



HAL
open science

Arm – Leg coordination profiling during the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out in elite breaststrokes

Ludovic Seifert, Ana Conceição, Tomohiro Gonjo, Jan Stastny, Bjorn Harald Olstad

► **To cite this version:**

Ludovic Seifert, Ana Conceição, Tomohiro Gonjo, Jan Stastny, Bjorn Harald Olstad. Arm – Leg coordination profiling during the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out in elite breaststrokes. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 2021, 39 (23), <10.1080/02640414.2021.1950446>. <hal-05578904>

HAL Id: hal-05578904

<https://hal.science/hal-05578904v1>

Submitted on 3 Apr 2026

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.



HAL Authorization

**Arm – leg coordination profiling during the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out in elite
breaststrokers**

Seifert L.¹, Conceição A.², Gonjo T.³, Stastny J.⁴, Olstad B.H.³

¹ CETAPS EA3832, Faculty of Sport Sciences, University of Rouen Normandie, Mont Saint
Aignan, France

² Sport Sciences School of Rio Maior, Rio Maior, Portugal, Research Centre of Sports, Health
and Human Development, CIDESD, STRONG Research Community, Portugal

³ Department of Physical Performance, Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Oslo, Norway

⁴ Centre of Sports Activities, Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Republic

Corresponding author:

Ludovic Seifert

CETAPS EA3832,

Faculty of Sport Sciences,

University of Rouen Normandie,

Boulevard Siegfried, bâtiment 36A

F-76821 Mont Saint Aignan cedex

Mobile: +33 682 077 021

@: ludovic.seifert@univ-rouen.fr

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1712-5013>

Web of Science ResearcherID [AAI-7486-2020](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1712-5013)

Word count: 5200

Arm – leg coordination profiling during the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out in elite breaststrokes

Abstract

In breaststroke races, the dolphin kick could finish before, at the same time, or during the arm pull-out, but it is unclear how swimmers perform this technique. The aim of this study was to investigate whether swimmers glide between the dolphin kick and arm pull-out, favour continuity or even overlap those two phases, as it would impact the active underwater sequence. Fourteen international and national male swimmers performed 100-m breaststroke with all-out effort in a pre-calibrated 25 m swimming pool. A multi-camera system with five underwater and five above water cameras positioned at the side of the pool tracked the head of the swimmers throughout the trial and provided the two-dimensional displacement of the head. Key points of the active underwater sequence were obtained from notational analysis in order to assess the coordination between the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out, the mean speed, the relative time and distance covered by the head. A hierarchical cluster analysis identified three coordination profiles. All swimmers started their dolphin kick before the arm pull-out. However, one swimmer started the arm pull-out before the end of the dolphin kick (i.e. ‘*superposition*’ pattern of coordination), seven swimmers started the arm pull-out after the end of the dolphin kick (i.e. ‘*glide*’ pattern of coordination), and four swimmers synchronised the beginning of the arm pull-out and the end of the dolphin kick (i.e. ‘*continuity*’ pattern of coordination), while two other swimmers mixed two coordination profiles among the start and the three turns. Those different profiles allow achieving similar performance outcome, suggesting individual training regarding the underwater phase.

Key words: coordination, cluster analysis, underwater sequence, swimming, biomechanics

1
2 **1. Introduction**
3

4 Previous researches in swimming biomechanics have emphasized the importance of the start
5 and turns segments in swimming races. A recent study examining the key factors related to
6 short course 100-m breaststroke performance showed that turns were the largest time
7 contributor to the finishing time ($44.30 \pm 0.58\%$), followed by clean swimming ($38.93 \pm$
8 0.50%), start ($11.39 \pm 0.22\%$), and finish ($5.36 \pm 0.18\%$) (Olstad, Wathne, & Gonjo, 2020).
9 Both in start and turn-outs, the underwater phase has a great influence on the 15-m start and
10 turn-out time (Vantorre, Chollet, & Seifert, 2014). This suggests the importance of managing
11 the time spent and the distance travelled during the glide as well as the appropriate timing to
12 start underwater movements (e.g. dolphin kick) in order to maximize the speed during the
13 underwater phase (Vantorre et al., 2014; Vantorre, Seifert, Fernandes, Vilas-Boas, & Chollet,
14 2010; Veiga, Cala, Frutos, & Navarro, 2014). For instance, Veiga et al. (2014) observed
15 greater distance and speed during the underwater phase of the start than of the turns during
16 200-m breaststroke and between national compared to regional level male swimmers. Veiga
17 et al. (2014) also observed greater speed during the underwater phase of the start and turns in
18 100-m breaststroke for national compared to regional level male swimmers.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 While some studies investigated the drag force during the first and second gliding positions of
42 the breaststroke underwater stroke (e.g., Costa et al., 2015; Vilas-Boas et al., 2010), only two
43 published studies investigated the coordination between the arm pull-out and the dolphin kick
44 in breaststroke (Adams, Scharbrough, & McLean, 2018; Hayashi, Homma, & Luo, 2015).
45 Adams et al. (2018) compared the time spent and the distance travelled between an early-
46 initiation (performed before the initiation of the arm pull-out) and late-initiation (performed at
47 the completion of the arm pull-out) of the dolphin kick during the turn sequence in fourteen
48 collegiate swimmers performing four 50 yards (i.e. 47.5 m) breaststroke. Their findings
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 exhibited a 0.12 s shorter time to 6 m from the wall when performing a late-initiation ($3.06 \pm$
2 0.31 s) compared with an early-initiation (3.18 ± 0.24 s) of the dolphin kick. However, the
3
4 arm pull-out with the late-initiation of the dolphin kick occurred 0.22 m closer to the wall
5
6 (3.33 ± 0.52 m) than with the early-initiation (3.55 ± 0.47 m) (Adams et al., 2018). Therefore,
7
8 to provide a more equitable comparison between the variations, the analysis was repeated
9
10 using time measured from the initiation of movement. Thus, the time to reach 3.5 m from
11
12 initiation of movement was 0.27 s shorter when performing the early-initiation (3.79 ± 0.42 s)
13
14 than the late-initiation (4.06 ± 0.44 s) of the dolphin kick. Swimmers travelled nearly 1 m
15
16 further underwater when using the early-initiation (3.44 ± 0.53 m) than the late-initiation
17
18 (2.50 ± 0.53 m) of the dolphin kick. These findings suggested that the early-initiation of the
19
20 dolphin kick was better for covering distance in less time after initiation of movement,
21
22 leading to an increase in the distance travelled underwater (Adams et al., 2018). However, this
23
24 study was limited to collegiate swimmers and short distance race, and the knowledge in top
25
26 elite swimmers, as well as that in medium and long race events, is lacking. In another study,
27
28 Hayashi et al. (2015) investigated the optimal timing between the dolphin kick and arm pull-
29
30 out in the active underwater sequence in breaststroke through computational simulation
31
32 modelling. The simulation indicated that swimmers should perform the dolphin kick 0.4 s
33
34 earlier than the arm pull-out to maintain a streamlined position during each sequence
35
36 (Hayashi et al., 2015). Nevertheless, this modelling involved only one swimmer from a
37
38 university team and its validity should be tested before any application to elite swimmers.
39
40

