Article title: A biomechanical comparison of initial sprint acceleration performance and technique in an elite athlete with cerebral palsy and able-bodied sprinters

Article type: Original research

Authors: Ian N. Bezodis[a], James Cowburn[b], Adam Brazil[a], Rhian Richardson[c], Cassie Wilson[b], Timothy A. Exell[d], Gareth Irwin[a]

Affiliations: [a]Cardiff School of Sport and Health Sciences, Cardiff Metropolitan University, Cardiff, United Kingdom; [b]Department for Health, University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom; [c]Bristol Medical School, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom; [d]Department of Sport and Exercise Science, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, United Kingdom.

Correspondence: I. N. Bezodis, Ph.D., Cardiff School of Sport and Health Sciences, Cardiff Metropolitan University, Cyncoed Road, Cardiff, United Kingdom, CF23 6XD. Telephone: +44 (0) 2920 41 7245; E-mail: ibezodis@cardiffmet.ac.uk; ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-0250-032X

Abstract word count: 200

Text-only word count: 3757

No. of figures & tables: 2 figures, 2 tables

Abstract:

Cerebral palsy is known to generally limit range of motion and force producing capability during movement. It also limits sprint performance, but the exact mechanisms underpinning this are not well known. One elite male T36 multiple-Paralympic sprint medallist (T36) and 16 well-trained able-bodied (AB) sprinters each performed 5-6 maximal sprints from starting blocks. Whole body kinematics (250 Hz) in the block phase and first two steps, and synchronised external forces (1000 Hz) in the first stance phase after block exit were combined to quantify lower-limb joint kinetics. Sprint performance (normalised average horizontal external power in the first stance after block exit) was lower in T36 compared to AB. T36 had lower extensor range of motion and peak extensor angular velocity at all lower limb joints in the first stance after block exit. Positive work produced at the knee and hip joints in the first stance was lower in T36 than AB, and the ratio of positive:negative ankle work produced was lower in T36 than AB. These novel results directly demonstrate the manner in which cerebral palsy limits performance in a competition-specific sprint acceleration movement, thereby improving understanding of the factors that may limit performance in elite sprinters with cerebral palsy.

Keywords: inverse dynamics, kinetics, Paralympics, performance, track and field

Introduction:

Cerebral palsy (CP) is a non-degenerative neurological condition that affects movement. Previous research has shown that CP can limit range of motion (de Bruin, Smeulders, & Kreulen, 2013), the ability to rapidly generate force (Brouwer, Wheeldon, & Stradiotto-Parker, 1998; Mathewson et al., 2014; Moreau, Falvo, & Damiano, 2012), and the ability to generate maximum force (Jung, Her, & Ko, 2013; Moreau et al., 2012), which has a detrimental effect on the mass centre velocity achieved across a range of modes of gait. Research specifically investigating running in participants with CP is limited. However, children with CP have been shown to increase running velocity by increasing step frequency (Davids, Bagley, & Bryan, 1998; Iosa, Morelli, Marro, Paolucci, & Fusco, 2013), and to depend more on proximal hip musculature for power generation as velocity increases (Davids et al., 1998). Whilst these findings can be used to help inform the Paralympic classification system (Beckman, Connick, & Tweedy, 2016; Connick, Beckman, Spathis, Deuble, & Tweedy, 2015), very little is known about the mechanisms that directly limit sprint performance in Paralympic CP athletes compared to their able-bodied (AB) counterparts, particularly regarding the kinetic underpinnings of performance (Morriën, Taylor, & Hettinga, 2017).

The start and initial acceleration are vital to elite 100 m sprint performance (Bezodis, Salo, & Trewartha, 2010; Morin et al., 2012; Nagahara, Naito, Morin, & Zushi, 2014). The generation of force and power in the blocks and early ground contacts act to accelerate the athlete towards the finish line in the shortest time possible. Kinematic analyses of trained CP sprinters have suggested that reduced step length in the first three steps (Andrews, Ferreira, & Bressan, 2011), and at 20 m (Pope & Wilkerson, 1986), as well as an increased contact time: flight time ratio (Pope & Wilkerson, 1986) inhibit CP sprint performance, but research is limited at present.

