



25	<b>Influence of lower-limb muscle power-related variables on the</b>
26	<b><i>ippon-seoi-nage</i> of elite judokas</b>
27	

28 **Abstract**

29 This study investigated the influence of the lower-limb extension mechanical  
30 variables (strength variables) on the *ippon-seoi-nage* kinematic variables (technical  
31 variables) in elite judokas. Additionally, we studied the effect of performing *ippon-*  
32 *seoi-nage* with lower-limb flexion-extension action *vs.* without it, on the technical  
33 and strength variables, as well as on their relationship. Twenty-four male elite  
34 judokas were classified in two groups depending on the type of *ippon-seoi-nage*  
35 performed, i.e., with lower-limb flexion-extension action or without it. Mechanical  
36 outputs from an incremental loaded countermovement jump test were assessed, as  
37 well as kinematic variables transferred to the *uke* (person who is thrown) during an  
38 *ippon-seoi-nage* technique test. The strength parameters did not positively correlate  
39 with the technical ones, showing no transference between the variables studied.  
40 Furthermore, the judokas that performed the *ippon-seoi-nage* with lower-limb  
41 flexion-extension action presented lower times in the execution of the technique  
42 than the group that did not perform this action. Therefore, the transference from  
43 strength parameters to the performance of *ippon-seoi-nage* is not yet explained,  
44 even when considering different technical styles.

45

46 **Keywords:** *judo, ippon-seoi-nage, lower-limb muscle power.*

47

## 48 **Introduction**

49 Judo is a grappling combat sport characterized by high-intensity intermittent efforts  
50 (Degoutte et al., 2003). The main goal of a judoka is either to throw the adversary  
51 on his back, hold him down on his back for 20 s, apply a joint lock or a strangulation  
52 technique (Miarka et al., 2014). To achieve this goal, the judoka must apply  
53 different judo techniques. These complex skills are categorized according to  
54 whether they are employed on the ground or standing, as well as according to how  
55 the body segments are used (Abalde-Amoedo & Pino-Juste, 2016; Gomes et al.,  
56 2017). In this regard, the *ippon-seoi-nage* is one of the throwing techniques most  
57 used in judo (Carratalá et al., 2009; Ishii, Ae, Suzuki, et al., 2018). Accordingly, it  
58 is the most analysed technique in the scientific literature (L. Blais et al., 2007;  
59 Imamura et al., 2006; Ishii, Ae, Suzuki, et al., 2018).

60

61 Descriptive kinematic analysis of judo throws can explain the motor skills used by  
62 athletes in order to improve the technical learning process (Gomes et al., 2017).  
63 Some authors have analysed judo techniques from a biomechanical perspective  
64 using tridimensional analysis via camera systems (L. Blais et al., 2007; Imamura et  
65 al., 2006; Ishii, Ae, Suzuki, et al., 2018). However, these results should be  
66 interpreted with caution due to the reduced size of the sample in most of the studies  
67 ( $n < 10$ ), although it was of high quality. It is also worth noting that the camera  
68 systems used were highly expensive, not portable and recorded at a 250 Hz  
69 sampling rate, which is insufficient to analyse a technique performance of  $\sim 1.2$  s.  
70 Moreover, considering that judokas should move high loads (the opponent's body  
71 mass), it is important to focus on the *uke's* (person who is thrown) mechanical  
72 parameters, in addition to those related to the *tori* (person who throws). Indeed, the

73 velocity and acceleration that *tori* is able to transmit to unbalance *uke* and throw is  
74 a fundamental parameter (Imamura et al., 2006), and not only *tori*'s capacity to  
75 move his own body at high speed before colliding with *uke*. To date, only four  
76 studies analysed the *seoi-nage* kinematic parameters from this perspective  
77 (Almeida et al., 2018; Almeida et al., 2021; Imamura et al., 2006; Ishii &  
78 Michiyoshi, 2014). Additionally, although the lower-limb flexion-extension action  
79 has been considered a fundamental parameter in the performance of *ippon-seoi-*  
80 *nage* (Laurent Blais & Trilles, 2004; Ishii & Ae, 2015; Ishii, Ae, Koshida, et al.,  
81 2018), only one study analysed the influence of strength parameters on the technical  
82 performance displaying no association between them (Almeida et al., 2018).  
83 Finally, no study endeavoured to explore the influence of the type of *ippon-seoi-*  
84 *nage* on this relationship, as well as the differences between the 2 main *ippon-seoi-*  
85 *nage* styles.

