

This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document, This is a non-final version of an article published in final form in Read, Paul and Hughes, Jonathan and Stewart, Perry and Chavda, Shyam and Bishop, Chris and Edwards, Mike and Turner, Anthony (2014) A Needs Analysis and Field Based Testing Battery for Basketball. Strength and Conditioning Journal, 36 (3). pp. and is licensed under Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 license:

Read, Paul, Hughes, Jonathan, Stewart, Perry, Chavda, Shyam, Bishop, Chris, Edwards, Mike and Turner, Anthony (2014) A Needs Analysis and Field Based Testing Battery for Basketball. Strength and Conditioning Journal, 36 (3). pp. 13-20. ISSN 1524-1602

Official URL: <http://journals.lww.com/nsca-scj/Pages/default.aspx>

EPrint URI: <http://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/3312>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document:

Read, Paul and Hughes, Jonathan and Stewart, Perry and Chavda, Shyam and Bishop, Chris and Edwards, Mike and Turner, Anthony (2014). *A Needs Analysis and Field Based Testing Battery for Basketball*. *Strength and Conditioning Journal*, 36 (3), 13-20. ISSN 1524-1602

Published in *Strength and Conditioning Journal*, and available online at:

<http://journals.lww.com/nsca-sci/Pages/default.aspx>

We recommend you cite the published (post-print) version.

The URL for the published version is <http://journals.lww.com/nsca-sci/Pages/default.aspx>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

Strength and Conditioning Journal
A Needs Analysis and Field Based Testing
Battery for Basketball
--Manuscript Draft--

1
2
3
4 **A Needs Analysis and Field Based Testing Battery for Basketball**
5

6
7 Paul J. Read, MSc, ASCC, CSCS 1; Jonathan. Hughes, PhD, ASCC 2; Perry. Stewart,
8
9 MSc, ASCC, CSCS 3; Shyam. Chavda, MSc, ASCC, CSCS 4; Chris. Bishop, MSc,
10
11 ASCC 4; Mike. Edwards, MSc, ASCC 4 and Anthony. N. Turner, MSc, ASCC, CSCS 4
12
13

- 14
15
16
- 17 1. School of Sport, Health & Applied Sciences, St Mary's University College, UK
 - 18 2. School of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Gloucestershire, Gloucester,
19
20 UK
 - 21 3. Sports Science Department, Queens Park Rangers Football Club, London, UK
 - 22 4. London Sports Institute, Middlesex University, UK
- 23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Address for Correspondence:

32
33 Mr Paul Read

34
35 St Mary's University College

36
37 Waldegrave Road

38
39 Strawberry Hill

40
41 Twickenham

42
43 London, UK

44
45 TW1 4SX

46
47 E-mail: paul.read@smuc.ac.uk

48
49 Telephone Number: +4420 8240 4255
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

Basketball is a high intensity sport requiring a range of athletic abilities; explosive strength and rate of force development, agility, co-ordination, speed, anaerobic lactate and alactic capacities. Within elite basketball strength and conditioning programmes, distinct variation in the assessment of such qualities is evident, highlighting the need for evidence based practice to determine acceptable validity and reliability of the measures used. Therefore, the purpose of this review was to determine the physiological requirements of the sport so that suitable testing approaches can be identified from which coaches can optimally assess the physical capabilities of their athletes.

Key Words: Basketball, Testing, Physical Performance

1
2
3
4 **Introduction**
5

6
7 Basketball involves repeated bouts of intense action such as, sprinting, abrupt stops, fast
8 changes in direction, acceleration, shuffling and jumping separated by short bouts of low
9 intensity activity in the forms of walking, jogging and recovery (Abdelkrim et al., 2007).
10
11 For high levels of performance in the above tasks it has been suggested that players must
12 possess the following motor and functional abilities; explosive strength and rate of force
13 development (RFD) in the legs, strength of the arms and shoulder girdle, agility with and
14 without the ball, co-ordination, speed, anaerobic lactate and alactic capacities (Stone,
15 2007). This is supported by Erculj et al. (2003) identifying that explosive strength, RFD,
16 speed and agility contributed significantly ($p < 0.05$) to efficient movement with and
17 without the ball. Thus, it can be determined that physical qualities play an important role
18 in the requisite performance of basketball techniques.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Successful basketball performance is also influenced heavily by anthropometrics (e.g.
34 limb length, stature and mass), with elite players being greater in stature (Hoare, 2000).
35
36 However, evidence suggests that taller players are inferior in their general motor abilities
37 (Kapowicz, 2006), including; acceleration and acyclic speed both with and without the
38 ball (Erculji et al., 2003). As such, the development of athletic qualities for basketball
39 athletes is paramount to performance and should be considered a fundamental component
40 of a holistic training program.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54
55 Distinct variation is evident in the physical and physiological assessment methods of a
56 range of fitness components (strength, speed, power, endurance, agility, flexibility and
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 body composition) in elite basketball. This was highlighted by Simenz et al. (2005) in
5
6
7 their analysis of the practices undertaken by strength & conditioning (S&C) coaches
8
9 within the national basketball association (NBA). Such variety prevents the establishment
10
11 of normative data from which practioners can compare basketball athletes to national
12
13 standards. Additionally, the validity and reliability of the selected assessment methods
14
15 may be affected. The purpose of this review was to analyze the physiological
16
17 requirements and injury considerations of the sport in order to identify suitable testing
18
19 approaches from which coaches can optimally assess the physical capabilities of their
20
21 athletes.
22
23
24

