

# THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Upper limb kinematic differences between breathing and nonbreathing conditions in front crawl sprint swimming

#### Citation for published version:

McCabe, C, Sanders, R & Psycharakis, S 2015, 'Upper limb kinematic differences between breathing and non-breathing conditions in front crawl sprint swimming', Journal of Biomechanics, vol. 48, no. 15, pp. 3995-4001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2015.09.012

#### **Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

10.1016/j.jbiomech.2015.09.012

#### Link:

Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

**Document Version:** Peer reviewed version

**Published In:** Journal of Biomechanics

#### **General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



#### **Title Page**

#### Type of Submission: Original article

<u>Full Title</u>: Upper limb kinematic differences between breathing and non-breathing conditions in front crawl sprint swimming.

Authors: Carla B McCabe<sup>1,2</sup> Ross H Sanders<sup>2,3</sup> and Stelios G Psycharakis<sup>2,4</sup>

#### Affiliations:

<sup>1</sup>School of Sport, Ulster University, Jordanstown, UK.

<sup>2</sup>Centre for Aquatics Research & Education, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

<sup>4</sup>Institute of Sport, Physical Education and Health Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

### Corresponding Author: Dr Carla B McCabe

| Address:   | School of Sport,      |  |  |  |
|------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
|            | Ulster University,    |  |  |  |
|            | Jordanstown Campus,   |  |  |  |
|            | BT37 0QB.             |  |  |  |
| E-mail:    | c.mccabe@ulster.ac.uk |  |  |  |
| Telephone: | 0044 2890366388       |  |  |  |

Word Count (Intro-Discussion): 4000

#### Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the breathing action in front crawl (FC) sprint swimming affects the ipsilateral upper limb kinematics relative to a non-breathing stroke cycle (SC). Ten male competitive swimmers performed two 25m FC sprints: one breathing to their preferred side (Br) and one not breathing (NBr). Both swim trials were performed through a 6.75m<sup>3</sup> calibrated space and recorded by six gen-locked JVC KY32 CCD cameras. A paired t-test was used to assess statistical differences between the trials, with a confidence level of p<0.05 accepted as significant. Swimmers were slower (3%) when breathing. Within the entry phase, swimmers had a slower COM horizontal velocity (3.3%), less shoulder flexion (8%), abduction (33%) and roll (4%) when breathing. The pull phase was longer in duration (14%) swimmers had a shallower hand path (11%), less shoulder abduction (11%), a slower hand vertical acceleration (30%) and slower centre of mass (COM) horizontal velocity (3%) when breathing. In the push phase, swimmers had a smaller elbow range of motion (ROM) (38%), faster backwards hand speed (25%) and faster hand vertical acceleration (33%) when breathing. Swimmers rolled their shoulders more (12%) in the recovery phase when breathing. This study confirms that swim performance is compromised by the inclusion of taking a breath in sprint FC swimming. It was proposed that swimmers aim to orient their ipsilateral shoulder into a stronger position by stretching and rolling the shoulders more in the entry phase whilst preparing to take a breath. Swimmers should focus on lengthening the push phase by extending the elbow more and not accelerating the hand too quickly upwards when preparing to inhale.

Key words: Freestyle swimming; three-dimensional; breath-holding; ipsilateral, technique.

#### 1 Introduction

2 Researchers have often recommended that swimmers limit the number of breaths taken during a race 3 due to the possible adverse effects that the front crawl breathing action may have on stroke mechanics 4 and hydrodynamic drag (Di Prampero et al., 1974; Pendergast et al., 1977; Town and Vaness, 1990; 5 Cardelli et al., 1999; Formosa et al., 2014). However the literature does not conclusively support the 6 premise that breathing in front crawl swimming has a negative effect on swim performance. Some 7 studies have reported reduced swim velocity and/or stroke frequency as a result of breathing 8 compared to not breathing (Pedersen and Kjendlie, 2006; Psycharakis and McCabe, 2011), whereas 9 other researchers have reported no differences (Castro et al., 2006; Vezos et al., 2007; Seifert et al., 10 2008). The disparity within the literature may be attributed to methodological issues such as whether 11 the centre of mass (COM) or hip joint was utilised to quantify the above variables, which 12 mathematical approach was implemented, and the range of swim speeds assessed within these studies. 13 Nevertheless, as breathing is a fundamental skill within front crawl swimming, it is imperative to 14 further assess what effect it may have on a swimmer's sprint performance.

15

16 As the arms contribute to propulsion more than the legs in front crawl swimming (Di Prampero et al., 17 1974; Watkins and Gordon, 1983), this study will focus on examining the effect breathing has on 18 various key upper limb kinematic variables linked to swim performance. Shoulder and hip roll 19 rotations have been strongly related to front crawl swim performance (Payton et al., 1999; Castro et 20 al., 2002; Psycharakis and Sanders, 2010). Swimming at a 200m pace, Payton et al. (1999) reported 21 that swimmers rolled their shoulders 9degs more during a breathing trial compared to a non-breathing 22 trial. More recently Psycharakis and McCabe (2011) found that although the total magnitude of 23 shoulder and hip roll angles did not differ between breathing conditions, male sprinters rolled their 24 shoulders and hips to the breathing side significantly more (9.5° or 18.8%) relative to the non-25 breathing side. Previous studies have tended to examine shoulder and hip roll angles in terms of the 26 total magnitudes within the SC. The aim of this study will be to investigate shoulder and hip roll 27 angles within the integral phases of the SC in order to provide a more comprehensive insight as to 28 how these parameters may, or may not, be influenced by the breathing action.

The motion of the shoulders, in terms of flexion/extension, abduction/adduction internal/external rotation and elevation have been associated with determining upper limb propulsion. However, shoulder kinematics are more commonly discussed within aquatic literature in relation to injury and rarely with respect to swim performance within an ecological environment. Consequently, it is unknown whether incorporating a breath within the SC causes alterations of the shoulder movements and thus influences the swimmer's overall performance.

