

Power in sports

A literature review on the application, assumptions, and terminology of mechanical power in sport research

van der Kruk, Eline; van der Helm, Frans; Veeger, DirkJan; Schwab, Arend

DOI

[10.1016/j.jbiomech.2018.08.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2018.08.031)

Publication date

2018

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in

Journal of Biomechanics

Citation (APA)

van der Kruk, E., van der Helm, F., Veeger, D., & Schwab, A. (2018). Power in sports: A literature review on the application, assumptions, and terminology of mechanical power in sport research. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 79, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2018.08.031>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable). Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1

2

3

4

POWER IN SPORTS: A LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE APPLICATION, ASSUMPTIONS, AND TERMINOLOGY OF MECHANICAL POWER IN SPORT RESEARCH.

E. van der Kruk¹, F.C.T. van der Helm¹, H.E.J. Veeger¹ and A.L. Schwab¹,

¹*Department of Biomechanical Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Mekelweg 2, Delft, The Netherlands*
Tel: +3115-2784270

e.vanderkruk@tudelft.nl

Key words: *mechanical power, internal power, external power, mechanical energy expenditure, joint power*

5

6

7 **Power in Sports: a literature review on the application, assumptions, and**
8 **terminology of mechanical power in sport research.**

9 E. van der Kruk¹, F.C.T. van der Helm¹, H.E.J. Veeger¹ & A.L. Schwab¹

10 **Abstract**

11 *The quantification of mechanical power can provide valuable insight into athlete performance*
12 *because it is the mechanical principle of the rate at which the athlete does work or transfers energy to*
13 *complete a movement task. Estimates of power are usually limited by the capabilities of*
14 *measurement systems, resulting in the use of simplified power models. This review provides a*
15 *systematic overview of the studies on mechanical power in sports, discussing the application and*
16 *estimation of mechanical power, the consequences of simplifications, and the terminology. The*
17 *mechanical power balance consists of five parts, where joint power is equal to the sum of kinetic*
18 *power, gravitational power, environmental power, and frictional power . Structuring literature based*
19 *on these power components shows that simplifications in models are done on four levels, single vs*
20 *multibody models, instantaneous power (IN) versus change in energy (EN), the dimensions of a model*
21 *(1D, 2D, 3D), and neglecting parts of the mechanical power balance. Quantifying the consequences*
22 *of simplification of power models has only been done for running, and shows differences ranging from*
23 *10% up to 250% compared to joint power models. Furthermore, inconsistency and imprecision were*
24 *found in the determination of joint power, resulting from inverse dynamics methods, incorporation of*
25 *translational joint powers, partitioning in negative and positive work, and power flow between*
26 *segments. Most inconsistency in terminology was found in the definition and application of ‘external’*
27 *and ‘internal’ work and power. Sport research would benefit from structuring the research on*
28 *mechanical power in sports and quantifying the result of simplifications in mechanical power*
29 *estimations.*

Glossary power terminology

<p>work work done by a system is the energy transferred from that system to the surrounding</p> <p>energy the quantitative property that must be transferred to an object in order to perform work on it</p> <p>power the rate of work, the amount of energy generated or transferred per unit time.</p> <p>Joint power the mechanical power generated by the human at the joints $P_j = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} M_{i,i+1} \cdot (\omega_{i+1} - \omega_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} M_j \cdot \omega_j$</p> <p>Kinetic power the rate of change of the kinetic energy $P_k = \sum \frac{dE_k}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{dt} (I_i \omega_i) \cdot \omega_i + \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \cdot a_i \cdot v_i$</p> <p>Gravitational power the rate of change of the gravitational energy $P_G = \sum_{i=1}^N v_i \cdot m_i \cdot g$</p> <p>Environmental power the mechanical power from external applied forces and moments. $P_e = \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i \cdot M_{e,i} + \sum_{i=1}^N v_i \cdot F_{e,i}$ We here use the term environmental power to avoid the term external power which has been used to describe several different models (see section 5.2.1)</p> <p>Frictional power the power loss from the frictional forces (e.g. air friction, roll friction) $P_f = \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i \cdot M_{f,i} + \sum_{i=1}^N v_i \cdot F_{f,i}$</p> <p>Mechanical power balance the mechanical power balance consists of five parts: joint power, kinetic power, gravitational power, environmental power, and frictional power. $P_j = P_k + P_f - P_G - P_e$</p> <p>Validity the process of determining the degree to which a model is an accurate representation of the real world from the perspective of the intended uses of the model (Thacker, 2001)</p> <p>Technique factors variables in the movement coordination of an athlete</p> <p>Mechanical power in human movement can be determined by applying the laws of classic mechanics to the human body, and by modelling it as a linked segment model consisting of several bodies</p> <p>Muscle power the rate at which a muscle does work or transfers energy to complete a movement task</p> <p>Metabolic power metabolic work per unit time</p>	<p>Metabolic work the amount of energy used by a human (during a movement task) (metabolic approach); Metabolic work can be measured by the rate of oxygen uptake, from which the energy expenditure for the complete body is estimated.</p> <p>Mechanical energy expenditure The amount of energy used by an athlete to complete a movement task based on the mechanical power balance</p> <p>Single body The human is simplified to a single mass model</p> <p>Multibody The human is modelled as a number of rigid bodies connected by idealized joints</p> <p>Instantaneous power (IN) power at any instant of time, which can be calculated using the mechanical power balance equation</p> <p>Change of energy (EN) Power, $\Delta E/\Delta t$, which is estimated by determining the change of kinetic and gravitational energy of a system ΔE over a larger time span Δt, e.g. the cycle time, and divide by Δt.</p> <p>Kinematic approach In the <i>kinematic approach</i>, only recorded kinematic data are used to estimate mechanical power.</p> <p>Joint power: Single joint joint power of an individual joint is estimated</p> <p>Joint power: Multiple joints in these researches the joint power is estimated over multiple joints</p> <p>Internal power See peripheral power</p> <p>External power See environmental power</p> <p>Peripheral power Power due to moving body segments relative to the COM (Zelik & Kuo 2012; Riddick & Kuo 2016). Only to be used when the power due to motion of the COM and due to motion of the segments relative to the COM are to be separated for measurement conveniences. Note however, that peripheral power and environmental power should not be interpreted as separate energy measures (mechanical work).</p> <p>Maintenance power the rate at which energy is used to maintain the body processes</p> <p>Entropy Represents the loss of energy to heat dissipation</p> <p>Non-conservative power Power from an irreversible process like heat dissipation, negative work, frictional work.</p> <p>Conservative power power due to conservative forces, which in principle can be re-used such as with tendon stretch</p> <p>E-gross E-gross is the ratio between the expended work (metabolic work) and the performed work (mechanical work)</p> <p>Positive work Work done by muscles to accelerate the motion.</p> <p>Negative work Work done by muscles to decelerate the motion, non-regenerative work.</p>
---	---

30

31 **1. Introduction**

32 Mechanical power is a metric often used by sport scientists, athletes, and coaches for research and
 33 training purposes. Mechanical power is the mechanical principle of the rate at which the athlete does
 34 work or transfers energy to complete a movement task. A mechanical power balance analysis can
 35 provide valuable insight in the capability of athletes to generate power, and also in technique factors
 36 affecting the effective use of power for performance. The estimates of mechanical power are usually
 37 limited by the capabilities of motion capture systems, resulting in the necessity to use simplified
 38 power models. However, due to the introduction of these simplified models and thus variation in
 39 how power is calculated, the overview in literature in the terminology and estimation of mechanical
 40 power is disordered. Furthermore, the validity of the simplifications is often disregarded.
 41 The inconsistency in the use and definition of power came to our attention, when attempting to
 42 estimate the mechanical power balance in speed skating (Winter et al. 2016; van der Kruk 2018).
 43 Although thorough reviews exist addressing the issues of the mechanical power equations (van Ingen
 44 Schenau & Cavanagh 1990; Aleshinsky 1986) and mechanical efficiency (van Ingen Schenau &
 45 Cavanagh 1990), we found inconsistencies in the (post 1990) literature on the power estimations
 46 and terminology. Moreover, the quantification on consequences of simplifications has usually been
 47 disregarded. This not only makes the choice for a proper power model complicated, but also

48 hampers interpretation and comparison to the literature. Providing insight into the interrelations
49 between the different models, estimations, and assumptions can benefit the interpretation of power
50 results and assist scientists in performing power estimations which are appropriate for their specific
51 applications.

52 The aim of this study is to provide an overview of the existing papers on mechanical power in sports,
53 discussing its application and estimation, consequences of simplifications, and terminology.

54

55

56 2. Method

57 A literature search was carried out in July 2017 in the database Scopus. The keywords “mechanical
58 power” and “sport” were used in the search (128 articles) (*Search 1*). The search was limited to
59 papers in English. Abstracts of the retrieved papers were read to verify whether the article was
60 suited to the aim of the paper, papers that estimated ‘power’ for a sporting exercise were included
61 (resulting in 94 articles). Three additional searches were performed in August 2017 addressing three
62 specific power estimations, combining the keyword “sport” with “external power” (30 articles)
63 (*Search 2*), “internal power” (4 articles) (*Search 3*), and “joint power” (35 articles) (*Search 4*),
64 restricted to articles published after 1990. Again, the abstracts of the retrieved papers were read to
65 verify whether the papers were suited for the current review. Papers that estimated ‘power’ for a
66 sporting exercise were included (resulting in respectively 13, 3, and 26 articles).