86

87 Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to analyse the influence of the lower-  
88 limb extension mechanical variables on the *ippon-seoi-nage* kinematic variables in  
89 elite judokas. Additionally, we aimed to compare the effect of *ippon-seoi-nage* style  
90 (with lower-limb flexion-extension action vs. without it) on the kinematic variables  
91 of the technique, on the lower-limb mechanical variables, as well as on their  
92 relationship. We hypothesized that: (1) the lower-limb mechanical variables would  
93 positively correlate with the *ippon-seoi-nage* kinematic variables and (2) this  
94 association would be stronger in the group that performed the *ippon-seoi-nage* with  
95 lower-limb flexion-extension action; furthermore, (3) the *ippon-seoi-nage*  
96 kinematic variables would improve when the technique includes a lower-limb  
97 flexion-extension action.

98

99 **Materials and methods**100 ***Experimental approach to the problem***

101 We employed a cross-sectional design to assess the relationship between the *ippon-*  
102 *seoi-nage* kinematic variables and the lower-limb mechanical variables in elite  
103 judokas (McKay et al., 2022). Furthermore, we compared the effect of performing  
104 *ippon-seoi-nage* with two different styles (i.e., with lower-limb flexion-extension  
105 action vs. without it) on the *ippon-seoi-nage* kinematic variables, on the lower-limb  
106 mechanical variables and on their relationship. Participants were classified in two  
107 groups depending on the type of *ippon-seoi-nage* performed, i.e., with lower-limb  
108 flexion-extension action ( $n = 14$ ) or without it ( $n = 10$ ).

109

110 ***Subjects***

111 Twenty-four male elite judokas (McKay et al., 2022) from the High-Performance  
112 Centre of Valencia (age:  $22.04 \pm 3.18$  years; body mass:  $84.54 \pm 19.17$  kg; height:  
113  $179.36 \pm 9.84$  cm; fat percentage:  $11.83 \pm 3.28\%$ ; relative one repetition maximum  
114 [1RM] in the half squat:  $1.86 \pm 0.27$  kg.kg<sup>-1</sup> of body mass) participated in this study.  
115 All participants had experience in the loaded countermovement jump, as well as in  
116 the specific protocol used in this study. They had been practicing judo for at least  
117 10 years and all had attained the rank of black belt (from first to third Dan). All  
118 participants had been medallists in the junior or senior National Championships in  
119 Spain, Dominican Republic, or Georgia; eight of them in junior or senior European  
120 Cups; four in Continental Opens; one in Grand Prix; two in junior Continental  
121 Championships; and one in junior World Championships. All participants self-  
122 reported no chronic diseases or recent injuries that might compromise performance.

123 Participants were instructed to avoid any strenuous exercise for a minimum of two  
124 days preceding the testing sessions. They were informed about the study protocol  
125 and signed a written informed consent form prior to investigation. The study  
126 protocol was approved by the university Institutional Review Board (approval  
127 number 453/CEIH/2017) and was carried out in accordance with the Declaration of  
128 Helsinki.

129

### 130 ***Procedures***

#### 131 *Countermovement jump test*

132 After a 10-min standardized warm-up (jogging, dynamic stretching, joint mobility  
133 exercises, unloaded countermovement jumps, and 5 countermovement jumps  
134 loaded with 20 kg), participants undertook an incremental loaded countermovement  
135 jump test. The protocol consisted of 2 repetitions per each loading condition (20,  
136 40, 60 and 80 kg), separated by 1 min of rest between repetitions with the same load  
137 and 3 min between each loading condition. A complete description of the  
138 countermovement jump technique can be found elsewhere (Almeida et al., 2018).  
139 The test was performed in a Smith machine (Multipower Fitness Line, Peroga,  
140 Murcia, Spain) with a linear velocity transducer (T-Force System, Ergotech,  
141 Murcia, Spain) at 1000 Hz sampling rate attached to the bar. The peak velocity and  
142 the mean propulsive velocity of each jump were recorded. The repetition with the  
143 highest peak velocity of each load was selected and used for analysis. The  
144 relationship between load displaced and peak velocity was established through a  
145 linear regression (load-velocity relationship) and subsequently the peak velocity  
146 associated to the load displacement equivalent to the 25, 50, 75 and 100% of the  
147 judoka's body mass was calculated. The 1RM was considered as the absolute load  
148 linked to a mean propulsive velocity of  $0.33 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  obtained from the individual load-