25 26 27 28 **Time Motion Analysis**

29 Time motion analysis is a key tool for determining fundamental movements of play and
30
31 the frequency in which they occur. In match play, nine specific movements have been
32
33 identified, including; standing, walking, jogging, running, striding, sprinting, jumping,
34
35 turning and side movements (Abdelkrim et al., 2007), with thirty four percent of the
36
37 game in active movements, such as, running and jumping (Nazaraki et al., 2008). To
38
39 allow the reader to fully understand the physiological demands of the sport, in this
40
41 review, high intensity activities will be defined in accordance with the work of
42
43 Abdelkrim et al. (2007) to include; sprinting, abrupt stops, fast changes in direction,
44
45 acceleration, shuffling and jumping.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54
55 Highlighting the multi-directional nature of the sport, reported changes between
56
57 movement patterns occur every two seconds (McInnes et al., 1995). This would imply
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 that frequent changes of direction, and subsequently speed and agility are of major
5
6 importance in match play. Further, it was evidenced that 22% of the game distances
7
8 covered involved lateral movement. This is an important consideration for strength &
9
10 conditioning specialists due to the fact that lateral movements have been reported to be
11
12 more metabolically demanding in comparison to straight line running (Ziv and Lidor,
13
14 2009). Therefore, the development of strength, optimal mechanics and conditioning in
15
16 multiple planes of movement (frontal, saggital and transverse) should be considered
17
18 essential.
19
20
21

22
23
24
25
26 Initial research pertaining to game analysis has identified differential demands based on
27
28 position, namely; guards, forwards and centres. Positions are then further defined by
29
30 specific roles; centres, point guard, shooting guard, small forward and power forward.
31
32 Centres are involved in less high intensity movements than both forwards and guards
33
34 respectively (Grosgeorge, 1990), with forwards completing greater volumes of running
35
36 (Miller and Bartlett, 1994). More recently, the frequency of high intensity movements
37
38 during a game has also been analyzed, with Abdelkrim et al. (2007) reporting higher
39
40 occurrences in guards and forwards compared with centres (17.1%, 16.6% vs 14.7%)
41
42 respectively. It is also important to note, that this research has been carried out since the
43
44 rule change in May 2000. These modifications have resulted in shorter attack times from
45
46 30 to 24 seconds, a reduction in the time spent on the backcourt and 4 ten minute quarters
47
48 as opposed to two 20 minute half's. This adjustment also precipitated an alteration in the
49
50 game demands leading to the increased time spent in high intensity activities (Abdelkrim
51
52 et al., 2007). As such, caution is required when referring to evidence in the literature as it
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 may not be truly reflective of current game demands, including the work of Miller and
5
6
7 Bartlett (1994) where high intensity movements were performed every 21 seconds and
8
9 only 5% of sprints lasted more than 4 seconds. Although the above data could be deemed
10
11 useful in designing assessment and conditioning strategies based on positional differences
12
13 with an optimization of work to rest ratios, it may not be truly reflective of current game
14
15 demands. Therefore, the work of Abdelkrim et al. (2007) may provide a more accurate
16
17 representation. However, practioners should also be cognizant of the fact that the subjects
18
19 used in the work of Abdelkrim et al. were elite U19 players, and as such, these results
20
21 may not be applicable to players of all ages and levels.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 To date, limited evidence is available regarding distances covered during a game.
30
31 Abdelkrim (2010) reported that a total of 7,558 metres provided a baseline figure during
32
33 junior basketball matches, with only 2% of match play involving high intensity activities.
34
35 Although this data may be valid for junior players, its relevance to adult and elite
36
37 populations is speculative. Further to this, it should be noted that it is not the total
38
39 distance covered that dictates basketball performance (Abdelkrim, 2010). Therefore, it
40
41 has been suggested that determining the amount of high intensity activity may be a more
42
43 prudent strategy to differentiate between levels of performance (Abdelkrim, 2010).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Physical requirements of the Game**

52
53 For successful performance, players are required to possess a number of physical
54
55 attributes, including; muscular power (Hunter, Hilyer and Foster, 1993), aerobic power
56
57 (Hunter et al., 1993), speed and agility (Hoffman et al., 1991). The relationship between
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 athletic ability and playing time has been measured previously (Hoffman et al., 1996),
5
6
7 with players demonstrating the greatest athletic ability (based on the fitness tests)
8
9 accumulating greater playing times. As such, determining the level of appropriate
10
11 physical qualities is of fundamental importance for strength & conditioning coaches for
12
13 talent identification and monitoring the effects of their programming.
14
15
16
17
18

19 *Energy System Requirements*

20
21 It has been suggested that a large proportion of the energy required for the high intensity
22
23 bursts within a game is derived from the Adenosine Tri-Phosphate (ATP) and Creatine
24
25 Phosphate (CP) systems (Baslom et al., 1992). Abdelkrim et al. (2010) identified, 6
26
27 seconds of high to moderate intensities followed by 22 seconds of sub maximal work
28
29 (walking, jogging and recovery) equating to a mean work to rest ratio of 1:3.6. This
30
31 suggests an insufficient time period in which to replenish creatine phosphate stores, and a
32
33 subsequent reliance on anaerobic glycolysis (Baslom et al., 1992). Additionally,
34
35 Ratamass et al. (2008) identified that the metabolic demands of basketball required a high
36
37 proportion of the phosphagen system, a moderate to high requirement for anaerobic
38
39 glycolysis, and the contribution of aerobic metabolism as a less significant factor.
40
41 Collectively these findings demonstrate the need for the inclusion of appropriate testing
42
43 and training protocols for both the anaerobic alactic (underpinned by the ATP-PC
44
45 systems) and anaerobic glycolytic systems (Castagna et al., 2008), i.e. maximal sprint
46
47 tests and repeated sprint protocols.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 *Aerobic vs. Anaerobic*