67 3. Application of the term power

68 When the terms *mechanical power* and *sport* were used in articles, the scope of the papers can
69 roughly be divided into two categories: the term power was either used as a *strength characteristic*
70 *or performance measure* (approximately 75% of the articles), or as an indication of *mechanical*
71 *energy expenditure (MEE)* (muscle work), which we focus on in this review.
72 The first application was mainly found in fitness and strength studies. Power is then wrongly used as
73 a *strength measure*, attributed to a certain athlete (Winter et al. 2016). This would implicate that
74 (peak) mechanical power is a synonym for short-term, high intensity neuromuscular performance
75 characteristic, which is directly related to performance of an athlete. However, as Knudson (2009)
76 also discusses, a peak power is not a fixed characteristic of a certain athlete. The power estimation in
77 a certain exercise, e.g. the well-known vertical jump (Bosco et al. 1983), cannot be directly translated
78 into performance of an athlete for other movements. Secondly, while strength is a force
79 measurement, power is a combination of force and velocity (Minetti 2002); these two are not
80 interchangeable.

81 Power can of course be used as an *indication of performance* during endurance sports. In cycling
82 practices, power meters (e.g., SRM systems, Schoberer Rad Messtechnik, Welldorf, Germany) are
83 widely accepted and used as an indication of the intensity of the training or race. Since a SRM system
84 determines power as the product of pedal force and rotational velocity of the sprocket, under the
85 same conditions (e.g. equal frictional and gravitational forces), the cyclist with the highest generated
86 power per body weight over time (work) will be fastest. This is, however, not applicable for every
87 sport. For example, power generated by a skater not only generates a forward motion (in line with
88 the rink), but also a lateral one (perpendicular to the rink). The result of this being that the skater
89 that generates the most power is not necessarily the fastest one finishing. Technique factors will
90 determine the effectiveness of the generated power towards propulsion.
91 This review focuses on the second purpose of power estimation: as indication of *mechanical energy*
92 *expenditure (MEE)*. Power is the rate of doing work, the amount of energy transferred per unit time.
93 The relationship between mechanical power, muscle power and metabolic power is shown in Figure
94 1. Metabolic power can be measured by the rate of oxygen uptake, from which the energy

95 expenditure for the complete body in time is estimated. Mechanical power can be determined by
 96 applying the laws of classic mechanics to the human body, and by modelling it as a linked segment
 97 model consisting of several bodies (Aleshinsky 1986). Both metabolic power and mechanical power
 98 estimates eventually aim to approach muscle power (either via the metabolic or via the mechanical
 99 approach). Although muscle work is closely related to the MEE for the movement, mechanical power
 100 and work are far from an exact estimation of muscle power and work and thus from MEE.
 101 The disparity between mechanical power and muscle power can, next to measurement inaccuracies,
 102 be attributed to physiological factors. In a mechanical approach, the part of the muscle power which
 103 is degraded into heat or non-conservative frictional forces inside the body or in antagonistic co-
 104 ntractions is not taken into account (Figure 1). Neither is the power against conservative forces
 105 taken into account, such as tendon stretch, which in principle can be re-used (van Ingen Schenau &
 106 Cavanagh 1990).

107




108

109 **Figure 1** The power flow in human movement. Metabolic power and work are a chemical process, estimated by
 110 for example measuring lactate or oxygen uptake (a). Energy distributes into muscle power, maintenance power
 111 and entropy. Muscle power results in mechanical power (force times contraction velocity), except for non-
 112 conservative power (e.g., power due to heat dissipation, non-conservative frictional forces inside the body, or
 113 when muscles work against each other) and conservative power (e.g. power due to conservative forces, which in
 114 principle can be re-used such as with tendon stretch). It is possible to convert the mechanical power into an
 115 actual estimation of muscle power by the use of musculoskeletal models (II). The mechanical power balance
 116 consists of joint power, which is generated by the human, which results in the kinetic power, which is the rate of
 117 change of the kinetic energy, frictional power, due to e.g. air resistance, environmental power, which is induced
 118 by external forces and moments, and gravitational power. The mechanical power can therefore be estimated
 119 by the joint power alone, or by the combination of kinetic, frictional, environmental and gravitational power. E-
 120 gross is the ratio between the expended work (metabolic work) and the performed work (mechanical work).

121

- ⊙ center of pressure air friction (CP)
- ⊕ center of mass (COM)



122 **Figure 2** Free body diagram of a rigid segment model of a human (adopted from van der Kruk et al. (2018)). The
 123 human body is here divided into eight segments; the feet (f), the legs (e), the thighs (t), the pelvis (p) and a HAT
 124 (h), which are the head-arms-trunk. Note that HAT can only be appropriately grouped for certain sports
 125 activities (such as ones that focus on lower extremity movement). In other activities, the HAT should be taken as
 126 separate segments. The forces acting on the human are the ground reaction forces and the air frictional forces.
 127 There are joint forces and moments acting at the Ankle (A), Knee (K), Hip (H) and LumboSacral (L) joints.
 128 Indicated are the Center of Mass (COM) of each segment, the Center of Pressure of the air friction (CP), where
 129 the air frictional force acts upon, and the Center of pressure of the ground reaction force (COP).
 130

131

132 4. Mechanical power equations

133 Before elaborating on the interpretation of mechanical power in the literature, we first set-up the
 134 complete human mechanical power balance equations (based on the work of Aleshinsky (1986) and
 135 van Ingen Schenau & Cavanagh (1990)), to expound the terminology used in this review. The
 136 equations are based on the free body diagram shown in Figure 2.
 137 The human is modelled as a chain of N linked rigid bodies ($N \geq 1$), where each body is identified as a
 138 segment with index i . We start by writing down the power balance of every segment and then add
 139 them to come to the power balance for the complete system. For a better understanding of the
 140 system behaviour we distinguish between the joint power, which is the mechanical power generated
 141 by the human at the joints; the frictional power losses; the kinetic power, which is the rate of change
 142 of the kinetic energy; the gravitational power; and the environmental power, which is the mechanical
 143 power from external applied forces and moments. We here use the term environmental power to
 144 avoid confusion, since the term external power has been used to describe several different models
 145 (e.g. the change in kinetic energy of the centre of mass (COM), as well as the power measured with a
 146 power meter in cycling) (see section 5.2.1). Then, for one segment i we can determine these powers
 147 from the Newton-Euler equations of motion by multiplying them with the appropriate velocities.

148 Starting with the translational part, the Newton equation, we get for segment i .,

$$149 \quad (\mathbf{F}_{j,i} + \mathbf{F}_{G,i} + \mathbf{F}_{e,i} - \mathbf{F}_{f,i}) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i = m_i \cdot \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \quad (1)$$

150 In which $\mathbf{F}_{j,i}$ are the joint forces, $\mathbf{F}_{G,i}$ are the gravitational forces, $\mathbf{F}_{e,i}$ are the external forces, and
 151 $\mathbf{F}_{f,i}$ are the frictional forces working at the segment (e.g. air friction, ice friction). \mathbf{a}_i and \mathbf{v}_i are
 152 respectively the linear acceleration and velocity of the segment. We write the translational power
 153 balance equation as

$$154 \quad P_{j,tr,i} + P_{G,tr,i} + P_{e,tr,i} - P_{f,tr,i} = P_{k,tr,i} \quad (2)$$

155 Where $P_{j,tr,i}$, $P_{G,tr,i}$, $P_{f,tr,i}$, $P_{e,tr,i}$ are respectively the translational joint power, the translational
 156 gravitational power, the translational frictional power, and the translational environmental power.
 157 $P_{k,tr,i}$ is the translational kinetic power.

158 For the rotational power we can take the Euler equation of motion, expressed in the global reference
 159 system, and multiply by the angular velocities at the segment, to come to the rotational power
 160 equation, as in

$$161 \quad (\mathbf{M}_{j,i} + \mathbf{M}_{e,i} - \mathbf{M}_{f,i}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_i = \frac{d}{dt} (I_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_i) \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_i \quad (3)$$

162 Where $\mathbf{M}_{j,i}$ are the joint moments, $\mathbf{M}_{e,i}$ are the external moments, $\mathbf{M}_{f,i}$ are the frictional moments,
 163 and $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$ is the segment angular velocity. We write the power as

$$164 \quad P_{j,ro,i} + P_{e,ro,i} - P_{f,ro,i} = P_{k,ro,i} \quad (4)$$

165 Next, we add up the rotational and translational segment powers of all segments. The constraint
 166 forces in the joints have no contribution to the total power equation, since only relative rotation at
 167 the joint between the two segments is assumed (linked segment model), and therefore will drop out

168 of the equation. Joint forces can redistribute energy between segments and links, but not add energy
 169 to the total body system (Aleshinsky 1986). Note however, that if an applied inverse kinematics
 170 method allows for translations in the joint, as in Ojeda et al. (2016), or a six degree of freedom joint
 171 is applied (e.g., as is possible in biomechanical modelling software such as OpenSim (Delp et al. 2007)
 172 and Visual3D (C-Motion, Germantown, MD, USA)), joint forces do play a role and the constraint forces
 173 should be accounted for in the power determination (see section 5.1.3).