149 velocity relationship (Conceição et al., 2016; Loturco et al., 2016). Afterwards, the  
150 1RM relative to body mass ( $\text{kg}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$  BM) was calculated. Test-retest reliability of  
151 this test has been previously reported (García-Ramos et al., 2017). Simultaneously,  
152 Samozino's method (Samozino et al., 2008) was used to assess the mechanical  
153 outputs under the above mentioned four individual loading conditions, plus a  
154 loading condition of 0.2 kg (free jump with a plastic bar to maintain the same body  
155 position). For this, countermovement jump height was estimated from the flight  
156 time collected by an infrared platform (Optojump, Microgate, Bolzano, Italy) at a  
157 1000 Hz sampling rate. All jumps were monitored to ensure that the assumptions  
158 of the flight-time method were met (Linthorne, 2001). The highest of the 2 jumps  
159 was selected and used for analysis. The countermovement jump height with 0.2 kg  
160 was considered the jumping performance. The mean values of force and velocity at  
161 each loading condition were calculated from the equations proposed by Samozino  
162 et al. (2008) and validated for the countermovement jump (Jiménez-Reyes et al.,  
163 2017). Test-retest reliability of this test has been previously reported (Jiménez-  
164 Reyes et al., 2017). Afterwards, these mean values were used to assess the current  
165 force-velocity relationship and the associated maximum theoretical force ( $F_0$ , force-  
166 axis intercept), velocity ( $V_0$ , velocity-axis intercept) and power ( $P_{\max} = F_0 \cdot V_0 / 4$ )  
167 values through a linear regression. A specific spreadsheet based on the equations  
168 proposed by Samozino et al. (2008) for squat jump and validated for the  
169 countermovement jump by Jiménez-Reyes et al. (2017) was used for all  
170 calculations (Morin & Samozino, 2017). The data were checked to ensure they met  
171 the assumptions of least squares regressions before fitting any relationship.

172

173 *Ippon-seoi-nage test*

174 Participants performed a specific warm-up (5 *ippon-seoi-nage* repetitions) to  
175 prepare for the technique test. During the warm-up and the technique test,  
176 participants used a dummy as an *uke* (57 kg of mass) to ensure stable execution  
177 conditions during all the assessments. The technique test began after 3 min of rest  
178 and included 3 repetitions of the *ippon-seoi-nage* with 1 min of rest between  
179 attempts. A complete description of the *ippon-seoi-nage* is provided elsewhere  
180 (Almeida et al., 2018). Kinematic variables transferred to the *uke* during the *ippon-*  
181 *seoi-nage* technique test were assessed by using a wearable sensor (Wimu,  
182 Realtrack System, Almería, Spain) placed on the back of the dummy. The sensor  
183 was fixed with a belt at waist height. This placement was considered as the centre  
184 of mass and ensured that the sensor was protected from direct impact from the  
185 judoka or the floor. The device analysed acceleration (G) and angular velocity  
186 ( $\text{rad}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) in the three axes ( $x$  or longitudinal axis,  $y$  or transversal axis and  $z$  or  
187 anterior-posterior axis) at a 1000 Hz sampling rate (Figure 1). The beginning of the  
188 repetition was defined as the time when the dummy started to become unbalanced  
189 (*i.e.*, the angular velocity in the  $y$  axis deviates from the baseline with a permanent  
190 change of at least 50 ms). Three peaks of the resultant acceleration (AccelT) were  
191 determined, the first related to the off-balance (Peak1\_accelT), the second to the  
192 judoka's leg extension (Peak2\_accelT) and the third to the dummy's impact on the  
193 ground (Peak3\_accelT) (Figure 1A). In addition, three peaks of the resultant  
194 angular velocity (GyroT) were assessed, the first related to pulling the dummy off  
195 balance (Peak1\_gyroT), the second to the dummy's flight over the *tori*  
196 (Peak2\_gyroT) and the third to the end of the repetition (Peak3\_gyroT). Lastly, the  
197 inflection point on the angular velocity of the  $y$  axis normalized (GyroYnormalized)  
198 was assessed and associated to the dummy's horizontal position (Figure 1B). The