36

29

37 The shoulder motion has often been linked to the hand-path throughout the underwater stroke cycle 38 (SC) which consists of horizontal, vertical and lateral motions in order to achieve forward propulsion 39 of the body (Schleihauf et al., 1983; Deschodt et al., 1996a; Deschodt et al., 1999). To date, only two 40 studies have investigated the influence the breathing action has on hand-path trajectory. Payton et al. 41 (1999) reported that the front crawl breathing action did not interfere with the underwater hand-path, 42 in terms of maximum depth and width when elite male swimmers swam at a 200m pace. However 43 Vezos et al. (2007) found that the breathing action caused significant modifications in hand-path when 44 investigating a group of female front crawl sprinters at a submaximal pace. Vezos et al. (2007) 45 speculated that the discrepancies with Payton et al. (1999) were due to anthropometric differences 46 associated with opposing genders sampled, yet did not consider the differing swim pace. Because 47 Payton et al. (1999) analysed swimmers at a 200m pace, it is unknown whether male swimmers adjust 48 their hand-path between breathing and non-breathing conditions when swimming at a sprint pace. 49 Such knowledge is beneficial in terms of how the breathing action may, or may not, alter a swimmer's 50 hand-path when maximally swimming, thus ultimately influencing their forward propulsion and 51 performance.

52

The elbow angle magnitude during the underwater phase of the SC has been proposed to influence the hand-path trajectory (Hay et al., 1993) whilst also affecting the propulsive actions of the upper limbs (Cappaert, 1998; Haffner and Cappaert, 1998). Payton et al. (1999) is the only study to examine the elbow angle between breathing and non-breathing conditions, reporting that the breathing action did

57 not influence the elbow angle range of motion (ROM) during the pull phase (breathing:  $44 \pm 15^{\circ}$ ; non-58 breathing:  $45 \pm 14^{\circ}$ ). Therefore, with the exception of only the pull phase, no study has examined the 59 elbow angle magnitudes throughout the underwater SC between breathing conditions when front 60 crawl sprinting, which could affect the capability of the upper limbs to generate propulsion.

61

62 The pull and push phases are regarded as propulsive and the entry and recovery phases are regarded 63 non-propulsive (Chollet et al., 2000). Payton et al. (1999) noted that male swimmers had a longer 64 duration of the underwater phase during the breathing trials  $(1.11 \pm 0.15s)$  vs. non-breathing trials 65  $(1.05 \pm 0.12s)$  but did not comment whether this observed difference was significant. Vezos et al. 66 (2007) found similar results within a female sprint group (breathing:  $1.25 \pm 0.17$ s vs. breath-holding: 67  $1.16 \pm 0.15$ s; p<0.05), but added that the longer duration within breathing trials was the result of a 68 prolonged entry phase compared to the non-breathing trials. Payton et al. (1999) did not report the 69 durations of the discrete phases between breathing conditions. Thus, it is important to explore whether 70 the breathing action affects the duration of the propulsive and/or non-propulsive stroke phases in front 71 crawl sprint swimming as ultimately any changes are likely to affect swim performance.

72

The velocity of the swimmer's COM has become a valuable tool as it indicates when and to what extent phases of the SC are effective in propelling the body forwards (Maglishco et al., 1989; Alves et al., 1994). To date, no study has investigated the COM velocity magnitude within the integral phases of the SC in relation to breathing vs. non-breathing conditions. The literature further indicates that the COM velocity is strongly influenced by swimmers accelerating their hands (Schleihauf, 1984), yet no study has examined these characteristics between breathing conditions within a male sprinting population.

80

In summary, it is unclear to what extent breathing affects performance in terms of, shoulder/hip roll, shoulder kinematics, hand-path, elbow angle magnitudes, stroke phase durations, COM velocity profile, hand velocity and acceleration throughout the SC. The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the breathing action in front crawl sprint swimming affects the ipsilateral upper limb kinematics (same side as breathing side) relative to a non-breathing stroke cycle and to assess any changes in swimming performance. The rationale to analyse the ipsilateral hand was to compare datasets in relation to previous studies and its action may be constrained by the breathing rotation whereas there is no a priori reason to expect that the hand motion on the non-breathing side would be affected.

90

#### 91 Materials and Methods

92 **Participants** 

Ten male front crawl swimmers (age:  $18.4 \pm 2.6$  years; mass:  $72.9 \pm 10.2$  kg; height:  $182.7 \pm 7.9$  cm) volunteered to participate in this study. These athletes competed at a national/international level and registered a personal best time of  $25.31 \pm 0.98$ s (long course) for 50m front crawl sprint. The test procedures were approved by the University Ethics Committee and all swimmers provided written informed consent.

98

#### 99 **Testing Procedure**

Following an individualised warm-up each participant swam two randomised maximal 25m front
crawl sprints: one 25m sprint breathing once to their preferred side (Br) and one 25m sprint with no
breathing (NBr) throughout the 25m.

103

104 The testing set-up was similar to Psycharakis et al. (2010) with all swim trials performed through a 105 6.75m<sup>3</sup> pre-calibrated volume (orthogonal axes: 4.5m [X- horizontal], 1.5m [Y- vertical], 1.0m [Z-106 medio-lateral]). Based on previous accuracy and reliability calculations for this frame (Psycharakis et 107 al., 2005), 20 control points were used for calibration. Reconstruction errors were calculated 108 following 10 repeated digitisations by the same operator (20 control points and 10 different points 109 representing the 'markers'), which were found as low in all three directions (2.4mm-4.5mm absolute 110 errors; 3.3mm-5.2mm root mean square errors; 0.1%-0.5% of the calibrated space). Six gen-locked 111 JVC KY32 CCD cameras (four below and two above water) sampling at a frequency of 50 fields per second and a shutter speed of 1/120s were positioned similar to Psycharakis et al. (2010) so that all cameras captured the swimmer throughout the pre-calibrated space.

114

To enable subsequent calculation of the whole body COM using the 'eZone' method (Deffeyes and Sanders, 2005) each swimmer had 19 markers applied to the following anatomical landmarks: vertex of the head, the right and left of the: 3<sup>rd</sup> distal phalanx tip (hand), wrist axis, elbow axis, shoulder axis, hip axis, knee axis, ankle axis, 5<sup>th</sup> metatarsophalangeal joint, and the tip of 1<sup>st</sup> phalanx (big toe).

119

#### 120 Data Processing

121 One SC, defined as the period between the instant of hand entry to the instant of entry of the same 122 hand, was selected for analysis. Whilst the full stroke cycle was digitised, only the pulling arm on the 123 same side that the swimmer took the breath was analysed (ipsilateral upper limb to breathing side), 124 representing the first hand entry of the SC. The Ariel Performance Analysis System (APAS-2000 125 Ariel Dynamics, San Diego, CA) software was used to manually digitise the 19 anatomical landmarks 126 from all camera views. Incorporating the direct linear transformation (DLT) algorithms in APAS, 3-127 dimensional coordinates of the anatomical landmarks were obtained and smoothed using a Fourier 128 series transform (Bloomfield, 1976) retaining six harmonics.

