



HAL
open science

Hue et al Swimming Abilities in Afro-Caribbean Swimmers Anthropometric and Physiological Characteristics in Young Afro-Caribbean Swimmers: A Preliminary Study

Olivier Hue, Sophie Antoine-Jonville, Olivier Galy, Stephen Blanc

► **To cite this version:**

Olivier Hue, Sophie Antoine-Jonville, Olivier Galy, Stephen Blanc. Hue et al Swimming Abilities in Afro-Caribbean Swimmers Anthropometric and Physiological Characteristics in Young Afro-Caribbean Swimmers: A Preliminary Study. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 2013, 8 (3), pp.271-278. hal-01137258

HAL Id: hal-01137258

<https://hal.univ-antilles.fr/hal-01137258>

Submitted on 30 Mar 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Anthropometry

Leg length (measured at the gluteal furrow) and arm span (measured from the tip of the middle finger of one hand to the other) were obtained with a polyester measuring tape and an anthropometer. After height and body-mass measurements, the percentage of fat body mass (%FBM) was estimated from the skinfold thickness, expressed in millimeters, of the sum of 4 skin areas (biceps, triceps, subscapula, and suprailiac) measured on the right side of the body with Harpenden skinfold calipers, following the method described by Durnin and Rahaman.¹⁶ Sexual maturation was evaluated from the puberty stages of Tanner¹⁷ by the physician in charge of the swimming league.

Buoyancy was evaluated by measuring hydrostatic lift (HL) as described by Chatard et al.¹⁸ This was measured at the end of a maximal inspiration when the subjects were floating in the fetal position facing downward. Lead weights, varying from 0.1 kg to 1 kg, were successively applied to the back at the level of the shoulder blades. The final load necessary to maintain the subjects in a balanced position just under water was considered HL. This method has been shown to be highly reliable ($r = .98$ for 8 swimmers)¹⁶ and is easy to use.

Jump-and-Reach Test

The jump-and-reach test was performed using an Ergojump (Jump-MD, Takei, Japan). The subjects were asked to perform a countermovement jump (CMJ) as previously described.¹ The power output during the jump-and-reach test was determined by entering the jump-height and body-weight variables into the equation of Sayers et al,¹⁹

$$\text{CMJ}_{\text{peakP}} (\text{W}) = 51.9 \times \text{CMJ height (cm)} + \text{body mass (kg)} - 2007$$

where $\text{CMJ}_{\text{peakP}}$ is the peak power obtained with the CMJ and CMJ height is the height attained.

A standardized 15-minute warm-up was performed by all subjects 10 minutes before the test. This warm-up was exclusively composed of lower limb stretching movements (knee flexors and extensors).

Performance

The day of the anthropometric measurements, the swimmers performed two 15-m sprints without diving, and the best performance was kept as their maximal swim speed. The best performance in a 400-m competitive event in a 50-m swimming pool at the time of the current season (ie, within the last 2 months) was recorded for each swimmer.

Glide

The passive-glide measure (ie, without any kicking phase) was the distance attained by the swimmer's head after a push on the swimming pool wall in the prone ventral hydrodynamic position at a depth between 0.5 m and 1 m.²⁰ Each swimmer performed the test 3 times to become

familiar with it and to find the best gliding position. The best distance was retained.

Estimated Maximal Aerobic Power

The outdoor incremental test was the University of Montréal track test,²¹ an indirect continuous multistage test that is valid and reliable for estimating indirect maximal aerobic power ($e\text{VO}_{2\text{max}}$) from maximal aerobic velocity. The subjects ran along markers placed every 20 m on a 400-m track and were paced by audible cues. The interval between cues decreased gradually (every 1 min), and the subjects thus had to increase their speed ($0.5 \text{ km} \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$) to keep pace with the cues.

Statistical Analysis

All values are expressed as mean \pm SD. A 2-way (sex \times age) ANOVA for unpaired populations was applied, with post hoc analysis if necessary. When statistical significance was observed, post hoc analysis was done. Pearson product-moment correlations describe the relationship between the individual anthropometric and physiological variables and 400-m performance.

