following resistance exercise. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol* 276:C120–7

Baar K. (2006) Training for Endurance and Strength: Lessons from Cell Signalling. *Med Sci Sports Ex* 38(11):1939-44

Bangsbo J, Mohr M, and Krstrup P. (2006). Physical and metabolic demands of training and match-play in the elite football player. *Journal of Sports Sciences* 24(7):665-74

Bartlett JD, Hwa Joo C, Jeong TS, Louhelainen J, Cochran AJ, Gibala MJ, Gregson W, Close GL, Drust B, and Morton JP. (2012) Matched work high-intensity interval and continuous running induce similar increases in PGC-1 α mRNA, AMPK, p38, and p53 phosphorylation in human skeletal muscle. *J Appl Physiol* 112(7):1135-43

Blazevich AJ, Gill ND, Bronks R, and Newton RU. (2003) Training-specific muscle architecture adaptation after 5-wk training in athletes. *Med Sci Sports Ex* 35(12):2013-22

Blazevich AJ. (2006) Effects of physical training and detraining, immobilisation, growth and aging on human fascicle geometry. *Sports Med* 36(12):1003-17

Blazevich, AJ, Cannavan, D, Coleman, DR, and Horne S (2007) Influence of concentric and eccentric resistance training on architectural adaptation in human quadriceps muscles. *J Appl Physiol* 103: 1565–1575

Churchley EG, Coffey VG, Pedersen DJ, Shield A, Carey KA, Cameron-Smith D, and Hawley JA. (2007) Influence of preexercise muscle glycogen content on transcriptional activity of metabolic and myogenic genes in well-trained humans. *J Appl Physiol* 102(4):1604-11

Coffey VG, Pilegaard H, Garnham AP, O'Brien BJ, and Hawley JA. (2009) Consecutive bouts of diverse contractile activity alter acute responses in human skeletal muscle. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 106(4):1187-97

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for The Behavioural Sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, Nj: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Creer A, Gallagher P, Slivka D, Jemiolo B, Fink W, and Trappe S. (2005) Influence of muscle glycogen availability on ERK1/2 and Akt signaling after resistance exercise in human skeletal muscle. *J Appl Physiol* 99(3):950-6

Drummond MJ, Dreyer HC, Fry CS, Glynn EL, and Rasmussen BB. (2009) Nutritional and contractile regulation of human skeletal muscle protein synthesis and mTORC1 signalling. *J Appl Physiol* 106(4):1374-84

Enright, K. (2014). The impact of concurrent-training on the physiological adaptations to sport specific exercise in elite footballers. Ph.D. thesis. Liverpool John Moores University, UK.

Figoni SF, and Morris AF (1984). Effects of knowledge of results on reciprocal, isokinetic strength and fatigue. *Med Sci Sports Ex* 16(2):167

