

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Key anthropometric variables associated with front-crawl swimming performance in youth swimmers: an allometric approach

Running head: Allometric models and front crawl swimming performance.

26 **Abstract**

27 This study aimed to establish key anthropometric characteristics (e.g., optimal body height,
28 limb-segment length and girth/breadth ratios) related to 100-m front crawl performance in
29 young swimmers. In total, 74 swimmers (boys [n=41; age: 18.1 ± 3.5 years]; girls [n=33; age:
30 15.9 ± 3.1 years]) participated in this study. We adopted a multiplicative allometric log-linear
31 regression model to identify key anthropometric characteristics associated with 100-m front
32 crawl swimming performance. The main outcomes indicated that length ratio= ([height/leg
33 length]), foot length and ankle girth, biacromial breadth and % of body fat were associated
34 with 100-m front crawl mean swimming speed performance. These findings highlight the
35 importance of assessing anthropometric characteristics in young front crawl swimmers for
36 talent identification and development.

37 **Key Words:** allometric model; somatic measurements; swimmer athletes.

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53 **INTRODUCTION**

54 Optimal performance in sports is multifactorial and affords the assessment of
55 anthropometrics, technical/tactical, physiological and physical qualities to identify and
56 develop young talents (1,17). Some of these factors are rather difficult to assess (e.g.,
57 technical/tactical). Others however (e.g., anthropometrics) can be accurately tested using
58 standardized methods that may provide useful information for talent scouts, coaches and
59 strength and conditioning trainers (25).

60 In fact, understanding the main anthropometric variables underpinning youth's swimming
61 performance is crucial for talent identification (21). There is compelling evidence from
62 swimming studies that anthropometric variables are related to swimming performance (15, 21,
63 23, 24, 25). It is well-known from previous studies that tall and heavier swimmers are able to
64 produce greater force per stroke (14). This observation is mainly due to their longer stroke
65 length (21). Shorter swimmers, on the other hand, cannot achieve such long stroke length and
66 they generally compensate by utilising a higher stroke rate (14). Of note, better swimming
67 (i.e., propelling) economy and longer stroke length are associated with a greater stature and
68 segment length in front-crawl adult male swimmers (28). Likewise, arm span appears to be
69 the principal anthropometric variable predicting 100-m front crawl swimming performance in
70 young swimmers aged 12 years (20).

71 Recently, Nevill et al. (21) applied an allometric approach to identify the optimal body size
72 and limb length segment associated with 100-m front-crawl speed performance in young
73 swimmers aged 11–16 years. These authors revealed that lean body mass was the most
74 important whole body characteristic associated with front-crawl swimming performance. In
75 addition, the same authors revealed that limb segment length ratios (i.e., arm ratio = lower
76 arm/upper arm; foot-to- leg ratio = foot/lower leg) was a key front-crawl swimming speed
77 predictor. Yet, the same authors did not consider the girth of the associated segment. This
78 needs to be further explored as segment girths have been shown to be key performance
79 determinants associated with breaststroke (forearm and wrist girth) (24), butterfly (calf and
80 ankle girth) (23), and backstroke (forearm and arm relaxed girth) (25) swimming
81 performances in young swimmers.

82 Previously, Sammoud et al. (24) reported positive associations between 100-m breaststroke
83 performance and upper limb-girth ratio (girth ratio = forearm girth/wrist girth) in young

84 swimmers aged \leq 12 years. Moreover, limb-girth ratio (girth ratio =calf girth/ankle girth) has
85 been shown to be one of the key determinants in butterfly swimming performance in a large
86 sample of youth male and female swimmers aged \leq 13 years (24). More recently, Sammoud et
87 al (25) revealed that forearm girth as well as arm relaxed girth are among the main backstroke
88 performance predictors in young swimmers aged 13-14 years.

89 Taken together, lower and upper limb girths appear to be key anthropometric variables related
90 to breaststroke (forearm and wrist girth) (24), butterfly (calf and ankle girth) (23), and
91 backstroke (forearm and arm relaxed girth) (25) swimming performance. Surprisingly, the
92 impact of limb girth on front crawl swimming performance has not yet been examined.
93 Therefore, this study aimed to establish key anthropometric characteristics (e.g., limb girth,
94 body height, mass etc) associated with 100-m front crawl speed performance in male and
95 female young national level swimmers.