129

130 The average X swimming velocity  $(V_{av})$  was calculated by dividing the swimmer's mean COM X 131 displacement by the time to complete one SC. The COM X velocity  $(m \cdot s^{-1})$  was obtained by 132 differentiating the COM displacement using the first central difference formula. Stroke frequency 133 (SF) was the inverse of the time (seconds) to complete one SC which was then multiplied by 60 to 134 yield units of strokes per minute. Stroke length (SL) was the X displacement of the COM during one 135 SC.

136

137 Shoulder and hip roll angles were each determined as the angle between the unit vector of the line 138 joining the shoulders and hips respectively, projected onto the yz plane (i.e. the plane perpendicular to 139 the swimming direction) and the horizontal. Computationally, this is: arc-tangent  $(S_z/S_y)$  and arc140 tangent  $(H_z/H_y)$ ; where  $S_z$  and  $S_y$  are the z and y components of the shoulder unit vector and  $H_z$  and  $H_y$ 141 are the z and y components of the hip unit vector.

142

143 To assess the orientation of the shoulder to elbow joint, the longitudinal axis of the segment was 144 expressed with respect to an internal frame of reference. The internal frame of reference consisted of 145 the X<sub>int</sub> being the unit vector in the direction of the vector joining the midpoint of the shoulder axes to 146 the midpoint of the hip axes; the Y<sub>int</sub> axis being the unit vector formed by the cross product of X<sub>int</sub> and 147 the unit vector in the direction of the vector joining the shoulder joints and Z<sub>int</sub> the unit vector formed 148 as the cross product of X<sub>int</sub> and Y<sub>int</sub>. A Cardan angle to each of the reference axes was then quantified 149 as the arc-cosine of the dot product of the arm unit vector and the reference axis unit vector. Flexion 150 and extension of the shoulder was indicated by the Cardan angle between the arm segment and the  $X_{int}$ 151 axis. The angle was adjusted by subtracting 90 degrees so that 0 degrees corresponded to the 152 transition between the pull and the push, the angle at entry was close to -90 degrees and approached 153 90 degrees of flexion at exit. Abduction refers to the angle of the arm axis to the Z axis with 154 correction so that alignment with the  $Z_{int}$  axis is 90 degrees of abduction and -90 degrees represents 90 155 degrees of adduction.

156

157 The Y and X motion of the hand was represented by the displacement (m) of the 3<sup>rd</sup> distal phalanx 158 (with respect to a pool-fixed Cartesian reference system). Similar to Vezos et al. (2007) the 159 underwater pull length (X) was defined as the backward displacement of the hand from its most 160 forward position to its most backward position. The lateral motion of the hand, with respect to the 161 swimmer's COM, was calculated as the absolute Z displacement (m) of the 3<sup>rd</sup> distal phalanx.

162

The elbow angle was determined as the arc-cosine of the dot product of the upper and lower arm unit vectors and was quantified at four instants throughout the underwater SC in accordance with McCabe et al. (2011). The first instant ('first back') was defined as the moment the finger began to move horizontally backward. The second instant ('shoulder x') as the moment the finger was vertically aligned with the shoulder. The third instant ('end back') was defined as the moment the finger stopped moving horizontally backwards and the fourth instant ('re-entry') when the hand entered the water. On identification of these four instants the corresponding time was noted and the elbow angles calculated accordingly. This process also allowed the identification of the stroke phases: entry phase period between hand entry to 'first back' position; pull phase - period between 'first back' to 'shoulder x'; push phase - time between 'shoulder x' and 'end back'; recovery phase - period from 'end back' to 're-entry'. The stroke phase durations were expressed as a percentage of the SC (%SC).

174

Hand velocity was calculated in the X and Y axis (with respect to an external reference point) throughout the underwater SC. Hand speed was quantified as the resultant of the X, Y and Z hand velocity components. Since acceleration is the second derivative of position, the X and Y acceleration of the hand was obtained by double differentiating positional data of the hand throughout the underwater SC.

180

Errors due to manual digitisation were assessed through 10 repeated digitisations of a SC by the same operator. The standard deviation (SD) and coefficient of variation (CV) showed small and acceptable errors for all variables (CV: 0.22 to 4.92%).

184

#### 185 Statistical Analysis

The assumption of normality was verified through the Shapiro–Wilk test. A paired t-test was used to assess statistical differences between breathing conditions, with a confidence level of p<0.05 accepted as significant, using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0. Taking into account the increased possibility of type 1 or type 2 errors (large number of variables tested), effect size (d) calculations (mean difference between the conditions relative to the pooled standard deviation) were performed across all variables using Cohen's (1992) criteria for interpreting the results.

193

194 **Results** 

#### **195 Race Parameters**

196 Swim velocity was significantly greater during the NBr ( $1.82 \pm 0.08 \text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ ) compared to Br ( $1.77 \pm$ 

198 conditions for SL (NBr:  $1.98 \pm 0.14$ m; Br:  $1.96 \pm 0.18$ m; t(9)=0.52; d=0.12) and SF (NBr:  $55.2 \pm 4.1$ 

 $0.07 \text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ ) trials (t(9)=2.78; p=0.02; d=0.67). There were no significant differences between

- 199 cycles·min<sup>-1</sup>; Br:  $54.6 \pm 4.5$  cycles·min<sup>-1</sup>; t(9)=0.63; d=0.14).
- 200

197

#### 201 Shoulder and Hip Roll

Figure 1 illustrates the finding that average shoulder roll angle was 4 degs (11%) greater within the entry phase of the NBr trial compared to Br trial (p=0.03; d=1.04). The magnitude of maximum shoulder roll was found to be 12% (7.6degs) greater during the recovery phase of the Br vs. NBr trial (p=0.02; d=0.97) (Table 1). Shoulder and hip roll magnitudes at all other instances did not differ between breathing conditions (Table 1).

207

#### 208 Shoulder Angle

Within the entry phase, it was found that the shoulder was flexed 6degs (8%) more during the NBr vs. Br trial (p=0.01; d=1.14) (Table 1). Figure 2 illustrates that the shoulder abducts further within both the entry (7degs; 33%) and pull (7degs; 11%) phases during the NBr compared to the Br trial (Table 1). There were no other significant differences between breathing conditions in relation to shoulder flexion/extension and abduction/adduction (Table 1).