41
42 Previous research investigating intra-cyclic velocity variations in breaststroke revealed that
43
44 the highest velocity peak could occur either during leg propulsion (corresponding to ‘leg
45
46 propulser’ profile) or during arm propulsion (corresponding to ‘arm propulser’ profile)
47
48 (Seifert, Leblanc, Chollet, Sanders, & Persyn, 2011). This suggests that ‘leg propulser’
49
50 swimmers might generate a strong dolphin kick and might use a *glide* pattern of coordination
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 between the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out, while ‘arm propulser’ swimmers might favour
2 a strong arm pull-out and minimise the glide between the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out
3
4 (i.e. using *continuity* or *superposition* patterns of coordination). However, it remains unclear
5
6 how elite swimmers organize the set of arm pull-out and dolphin kick motion.
7

8
9 Moreover, the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out are not the only actions of the active
10
11 underwater sequence, as swimmers perform arm recovery and leg kicking until the head
12
13 breaks the water surface. Thus, it is reasonable to hypothesise that the timing between the
14
15 dolphin kick and the arm pull-out could influence the following arm and leg actions during
16
17 the active underwater sequence until the head breaks the water. For instance, Seifert et al.
18
19 (2007) compared the arm-leg coordination at different key points of the active underwater
20
21 sequence between an international and ten national swimmers; the analysed variables
22
23 included (i) the time spent with the arms close to the thighs after the completion of the arm
24
25 pull-out, (ii) the time-gap between the end of the arm recovery and the beginning of the leg
26
27 propulsion during the pull-out phase and at the first swim stroke, and (iii) the time-gap
28
29 between the end of leg propulsion and the beginning of arm propulsion. The results showed
30
31 that the international swimmers had a shorter 15-m start time than the national swimmers due
32
33 to shorter times in the swim phase, longer times in the underwater phase, longer times spent
34
35 with the arms close to the thighs and in glide with the body in extension (Seifert et al., 2007).
36
37 The whole population showed a negative superposition of leg propulsion with arm recovery at
38
39 the pull-out phase (i.e. leg propulsion started before the arms completed their recovery),
40
41 which was not observed at the first swim stroke (Seifert et al., 2007). According to the fact
42
43 that the arm-leg coordination differs between the pull-out phase and the first swim stroke, it
44
45 was crucial to understand and explain how elite swimmers coordinate their arms and legs
46
47 actions during the active underwater sequence until the first swim stroke.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate whether swimmers glide between the
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 dolphin kick and arm pull-out, favour continuity or even overlap those two phases, as it would
2 impact the active underwater sequence. On one hand, from a motor control point of view,
3
4 performing one action after another could be less complex than controlling a partial
5
6 superposition of two different actions (i.e. when arm pull-out starts before the dolphin kick
7
8 finishes). On the other hand, from a biomechanical perspective, separating arm pull-out from
9
10 the dolphin kick would require swimmers to manage the gliding time between those two
11
12 actions in order to minimise velocity variations of the centre of mass. Based on these motor
13
14 control and biomechanical aspects, we hypothesised that swimmers might favour glide and
15
16 continuity patterns of coordination, which would be associated to similar performance
17
18 outcome of the active underwater sequence.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **2. Methods**

27 **2.1. Participants and testing procedures**

28
29 Fourteen international and national male breaststroke swimmers (mean age: 19.13 ± 2.45 yr,
30
31 mean height: 184.37 ± 5.88 cm, mean body mass: 80.34 ± 7.72 kg) performed 100-m
32
33 breaststroke with maximal effort within 64.54 ± 3.11 s, which was 2.5% slower than their best
34
35 record for Short course 100-m breaststroke (62.95 ± 2.65 s, which corresponded to
36
37 $88.48 \pm 3.69\%$ of the current world record). All participants were qualified for the National
38
39 Senior Swimming Championships. The protocol and data collection procedures were
40
41 approved by the local ethical committee and the National Data Protection Agency for
42
43 Research according to the Declaration of Helsinki. The protocol, benefits, and potential risks
44
45 of the testing were explained to the swimmers, who then gave their written informed consent
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