Sex-specific and nonspecific multiple linear models were developed to identify the best combinations of multiple simultaneous determinants of the 400-m and 15-m sprint performances from the initial set of variables. A multipronged strategy was adopted for data selection after checking for assumptions. This consisted of examining the possible regression methods (backward, forward) to check for the consistency of the significant variables and for model optimization. The probabilities of F-to-enter and F-to-remove were .05 and .10, respectively. The adjusted r^2 values are provided in the results. The equations resulting from the regression analysis were applied to estimate 400-m performance and to relate it to the actual measured performance.

The boys in the 2011 elite subgroup were compared with the other boys age 10 to 12 years in 2004, through unpaired Student t tests performed on all anthropometric, physiological, and performance variables. Binary logistic-regression analysis was performed to determine the significant predictors of endpoint level of practice in 2011 (elite or not) from the following initially measured variables: height, leg length, arm span, weight, %FBM, $e\text{VO}_{2\text{max}}$, $\text{CMJ}_{\text{peakP}}$, power output, glide, HL, and 400-m-crawl performance. Because of missing data points, the analysis included 5 elite and 28 nonelite swimmers.

We used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 18.0. For all statistics, a significance level of $P < .05$ was preset.

Results

Anthropometry

As presented in Table 1, all the anthropometric data except %FBM changed with age. There were no differences in anthropometric data between boys and girls

Parameters Involved in 400-m Performance

The 400-m distance is a valid test to evaluate maximal aerobic power in swimmers³⁸ and is regularly used in the literature. The performance during the 400-m swim could be favorably compared with the times noted in the literature for the same age and the same sex (399–335 s for 400-m in boys 11–14 y and 374–367 s for 400-m in girls 12.5–13.5 y).^{23,24,26,27,39} In contrast, the results of the 2011 elite subgroup were better than those noted in the literature (ie, a mean of 330 s for the 400-m in 10- to 12-y-old boys).

Performance was poorly but significantly correlated with glide, age, and eVO_{2max} , indicating that the older children with better glide and better eVO_{2max} demonstrated better performance in the 400-m swimming trial. These results agree with the literature, which shows a correlation with direct or indirect VO_{2max} in young swimmers.^{23,24,26,39} We measured indirect VO_{2max} with a running test known to show higher results with longer leg length and greater running economy, and these 2 factors are well known to improve with age. It was therefore not surprising that 400-m performance was also related to age, as older swimmers normally swim with better efficiency than do younger ones.²⁵ Lätt et al²⁶ demonstrated that 400-m performance increases with age according to increases in body height and arm span and improvement in VO_2 , as well as in relation to technical factors.

The implication of the glide in 400-m performance emphasizes the importance of underwater resistance in swimming. Glide's effect on swimming performance has been studied during short swimming durations and consecutive to the start and grab phases^{40,41} or across passive drag.¹⁸ The following has been demonstrated: Swimmers with longer glides usually have the most effective hydrodynamic position to avoid a high loss of velocity during the glide,^{40,41} and a good glide associated with low passive drag should be considered a good indicator of general aptitude for swimming.¹⁸ It is not certain, however, that the swimmers with better passive drag (ie, better glides) are more economical during active drag, because 400-m swimming performance in a 25-m pool means 15 glides, which could amount to substantial energy conservation for swimmers with a better glide. Sanders and Byatt-Smith⁴² demonstrated that starting aquatic propulsion too early (ie, opposite the glide) raises the energy cost of swimming, and Vantorre et al^{40,41} suggested that a longer gliding phase (ie, after the start phase and after each "flip turn") is more economical because the swimmers do not act to move forward and remain in a hydrodynamic position. Moreover, Chatard et al¹⁸ showed a correlation with passive drag and swimming performance.

When boys and girls were separated, the factors implicated in the variability of 400-m performance were age and eVO_{2max} in boys ($r^2 = 0.431$, $P < .01$) and leg length, eVO_{2max} , and glide in girls ($r^2 = .229$, $P < .01$). The finding that age was not correlated in girls and was replaced by an anthropometric parameter (ie, leg length) may be explained by different maturation rates in boys

and girls of the same age, with girls attaining final maturation (ie, reflected by the Tanner stage) earlier.