214

#### 215 Hand Path

Maximum depth (Y) of the ipsilateral hand was found to be significantly greater by 0.04m (6%) during NBr vs. Br trial. Figure 3 illustrates the ipsilateral hand travelled deeper during the NBr vs. Br trial mostly during the pull phase (0.07m, 11%). Neither the X or Z average hand displacements throughout the SC differed significantly between breathing conditions (Table 1).

220

#### 221 Stroke Phase Durations

The durations of the entry and recovery phases were not significantly different between Br and NBr (Figure 4). The difference in duration of the pull and push phases between the two breathing conditions was significant with a large effect size (t(9)=2.85; p=0.02; d>0.80). Figure 4 illustrates that during the breathing trial, swimmers spent 14% longer in the pull phase and 16% less time in the push phase compared to when they did not breathe.

227

#### 228 Elbow angle

The elbow extension angle at the 'end back' position was  $11.4^{\circ}$  (8%) greater during the NBr than Br trial (p=0.02; d=0.76) (Table 1). It was also found that the elbow ROM within the push phase had a  $17.3^{\circ}$  (38%) greater extension during the NBr trial compared to the Br trial (p=0.02; d=0.99). The magnitudes of elbow angle at all other specified instants throughout the SC were not significantly different between breathing conditions (Table 1).

234

#### 235 Hand Speed & Acceleration

Table 1 indicates that X hand velocity during the push phase was  $0.5 \text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  (25%) faster during the Br vs. NBr trial (p=0.01; d=1.51). Y acceleration of the hand was found as  $4.8 \text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$  (30%) faster within the pull phase when NBr compared to Br (p=0.04; d=1.21). In contrast, within the push phase, the Y hand acceleration was approx  $7.8 \text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$  (33%) faster during the breathing trial (p=0.03; d=0.96). Differences between breathing conditions in relation to the X hand acceleration during the pull and push phases approached significance (p=0.06) with large effect sizes (d>0.80).

242

#### 243 COM Horizontal Velocity

During both the entry and pull phases, swimmers' COM X velocity was  $0.6\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  (3.3-3.4%) faster during the NBr vs. Br trial (p<0.02; d≥0.70; Table 1). There was no difference between conditions in

relation to the COM X velocity within the push or recovery phases.

247

#### 248 Discussion

When incorporating a breath into the SC, swimmers were overall slower. For the entry phase, swimmers had a slower COM horizontal velocity, less shoulder flexion, abduction and roll during the breathing trial. The pull phase was longer in duration, swimmers had a shallower hand path, less shoulder abduction, a slower hand vertical acceleration and slower COM horizontal velocity when breathing. The push phase was shorter in duration, swimmers had a smaller range of elbow extension, faster hand horizontal velocity and greater hand vertical acceleration when breathing. Finally, in the recovery phase, swimmers displayed greater maximum shoulder roll in the breathing trial.

256

The finding that incorporating a breath into the front crawl SC resulted in a  $0.05 \text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  decrement in 257 258 swim velocity compared to not taking a breath is in agreement with Pedersen and Kjendlie, 2006but in 259 contrast to Vezos et al. (2007), who reported no difference in swim velocity between breathing 260 conditions within a female sprint population. The discrepancy between studies is perhaps due to 261 findings that elite male swimmers experience significantly higher net drag forces than their female 262 counterparts (26% vs. 16%) during breathing compared to non-breathing trials at a maximal pace 263 (Formosa et al., 2014). The authors suggested that female participants demonstrated similar 264 swimming technique regardless of the breathing condition compared to male swimmers (which 265 contributed to the increased drag force), recommending further investigation in relation to kinematic 266 changes between breathing conditions which will be explored within this discussion. While the 267 changes in both SL and SF did not reach statistical significance, their combined effect meant that 268 swim velocity between conditions was significantly different. Moreover, since SL did not differ 269 between breathing conditions, it is estimated that the breathing action in front crawl sprinting results 270 in a loss of 0.02s per SC. Interestingly, Pedersen and Kjendlie (2006) reported a loss of 0.03s within 271 the SC when breathing. These studies affirm that incorporating a breath into the front crawl SC costs 272 time. Therefore with such fine margins defining success, it is recommended that 50m/100m sprinters 273 limit the number of breaths taken.

276 Weldon & Richardson (2001) suggested that shoulder abduction and increased body roll enhances 277 shoulder joint stability and net humeral joint reactive force. Consequently, the finding that swimmers 278 rolled (4%) and abducted (33%) the ipsilateral shoulder more within the entry phase of the non-279 breathing trial, suggests that the shoulder is in a more stable and perhaps stronger position whilst 280 breath-holding. Increased shoulder roll and abduction have also been linked to greater muscle 281 activation from the supraspinatus and anterior/middle deltoids (Pink et al., 1991). As the ipsilateral 282 shoulder within the NBr trial abducts further from the swimmer's COM, it creates a longer moment 283 arm; combined with a greater muscle recruitment may provide an increased potential to produce 284 greater torque and thus propulsion. It is recommended that kinetic and EMG analyses are combined in 285 future studies to confirm the above assumption. As shoulder strength and swim speed are directly 286 related (Weldon & Richardson, 2001), it is therefore possible that the actions of the shoulder between 287 breathing conditions may have contributed to the finding that the COM X velocity was 3.3% faster 288 during the entry phase of the NBr trial compared to the Br trial. To test this assumption, the 289 researchers conducted a post-hoc analysis investigating the changes in COM X velocity within the 290 entry phase. It was found that COM X velocity increased during the entry phase, but equally for both the breathing  $(0.09 \pm 0.16 \text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1})$  and non-breathing cycles  $(0.09 \pm 0.26 \text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1})$ , with the difference 291 292 between breathing conditions not significant (p=0.99). Therefore, it is unlikely that differences of 293 shoulder kinematics within this phase during the non-breathing SC were beneficial in terms 294 generating propulsion.

295

#### 296 Pull Phase

The finding that the COM X velocity was greater during the pull phase of the NBr trial compared to the Br trial was further explored to minimise any possible 'knock-on' effect from the preceding entry phase, since COM X velocity was higher at the beginning of the pull phase within the NBr vs. Br trial. It was found that COM X velocity decreased during the pull phase within both breathing (-0.16  $\pm$ 0.16m·s<sup>-1</sup>) and non-breathing cycles (-0.10  $\pm$  0.10m·s<sup>-1</sup>), with the difference between breathing conditions not significant (p=0.49). Therefore, it is unlikely that the kinematic differences (described below) during the non-breathing SC were more beneficial in terms of generating higher propulsion.