58 **2.2. Data collection**

1 A synchronised multi-camera system consisting of five underwater (0.7 m below the water
2 surface) and five above water (approximately 5 m above the floor) cameras (AIMSys Sweden
3 AB, Lund, Sweden) recorded the swimming trials. Each camera was positioned and zoomed
4 to observe the centre lane of the pool with an approximate field of view of 6 - 8 m in the
5 swimming direction. The cameras were calibrated in the manner described by Haner, Svärm,
6 Ask, and Heyden (2015), and the mean calibration error was 2.0 pixels corresponding to
7 0.025 degrees and 0.006 m of angular and linear error, respectively. After recording, the lens
8 distortion, exposure, and the chromatic aberration were corrected in the AIMSys software,
9 and camera images were joined by matching the global coordinate points of the subsequent
10 cameras to produce a panning video image of the entire swimming trial (Haner et al., 2015).

11 The system was equipped with an automatic colour tracking algorithm, based on a support
12 vector machine and a non-linear colour transformation, which detects a yellow colour object
13 with a disc radius of 5-50 pixels and provides the coordinates of its centre (Haner et al.,
14 2015). All swimmers were instructed to wear a plain yellow silicon cap so that the system
15 would track their head throughout the trial and calculate the displacement of the centre of the
16 head relative to the global coordinate system. For further analysis, the panning video file and
17 the head displacement data were exported as the format of MPEG-4 Part 14 and Excel Macro-
18 Enabled Workbook, respectively (and was recently used for race analysis, Olstad, Wathne, &
19 Gonjo, 2020). The timeline of the exported video and displacement data were synchronised
20 with the sampling frequency of 50 Hz.

21 **2.3. Data analysis**

22 *Performance outcomes*

23 The performance outcomes were determined as i) the time; ii) the distance travelled by the
24 head and iii) the mean speed during the active underwater sequence, which was defined as

1 from the first arm or leg action to when the head breaks the water surface. Moreover, the time
2 of the whole event and each lap was measured with an electronic timing system (Omega,
3 Bienne, Switzerland) in order to attest that swimmers were engaged in the testing with their
4 maximal effort.
5
6
7
8
9

10 11 *Key points and phases of the active underwater sequence of the start and turn out*

12 Six key points for arm actions (A to F) and seven key points for legs action (1 to 7) were
13 defined as shown in Figure 1: (A) First arm action, when the hands start to separate to break
14 the initial streamlined position, (B) Start of pull-out, when the hands start to move backwards
15 following the initial streamlined position, (C) End of pull-out, when the hands stop moving
16 backwards at the thigh, (D) Start of the recovery, when the elbows start flexing which leads
17 the hands to move forward from the thigh, (E) End of recovery, when the arms are fully
18 extended to make the second streamlined position before the breakout, (F) The first arm
19 action following the second streamlined glide (beginning of the first cycle of the surface
20 swimming); (1) Start of dolphin kick recovery, when the knees actively start flexing and feet
21 go upward, (2) Start of dolphin kick, when the knees actively start extending which leads the
22 feet to move downward, (3) End of dolphin kick, when the feet reach their deepest position,
23 (4) Start of leg recovery, when the knees actively start flexing which leads the feet to go
24 upward, (5) Start of leg propulsion, when the feet move backward after the knees show their
25 maximum flexion, (6) End of outswEEP, when the legs are fully extended, (7) End of insweep,
26 when the feet are maximally closed after the leg extension.
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 *Insert figure 1 about here*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Based on the underwater side and aerial views, five expert operators visually analysed the key
2 points for the active underwater sequence of the four laps with a blind technique, that was,
3
4 without knowing the analyses of the other four operators (as previously done for arm and leg
5 stroke phases in breaststroke; Chollet, Seifert, Leblanc, Boulesteix, & Carter, 2004; Leblanc,
6
7 Seifert, Baudry, & Chollet, 2005; Seifert & Chollet, 2005). To ensure that all operators shared
8
9 the same interpretation of the key points, all five operators obtained the key points from all
10
11 four laps of one swimmer. Intra-class correlation was then computed to assess inter-operator
12
13 variability for each key point. Despite a high coefficient of intra-class correlation (between
14
15 0.999 and 1; $p < 0.05$), when the five operators compared their analysis, a mean discrepancy
16
17 of 0.12 s was observed for the assessment of the start of the arms pull-out and a mean
18
19 discrepancy of 0.17 s was observed for the assessment of the start of the arm recovery.
20
21 Therefore, for key points that showed a difference between the five operators of over 0.04 s,
22
23 all operators together discussed the definition of the points again and redid the assessment in
24
25 order to validate the key point of each phase. After all operators agreed on the interpretation
26
27 of all key points, each operator assessed the key points of the four laps once again and
28
29 confirmed that all operators shared the same quantitative definition (the largest inter-operator
30
31 error was ≤ 0.04 s).
32
33

34
35 The five operators were then randomly paired and analysed the key points for the other twelve
36
37 swimmers with the blind technique. When the difference between the two video analyses did
38
39 not exceed a discrepancy of 0.04 s, the mean of the two analyses was accepted to validate the
40
41 key point of each phase. When the discrepancy exceeded 0.04 s, the two operators discussed
42
43 their differences and proceeded to a new assessment of the key point. A previous study has
44
45 shown that expert operators can analyse motion key points subjectively with high accuracy in
46
47 comparison to data obtained by a quantitative method using video footage and manual
48
49 digitising (Seifert et al., 2006).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 *Arm – leg coordination during the active underwater sequence*
3