- Fukunaga T, Kawakami Y, Kuno S, Funato K, and Fukashiro S.** (1997) Muscle architecture and function in humans. *Journal of Biomechanics* 30(5):457-63
- Fyfe JJ, Bishop DJ & Stepto NK** (2014) Interference between Concurrent Resistance and Endurance Exercise: Molecular Bases and the Role of Individual Training Variables. *Sports Med Jun*;44(6):743-62.
- Haff GG, Lehmkuhl MJ, McCoy LB, and Stone MH** (2003) Carbohydrate supplementation and strength training. *J Strength Cond Res* 17(1):187-96
- Hawley JA, Tipton KD, and Millard-Stafford ML.** (2006) Promoting training adaptations through nutritional interventions. *J Sports Sci* 24(7):709-21
- Hawley JA.** (2009) Molecular responses to strength and endurance training: Are they incompatible? *Applied Physiology, Nutrition & Metabolism* 34(3):355-61
- Hill-Haas, S., Coutts, A., Rowsell, G. & Dawson, B.** (2008). Variability of Acute Physiological Responses and Performance Profiles of Youth Soccer Players In Small-Sided Games. *Journal of Science Medicine in Sport* 11, 487-90
- Hopkins, WG, Marshall, SW, Batterham, AM, and Hanin, J.** (2009) Progressive statistics for studies in sports medicine and exercise science. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 41: 3–13.
- Iga J, George K, Lees A, and Reilly T** (2009) Cross-sectional investigation of indices of isokinetic leg strength in youth soccer players and untrained individuals. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 19(5):714-9.
- Jeukendrup, A** (2014) A Step Towards Personalized Sports Nutrition: Carbohydrate Intake During Exercise. *Sports Med* 44(Suppl 1): 25–33
- Kanehisa H, Muraoka Y, Kawakami Y, and Fukunaga T.** (2003) Fascicle arrangements of vastus lateralis and gastrocnemius muscles in highly trained soccer players and swimmers of both genders. *International Journal of Sports Medicine* 24(2):90-5
- Kawakami, Y., T. Abe, S.-Y. Kuno, and T. Fukunaga. Training-induced** (1995) Changes in muscle architecture and specific tension. *Eur.J. Appl. Physiol.* 72:37–43
- Kearns CF, Isokawa M, and Abe T.** (2001) Architectural characteristics of dominant leg muscles in junior soccer players. *European Journal of Applied Physiology* 85(3-4):240-3
- Kellis E, Galsnis N, Natsis K, Kapetanios G** (2009) Validity of architectural properties of the hamstring muscles: Correlation of ultrasound findings with cadaveric dissection. *Journal of biomechanics* 42: 2549-2554
- Kim SG, Hoffman GR, Poulgiannis G.** (2013) Metabolic stress controls mTORC1 lysosomal localization and dimerization by regulating the TTT-RUVBL1/2 complex. *Mol Cell* 49:172–85
- Kumagai, K., T. Abe, W. F. Brechue, T. Ryushi, S. Takano, & M.Mizuno.** (2000) Sprint performance is related to muscle fascicle length in male 100-m sprinters. *J. Appl. Physiol.* 88:811–816
- Leveritt, M. & Abernethy, P. J.** (1999). Acute Effects of High-Intensity Endurance Exercise on Subsequent Resistance Activity. *J Strength Cond Res* 13, 47-51


- Little T, and Williams AG** (2006). Suitability of soccer training drills for endurance training. *J Strength Cond Res* 20(2):316-9
- Lundberg, T. R., Fernandez-Gonzalo, R., Gustafsson, T. & Tesch, P. A.** (2012). Aerobic Exercise Alters Skeletal Muscle Molecular Responses To Resistance Exercise. *Med Sci Sports Ex* 44, 1680-1688
- Lundberg, T. R., Fernandez-Gonzalo, R., Gustafsson, T. & Tesch, P. A.** (2013). Aerobic Exercise Does Not Compromise Muscle Hypertrophy Response To Short-Term Strength training. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 114, 81-89
- MacKenzie MG, Hamilton DL, Murray JT** (2009), mVps34 is activated following high-resistance contractions. *J Physiol* 587:253–60
- Mohr M, Krstrup P, and Bangsbo J.** (2003) Match performance of high-standard soccer players with special reference to development of fatigue. *Journal of Sports Sciences* 21(7):519-28
- Morgans, R., Orme, P., Anderson, L., Drust, B., Morton, J** (2014) An Intensive Winter Fixture Schedule Induces a Transient Fall in Salivary IgA in English Premier League Soccer Players. *Research in Sports Medicine.* 22(4):346-354
- Morton JP, Atkinson G, MacLaren DP, Cable NT, Gilbert G, Broome C, McArdle A, and Drust B.** (2005) Reliability of maximal muscle force and voluntary activation as markers of exercise-induced muscle damage. *European Journal of Applied Physiology* 94(5-6):541-8
- Phillips SM.** (2012) Dietary Protein Requirements and Adaptive Advantages in Athletes. *Br. J. Nutr* 108(S2): S158-S167
- Saltin, B** (1973). Metabolic fundamentals in exercise. *Med Sci Sports* 137-146
- Siegl P, and Schultz K.** (1984) [The Borg Scale as an instrument for the detection of subjectively experienced stress in industrial medicine laboratory and field studies]. *Z Gesamte Hyg* 30(7):383-6
- Stepto NK, Coffey V, Canny BJ, Ponnampalam AP, Clark SA, and Hawley JA.** (2005) Differential global gene expression profiles from chronically endurance- and strength-trained athletes. *Faseb Journal* 19(4):A115-A
- Tesch PA, Colliander EB, and Kaiser P** (1986) Muscle metabolism during intense, heavy-resistance exercise. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 55(4):362-6
- Tipton KD, and Ferrando AA.** (2008) Improving muscle mass: response of muscle metabolism to exercise, nutrition and anabolic agents. *Essays Biochem.* 2008;44:85-98
- Wisloff U, Castagna C, Helgerud J, Jones R, and Hoff J** (2004). Strong correlation of maximal squat strength with sprint performance and vertical jump height in elite soccer players. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 38(3):285-8
- Wisloff U, Helgerud J, and Hoff J** (1998). Strength and endurance of elite soccer players. *Med Sci Sports Ex* 30(3):462-7