199 studied variables were organized as (1) time variables (T): time to reach the first,  
200 second and third peak of the resultant acceleration (Tpeak1\_accelT, Tpeak2\_accelT  
201 and Tpeak3\_accelT, respectively), and of the resultant angular velocity  
202 (Tpeak1\_gyroT, Tpeak2\_gyroT and Tpeak3\_gyroT, respectively) and time to reach  
203 the dummy's horizontal position (Thor); (2) acceleration variables: values of  
204 resultant acceleration in the first (Max1\_accelT), second (Max2\_accelT) and third  
205 (Max3\_accelT) peaks; and (3) angular variables: values of resultant angular  
206 velocity in the first (Max1\_gyroT), second (Max2\_gyroT) and third (Max3\_gyroT)  
207 peaks. A video camera, Casio EX-F1 (Tokyo, Japan), was used to record the  
208 technical testing sessions at a 250 Hz sampling rate. Two experienced coaches rated  
209 the 3 *ippon-seoi-nage* repetitions based on the technical model approach of the  
210 Kodokan School (Daigo, 2005), displaying a high interrater reliability (ICC = 0.84;  
211 90% CI: 0.67, 0.92). The two best repetitions were selected for motion and  
212 reliability analysis. Afterwards the repetition with the quickest time to reach the  
213 dummy's horizontal position was chosen as the best repetition for analysis. Finally,  
214 the best *ippon-seoi-nage* was classified by three experienced coaches according to  
215 the presence or not of a lower-limb flexion-extension action (ICC = 0.82; 90% CI:  
216 0.68, 0.91).

217

### 218 ***Statistical analyses***

219 Data are presented as mean and SD. Between-repetition reliability of the *ippon-*  
220 *seoi-nage* kinematic variables was assessed by the within-subjects coefficient of  
221 variation (CV) and intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) with their respective  
222 95% compatibility intervals (CIs). Additionally, the individual CV was also

223 calculated for each variable. An acceptable variability was defined as a CV < 15%  
224 and an ICC > 0.70 (Haff et al., 2015).

225 For each outcome, an independent-samples T test was created to compare the effect  
226 of performing *ippon-seoi-nage* with lower-limb flexion-extension action vs.  
227 without it. This model was built for the technical variables and lower-limb  
228 mechanical variables. We calculated the between-group difference with 90% CIs  
229 using the bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrap with 2000 replicates, resampled  
230 on the subject level (Davison & Hinkley, 1997). To complement the inferential  
231 statistics, Hedges' g effect sizes (ES) were calculated by dividing the between-  
232 group difference by the pooled baseline standard deviations adjusted to the sample  
233 size of each group.

234 Correlation analysis between the *ippon-seoi-nage* kinematic variables and the  
235 lower-limb mechanical variables was assessed through a Pearson correlation  
236 coefficient ( $r$ ). Predictions for the *ippon-seoi-nage* performance were estimated  
237 from the technique type, height and strength variables through multiple linear  
238 regression models using a manual stepwise approach. P-value and coefficient of  
239 determination ( $R^2$ ) were used to assess the prediction models.

240 The reliability analysis was performed by means of a custom spreadsheet (Hopkins,  
241 2000). SPSS software version 28.0 (IBM SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA) was used for  
242 all the other analyses.

243

## 244 **Results**

### 245 ***Reliability***

246 Table 1 shows the reliability of the *ippon-seoi-nage* kinematic variables in the 2  
247 studied groups, as well as considering all participants. All variables displayed a

248 good individual reliability when all participants were considered that contrasted  
249 with a worse within-subjects reliability.

250 [Insert Table 1 near here]

251

### 252 ***Comparisons***

253 Table 2 shows within-group descriptive statistics for the *ippon-seoi-nage* kinematic  
254 variables in both groups and the between-group differences and their respective CIs,  
255 p-values, and ES. The between-group effects for the *ippon-seoi-nage* times indicate  
256 lower times to perform the technique (i.e., a beneficial effect) in the group that  
257 performed the *ippon-seoi-nage* with the lower-limb flexion-extension action  
258 compared to the other group (ranging between -47 and -126 ms).

259 Likewise, the between-group effect for the angular velocity on the first peak  
260 (Max1\_gyroT) also favoured the group that performed the *ippon-seoi-nage* with the  
261 lower-limb flexion-extension action (1.06 rad.s<sup>-1</sup>; CI: 0.35, 1.77 rad.s<sup>-1</sup>). No other  
262 notable differences were seen between groups, both in the kinematic variables of  
263 *ippon-seoi-nage* and in the lower-limb extension mechanical variables.

