



**HAL**  
open science

## Both vertical and horizontal plyometric training influence sprint force-velocity profile in young elite soccer players.

Florian Norgeot, Alexandre Fouré

### ► To cite this version:

Florian Norgeot, Alexandre Fouré. Both vertical and horizontal plyometric training influence sprint force-velocity profile in young elite soccer players.. 29th annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science (ECSS), Jul 2024, Glasgow, United Kingdom. hal-04550083v1

**HAL Id: hal-04550083**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04550083v1>**

Submitted on 17 Apr 2024 (v1), last revised 5 Jul 2024 (v2)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.


L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License



# BOTH VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL PLYOMETRIC TRAINING INFLUENCE SPRINT FORCE-VELOCITY PROFILE IN YOUNG ELITE SOCCER PLAYERS



## Introduction

During a soccer match, sprint horizontal acceleration ability is determinant for performance. Development of sprint force and velocity qualities has been reported after plyometric training (Barrera-Dominguez *et al.* 2023).

However, the orientation of plyometric training exercises can influence functional performances (Dello Iacono *et al.* 2017). The force-velocity profile (FVP) can be of great interest to assess the plyometric training-induced effects on the changes in performance and athletes' behavior during a linear sprint (Watkins *et al.*, 2021). Nevertheless, a comparison between horizontal and vertical plyometric training on sprint FVP has yet to be conducted.

The purpose of the present study was to **evaluate and compare the effects of 8-week horizontal and vertical plyometric training on explosiveness performance and sprint force-velocity profile in young soccer players**

## Methods

• **Population:** Twenty-eight soccer players (age: 30 ± 6 y, height: 169 ± 9 cm, mass: 65 ± 12 kg) divided in a vertical (n = 14) and a horizontal (n = 14) group.

• **Training protocol:** 2000 contacts | 16 session (2 sessions/wk) (Table 1)

• **Jump performances:** Vertical and horizontal jumps including: squat jump (SJ), counter-movement jump (CMJ) and drop jump 30 cm (DJ) | Optojump and MyJump app.

• **Sprint FVP:** Linear 30 m sprint – Times at 5, 10, 15 and 30 m | MySpring app. From the F-V relationship modeling of the 30 m sprint: maximal force (F<sub>0</sub>), maximal velocity (V<sub>0</sub>), maximal power (P<sub>max</sub>), maximal ratio of force (RF<sub>max</sub>) and the decrease rate in RF with increasing speed (DRF) (Samozino *et al.*, 2022).

• **Statistical analysis:** 2-way ANOVA (time [PRE – POST] \* group [VG – HG]) for all the variables (Tukey HSD post-hoc test in case of interaction) | Student t-test for the time effect in each group.

Week	Session	Vertical group (n = 14)	Horizontal group (n = 14)
1	1	8 x 5 bilateral HJ (15cm)   8 x 5 CMJ	8 x 5 bouncing strides (free)   8 x 5 lateral jumps (free)
	2	8 x 5 bilateral HJ (15cm)   8 x 5 CMJ	8 x 5 bouncing strides (120cm)   8 x 5 lateral jumps (90cm)
2	3	8 x 5 bilateral HJ (15cm)   8 x 5 CMJ	8 x 5 bouncing strides (120cm)   8 x 5 lateral jumps (100cm)
	4	10 x 4 unilateral HJ (15cm)   10 x 4 CMJ	10 x 4 bouncing strides (140cm)   10 x 4 unilateral strides (90cm)
3	5	10 x 4 unilateral HJ (15cm)   10 x 4 CMJ	10 x 4 bouncing strides (free)   10 x 4 unilateral strides (free)
	6	10 x 4 bilateral HJ (15cm)   10 x 4 CMJ	10 x 4 bouncing strides (140cm)   10 x 4 lateral jumps (100cm)
4	7	10 x 6 unilateral HJ (15cm)   10 x 6 CMJ	10 x 6 bouncing strides (140cm)   10 x 6 unilateral strides (120cm)
	8	10 x 6 bilateral HJ (30cm)   10 x 6 CMJ	10 x 6 bouncing strides (180cm)   10 x 6 lateral jumps (120cm)
5	9	10 x 7 unilateral HJ (30cm)   10 x 7 CMJ	10 x 7 bouncing strides (180cm)   10 x 7 unilateral strides (130cm)
	10	10 x 7 unilateral HJ (30cm)   10 x 7 CMJ	10 x 7 bouncing strides (210cm)   10 x 7 unilateral strides (free)
6	11	10 x 7 bilateral HJ (30cm)   10 x 7 CMJ	10 x 7 unilateral strides (140cm)   10 x 7 lateral jumps (140cm)
	12	10 x 8 unilateral HJ (30cm)   10 x 8 CMJ	10 x 8 bouncing strides (240cm)   10 x 8 unilateral strides (free)
7	13	10 x 8 unilateral HJ (30cm)   10 x 8 CMJ	10 x 8 bouncing strides (240cm)   10 x 8 unilateral strides (150cm)
	14	10 x 8 bilateral HJ (45cm)   10 x 8 CMJ	10 x 8 bouncing strides (240cm)   10 x 8 lateral jumps (140cm)
8	15	10 x 9 bilateral HJ (45cm)   10 x 9 CMJ	10 x 9 bouncing strides (240cm)   10 x 9 lateral jumps (140cm)
	16	10 x 10 unilateral HJ (45cm)   10 x 10 CMJ	10 x 10 bouncing strides (270cm)   10 x 10 lateral jumps (180cm)
Total		2000 contacts (27% unilateral)	2000 contacts (72% anterior   28% lateral)

Table 1: Plyometric training in vertical and horizontal groups. Data are expressed as number of contacts (series × jumps) and intensity are displayed between parentheses (jump height [for vertical group] or length [for horizontal group] in centimeters). Unilateral jumps were made on a single leg (and repeated on the other). HJ: hurdle jump, CMJ: counter movement jump.