Wojtaszewski JF, Nielsen P, Hansen BF. (2000) Isoform-specific and exercise intensity-dependent activation of 5'-AMP-activated protein kinase in human skeletal muscle. *J Physiol* 528:221–6

Woodard CM, James MK, and Messier SP. (1999) Computational methods used in the determination of loading rate: Experimental and clinical implications. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics* 15(4):404-17

DRAFT

E + S



S + E




Figure 1: Schematic depicting the two exercise sequences employed.

S + E; strength-endurance sequence, E + S; endurance-strength sequence, Meal: breakfast/lunch, S; Strength training, E; Endurance training, ↓ 25g whey protein. Note that whilst the pattern of energy delivery was different between trials, the total energy availability over the study period was matched.




Figure 2: The organisation of physiological testing before and after the intervention period.




Figure 3: Within-group relative changes in isokinetic quadriceps and hamstring strength before endurance (S+E) compared with endurance before strength (E+S) training programs (bars indicate uncertainty in the true mean changes with 90% confidence intervals). Trivial area was calculated from the smallest worthwhile change as described in the method.

Table 1: Summary of the training load completed by each experimental group (Statistical analysis revealed no differences between groups)

| S + E | | | | | | E + S | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Week | No of Sessions | Total Duration (Mins) | Average Minutes > 85% HR Max | Strength Volume Load | RPE Load (RPE*Min) | No of Sessions | Total Duration (Mins) | Average Minutes > 85% HR Max | Strength Volume Load | RPE Load (RPE*Min) |
| Week 1 | 6.0 | 490 | 00:32:20 | 13251 ± 236 | 2400.0 | 6.0 | 490 | 00:30:53 | 12217.5 ± 1047 | 2344.0 |
| Week 2 | 6.0 | 633 | 00:28:56 | 15758 ± 8626 | 3504.9 | 6.0 | 633 | 00:35:02 | 12228 ± 107 | 3349.0 |
| Week 3 | 6.0 | 532 | 00:28:52 | 9330 ± 4823 | 2704.3 | 6.0 | 532 | 00:30:35 | 10035 ± 4723 | 2650.0 |
| Week 4 | 6.0 | 487 | 00:23:36 | 13988 ± 4947 | 2465.4 | 6.0 | 487 | 00:24:55 | 14430 ± 3360 | 2290.0 |
| Week 5 | 6.0 | 554 | 00:39:00 | 14890 ± 4239 | 3041.9 | 6.0 | 554 | 00:47:59 | 12795 ± 4698 | 2980.0 |
| M ± SD | 6.0 | 539.3 ± 59.6 | 00:30:33 ± 00:05:40 | 13443 ± 2485 | 2823 ± 456 | 6.0 | 539.3 ± 59.6 | 00:33:53 ± 00:08:40 | 12341 ± 1574 | 2722 ± 445 |
| Total | 30.0 | 2696.5 | 02:32:44 | 67217 | 14116.5 | 30.0 | 2696.5 | 02:49:24 | 61705 | 13613.0 |