264 [Insert Table 2 near here]

265

### 266 ***Correlations***

267 No significant positive correlations were found between the *ippon-seoi-nage*  
268 kinematic variables (Max2\_accelT, Max2\_gyroT and Thor) and the lower-limb  
269 mechanical variables (peak velocity, 1RM, jump height and variables from the  
270 force-velocity relationship) in both groups, as well as when all participants were  
271 considered.

272

### 273 ***Multiple regression analysis***

274 Several multiple linear regression models were built to predict the time to horizontal  
275 position of the dummy (Thor), the acceleration (Max2\_accelT) and the angular  
276 velocity (Max2\_gyroT) on peak 2 (i.e., the technical performance) from all possible  
277 combinations between *ippon-seoi-nage* type, height, and the lower-limb  
278 mechanical variables. Results show that *ippon-seoi-nage* type contributed to  
279 explain 24% of the variance of the time to horizontal position of the dummy (Thor).  
280 The rest of the mechanical variables incorporated into the model hardly improve  
281 the prediction. 1RM and peak velocity have separately contributed to explain ~15%  
282 of the variance of the angular velocity on peak 2 (Max2\_gyroT) (Table 3).

283 [Insert Table 3 near here]

284

### 285 **Discussion**

286 The primary aim of this study was to analyse the influence of the lower-limb  
287 extension mechanical variables (strength variables) on the *ippon-seoi-nage*  
288 kinematic variables (technical variables) in elite judokas. Additionally, we aimed  
289 to compare the effect of performing *ippon-seoi-nage* with lower-limb flexion-  
290 extension action vs. without it, on the technical and strength variables, as well as on  
291 their relationship. The strength parameters did not positively correlate with the  
292 technical ones, showing no transference between the variables studied.  
293 Furthermore, the judokas that performed the *ippon-seoi-nage* with lower-limb  
294 flexion-extension action presented lower times in the execution of the technique  
295 than the group that did not perform this action.

296

297 The relationship between strength variables and the *ippon-seoi-nage* performance  
298 has been scarcely investigated. Although the lower-limb extension action has been  
299 considered a fundamental parameter in the technical performance of *ippon-seoi-*  
300 *nage* (Laurent Blais & Trilles, 2004; Ishii & Ae, 2015; Ishii, Ae, Koshida, et al.,  
301 2018), no positive significant relationship was found between the strength variables  
302 and the acceleration or angular velocity transferred to the *uke*. This result is in  
303 accordance with a previous research (Almeida et al., 2018). There was no positive  
304 association even when only the participants that performed the *ippon-seoi-nage*  
305 with lower-limb flexion-extension action were considered. Moreover, 1RM and  
306 peak velocity were the only two strength variables that have contributed to explain  
307 the variance of the *ippon-seoi-nage* kinematic variables, but only for the angular  
308 velocity on peak 2 (Max2\_gyroT), and only explained ~15% of the variance,  
309 regardless of the type of the *ippon-seoi-nage*. Judo techniques require high lower-  
310 limb muscle power (Bonitch-Domínguez et al., 2010) and a judoka should be  
311 capable of applying this power, especially during the lower-limb extension phase  
312 of the *ippon-seoi-nage* (represented in the movement sequence by the  
313 Peak2\_accelT, Figure 1A). From a strictly technical point of view, the *ippon-seoi-*  
314 *nage* gold standard performance highlights the lower-limb extension action  
315 (Laurent Blais & Trilles, 2004; Ishii & Ae, 2015; Ishii, Ae, Koshida, et al., 2018).  
316 Consequently, from a mechanical point of view, strength variables should be  
317 positively linked to the acceleration and angular velocity in the peak 2 of this  
318 technique. However, this research failed to demonstrate this association. Although  
319 *ippon-seoi-nage* is a widespread technique, taught from early stages of training and  
320 consequently one of the techniques most used (Ishii, Ae, Suzuki, et al., 2018), the  
321 absence of association could indicate that, at least in the sample studied, the lower-

322 limb implication during the *ippon-seoi-nage* was not sufficient according to the  
323 technical gold standard, even when considering only the judokas that performed the  
324 *ippon-seoi-nage* with lower-limb flexion-extension action. Several reasons for this  
325 can be outlined such as having initially learned an incorrect technique pattern,  
326 lacking lower-limb strength, or substituting part of the lower-limb action for actions  
327 of the arms, trunk, or the turn itself. Moreover, the presence of reliable individual  
328 adaptations of the technique to the participants' own characteristics can also affect  
329 the studied association.