The kinetic factors that limit AB initial sprint acceleration performance are better understood. Normalised average horizontal external power is a widely accepted measure of sprint start performance that incorporates both the velocity produced and the time taken to produce it (Bezodis et al., 2010). In the block phase, the application of a high average horizontal force by both legs is important to performance (Willwacher et al., 2016). Elite sprinters have been shown to create greater horizontal impulses than sub-elite athletes in the block phase and first two ground contacts (Slawinski et al., 2010). Throughout the acceleration phase it is the magnitude of propulsive, rather than braking impulse that is most closely linked to performance (Morin et al., 2015). Early in the first stance following block exit, it has been shown that the magnitude of energy absorption at the ankle joint is important to performance in AB sprinters (Charalambous, Irwin, Bezodis, & Kerwin, 2012). In terms of energy generation, the ankle plantarflexors and hip extensors are known to play important roles (Bezodis, Salo, & Trewartha, 2014; Brazil et al., 2017; Charalambous et al., 2012). The relative magnitude of energy generation at the knee joint in the first stance is less clear between studies (Bezodis et al., 2014; Brazil et al., 2017; Charalambous et al., 2012; Debaere, Delecluse, Aerenhouts, Hagman, & Jonkers, 2013), but it is thought to discriminate between AB sprinters of differing abilities (Bezodis et al., 2014; Debaere et al., 2013).

The primary aim of this study was to understand the factors that contribute to maximal sprint acceleration in an elite athlete with CP. The secondary aim was to compare these factors to a sample of AB controls to investigate the factors that might limit sprint acceleration performance due to CP. The purpose of this investigation was to inform coaches and sports scientists working with sprinters with CP, to understand the mechanisms that might limit sprint acceleration performance so that training and conditioning programmes could be designed accordingly. It was hypothesised that the elite athlete with CP would 1) produce less normalised

average horizontal external power; and 2) display reduced range of motion at each of the lower limb joints compared with the able-bodied controls.

Methods:

Participants

One elite T36 multiple-Paralympic sprint medallist, hereafter identified as T36 (1.73 m, 55.4 kg, <12.50 s 100 m PB, equivalent to less than 5.0% slower than the T36 100 m world record), and 16 well trained AB sprinters (mean ± SD; 22.7 ± 4.3 years, 1.79 ± 0.05 m, 76.4 ± 5.3 kg, 10.66 ± 0.32 s [range = 10.10-11.20 s] 100 m PB) gave written informed consent to participate after institutional ethical approval. Athletes in the T36 classification are defined as demonstrating 'moderate athetosis, ataxia and sometimes hypertonia or a mixture of these which affects all four limbs' (International Paralympic Committee, 2018). Testing took place on an indoor athletics track during normal acceleration training sessions. All athletes were in the preparation phase of training, in advance of the competitive outdoor season. After undertaking an individualised coach-prescribed warm-up, each athlete performed five or six maximal 10 m sprints from starting blocks, set to individual preferences.

Equipment

Three dimensional kinematic data were captured using a 15 camera automatic system (250 Hz, Vicon, Oxford Metrics, UK) calibrated using a 240 mm wand to residual errors of < 0.3 mm. Retroreflective markers (14 mm) were attached bilaterally to the athlete's sprint shoes on the first and fifth metatarsal heads, calcaneus and head of second toe, and to the skin on the iliac crest, posterior and anterior superior iliac spines, lateral and medial femoral epicondyles and malleoli, acromions, lateral and medial elbow and wrist joints and second metacarpal heads. Unilateral markers were attached to the superior sternum, xiphoid process and C7 and T10

vertebrae. Four-marker technical clusters were attached towards the distal end of thigh and shank segments and three-marker technical clusters to the upper and lower arms. A four-marker headband was also worn. External forces were captured for the first stance after block exit. The force platform (1000 Hz, 9287A, Kistler, Switzerland) was mounted underneath the Mondo (Warwickshire, UK) track surface and internally amplified. Force and kinematic data were synchronised. Ground contact was defined when vertical force was greater than 10 N.

Data Processing and Analysis

Marker trajectories were labelled in Nexus v1.8.5 (Vicon, Oxford Metrics, UK), after which data processing took place in Visual 3D (C-Motion Inc., Germantown, UK). After residual analysis (Winter, 2005), raw marker trajectories were low pass filtered at 12 Hz (4th order Butterworth). A 17-segment whole body model (pelvis, trunk, head, and bilateral thigh, shank, foot, toe, upper arm, lower arm and hand) was created. Hip joint centres were defined using regression equations (Bell, Brand, & Pedersen, 1989). Knee and ankle joint centres were defined as midpoints between medial and lateral epicondyles and malleoli, respectively, and metatarso-phalangeal (MTP) joints were defined as the midpoints between first and fifth metatarsal heads (Smith, Lake, & Lees, 2014). Whole-body centre of mass position was calculated in Visual 3D.