Table 2: Muscle strength data, 1RM half back squat (kg) Isometric peak force and isometric loading rate and concentric and eccentric peak torque (Nm) of the quadriceps for S+E and E+S experimental groups before and after training

| | S+E | | | | | | | | E+S | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------|-------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----|-------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|-------|------|----|-------|--------|----|-------|
| | Pre | Post | % Δ | ES | confidence intervals | | | | Pre | Post | % Δ | ES | confidence intervals | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Upper limit | Lower limit | Upper limit | Lower limit | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HBS 1-RM(kg) | 121.9 ± 23.9 | 134.4 ± 22.10*† | 10.30% | -0.54 | 10.8 | to | 44.9 | 1.3 | to | 5.5 | 115.7 ± 10.20 | 137.8 ± 14.10* | 19.10% | -1.79 | 13.5 | to | 64.5 | 1.8 | to | 8.8 |
| IMVC PF (N) | 628 ± 189 | 631 ± 136 | 0.60% | -0.01 | 63.7 | to | 264.9 | -253.6 | to | -61.0 | 690 ± 147 | 721 ± 143 | 4.40% | -0.21 | 41.5 | to | 199.0 | -112.5 | to | -23.5 |
| IMVC LR | 1018 ± 427 | 1225 ± 389* | 20.30% | -0.5 | 218.2 | to | 907.5 | -240.0 | to | -57.7 | 1185 ± 316 | 1508 ± 295* | 27.30% | -1.05 | 41.5 | to | 199.0 | -112.5 | to | -23.5 |
| Quad Con60 | 218 ± 33 | 217 ± 31 | -0.40% | 0.03 | 23.6 | to | 97.9 | -100.8 | to | -24.2 | 217 ± 24 | 242 ± 32 | 11.30% | -1.87 | 23.7 | to | 133.6 | -63.7 | to | -13.3 |
| Quad Con180 | 194 ± 22 | 199 ± 21* | 2.50% | -0.23 | 22.6 | to | 94.2 | -78.5 | to | -18.9 | 203 ± 20 | 230 ± 15* | 13.20% | -1.52 | 19.2 | to | 108.6 | -33.4 | to | -7.0 |
| Quad Ecc120 | 262 ± 47 | 269 ± 29 | 2.70% | -0.17 | 34.0 | to | 141.4 | -118.9 | to | -28.6 | 275 ± 47 | 288 ± 48 | 4.70% | -0.27 | 33.7 | to | 190.3 | -153.9 | to | -32.1 |
| Ham Con60 | 108 ± 18 | 121 ± 22* | 12.20% | -0.64 | 15.5 | to | 64.5 | -22.2 | to | -5.3 | 120 ± 23 | 143 ± 25* | 19.20% | -0.95 | 15.6 | to | 88.3 | -22.6 | to | -4.7 |
| Ham Con180 | 106 ± 20 | 116 ± 19* | 9.50% | -0.51 | 16.6 | to | 69.1 | -36.4 | to | -8.8 | 115 ± 14 | 128 ± 21* | 11.20% | -0.72 | 12.8 | to | 72.3 | -35.9 | to | -7.5 |
| Ham Ecc120 | 133 ± 23 | 155 ± 32* | 16.80% | -0.78 | 27.9 | to | 116.2 | -15.8 | to | -3.8 | 156 ± 21 | 192 ± 25* | 23.30% | -1.55 | 18.5 | to | 104.3 | -33.4 | to | -7.0 |

Table Key: Half Back Squat 1-RM; HBS 1RM, Isometric MVC Peak force; IMVC PF, Isometric MVC Loading Rate; IMVC LR, Concentric quadriceps (60deg/sec); Quad Con60 Concentric quadriceps (180degs/sec); Quad Con180, Eccentric quadriceps (120degs/sec) Quad Ecc120, Concentric hamstrings (60deg/sec); Ham Con60, Concentric hamstrings (180degs/sec); Ham Con180, Eccentric hamstrings (120degs/sec); Ham Ecc120, squat jump (SJ) (cm), countermovement jump (CMJ) (cm), and fastest 10 m and 30 m sprint time (s), *denotes significant effect for time † denotes a significant interaction between group and time

Table 3: Muscle power properties: Squat Jump (cm), countermovement jump (cm), and fastest 10/30m sprint time (s) before and after the intervention period