330

331 Our findings provide evidence-based recommendations for teaching and training  
332 the *ippon-seoi-nage*. Ishi et al. (2018; 2018; 2014; 2016; 2013) found that a higher  
333 upper-limb angular velocity and a higher velocity in the sleeve pulling action  
334 (*hikite*), in the displacement of the centre of mass and in the hip action while  
335 throwing were determinant for the technical efficacy. However, these studies  
336 focused on the study of kinematic parameters of the *tori* and not on the capacity to  
337 transfer them to the *uke*, which is the main goal of a judo throw. In this sense, our  
338 study provide data about the angular velocity and acceleration that *tori* is able to  
339 transmit to unbalance *uke* and throw. This approach is becoming more extended in  
340 the last few years (Almeida et al., 2018; Almeida et al., 2021; Imamura et al., 2006;  
341 Ishii & Michiyoshi, 2014). Nevertheless, the present study is innovative because it  
342 differentiates between 2 types of *ippon-seoi-nage*. Although theoretically they are  
343 the same technique, the competition promoted the acquisition of 2 main different  
344 styles: *ippon-seoi-nage* with lower-limb flexion-extension action and without it. In  
345 this sense, our results suggest that to perform the first type of *ippon-seoi-nage* a  
346 high velocity of execution and a quick fit-in underneath the *uke*'s centre of mass to

347 powerfully extend the lower-limbs should be prioritized, similarly to the description  
348 of *seoi-nage* made by Imamura et al. (2006). Contrary, the second type of *ippon-*  
349 *seoi-nage* is a much slower movement, where the judoka should prioritize the  
350 creation of a higher momentum prior to collision with *uke*'s centre of mass, to lift  
351 him, withdrawing his base of support, to subsequently turn and throw him. This  
352 type of technical performance resembles the *harai-goshi* description made by the  
353 same authors (Imamura et al., 2006).

354

355 Despite having divided the judokas in 2 groups according to their lower-limb action  
356 during the *ippon-seoi-nage*, there was still a low intra-group reliability. This seems  
357 to suggest that there may be more variations in the technical performance that  
358 interfere with the execution that we did not studied. Furthermore, the type of *ippon-*  
359 *seoi-nage* only predicts the time to horizontal position of the *uke* (Thor), explaining  
360 24% of its variance. Contrary to what was expected, the inclusion of other variables  
361 related to the lower-limb power (jump height, peak velocity, 1RM, maximal  
362 theoretical power, velocity and force) hardly improve this predicting model (barely  
363 1-2%). Moreover, as reported previously and also unexpectedly, the strength  
364 variables (1RM and peak velocity) only explained ~15% of the variance of the  
365 angular velocity on peak 2 (Max2\_gyroT). The fact that the lower-limb power-  
366 related variables do not affect the predicting model (for Thor and Max2\_accelT) or  
367 have a small contribution on the prediction (for Max2\_gyroT) implies that there are  
368 other factors affecting them that we did not measure. Additionally, they did not  
369 worsen the prediction models, which means that they do not interfere with the  
370 technical performance in the terms it has been analysed.

371

372 Therefore, the transference from strength parameters to the performance of *ippon-*  
373 *seoi-nage* is not yet explained, even when considering different technical styles.  
374 Additionally, from a mechanical point of view the key difference between the 2  
375 main *ippon-seoi-nage* styles concerns the times of execution. All these findings  
376 warrant the need to further study the kinematic parameters of the judo technique  
377 and its relationship with lower-limb muscle power to ultimately provide a better  
378 understanding of the factors that constitute a mechanically efficient throw.

379

### 380 **Acknowledgments**

381 The authors would like to thank the volunteers and the High-Performance Centre  
382 of Valencia for their contributions to this study.