4 Three time-gaps (T1-T3) were computed to assess the arm-leg coordination during the
5 underwater sequence (Chollet et al., 2004; Seifert & Chollet, 2005): T1: *Glide duration* with
6 arms at the thigh; T2: *Synchronisation between the beginning of arm and leg recovery*; and
7 T3: *Synchronisation between the end of arm and leg recovery*. These time-gaps were
8 expressed in absolute time (s) and relative time (% of the active underwater sequence
9 duration).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 When T1 is zero, there was no glide motion, and if positive, it shows the duration of the glide
19 with the arms at the thigh. When T2 is zero, it indicates that the leg and arm recovery started
20 at the same time, if negative and positive, the time-gap indicates that the arm recovery started
21 respectively earlier and later than leg recovery. T3 being zero means that the leg and arm
22 recovery ended at the same time, and when T3 is smaller or larger than zero, it shows that
23 respectively the leg propulsion overlapped the arm recovery action or the arms were fully
24 extended while the legs were still performing their recovery.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Following previous research (Adams et al., 2018; Hayashi et al., 2015), the two time-gaps (T4
39 and T5) were also computed and expressed in absolute (s) and relative (%) time to assess the
40 *coordination between the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out*. T4 is a time-gap between the end
41 of the dolphin kick and the beginning of the arm pull-out. A positive or negative time-gap
42 means respectively that the dolphin kick finished before or after the beginning of the arm
43 pull-out (the negative time-gap shows an overlap between the arm pull-out and dolphin kick).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 On the other hand, negative T5 shows that the beginning of the dolphin kick was before the
2 end of the arm pull-out, and zero T5 means that the arm pull-out and the dolphin kick were
3 performed continuously. In summary, the dolphin kick occurred before the arm pull-out when
4 T4 > 0 and T5 < 0; and after the arm pull-out when T5 > 0. The dolphin kick overlapped the
5 arm pull-out when T4 and T5 < 0.
6
7
8
9

10
11 The duration of the downward *dolphin kick* (from the highest to the deepest position of the
12 feet), and the duration of the *arm pull-out* (when the hands started to move backwards until
13 they stopped at the thigh) were also quantified.
14
15
16
17

18 The absolute (m) and the relative (%) of the head distance travelled during the active
19 underwater sequence and the mean speed were computed to assess the arm-leg coordination
20 during the five time-gaps, the dolphin kick, and the arm pull-out of the active underwater
21 sequence.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **2.4. Coordination profiling**

32 *Cluster analysis*

33
34 Cluster analysis is a common technique to detect hidden groups within high dimensional
35 datasets. One significant advantage of coordination pattern clustering is that no prior
36 assumptions about the structure of the dataset are required to identify similar patterns (Rein,
37 Button, Davids, & Summers, 2010). Cluster analysis is a means to investigate coordination
38 variability and thus potentially be able to define performance profiles for individuals. For
39 example, if all laps of one swimmer are in the same cluster, it suggests a low intra-individual
40 variability. Similarly, when different swimmers are allocated to the same cluster, it indicates a
41 low inter-individual variability. A previous study (Chow, Davids, Button, & Rein, 2008)
42 employed a cluster analysis to detect inter-individual differences of coordination patterns to
43 perform a shot in soccer. Rein, Davids, and Button (2010) also used cluster analysis to
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 explore inter-individual differences of performers with different skill levels performing the
2 basketball hook shot.
3

4 In our study, cluster analysis was chosen because the active underwater sequence is composed
5 of several phases (i.e. arm and leg actions described in Figure 1) that must be well temporally
6 sequenced to be effective. Assuming that an ineffective arm-leg coordination at each moment
7 (identified by our five time-gaps) of the sequence can destabilise the whole active underwater
8 sequence, the cluster analysis would be useful to identify which time-gaps classify various
9 arm-leg coordination profiles during the active underwater sequence. For this purpose, a
10 hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) with the Euclidean distance dissimilarity measure and the
11 complete linkage method was used (Duda, Hart, & Stork, 2001; Hastie, Tibshirani, &
12 Friedman, 2009). The cluster analysis was performed on the basis of 24 features that are the
13 relative duration, the relative distance, the mean speed of the five time-gaps, of the dolphin
14 kick and of the arm pull-out, as well as the absolute duration, the absolute distance and the
15 mean speed of the active underwater sequence. Relative duration and relative distance were
16 preferred to the absolute duration and distance to express the data in reference to the active
17 underwater sequence. Moreover, each feature was scaled to zero mean and unit variance in
18 order to give the same weight to each feature. As each swimmer performed four underwater
19 active sequences (one start and three turns), 56 data (four active underwater sequences x 14
20 swimmers) were considered in the HCA.
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 *Cluster validation* 49

50 The Calinski-Harabasz (CH) index was used to estimate the number of clusters that best fitted
51 the data and thus best classified the participants in each cluster (Calinski & Harabasz, 1974):
52
53

$$54 \quad CH(k) = \frac{B(k) \cdot (n-k)}{W(k) \cdot (k-1)} \quad (1)$$

55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

where n represents the number of participants, k denotes the number of clusters, and $B(k)$ and $W(k)$ denote the between- and within-cluster sums of squares of the partition. The highest CH among all potential cluster combinations indicates the optimal ratio between inter-cluster distance (*i.e.* inter-cluster separation) and intra-cluster distance (*i.e.* intra-cluster compactness) and in turn, an optimal number of clusters (Duda, Hart, & Stork, 2001; Everitt, Landau, & Morven, 2001; Hastie, Tibshirani, & Friedman, 2001; Zhao & Karypis, 2005). The CH index was calculated from two to ten potential clusters with Cluster Validity Analysis Platform (CVAP) (Version 3.7) (Wang, Wang, & Peng, 2009) and Matlab (R2014a, 1994–2014, MathWorks Inc, Massachusetts). According to the sample size (fourteen swimmers x four turn-outs = 56 observations), we did not look for more than ten potential clusters.