| | S+E | | | | | | | | | E+S | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|--------|-------|----------------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|--------------|--------|-------|----------------------|----|-------|-------|----|-------|
| | Pre | Post | % Δ | ES | confidence intervals | | | | | | Pre | Post | % Δ | ES | confidence intervals | | | | | |
| | | | | | Upper limit | | Lower limit | | Upper limit | | | | | | Lower limit | | | | | |
| SJ (cm) | 38.9 ± 2.9 | 41.8 ± 2.4* | 4.40% | -1.08 | 2.35 | to | 9.77 | -7.51 | to | -1.8 | 38.0 ± 5.7 | 41.1 ± 5.2* | 8.10% | -0.56 | 1.39 | to | 7.87 | -5.79 | to | -1.21 |
| CMJ (cm) | 39.2 ± 4.7 | 39.2 ± 3.3 | -0.10% | 0 | 2.61 | to | 10.86 | -0.91 | to | -0.22 | 40.7 ± 1.9 | 41.4 ± 2.8 | -1.00% | -0.29 | 2.2 | to | 12.45 | -4.37 | to | -0.91 |
| Fastest 10m (s) | 1.72 ± 0.65 | 1.72 ± 0.76 | -0.10% | 0 | 0.03 | to | 0.14 | -0.14 | to | -0.03 | 1.80 ± 0.36 | 1.70 ± 0.42† | -5.90% | 0.25 | 0.01 | to | 0.07 | -0.35 | to | -0.07 |
| Fastest 30m (s) | 4.22 ± 0.23 | 4.21 ± 0.20.2 | -0.30% | 0.04 | 0.14 | to | 0.59 | -0.62 | to | -0.15 | 4.29 ± 0.73 | 4.19 ± 0.12 | -2.70% | 0.19 | 0.04 | to | 0.22 | -0.5 | to | -0.1 |

Table key; Squat jump (SJ) (cm), countermovement jump (CMJ) (cm), and fastest 10 m and 30 m sprint time (s), *denotes significant effect for time † denotes a significant interaction between group and time

Table 4: Mean (\pm SD) total muscle thickness (cm), angle of pennation ($^{\circ}$), fascicule length (cm) before, after 5 resistance-training sessions (mid) and 1 week following intervention training for S+E and E+S

| | S+E | | | | | | | | E+S | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------|-----------------|------------|-------|----------------------|----|-------------|-------|-----|-------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|-------------|----|-------|-------|----|-------|
| | Pre | Post | % Δ | ES | confidence intervals | | | | Pre | Post | % Δ | ES | confidence intervals | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Upper limit | | Lower limit | | | | | | Upper limit | | Lower limit | | | | | |
| MT-D | 4.72 \pm 0.16 | 4.77 \pm 0.15 | 0.88% | -0.32 | 0.12 | to | 0.65 | -0.51 | to | -0.11 | 4.67 \pm 0.45 | 5.08 \pm 0.73 | 8.80% | -0.67 | 0.74 | to | 3.07 | -1.74 | to | -0.42 |
| MT-M | 4.79 \pm 0.50 | 4.90 \pm 0.32 | 2.48% | -0.26 | 0.27 | to | 1.13 | -0.75 | to | -0.18 | 4.95 \pm 0.29 | 4.98 \pm 0.39 | 0.55% | -0.08 | 0.16 | to | 0.88 | -0.79 | to | -0.16 |
| MT-P | 3.97 \pm 0.39 | 4.01 \pm 0.27 | 0.88% | -0.65 | 0.15 | to | 0.63 | -0.52 | to | -0.13 | 4.00 \pm 0.45 | 4.07 \pm 0.66 | 1.89% | -0.12 | 0.21 | to | 1.21 | -0.96 | to | -0.2 |
| AoP-M | 14.60 \pm 1.72 | 15.7 \pm 1.3* | 7.92% | -0.72 | 2.27 | to | 8.82 | -0.81 | to | -0.17 | 14.18 \pm 1.42 | 16.21 \pm 0.80*† | 14.31% | -1.76 | 3.04 | to | 12.66 | -4.4 | to | -1.06 |
| FL-M | 10.34 \pm 1.13 | 9.65 \pm 1.21 | -6.73% | 0.56 | 0.67 | to | 2.79 | -5.03 | to | -1.21 | 11.42 \pm 0.89 | 10.41 \pm 1.6 | -8.79% | 1.57 | 0.92 | to | 5.21 | -8.53 | to | -1.78 |

Table key; Muscle thickness (Distal) (cm), Muscle thickness (Mid) (cm), Muscle thickness (Proximal) (cm), Angle of Pennation (Mid) ($^{\circ}$), Fascicule Length (Mid) (cm). *denotes significant effect for time † denotes a significant interaction between group and time.