



UNIVERSITY OF  
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

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 ORCID: 0000-0002-9905-8055, 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.**

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

EPrint URI: <https://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 MSc, ASCC, CSCS 3; Shyam. Chavda, MSc, ASCC, CSCS 4; Chris. Bishop, MSc,  
9 ASCC 4; Mike. Edwards, MSc, ASCC 4 and Anthony. N. Turner, MSc, ASCC, CSCS 4  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

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

31 Address for Correspondence:

32  
33 Mr Paul Read  
34

35  
36 St Mary's University College  
37

38 Waldegrave Road  
39

40  
41 Strawberry Hill  
42

43 Twickenham  
44

45  
46 London, UK  
47

48 TW1 4SX  
49

50 E-mail: paul.read@smuc.ac.uk  
51

52  
53 Telephone Number: +4420 8240 4255  
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 both maximal acceleration and repeated sprint abilities with aerobic abilities as a  
19  
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 remain with multi-joint lifts such as squats, deadlifts and Olympic lifting variations, as  
18  
19 confirmed by Hoffman et al. (1996) where 1RM bench press scores were not a good  
20  
21 indicator of playing time.  
22  
23  
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 Traditionally defined as the ability to change direction rapidly, without losing balance,  
40  
41 using a combination of strength, power and neuromuscular co-ordination (Little and  
42  
43 Williams, 2005). Such qualities are clearly evident within game play however; this may  
44  
45 be more accurately described as change of direction speed (Young et al., 2002). More  
46  
47 recently, Shephard and Young. (2006) have identified that agility is affected by the  
48  
49 athlete's perception and decision making skills. This is highlighted by the fact that more  
50  
51 skilled athletes are better able to respond to kinematic and postural cues (Abernethy et al.,  
52  
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  
9 should be considered that players are not only required to sprint in linear planes of  
10  
11 motion. Backwards gait and side shuffling movements are common, subsequently  
12  
13 suggesting the relevance of the T-Test. This is supported by Delextrat and Cohen. (2008)  
14  
15 where first team players achieved significantly lower times compared to the second team,  
16  
17  
18 further confirmed by Gillam (1985), with significant differences between basketball  
19  
20 athletes and physical education majors. Whilst, the T-Test has gained support within the  
21  
22 literature, other change of direction speed tests including the pro-agility test or 5-0-5 may  
23  
24 also be appropriate due to the frequent changes of direction (McInnes, 1995) and inherent  
25  
26 game demands where sprints will often begin whilst players are in motion (Abdelkrim,  
27  
28 2007), further justifying the use of the 5-0-5 test. Also speculatively, performing lateral  
29  
30 motions in closed environments under timed conditions (as in the T-Test) is not reflective  
31  
32 of the perceptual components and will likely effect movement mechanics, thus reducing  
33  
34 the content validity of the test. An alternative option may be to perform a qualitative  
35  
36 assessment of lateral abilities and changes of direction in response to a variety of stimuli.  
37  
38 Lastly it should also be noted at this point that none of the tests suggested above are true  
39  
40 tests of agility, however, at this time efficient, cost effective and reliable measures are  
41  
42 limited (Turner, 2012).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 *Speed*

54  
55 When analysing speed, the majority of the literature has reported data pertaining to  
56  
57 distances of 20-27 metres, close to length of the basketball court (Hoffman et al., 2000).  
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 Foster, 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 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 *Landing Mechanics / Utilization of the Stretch Shortening Cycle (SSC)*

56  
57 It has been evidenced that maximal power production in jumping tasks is related to lower  
58  
59 limb stiffness (Arampatzis et al., 2001). Further that athletes from power based sports  
60  
61 demonstrating higher leg stiffness than endurance-trained athletes during a one-legged  
62  
63 vertical jump (Laffaye et al., 2005). Stiffness is an important parameter to the power  
64  
65 athlete as they will maximise the storage and release of elastic energy in the  
66  
67 musculotendinous unit to improve muscle power and jump height (Bobbert, 2001).  
68  
69 During a counter-movement jump, a stiffer musculotendinous system might benefit the  
70  
71 performance via a faster elastic recoil during the upward, concentric, phase of the jump  
72  
73  
74  
75

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 *Uni-Lateral Assessment / Asymmetry*  
56  
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 10<sup>th</sup> 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  
13 mode on repeated sprint ability in young basketball players. *J Strength and Cond*  
14  
15 *Research* 22(3): 923-929, 2008  
16  
17  
18 15. Castagna, C, Impellizzeri, FM, Rampinini, E, D'Ottavio, S, and Manzi, V. The  
19  
20 Yo-Yo intermittent recovery test in basketball players. *J Sci Med Sport* 11: 202–  
21  
22 208, 2008.  
23  
24  
25 16. Caterisano A, Patrick BT, Edenfield WL and Batson MJ. The effects of a  
26  
27 basketball season on aerobic strength parameters among college med, starters vs  
28  
29 reserves. *J Strength and Cond Research* 11: 21-24, 1997  
30  
31  
32 17. Chaouachi A, Bruhelli M, Chamari K, Levin G, Ben-Abdelkrim N, Laurencelle L  
33  
34 and Castagna C. Lower Limb maximal dynamic strength and agility determinants  
35  
36 in elite basketball players. *J Strength Cond Research* 23: 1570-1577, 2009  
37  
38  
39  
40 18. Cormery B, Marcil M & Bouvard M. Rule change incidence of physiological  
41  
42 characteristics of elite basketball players. A 10 year investigation. *Br J Sports*  
43  
44 *Med*. 42: 25-30, 2008  
45  
46  
47 19. Costil DL, Daniels J, Evans W, Fink W, Krahenbuhl G & Saltin B. Skeletal  
48  
49 muscle enzymes and fiber composition of male and female athletes. *J Applied*  
50  
51 *Physiol* 40: 149- 154, 1978  
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  
7 basketball players: a comparison of women's national basketball association and  
8  
9 national basketball association athletes. *Am J Sports Med.* 34: 1077-1083, 2006  
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 22. Drouin JM, Valovich,-McLeod TC, Schultz SJ, Ganseneder BM, and Perrin DH.  
18  
19 Reliability and Validity of Biodex system pro isokinetic dynameter velocity,  
20  
21 torque and position measurements. *Eur J Applied Phys* 91: 22-29, 2004  
22  
23  
24 23. Erculj F, Dezman Band Vuckovic G. Differences between playing positions in  
25  
26 motor abilities of young female basketball players. *Journal of strength &*  
27  
28 *conditioning research*, 24(11): 2970–2978, 2003  
29  
30  
31 24. Erculj F, Dezman B and Vuckovic G. Differences between three basic types of  
32  
33 young basketball players in terms of height and contact time in various jumps.  
34  
35 *Kinesiol Sloven* 10: 5-15, 2004  
36  
37  
38 25. Erculj F, Mateja B and Bracic M. Physical demands on young elite European  
39  
40 female basketball players with special reference to speed, agility, explosive  
41  
42 strength and take off power. *J Strength and Cond Research* 24: 2970 – 2978,  
43  
44 2010  
45  
46  
47 26. Gillam GM. Basketball Energetic. A Physiological Basis. *Nat Strength and*  
48  
49 *Conditioning Association Journal* 6: 44-7, 1985  
50  
51  
52  
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  
50 34. Hoffman JR, Epstein S, Einbinder M and Weinstein Y. A comparison between the  
51  
52 Wingate anaerobic power test to both vertical jump and line drill tests in  
53  
54 basketball players. J Strength Cond Research 14: 261-264, 2000  
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 (2<sup>nd</sup> 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