Each segment's local coordinate system (SCS) was defined with a static calibration trial, with the x-axis pointing right, y-axis forwards and z-axis upwards. Joint angular velocity (°/s) was defined as the rate of change of the angle of the distal SCS relative to the proximal, described by an X, Y, Z Cardan sequence. Resultant joint moments at the MTP, ankle, knee and hip joints were resolved in the proximal SCS using Newton-Euler inverse dynamic procedures (Selbie, Hamill, & Kepple, 2014), with external force data filtered at the same cut-off frequency as the kinematic data (Bezodis, Salo, & Trewartha, 2013). Due to movements in the sagittal plane

being of primary importance in sprinting (Bezodis, Kerwin, & Salo, 2008; Bezodis et al., 2014; Charalambous et al., 2012), only flexion-extension (x-axis) data are reported here, with extension and plantarflexion defined as positive. Joint power was calculated as the product of joint moment and joint angular velocity. The main phases of positive and negative joint power were identified, and joint work was calculated for each by integrating power-time curves (trapezium rule), to define positive (energy generation) and negative (energy absorption) work. Antero-posterior and vertical ground reaction forces were integrated (trapezium rule) to calculate impulse, and ratio of antero-posterior to vertical forces (RF) were calculated, to determine the effectiveness of the force application for sprint acceleration (Morin et al., 2012). Average horizontal external power, the outcome performance measure, was calculated for the stance on the force platform, using incoming centre of mass velocity from kinematic data, then external force data to calculate change in velocity (Bezodis et al., 2010). All joint data (except angles) and external powers were normalised to dimensionless values to allow between-athlete comparisons (Bezodis et al., 2010; Hof, 1996). The instant of block exit was defined by the peak horizontal acceleration of the head of the second toe of the front foot, and was used to calculate flight time and step length between block exit and first stance.

Statistical Analysis

Joint kinematic and kinetic values were time-normalised to 100% of stance using a cubic spline. Means of all variables were calculated separately for the six trials of the T36 athlete and across the 16 AB sprinters. 95% confidence intervals were calculated between-trials for T36 and between-athletes for AB, and are reported in the results as (lower limit : upper limit). Since confidence intervals represent the likely range of true values, differences in dependent variables between T36 and AB were identified where the confidence intervals did not overlap (Bezodis et al., 2014).

Results:

All kinetic results presented in this paragraph are from the first foot contact after block clearance. T36 showed reduced absolute (95% CI 735 : 885 W v 1713 : 1893 W) and normalised (0.47 : 0.56 v 0.78 : 0.86) average horizontal external power compared to AB (Table 1). The magnitude of peak braking force was greater in T36 than AB (-0.89 : -0.59 BW v -0.44 : -0.21 BW, Figure 1), whilst the magnitude of peak propulsive force was lower in T36 (0.72 : 0.82 BW v 1.06 : 1.13 BW), resulting in a lower net horizontal impulse (44 : 54 Ns v 85 : 96 N·s) and a lower increase in horizontal velocity (0.79 : 0.97 m/s v 1.11 : 1.25 m/s) in T36. Ratio of forces was lower (more vertical) in T36 compared to AB (0.28 : 0.34 v 0.42 : 0.44).

T36 spent longer pushing on the starting blocks (0.384 : 0.447 s v 0.363 : 0.379 s) and less time in the subsequent flight phase (0.006 : 0.075 s v 0.084 : 0.144 s) than AB. There were no clear differences between T36 and AB in contact time, flight time or step frequency for the second step. Step length was shorter in T36 than AB for both the first (0.69 : 0.80 m v 1.02 : 1.09 m) and second steps (0.91: 0.95 m v 1.04 : 1.15 m).

**** Insert Table 1 near here ****

**** Insert Figure 1 near here ****

At the joint level, T36 showed reduced extensor range of motion and peak extensor angular velocity at MTP, ankle, knee and hip joints compared to AB (Figure 2). Magnitudes of peak power during the respective generation and absorption phases were generally similar across the joints between T36 and AB. However, the magnitude of negative work performed at the ankle joint was greater in T36 than AB (-0.082 : -0.064 v -0.051 : -0.036, Table 2), whilst the magnitude of positive work performed at the knee and hip was lower in T36 than AB (0.064 : 0.087 v 0.093 : 0.127 and 0.031 : 0.097 v 0.116 : 0.150, respectively). Furthermore, the hip

joint was a net energy absorber in T36, whereas it was a net energy generator in AB, and the ratio of positive:negative work at the ankle joint was lower in T36 than AB.