## Results

	Group	Pre-test	Post-test	Statistical effects
SJ (cm)	VG	31.1 ± 6.3	33.5 ± 5.1 <sup>a</sup>	Time effect p = 0.001   d = 0.410
	HG	29.8 ± 3.0	32.7 ± 2.8 <sup>a</sup>	η <sup>2</sup> <sub>p</sub> = 0.623, p = 0.001 p = 0.001   d = 0.994
CMJ (cm)	VG	32.5 ± 5.8	33.9 ± 5.3 <sup>a</sup>	Time effect p = 0.025   d = 0.254
	HG	31.1 ± 3.2	32.9 ± 3.2 <sup>a</sup>	η <sup>2</sup> <sub>p</sub> = 0.333, p = 0.001 p = 0.005   d = 0.548
DJ (cm)	VG	33.7 ± 6.2	37.0 ± 5.2 <sup>a</sup>	Time effect p = 0.009   d = 0.557
	HG	33.6 ± 4.6	35.9 ± 3.9 <sup>a</sup>	η <sup>2</sup> <sub>p</sub> = 0.348, p = 0.001 p = 0.010   d = 0.532
V <sub>0</sub> (m/s)	VG	8.30 ± 0.81	8.47 ± 0.60	ns
	HG	8.30 ± 0.64	8.33 ± 0.41	ns
F <sub>0</sub> (N/kg)	VG	6.51 ± 0.82	7.36 ± 0.67	Time effect p = 0.003   d = 1.135
	HG	6.33 ± 0.86	8.01 ± 1.29	η <sup>2</sup> <sub>p</sub> = 0.546, p = 0.001 p = 0.001   d = 1.532
P <sub>max</sub> (W/kg)	VG	13.43 ± 1.53	15.57 ± 1.73	Time effect p = 0.001   d = 1.310
	HG	13.09 ± 1.71	16.63 ± 2.40	η <sup>2</sup> <sub>p</sub> = 0.703, p = 0.001 p = 0.001   d = 1.699
RF <sub>max</sub> (%)	VG	46.79 ± 2.64	50.14 ± 2.54	Time*Group interaction p = 0.006   d = 1.293
	HG	46.14 ± 2.68	52.36 ± 3.10	η <sup>2</sup> <sub>p</sub> = 0.157, p = 0.037 p = 0.001   d = 2.147
DRF	VG	-0.078 ± 0.010	-0.083 ± 0.009	Time effect p = 0.001   d = 1.166
	HG	-0.075 ± 0.011	-0.091 ± 0.016	ns

Table 2: Vertical jump performances and 30 m sprint force-velocity profile parameters evaluated before (Pre-test) and after (Post-test) the 8-week plyometric training for the vertical (VG) and horizontal (HG) groups. <sup>a</sup>: Significantly different from Pre-test (p < 0.05), η<sup>2</sup><sub>p</sub>: partial eta squared (ANOVA main effect), d: Cohen's d (from Student t-test), ns: non-significant. SJ: squat jump, CMJ: counter-movement jump, DJ: drop jump, V<sub>0</sub>: maximal velocity, F<sub>0</sub>: maximal force, P<sub>max</sub>: the maximal power, RF<sub>max</sub>: the maximal force ratio, DRF: the decrease rate in RF with increasing speed

• Significant changes in both VG and HG were observed in vertical performances after the plyometric training (p > 0.05, Table 2).

• Significant differences in horizontal jumps, sprint performances and FVP parameters relative changes between VG and HG were also found (p < 0.05, Figure 1).




Figure 1: Significant mean relative changes between pre- and post-tests for the vertical group (VG) and the horizontal group (HG) in horizontal jump performances (squat jump [SJ], counter-movement jump [CMJ] and drop jump [DJ]), sprint performances (sprint time at 5m, 10m, 15m and 30m) and force-velocity profile parameters (including the maximal force [F<sub>0</sub>], the maximal power [P<sub>max</sub>], the maximal force ratio [RF<sub>max</sub>] and the decrease rate in RF with increasing speed [DRF]). ns: no significant changes in vertical group or horizontal group, a: significant difference between relative changes assessed in VG and HG (p < 0.05).

## Discussion

Both horizontal and vertical plyometric training can be either used in young soccer players to improve vertical and horizontal performances in jump and sprint as previously reported (Ramirez-Campillo *et al.*, 2015). However, horizontal plyometric training may give a larger gain in horizontal ballistic actions while developing vertical jump qualities in young soccer players.

Further studies are necessary to more deeply compare motor coordination and muscular synergies involved in vertical and horizontal actions and potential specific effects on musculoskeletal structural adaptations. Additionally, the comparison of directions (*i.e.*, lateral and anterior) of horizontal plyometric exercises needs to be further investigated.

## References

- Barrera-Dominguez *et al.* (2023) Eur J Sport Sci, 23(12):2379-2388.  
 Dello Iacono *et al.* (2017) J Strength Cond Res, 31(4):921-931.  
 Watkins *et al.* (2021) J Strength Cond Res, 35(3):604-615.  
 Samozino *et al.* (2022) Scand J Med Sci Sports, 32(3):559-575.  
 Ramirez-Campillo *et al.* (2015) J Strength Cond Res, 29(7):1784-95.