The Fisher information was then computed for each of the 21 features to understand which feature(s) significantly differentiated the clusters. Fisher information corresponds to the ratio between inter-cluster and intra-cluster distances (J_b / J_w).

Inter-cluster distance (J_b) corresponds to:

$$J_b = \sum_g N_g \cdot d^2(\mu_g, \bar{X}) \quad (2)$$

where N_g is the number of elements in the cluster g , d is the chosen distance, μ_g is the centre of cluster g (*i.e.* the mean of all points in g) and \bar{X} is the centre of all the points (*i.e.* mean of all the points).

Intra-cluster distance (J_w) corresponds to:

$$J_w = \sum_g \sum_{i \in C_g} d^2(x_i, \mu_g) \quad (3)$$

where C_g is the number of observations in cluster g , and x_i is the value of each observation.

The higher the Fisher information, the more discriminative are the features, notably because a Fisher information of > 1 means that the inter-cluster distance is greater than the intra-cluster distance.

3. Results

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

The CH index exhibited its highest breakpoint value when the participants were classified in three clusters (C1, C2 and C3) (Figure 2), which was also displayed in the dendrogram (Figure 3).

Insert Figures 2 & 3 about here

Cluster C1 was composed of 19 data: four swimmers, S1, S2, S4, S9, whose start and the three turns were all characterised in this cluster; one swimmer, S8, had the three turns in C1. The swimmers in C1 exhibited a negative relative duration for T5, meaning that the dolphin kick started before the end of the arm pull-out. However, those swimmers also demonstrated a relative duration of T4 of approximately 0%, showing continuity between the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out, i.e., no time-gap between two propulsive actions.

Cluster C2 included 30 data: seven swimmers, S3, S5, S6, S7, S11, S12, S14, whose start and the three turns were included and two swimmers, S8, S13, who had only the start in C2. The swimmers in C2 had a negative relative duration of T5 that shows the start of the dolphin kick before the end of the arm pull-out, and a positive relative duration in T4, which means that the dolphin kick finished before the beginning of the arm pull-out.

Cluster C3 comprised seven data: one swimmer, S10, who had the start and the three turns in this cluster and one swimmer, S13, whose three turns were included in C3. The swimmers in C3 showed a negative relative duration in both T5 and T4, suggesting that the dolphin kick started before the end of the arm pull-out, and the beginning of the arm pull-out overlapped with the end of the dolphin kick.

In summary, eleven swimmers, S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S9, S10, S11, S12, S14, used the same coordination profile throughout the 100-m, whereas two swimmers, S8 and S13, had different coordination profiles during the start and turns; S8 switched from C2 to C1 and S13 switched from C2 to C3 from the start to turns, respectively. The features with the highest

1 Fisher information (near 1) that distinguish the three clusters were the relative duration spent
2 in T1, T4 and T5, the relative distance travelled during T1, T4, T5 and the dolphin kick. The
3
4 Fisher information of the relative time, the relative distance travelled by the head and the
5
6 mean speed during the active underwater sequence were very low, meaning that the intra-
7
8 cluster distance is close to the inter-cluster distance, and suggest that the three clusters did not
9
10 differ in terms of performance outcome.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *Insert Tables 1, 2 and 3 about here*
23

24 **4. Discussion**

25 The main aim of this study was to investigate whether swimmers glide between the dolphin
26 kick and arm pull-out, favour continuity or even overlap those two phases, as it would impact
27 the performance outcome of the active underwater sequence of the start and three turn-outs in
28
29 100-m breaststroke. According to the Fisher information displayed in Tables 1 to 3, our
30
31 findings highlighted (i) three coordination profiles ('continuity', 'glide', 'superposition') to
32
33 manage the timing between the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out (i.e. dolphin kick performed
34
35 before, during or after the arm pull-out), which were mainly distinguished by T4 and T5, but
36
37 not by T2 and T3, (ii) various relative duration of the glide with the arms at the thighs
38
39 (assessed by T1) which was also related to those three profiles, and (iii) those different
40
41 coordination profiles exhibited similar performance outcome, as they did not differ in terms of
42
43 relative time, relative distance and mean speed during the active underwater sequence.
44
45
46
47
48
49 Another finding is that ineffective synchronisation of the arm and leg recovery (assessed by
50
51 T2 and T3) occurred before the first swimming arm stroke for all participants.
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **4.1. Timing between the arm pull-out and the dolphin kick**