**** Insert Table 2 near here ****

**** Insert Figure 2 near here ****

Discussion and Implications:

The aims of this study were to understand the factors that contribute to maximal sprint acceleration in an elite CP athlete, and to compare those factors to a sample of AB sprinters to investigate which factors might limit sprint acceleration performance due to CP. This will aid the informed design of training and conditioning programmes for sprinters with CP, to account for the effect of those performance-limiting factors. In agreement with Hypothesis 1, performance in T36 was lower than the AB athletes, shown by the clear reduction in normalised average horizontal external power created in the first ground contact after block exit. The reduced performance in T36 was to be expected due to the nature of CP. It has previously been demonstrated under passive dorsiflexion conditions that children with CP can produce less isometric force than controls (Brouwer et al., 1998). In a separate study, following muscle biopsy from the gastrocnemius and soleus, passively stretched single muscle fibres were shown to be stiffer in the CP group (Mathewson et al., 2014), suggesting a reduced capability to rapidly create force. Whilst the measurement of individual muscle or muscle fibre properties was beyond the scope of this research, the reduction in external power production in T36 was a clear manifestation of the lack of individual muscles' ability to generate power. This reduced force production can be explained in terms of the motor control strategies adopted by individuals with CP. Co-contraction is a common motor control strategy often activated when a person needs increased joint stability or improved movement accuracy (Damiano, 1993) and therefore not surprisingly, increased co-contraction has been demonstrated in individuals with

CP (Hussain, Onambele, Williams, & Morse, 2014). However, from a mechanical point of view, the activation patterns associated with muscle co-contraction increase joint stiffness and limit force production of the agonists. To the authors' knowledge the current study is the first time that reduced power generation has been quantified in an elite sports performance setting, and further investigation of the underlying joint-level technique of the sprint start will reveal how the reduced power-generating capability limits sprint performance in sprinters with CP.

The generation of positive mechanical work by the muscles that act to extend the joints of the leg is crucial to the acceleration of the athletes' centre of mass, and therefore to sprint performance. Primarily due to markedly reduced energy generation by the hip extensor muscles during early ground contact in T36, the muscles that crossed the hip were net energy absorbers in the contact phase for that athlete. This net energy absorption was in contrast to AB, who generated over 1.6 times as much energy at the hip early in stance than was absorbed before take-off. The ability of the large hamstring and gluteal muscle groups to generate energy has previously been shown to be important to sprint performance at maximum velocity (Bezodis et al., 2008; Mann & Sprague, 1980). In elite athletes, in the first stance after the blocks, the muscles that cross the hip have been shown to generate between three and five times more energy than they absorb (Bezodis et al., 2014). In this study, the knee extensor musculature also generated less energy early in stance in T36 compared to AB. The role of the knee joint is thought to vary more than other joints throughout a maximal sprint (Bezodis et al., 2008), but the magnitude of energy generated by the knee in early stance has been shown to discriminate between sprinters of different abilities in the early acceleration phase (Bezodis et al., 2014; Debaere et al., 2013).

Regarding the ankle joint work quantified in this study, the primary difference between T36 and AB was that the plantarflexors absorbed nearly twice as much energy early in stance in T36 compared to AB. This came about due to an increase in the plantarflexor moment in T36

early in stance, rather than any difference in the angular velocity of dorsiflexion, which was similar in T36 and AB. Therefore, T36 had a stiffer ankle joint during the loading phase of the ground contact, in line with the co-contraction motor control strategy discussed above. Based on a within-athlete analysis, it has previously been shown that a stiffer ankle in the loading phase at the start of the first contact after the blocks leads to an increase in the velocity of the centre of mass at take-off (Charalambous et al., 2012). However, that increase in velocity comes about not just because of the stiff ankle joint early in stance, but because of the subsequent generation of energy by the plantarflexors during the propulsive phase before take-off (Bruggemann, Arampatzis, Emrich, & Potthast, 2008). T36 was only able to generate twice as much energy at the ankle late in stance, as that absorbed in the loading phase, compared to a ratio of 3.8 times positive:negative work at the ankle in AB, and 3.0 in three elite sprinters (Bezodis et al., 2014).