59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Speculation as to whether Basketball should be classified as an aerobic or anaerobic sport
5
6
7 is present within the available literature. A reliance on the ATP-PC and glycolytic
8
9 systems has been suggested (Hoffman et al., 1991), with the aerobic system identified as
10
11 a secondary energy source. This is highlighted in the fact that mean VO_{2max} values are
12
13 lower than that of other more endurance based activities (Caterisano et al., 1997).
14
15 Further support can be derived from Hoffman et al. (1996) who suggested that basketball
16
17 appears to be more dependent upon anaerobic power, rather than aerobic power and
18
19 capacity. Over a four year period assessing the relationships between athletic
20
21 performances and playing time, a significant negative correlation was reported with
22
23 aerobic capacity. Of particular note, when aerobic fitness was greater than or equal to the
24
25 population average, no further benefit was derived when aerobic fitness was greater than
26
27 or equal to the population average, no further benefit was derived. This suggests that
28
29 once an aerobic base has been established sport specific practices and games may be
30
31 sufficient to maintain aerobic fitness. This is especially important for strength and
32
33 conditioning coaches to consider, as it has been reported that continuous aerobic training
34
35 in anaerobic sports leads to mal-adaptations and performance decrements, for example
36
37 reductions in strength, power (Elliot et al., 2007) and rate of force development (Behm
38
39 and Sale, 1993).
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47
48
49
50 The intensity demands are also reflected by the fact that lactate production is evident in
51
52 basketball. McInnes et al. (1995) reported elevated blood lactate levels throughout a
53
54 basketball game, with a high variability among players. This is supported by Abdelkrim
55
56 et al. (2007) who reported that mean (SD) plasma lactate concentrations [La] were
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 significantly higher for guards ($p < 0.05$) than for centres (6.36 (1.24) v 4.92 (1.18)
5
6 mmol/l, respectively. It was suggested that the elevated lactate levels demonstrate a
7 glycolytic pathway making an important contribution to energy production during a
8 game. As well as the reported lactate production, heart rate has also been analysed
9 during competition (Abdelkrim et al., 2010), where it was shown that heart rate was
10 above 95% for 19% and above 85% for 74% of game play.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18
19
20
21 Contrary to the above evidence, aerobic endurance has been reported to affect basketball
22 performance (Abdelkrim et al., 2007). Specifically, distance covered in a maximal
23 shuttle-running test was related to basketball game variables, namely the ability to sustain
24 high-intensity efforts (Abdelkrim et al., 2007; Castagna et al., 2008). Of note, Castagna et
25 al. (2008) assessed aerobic performance using the Yo-Yo IR1 detecting significant
26 differences across the competitive level ages, demonstrating the construct validity of the
27 Yo-Yo IR1 within basketball. This is in contradiction to the work of Hoffman (1996) as
28 stated above, however, a growing body of research has highlighted the importance of
29 aerobic performance. For example, Abdelkrim et al. (2010) determined that aerobic
30 performance (in the form of a 20 metre repeated shuttle test) was associated with high
31 intensity performance during a basketball game. In spite of this, it should be considered
32 that this test, due to the non-continuous nature, deceleration, changes of direction and
33 acceleration components is not a true test of aerobic performance, rather a test of repeated
34 incremental shuttles demonstrating both aerobic and anaerobic requirements.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Accordingly, it should be considered based on the literature outlined above, that
5
6
7 successful basketball performance is underpinned by maximal anaerobic parameters (i.e.
8
9 maximal sprints and jumps), the ability to repeat high intensity movements under
10
11 conditions of fatigue (namely repeated sprint ability), and periods of low level activity
12
13 involving recovery via aerobic metabolism. Based on this, strength and conditioning
14
15 coaches may wish to consider a primary emphasis of testing and training protocols for
16
17
18
19 both maximal acceleration and repeated sprint abilities with aerobic abilities as a
20
21 secondary measure.

22 23 24 25 26 *Strength and Power*

27
28
29 Strength is a key component within elite basketball, highlighted by Delextrat and Cohen
30
31 (2008) in their assessment of knee extensor strength using an isokinetic dynamometer,
32
33 noting that first team players developed significantly greater peak torques than second
34
35 team players. Therefore, elite players may be stronger than lesser skilled players.
36
37 However, it should be considered that the assessment used in their work requires
38
39 expensive equipment and may not reflect closed chain movement patterns inherent to
40
41 basketball, such as jumping and sprinting. Of note, 1 repetition maximum (1RM) squat
42
43 strength has demonstrated strong correlations ($r = 0.94$) with increases in vertical jump
44
45 height and improved acceleration abilities in elite level soccer players (Wisloff et al.,
46
47 2004). Therefore, it could be argued that the 1RM squat test is a valid measure of strength
48
49 in the assessment of elite basketball performance. This becomes more apparent with
50
51 Hoffman (1991) reporting that squat strength should be considered as a staple
52
53 performance variable throughout a competitive season and is also a good predictor of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 playing time. Additionally, 1RM squat strength has been shown to be the best single
5
6 predictor of 5 and 10m sprint times in elite basketball players (Chaouachi et al., 2009),
7
8 with the ability to squat 1.5 times bodyweight a suggested strength pre-requisite for elite
9
10 level males (Hoffman et al., 1996).
11
12

13
14
15
16 The ability to generate maximal force in the shortest period of time has been considered
17
18 essential in achieving high levels of basketball performance (Brittenham, 1996), with
19
20 elite players characterised by a significantly higher percentage of fast twitch fibers than
21
22 less skilled competitors (Sergej, Ostojic and Nenad, 2006; Bolonchuk et al., 1991). In
23
24 support of this, Latin et al. (1994) measured the physical abilities of elite collegiate
25
26 players, identifying that high levels of strength and anaerobic parameters enable more
27
28 powerful rebounds, in addition to enhanced shooting, shuffling and jumping
29
30 performances. With vertical jump scores ranging from 60cm (Vitasalo et al., 1992) to
31
32 mean values of more than 70cm (Hoffman et al., 1996), it is suggested that elite players
33
34 achieve significantly greater vertical jump heights. Confirming this, Hoare. (2000)
35
36 reported significant differences in jump height between the 8 best shooting guards and
37
38 the other shooting guards involved in a national championship. In addition, the ability to
39
40 repeat this explosive action across the course of a game is also of great importance, with
41
42 reports of 44-46 jumps during a game (Abdelkrim et al., 2007; McInnes, 1995).
43
44 Consequently, jumping is a key determinant to basketball performance and should form
45
46 part of athlete assessment strategies.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Upper body strength in the form of 1RM bench press has also been assessed with first
5
6
7 team players displaying greater strength scores, compared with those of the second team
8
9 (Delextrat and Cohen, 2008). This has been confirmed by Caterisano et al. (1997) who
10
11 reported a difference of 6.3% between the 'best' and the 'rest' of players with collegiate
12
13 level athletes. These findings suggest that an appropriate level of upper body strength is
14
15 necessary for optimal basketball performance. However, the primary emphasis should
16
17
18 remain with multi-joint lifts such as squats, deadlifts and Olympic lifting variations, as
19
20 confirmed by Hoffman et al. (1996) where 1RM bench press scores were not a good
21
22
23 indicator of playing time.
24
25
26
27
28