174 The total power equations for the system, now written in terms of joint power, kinetic power,
 175 frictional power, gravitational power, and environmental power are,

$$176 \quad P_j = P_k + P_f - P_G - P_e \quad (5)$$

177

178 In which we have the joint power (P_j) which is directly calculated using the moments at the joint (M_j)
 179 and the rotational velocities around the joint (ω_j), as in

$$180 \quad P_j = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \mathbf{M}_{i,i+1} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{\omega}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \mathbf{M}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_j \quad (6)$$

181 We find the gravitational power in equation 5, as in

$$182 \quad P_G = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{v}_i \cdot m_i \cdot \mathbf{g} \quad (7)$$

183 And the frictional power, which consists of translational power and rotational power,

$$184 \quad P_f = \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\omega}_i \cdot \mathbf{M}_{fr,i} + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{F}_{fr,i} \quad (8)$$

185 And the environmental power, which consists of translational power and rotational power,

$$186 \quad P_e = \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\omega}_i \cdot \mathbf{M}_{e,i} + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{F}_{e,i} \quad (9)$$

187 And the change of kinetic energy in the segments,

$$188 \quad P_k = \sum \frac{dE_{seg}}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{dt} (I_i \boldsymbol{\omega}_i) \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_i + \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \cdot \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \quad (10)$$

189 In summary, the mechanical power balance consists of five parts, joint power, kinetic power,
 190 gravitational power, environmental power and frictional power. Joint power is generated by the
 191 human, and is the result of muscle power. This entails that for the most complete estimation of
 192 mechanical (human) power either the joint power should be determined directly through
 193 measurements of joint torques and angular velocity, or indirectly via the sum of frictional, kinetic,
 194 environmental and gravitational power, P_f , P_k , P_e , and P_G (Figure 1). Usually, these powers are
 195 approximated depending on the available recording methods, and therefore sometimes not all terms
 196 in the mechanical power balance are estimated resulting in a simplified model.

197

198 *Instantaneous power (IN) versus change of energy (EN)*

199 Power is the amount of energy per unit of time. In the literature there are, apart from the different
 200 models, two different approaches to estimate power. First, what is referred to as instantaneous
 201 power (IN). Instantaneous power is power at any instant of time, which can be calculated using the
 202 power balance equation presented earlier (van Ingen Schenau & Cavanagh 1990). The second
 203 approach is by determining the change of kinetic and gravitational energy of a system (EN) over a
 204 larger time span, e.g. the cycle time, and divide this energy over the larger Δt . We know that the
 205 kinetic energy at time t is:

$$206 \quad E_{k,i,t} = \frac{1}{2} m \cdot \mathbf{v}_{i,t}^T \cdot \mathbf{v}_{i,t} + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,t}^T \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,t} \quad (11)$$

207 And the gravitational energy at time t :

$$208 \quad E_{g,i,t} = m \cdot g \cdot y_{i,t} \quad (12)$$

209 Note that EN only estimates average mechanical power, and does not give insight into the power
 210 development, or peak powers. Also, oscillatory movements will result in a zero outcome with EN (e.g.
 211 walking).

212 **5. Power models in the literature**

213 Based on the mechanical power equations, we sorted the literature of *Search 1-3* concerning the
 214 estimation of mechanical power as an indication of mechanical energy expenditure in Tables 1 & 2.
 215 For each study the power model (P_j, P_k, P_f, P_g, P_e), the estimation approach (IN, EN) and the
 216 dimensions (1D, 2D, 3D) are indicated. Results show that simplifications are done on three scales:
 217 the number of bodies (single body vs multibody), the recorded data (kinematic versus kinetic data),
 218 and the time interval (IN versus EN). The analysis on results for the literature of *Search 4*, are given
 219 separately in Table 3, divided into articles for single joints versus multi-joints, and work versus power
 220 results.

221 **5.1 Simplifications of power models**

222 *5.1.1 Single body models*

223 When an athlete is simplified to a single mass, the assumption is that this mass is located at the COM
 224 of the full body. Constructing the mechanical power balance (eq. 5) for this single body system
 225 results in an equation with one body left, the COM, which automatically neglects any relative
 226 motions between the segments and the COM, and any power related to these motions. Although this
 227 single body approach is used often (27 papers, see Table 1), estimation of the impact of this
 228 simplification has only been performed in two studies, both on running (Arampatzis et al. 2000;
 229 Martin et al. 1993).
 230 Arampatzis et al. (2000) (see also Table 1) compared four mechanical power models in over-ground
 231 running at velocities ranging from 2.5-6.5 m/s. Their results showed that the mean mechanical power
 232 estimated with the single body model, based on the change in potential and kinetic energy, is 32%
 233 higher than the power of the 2D joint power estimation at 3.5m/s running speed. Martin et al. (1993)
 234 determined the mechanical power in treadmill running with three methods (see Table 1). Based on
 235 their results, a single body kinematic approach resulted in a 47% lower mechanical power estimation
 236 compared to joint power, running at 3.35 m/s. Since the neglected frictional power (air friction) at
 237 these running speeds is relatively small (<1% of joint power, based on Tam et al. (2012)), the
 238 difference between joint power estimation and the kinematic approach for the single body
 239 estimation is attributed to the neglected relative motions of the segments to the COM and the fact

Table 1
Structuring of the literature for single body models Indicated are the terminology, the power estimation, the dimensions of the model (1D, 2D, 3D) and whether the power is estimated instantaneously (Instantaneous power (IN)) or via the change in energy over a time span (EN). Inconsistent terminology and oversimplifications are indicated in the final column.

Article	Terminology	Dimensions	P _j	P _k TRANS	P _k ROT	P _r	P _g	P _e	IN/ EN	Comments	Applicable topics from this review	
Single Body models												
Running												
Yanagiya et al. (2003)	Mechanical power	1						X	IN	velocity of the belt times the horizontal force on the handle bar	Directional power (see 5.2.2)	
Fukunaga et al. (1981) (sprint)	Forward power	2					X		IN			
Pantaja et al. (2016) (sprint)	Mechanical power	1	X			X			IN			
di Prampero et al. (2014) (sprint)	Mechanical accelerating power	1	X				X		IN			
Minetti et al. (2011) (skyscraper)	External power (internal power)	1					X		EN	Regression for internal power	Internal and external work (see 5.2.1)	
Gaudino et al. (2013) (soccer)	Mechanical power	1	X						EN		Directional power (see 5.2.2)	
Arampatzis et al. (2000)	Mechanical power	2					X		IN	+14% mean mechanical power ^a [compared to joint power in same experiment, Table 2]	Oversimplified model (see 5.1.1)	
Martin et al. (1993)	COM kinematics approach	2		X		X			EN	+32% mean mechanical power ^b [compared to joint power in same experiment, Table 2]		
Bezodis et al. (2015)	External power	2		X		X			EN	-47% mean mechanical power ^c [compared to joint power in same experiment, Table 2]		
Cycling												
Telli et al. (2017)	External power	3		X				X	EN		Internal and external work (see 5.2.1)	
Van Ingen Schenau et al. (1992)	External power	1	X			X			EN		Internal and external power (see 5.2.1)	
Swimming												
Seifert et al. (2010)	External power, Relative power, absolute power	1				X			IN	<i>Drag measured:</i> the swimmers swam on the MAD-system, which allowed them to push off from fixed pads with each stroke These push-off pads were attached to a rod which was connected to a force transducer, enabling direct measurement of push-off forces for each stroke. Assuming a constant mean swimming speed, the mean propelling force equals the mean drag force. Theoretical, not measured		
Toussaint and Truijens (2005)		1	X			X			-			
Toussaint and Beek (1992)		1	X			X			-			
Rowing												
Hofmijster et al. (2008)	External power	1					X		IN			
Buckeridge et al. (2012)	External power	1					X		IN	Integral of handle displacement-handle force curve divided by time.		
Hofmijster et al. (2009)	Internal Power	1	X								Internal and external power (see 5.2.1)	
Colloud et al. (2006)	External mechanical power						X		IN	Handle*vhandle-Fstretcher*vstretcher		
Speed skating												
Houdijk et al. (2000a,b)	External power	1				X			EN	About 20% of the joint power consists of Pk + Pg based on van der Kruk et al. (2018)		
de Koning et al. (2005)	Power output	1	X			X			EN			
de Koning et al. (1992) (sprint)	External Power	1	X			X			EN			

Wheelchair									
Mason et al. (2011)	External Power Output	1	X	EN	<i>Fdrag measured:</i> The drag test setup consisted of a strain gauge force transducer, attached at the front of the treadmill to the front of the wheelchair. Participants were instructed to remain stationary while the treadmill was raised over a series of gradients at a constant velocity <i>Fdrag measured:</i> A cable was connected between the wheelchair (standing immobile on a sloped treadmill) and a force transducer mounted upon a frame at the front of the treadmill. Fdrag equalled the force needed to prevent the wheelchair from moving backward under influence of belt speed and slope effects.				Internal and external work (see 5.2.1)
Veeger et al. (1991)	External power	1	X	EN					
Kayaking									
Jackson (1995)									
Nakamura et al. (2004)	Internal power	1	X	EN	Theoretical, not measured Regression function				Internal and external work (see 5.2.1)
Sideway locomotion									
Yamashita et al. (2017)	External power, vertical power, horizontal power, lateral power	2	X	IN					Internal and external work (see 5.2.1) Directional power (see 5.2.2)
Bench press									
Jandacka and Uchytíl (2011) (soccer)		1	X	IN	Vertical velocity of the COM x ground reaction force of the bench to the floor				Oversimplified model (see 5.1.1)

^a Based on mean mechanical power of Table 2 at 3.5 m/s in A. Arampatzis et al. (2000): ((Method 1- Method 4)/(Method 4)) * 100%.