383

### 384 **Declaration of interest statement**

385 The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

386

### 387 **References**

- 388 Abalde-Amoedo, N., & Pino-Juste, R. (2016). Assessment of self-efficacy and self-  
389 esteem in athletic performance in judo. *Retos*, 29, 109-113.  
390 <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v0i29.38461>
- 391 Almeida, F., Bonitch-Góngora, J., Padial, P., de la Fuente, B., Morales-Artacho, A.  
392 J., & Feriche, B. (2018). Effect of acute exposure to moderate altitude on  
393 kinematic variables of the *ippon-seoi-nage* and its relationship with the  
394 countermovement jump in elite judokas. *PLoS One*, 13(10), e0206297.  
395 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206297>
- 396 Almeida, F., Padial, P., Bonitch-Góngora, J., De la Fuente, B., Schoenfeld, B. J.,  
397 Morales-Artacho, A. J., Benavente, C., & Feriche, B. (2021). Effects of  
398 power-oriented resistance training during an altitude camp on strength and  
399 technical performance of elite judokas. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 12, Article  
400 606191. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2021.606191>
- 401 Blais, L., & Trilles, F. (2004). Analyse mécanique comparative d'une même  
402 projection de judo: *Seoi Nage*, réalisée par cinq experts de la Fédération  
403 Française de Judo. *Movement and Sport Sciences*, 51(1), 49-68.  
404 <https://doi.org/10.3917/sm.051.0049>

- 405 Blais, L., Trilles, F., & Lacouture, P. (2007). Three-dimensional joint dynamics and  
 406 energy expenditure during the execution of a judo throwing technique  
 407 (Morote Seoi Nage). *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 25(11), 1211-1220.  
 408 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410600982204>
- 409 Bonitch-Domínguez, J., Bonitch-Góngora, J., Padiá, P., & Feriche, B. (2010).  
 410 Changes in peak leg power induced by successive judo bouts and their  
 411 relationship to lactate production. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 28(14), 1527-  
 412 1534. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2010.512641>
- 413 Carratalá, V., García-García, J. M., & Monteiro, L. (2009). Analysis of technical  
 414 actions of the judoist cadets participating in the judo championship of Spain.  
 415 *Revista Internacional de Ciencias del Deporte*, 15(5), 64-80.  
 416 <https://doi.org/10.5232/ricyde2009.01505>
- 417 Conceição, F., Fernandes, J., Lewis, M., González-Badillo, J. J., & Jiménez-Reyes,  
 418 P. (2016). Movement velocity as a measure of exercise intensity in three  
 419 lower limb exercises. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 34(12), 1099-1106.  
 420 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2015.1090010>
- 421 Daigo, T. (2005). *Kodokan judo throwing techniques* (K. I. Ltd, Ed. 1<sup>st</sup> ed.).
- 422 Davison, A. C., & Hinkley, D. V. (1997). *Bootstrap methods and their application*.  
 423 Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511802843>
- 424 Degoutte, F., Jouanel, P., & Filaire, E. (2003). Energy demands during a judo match  
 425 and recovery. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 37(3), 245-249.  
 426 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjism.37.3.245>
- 427 García-Ramos, A., Jaric, S., Pérez-Castilla, A., Padiá, P., & Feriche, B. (2017).  
 428 Reliability and magnitude of mechanical variables assessed from  
 429 unconstrained and constrained loaded countermovement jumps. *Sports*  
 430 *Biomechanics*, 16(4), 514-526.  
 431 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2016.1246598>
- 432 Gomes, F. R., Bastos, F. H., Meira, C. M., Jr., Neiva, J. F., & Tani, G. (2017).  
 433 Effects of distinct practice conditions on the learning of the o soto gari  
 434 throwing technique of judo. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 35(6), 572-578.  
 435 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2016.1180418>
- 436 Haff, G. G., Ruben, R. P., Lider, J., Twine, C., & Cormie, P. (2015). A comparison  
 437 of methods for determining the rate of force development during isometric  
 438 midhigh clean pulls. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 29(2),  
 439 386-395. <https://doi.org/10.1519/jsc.0000000000000705>
- 440 Hopkins, W. (2000). *Calculations for reliability (Excel spreadsheet)*. Retrieved  
 441 June 29, 2017 from <http://www.sportsci.org/resource/stats/relycalc.html>  
 442 2000
- 443 Imamura, R. T., Hreljac, A., Escamilla, R. F., & Edwards, W. B. (2006). A three-  
 444 dimensional analysis of the center of mass for three different judo throwing  
 445 techniques. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 5(CSSI), 122-131.
- 446 Ishii, T., & Ae, M. (2015). Comparison of kinetics of the leg joints in seoi-nage  
 447 between elite and college judo athletes. (Ed.),^(Eds.). 33rd International  
 448 Conference of Biomechanics in Sports, Poitiers, France.
- 449 Ishii, T., Ae, M., Koshida, S., & Fujii, N. (2018). Comparison of kinetics and  
 450 kinematics in seoi-nage between judo athletes with different skill levels.  
 451 *ISBS Proceedings Archive*, 36(1), 494-497.
- 452 Ishii, T., Ae, M., Suzuki, Y., & Kobayashi, Y. (2018). Kinematic comparison of the  
 453 seoi-nage judo technique between elite and college athletes. *Sports*