96

97 **METHODS**

98 **Experimental approach to the problem**

99 Several body measures were assessed including body height, body-mass, sitting-height,
100 skinfold thicknesses, limb lengths, girths, and breadths. Swimmers' body composition was
101 then calculated using established equations from the literature (10, 26)

102

103 **Participants**

104 In total, 74 front crawl swimmers (boys [n=41; age: 18.1 ± 3.5 years]; girls [n=33; age: $15.9 \pm$
105 3.1 years]) participated in this study. All participants were involved in five to six training
106 sessions per week (distance $5 \text{ km} \pm 1 \text{ km}$ per session; 8 ± 1 hour per week) including the four
107 swimming strokes. All swimmers are specialists in 50-m, and 100-m front-crawl race. The
108 study was approved by the local Ethics Institutional Review Committee for the ethical use of
109 human subjects at Ksar Saïd University, La Manouba, Tunisia.

110

111 **Performance time and average swimming speed ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)**

112 The 100-m swimming times and/or speeds (speed based on the race time) expressed in
113 seconds and meters per second ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$), respectively, were adopted as our measures of
114 swimming performance. Swimming performance was recorded in a 25-m swimming pool.
115 The front-crawl mean speed was calculated as the ratio between distances swam and the total
116 time recorded in this distance ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$). Performance (s) was measured with a high technology
117 electronic timing (Omega, Switzerland) and was extracted for all participants from the official
118 results published by the Tunisian Swimming Federation during the Winter National
119 Championships. Water temperature was kept between 25 and 28 degrees celsius, as
120 determined by Fédération Internationale De Natation (12).

121

122 **Anthropometric measurements**

123 All anthropometric measurements were taken by a qualified anthropometrist trained in
124 accordance with standardized procedures of the International Society for the Advancement of
125 Kinanthropometry (ISAK) (27) (Table 1). Testing was carried out in a standardized order
126 after careful calibration of the measuring devices. Each swimmer's anthropometrics were
127 assessed including body height (against the wall), body-mass, sitting-height, skinfold
128 thicknesses, limb lengths, girths, and breadths (m) and body-mass (kg). Skinfold
129 measurements (mm) were taken from the right-hand side of the body using Harpenden
130 skinfold calipers (Harpenden Instruments, Cambridge, UK). Skinfold data, alongside the
131 skinfold equation of Slaughter et al. (26), were used to estimate body-fat mass and fat-free
132 mass. The following limb-lengths, girths and breadths were assessed using a large sliding
133 caliper and a non-stretchable tape measure via direct measures using landmarks techniques:
134 arm span, upper-limb length, upper-arm length, lower-arm length, hand lengths, lower-limb
135 length, thigh length, leg length, foot length, arm-relaxed girth, forearm girth, wrist girth, thigh
136 girth, calf girth, ankle girth, biacromial and biiliocrystal-breadths.

137 Upper arm length was measured from landmarks placed to acromiale and dactylion while
138 athletes stood in the erect position. Upper arm length was determined as the distance between
139 the marked acromiale and radiale landmarks. The lower-arm length was measured by
140 calculating the distance between the radiale and stylium landmarks. For the hand length, the
141 measure was taken as the shortest distance from the marked midstylium line to the dactylion.
142 Lower limb length was determined by subtracting sitting height from standing height. Thigh
143 length was determined as the distance between the marked trochanterion and tibiale lateral
144 landmarks. Leg length was measured as the distance from the height of the tibiale lateral to
145 the top of the box (or the floor). Foot length was determined as the distance from the

146 akropodion (i.e., the tip of the longest toe which may be the first or second phalanx) to the
147 pternion (i.e., most posterior point on the calcaneus of the foot). Arm-relaxed girth was
148 measured at the marked level of the mid-acromiale- radiale. The tape was positioned
149 perpendicular to the long axis of the arm.