Girls Versus Boys

We did not see a sex \times age effect, but some parameters demonstrated a sex effect: The girls were significantly fatter, had lower eVO_{2max} and CMJ_{peakP} , and demonstrated lower performance for both the 400-m and 15-m trials. The results on body fat and VO_{2max} were reported for older boys and girls involved in swimming activity (ie, 13–15 y old),³⁸ as well as for school children.³² This sexual dimorphism is notable in puberty, which is associated for girls with significantly lower hemoglobin values and higher fat mass due to hormonal effects.⁴³

Although we found no significant sex \times age difference in 400-m performance, the girls increased their 400-m speed up to 13 years old and then stagnated, whereas the 400-m speed in boys continued to rise. Our results agree with findings that the most consistent rapid rise in swimming speed occurs from 11 to 13 years in boys⁴⁴ and girls.³⁹ However, although a slow increase in swimming speed is noted at 13 to 14 years followed by a second acceleration from 14 to 16 years of age,⁴⁴ which we noted in our girls, our boys demonstrated a stagnation at 12 and 13 and an acceleration at 14, certainly in relation to greater maturation and thus more muscle power at 14 than at 12 and 13 years old. This interpretation is consistent with the increase in Tanner stage in our boys at 14 years compared with 12 and 13. The significantly better 15-m performance in boys was consistent with greater muscle development, as reflected by the greater CMJ_{peakP} .

The 2011 Elite Subgroup

Costa et al⁴⁵ demonstrated that performance is not stable in young white swimmers until about 16 years of age, and therefore predictions of future performance are not really robust until data at 16 years are available. Nevertheless, it was very interesting to note that 3 of the 4 variables predictive of skill level were significantly better in the 2011 elite subgroup 7 years later (ie, CMJ_{peakP} , glide, and 400-m performance), which suggests that future elite swimmers are discriminated by CMJ_{peakP} , glide, HL, and 400-m performance and had better CMJ_{peakP} , glide, and 400-m. As CMJ_{peakP} was better in the 2011 elite group and may be linked to the glide (ie, swimmers with better leg power push harder on the wall, thereby having the best glide result), we investigated the glide: CMJ_{peakP} ratio. We found that the ratio did not differ between the 2011 elite subgroup and their counterparts (ie, 2.44 ± 1.28 vs 2.87 ± 1.27 in elite vs their counterparts for the [glide/ $CMJ_{peakP} \times 1000$] ratio; arbitrary units). This indicates that the better glide noted in the 2011 elite subgroup was not due to the better CMJ_{peakP} but certainly to more effective hydrodynamic characteristics.

However, the better CMJ_{peakP} denoted higher explosivity in the 2011 elite subgroup, which was confirmed by the better 15-m performance. This latter was

not a discriminating factor between the elite and nonelite swimmers in our study, and it is not a key factor of 400-m performance, as long-distance characteristics differ from those of sprint events.⁴⁶

Perspective

This study demonstrated that (1) although the Guadeloupean swimmers were fatter than most white swimmers of the same age, they had very poor HL, certainly in relation with ethnic characteristics; (2) they had better CMJ_{peakP}, also certainly in relation with ethnic characteristics; and (3) they performed as well as their white counterparts at the same age. The top 2 swimmers of Afro-Caribbean origin selected for the French team for both international and Olympic competition (ie, Julien Sicot and Malia Metella) were both sprinters, but only 1 of the 6 young swimmers of the current study is now a sprinter. This means that our young swimmers with great explosivity and poor HL, who were discriminated by important parameters implicated in long-distance swimming (400-m performance, a reflection of aerobic power) and glide, did not succeed in sprint events at an international level but in longer ones.

Further research is needed to investigate the motor organization and energy cost of swimming in Afro-Caribbean swimmers, because they clearly are different from those noted in whites.