29 *Agility*

30
31 Agility has been suggested as a key physical component in a number of team sports,
32
33 including basketball (Delextrat and Cohen, 2009). Due to frequent changes of direction
34
35 and reactive nature of the sport (McInnes, 1995), agility has been established as a
36
37 physiological pre-requisite for successful performance (Hoffman et al., 2000).
38
39
40 Traditionally defined as the ability to change direction rapidly, without losing balance,
41
42 using a combination of strength, power and neuromuscular co-ordination (Little and
43
44 Williams, 2005). Such qualities are clearly evident within game play however; this may
45
46 be more accurately described as change of direction speed (Young et al., 2002). More
47
48 recently, Shephard and Young. (2006) have identified that agility is affected by the
49
50 athlete's perception and decision making skills. This is highlighted by the fact that more
51
52 skilled athletes are better able to respond to kinematic and postural cues (Abernethy et al.,
53
54
55
56
57
58 1998).
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 When considering appropriate change of direction speed or agility tests for basketball it
8 should be considered that players are not only required to sprint in linear planes of
9 motion. Backwards gait and side shuffling movements are common, subsequently
10 suggesting the relevance of the T-Test. This is supported by Delextrat and Cohen. (2008)
11 where first team players achieved significantly lower times compared to the second team,
12 further confirmed by Gillam (1985), with significant differences between basketball
13 athletes and physical education majors. Whilst, the T-Test has gained support within the
14 literature, other change of direction speed tests including the pro-agility test or 5-0-5 may
15 also be appropriate due to the frequent changes of direction (McInnes, 1995) and inherent
16 game demands where sprints will often begin whilst players are in motion (Abdelkrim,
17 2007), further justifying the use of the 5-0-5 test. Also speculatively, performing lateral
18 motions in closed environments under timed conditions (as in the T-Test) is not reflective
19 of the perceptual components and will likely effect movement mechanics, thus reducing
20 the content validity of the test. An alternative option may be to perform a qualitative
21 assessment of lateral abilities and changes of direction in response to a variety of stimuli.
22 Lastly it should also be noted at this point that none of the tests suggested above are true
23 tests of agility, however, at this time efficient, cost effective and reliable measures are
24 limited (Turner, 2012).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 *Speed*

54 When analysing speed, the majority of the literature has reported data pertaining to
55 distances of 20-27 metres, close to length of the basketball court (Hoffman et al., 2000).
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 It should be considered that players rarely cover these distances in the same high intensity
5
6 effort with average distances of 10m recorded or between 1.7 and 2.1 seconds in duration
7
8 (Abdelkrim et al., 2007; McInnes, 1995). Therefore, the use of shorter distance tests (5
9
10 and 10m) to assess linear speed may be a more prudent strategy, with the measurement of
11
12 maximal running speed considered inappropriate. With the requirement for quick
13
14 accelerations and decelerations this further advocates the importance of strength, due to
15
16 the ability and effort required to overcome the body's inertia (McInnes et al., 1995). It
17
18 was also noted by Abdelkrim et al. (2007) that the percentage of high intensity
19
20 movements was reduced in each quarter. As such, the ability to repeat sprints under
21
22 conditions of fatigue (i.e. the 12x20m repeated sprint test) may be deemed appropriate.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 An assessment and training method that is commonly used within basketball is the
32
33 suicide run. Hoare (2000) reported significant differences in suicide run time in the
34
35 'best' versus the 'rest' in their assessment of Australian male and female basketball
36
37 players. However, the use of suicide runs has been questioned (Delextrat and Cohen,
38
39 2008), due to their non-specific nature in terms of game demands. Anaerobic capacity, a
40
41 key component of successful basketball performance, defined as the maximal rate of
42
43 energy production by the combined phosphagen and lactic acid energy systems, has been
44
45 suggested as the primary component for exercises lasting 30-90 seconds (Maud and
46
47 Fosters, 2006). Whilst it has been proposed that this test may reflect the anaerobic
48
49 capacity component of competition (Maud and Foster, 2006), with a duration of
50
51 approximately 30 seconds, validity concerns within the literature are present. This was
52
53 highlighted by Delextrat and Cohen. (2008) who reported no significant differences
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 between first and second team players in suicide run performance. This likely due to the
5
6 shorter, higher frequency game actions as has been reported previously (Abdelkrim,
7
8 2007).
9

10 11 12 13 14 *Aerobic Capacity*

15
16 As mentioned above aerobic performance has been shown to affect the game of
17
18 basketball due to the ability to repeat high intensity efforts (Castagna et al., 2005;
19
20 Abdelkrim et al., 2007). According to Castagna et al. (2005), the YYIR1 was able to
21
22 detect significant differences across competitive levels, suggesting that basketball
23
24 requires well developed aerobic and anaerobic capabilities, as has been confirmed
25
26 elsewhere (Abdelkrim et al., 2007; Miller, 1994; Abdelkrim et al., 2010). Whilst this
27
28 evidence should be considered, further research may be necessary to support these
29
30 findings as it opposes the majority of previous research discussed above.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 39 *Landing Mechanics / Utilization of the Stretch Shortening Cycle (SSC)*