150 Forearm girth was taken at the maximum girth of the forearm distal to the humeral
151 epicondyles. Wrist girth was measured distal to the styloid processes. This corresponds to the
152 minimum girth in this region. Thigh girth measures were taken at the marked mid-
153 trochanterion-tibiale-lateral site. Calf girth was defined as the maximum girth of the calf taken
154 at the marked medial calf skinfold site. Ankle girth was defined as the minimum girth of the
155 ankle taken at the narrowest point superior to the sphyrion tibiale. Biacromial breadths were
156 determined as the distance between the most lateral points of the acromion processes.
157 Biiliocrystal breath was defined as the distance between the most lateral points on the iliac
158 crests. All somatic measures were recorded twice and the mean scores were retained for
159 further statistical analysis. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) for test-retest reliability
160 ranged from 0.97 to 0.99 for all anthropometric and skinfolds measures.

161

162

163 **Table 1 near here**

164

165 **Statistical analyses**

166 Descriptive statistics were computed and expressed as means and standard deviations. Data
167 were tested for normality using Shapiro-Wilk's test. Between-group (boys vs. girls)
168 differences were examined using the independent t-test. Cohen's d effect size (ES) was
169 determined and classified as small ($0.00 < d < 0.49$), medium ($0.50 < d < 0.79$), and large ($d >$
170 0.80) (8). Test-retest reliability was assessed using ICCs. To identify the most suitable
171 somatic characteristics (i.e., body-mass [M], fat-free mass [FFM], fat mass [FM], height [H],
172 limb-lengths, girths or breadths [L]) that are associated with 100-m front crawl swimming
173 performance, we adopted the proportional multiplicative model with allometric body size
174 components, similar to the 100-m backstroke speed model used to analyze swimming speed in
175 children (25). Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 20.0 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL,
176 USA).

177

178 *The multiplicative model:*

179 Front crawl mean speed ($m \cdot s^{-1}$) = $a \cdot (M)^{k_1} \cdot (H)^{k_2} \cdot (\%BF)^{k_3} \cdot \prod (L_i)^{k_i} \cdot \epsilon$ (Eq 1)

180 where ‘a’ is a constant, M is mass, H is height, %BF is body fat percent and $\prod (L_i)^{k_i}$ ($i=4, \dots,$
181 n) signifies the product of all limb segment-lengths, girths or breadths measurements raised to
182 the power of k_i ; with $i=4$ to $i=n$ representing the full range of limb lengths, girths, and
183 breadths recorded for the swimmers.

184 The benefits of this model are that we included proportional body size components. Note that
185 “ ϵ ”, the multiplicative error ratio, also assumes the error associated with mean swimming
186 speed will increase in proportion with the athlete’s body size.

187

188 The model (Eq 1) can be linearized with a log transformation. A linear regression analysis on
189 \log (front crawl mean speed [$m \cdot s^{-1}$]) can then be used to estimate the unknown parameters of
190 the log-transformed model:

191 \ln (front crawl mean speed ($m \cdot s^{-1}$)) = $k_1 \cdot \log(M) + k_2 \cdot \log(H) + k_3 \cdot \log(\%BF) + \sum k_i \cdot \ln(L_i) + a +$
192 $\log(\epsilon)$ (Eq 2)

193 Having fitted the saturated model with all available body size variables, an appropriate
194 “parsimonious” model was obtained using “backward elimination” (21), in which the least
195 important (non-significant) body size, limb segment length, girth, and breadth variables was
196 eliminated during each processing step. A parsimonious model is a model that achieves an
197 acceptable level of explanation or prediction with as few predictor variables as possible. The
198 constant intercept parameter [$\ln(a)$ refers to natural logarithms in Eq 2] can vary for each
199 group (girls and boys) by introducing boys as a [0,1] indicator variable in the regression
200 analysis, see Table 2.

201

202

203 RESULTS

204 Table 1 shows anthropometric characteristics and swimming performance data of all
205 participants. All data were normally distributed (all $p > 0.05$). Boys and girls were aged 18.1
206 ± 3.5 years and 15.9 ± 3.1 years, respectively. Table 2 indicates the parsimonious solution to
207 the backward elimination regression analysis of \ln (Front Crawl mean speed [m/s^{-1}]). The
208 multiplicative allometric model exploring the association between 100-m front crawl mean
209 speed performance ($m \cdot s^{-1}$) and the different somatic characteristics estimated that foot length
210 is one of the main positive significant predictors of mean swimming performance ($\exp(0.264,$
211 and $p < 0.05$). In addition, our allometric model revealed positive significant associations

212 between height, and biacromial-breadth, with the 100-m swim performance ($\exp(0.789$, and
213 $0.537)$), for height and biacromial breadth, respectively; all $p < 0.05$). However, our statistical
214 calculation showed negative associations between the % body fat, leg length, ankle girth, with
215 the 100-m swimming performance ($\exp(-0.053$, -0.346 , and $-0.159)$), for body fat, leg length,
216 and ankle girth, respectively; all $p < 0.05$).