^b Based on mean mechanical power of Table 2 at 3.5 m/s in A. Arampatzis et al. (2000): ((Method 2- Method 4)/(Method 4)) * 100%.

^c Based on Martin et al. (1993): ((W_{EXCH} in Table 2-TMP in Table 4)/(TMP in Table 4)) * 100%.

Table 2 Structuring of the literature for multi body models. Indicated are the terminology, the power estimation, the dimensions of the model (1D, 2D, 3D) and whether the power is estimated directly (Instantaneous power (IN)) or via the change in energy over a time span (EN). Applicable topics from this review are indicated in the last column.

Article	Terminology	Dimensions	P _J	P _{K,TRANS}	P _{K,ROT}	P _F	P _G	P _e	IN /EN	Comments	Applicable topics from this review
Multibody models											
Running											
Willwacher et al. (2013)	Joint power	3	X						IN	15 segments	
Arampatzis et al. (2000)	Joint power Mechanical power	2 2	X X	X	X	X			EN	+10% difference in mean mechanical power ^a [compared to joint power in same experiment]	
Martin et al. (1993) (sprint)	Joint power Segments kinematics approach	2 2	X X	X	X	X			IN EN	15 segments 14 segments -56% mean mechanical power ^b [compared to joint power in same experiment]	
Cycling											
De Groot et al. (1994)	Joint power		X							theoretical	
Neptune and Van Den Bogert (1997)	Joint power Internal and external power Internal power	2 2 3	X X X	X X X	X X X	X X X			IN IN EN		Internal and external work (see 5.2.1) Internal and external work (see 5.2.1)
Telli et al. (2017)										Relative to COM	
Golf											
McNally et al. (2014)	Joint power	3	X								
Walking											
Royer and Martin (2005)	Mechanical work	2		X	X	X	X		EN		

^a Based on mean mechanical power of Table 2 at 3.5 m/s in A. Arampatzis et al. (2000); (Method 3-Method 4/Method 4) * 100%.

^b Based on Martin et al. (1993); ((W_{mean} in Table 3-TMP in Table 4)/(TMP in Table 4)) * 100%.

Table 3
Articles found with the search terms joint power and sport. The literature was divided into estimating power or work of a single joint (the research estimated the joint power of individual joints), and power and work of multiple joints (joint power was taken over multiple joints). Noted are the applied inverse dynamics technique with reference (N.M. = not mentioned). For the work estimation, the conversion from power to work is given and whether positive and negative work are separated. Articles are sorted on year of publication.

Joint power		Inverse dynamics method			
Power per joint	Movement	Inverse dynamics method		Power to work	Absolute
Paquette et al. (2017)	Running	"Newtonian inverse dynamics"	N.M.		
Middleton et al. (2016)	Cricket	"Standard inverse dynamics analysis"	N.M.		
Barratt et al. (2016)	Cycling	Inverse dynamics method	Elftman (1939)		
Pauli et al. (2016)	Squats, jumps	N.M.	N.M.		
Van Lieshout et al. (2014)	Exercises	N.M.	N.M.		
Creveaux et al. (2013)	Tennis	[Method is fully described in paper]	n.a.		
Kuntze et al. (2010)	Badminton	N.M.	N.M.		
Riley et al. (2008)	Running	"Vicon plug-in-gait"	Vicon		
Dumas and Cheze (2008)	Gait	"Inverse dynamics based on wrenches and quaternions"	Dumas et al. (2004)		
Vanrenterghem et al. (2008)	Jumping	N.M.	N.M.		
Schwameder et al. (2005)	Walking	"Standard 2D inverse dynamics routine"	N.M.		
Rodacki and Fowler (2001)	Exercise	"Newtonian equations of motion"	N.M.		
Jacobs and van Ingen Schenau (1992)	Sprint	"Linked segment model"	Elftman (1939)		
Energy per joint	Movement	Inverse dynamics method			
Schache et al. (2011)	Running	"A standard inverse dynamics technique"	Winter (2009)	integral of joint power over time	Not absolute (pos and neg work)
Hamill et al. (2014)	Running	"Newton-Euler inverse dynamics approach"	N.M.	N.M.	Not absolute (pos and neg work)
Sorenson et al. (2010)	Jump	Inverse Dynamics	Visual 3d	Integral of joint power over time	Not absolute (pos and neg work)
Yeow et al. (2010; Yeow et al. 2009)	Landing jump	N.M.	N.M.	Integral of joint power over time	Not absolute (pos and neg work)
Power multiple joints	Movement	Inverse dynamics method			
Strutzenberger et al. (2014)	Cycling	"Sagittal plane inverse dynamics"	Visual 3D	Integral of the summed ankle, knee, and hip powers	-
Energy multiple joints	Movement	Inverse dynamics method		Power to work	Absolute
Greene et al. (2013; 2009)	Rowing	Custom program	Winter (2009)	Sum of the joint mechanical energy	N.M.
Attenborough et al. (2012)	Rowing	Inverse dynamics	Winter (2009)	Integration of the absolute value of the power time series curve for each joint	Absolute per joint
Lees et al. (2006)	Jumping	"Inverse dynamics using standard procedures"	Miller and Nelson (1973), Winter (2009)	Time integral per joint "Standard procedure", de Koning and van Ingen Schenau (1994); sum of left and right limb;	Not absolute (pos and neg work)
Devita et al. (1992)	Running	"An inverse dynamics method"	N.M.	Resultant joint powers around hip, knee and ankle joint were summed at each time point.	Not absolute (pos and neg work)

240 that only measured kinematic data were used in the single body, which is expected to be less
241 accurate than the combination of measured force and kinematic data. The difference in results
242 between the two studies is surprising, since the mechanical equations, running speeds, and joint
243 power models (14 versus 15 segments, 2D, absolute per joint) are similar for both studies, while the
244 only difference was the treadmill versus over-ground condition. Unfortunately, Arampatzis et al.
245 (2000) do not discuss this difference.

246 It is clear that, although there is no consensus on whether a single body model under- or
247 overestimates the mechanical power in running (see also section 5.2.1), both studies show significant
248 differences between a single body model and a joint power model. Since this is the consequence of
249 disregarding the motions of the segments and kinematic measurement accuracy, validity will likely be
250 different for different movements.

251 Three studies were found that determined the mechanical power in locomotion with a single body
252 model by multiplication of an environmental force (e.g. the measured ground reaction forces) times
253 the velocity of the centre of mass of the complete body (Arampatzis et al. 2000; Yamashita et al.
254 2017; Jandacka & Uchytíl 2011). Theory of this model lays in the simplification of an athlete to one
255 rigid body being propelled by a force. Therefore, the ground reaction force, which acts on the foot is
256 now shifted to the COM and assumed to cause the movement of the complete (rigid) body. However,
257 although a force can be replaced by a resultant force acting at the COM without changing the motion
258 of the system, the work of the system will divert from the actual work. For example, the ground
259 reaction force in running, acting on the foot, in principle hardly generates power, after all the foot
260 has close to zero velocity (Zelik et al. 2015). By assuming that the force acts on the COM of the
261 athlete, the force suddenly generates all power (and therefore work). So although mechanically, with
262 the rigid body assumption, the simplified model is in balance, the validity of modelling an athlete as a
263 point mass (single body) driven by the ground reaction force is highly doubtful. The results of such a
264 model should in no case be interpreted as an indication of muscle power/work or MEE, since the
265 relationship with actual joint power is lost by the oversimplification of an athlete.

266 For single body power estimations, both IN approaches (e.g. Pantoja et al. 2016; di Prampero et al.
267 2014; Seifert et al. 2010) and EN approaches (e.g. Minetti et al. 2011; Gaudino et al. 2013; Houdijk et
268 al. 2000) were found. An EN approach results in an average mechanical power estimate.
269 Consequently, there is no insight into the course of power during the motion cycle, e.g. peak power.
270 Also, oscillatory motions are averaged such that positive and negative power would negate each
271 other, which are tricky assumptions for several sports like running, cycling, swimming, etc. Van der
272 Kruk (2018) found that the kinetic and gravitational power related to these oscillatory motions in
273 speed skating (zig-zag motion of the skater over the straight), appeared to account for almost 20% of
274 the joint power. Therefore, assumptions on ignoring velocity fluctuations, or motions that do not
275 directly contribute in the forward motion, should be well validated. Especially when working with
276 top-athletes or highly technical sports, these components could be the key-factors in an athlete's
277 performance, therefore IN models seem more appropriate than EN models for understanding
278 performance (Caldwell & Forrester 1992).