40
41 It has been evidenced that maximal power production in jumping tasks is related to lower
42
43 limb stiffness (Arampatzis et al., 2001). Further that athletes from power based sports
44
45 demonstrating higher leg stiffness than endurance-trained athletes during a one-legged
46
47 vertical jump (Laffaye et al., 2005). Stiffness is an important parameter to the power
48
49 athlete as they will maximise the storage and release of elastic energy in the
50
51 musculotendinous unit to improve muscle power and jump height (Bobbert, 2001).
52
53 During a counter-movement jump, a stiffer musculotendinous system might benefit the
54
55 performance via a faster elastic recoil during the upward, concentric, phase of the jump
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 (Arampatzis et al., 2001), as well as a more efficient transfer of force to the skeleton
5
6
7 (Wilson et al., 2003). Rabita et al. (2008) speculated that in trained athletes with a skilled
8
9 motor programme, the neuromuscular system adopts strategies to find the optimal
10
11 balance between these conflicting requirements.
12
13

14
15
16 In-effective absorption of impact forces has been noted within basketball (Erculj, Mateja
17
18 and Bracic, 2010). In particular, it was highlighted that females demonstrated inadequate
19
20 abilities to with-stand eccentric forces upon landing. This is an important consideration
21
22 for strength and conditioning coaches due to increases in injury risk, in addition to an in-
23
24 ability to effectively utilize elastic energy accumulated in the eccentric phase of the jump
25
26 (Bobbert et al., 1996). It has been suggested that the longer ground contact times
27
28 displayed within basketball athletes may be due to player specific body constitution,
29
30 differences in jumping technique, poorly developed explosive strength and elasticity of
31
32 the leg extensor muscles due to insufficient rigidity and poor landing mechanics (Ecrulj
33
34 et al., 2004). Subsequently, an assessment of the athlete's limb stiffness and reactive
35
36 strength index (RSI) is recommended as a measure of their effectiveness in switching
37
38 from an eccentric to a concentric contraction. In addition, a qualitative assessment of
39
40 landing mechanics, such as the Landing Error Scoring System (L.E.S.S), established by
41
42 Padua et al. (2009) will provide coaches with useful information that may aid in injury
43
44 prevention.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 *Uni-Lateral Assessment / Asymmetry*
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Another consideration in the assessment of basketball players is preferred limb
5
6 dominance and muscle balance. Theoharopoulos and Tsitskaris (2000) noted a difference
7
8 in the ankle plantar-flexor strength in favour of the preferred take off limb in professional
9
10 basketball players with observed differences of 10%. Some element of limb asymmetry
11
12 is to be anticipated, however, these findings may validate the use of a single leg
13
14 countermovement jump (CMJ) to determine power ratios and imbalances between limbs.
15
16
17 Of note; Bracic et al. (2010) identified that elite sprinters who demonstrated lower bi-
18
19 lateral deficits in CMJ, produced higher peak forces ($r = 0.63$). This is an important
20
21 consideration, as in addition to performance decrements, it has been reported that a
22
23 discrepancy $>15\%$ is an important injury predictor (Crossier and Creland, 2002).
24
25
26 Subsequently the inclusion of a uni-lateral measure of performance, such as a single leg
27
28 CMJ is recommended.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 ***Fitness Tests***

37
38 As highlighted above, strength, power, agility and speed are important characteristics for
39
40 elite basketball players (Hoffman et al., 1991; Latin et al., 1994). Based on the evidence
41
42 outlined in this article, the following testing battery is proposed to assist strength and
43
44 conditioning coaches in the determination of the physical abilities of basketball players
45
46 (see table 1). It is suggested that the order of testing provided is the most appropriate (i.e.
47
48 least to most fatiguing), and will ensure optimal efficiency. Further, the specified
49
50 sequencing is in agreement with NSCA recommendations (Harman, 2008).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 *****Table 1 near here*****
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Injuries in basketball

Previous work has reported that male high school basketball players sustained injuries at a rate of 16.9 per 1000 hours of game exposure (Messina et al., 1999). By way of comparison, the National Basketball Association noted an overall game injury rate of 19.3 per 1000 athlete exposures (Deitch et al., 2006). This data suggests that injuries are prevalent within competition, in particular, the joints most at risk are the knee (19.1%), ankle (16.9%), lumbosacral spine (9%) and the foot, accounting for 7.9% (Deitch et al., 2006). Additionally, 37% of all injuries occurred in the upper extremity with finger and shoulder the most frequent sites (Kostopoulos and Dimitrios, 2010).

Conversely, Randall et al. (2007) reported that the highest proportion of injuries were ankle ligament sprains (26.2%), with knee internal derangements as secondary (7.4%), over a 16 year period in male collegiate basketball players. Consequently, an important consideration for the S&C coach is to provide a detailed assessment of static and dynamic unilateral stability due to reported inhibition of the gluteus maximus and gluteus medius (key hip extensors and hip abductors respectively) following the occurrence of an ankle injury (Bullock Saxton et al., 1994; Friel et al., 2006). Such neuromuscular deficiencies may result in greater frontal plane loads at the knee, coinciding with higher hip adduction moments due to reduced muscle activation during landing tasks (Hewett et al., 2005). This bears relevance as ACL injuries likely occur when active muscular restraints are unable to compensate and adequately reduce joint torques during dynamic movements, such as landing, decelerating and pivoting (Beynon and Flemming, 1998). Consequently, reduced neuromuscular control directs excessive stress to the passive

1
2
3
4 ligamentous structures which may exceed their strength limit, resulting in mechanical
5
6 failure (Li et al., 1999).
7
8
9