The reduced external and internal power production in T36 compared to AB demonstrated here led to changes in higher order variables that are related to sprint performance, such as external forces and impulses and whole body kinematic measures. T36 created larger horizontal braking forces and smaller propulsive forces in the first stance than AB, but did so in a similar ground contact time. This meant that the magnitude of the net horizontal impulse generated by T36 was approximately half that created by AB. Furthermore, since vertical force and impulse production was similar in T36 and AB, the ratio of forces produced by T36 was more vertical. A more horizontal ratio of forces has been shown to be linked to performance in elite able-bodied sprinters (Morin et al., 2012), and amputee sprinters have been shown to have a more vertical force orientation in the blocks than able-bodied athletes (Willwacher et al., 2016). In this study, the changes in horizontal and vertical velocity created in the first stance by T36 were respectively lower and greater than those produced by AB. The cumulative effect of this was to result in a similar flight time, but reduced step length in T36 in the second step of the sprint.

The first step, however, had a reduced flight time as well as a reduced step length in T36 compared to AB. External forces were not measured in the block phase in this study, but it is likely that similar differences between T36 and AB were apparent as in the first stance after block exit. The reduced step lengths in T36 compared to AB were in agreement with previous kinematic analyses of CP sprint performance (Andrews et al., 2011; Pope & Wilkerson, 1986).

The biomechanical mechanisms that limit gross motor function in people with CP have been widely investigated in the literature, but to the authors' knowledge they have not previously been directly quantified at the extremes of human performance, as in this study. For example it has previously been shown that rate of force development, impulse and maximal strength (torque) were reduced in a maximal isometric knee extension task in children with CP compared to AB controls (Moreau et al., 2012). Furthermore, athletes with brain impairment (including CP) have reduced maximal strength in isometric leg flexion, leg extension and platarflexion tasks, and were slower in the acceleration and maximum velocity phases of a maximal 60 m sprint than AB controls (Beckman et al., 2016). In the same sample of athletes with brain impairment (including CP) there was reduced range of motion in two of five clinical tests of lower body range of motion (Connick et al., 2015). In a direct biomechanical comparison of maximal athletic performance in this study with AB controls, T36 created less normalised average external horizontal power, horizontal impulse, and positive work at the knee and hip during the first ground contact after block exit in a maximal sprint acceleration. Furthermore, T36 showed reduced range of motion at each of the hip, knee, ankle and MTP joints compared to AB. Therefore, the second hypothesis developed for this study was accepted. Interestingly, at each joint, the reduced range of motion was accompanied by a lower peak extensor angular velocity. This novel finding suggests a reduced capability of T36 to generate rapid propulsive joint actions during maximal sprint acceleration.

This study was limited by the recruitment of only one elite athlete with CP. However, particularly in Paralympic sport, populations of elite athletes are small, and the challenges of recruiting elite participants for research are widely acknowledged (Coutts, 2016; Kearney, 1999). Furthermore, despite the broad classification system in place, Paralympic athletes' physical conditions and impairments are often unique to the individual, and CP clearly affects individuals in differing ways (de Groot et al., 2012; Moreau et al., 2012). There is clear precedent in the comparison of a single Paralympic athlete to AB controls to understand the limits of performance in these individuals from a much smaller population than elite able-bodied athletes (Bruggemann et al., 2008; Weyand et al., 2009). The recruitment here of a large sample of 16 AB sprinters all tested under identical conditions to T36 lends confidence to the comparisons made.

Since this analysis was confined to the first step following block exit, no consideration was given to asymmetries in performance. Asymmetry may be particularly prevalent in general in athletes with CP, but the T36 classification includes athletes affected in all four limbs. Additionally, this analysis was confined to the sagittal plane, which has been shown to be the most important for sprint performance, but which ignores frontal plane motions which may again be prevalent in athletes with CP. Functional range of motion and strength tests were not carried out on the participants in this study. Future studies should look to combine those functional tests with direct measures of athletic performance as performed here, to provide a complete picture of the mechanisms that limit performance in CP sprinters. Due to the mechanical differences between phases of a 100 m sprint, future work should also look to understand performance across the transition and maximum velocity phases, as well as initial acceleration.

Conclusion

In conclusion, horizontal force and power producing capabilities were limited in T36 compared to AB. This accompanied reduced ranges of motion and peak extensor angular velocities at all joints of the leg, which led to reductions in step length and therefore overall performance in maximal sprint acceleration in T36. The current study is the first time that the mechanisms that underpin the limited performance have been directly investigated and explained. This information will help to further the understanding of the limits of performance in elite sprinters with CP, and could be used to help inform the design of training programmes for sprinters with CP, to account for those limits to performance.