References

- Babel K, Hertogh C, Hue O. Influence of ethnic origin on predictive parameters of performance in sprint running in prepubertal boys. *Int J Sports Med.* 2005;26:798–802. 10.1055/s-2004-830562. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1055/s-2004-830562](#)
- Samson J, Yerlès M. Racial differences in sports performance. *Can J Sport Sci.* 1988;13:109–116. [PubMed](#)
- Charles JD, Bejan A. The evolution of speed, size and shape in modern athletics. *J Exp Biol.* 2009;212:2419–2425. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1242/jeb.031161](#)
- Bejan A, Jones EC, Charles JD. The evolution of speed in athletics: why the fastest runners are black and swimmers white. *Int J Des Nat Ecodyn.* 2010;5:199–211. [doi:10.2495/DNE-V5-N3-199-211](#)
- Malina RM. Racial/ethnic variation in the motor development and performance of American children. *Can J Sport Sci.* 1988;13:136–143. [PubMed](#)
- Hutinger PW. Differences in speed between American Negro and White children in performance of the 35-yard dashes. *Res Q.* 1959;30:366–368.
- Milne C, Seefeldt V, Reuschlein P. Relationship between grade, sex, race, and motor performance in young children. *Res Q.* 1976;47:726–730. [PubMed](#)
- Ponthieux NA, Barker DG. Relationship between race and physical fitness. *Res Q.* 1965;36:468–472. [PubMed](#)
- Schutte JE, Townsend EJ, Hugg J, Shoup RF, Malina RM, Blomqvist CG. Density of lean body mass is greater in blacks than in whites. *J Appl Physiol.* 1984;56:1647–1649. [PubMed](#)
- Wang J, Horlick M, Thornton JC, Levine LS, Heymsfield SB, Pierson RN. Correlations between skeletal muscle mass and bone mass in children 6–18 years: influences of sex, ethnicity, and pubertal status. *Growth Dev Aging.* 1999;63:99–109. [PubMed](#)
- Himes JH. Racial variations in physical and body composition. *Can J Sport Sci.* 1988;13:117–126. [PubMed](#)
- Nelson JK, Nelson KR. Skinfold profiles of black and white boys and girls ages 11–13. *Hum Biol.* 1986;58:379–390. [PubMed](#)
- Ben Ayed K, Latiri I, Dore E, Tabka Z. Leg muscle power in 12-year-old black and white Tunisian football players. *Res Sports Med.* 2011;19:103–117. 10.1080/15438627.2011.556527. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1080/15438627.2011.556527](#)
- Irwin CC, Irwin RL, Ryan TD, Drayer J. Urban minority youth swimming (in)ability in the United States and associated demographic characteristics: toward a drowning prevention plan. *Inj Prev.* 2009;15:234–239. 10.1136/ip.2008.020461. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1136/ip.2008.020461](#)
- Harriss DJ, Atkinson G. Update—ethical standards in sport and exercise science research. *Int J Sports Med.* 2011;32:819–821. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1055/s-0031-1287829](#)
- Durnin JV, Rahaman MM. The assessment of the amount of fat in the human body from measurements of skinfold thickness. *Br J Nutr.* 1967;21:681–689. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1079/BJN19670070](#)
- Tanner JM. *Growth at Adolescence.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific; 1962.
- Chatard JC, Lavoie JM, Bourgoin B, Lacour JR. The contribution of passive drag as a determinant of swimming performance. *Int J Sports Med.* 1990;11:367–372. 10.1055/s-2007-1024820. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1055/s-2007-1024820](#)
- Sayers SP, Harackiewicz DV, Harman EA, Frykman PN, Rosenstein MT. Cross-validation of three jump power equations. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1999;31:572–577. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1097/00005768-199904000-00013](#)
- Machado L, Ribeiro J, Costa L, et al. The effect of depth on the drag force during underwater gliding: a CFD approach. *ISBS—Conference Proceedings Archive, 28 International Conference on Biomechanics in Sports 2010.* <http://w4.ub.uni-konstanz.de/cpa/article/view/4578>.
- Léger L, Boucher R. An indirect continuous running multistage field test: the Université de Montréal track test. *Can J Appl Sport Sci.* 1980;5:77–84. [PubMed](#)
- Bencke J, Damsgaard R, Saekmose A, Jørgensen P, Jørgensen K, Klausen K. Anaerobic power and muscle strength characteristics of 11 years old elite and non-elite boys and girls from gymnastics, team handball, tennis and swimming. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2002;12:171–178. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1034/j.1600-0838.2002.01128.x](#)