305 Within the pull phase, the ipsilateral shoulder was further abducted from the COM (11%) and the 306 hand trajectory was deeper (11%) when not breathing, yet the duration of this phase was shorter by 307 14% compared to the breathing trial. Lerda and Cardelli (2003) reported that stroke phase durations 308 are associated with the accelerative actions of the upper limbs, which was confirmed in this study by 309 the ipsilateral hand accelerating faster in the vertical direction (30%) and horizontal direction (35%) 310 within this phase when not incorporating a breath into the SC. It seems that the actions of the 311 ipsilateral hand travelling deeper, yet accelerating faster can account for the shorter duration of the 312 pull phase within the NBr vs. Br trial. It is assumed that any reduction in its duration would not be 313 beneficial in terms of production of impulse. Therefore it is questionable whether this action 314 contributed to the faster non-breathing vs. breathing trial.

315

#### 316 Push Phase

317 This study reported that all swimmers reduced elbow extension by 8% at the end back position and 318 the elbow extension ROM during the push phase by 38% when Br compared to the NBr trial. 319 Deschodt et al. (1996b) reported that a greater elbow displacement throughout the underwater SC was 320 strongly linked to swim performance, thus it is suggested that the greater elbow extension within the 321 push phase during the NBr trial may have contributed to this trial being faster than the Br trial. The 322 reduced elbow extension range during the push phase may have also contributed to the 16% shorter 323 duration when Br vs. NBr. As discussed previously, findings that the ipsilateral hand vertically 324 accelerated 33% faster and 25% faster horizontal hand velocity within the push phase of the Br vs. 325 NBr trial is also a contributing factor to the reduced phase duration. Whereas these factors may all 326 account/contribute towards a shorter push phase duration within the breathing trial, they do not appear 327 to influence the propulsive output as observed via the post hoc analysis that the change in COM X velocity within the push phase between breathing conditions (NBr:  $0.10\pm0.06$  m·s<sup>-1</sup>; Br:  $0.14\pm0.10$  m·s<sup>-1</sup> 328 329 <sup>1</sup>; p=0.57) was not significantly different.

330

#### 331 Recovery Phase

Finally within the recovery phase the finding that maximum shoulder roll was 12% (7.6degs) greater during the Br vs NBr trial is unsurprising and most likely as a consequence to facilitate the breathing action. Payton et al. (1999) reported a similar increase in body roll (9degs) during breathing trials when male swimmers swam at a 200m pace. Since the difference in COM X velocity during the recovery phase did not differ between conditions (NBr:- $0.02\pm0.12$ m·s<sup>-1</sup> vs. Br:  $-0.20\pm0.35$  m·s<sup>-1</sup>; p=0.21) it is suggested that the greater turning motion of the shoulders did not cause considerable resistance to affect swim performance.

339

#### 340 Conclusion

341 Taking a breath in sprint front crawl swimming resulted in a decrement in performance compared to 342 not taking a breath. Overall, as swimmers prepare to incorporate a breath into the stroke cycle, the 343 ipsilateral shoulder remains closer to the COM during both the entry and pull phases thus potentially 344 reducing the magnitude of torque applied compared to the faster non-breathing trial. Swimmers should 'stretch' and roll the shoulders more within the entry phase of a breathing trial as this should 345 346 bring the arm into a position to apply more force. Most kinematic differences between breathing 347 conditions occurred within the push phase. Swimmers are advised to focus on lengthening the push 348 phase by extending the elbow more and not accelerating the hand too quickly upwards when 349 preparing to inhale. Not all the kinematic changes found between breathing conditions could account 350 for the differences in swim performance, therefore it is suggested that the combined effect of other 351 contributing factors such as the activities of the opposite upper limb and/or leg kick should be 352 considered to assess the overall impact and constraint of breathing.

353

#### 354 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Georgios Machtsiras for his assistance during the data collection process.

357

#### 358 Conflict of Interest Statement

| 359 | None |
|-----|------|
| 359 | None |

#### 362 **References**

- Alves, F., Santos, P. M., Veloso, A., Pinto Correia, I., Gomes-Pereira, J., 1994. A method to evaluate
  intracycle propulsive force and body velocity changes. In Proceedings of the XII International
  Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, Budapest: Hungary, 35-37.
- 366
- 367 Bloomfield, P., 1976. Fourier Analysis of Time Series. Sydney, NSW: Wiley.
- 368
- Cappaert, J. M., 1998. Biomechanics of swimming analysed by three-dimensional techniques. In
  Proceedings of the VIII International Symposium on Biomechanics and Medicine in Swimming,
  Jyväskylä: Finland, 141-145.
- 372
- 373 Cardelli, C., Chollet, D., Lerda, R., 1999. Analysis of the 100-m front crawl as a function of skill level
  374 in non-expert swimmers. Journal of Human Movement Studies 36, 51-74.
- 375
- Castro, F., Minghelli, F., Floss, J., Guimaraes, A., 2002. Body roll angles in frontcrawl swimming in
  different velocities. In Biomechanics and Medicine in Swimming IX, St. Etienne: France, 111-114.
- 378
- Castro, F., Vilas-Boas, J. P., Guimaraes, A.C., 2006. Effect of swimming intensity and breathing in
  front crawl body roll angles for swimmers and triathletes. Brazilian Journal of Biomechanics 7, 85–
  90.
- 382
- Chollet, D., Chalies, S., Chatard, J. C., 2000. A new index of coordination for the crawl: description
  and usefulness. International Journal of Sports Medicine 21, 54-59.
- 385
- 386 Cohen, J., 1992. A power primer. Psychological Bulletin 112, 155-159.

| 388 | Deffeyes, J., Sanders, R. H., 2005. Elliptical zone body segment modelling software: digitising,      |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 389 | modelling and body segment parameter calculation. In Proceedings of XXIII International               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 390 | Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, The China Institute of Sports Science: Beijing, 749-752.         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 391 |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 392 | Deschodt, V. J., Rouard, A. H., Monteil, K. M., 1996a. Relationships between the three coordinates of |  |  |  |  |  |
| 393 | the upper limb joints with swimming velocity. In Proceedings of the VII International Symposium on    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 394 | Biomechanics and Medicine in Swimming, London: E & FN Spon, 52-58.                                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 395 |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 396 | Deschodt, V. J., Rouard, A. H., Monteil, K. M., 1996b. Relative displacements of the wrist, elbow,    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 397 | and shoulder. In Proceedings of the VII International Symposium on Biomechanics and Medicine in       |  |  |  |  |  |

