

INTRODUCTION

Motion capture systems (MCS) can be used to individual's upper-and an assess motions, both explosive and functional in nature. Advancements in technology and screening capable of protocols detecting are biomechanical alterations. More specifically, warmup routines have been shown to influence athletic performance.

PURPOSE

This study compared the effects of various warm-up routines [i.e. dynamic stretching (DS), static stretching (SS), foam rolling (FR), and control (CON)] using the functional motion analysis (FMA).

METHODS

 $X \pm SD;$ age=21.8±1.6 Five women yrs., hgt.=169.2±5.6 cm, wgt.=68.3±4.0 kg) and seven (age=21.4±1.3 yrs., hgt.=181.4±6.7 CM, men wgt.=84.1±12.2 kg) volunteered for this investigation. Subjects were screened using the FMA, consisting of 19 movements. Including shoulder ranges mobility (i.e., shoulder abduction and adduction, horizonal abduction and adduction, internal and external rotation, flexion and extension), trunk rotation, overhead squat, unilateral squats, forward lunges, single leg balance, vertical jump (VJ), unilateral VJs, static VJ, multiple unilateral VJs, and depth VJ. The 3-D MCS (DARI Motion, Scientific Analytics, Lincoln, NE) was used to analyze the kinetic and kinematic data, from which 192 variables were calculated and reported in FMA scores (i.e. composite, power, functional strength, dysfunction, vulnerability). Each subject completed four randomized experimental

ACUTE BIOMECHANICAL EFFECTS OF STATIC STRETCHING **VERSUS DYNAMIC STRETCHING VERSUS FOAM ROLLING ROUTINES USING MARKERLESS MOTION CAPTURE SYSTEM** E.M. Mosier¹, N. Richter², M. Symonds², R. Beemer², D. Leiss²

Exercise Science Laboratory, Washburn University, Topeka, KS. ²Human Performance Laboratory, Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville, MO.

lower-body acute

METHODS (continued)

warm-up routines (CON, DS, SS, FR) lasting 30 minutes in duration. Focusing on total-body and primary large muscle groups. The FMA scores were collected for each pre- and post- warm-up routine. Statistical analyses were conducted using the FMA scores x warm-up routines x time (pretest, post-test) repeated measures MANOVA.



Figure 1a Figure 1b Figure 1a, 1b. Displays the markerless motion capture system (MCS) used for investigation (Figure 1a) and example of MCS report used for pre- and post-warm-up task (Figure 1b).

RESULTS

The MANOVA indicated no significant interactions (condition x time x score) (p<0.05) (Table 01 and Table 02).

DISCUSSIONS

current investigation able to was not The statistically demonstrate the influences of the warmup routines. Further examination of the FMA scores during each of the warm-up routines speculates the mechanical influences following each warm-up task. Further investigations are needed to examine the effects of warm-up routines on total-body biomechanics.

Table 01. Functional movement analysis scores pre- and postwarm-up routines (dynamic, static, foam rolling, and control) using a markerless motion capture system

Pre-Static Post-Static Pre-Dynamic Post-Dynamic Pre-Foam Rollin Post-Foam Rolli Pre-Control Post-Control

Table 02. Functional movement analysis scores pre- and post- warm-up routines (dynamic, static, foam rolling, and control) using a markerless motion capture system

Pre-Stat Post-Sta Pre-Dyn Post-Dy Pre-Foa Post-Fo Pre-Con Post-Co

PRACTICAL APPLICATION

Various warm-up routines have been reported to influence exercising performances, however, movement analysis on total-body mechanics following warm-up routines has not been examined. As a coach, trainer, or athlete it is critical to understand influences and mechanical alterations on each warm-up routine.



	l		
	Composite	Power Score	Functional
	Score		Strength Score
	1418.5 ± 368.4	831.8±281.1	716.8±155.6
	1423.3 ± 333.9	834.9±286.4	712.4±148.4
	1376.3 ±319.3	706.5±150.3	829.6±277.8
	1426.3 ± 319.8	695.8±150.9	872.4±305.8
ng	1446.9 ± 380.2	836.8±309.4	728.1±128.0
ing	1434.8 ± 404.8	828.8 ± 295.2	739.1±141.0
	1437.1 ± 310.9	836.8±268.3	$728.3{\pm}144.4$
	1432.4 ± 321.3	831.6±283.5	737.5 ± 127.8

n=12, (*) idicates significant difference (p < 0.05).

	Dysfunction	Vulnerability		
	Score	Score		
tic	130.2 ± 74.4	47.2 ± 16.8		
atic	124.1±59.6	46.9±19.7		
namic	153.2 ± 80.7	51.9±18.9		
ynamic	141.9±81.6	52.8±26.2		
am Rolling	118.0 ± 84.8	44.9 ± 19.0		
oam Rolling	133.2 ± 61.4	46.5±15.3		
ntrol	$128.0{\pm}38.5$	48.6±15.4		
ontrol	136.7±66.6	46.5 ± 19.1		
*) idicates significant difference (n < 0.05)				

n=12, (*) idicates significant difference (p < 0.05).