Conflict of interest statement: The authors do not have any conflict of interest.

References:

Andrews, B. S., Ferreira, S., & Bressan, E. S. (2011). The usefulness of kinematic norms for Paralympic sprinters. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance, 17(Supplement 1)*, 29-38. doi: 10.4314/ajpherd.v17i3.68070

Beckman, E. M., Connick, M. J., & Tweedy, S. M. (2016). How much does lower body strength impact Paralympic running performance? *European Journal of Sport Science, 16*(6), 669-676. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2015.1132775

Bell, A. L., Brand, R. A., & Pedersen, D. R. (1989). Prediction of hip joint centre location from external landmarks. *Human Movement Science, 8*(1), 3-16. doi: 10.1016/0167-9457(89)90020-1

Bezodis, I. N., Kerwin, D. G., & Salo, A. I. T. (2008). Lower-limb mechanics during the support phase of maximum-velocity sprint running. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, 40*(4), 707-715. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e318162d162

Bezodis, N. E., Salo, A. I. T., & Trewartha, G. (2010). Choice of sprint start performance measure affects the performance-based ranking within a group of sprinters: which is the most appropriate measure? *Sports Biomechanics, 9*(4), 258-269.

Bezodis, N. E., Salo, A. I. T., & Trewartha, G. (2013). Excessive fluctuations in knee joint moments during early stance in sprinting are caused by digital filtering procedures. *Gait & Posture, 38*(4), 653-657. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2013.02.015

Bezodis, N. E., Salo, A. I. T., & Trewartha, G. (2014). Lower limb joint kinetics during the first stance phase in athletics sprinting: three elite athlete case studies. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 32*(8), 738-746. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2013.849000

Brazil, A., Exell, T., Wilson, C., Willwacher, S., Bezodis, I., & Irwin, G. (2017). Lower limb joint kinetics in the starting blocks and first stance in athletic sprinting. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 35*(16), 1629-1635. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2016.1227465

Brouwer, B., Wheeldon, R. K., & Stradiotto-Parker, N. (1998). Reflex excitability and isometric force production in cerebral palsy: the effect of serial casting. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology, 40*(3), 168-175. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8749.1998.tb15442.x

Brüggemann, G.-P., Arampatzis, A., Emrich, F., & Potthast, W. (2008). Biomechanics of double transtibial amputee sprinting using dedicated sprinting prostheses. *Sports Technology, 1*(4-5), 220-227.

Charalambous, L., Irwin, G., Bezodis, I. N., & Kerwin, D. (2012). Lower limb joint kinetics and ankle joint stiffness in the sprint start push-off. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 30*(1), 1-9. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2011.616948

Connick, M. J., Beckman, E., Spathis, J., Deuble, R., & Tweedy, S. M. (2015). How much do range of movement and coordination affect Paralympic sprint performance? *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 47*(10), 2216-2223.

Coutts, A. J. (2016). Working fast and working slow: The benefits of embedding research in high-performance sport. *International Journal of Sports Physiology & Performance, 11*(1), 1-2.

Damiano, D. L. (1993). Reviewing muscle cocontraction: is it a developmental, pathological, or motor control issue? *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*, *12*(4), 3-20.

Davids, J. R., Bagley, A. M., & Bryan, M. (1998). Kinematic and kinetic analysis of running in children with cerebral palsy. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology, 40*(8), 528-535. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8749.1998.tb15411.x

de Bruin, M., Smeulders, M. J. C., & Kreulen, M. (2013). Why is joint range of motion limited in patients with cerebral palsy? *Journal of Hand Surgery (European Volume), 38*(1), 8-13. doi: 10.1177/1753193412444401

de Groot, S., Dallmeijer, A. J., Bessems, P. J., Lamberts, M. L., van der Woude, L. H., & Janssen, T. W. (2012). Comparison of muscle strength, sprint power and aerobic capacity in adults with and without cerebral palsy. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine, 44*(11), 932-938. doi: 10.2340/16501977-1037

Debaere, S., Delecluse, C., Aerenhouts, D., Hagman, F., & Jonkers, I. (2013). From block clearance to sprint running: Characteristics underlying an effective transition. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 31*(2), 137-149. doi:10.1080/02640414.2012.722225

Hof, A. L. (1996). Scaling gait data to body size. *Gait & Posture, 4*(3), 222-223.