- 398 Swimming, London: E & FN Spon, 105-111.
- 399
- Deschodt, V. J., Arsac, M. L., Rouard, A. H., 1999. Relative contribution of arms and legs in humans
  to propulsion in 25-m sprint front-crawl swimming. European Journal of Applied Physiology and
  Occupational Physiology, 80, 192-199.
- 403
- 404 Di Prampero, P. E., Pendergast, D. R., Wilson, D.W., 1974. Energetics of swimming in man. Journal
  405 of Applied Physiology 37, 1-5.
- 406
- Formosa, D., Sayers, M. G. L., Burkett, B., 2014. The influence of the breathing action on net drag
  force production in front crawl swimming. International Journal of Sports Medicine, 35, 1124-1129.
- 409
- Hay, J. G., Lui, Q., Andrews, J. G., 1993. Body roll and handpath in freestyle swimming: a computer
  simulation study. Journal of Applied Biomechanics, 9, 227-237.
- 412
- 413 Haffner, M. Cappaert, J. M., 1998. Underwater analysis of the freestyle stroke from three different
- 414 points in the stroke cycle. In Proceedings of the VIII International Symposium on Biomechanics and
- 415 Medicine in Swimming, Jyväskylä: Finland. 153-157.

417

418

| 419 |  |
|-----|--|
| 420 | Maglischo, E. W., Maglischo, C. W., Santos, T. R., 1989. Patterns of forward velocity in the four    |
| 421 | competitive swimming strokes. In Proceedings of the VIIth International Symposium of The Society     |
| 422 | of Biomechanics in Sports, Footscray: Australia, 139-149.  |
| 423 |  |
| 424 | McCabe, C.B., Psycharakis, S., Sanders, R., 2011. Kinematic differences between front crawl sprint   |
| 425 | and distance swimmers at sprint pace. Journal of Sports Sciences 29, 115-123.                        |
| 426 |  |
| 427 | Payton, C. J., Bartlett, R. M., Baltzopoulos, V., Coombs, R., 1999. Upper extremity kinematics and   |
| 428 | body roll during preferred-side breathing and breath-holding front crawl swimming. Journal of Sports |
| 429 | Sciences 17, 689-695.  |
| 430 |  |
| 431 | Pedersen, T., Kjendlie, P-L., 2006. The effect of the breathing action no velocity in front crawl    |
| 432 | sprinting. Portuguese Journal of Sport Sciences 6, 75-77.  |
| 433 |  |
| 434 | Pendergast, D. R., Di Prampero, P. E., Craig, A. B., Wilson, D. R., Rennie, D.W., 1977. Quantitative |
| 435 | analysis of the frontcrawl in men and women. Journal of Applied Physiology 43, 475-479.              |
| 436 |  |
| 437 | Pink, M., Perry, J., Browne, A., Scovazzo, M.L., Kerrigan, J., 1991. The normal shoulder during      |
| 438 | freestyle swimming: An electromyographic and cinematographic analysis of twelve muscles. The         |
| 439 | American Journal of Sports Medicine, 6, 569-576.   |
| 440 |  |
| 441 | Psycharakis, S. G., Sanders, R. H., 2010. Body roll in swimming: A review. Journal of Sport          |
| 442 | Sciences, 28, 229-236.   |
| 443 |  |
|     | 17   |
|     |  |
|     |  |

Lerda, R. Cardelli, C., 2003. Breathing and propelling in crawl as a function of skill and swim

velocity. International Journal of Sports Medicine, 24, 75-80.

| 444 | Psycharakis, S. G., Naemi, R., Connaboy, C., McCabe, C., Sanders, R. H., 2010. Three-dimensional  |
|-----|---|
| 445 | analysis of intracycle velocity fluctuations in front crawl swimming. Scandinavian Journal of Med |
| 446 | and Science in Sports, 20, 128–135.   |

Psycharakis, S. G., McCabe, C., 2011. Shoulder and hip roll differences between breathing and nonbreathing conditions in front crawl swimming. Journal of Biomechanics 44, 1752-1756.

450

Schleihauf, R. E., Gray, L., DeRose, J., 1983. Three dimensional analysis of swimming propulsion in
sprint front crawl stroke. In Swimming IV, Baltimore: USA, 173–183.

453

454 Schleihauf, R. E., 1984. Three-dimensional analysis of hand propulsion in the front crawl stroke. In

455 Proceedings of Biomechanics and Medicine in Swimming, Human Kinetics: Champaign, 173–183.

456

457 Seifert, L., Chehensse, A., Tourny-Chollet, C., Lemaitre, F., Chollet, D., 2008. Effect of breathing
458 pattern on arm coordination symmetry in front crawl. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research
459 22, 1670-1676.

460

461 Town, G. P., Vanness, J. M., 1990. Metabolic responses to controlled frequency breathing in
462 competitive swimmers. Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise 22, 112-116.

463

Vezos, N., Gourgoulis, V., Aggeloussis, N., Kasimatis, P., Christoforidis, C., Mavromatis, G., 2007.
Underwater stroke kinematics during breathing and breath-holding front crawl swimming. Journal of
Sports Science and Medicine 6, 58-62.

467

Watkins, J., Gordan, A. T., 1983. The effects of leg action on performance in the sprint front crawl
stroke. In Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of Biomechanics in Swimming and the
Fifth International Congress on Swimming Medicine, Amsterdam: Holland, 310-314.

- 472 Weldon, E.J., Richardson, A.B., 2001. Upper extremity overuse injuries in swimming. Clinics in
- 473 Sports Medicine, 3, 423-438

475 Table 1. Data and statistical comparisons of the differences between non-breathing (NBr) and 476 breathing (Br) conditions for the following variables: upper limb displacement, elbow angle 477 magnitudes, hand speed, and hand acceleration on the ipsilateral (breathing) side and COM velocity.