59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 While Adams et al., (2018) distinguished an early- and a late-initiation of the dolphin kick
2 (performed before the initiation of the arm pull-out versus at the completion of the arm pull-
3 out), our findings highlighted that all swimmers started their dolphin kick before the initiation
4 of the arm pull-out (measured by negative T5 values). However, three profiles were
5 distinguished concerning the initiation of the arm pull-out: 'continuity', 'glide' and
6 'superposition'. Four swimmers (C1) performed a 'continuity' pattern of coordination as they
7 synchronised the beginning of the arm pull-out and the end of the dolphin kick ($T4 = 0\%$).
8 The swimmers with a 'glide' pattern of coordination (C2) were the most represented in the
9 sample and started the arm pull-out after the end of the dolphin kick ($T4 > 0\%$). In C2, the
10 absolute duration of T4 was around 0.36 s (10.5% of the duration of the active underwater
11 sequence that took 3.44 s), which supports the findings of the case study of Hayashi et al.,
12 (2015), who advised performing the dolphin kick 0.4 s earlier than the arm pull-out to
13 maintain a streamlined position during the active underwater sequence. Then, one swimmer
14 performed a 'superposition' pattern of coordination as he started the arm pull-out before the
15 end of the dolphin kick ($T4 < 0\%$). The positive effect of overlapping the beginning of the
16 arm pull-out before the end of the dolphin kick could be to cover a greater distance during the
17 dolphin kick (in our study 0.38 m, which was 8.3% of the distance covered during the 4.6 m
18 active underwater sequence). However, further investigation of the instantaneous speed would
19 help to understand whether the partial overlap of the arm pull-out to the dolphin kick could
20 add speed to the leg kick or if it is wasted because the dolphin kick is not performed with the
21 upper limbs in a streamlined position (as suggested by Hayashi et al., 2015). Lastly, two
22 swimmers, S8 and S13, exhibited a mixed coordination profile at start and turns, as they used
23 a 'glide' pattern of coordination (C2) during start, then S8 and S13 respectively switched to
24 C1 and C3 for their three turns. They might prefer a glide pattern of coordination during the
25 active underwater sequence of the start to take advantage of the high speed reached from the
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

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

dive start. On the other hand, because the wall push-off provides less speed than the dive start, the swimmers probably switched to another coordination pattern to adjust the active underwater sequence of the turn-outs. As only two swimmers mixed two coordination profiles, further research is needed to understand whether a mixed profile could relate to the effect of speed and/or fatigue (for instance, by comparing the sprint pace with 200 m pace or investigating differences between seven turns in the 200 m).

4.2. Glide phase with the arms at the thighs

T1 showed that swimmers in C2 glided less (in terms of relative time and relative distance) than swimmers in C1 and C3 before starting the dolphin kick. This was probably because (i) they glided more after the wall push-off (Hayashi et al., 2015), and (ii) they already glided between the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out. The absolute duration of T1 (16% of the active underwater sequence 3.44 s = 0.55 s) for the swimmers in C2 is aligned with previous findings exhibiting a glide duration with arms at the thighs ranging from 0.30 - 0.52 s in French national swimmers to 1.06 s in the bronze medallist of the Athens 2004 and the Beijing 2008 Olympics (Seifert et al., 2007).

4.3. Synchronisation of the arm and leg recovery before the first swimming arm stroke

Regarding the synchronisation of the arm and leg recovery before the first swimming stroke, which were assessed by T2 and T3, the three clusters exhibited negative T2 and T3. The relative duration of T2 ranged from -5.9 to -8.4% (absolute duration between 0.20 and 0.29 s), meaning that the arm recovery started earlier than the leg recovery. This coordination was also observed in an Olympic bronze medallist (Seifert et al., 2007), but not in elite and non-expert swimmers (Chollet et al., 2004; Leblanc et al., 2005; Seifert & Chollet, 2005).

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
However, although the arms started their recovery earlier than the legs, it did not help to have a streamlined position of the upper limbs when the legs start their kicking action, which was supported by the negative relative duration of T3. The range of T3 was between -4.5 and -4.7% (absolute duration between 0.14 and 0.16 s), meaning that the legs started their propulsive kicking before the arm recovery reached full extension. This arm – leg coordination was not effective because the arms are not in a streamlined position when the legs initiate their propulsion, as already observed more than 10 years ago in national and international swimmers (absolute duration of T3 was between -0.1 and -0.16 s; Seifert et al., 2007). Those authors also mentioned that T3 came closer to 0% from the first swim stroke and stayed near 0% throughout the regular swimming, as observed in other studies (Chollet et al., 2004; Leblanc et al., 2005; Seifert & Chollet, 2005). This strategy is likely effective because the arm recovery does not interfere with the leg propulsion (Takagi, Sugimoto, Nishijima, & Wilson, 2004). The fact that swimmers can perform a complete arm pull-out (i.e. pull and push until reaching the thighs) instead of stopping the arm action at the chest level as during the regular swimming, might explain this overlap between the end of the arm recovery and the beginning of the leg propulsion because the arms must travel a longer distance than during regular swimming.

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
In conclusion, although three patterns of coordination (i.e. glide, continuity and superposition) were used to synchronise the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out, the swimmers mainly used the glide and continuity patterns of coordination. Surprisingly, two swimmers changed the way they synchronised their dolphin kick and arm pull-out between the start and the three turns. The three patterns of coordination led to similar performance outcome of the active underwater sequence. Therefore, it is recommended that coaches and swimmers should seek an individually advantageous pattern among the three rather than focusing on only one way of coordinating the dolphin kick with the arm pull-out. Our findings also exhibited that all

1 swimmers initiated the leg propulsion while the arms did not finish their recovery, probably
2 because the hands had to travel a longer backward distance relative to the body than during
3 regular swimming. This finding suggests practitioner to train specifically the synchronisation
4 of the leg and arm recoveries following the arm pull-out as the overlap of two contradictory
5 actions (i.e. leg propulsion started before arms finished their recovery) affect the performance
6 outcome of the active underwater sequence.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Acknowledgments**