Hussain, A. W., Onambele, G. L., Williams, A.G., & Morse, C. I. (2014). Muscle size, activation, and coactivation in adults with cerebral palsy. *Muscle & Nerve*, *49*(1), 76-83. doi: 10.1002/mus.23866

Iosa, M., Morelli, D., Marro, T., Paolucci, S., & Fusco, A. (2013). Ability and stability of running and walking in children with cerebral palsy. *Neuropediatrics, 44*(3), 147-154. doi: 10.1055/s-0033-1336016

International Paralympic Committee (2018). *Athletics Classification.* Retrieved from
https://www.paralympic.org/athletics/classification

Jung, J. W., Her, J. G., & Ko, J. (2013). Effect of strength training of ankle plantarflexors on
selective voluntary motor control, gait parameters, and gross motor function of children
with cerebral palsy. *Journal of Physical Therapy Science, 25*(10), 1259-1263. doi:
10.1589/jpts.25.1259

Kearney, J. T. (1999). Sport performance enhancement: Design and analysis of research.
Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, 31(5), 755-756.

Mann, R. V., & Sprague, P. (1980). A kinetic analysis of the ground leg during sprint running.
Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 51(2), 334-348.

Mathewson, M. A., Chambers, H. G., Girard, P. J., Tenenhaus, M., Schwartz, A. K., & Lieber,
R. L. (2014). Stiff muscle fibers in calf muscles of patients with cerebral palsy lead to
high passive muscle stiffness. *Journal of Orthopaedic Research, 32*(12), 1667-1674.
doi: 10.1002/jor.22719

Moreau, N. G., Falvo, M. J., & Damiano, D. L. (2012). Rapid force generation is impaired in
cerebral palsy and is related to decreased muscle size and functional mobility. *Gait &
Posture, 35*(1), 154-158. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2011.08.027

Morin, J.-B., Bourdin, M., Edouard, P., Peyrot, N., Samozino, P., & Lacour, J.-R. (2012).
Mechanical determinants of 100-m sprint running performance. *European Journal of
Applied Physiology, 112*(11), 3921-3930. doi: 10.1007/s00421-012-2379-8

Morin, J.-B., Slawinski, J., Dorel, S., de Villareal, E. S., Couturier, A., Samozino, P., Brughelli,
M., & Rabita, G. (2015). Acceleration capability in elite sprinters and ground impulse:
Push more, brake less? *Journal of Biomechanics, 48*(12), 3149-3154. doi:
10.1016/j.jbiomech.2015.07.009

Morriën, F., Taylor, M. J. D., & Hettinga, F. J. (2017). Biomechanics in Paralympics: Implications for performance. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, *12*(5), 578-589. doi: 10.1123/ijspp.2016-0199

Nagahara, R., Naito, H., Morin, J. B., & Zushi, K. (2014). Association of acceleration with spatiotemporal variables in maximal sprinting. *International Journal of Sports Medicine, 35*(9), 755-761. doi: 10.1055/s-0033-1363252

Pope, C., & Wilkerson, J. (1986). *Comparison of cerebral palsied and healthy sprinters*. Paper presented at the International Society of Biomechanics in Sports Conference Proceedings (pp. 233-238). Retrieved from https://ojs.ub.uni-konstanz.de/cpa/article/view/1490.

Selbie, S. W., Hamill, J., & Kepple, T. M. (2014). Three-dimensional kinetics. In G. E. Robertson, G. E. Caldwell, J. Hamill, G. Kamen, & S. N. Whittlesey (Eds.), *Research Methods in Biomechanics (2nd Edition)* (pp. 151-176). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Slawinski, J., Bonnefoy, A., Leveque, J. M., Ontanon, G., Riquet, A., Dumas, R., & Cheze, L. (2010). Kinematic and kinetic comparisons of elite and well-trained sprinters during sprint start. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 24*(4), 896-905. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181ad3448

Smith, G., Lake, M., & Lees, A. (2014). Metatarsophalangeal joint function during sprinting: A comparison of barefoot and sprint spike shod foot conditions. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics, 30*(2), 206-212.