279 5.1.2 Multibody models

280 Using a multi-body approach is much more complex than the single body approach, since the motion
281 of the separate body parts needs to be measured. The benefit of this approach is that the power per
282 segment gives insight into the distribution of power over the body. In the *kinematic approach*, only
283 recorded kinematic data are used to indirectly estimate mechanical power: frictional power, kinetic
284 power and gravitational power (P_f , P_k and P_G). The main difference with the joint power estimation,
285 is the absence of measured force data. Furthermore, in the kinematic approach frictional power is
286 neglected in running and walking studies, and gravitational power in cycling studies.

287 The studies by Arampatzis et al. (2000) and Martin et al. (1993), which were mentioned earlier,
288 enable the comparison of a kinematic multi-body approach, which resulted in respectively 10% more
289 mechanical power and 56% less mechanical power when compared to the joint power estimation (at
290 respectively 3.5 m/s and 3.35 m/s) (Table 2). Again, their results are contradictory and largely diverge
291 in magnitude. However, the results do stress the need of accurate kinematic measurements in the
292 models. The approaches in which both recorded kinematic and force data were used to estimate
293 MEE correlated better with the aerobic demand of the athletes than the kinematic data only
294 approaches (Martin et al. 1993).

295 5.1.3 Joint power

296 Since we found several inconsistencies in estimating joint power in the articles of *Search 1-3* (see
297 Table 2), we performed a specific search for joint power (*Search 4*). Analysis of these studies lets us
298 identify two classes of differences in joint power estimation: the inverse dynamics method (including
299 the degrees of freedom of the joints) and the estimation of power to work (see Table 3).

300 Joint power estimation requires the determination of joint moments and forces via *an inverse*
301 *dynamics method*. Although several methods exist to estimate joint moments (e.g. Dumas et al.
302 2004; Kuo 1998; Elftman 1939), the bottom-up approach (Winter 2009; Elftman 1939; Miller &
303 Nelson 1973) is still the most applied method, and referred to as the 'standard inverse dynamics
304 method' or 'Newton(-Euler) inverse dynamics approach' without citing further reference. However,
305 since the bottom-up approach can leave large residuals at the trunk and the joint power is largely
306 influenced by the inverse dynamics method (up to 31% (van der Kruk 2018)), there should be more
307 attention towards this part of the power estimation.

308
309 Underlying the inverse dynamics is the choice for the kinematic model, where we mainly found
310 differences in the *degrees of freedom of the joint* (van der Kruk et al. 2018). If translation is allowed
311 in the joints, the joint forces suddenly generate power (see eq. 2). Application of 6 DOF joints, and
312 therefore incorporation of translational joint power is becoming more common, due to the ever
313 more detailed 3D human joint models (e.g. OpenSim, Visual3D). The effect of these forces on the
314 joint power, and whether the translations are not part of residuals of the choice in inverse kinematics
315 method, rather than a physiological phenomenon, falls outside of the scope of this review (Ojeda et
316 al. 2016; Zelik et al. 2015). However, we want to make the reader aware that differences do occur
317 and thereby influence the joint power estimations, where the increase in complexity will not
318 automatically imply improvement.

319
320 The second class of difference was found in the integration of joint *power to work* (as indication of
321 MEE). For the power in a single joint, a separation is made between *negative and positive power*.
322 Negative power occurs when the moment around the joint is opposite to the angular velocity of the
323 joint, which would denote braking (dissipation of energy). With only mono-articular muscles, this
324 would imply the production of eccentric power. However, bi-articular muscles can 'transfer' power to
325 adjacent joints. Converting power into work is done by taking the integral of the power curve over
326 time. In the literature, the division is made between *positive work* and *negative work* (Schache et al.
327 2011; Yeow et al. 2009; Hamill et al. 2014; Sorenson et al. 2010). This division is made since, from a
328 biomechanical perspective, it is assumed that for negative muscle work (or eccentric muscle
329 contraction) the metabolic cost is lower than for positive muscle power requiring concentric muscle
330 contraction. However, there is no general consensus on the exact magnitude of this difference.
331 Caldwell & Forrester (1992) even argue that the division into positive and negative work should be
332 rejected, since mechanical power is an indication of muscle power, not metabolic cost and thus 1 J of
333 negative power reflects 1 J of positive power. However, currently the general consensus is to


334 separate negative from positive work; musculoskeletal simulations might shed light on the difference
 335 in magnitude in the future.

336
 337 For power estimation in multiple joints, the estimation of mechanical work (indication of MEE)
 338 becomes more complicated due to the *power flow* between segments (and thus joints); bi-articular
 339 muscles activations can induce both negative and positive power simultaneously around adjacent
 340 joints (Van Ingen Schenau & Cavanagh 1990). When no power flow is assumed, the integral of the
 341 absolute joint power per joint is taken and summed over the joints (Attenborough et al. 2012). If
 342 power flow is assumed, the joint powers are first summed over the joints and then the integral over
 343 time is taken, again allowing for the separation of negative and positive power (Lees et al. 2006;
 344 Devita et al. 1992). What the best approach is, has yet to be determined. Hansen (2003) found in
 345 cycling that the MEE was most accurately measured with a model that allowed for energy transfer
 346 only between segments of the same limb. Articles that do not report the method for MEE estimation
 347 are inappropriate for comparison (e.g. Greene et al. 2013), since the difference between the two
 348 methods can go up to >2.5x the MEE (measured in running (Martin et al. 1993). Note that this power
 349 flow issue not only accounts for the estimation of joint power over several joints, but also for power
 350 transfer between segments in other kinematic multi-body models (Willems et al. 1995).

351 [Table 3]

352

353 5.2 Inconsistent terminology



354

355 **Figure 3** Free body diagram of a two-link segment body

356 5.2.1 Internal and external work

357 The terms internal and external power and work are often used. However, these terms are ill-
 358 defined, terminology is inconsistent, and the actual purpose of separation is dubious. We will discuss
 359 these issues by considering a simple 2D two-link model (Figure 3). The mechanical power equations
 360 of this simple model can be divided into external powers and internal powers. We here employ the
 361 definition of internal power as the energy changes of the segments, relative to the COM of the
 362 complete body (Aleshinsky 1986). The power equation for this model can be divided as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dE}{dt} = & \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \frac{M \cdot (\dot{x}_{com}^2 + \dot{y}_{com}^2)}{2} + M \cdot g \cdot y_{com} \right\} + \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{m_i \cdot (\dot{x}_{ci/com}^2 + \dot{y}_{ci/com}^2)}{2} + \frac{I_{ci} \cdot \dot{\phi}_i}{2} \right] \right\} = \\
 & \left[F_o^x \cdot \dot{x}_{com} - F_d^x \cdot \dot{x}_{com} + F_o^y \cdot \dot{y}_{com} - F_d^y \cdot \dot{y}_{com} \right] + \left[F_o^x \cdot \dot{x}_{olcom} + F_o^y \cdot \dot{y}_{olcom} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} M_{1,2} \cdot (\dot{\phi}_2 - \dot{\phi}_1) \right] + M_o \cdot \dot{\phi}_1
 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

364 in which the parts in the blue boxes represent the external powers, and the parts in the green boxes
 365 the internal powers. Note that the external force F_o acts at o , and:

$$366 \quad \dot{x}_o = \dot{x}_{com} + \dot{x}_{olcom}; \quad \dot{y}_o = \dot{y}_{com} + \dot{y}_{olcom} \quad (14)$$

367 Although these equations show that the system energy can be presented as a sum of external and
 368 internal power, the mechanical work is *not equal* to the sum of the ‘internal’ and ‘external’ work
 369 (Zatsiorsky 1998; Aleshinsky 1986). Take into consideration that:

$$370 \quad \dot{x}_{com} = \dot{x}_o - \dot{x}_{olcom}; \quad \dot{y}_{com} = \dot{y}_o - \dot{y}_{olcom} \quad (15)$$

371 If we then determine mechanical work by taking the absolute integral of the power equations
 372 separated into internal and external power, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{T1}^{T2} \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \frac{M \cdot (\dot{x}_{com}^2 + \dot{y}_{com}^2)}{2} + M \cdot g \cdot y_{com} \right\} dt + \int_{T1}^{T2} \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{m_i \cdot (\dot{x}_{ci/com}^2 + \dot{y}_{ci/com}^2)}{2} + \frac{I_{ci} \cdot \dot{\phi}_i}{2} \right] \right\} dt \neq \\
 & \int_{T1}^{T2} \left[F_o^x \cdot \dot{x}_o - F_d^x \cdot \dot{x}_{com} + F_o^y \cdot \dot{y}_o - F_d^y \cdot \dot{y}_{com} - F_o^x \cdot \dot{x}_{olcom} - F_o^y \cdot \dot{y}_{olcom} \right] dt + \\
 & \int_{T1}^{T2} \left[F_o^x \cdot \dot{x}_{olcom} + F_o^y \cdot \dot{y}_{olcom} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} M_{1,2} \cdot (\dot{\phi}_2 - \dot{\phi}_1) \right] + M_o \cdot \dot{\phi}_1 dt
 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