10
11 The primary injury mechanisms within a game have been classified as player contact,
12
13 other contact (e.g. balls or the ground) and no contact, with the highest proportion of
14
15 injuries being as a result of player contact (Randall et al., 2007). In the same study the
16
17 authors determined that a majority of the injuries were soft tissue in nature, to the lower
18
19 limb and back, attributed to the fact that basketball is characterized by rapid changes of
20
21 direction, non linear movements and high eccentric forces (in the forms of landing from a
22
23 jump, cutting manoeuvres and sudden decelerations). A point of caution is highlighted
24
25 by Beiser et al. (2001) in their analysis of planned vs. unplanned cutting movements. In
26
27 the subjects tested, unplanned cutting tasks allowed insufficient time to make the
28
29 necessary postural adjustments, resulting in compromised leg placements and
30
31 significantly greater loads on the knee joint. The authors summarised that learning to
32
33 respond to stimuli more quickly in change of direction tasks may enhance performance
34
35 and also reduce injury risk. This suggests that the development of sufficient strength and
36
37 neuromuscular control is essential in order to tolerate the increased forces displayed in
38
39 open environments. In addition, it is recommended that players develop optimal on court
40
41 movement mechanics using primarily closed drills, and when technique is appropriate,
42
43 progress to more open situations with a reactive component. It is beyond the scope of this
44
45 article to discuss further details of approaches to develop change of direction speed and
46
47 agility, however, the reader is directed to the work of Turner et al. (2011) and for
48
49 specifics to youth populations, Lloyd et al. (2013) for more detailed explanations.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Summary**
5
6
7

8 This article has provided an analysis of the demands of basketball with regards to the key
9 physical, physiological and biomechanical components. Further, based on the evidence
10 provided, a subsequent testing battery has been proposed by which strength and
11 conditioning professionals can effectively assess and monitor the abilities of their athletes
12 to assist in the development of optimal training provision with the aims of reducing
13 injuries and optimising performance.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **References**
26
27