Weyand, P. G., Bundle, M. W., McGowan, C. P., Grabowski, A., Brown, M. B., Kram, R., & Herr, H. (2009). The fastest runner on artificial legs: different limbs, similar function? *Journal of Applied Physiology, 107*(3), 903-911. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.00174.2009

Willwacher, S., Herrmann, V., Heinrich, K., Funken, J., Strutzenberger, G., Goldmann, J.-P., … Brüggemann., G.-P. (2016). Sprint start kinetics of amputee and non-amputee sprinters. *PLoS ONE*, *11*(11): e0166219. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0166219

Winter, D. A. (2005). *Biomechanics and Motor Control of Human Movement* (Third Edition, pp. 42-50). Hoboken, NJ.: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Table 1. External kinetic and whole body kinematic measures

	T36	AB
	Mean (95% CI)	Mean (95% CI)
Average horizontal external power [W]	810 (735 : 885)*	1803 (1713 : 1893)
Normalised average horizontal external power	0.51 (0.47 : 0.56) *	0.82 (0.78 : 0.86)
Net horizontal impulse [N·s]	49 (44 : 54) *	90 (85 : 96)
Vertical impulse [N·s]	40 (36 : 44)	38 (32 : 45)
Change in velocity due to horizontal impulse [m/s]	0.88 (0.79 : 0.97) *	1.18 (1.11 : 1.25)
Change in velocity due to vertical impulse [m/s]	0.72 (0.64 : 0.80) *	0.50 (0.42 : 0.59)
Ratio of forces [%]	0.31 (0.28 : 0.34) *	0.43 (0.42 : 0.44)
Block time [s]	0.415 (0.384 : 0.447) *	0.371 (0.363 : 0.379)
Flight time (block to first contact) [s]	0.041 (0.006 : 0.075) *	0.099 (0.084 : 0.114)
Step one frequency [Hz]	2.20 (2.11 : 2.28)	2.15 (2.09 : 2.20)
Step one length [m]	0.75 (0.69 : 0.80) *	1.06 (1.02 : 1.09)
First contact time [s]	0.195 (0.185 : 0.206)	0.193 (0.185 : 0.202)
Flight time (first to second contact) [s]	0.040 (0.027 : 0.053)	0.050 (0.043 : 0.056)
Step two frequency [Hz]	4.27 (3.94 : 4.59)	4.15 (3.98 : 4.31)
Step two length [m]	0.93 (0.91 : 0.95) *	1.09 (1.04 : 1.15)

* No overlap between T36 and AB 95% confidence intervals

Table 2. Absolute and normalised negative and positive work performed at each lower limb joint

Joint	Phase	Unit	T36 Mean (95% CI)	AB Mean (95% CI)
MTP	Negative	J	-10 (-11 : -8) *	-16 (-18 : -13)
		n/a	-0.021 (-0.024 : -0.017)	-0.024 (-0.028 : -0.020)
	Positive	J	2 (2 : 3) *	6 (5 : 8)
		n/a	0.005 (0.004 : 0.006)	0.010 (0.008 : 0.012)
Ankle	Negative	J	-34 (-38 : -30)	-29 (-34 : -23)
		n/a	-0.073 (-0.082 : -0.064) *	-0.043 (-0.051 : -0.036)
	Positive	J	70 (66 : 73) *	108 (100 : 117)
		n/a	0.149 (0.142 : 0.156)	0.164 (0.151 : 0.177)
Knee	Positive	J	35 (30 : 41) *	73 (61 : 86)
		n/a	0.075 (0.064 : 0.087) *	0.110 (0.093 : 0.127)
	Negative	J	-1 ± (-1 : -1)	-2 (-3 : -1)
		n/a	-0.002 (-0.003 : -0.001)	-0.004 (-0.005 : -0.002)
Hip	Positive	J	30 (14 : 46) *	88 (77 : 99)
		n/a	0.064 (0.031 : 0.097) *	0.133 (0.116 : 0.150)
	Negative	J	-41 (-56 : -26)	-55 (-65 : -45)
		n/a	-0.088 (-0.120 : -0.056)	-0.082 (-0.095 : -0.069)

* No overlap between T36 and AB 95% confidence intervals. n/a shows dimensionless normalised work values.

Figure 1. Horizontal (antero-posterior) and vertical ground reaction forces during first stance phase. T36 mean, dashed grey line; T36 95% confidence intervals, dotted grey lines; AB mean, solid black line; AB 95% confidence intervals, dotted black lines.

Figure 2. Joint angle and normalised angular velocity, moment and power at MTP, ankle, knee and hip joints during first stance phase. T36 mean, dashed grey line; T36 95% confidence intervals, dotted grey lines; AB mean, solid black line; AB 95% confidence intervals, dotted black lines.