217 The constant $[\ln(a)]$ varied significantly by sex, with boys being 3.8% ($\exp(0.037)=1.038$)
218 faster than girls, see Table 2 .

219

220

Table 2 near here

221 **DISCUSSION**

222 This study attempted to elucidate key anthropometric variables related to 100-m front-crawl
223 mean speed performance in national Tunisian male and female swimmers. Results of this
224 study support previous investigations, indicating that anthropometrics are highly related to
225 swimmers' performance (15, 23).

226

227 Our results revealed that height and percentage of body fat are the most important whole body
228 sizes that contribute significantly to the allometric model. This is in agreement with
229 previously published studies (3, 19, 23).

230 Particularly, Latt et al. (19) reported that swimming performance was primarily associated
231 with body size (height) and arm span, thereby reflecting a higher VO_{2peak} ($ml \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot min^{-1}$) and
232 improved biomechanical swimming variables. It appears that a longer torso allows swimmers
233 to cut the water with less water resistance and their long bodies give them an automatic edge
234 (25). In addition, Caputo et al. (3) showed that for events with a short duration, in which
235 power production capacity is considered a key variable, anthropometric characteristic such as
236 body height, and body composition may also contribute to the level of performance. However,
237 these morphological attributes largely depend on genetic factors and may have a decisive
238 influence on swimming performance (Latt et al., 2010). In addition, Sammoud et al (2017)
239 revealed that fat mass was the only whole-body size characteristic negatively associated with
240 butterfly speed performance in children and adolescent swimmers. In the same context,
241 Jürimäe et al. (17) reported a significant correlation between fat-free mass and 400-m front
242 crawl performance in young swimmers. The disadvantage of having higher fat mass suggests
243 that swimmers require greater fat-free mass, implying that they require more muscle mass to
244 swim fast (14, 21, 22).

245

246 Our statistical calculations showed that boys front crawl mean speed performance is 3.8%
247 faster than girls' elite swimmers. Our findings are in accordance with those established by
248 Sammoud et al. (23) who found that male butterfly mean speed performance is 5.6% greater
249 than female swimmers. Likewise, Geladas et al. (15) found that elite male 100-m front-crawl
250 speed performance is 3.8% faster than female elite swimmers. More recently, Sammoud et al.
251 (25) revealed that girls' backstroke mean speed performance is 4.1% less than boys. In the
252 same context, Kennedy et al. (18) showed that males usually swam faster (about 10% on
253 mean) than women in the four 100-m swimming events (i.e., backstroke, breaststroke,
254 butterfly, and front crawl) during the Seoul Olympic Games (1988). East, (11) found that male
255 swimmers had longer stroke lengths but similar stroke rates than their female counterparts.
256 The same author concluded that the longer stroke length produced by men was most likely the
257 result of greater propulsive force.

258

259 The advantage of having greater limb segment length ratios (i.e., leg length ratio =
260 [height]/[leg-length]) appears to be the most important indicator derived from the allometric
261 model on front crawl mean speed performance (Table 2). In addition, our results indicated
262 that the foot-length made a positive contribution to the 100-m front crawl mean speed
263 performance, but having a longer leg length impairs performance. These findings support
264 those reported by Nevill et al. (21) who detected a negative contribution of leg length and a
265 positive contribution of foot length in 100-m front crawl performance in male and female
266 swimmers. According to Zamparo et al. (29), the advantage of having a greater foot length
267 permits increasing surface area, thus leading to greater propelling economy (29). However,
268 having longer legs are unnecessary in swimming, as increased leg length will alter the
269 flotation of the swimmer, potentially resulting in sinking of the legs. An increase in the
270 downward inclination of the legs would increase resistance through water, therefore
271 increasing the energy cost of swimming (5). This may at least partially explain the advantage
272 of having shorter lower legs.