- 28 1. Abdelkrim, B, El Fazaa, S & El Ati J. Time motion analysis and physiological
29 data of elite under 19 basketball players during competition. Br J Sports Med 41:
30 69-75, 2007
31
32
- 33 2. Abdelkrim B, Castagna C, Jabri, I, Battikh T, El Fazaa S and El Ati J. Activity
34 Profile and Physiological Requirements of Junior Elite Basketball Players in
35 relation to aerobic and anaerobic fitness. J Strength and Cond Research 2(9):
36 230-232, 2010
37
38
39
- 40 3. Arampatzis, A., Schade, F., Walsh, M. and Bruggemann, G. P. Influence of leg
41 stiffness and its effect on myodynamic jumping performance. J. Electromyogr.
42 Kinesiol. 11, 355-364, 2001
43
44
- 45 4. Baslom PD, Seger JY, Sjodin B and Ekblom B. Physiological responses to
46 maximal intensity exercise. Eur J Applied Phys 65: 144-19, 1992
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 5. Baslom PD, Seger JY, Sjodin B and Ekblom B. Physiological responses to
5
6 maximal intensity exercise. Effect of recovery duration. *Int J Sports Med* 13:
7
8 528-533, 1992
9
- 10
11 6. Besier TF, Lloyd DG, Cochrane JL and Ackland TR. External loading of the knee
12
13 joint during running and cutting manoeuvres. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 33: 1168-
14
15 1175, 2001.
16
- 17
18 7. Beynon B, Howe JG, Pope MH, Johnsn RJ, Flemming BC. The measurement
19
20 of ACL strain in-vitro. *Int Orth*, 16(1), 1992: 1-12
21
- 22
23 8. Bobbert MF, Gerritsen KGM, Litjens MCA, and Van Soest AJ. Why is
24
25 countermovement jump height greater than squat jump height? *Med Sci Sports*
26
27 *Exerc* 28: 1402–1412, 1996.
28
- 29
30 9. Bobbert, M. F. Dependence of human squat jump performance on the series
31
32 elastic compliance of the triceps surae: a simulation study. *J. Exp. Biol.* 204, 533-
33
34 542, 2001
35
36
- 37
38 10. Bolunchuk WW, Lukaski HC and Siders WA. The structural, functional and
39
40 nutritional adaptations of college basketball players over a season. *J Sports Med.*
41
42 *Phys Fitness* 31:165-172, 1991
43
- 44
45 11. Brittenham, G. Complete conditioning for basketball. Champaign Ill. Human
46
47 Kinetics, 1996
48
- 49
50 12. Castagna C, D'Ottavio S, Manzi V, Annino G, Colli R, Belardinelli R and
51
52 Lacalaproce F. HR and V02 responses during basketball drills. In Book of
53
54 abstract of the 10th annual congress of the European college of sport sci. Dikic N,
55
56
57
58 Zinanic S, Astojic S and Tornjanski Z, eds. Belgrade, Serbia, 2005. pp 160
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 13. Castagna C, Manzi V, D'Ottavio S, Annino G, Padua E and Bishop D. Relation
5
6 between maximal aerobic power and the ability to repeat sprints in young
7
8 basketball players. *J Strength Cond Research*. 21(4): 1172-1176, 2007
9
10
11 14. Castagna, C, Abt G, Manzi V, Padua E and D'Ottavio S. Effects of recovery
12 mode on repeated sprint ability in young basketball players. *J Strength and Cond*
13
14 *Research* 22(3): 923-929, 2008
15
16
17 15. Castagna, C, Impellizzeri, FM, Rampinini, E, D'Ottavio, S, and Manzi, V. The
18
19 Yo-Yo intermittent recovery test in basketball players. *J Sci Med Sport* 11: 202–
20
21 208, 2008.
22
23
24 16. Caterisano A, Patrick BT, Edenfield WL and Batson MJ. The effects of a
25
26 basketball season on aerobic strength parameters among college med, starters vs
27
28 reserves. *J Strength and Cond Research* 11: 21-24, 1997
29
30
31 17. Chaouachi A, Bruhelli M, Chamari K, Levin G, Ben-Abdelkrim N, Laurencelle L
32
33 and Castagna C. Lower Limb maximal dynamic strength and agility determinants
34
35 in elite basketball players. *J Strength Cond Research* 23: 1570-1577, 2009
36
37
38 18. Cormery B, Marcil M & Bouvard M. Rule change incidence of physiological
39
40 characteristics of elite basketball players. A 10 year investigation. *Br J Sports*
41
42 *Med*. 42: 25-30, 2008
43
44
45 19. Costil DL, Daniels J, Evans W, Fink W, Krahenbuhl G & Saltin B. Skeletal
46
47 muscle enzymes and fiber composition of male and female athletes. *J Applied*
48
49 *Physiol* 40: 149- 154, 1978
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 20. Deitch JR, Starkey C, Walters SL and Mosley BJ. Injury risk in professional
5
6 basketball players: a comparison of women's national basketball association and
7
8 national basketball association athletes. *Am J Sports Med.* 34: 1077-1083, 2006
9
10
11 21. Delextrat A and Cohen D. Physiological testing of basketball players. Toward a
12
13 standard evaluation of anaerobic fitness. *J Strength and Cond Research* 22: 1066-
14
15 1072, 2008
16
17
18 22. Drouin JM, Valovich,-McLeod TC, Schultz SJ, Ganseneder BM, and Perrin DH.
19
20 Reliability and Validity of Biodex system pro isokinetic dynameter velocity,
21
22 torque and position measurements. *Eur J Applied Phys* 91: 22-29, 2004
23
24
25 23. Erculj F, Dezman Band Vuckovic G. Differences between playing positions in
26
27 motor abilities of young female basketball players. *Journal of strength &*
28
29 *conditioning research*, 24(11): 2970–2978, 2003
30
31
32 24. Erculj F, Dezman B and Vuckovic G. Differences between three basic types of
33
34 young basketball players in terms of height and contact time in various jumps.
35
36 *Kinesiol Sloven* 10: 5-15, 2004
37
38
39
40 25. Erculj F, Mateja B and Bracic M. Physical demands on young elite European
41
42 female basketball players with special reference to speed, agility, explosive
43
44 strength and take off power. *J Strength and Cond Research* 24: 2970 – 2978,
45
46 2010
47
48
49
50 26. Gillam GM. Basketball Energetic. A Physiological Basis. *Nat Strength and*
51
52 *Conditioning Association Journal* 6: 44-7, 1985
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 27. Harris GR, Stone MH, O'Bryant HS, Proulx CM and Johnson RI. Short term
5
6 effects of high speed, high force or combined weight training. J Strength and
7
8 Cond Research 14: 14-20, 2000
9
- 10
11 28. Hewett, TE, Ford, KR, Myer, GD et al. Effect of puberty and gender on landing
12
13 force and jump height. Med Sci Sport and Exercise, 37. 2005: S66
14
- 15
16 29. Hoare DG. Predicting Success in junior elite basketball players. The contribution
17
18 of anthropometric and physiological attributes. J Sc Med Sport : 391-405, 2000
19
- 20
21 30. Hoffman J, Fry AC, Howard R, Maresh CM & Kraemer WJ. Strength, Speed and
22
23 Endurance changes during the course of a division 1 basketball season. J Strength
24
25 and Conditioning Research 5: 144-149, 1991
26
- 27
28 31. Hoffman J, Tennenbaum CM, Maresh CM and Kraemer WJ. Relationship
29
30 between athletic performance tests and playing time in elite college basketball
31
32 players. J strength and Cond research 10: 67-71, 1996
33
- 34
35 32. Hoffman JR, Epstein S, Einbinder MAND Weinstein Y. The influence of aerobic
36
37 capacity on anaerobic performance and recovery indices in basketball players. J
38
39 Strength Cond Research 13: 407-413, 1999
40
- 41
42 33. Hoffman JR and Maresh CM. Physiology of basketball. In Exercise and Sport
43
44 Sci. Garrett WE and Kirkendall DT eds. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and
45
46 Wilkins, 2000. pp 733-744
47
- 48
49 34. Hoffman JR, Epstein S, Einbinder M and Weinstein Y. A comparison between the