23. Duché P, Falgairette G, Bedu M, Lac G, Robert A, Coudert J. Analysis of performance of prepubertal swimmers assessed from anthropometric and bioenergetic characteristics. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol.* 1993;66:467–471. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1007/BF00599623](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00599623)
24. Jürimäe J, Haljaste K, Cicchella A, et al. Analysis of swimming performance from physical, physiological, and biomechanical parameters in young swimmers. *Pediatr Exerc Sci.* 2007;19:70–81. [PubMed](#)
25. Kjendlie PL, Ingjer F, Stallman RK, Stray-Gundersen J. Factors affecting swimming economy in children and adults. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2004;93:65–74. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1007/s00421-004-1164-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-004-1164-8)
26. Lätt E, Jürimäe J, Haljaste K, Cicchella A, Purge P, Jürimäe T. Longitudinal development of physical and performance parameters during biological maturation of young male swimmers. *Percept Mot Skills.* 2009;108:297–307. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.2466/pms.108.1.297-307](https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.108.1.297-307)
27. Poujade B, Hautier CA, Rouard A. Determinants of the energy cost of front-crawl swimming in children. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2002;87:1–6. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1007/s00421-001-0564-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-001-0564-2)
28. Hue O, Galy O, Blonc S, Hertogh C. Anthropometrical and physiological determinants of performance in French West Indian monofin swimmers: a first approach. *Int J Sports Med.* 2006;27:605–609. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1055/s-2005-865856](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2005-865856)
29. Harik-Khan RI, Muller DC, Wise RA. Racial difference in lung function in African-American and white children: effect of anthropometric, socioeconomic, nutritional and environmental factor. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2004;160:893–900. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1093/aje/kwh297](https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwh297)
30. Lätt E, Jürimäe J, Haljaste K, Cicchella A, Purge P, Jürimäe T. Physical development and swimming performance during biological maturation in young female swimmers. *Coll Antropol.* 2009;33:117–122. [PubMed](#)
31. Falgairette G, Bedu M, Fellmann N, Van-Praagh E, Coudert J. Bio-energetic profile in 144 boys aged from 6 to 15 years with special reference to sexual maturation. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol.* 1991;62:151–156. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1007/BF00643734](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00643734)
32. Berthoin S, Pelayo P, Lensel-Corbeil G, Robin H, Gerbeaux M. Comparison of maximal aerobic speed as assessed with laboratory and field measurements in moderately trained subjects. *Int J Sports Med.* 1996;17:525–529. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1055/s-2007-972889](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2007-972889)
33. Ben Ayed K, Latiri I, Dore E, Tabka Z. Leg muscle power in 12-year-old black and white Tunisian football players. *Res Sports Med.* 2011;19:103–117. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1080/15438627.2011.556527](https://doi.org/10.1080/15438627.2011.556527)
34. Bosco C, Komi PV, Tihanyi J, Fekete G, Apor P. Mechanical power test and fiber composition of human leg extensor muscles. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol.* 1983a;51:129–135. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1007/BF00952545](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00952545)
35. Bosco C, Mogroni P, Luhtanen P. Relationship between isokinetic performance and ballistic movement. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol.* 1983b;51:357–364. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1007/BF00429072](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00429072)
36. Vandewalle H, Pérès G, Monod H. Standard anaerobic exercise tests. *Sports Med.* 1987;4:268–289. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.2165/00007256-198704040-00004](https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-198704040-00004)
37. Ama PF, Simoneau JA, Boulay MR, Serresse O, Thériault G, Bouchard C. Skeletal muscle characteristics in sedentary black and Caucasian males. *J Appl Physiol.* 1986;61:1758–1761. [PubMed](#)
38. Rodríguez FA. Maximal oxygen uptake and cardiorespiratory response to maximal 400-m free swimming, running and cycling tests in competitive swimmers. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness.* 2000;40:87–95. [PubMed](#)
39. Lätt E, Jürimäe J, Haljaste K, Cicchella A, Purge P, Jürimäe T. Physical development and swimming performance during biological maturation in young female swimmers. *Coll Antropol.* 2009;33:117–122. [PubMed](#)
40. Vantorre J, Seifert L, Fernandes RJ, Boas JP, Chollet D. Comparison of grab start between elite and trained swimmers. *Int J Sports Med.* 2010;31:887–893. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1055/s-0030-1265150](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0030-1265150)
41. Vantorre J, Seifert L, Fernandes RJ, Boas JP, Chollet D. Kinematical profiling of the front crawl start. *Int J Sports Med.* 2010;31:16–21. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1055/s-0029-1241208](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0029-1241208)
42. Sanders RH, Byatt-Smith J. Improving feedback on swimming turns and starts exponentially. *Proceedings of XIX Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, San Francisco[AUQ2].* 2001:91–94.
43. Van Praagh E, Doré E. Short-Term muscle power during growth and maturation. *Sports Med.* 2002;32:701–728. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.2165/00007256-200232110-00003](https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-200232110-00003)
44. Vorontsov A, Binevski D. Swimming speed, stroke rate and stroke length during maximal 100 m freestyle of boys 11–16 years of age. In: Chatard JC, ed. *Biomechanics and Medicine in Swimming IX.* Saint-Etienne, France: Université de Saint-Etienne; 2002[AUQ3].
45. Costa MJ, Marinho DA, Bragada JA, Silva AJ, Barbosa TM. Stability of freestyle performance from childhood to adulthood. *J Sports Sci.* 2011;29:1183–1189. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1080/02640414.2011.587196](https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2011.587196)
46. Seifert L, Komar J, Leprêtre PM, et al. Swim specialty affects energy cost and motor organization. *Int J Sports Med.* 2010;31:624–630. [PubMed](#) [doi:10.1055/s-0030-1255066](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0030-1255066)