| Variables                                | NBr                       | Br                        | t- Value | P-Value | Effect Size |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------|---------|-------------|
| Maximum Hand Y Depth (m)                 | $-0.67 \pm 0.06$          | $-0.63 \pm 0.06$          | 2.41     | 0.04*   | 0.78†       |
| Av. Hand Y Depth (m)                     | $-0.40\pm0.06$            | $-0.36\pm0.05$            | 2.87     | 0.02*   | 0.89†       |
| Av. Hand Y Depth- Entry (m)              | $\textbf{-0.21} \pm 0.06$ | $\textbf{-0.17} \pm 0.07$ | 1.85     | 0.10    | 0.61        |
| Av. Hand Y Depth- Pull (m)               | $\textbf{-0.62} \pm 0.06$ | $\textbf{-0.55} \pm 0.08$ | 2.55     | 0.03*   | 0.99†       |
| Av. Hand Y Depth- Push (m)               | $\textbf{-0.37} \pm 0.07$ | $-0.34 \pm 0.11$          | 0.78     | 0.45    | 0.33        |
| Av. Hand Z Width- Entry (m)              | $0.23\pm0.06$             | $0.20\pm0.07$             | 1.33     | 0.22    | 0.46        |
| Av. Hand Z Width- Pull (m)               | $0.36\pm0.13$             | $0.36\pm0.13$             | 0.10     | 0.93    | 0.00        |
| Av. Hand Z Width- Push (m)               | $0.15\pm0.06$             | $0.17\pm0.07$             | 0.58     | 0.58    | 0.31        |
| Av. Hand X– Entry (m)                    | $\textbf{-0.51} \pm 0.17$ | $-0.53 \pm 0.24$          | 0.42     | 0.68i   | 0.10        |
| Av. Hand X – Pull (m)                    | $0.25\pm0.05$             | $0.28\pm0.11$             | 0.73     | 0.49    | 0.35        |
| Av. Hand X – Push (m)                    | $0.29\pm0.05$             | $0.25\pm0.08$             | 1.25     | 0.24    | 0.60        |
| Av. Total Hand X Pull Length (m)         | $0.55\pm0.06$             | $0.53\pm0.08$             | 0.64     | 0.54    | 0.28        |
| Elbow Angle: 1 <sup>st</sup> Back (degs) | $147.6\pm8.4$             | $151.7 \pm 11.4$          | 0.99     | 0.35    | 0.41        |
| Elbow Angle: Shoulder X (degs)           | $105.4\pm7.3$             | $111.2\pm8.3$             | 1.60     | 0.14    | 0.74        |
| Elbow Angle: End Back (degs)             | $151.2\pm11.7$            | $139.8 \pm 17.7$          | 2.96     | 0.02*   | 0.76†       |
| Elbow Angle: Range of Pull (degs)        | $42.2\pm9.8$              | $40.5\pm13.8$             | 0.27     | 0.79    | 0.14        |
| Elbow Angle: Range of Push (degs)        | $45.8 \pm 15.4$           | $28.5\pm19.2$             | 2.88     | 0.02*   | 0.99†       |
| Av. Shoulder flex/ext – Entry (degs)     | $-65.79 \pm 4.62$         | $-71.76 \pm 5.22$         | 4.46     | 0.01*   | 1.14†       |
| Av. Shoulder flex/ext – Pull (degs)      | $-2.90 \pm 10.00$         | $-2.91 \pm 13.64$         | 0.01     | 0.99    | 0.01        |
| Av. Shoulder flex/ext – Push (degs)      | $65.22\pm3.70$            | $63.25\pm9.82$            | 0.59     | 0.57    | 0.27        |
| Max Shoulder Flexion (degs)              | $-80.37 \pm 7.20$         | $-82.06 \pm 4.41$         | 1.08     | 0.31    | 0.28        |
| Max Shoulder Extension (degs)            | $78.23 \pm 2.47$          | $78.23 \pm 7.28$          | 0.01     | 0.99    | 0.01        |
| Av. Shoulder Abd –Entry (degs)           | $21.14 \pm 6.46$          | $14.14\pm6.07$            | 3.89     | 0.01*   | 1.12†       |

| Av. Shoulder Abd - Pull (degs)                | $59.72\pm5.94$    | $52.90 \pm 5.41$  | 3.30 | 0.01* | 1.20† |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Av. Shoulder Abd – Push (degs)                | $14.03\pm3.54$    | $16.75\pm9.57$    | 0.91 | 0.39  | 0.38  |
| Hand X Speed – Entry $(m \cdot s^{-1})$       | $1.47\pm0.26$     | $1.50\pm0.36$     | 0.31 | 0.76  | 0.10  |
| Hand X Speed – Pull (m·s <sup>-1</sup> )      | $1.27\pm0.17$     | $1.34\pm0.30$     | 0.80 | 0.44  | 0.29  |
| Hand X Speed – Push (m·s <sup>-1</sup> )      | $1.54\pm0.26$     | $2.04\pm0.39$     | 3.50 | 0.01* | 1.51† |
| Hand Y Speed – Entry $(m \cdot s^{-1})$       | $1.48 \pm 0.41$   | $1.35\pm0.42$     | 1.69 | 0.12  | 0.31  |
| Hand Y Speed – Pull $(m \cdot s^{-1})$        | $1.22\pm0.14$     | $1.17\pm0.21$     | 0.46 | 0.65  | 0.28  |
| Hand Y Speed – Push (m·s <sup>-1</sup> )      | $2.56\pm0.38$     | $2.89 \pm 0.91$   | 1.15 | 0.28  | 0.47  |
| Res. Hand Speed – Entry $(m \cdot s^{-1})$    | $2.33\pm\ 0.14$   | $2.34\pm0.17$     | 0.23 | 0.82  | 0.06  |
| Res. Hand Speed – Pull $(m \cdot s^{-1})$     | $2.52 \pm 1.03$   | $2.19\pm0.18$     | 1.01 | 0.34  | 0.45  |
| Res. Hand Speed – Push $(m \cdot s^{-1})$     | $3.57\pm0.80$     | $3.32\pm0.46$     | 0.88 | 0.40  | 0.38  |
| Res. Hand Speed – Recovery $(m \cdot s^{-1})$ | $6.25 \pm 1.34$   | $6.76\pm0.60$     | 1.25 | 0.24  | 0.49  |
| Hand X accel. – Entry $(m \cdot s^{-2})$      | $-7.62 \pm 1.95$  | $-7.25 \pm 2.22$  | 0.37 | 0.72  | 0.18  |
| Hand X accel Pull (m·s <sup>-2</sup> )        | $-4.73 \pm 2.60$  | $-7.29\pm3.5$     | 2.12 | 0.06  | 0.83† |
| Hand X accel Push $(m \cdot s^{-2})$          | $13.87 \pm 5.59$  | $20.09\pm8.67$    | 2.11 | 0.06  | 0.85† |
| Hand X accel Recovery (m·s <sup>-2</sup> )    | $-7.95\pm9.27$    | $-6.64 \pm 12.35$ | 0.44 | 0.67  | 0.12  |
| Hand Y accel Entry (m·s <sup>-2</sup> )       | $-3.54 \pm 1.87$  | $-3.61 \pm 2.64$  | 0.13 | 0.89  | 0.03  |
| Hand Y accel Pull (m·s <sup>-2</sup> )        | $16.37 \pm 4.54$  | $11.54 \pm 4.06$  | 2.40 | 0.04* | 1.12† |
| Hand Y accel Push $(m \cdot s^{-2})$          | $15.86\pm5.56$    | $23.66 \pm 10.11$ | 2.52 | 0.03* | 0.96† |
| Hand Y accel Recovery (m·s <sup>-2</sup> )    | $-14.43 \pm 4.15$ | $14.38\pm6.18$    | 0.03 | 0.97  | 0.01  |
| COM X velocity – Entry $(m \cdot s^{-1})$     | $1.84\pm0.09$     | $1.78\pm0.08$     | 2.94 | 0.02* | 0.70  |
| COM X Velocity – Pull ( $m \cdot s^{-1}$ )    | $1.79\pm0.08$     | $1.73\pm0.08$     | 3.21 | 0.01* | 0.75† |
| COM X Velocity – Push $(m \cdot s^{-1})$      | $1.82\pm0.10$     | $1.85\pm0.11$     | 0.68 | 0.51  | 0.27  |
| COM X Velocity – Recovery $(m \cdot s^{-1})$  | $1.81 \pm 0.08$   | $1.76\pm0.09$     | 2.19 | 0.06  | 0.59  |
| Av. Shoulder roll – Entry (degs)              | $36.67\pm3.74$    | $32.81 \pm 3.69$  | 2.68 | 0.03* | 1.04† |
| Av. Shoulder roll – Pull (degs)               | $35.81 \pm 8.73$  | $35.62\pm5.52$    | 0.09 | 0.93  | 0.03  |
| Av. Shoulder roll – Push (degs)               | $32.38\pm 6.93$   | $35.67 \pm 9.13$  | 0.80 | 0.44  | 0.41  |
|   |                   |                   |      |       |       |