375 As mentioned by Aleshinsky in 1986, there are external forces (F_o) inside the ‘internal’ work,
 376 therefore the internal and external work are not independent measures. Moreover, the absolute
 377 values (due to positive and negative work) destroy the balance. Members of the expressions in the
 378 internal and external work are powers which regularly fluctuate out of phase, thereby cancelling
 379 each other out. By treating them as independent measures, the work doubles instead of cancelling
 380 out, while in reality these powers do not cost any mechanical energy (e.g. pendulum motion).
 381 Replacing an actual system of forces applied to a body by the resultant force and couple does not
 382 change the body motion. It can change, however, the estimation of performed work. Therefore, the
 383 power of the external forces as a hypothetical drag force, when assumed this acts at the COM, can be
 384 seen separate from the internal power (there is no relative velocity between the point of application
 385 of the force and the COM). However, ground reaction forces, or any other forces with a point of
 386 application different from the COM will be part of both the ‘internal’ and ‘external’ work, and
 387 therefore are not independent measures (see also section 5.1.1).
 388 Despite the mechanical incorrectness of the separation of internal from external work, and the
 389 discussion involving these measures (Zatsiorsky 1998; van Ingen Schenau 1998), more recent
 390 publications still make this distinction (e.g. Minetti et al. 2011; Nakamura et al. 2004), raising the
 391 question what the benefit is of separating the mechanical energy into internal and external energies
 392 if the separation is mechanically incorrect? In cases where the whole mechanical power balance is
 393 estimated, there seems no point in dividing the power into internal and external power or work. This

394 separation has not given additional useful insight into human power performance in sports so far.
 395 The only application of the separation could be when a single body model is used and therefore only
 396 external power can be measured. The balance ratio between internal and external power can then
 397 be used to provide insight into the consequences of the simplification.
 398 Adding to the confusion of the interpretation of external and internal power, is the inconsistent use
 399 of the terms. The use of the term 'internal' is logically diffuse, while it might refer to muscular or
 400 metabolic work (Williams 1985). In this literature review, two articles were found that used the
 401 internal power for estimations different from the definition given above, defining internal
 402 mechanical power loss as the part of power absorbed by the muscles that is lost to heat (estimated
 403 as fluctuations in kinetic energy of the back and forth moving of the rower on an ergometer)
 404 (Hofmijster et al. 2009), or the total energy required to move segments (Neptune & Van Den Bogert
 405 1997). However, more models and interpretations of internal power have been published, that all
 406 largely (up to 3x) differ in power output estimation (Hansen et al. 2004).
 407 Also the term external power is inconsistently used. Aleshinsky (1986) defined the term as the
 408 change in energy of the COM of the athlete, and can therefore be seen as a single body model. The
 409 origin of the term lies in the assumption that the human generates power only to overcome external
 410 forces (e.g. air friction, ground friction). In speed skating (Houdijk et al. 2000; de Koning et al. 1992),
 411 wheelchair sports (Veeger et al. 1991; Mason et al. 2011) and swimming (Seifert et al. 2010), the
 412 term external power is used for the estimation of frictional power (P_f), assuming that, under constant
 413 velocity, this is equal to the power generated by the human. In rowing (Hofmijster et al. 2008;
 414 Buckeridge et al. 2012; Colloud et al. 2006) and cycling (Telli et al. 2017), where ergometers are
 415 available, the term external power is used to describe the power output measured by the ergometer,
 416 what we define as environmental power (P_e). Note however, that the power output measured with
 417 an ergometer or a system such as SRM is not necessarily the same as the COM movement. If a cyclist
 418 stops pedalling on an ergometer but moves her or his upper body up and down, there is a COM
 419 movement (due to joint power), but there is no power measured at the ergometer (P_e) (the cyclist of
 420 course does not have to stop pedalling for the same effect). In running and walking, where the
 421 frictional power is only marginal and environmental power in principle is zero, the term external
 422 power is used to describe the change in kinetic energy (P_k) (Bezodis et al. 2015) and/or gravitational
 423 energy (P_g) (Minetti et al. 2011) of the COM, but also for an estimation done by multiplication of the
 424 ground reaction forces times the COM velocity (see section 5.1.1 on the reliability of this model).
 425 More interpretations of external power can be found in Table 1.
 426 So even though the term external power is well known and frequently used, the estimation is not
 427 straightforward and interrelations are not always clear. The terms internal and external power can,
 428 however, be structuralized and classified by the mechanical power balance from section 3, as was
 429 done in Table 1 and 2. We propose a standard in section 6.

430 5.2.2 Directional power

431 In the studies on running and walking, we found many power terms related to some sort of direction:
 432 forward power, lateral power, etc. (see Table 1 and 2). Since power is a scalar, it is in principle
 433 incorrect to give the power a certain direction, although of course the forces and velocities related to
 434 power have a direction. The separation of the mechanical power equations into these different
 435 directions is actually not beneficial. Take for example a situation where there is no environmental
 436 power acting on the human e.g. walking; in that situation the power equation simplifies to:

$$437 \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \frac{M \cdot (\dot{x}_{com}^2 + \dot{y}_{com}^2)}{2} + M \cdot g \cdot y_{com} \right\} + \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{m_i \cdot (\dot{x}_{ci/com}^2 + \dot{y}_{ci/com}^2)}{2} + \frac{I_{ci} \cdot \dot{\phi}_i}{2} \right] \right\} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} M_{1,2} \cdot (\dot{\phi}_2 - \dot{\phi}_1) \right]$$

(17)

439 Although the translational left side of this equation can be divided into terms related to a certain
440 translational direction, the eventual power production, on the right side of this equation, cannot be
441 separated into these directions. Separating the left side of the equation into directional terms, is
442 completely dependent on the chosen global frame; moreover, 'vertical' power can very easily be
443 translated into a 'lateral power' without adding power to the system, e.g. due to centrifugal forces.

444 5.3 E-gross

445 This review clearly showed that there arise large differences in mechanical power estimation based
446 on the choice for a model. These differences also impact research studies which estimate metabolic
447 power with gross efficiency calculations (e-gross), which is the ratio between the expended work
448 (metabolic work) and the performed work (mechanical work). E-gross is often determined in a lab,
449 using VO_2 -measurements, to convert mechanical work into energy expenditure. Main causes in the
450 differences among athletes and inaccuracies in measurement of e-gross have been ascribed to the
451 metabolic side of the equation. However, determination of the mechanical power with simplified
452 models influences the e-gross estimation evenly well. When only part of the mechanical power
453 balance is determined, for example with a single body model, the dependency of e-gross to the
454 relative movements of the segments is neglected (e.g. de Koning et al. (2005)). If an athlete would
455 then change movement coordination (technique) between the submaximal experiment (where e-
456 gross is set) and the actual experiment, the change in segment motion is neglected in the mechanical
457 power and thus in the metabolic power estimation. Especially for technique dependent sports (e.g.
458 swimming, speed skating), this seems an important fact.

459 6. Discussion

460 This review provided an overview of the existing papers on mechanical power in sports, discussing
461 the application and the estimation of mechanical power, the consequences of simplifications,
462 mechanically inconsistent models, and the terminology on mechanical power. Structuring the
463 literature shows that simplifications in models are done on four levels: single vs multibody models,
464 instantaneous power (IN) versus change in energy (EN), the dimensions of a model (1D, 2D, 3D) and
465 neglecting parts of the mechanical power balance. Except for the difference between single versus
466 multibody models in running, no studies were found that quantified the consequences of simplifying
467 the mechanical power balance in sport. Furthermore, inconsistency was found in joint power
468 estimations between studies in the applied inverse dynamics methods, the incorporation of
469 translational joint power, and the integration of joint power to energy. Both the validation on
470 simplification of models and the lack of a general method for joint power or work are research areas
471 well worth investigating.

472 The terms internal power and external power/work are, apart from the discussion on the actual
473 usefulness of this power separation, confusing, since several meanings were attributed to the terms.
474 The interrelations between the different interpretations of external power have been discussed here.
475 Based on the above, we suggest that it might be more clear to use the terms from the mechanical
476 power balance: joint power (eq. 6), gravitational power (eq. 7), frictional power (eq. 8),
477 environmental power (eq. 9) and kinetic power (eq. 10) and not use the terms internal and external
478 power or work. In case the power due to motion of the COM and due to motion of the segments
479 relative to the COM are to be separated for measurement conveniences, we propose to work with
480 the term Peripheral Power for moving body segments relative to the COM (Zelik & Kuo 2012; Riddick
481 & Kuo 2016). Note however, that these should not be interpreted as separate energy measures
482 (mechanical work). The awareness that terms internal and external work/power are not self-evident
483 and therefore need explanation *and* interrelation to the mechanical power balance, will reduce the
484 possibility of errors and increase the comprehension for the reader.
485 To quote Winter et al. (2016): 'if sport and exercise science is to advance, it must uphold the
486 principles and practices of science.' This review only revealed the tip of the iceberg of the studies

487 concerned with estimating ‘power’ in sport (the search term *power* and *sport* results in 9,751 articles
488 (August 2017)), but illustrates clearly that the sport literature would benefit from structuring and
489 validating the research on (mechanical) power in sports. By structuring the existing literature, we
490 identified some obstacles that may hamper sport research from making headway in mechanical
491 power research.