Figure 1 — Observed and predicted sex-specific 400-m performance in future high-level performers (black circles) and in other boys (gray circles) and girls (white circles).

Table 1 Anthropometric Differences Between Boys and Girls Over Time

	Age, y	n	Tanner stage	Height, cm*	Leg length, cm*	Arm span, cm*	Weight, kg*	Body fat, %
Boys	10	9	1–2	148.1 ± 12.6	70.5 ± 5.3	156.0 ± 13.8	39.9 ± 11.2	17.5 ± 5.0
	11	14	1–2	152.3 ± 5.9	71.1 ± 5.5	156.1 ± 9.5	41.3 ± 8.1	20.6 ± 4.4
	12	16	1–2	155.9 ± 6.2 ^{a,b}	76.9 ± 4.3 ^{a,b}	165.1 ± 11.2 ^b	45.1 ± 8.9	15.6 ± 3.5
	13	12	1–3	169.7 ± 5.5 ^{a,b,c}	79.7 ± 4.9 ^{a,b}	177.3 ± 7.4 ^{a,b,c}	51.3 ± 7.5	16.6 ± 5.3
	14	10	2–4	170.4 ± 9.3 ^{a,b,c}	82.2 ± 5.4 ^{a,b,c}	175.7 ± 13.3 ^{a,b,c}	59.5 ± 12.4	19.9 ± 8.0
mean				159.0 ± 11.6	76.1 ± 6.6	166.1 ± 13.7	46.8 ± 11.3	17.9 ± 5.5
Girls	10	12	1–2	144.8 ± 7.1	68.7 ± 4.9	152.2 ± 10.1	39.3 ± 6.7	29.6 ± 4.7
	11	17	1–3	154.9 ± 7.4 ^a	74.7 ± 7.3 ^a	160.1 ± 9.8	43.2 ± 7.4	24.9 ± 4.4
	12	19	2–4	158.4 ± 4.6 ^a	75.2 ± 4.3 ^a	166.7 ± 7.6 ^a	46.6 ± 8.0 ^a	25.3 ± 6.1
	13	8	3–5	163.1 ± 5.4 ^{a,b}	81.1 ± 5.1 ^{a,b,c}	171.4 ± 10.1 ^a	54.1 ± 4.8	28.9 ± 4.8
	14	9	3–5	163.7 ± 6.3 ^{a,b,c}	77.8 ± 5.3 ^a	170.3 ± 8.3 ^{a,b}	55.9 ± 10.2	27.7 ± 3.2
mean				156.8 ± 8.4	75.3 ± 6.4	165.0 ± 10.4	47.0 ± 9.3	26.6 ± 5.2

Note: Bold indicates sex effect: different from boys at the same age ($P < .001$).

*Age effect ($P < .001$): a, different from 10 y; b, different from 11 y; c, different from 12 y ($P < .05$).