50
51 Wingate anaerobic power test to both vertical jump and line drill tests in
52
53 basketball players. J Strength Cond Research 14: 261-264, 2000
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 35. Hunter GR, Hilyer J and Foster MA. Changes in Fitness during 4 years of
5
6 intercollegiate basketball. J Strength and Conditioning Research 7: 26-29, 1993
7
8
9 36. Kapowicz, K. Interrelation of selected factors determining the effectiveness of
10
11 training in young basketball players. Hum Mov 7: 130-146, 2006
12
13
14 37. Kostopoulos Nand Dimitrios P. Injuries in basketball. Biology of Exercise 6: 47-
15
16 55, 2010
17
18
19 38. Laffaye, G., Bardy, B.G., Durey, A. Leg stiffness and expertise in men jumping.
20
21 Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise 37, 536-543, 2005
22
23
24 39. Latin RW, Berk K and Baechle T. Physical and Performance Characteristics of
25
26 NCAA division 1 male basketball players. J Strength and Cond research 8: 214-
27
28 218, 1994
29
30
31 40. Li G, Rudy TW, Sakane M, Kanamori A, Ma CB, and Woo SL. The importance
32
33 of quadriceps and hamstring muscle loading on knee kinematics and in-situ forces
34
35 in the ACL. J Biomech 32: 395–400, 1999
36
37
38 41. Little T and Williams AG. Specificity of acceleration, max speed and agility in
39
40 professional soccer players. J Strength and Cond Research 19:76-78, 2005
41
42
43 42. Lloyd, RS, Read, P, Oliver, JL, Meyers, RW, Nimphius, S, Jeffreys, I.
44
45 Considerations for the Development of Agility During Childhood and
46
47 Adolescence. Strength and Conditioning Journal, 35(3): 2-11
48
49
50 43. MacDougal JD and Wenger HA. The purpose of physiological testing. In
51
52 Physiological testing of elite athlete JD MacDougal, HA Wengner and HJ Green,
53
54 eds. Ithaca NY: Mouvement, 1982. Pp.1-2
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 44. Maud PJ and Foster C. Physiology Assessment of Human Fitness (2nd ed).
5
6 Champaign IL: Human Kinetics, 2006
7
8
9 45. McInnes SE, Carlson JS, Jones CE. The physiological load imposed on basketball
10 players during competition. J Sports Sci 1: 387-397, 1985
11
12
13 46. Messina FD, Farney WC, DeLee JC. The incidence of injury in Texas high school
14 basketball: a prospective study among male and female athletes. Am J Sports
15 Med 27(3): 294-299, 1999
16
17
18 47. Miller R. The passing game. In, Coaching Basketball. Krause J, (ed).
19 Indianapolis: Master Press, 1994
20
21
22 48. Nazaraki K, Berg K, Stergiou N and Chen, B. Physiological demands of
23 competitive basketball. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 19(3):425-32, 2009
24
25
26 49. Rabita, G., Couturier, A. and Lambertz, D. Influence of training background on
27 the relationships between plantarflexor intrinsic stiffness and overall
28 musculoskeletal stiffness during hopping. Eur. J. Appl. Physiol. 103, 163-171,
29 2008
30
31 50. Randall D, Hertel J, Agel J, Grossman J and Marshall S. Descriptive
32 Epidemiology of Collegiate Athletic Association Injury Surveillance System,
33 1988-1989 through 2003-2004. J of Athletic Training 42(2): 194-201, 2007
34
35
36 51. Ratamess NA. Adaptations to anaerobic training programs. In: Essentials of
37 Strength Training and Conditioning. Baechle TR and Earle RW, eds. Champaign,
38 IL: Human Kinetics, 2008. pp. 93–119.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 52. Rodriguez-Alonso M, Fernandez –Garcia B, Perez-Landalauce, J and Terrados N.
5
6 Blood lactate and heart rate during national and international women’s basketball.
7
8 J Sports Med Phys Fitness 43: 432-436, 2003
9
- 10
11 53. Semenik, D. The T-Test. NSCA J 12:36-37, 1990
12
13
14 54. Sergej M, Ostojic S and Nenad D. Profiling in Basketball: Physical and
15
16 Physiological characteristics of elite players. J Strength and Cond Research 20:
17
18 740-744, 2006
19
20
21 55. Shephard JM and Young WB (2006): Agility literature review. Classifications,
22
23 training and testing. J Sport Sciences 24: 919-932, 2006
24
25
26 56. Simenz CJ, Dugan CA and Ebben WP. Strength and Conditioning practices of
27
28 National Basketball Association strength and conditioning coaches. J Strength
29
30 and Cond Research 19: 495-504, 2005
31
32
33 57. Smith HK & Thomas SG. Physiological characteristics of elite female basketball
34
35 players. Can J Sport Sci 16: 289-295, 1991
36
37
38 58. Stapf A. Protocols for physiological assessment of basketball players. In
39
40 physiological tests for elite athletes. Gore CJ ed. Champaign IL. Human
41
42 Kinetics, 2000. pp. 1027
43
44
45 59. Stone MH, O’Bryant H, and Garhammer J. A hypothetical model for strength
46
47 training. J Sports Med. 21: 342-351, 1981
48
49
50 60. Stone, N. Physiological Response to Sport-Specific Aerobic Interval Training in
51
52 High School Male Basketball Players. Auckland: Auckland University of
53
54 Technology, School of Sport and Recreation, 2007
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
61. Theoharopoulos A and Tsitskaris G. Isokinetic evaluation of the ankle plantar and dorsiflexion strength to determine the dominant limb in basketball players. *Isokinetic Exerc Sci* 8 (4): 181-186, 2000
 62. Tsiokanos A, Kellis E, Jamurtas A and Kellis S. The relationship between jumping performance and isokinetic strength of the hip and knee extensors and ankle plantar flexors. *Isokinetic Exerc Sci* 10: 107-115, 2002
 63. Vitasalo JT, Rahkila P, Osterback L and Allen M. Vertical Jumping Height and Horizontal Overhead Throwing Velocity in young male athletes. *J Sports Sci* 10: 401-413, 1992
 64. Wilson, A. M., Watson, J. C. and Lichtwark, G. A. Biomechanics: a catapult action for rapid limb protraction. *Nature* 421: 35-36, 2003
 65. Wislof U, Castagna C, Helg्रेud J, Jones R and Hoff J. Maximal Squat strength is strongly correlated to sprint performance and vertical jump height in elite soccer players. *BR J Sports Med* 38: 285-288, 2004
 66. Wojtys EM, Ashton-Miller JA, and Hutson JA. A gender related difference in the contribution of knee musculature to saggital plane shear stiffness in subjects with similar knee laxity. *J Joint Bone Surg Am* 84:10-16, 2002
 67. Ziv G and Lidor R (2009): Physical attributes, physiological characteristics, on court performances and nutritional strategies of female and male basketball players. *Sports Med* 39: 547-568

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1: Suggested Fitness Testing Battery for the assessment of the physical abilities of Basketball players.

Physical Characteristic	Test	Rest Period
Gym Tests		
Anthropometry	3 Site Skinfold, Height, Weight	n/a
Flexibility	Overhead Squat in addition to Goniometric assessment of ankle dorsiflexion, hip extension, internal / external rotation and shoulder flexion	n/a
Power	Squat Jump, Countermovement Jump	≥ 5 mins
Asymmetry	Single Leg Countermovement Jump	
Stiffness, RSI and Landing Mechanics	Submaximal hopping, Drop Jump (30cm box) and Landing Error Scoring System (L.E.S.S) Test	
Strength	1 Repetition Maximum Squat, Bench Press (if technique is appropriate)	
Court Based Tests		
Agility	T-Test and Pro Agility	≥ 5 mins
Acceleration	10m Sprint	
Anaerobic Capacity	Short Repeated Sprint Test (12x20m)	n/a