492 7. Conclusions

- 493
- 494 • Performance is not a direct translation of mechanical power.
- 495 • Mechanical power is not a direct estimation of muscle power. Mechanical work is also no
496 direct measure of energy expenditure for movement.
- 497 • Mechanical power is estimated via the joint power directly, or via the sum of kinetic,
498 frictional, gravitational and environmental power; all other estimations are simplifications.
- 499 • Due to limitations in human motion capture in sports, simplified models are employed to
500 determine power. Simplifications in models are done on four levels: single vs multibody
501 models, instantaneous power (IN) versus change in energy (EN), the dimensions of a model
502 (1D, 2D, 3D) and neglecting parts of the mechanical power balance.
- 503 • Single body models by definition neglect the relative motion of the separate body segments
504 to the COM of the body. The resulting underestimation in power, as an indication of muscle
505 power, is rarely determined in sports, whereas this part of power is an essential part of the
506 mechanical power balance in technique driven sports as e.g. speed skating, swimming or
507 skiing.
- 508 • IN models are more appropriate than EN models for understanding performance of elite
509 athletes. EN automatically results in determination of average power and therefore
510 oscillatory movements are averaged such that positive and negative power would negate
511 each other.
- 512 • Little attention is given to the chosen inverse dynamics technique to estimate joint moments
513 and forces, although its influence on joint power estimation is large (e.g. 31% in speed
514 skating).
- 515 • When 6DOF joints are applied (e.g. OpenSim, Visual3D), joint forces not only distribute
516 energy, as in the classical 3DOF joint rotational models, but also allow for translational
517 power; Sport researchers should be aware of the differences between these joint power
518 estimations.
- 519 • There is no consensus on how negative and positive work in a single joint should be summed.
520 On the same note, there is no standard on whether to allow for energy flow between joints.
521 The chosen approach is not always clear from the articles, although factors of 2.5x difference
522 between approaches have been found.
- 523 • The terms external and internal power and work are inconsistent. The terms can easily be
524 replaced by the terms joint power, kinetic power, gravitational power, frictional power and
525 environmental power mentioned in the mechanical power balance of this review paper,
526 which will avoid future confusion.
- 527 • Gross-efficiency (e-gross) is not constant within and between athletes. Apart from metabolic
528 causes, this can also be caused by the procedure of mechanical power determination.

529

530 Acknowledgements

531 This study was supported by NWO-STW 12870.

532 **Conflict of interest: none.**

- 533 Aleshinsky, S.Y., 1986. An energy “sources” and “fractions” approach to the mechanical energy
534 expenditure problem- II. movement of the multi-link chain model. *Journal of Biomechanics*,
535 19(4).
- 536 Arampatzis, A. et al., 2000. Mechanical power in running: a comparison of different approaches.
537 *Journal of Biomechanics*, 33(4), pp.457–463
- 538 Attenborough, A.S., Smith, R.M. & Sinclair, P.J., 2012. Effect of gender and stroke rate on joint power
539 characteristics of the upper extremity during simulated rowing. *Journal of Sports Sciences*,
540 30(5).
- 541 Barratt, P. R., Martin, J. C., Elmer, S. J., & Korff, T. 2016. Effects of pedal speed and crank length on
542 pedaling mechanics during submaximal cycling. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*,
543 48(4). <http://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000000817>
- 544 Bezodis, N.E., Salo, A.I.T. & Trewartha, G., 2015. Relationships between lower-limb kinematics and
545 block phase performance in a cross section of sprinters. *European Journal of Sport Science*,
546 15(2).
- 547 Bosco, C. et al., 1983. Mechanical power test and fiber composition of human leg extensor muscles.
548 *European Journal of Applied Physiology and Occupational Physiology*, 51(1).
- 549 Buckeridge, E. et al., 2012. Kinematic asymmetries of the lower limbs during ergometer rowing.
550 *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 44(11).
- 551 Caldwell, G.E. & Forrester, L.W., 1992. Estimates of mechanical work and energy transfers:
552 Demonstration of a rigid body power model of the recovery leg in gait. *Medicine and Science in*
553 *Sports and Exercise*, 24(12).
- 554 Colloud, F. et al., 2006. Fixed versus free-floating stretcher mechanism in rowing ergometers:
555 Mechanical aspects. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24(5).
- 556 Creveaux, T., Dumas, R., Hautier, C., Macé, P., Chèze, L., & Rogowski, I. 2013. Joint kinetics to assess
557 the influence of the racket on a tennis player’s shoulder. *Journal of Sports Science and*
558 *Medicine*, 12(2).
- 559 de Koning, J.J. et al., 2005. Experimental evaluation of the power balance model of speed skating.
560 *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 98(1), pp.227–233.
- 561 de Koning, J.J., de Groot, G. & van Ingen Schenau, G.J., 1992. A power equation for the sprint in
562 speed skating. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 25(6), pp.573–580.
- 563 de Koning, J. J., & van Ingen Schenau, G. J. 1994. On the Estimation of Mechanical Power in
564 Endurance Sports. *Sports Science Review*, 3(2), 34–54.
- 565 De Groot, G. et al., 1994. Power, muscular work, and external forces in cycling. *Ergonomics*, 37(1)
- 566 Delp, S.L. et al., 2007. OpenSim: open-source software to create and analyze dynamic simulations of
567 movement. *IEEE transactions on biomedical engineering*, 54(11), pp.1940–1950.
- 568 Devita, P., Hunter, P.B. & Skelly, W.A., 1992. Effects of a functional knee brace on the biomechanics
569 of running. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 24(7).
- 570 Dumas, R., Rachid, A. & Guise, J.A. de, 2004. A 3D generic inverse dynamic method using wrench
571 notation and quaternion algebra. *Computer methods in biomechanics and biomedical*
572 *engineering*, 7(3), pp.159–166.

- 573 Dumas, R., & Cheze, L. (2008). Hip and knee joints are more stabilized than driven during the stance
574 phase of gait: An analysis of the 3D angle between joint moment and joint angular velocity. *Gait
575 and Posture*, 28(2). <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2007.12.003>
- 576 Elftman, H.O., 1939. Forces and energy changes in the leg during walking. *American Journal of
577 Physiology*, 125(2), pp.339–356. Available at:
578 <http://ajplegacy.physiology.org/content/125/2/339>.
- 579 Gaudino, P. et al., 2013. Biomechanics and predicted energetics of sprinting on sand: Hints for soccer
580 training. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 16(3).
- 581 Fukunaga, A., Matsuo, A. & Ichikawa, M., 1981. Mechanical energy output and joint movements in
582 sprint running. *Ergonomics*, 24(10).
- 583 Greene, A. J., Sinclair, P. J., Dickson, M. H., Colloud, F., & Smith, R. M. (2009). Relative shank to thigh
584 length is associated with different mechanisms of power production during elite male
585 ergometer rowing. *Sports Biomechanics*, 8(4). <http://doi.org/10.1080/14763140903414391>
- 586 Greene, A.J. et al., 2013. The effect of ergometer design on rowing stroke mechanics. *Scandinavian
587 Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, 23(4).
- 588 Hamill, J., Gruber, A.H. & Derrick, T.R., 2014. Lower extremity joint stiffness characteristics during
589 running with different footfall patterns. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 14(2).
- 590 Hansen, E.A., Jørgensen, L.V. & Sjøgaard, G., 2004. A physiological counterpoint to mechanistic
591 estimates of “internal power” during cycling at different pedal rates. *European journal of
592 applied physiology*, 91(4), pp.435–442.
- 593 Hofmijster, M.J., Van Soest, A.J. & De Koning, J.J., 2009. Gross efficiency during rowing is not affected
594 by stroke rate. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 41(5).
- 595 Hofmijster, M.J., Van Soest, A.J. & De Koning, J.J., 2008. Rowing skill affects power loss on a modified
596 rowing ergometer. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 40(6).
- 597 Houdijk, H. et al., 2000. Physiological responses that account for the increased power output in
598 speed skating using klapskates. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 83(4–5), pp.283–288.
- 599 Houdijk, H. et al., 2000. Push-off mechanics in speed skating with conventional skates and klapskates.
600 *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 32(3), pp.635–641.
- 601 Jackson, P.S., 1995. Performance prediction for olympic kayaks. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 13(3).
- 602 Jacobs, R., & van Ingen Schenau, G. J. 1992. Intermuscular coordination in a sprint push-off. *Journal
603 of Biomechanics*, 25(9), 953–965. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290\(92\)90031-U](http://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(92)90031-U)
- 604 Jandacka, D. & Uchytíl, J., 2011. Optimal load maximizes the mean mechanical power output during
605 upper extremity exercise in highly trained soccer players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning
606 Research*, 25(10).
- 607 Knudson, D.V., 2009. Correcting the use of the term “power” in the strength and conditioning
608 literature. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 23(6).
- 609 Kuntze, G., Mansfield, N., & Sellers, W. 2010. A biomechanical analysis of common lunge tasks in
610 badminton. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 28(2). <http://doi.org/10.1080/02640410903428533>
- 611 Kuo, A.D., 1998. A least-squares estimation approach to improving the precision of inverse dynamics