| Av. Shoulder roll – Recovery (degs) | $41.19 \pm 4.70$ | $45.95\pm9.97$   | 1.85 | 0.10  | 0.61  |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Max Shoulder roll – Entry (degs)    | $52.02\pm7.15$   | $52.07 \pm 7.91$ | 0.03 | 0.98  | 0.01  |
| Max Shoulder roll – Pull (degs)     | $50.87 \pm 6.48$ | $48.92\pm 6.85$  | 0.69 | 0.51  | 0.29  |
| Max Shoulder roll – Push (degs)     | $50.19 \pm 7.39$ | $53.96 \pm 8.87$ | 0.90 | 0.39  | 0.46  |
| Max Shoulder roll – Recovery (degs) | $54.49 \pm 5.10$ | $62.06\pm9.73$   | 2.92 | 0.02* | 0.97† |
| Av. Hip Roll – Entry (degs)         | $12.77\pm4.57$   | $12.70\pm5.46$   | 0.03 | 0.98  | 0.01  |
| Av. Hip Roll – Pull (degs)          | $8.15\pm3.85$    | $10.83 \pm 3.47$ | 2.14 | 0.06  | 0.73  |
| Av. Hip Roll – Push (degs)          | $11.20\pm4.75$   | $14.46\pm6.97$   | 1.46 | 0.18  | 0.55  |
| Av. Hip Roll – Recovery (degs)      | $14.34\pm3.32$   | $18.39 \pm 9.33$ | 1.90 | 0.09  | 0.58  |
| Max Hip Roll – Entry (degs)         | $20.49 \pm 6.67$ | $20.49 \pm 5.09$ | 0.01 | 0.99  | 0.01  |
| Max Hip Roll – Pull (degs)          | $17.71 \pm 7.51$ | $19.40\pm6.31$   | 0.84 | 0.42  | 0.24  |
| Max Hip Roll – Push (degs)          | $17.84 \pm 5.05$ | $21.18\pm7.58$   | 1.94 | 0.08  | 0.52  |
| Max Hip Roll – Recovery (degs)      | $22.73 \pm 3.99$ | 28.74± 11.90     | 1.68 | 0.13  | 0.68  |
|                                     |                  |                  |      |       |       |

478 Data are expressed as mean (± SD), p value and effect size. \* indicates a significant difference

479 between conditions, † indicates a large effect size. X – Horizontal; Y – Vertical; Z – Mediolateral; Av.

480 – Average; accel. – acceleration; Res. – resultant; Max – maximum.

#### 485 Figure Legends

Figure 1: Average shoulder roll throughout the stroke cycle for both breathing conditions. As the hand entry was not always the same for each swimmer, the absolute shoulder roll angles are plotted. Peaks represent maximum shoulder rotation and troughs that the swimmer is neutral in the water (i.e. no shoulder rotation). Breathing (Br) trial: A - beginning of finger moving horizontally backward; B finger vertically aligned with the shoulder; C - end of finger backwards movement; D – finger water.  $A \rightarrow B =$  pull phase;  $B \rightarrow C =$  push phase;  $C \rightarrow D =$  recovery phase. Non-breathing (NBr) trial was defined similarly as Br with an added annotation (e.g. A') to distinguish between conditions.

493

Figure 2: Average ipsilateral shoulder abduction throughout the stroke cycle for both conditions. Increased magnitudes represent the shoulder abducting further away from the swimmer, whereas decreased magnitudes represent the shoulder moving towards the swimmer. Breathing (Br) trial: A beginning of finger moving horizontally backward; B - finger vertically aligned with the shoulder; C end of finger backwards movement; D – finger water.  $A \rightarrow B =$  pull phase;  $B \rightarrow C =$  push phase;  $C \rightarrow D$ = recovery phase. Non-breathing (NBr) trial was defined similarly as Br with an added annotation (e.g. A') to distinguish between conditions.

501

Figure 3: Ipsilateral hand vertical displacement throughout the stroke cycle for both breathing conditions. Breathing (Br) trial: A - beginning of finger moving horizontally backward; B - finger vertically aligned with the shoulder; C - end of finger backwards movement; D – finger water.  $A \rightarrow B$ = pull phase;  $B \rightarrow C$  = push phase;  $C \rightarrow D$  = recovery phase. Non-breathing (NBr) trial was defined similarly as Br with an added annotation (e.g. A') to distinguish between conditions.

507

Figure 4: Stroke phase durations for non-breathing (NBr) and breathing (Br) trials. Mean stroke phase
duration data are indicated. Bars represent standard deviation. \* Significant at p<0.05.</li>