Table 2 Physiological and Performance Results

	Age, y	n	eVO _{2max} , mL · min ⁻¹ · kg ⁻¹ *	MAV, km · h ⁻¹	CMJ, cm*	CMJ _{peakP} , W*	HL, kg	Glide, m*	400-m, s	15-m, s
Boys	10	9	51.3 ± 3.9	9.4 ± 2.1	43.2 ± 9.3	2079 ± 549	1.1 ± 0.6	7.7 ± 1.0	389 ± 47	10.7 ± 0.7
	11	14	50.6 ± 3.0	9.7 ± 1.6	45.4 ± 6.6	2367 ± 559	1.2 ± 0.8	6.9 ± 1.1	371 ± 30	10.3 ± 0.6
	12	16	52.3 ± 5.1	11.3 ± 2.3	47.7 ± 5.2	2672 ± 511 ^a	1.1 ± 0.5	7.7 ± 1.3	348 ± 39 ^a	10.0 ± 0.9
	13	12	54.8 ± 4.6 ^b	12.9 ± 2.4 ^{a,b}	48.0 ± 7.9	2995 ± 504 ^{a,b}	1.0 ± 0.7	7.2 ± 1.0	347 ± 34 ^a	10.0 ± 0.7
	14	10	57.0 ± 4.6 ^{a,b,c}	13.8 ± 3.0 ^{a,b,c}	50.8 ± 7.2	3588 ± 699 ^{a,b,c}	0.8 ± 0.5	8.6 ± 1.1 ^{b,d}	310 ± 33 ^{a,b,c,d}	9.7 ± 0.6
mean			45.4 ± 4.5	5.7 ± 1.7	39.1 ± 5.1	1948 ± 457	1.2 ± 0.9	7.5 ± 1.3	397 ± 74	11.8 ± 1.2
Girls	10	12	47.8 ± 4.1	8.6 ± 2.2	41.0 ± 4.1	2243 ± 275	1.0 ± 0.6	7.2 ± 1.3	381 ± 39	10.6 ± 0.8
	11	17	49.1 ± 2.4^a	8.8 ± 1.5^a	42.2 ± 4.7	2393 ± 400 ^a	1.3 ± 0.7	8.6 ± 1.4 ^b	352 ± 41	10.6 ± 1.2
	12	19	48.8 ± 2.4	8.3 ± 1.8^a	48.1 ± 5.4	3019 ± 282 ^{a,b,c}	1.3 ± 0.4	7.2 ± 2.3	348 ± 31	10.9 ± 0.3
	13	8	48.7 ± 3.8	10.5 ± 1.8^a	42.2 ± 7.0	2690 ± 226^{a,b,d}	1.5 ± 0.8	9.8 ± 0.3 ^{a,b}	356 ± 23	10.4 ± 0.6
	14	9								
mean			48.1 ± 3.6	8.5 ± 2.1	42.2 ± 5.6	2397 ± 466	1.3 ± 0.7	8.0 ± 1.5	367 ± 48	10.9 ± 1.0

Abbreviations: eVO_{2max} indicates estimated aerobic power; MAV, maximal aerobic velocity; CMJ, countermovement jump; CMJ_{peakP}, CMJ peak power; HL, hydrostatic lift. Note: Bold indicates sex effect: different from boys at the same age ($P < .001$).

*Age effect ($P < .001$). a, different from 10 y; b, different from 11 y; c, different from 12 y; d, different from 13 y ($P < .05$).

Table 3 Anthropometric Differences Between Elite and Nonelite Swimmers

	n	Age, y	Height, cm	Leg length, cm	Arm span, cm	Weight, kg	Body-fat mass, %
Elite	6	11.5 ± 0.8	158.1 ± 12.4	74.2 ± 6.2	168.6 ± 14.8	46.9 ± 10.6	18.7 ± 1.2
Nonelite	33	11.1 ± 0.3	151.8 ± 9.6	73.2 ± 5.7	158.1 ± 10.6*	41.6 ± 9.0	17.6 ± 5.1

* $P < .05$.

Table 4 Physiological and Performance Results in Elite Versus Nonelite Swimmers

	n	eVO _{2max} , mL · min ⁻¹ · kg ⁻¹	CMJ _{peakP} , W	HL, kg	Glide, m	400-m, s	15-m, s
Elite	6	51.9 ± 4.3	2793 ± 597	1.1 ± 0.4	9.3 ± 0.6	330 ± 16	9.3 ± 0.6
Nonelite	33	45.0 ± 6.5	2357 ± 556*	1.1 ± 0.6	7.2 ± 1.1*	374 ± 40*	10.5 ± 0.7*

Abbreviations: eVO_{2max} indicates estimated aerobic power; CMJ_{peakP}, countermovement peak power; HL, hydrostatic lift.* $P < .05$.