- 612 computations. *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering-Transactions of the Asme*, 120(1), pp.148–
613 159.
- 614 Lees, A., Vanrenterghem, J. & De Clercq, D., 2006. The energetics and benefit of an arm swing in
615 submaximal and maximal vertical jump performance. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24(1).
- 616 Martin, P.E., Heise, G.D. & Morgan, D.W., 1993. Interrelationships between mechanical power,
617 energy transfers, and walking and running economy. *Medicine and Science in Sports and
618 Exercise*, 25(4).
- 619 Mason, B. et al., 2011. Effects of camber on the ergonomics of propulsion in wheelchair athletes.
620 *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 43(2).
- 621 McNally, M.P., Yontz, N. & Chaudhari, A.M., 2014. Lower extremity work is associated with club head
622 velocity during the golf swing in experienced golfers. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*,
623 35(9).
- 624 Middleton, K. J., Mills, P. M., Elliott, B. C., & Alderson, J. A. (2016). The association between lower
625 limb biomechanics and ball release speed in cricket fast bowlers: A comparison of high-
626 performance and amateur competitors. *Sports Biomechanics*, 15(3).
627 <http://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2016.1163413>
- 628 Miller, D.I. & Nelson, R.C., 1973. *Biomechanics of Sport*,
- 629 Minetti, A.E., 2002. On the mechanical power of joint extensions as affected by the change in muscle
630 force (or cross-sectional area), ceteris paribus. *European journal of applied physiology*, 86(4),
631 pp.363–369.
- 632 Minetti, A.E. et al., 2011. Skyscraper running: Physiological and biomechanical profile of a novel sport
633 activity. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, 21(2).
- 634 Nakamura, F.Y. et al., 2004. Energetic cost estimation and contribution of different metabolic
635 pathways in speed kayaking. *Revista Brasileira de Medicina do Esporte*, 10(2).
- 636 Neptune, R.R. & Van Den Bogert, A.J., 1997. Standard mechanical energy analyses do not correlate
637 with muscle work in cycling. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 31(3), pp.239–245.
- 638 Ojeda, J., Martínez-Reina, J. & Mayo, J., 2016. The effect of kinematic constraints in the inverse
639 dynamics problem in biomechanics. *Multibody System Dynamics*, 37(3), pp.291–309.
- 640 Pantoja, P.D. et al., 2016. Sprint Acceleration Mechanics in Masters Athletes. *Medicine and Science in
641 Sports and Exercise*, 48(12).
- 642 Paquette, M. R., Peel, S. A., Schilling, B. K., Melcher, D. A., & Bloomer, R. J. 2017. Soreness-related
643 changes in three-dimensional running biomechanics following eccentric knee extensor exercise.
644 *European Journal of Sport Science*, 17(5). <http://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2017.1290140>
- 645 Pauli, C. A., Keller, M., Ammann, F., Hübner, K., Lindorfer, J., Taylor, W. R., & Lorenzetti, S. (2016).
646 Kinematics and kinetics of squats, drop jumps and imitation jumps of ski jumpers. *Journal of
647 Strength and Conditioning Research*, 30(3). <http://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000001166>
- 648 di Prampero, P.E., Botter, A. & Osgnach, C., 2014. The energy cost of sprint running and the role of
649 metabolic power in setting top performances. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 115(3).
- 650 Riddick, R.C. & Kuo, A.D., 2016. Soft tissues store and return mechanical energy in human running.
651 *Journal of biomechanics*, 49(3), pp.436–441.

- 652 Riley, P. O., Dicharry, J., Franz, J., Croce, U. D., Wilder, R. P., & Kerrigan, D. C. 2008. A kinematics and
653 kinetic comparison of overground and treadmill running. *Medicine and Science in Sports and*
654 *Exercise*, 40(6). <http://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181677530>
- 655 Rodacki, A. L. F., & Fowler, N. E. 2001. Intermuscular coordination during pendulum rebound
656 exercises. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 19(6). <http://doi.org/10.1080/026404101300149366>
- 657 Royer, T.D. & Martin, P.E., 2005. Manipulations of leg mass and moment of inertia: Effects on energy
658 cost of walking. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 37(4).
- 659 Schache, A.G. et al., 2011. Effect of running speed on lower limb joint kinetics. *Medicine and Science*
660 *in Sports and Exercise*, 43(7).
- 661 Schwameder, H., Lindenhofer, E., & Müller, E. 2005. Walking: Effect of walking speed on lower
662 extremity joint loading in graded ramp walking. *Sports Biomechanics*, 4(2).
663 <http://doi.org/10.1080/14763140508522865>
- 664 Seifert, L. et al., 2010. Arm coordination, power, and swim efficiency in national and regional front
665 crawl swimmers. *Human Movement Science*, 29(3).
- 666 Sorenson, S.C. et al., 2010. Knee extensor dynamics in the volleyball approach jump: The influence of
667 Patellar Tendinopathy. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy*, 40(9).
- 668 Strutzenberger, G., Wunsch, T., Kroell, J., Dastl, J., & Schwameder, H. 2014. Effect of chainring ovality
669 on joint power during cycling at different workloads and cadences. *Sports Biomechanics*, 13(2).
670 <http://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2014.908946>
- 671 Tam, E. et al., 2012. Energetics of running in top-level marathon runners from Kenya. *European*
672 *journal of applied physiology*, 112(11), pp.3797–3806.
- 673 Telli, R. et al., 2017. Recumbent vs. upright bicycles: 3D trajectory of body centre of mass, limb
674 mechanical work, and operative range of propulsive muscles. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 35(5).
- 675 Toussaint, H. & Truijens, M., 2005. Biomechanical aspects of peak performance in human swimming.
676 *Animal Biology*, 55(1).
- 677 Toussaint, H.M. & Beek, P.J., 1992. Biomechanics of Competitive Front Crawl Swimming. *Sports*
678 *Medicine: An International Journal of Applied Medicine and Science in Sport and Exercise*,
679 13(1).
- 680 van Ingen Schenau, G.J., 1998. Positive work and its efficiency are at their dead-end: comments on a
681 recent discussion. *Journal of biomechanics*, 31(2), pp.195–197.
- 682 van Ingen Schenau, G.J. & Cavanagh, P.R., 1990. Power equations in endurance sports. *Journal of*
683 *Biomechanics*, 23(9), pp.865–881.
- 684 Van Ingen Schenau, G.J. & Cavanagh, P.R., 1990. Power equations in endurance sports. *Journal of*
685 *Biomechanics*, 23(9), pp.865–881.
- 686 Van Ingen Schenau, G.J., De Koning, J.J. & De Groot, G., 1992. The distribution of anaerobic energy in
687 1000 and 4000 metre cycling bouts. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 13(6).
- 688 van der Kruk, E. et al., 2018. Getting in shape: Reconstructing three-dimensional long-track speed
689 skating kinematics by comparing several body pose reconstruction techniques. *Journal of*
690 *Biomechanics*.

- 691 van der Kruk, E., 2018. *Parameter analysis for speed skating performance*. PhD. thesis, Delft
692 University of Technology. Available at:
693 [https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid%3A70679175-8672-42e4-88dc-
dfe927448596](https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid%3A70679175-8672-42e4-88dc-
694 dfe927448596).
- 695 Van Lieshout, K. G., Anderson, J. G., Shelburne, K. B., & Davidson, B. S. 2014. Intensity rankings of
696 plyometric exercises using joint power absorption. *Clinical Biomechanics*, 29(8).
697 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2014.06.015>
- 698 Vanrenterghem, J., Lees, A., & Clercq, D. D. 2008. Effect of forward trunk inclination on joint power
699 output in vertical jumping. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 22(3).
- 700 Veeger, H.E.J. et al., 1991. Peak oxygen uptake and maximal power output of olympic wheelchair-
701 dependent athletes. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 23(10).
- 702 Willems, P.A., Cavagna, G.A. & Heglund, N.C., 1995. External, internal and total work in human
703 locomotion. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 198.
- 704 Williams, K.R., 1985. The relationship between mechanical and physiological energy estimates.
705 *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 17(3).
- 706 Willwacher, S. et al., 2013. Does specific footwear facilitate energy storage and return at the
707 metatarsophalangeal joint in running? *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*, 29(5).
- 708 Winter, D.A., 2009. *Biomechanics and motor control of human movement*, John Wiley & Sons.
- 709 Winter, E.M. et al., 2016. Misuse of “power” and other mechanical terms in sport and exercise
710 science research. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*, 30(1), pp.292–300.
- 711 Yamashita, D. et al., 2017. Asymmetric interlimb role-sharing in mechanical power during human
712 sideways locomotion. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 57.
- 713 Yanagiya, T. et al., 2003. Effect of gender on mechanical power output during repeated bouts of
714 maximal running in trained teenagers. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 24(4).
- 715 Yeow, C.H., Lee, P.V.S. & Goh, J.C.H., 2009. Regression relationships of landing height with ground
716 reaction forces, knee flexion angles, angular velocities and joint powers during double-leg
717 landing. *Knee*, 16(5).
- 718 Yeow, C. H., Lee, P. V. S., & Goh, J. C. H. 2010. Sagittal knee joint kinematics and energetics in
719 response to different landing heights and techniques. *Knee*, 17(2).
720 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2009.07.015>
- 721 Zatsiorsky, V.M., 1998. Can total work be computed as a sum of the “external” and “internal” work?
722 *Journal of biomechanics*, 31(2), pp.191–3.
- 723 Zelik, K.E. & Kuo, A.D., 2012. Mechanical work as an indirect measure of subjective costs influencing
724 human movement. *PLoS One*, 7(2), p.e31143.
- 725 Zelik, K.E., Takahashi, K.Z. & Sawicki, G.S., 2015. Six degree-of-freedom analysis of hip, knee, ankle
726 and foot provides updated understanding of biomechanical work during human walking.
727 *Journal of experimental biology*, 218(6), pp.876–886.