273

274 Our findings further illustrate positive associations between the biacromial breadth with 100-
275 m front-crawl speed performance (Table 2). Geladas et al. (15) showed that swimming sprint
276 time was significantly correlated with biacromial breadth ($r = -0.61$) in male swimmers (the
277 negative correlation is the result of using performance time not speed). More recently,
278 Sammoud et al. (23) and Sammoud et al. (25) demonstrated that having greater biacromial

279 breadth is a key anthropometric feature associated with better 100-m butterfly and backstroke
280 speed performance in young male and female swimmers. Altogether, these findings may be
281 related to the fact that swimmers with broad shoulders are better suited for high power output
282 in the water (4). In addition, the positive association between body breadths and 100-m front
283 crawl performance in our study suggests that a larger body cross-sectional area in swimmers
284 may be related to better sprint performance time (16). According to the effect of cross-
285 sectional area on the pressure drag, several studies (2, 5) have shown that some
286 anthropometric parameters like the chest girth, depth and breadth are correlated with drag
287 values. In addition to the anthropometric parameters, the shape and the contour of the body
288 are also important factors affecting the pressure drag because they determine how the flow
289 moves over the body (13).

290

291 We also identified that the ankle-girth made a negative contribution to the prediction of 100-
292 m front-crawl speed performance. These results are supported by those of Sammoud et al.
293 (23) who showed that having a greater ankle-girth impairs butterfly speed performance in
294 youth swimmers. Therefore, having a greater ankle-girth impairs performance. Of note, it has
295 been suggested that increased joint flexibility enables the swimmer to achieve a greater range
296 of motion (ROM) (9). In the same context, Cohen et al. (7) revealed that swimmers require
297 good plantar flexion of the ankles. The same authors found a significant effect between ankle
298 flexibility and propulsive force which allows swimmers a larger range of motion.

299

300 **Conclusions**

301 Findings from the present study suggest that foot length, length ratio ([height/leg length]) and
302 ankle girth, biacromial breadth and % of body fat were related to 100-m front crawl mean
303 swim speed performance. These findings are of practical relevance for talent identification and
304 development for talent scouts, coaches and practitioners in the field of youth swimming.

305

306 **Disclosure statement**

307 All authors report no potential conflict of interest.

308

309

310

311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343

References

1. Barbosa, TM, Costa, M, Marinho, JD, Coelho, M, Moreira, M, Silva, AJ. Modeling the links between young swimmer's performance: energetic and biomechanical profiles. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 22:379–391, 2010.
2. Benjanuvatra, N, Blanksby, BA, Elliott, BC. Morphology and hydrodynamic resistance in young swimmers. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 13(3):246–55, 2001.
3. Caputo, F, Oliveira, MFM, Denadai, BS, Greco, CC. Intrinsic factors of the locomotion energy cost during swimming. *Rev Bras Med Esp* 12: 399-404, 2006.
4. Carter, JEL, Ackland, TR. Kinanthropometry in aquatic sports: A study of world class athletes. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics 1994.
5. Chatard, JC, Lavoie, JM, Bourgoin, B, et al. The contribution of passive drag as a determinant of swimming performance. *Int J Sports Med* 11(5):367–72. 13, 1990.
6. Chatard, JC, Padilla, S, Cazorla, G, Lacour, JR. Influence of body height, weight, hydrostatic lift and training on the energy cost of the front crawl. *N Z J Sports Med* 13:82–4, 1985.
7. Cohen, RCZ, Cleary, PW, Mason, BR. Simulations of dolphin kick swimming using smoothed particle hydrodynamics. *Hum Mov Sci* 31(3), 604–619, 2012.
8. Cohen, J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates 1998.
9. Counsilman JE. The Science of Swimming. Englewood Cliffs, Nj: Prentice-Hall 1968.
10. Durnin, JVGA, Womersley, J. La graisse corporelle évaluée à partir de la densité totale du corps et son estimation de l'épaisseur du pli cutané : mesures sur 481 hommes et femmes âgés de 16 à 72 ans. *Br J Nutr* 32 :77-97, 1974.
11. East, DJ. Swimming: An analysis of stroke frequency, stroke length and performance. *NZ J Health Phys Ed Recr* 3, 16-27, 1970.
12. Federation Internationale De Natation (FINA). Talent identification programmes. 2014 [cited 18 September 2014]. Available from: <http://www.fina.org/>.
13. Fish, FE, Hui, CA. Dolphin swimming—a review. *Mammal Rev* B(21):181–95, 1991.
14. Fritzdorf, SG, Hibbs, A, Kleshnev, V. Analysis of speed, stroke rate, and stroke distance for world-class breaststroke swimming. *J Sport Sci* 27:373–8, 2009.