18
19 This work was supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology, I.P.
20 under Grant UID04045/2021; by the Institutional developing project of Brno University of
21 Technology under Grant RP 902025009; and by the French National Agency of Research
22 under Grant PIA ANR-19-STHP-0004, NePTUNE project.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Declaration of interest**

31
32 The authors declare no conflict of interest.
33
34

35 **References**

- 36
37 Adams, T., Scharbrough, M., & McLean, S. (2018). Effect of Dolphin Kick Timing on
38 Breaststroke Pullout Performance. *International Journal of Exercise Science:*
39 *Conference Proceedings*, 2(10). Retrieved from
40 <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/ijesab/vol2/iss10/42>
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Calinski, T., & Harabasz, J. (1974). A dendrite method for cluster analysis. *Communications*
48 *in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 3(1), 1–27.
49
50 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610927408827101>
51
52
53
54
55 Chollet, D., Seifert, L., Leblanc, H., Boulesteix, L., & Carter, M. (2004). Evaluation of Arm-
56 Leg coordination in flat breaststroke. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 25, 486–
57 495.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Chow, J. Y., Davids, K., Button, C., & Rein, R. (2008). Dynamics of movement patterning in
2 learning a discrete multiarticular action. *Motor Control*, 12(3), 219–240.

3
4 Costa, L., Mantha, V. R., Silva, A. J., Fernandes, R. J., Marinho, D. A., Vilas-Boas, J. P., ...
5
6 Rouboa, A. (2015). Computational fluid dynamics vs. inverse dynamics methods to
7 determine passive drag in two breaststroke glide positions. *Journal of Biomechanics*,
8
9 48(10), 2221–2226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2015.03.005>
10
11

12
13
14 Duda, R., Hart, P., & Stork, D. (2001). *Pattern classification*. New York, New York, USA:
15
16 Wiley.

17
18
19 Duda, R. R. O., Hart, P. E. (Peter E.), & Stork, D. G. D. (2001). *Pattern classification*. New
20
21 York, New York, USA: Wiley. Retrieved from [https://www.wiley.com/en-](https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Pattern+Classification%2C+2nd+Edition-p-9780471056690)
22
23
24 us/Pattern+Classification%2C+2nd+Edition-p-9780471056690

25
26
27 Everitt, B., Landau, S., & Morven, L. (2001). *Cluster analysis, 4th Edition*. New York, NY:
28
29 Oxford University Press.

30
31
32 Haner, S., Svärm, L., Ask, E., & Heyden, A. (2015). Joint under and over water calibration of
33
34 a swimmer tracking system. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Pattern*
35
36 *Recognition Applications and Methods*, 2, 142–149.

37
38
39 Hastie, T, Tibshirani, R., & Friedman, J. (2001). *The elements of statistical learning: Data*
40
41 *mining, inference and prediction*. Springer-Verlag.

42
43
44 Hastie, Trevor, Tibshirani, R., & Friedman, J. (2009). Random Forests (pp. 587–604).
45
46 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-84858-7_15

47
48
49 Hayashi, Y., Homma, M., & Luo, Z. (2015). Optimal timing of dolphin kick during
50
51 breaststroke underwater swimming movement. In *2015 IEEE International Conference*
52
53 *on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO)* (pp. 249–254). IEEE.
54
55
56 <https://doi.org/10.1109/ROBIO.2015.7418775>

57
58
59 Leblanc, H., Seifert, L., Baudry, L., & Chollet, D. (2005). Arm-leg coordination in flat
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 breaststroke: a comparative study between elite and non-elite swimmers. *International*
2 *Journal of Sports Medicine*, 26(9), 787–797. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2004-830492>
3
4 Olstad, B. H., Wathne, H., & Gonjo, T. (2020). Key Factors Related to Short Course 100 m
5 Breaststroke Performance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public*
6 *Health*, 17(17), 6257. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17176257>
7
8 Rein, R., Button, C., Davids, K., & Summers, J. J. (2010). Cluster analysis of movement
9 patterns in multiarticular actions: a tutorial. *Motor Control*, 14(2), 211–239.
10
11 Rein, R., Davids, K., & Button, C. (2010). Adaptive and phase transition behavior in
12 performance of discrete multi-articular actions by degenerate neurobiological systems.
13 *Experimental Brain Research*, 201(2), 307–322. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-009-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-009-2040-x)
14 2040-x
15
16 Seifert, L., & Chollet, D. (2005). A new index of flat breaststroke propulsion: a comparison of
17 elite men and women. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 23(3), 309–320.
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410410001729964>
20
21 Seifert, L., Leblanc, H., Chollet, D., Sanders, R. H., & Persyn, U. (2011). Breaststroke
22 kinematics. In L. Seifert, D. Chollet, & I. Mujika (Eds.), *The world book of swimming :*
23 *from science to performance*. New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Hauppauge.
24
25 Seifert, L., Schnitzler, C., Aujouannet, Y. A., Carter, M., Rouard, A., & Chollet, D. (2006).
26 Comparison of subjective and objective methods of determination of stroke phases to
27 analyse arm coordination in front-crawl. *Portuguese Journal of Sport Sciences*, 6(Supl.
28 2), 92–94.
29
30 Seifert, L., Vantorre, J., & Chollet, D. (2007). Biomechanical analysis of the breaststroke
31 start. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 28(11), 970–976.
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2007-965005>
34
35 Takagi, H., Sugimoto, S., Nishijima, N., & Wilson, B. (2004). Differences in stroke phases,
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 arm-leg coordination and velocity fluctuation due to event, gender and performance level
2 in breaststroke. *Sports Biomechanics*, 3(1), 15–27.