- 454 *Biomechanics*, 17(2), 238-250.  
 455 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2017.1284256>
- 456 Ishii, T., & Michiyoshi, A. (2014). Biomechanical factors of effective seoi-nage in  
 457 judo. (Ed.),^(Eds.). 32nd International Conference of Biomechanics in  
 458 Sports, Johnson City, TN, USA.
- 459 Ishii, T., Michiyoshi, A., Koshida, S., & Fuji, N. (2016). The centre of mass  
 460 kinematics for elite women judo athletes in seoi-nage. (Ed.),^(Eds.). 34th  
 461 International Conference of Biomechanics in Sports, Tsukuba, Japan.
- 462 Ishii, T., Suzuki, Y., Kobayashi, Y., & Ae, M. (2013). Comparison of angular  
 463 factors to determine quickness in seoi-nage between elite and college judo  
 464 athletes. (Ed.),^(Eds.). 31st International Conference on Biomechanics in  
 465 Sports, Taipei, Taiwan.
- 466 Jiménez-Reyes, P., Samozino, P., Pareja-Blanco, F., Conceição, F., Cuadrado-  
 467 Penafiel, V., González-Badillo, J. J., & Morin, J. B. (2017). Validity of a  
 468 simple method for measuring force-velocity-power profile in  
 469 countermovement jump. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and*  
 470 *Performance*, 12(1), 36-43. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2015-0484>
- 471 Linthorne, N. P. (2001). Analysis of standing vertical jumps using a force platform.  
 472 *American Journal of Physics*, 69(11), 1198-1204.  
 473 <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1397460>
- 474 Loturco, I., Pereira, L. A., Cal Abad, C. C., Gil, S., Kitamura, K., Kobal, R., &  
 475 Nakamura, F. Y. (2016). Using bar velocity to predict the maximum  
 476 dynamic strength in the half-squat exercise. *International Journal of Sports*  
 477 *Physiology and Performance*, 11(5), 697-700.  
 478 <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2015-0316>
- 479 McKay, A. K., Stellingwerff, T., Smith, E. S., Martin, D. T., Mujika, I., Goosey-  
 480 Tolfrey, V. L., Sheppard, J., & Burke, L. M. (2022). Defining training and  
 481 performance caliber: a participant classification framework. *International*  
 482 *Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 17(2).  
 483 <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2021-0451>
- 484 Miarka, B., Cury, R., Julianetti, R., Battazza, R., Julio, U. F., Calmet, M., &  
 485 Franchini, E. (2014). A comparison of time-motion and technical-tactical  
 486 variables between age groups of female judo matches. *Journal of Sports*  
 487 *Sciences*, 32(16), 1529-1538.  
 488 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2014.903335>
- 489 Morin, J.-B., & Samozino, P. (2017). *Jump FVP profile spreadsheet*  
 490 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320146284\\_JUMP\\_FVP\\_profile](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320146284_JUMP_FVP_profile_spreadsheet)  
 491 [spreadsheet](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320146284_JUMP_FVP_profile_spreadsheet)
- 492 Samozino, P., Morin, J. B., Hintzy, F., & Belli, A. (2008). A simple method for  
 493 measuring force, velocity and power output during squat jump. *Journal of*  
 494 *Biomechanics*, 41(14), 2940-2945.  
 495 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2008.07.028>
- 496

497 **Figure captions**

498 Figure 1. Representation of the resultant acceleration (AccelT) (A), angular velocity  
499 in the three axes (GyroX, GyroY, and GyroZ) and resultant angular velocity  
500 (GyroT) (B) linked to the sequence of the *ippon-seoi-nage* performed by one judoka  
501 (C). Three landmarks of the AccelT (Peak1\_accelT, Peak2\_accelT, and  
502 Peak3\_accelT) and of the GyroT (Peak1\_gyroT, Peak2\_gyroT, and Peak3\_gyroT)  
503 are displayed. The beginning of the repetition (considering the baseline of the  
504 GyroY) and the dummy's horizontal position (represented by the inflection point  
505 on the GyroY normalized) are also displayed.