- 344 15. Geladas, N, Nassis, GP, Pavlicevic, S. Somatic And Physical Traits Affecting Sprint
345 Swimming Performance In Young Swimmers. *Int J Sports Med* 26: 139-144, 2005.
- 346 16. Huijing, P, Toussaint, H, Mackay, R, Vervoorn, K, Clarys, JP, de Groot, G,
347 Hollander, AP. Active drag related to body dimensions. In : Ungerechts B, Reischle K,
348 Wilke K (eds). *Swimming Science v.Champaign, IL : HU-man Kinetics*, 31-38, 1988.
- 349 17. Jurimae, J, Haljaste, K, Cicchella, A, Latt, E, Purge, P, Leppik, A, Jurimae, T.
350 Analysis of Swimming Performance From Physical, Physiological, and Biomechanical
351 Parameters in Young Swimmers. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 19: 70-81, 2007.
- 352 18. Kennedy, P, Brown, P, Somadeepti, N, Chengalur, R, Nels, C. Analysis of male and
353 female olympic swimmers in the 100- Meter events. *Int J Sport Biomech* 6, 187-197,
354 1990.
- 355 19. Lätt, E, Jürimäe, J, Mäestu, J, Purge, P, Rämson, R, Haljaste, K, Keskinen, KL,
356 Rodriguez, FA, Jürimäe, T. Physiological, biomechanical and anthropometrical
357 predictors of sprint swimming performance in adolescent swimmers. *J Sports Sci Med*
358 9:398–404, 2010.
- 359 20. Morais, JE, Jesus, S, Lopes, V, Garrido, N, Silva, A, Marinho, D, Barbosa, TM.
360 Linking selected kinematic, anthropometric and hydrodynamic variables to young
361 swimmer performance. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 24:649–64, 2012.
- 362 21. Nevill, AM, Oxford, SW, Duncan, MJ. Optimal Body Size and Limb Length Ratios
363 Associated with 100-m Personal-Best Swim Speeds. *Med Sci Sport Exercise* 47, 1714-
364 8, 2015.
- 365 22. Rushall, BS, Springings, EJ, Holt, LE, Cappaert, JM. A re-evaluation of forces in
366 swimming. *J Swim Res* 10: 6–30, 1994.
- 367 23. Sammoud, S, Nevill, AM, Negra, Y, Bouguezzi, R, Chaabene, H, Hachana, Y.
368 Allometric associations between body size, shape, and 100-m butterfly speed
369 performance. *J Sports Med Physi Fitness* 2017
- 370 24. Sammoud, S, Nevill, AM, Negra, Y, Bouguezzi, R, Chaabene, H, Hachana, Y. 100-
371 meter Breaststroke swimming performance in youth swimmers: the predictive value of
372 anthropometrics. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2018a.
- 373 25. Sammoud, S, Nevill, AM, Negra, Y, Bouguezzi, R, Chaabene, H, Hachana, Y. Key
374 somatic variables in young backstroke swimmers. *J Sport Sci* 37(10):1162-1167, 2019.
- 375 26. Slaughter, MH, Lohman, TG, Boileau, RA, Horswill, CA, Stillman, RJ, VanLoan,
376 MD, Bembien, DA. Skinfold equations for estimation of body fatness in children and
377 youth. *Hum Biol* 60: 709-23, 1988.

- 378 27. Stewart, A, Marfell-Jones, M, Olds, T, de Ridder, H. International Standards for
379 Anthropometric Assessment. *Lower Hutt, New Zealand: ISAK* pp. 57–72, 2011.
- 380 28. Toussaint, HM, Janssen, T, Kluft, M. Effect of propelling surface size on the
381 mechanics and energetics of front crawl swimming. *J biomech*, 24:205–11, 1991.
- 382 29. Zamparo P, Pendergast DR, Termin B, Minetti AE. Economy and efficiency of
383 swimming at the surface with fins of different size and stiffness. *Eur J Appl Physiol*
384 96:459–70, 2006
- 385