3
4
5 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14763140408522827>
6

7 Vantorre, J., Chollet, D., & Seifert, L. (2014). Biomechanical Analysis of the Swim-Start: A
8
9 Review. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 13(2), 223–231. Retrieved from
10
11
12 <https://www.jssm.org/hf.php?id=jssm-13-223.xml>
13

14 Vantorre, J., Seifert, L., Fernandes, R. J., Vilas-Boas, J. P., & Chollet, D. (2010). Kinematical
15
16 profiling of the front crawl start. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 31(1), 16–21.
17

18
19 Veiga, S., Cala, A., Frutos, P. G., & Navarro, E. (2014). Comparison of starts and turns of
20
21 national and regional level swimmers by individualized-distance measurements. *Sports*
22
23 *Biomechanics*, 13(3), 285–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2014.910265>
24

25
26 Vilas-Boas, J. P., Costa, L., Fernandes, R. J., Ribeiro, J., Figueiredo, P., Marinho, D., ...
27
28 Machado, L. (2010). Determination of the drag coefficient during the first and second
29
30 gliding positions of the breaststroke underwater stroke. *Journal of Applied*
31
32 *Biomechanics*, 26(3), 324–331. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jab.26.3.324>
33
34

35
36 Wang, K., Wang, B., & Peng, L. (2009). CVAP: Validation for Cluster Analyses. *Data*
37
38 *Science Journal*, 8, 88–93.
39

40
41 Zhao, Y., & Karypis, G. (2005). Data clustering in life sciences. *Molecular Biotechnology*,
42
43 31(1), 55–80.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1. Relative duration (in % of the active underwater sequence) of the five time-gaps, the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out for each cluster.

	T1 (%)	T2 (%)	T3 (%)	T4 (%)	T5 (%)	Dolphin kick (%)	Arm Pull-out (%)	Active Underwater Sequence (s)
Cluster 1	23.5 ± 3.7	-6.2 ± 2.6	-4.7 ± 1.5	0.0 ± 3.5	-21.6 ± 3.5	5.1 ± 1.0	16.5 ± 3.4	3.34 ± 0.51
Cluster 2	16.0 ± 4.8	-9.0 ± 6.1	-4.5 ± 1.3	10.5 ± 5.0	-32.1 ± 4.7	5.2 ± 0.7	16.3 ± 2.8	3.44 ± 0.34
Cluster 3	23.3 ± 3.3	-6.5 ± 2.2	-4.6 ± 0.9	-19.9 ± 1.1	-5.6 ± 1.6	5.5 ± 0.6	20.0 ± 2.1	3.08 ± 0.17
Fisher Information	0.78	0.08	0.01	5.81	4.85	0.03	0.17	0.09

Table 2. Relative distance travelled by the head (in % of the active underwater sequence) of the five time-gaps, the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out for each cluster.

	T1 (%)	T2 (%)	T3 (%)	T4 (%)	T5 (%)	Dolphin kick (%)	Arm Pull-out (%)	Active Underwater Sequence (m)
Cluster 1	27.8 ± 4.7	6.05 ± 2.5	3.1 ± 1.3	3.4 ± 2.5	28.2 ± 4.8	5.7 ± 1.2	22.3 ± 5.0	4.9 ± 1.0
Cluster 2	18.9 ± 5.4	8.8 ± 5.3	2.9 ± 1.2	11.9 ± 5.2	39.6 ± 4.9	6.5 ± 0.9	21.3 ± 3.7	5.1 ± 0.6
Cluster 3	29.0 ± 4.4	6.5 ± 2.4	2.9 ± 0.8	25.8 ± 1.3	8.5 ± 2.4	8.3 ± 0.9	26.0 ± 3.1	4.6 ± 0.4
Fisher Information	0.88	0.09	0.01	2.92	5.12	0.63	0.14	0.07

Table 3. Mean speed reached by the head (in m.s⁻¹) of the five time-gaps, the dolphin kick and the arm pull-out for each cluster.

	T1 (m.s ⁻¹)	T2 (m.s ⁻¹)	T3 (m.s ⁻¹)	T4 (m.s ⁻¹)	T5 (m.s ⁻¹)	Dolphin kick (m.s ⁻¹)	Arm Pull-out (m.s ⁻¹)	Active Underwater Sequence (m.s ⁻¹)
Cluster 1	1.84 ± 0.06	1.54 ± 0.10	0.88 ± 0.15	1.84 ± 0.45	1.91 ± 0.12	1.73 ± 0.15	2.00 ± 0.11	1.47 ± 0.10
Cluster 2	1.85 ± 0.09	1.57 ± 0.11	0.87 ± 0.12	1.62 ± 0.12	1.82 ± 0.09	1.82 ± 0.21	1.97 ± 0.12	1.49 ± 0.10
Cluster 3	1.86 ± 0.04	1.60 ± 0.08	0.79 ± 0.07	1.57 ± 0.05	1.78 ± 0.05	1.70 ± 0.17	1.91 ± 0.11	1.48 ± 0.07
Fisher Information	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.17	0.29	0.06	0.06	0.01

Figure Legends

1
2 Figure 1. Key points and phases of the active underwater sequence of the arms and legs
3

4
5 Figure 2. Values of Calinski-Harabasz (CH) index in relation with the number of clusters.
6

7 Figure 3. Dendrogram showing the distribution of the data relative to the active underwater
8
9 sequence, showing three clusters on the basis of the Euclidean distance similarity (here 50).
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

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3 B&W




Figure 3 color

