

1 *Title:*

2 Measurement error in estimates of sprint velocity from a laser displacement measurement  
3 device

4

5 *Authors:*

6 Neil E. Bezodis<sup>a,b</sup>, Aki I. T. Salo<sup>a</sup>, Grant Trewartha<sup>a</sup>

7 <sup>a</sup>Sport, Health and Exercise Science, University of Bath, UK.

8 <sup>b</sup>School of Sport, Health and Applied Science, St Mary's University College, Twickenham,  
9 UK.

10

11 *Corresponding author:*

12 Neil E. Bezodis, School of Sport, Health and Applied Science, St Mary's University College,  
13 Waldegrave Road, Twickenham, London, UK. TW1 4SX.

14 *E-mail:* bezodisn@smuc.ac.uk

15

16 *Abstract*

17 This study aimed to determine the measurement error associated with estimates of velocity  
18 from a laser-based device during different phases of a maximal athletic sprint. Laser-based  
19 displacement data were obtained from 10 sprinters completing a total of 89 sprints and were  
20 fitted with a fifth-order polynomial function which was differentiated to obtain instantaneous  
21 velocity data. These velocity estimates were compared against criterion high-speed video  
22 velocities at either 1, 5, 10, 30 or 50 m using a Bland-Altman analysis to assess bias and  
23 random error. Bias was highest at 1 m (+0.41 m/s) and tended to decrease as the  
24 measurement distance increased, with values less than +0.10 m/s at 30 and 50 m. Random  
25 error was more consistent between distances, and reached a minimum value ( $\pm 0.11$  m/s) at  
26 10 m. Laser devices offer a potentially useful time-efficient tool for assessing between-  
27 subject or between-session performance from the mid-acceleration and maximum velocity  
28 phases (i.e. at 10 m and beyond), although only differences exceeding 0.22 to 0.30 m/s  
29 should be considered genuine. However, laser data should not be used during the first 5 m of  
30 a sprint, and are likely of limited use for assessing within-subject variation in performance  
31 during a single session.

32

33 *Key words:* athletics, biomechanics, methods, performance, running, sprinting.

34

35 *Introduction*

36 Biomechanical research in sprinting commonly restricts analysis to a single step within a  
37 specific phase of a sprint [5, 16, 17]. However, researchers are often also interested in  
38 performance during multiple steps or phases, and horizontal velocity-time profiles from larger  
39 sections of a sprint are therefore considered [4, 8, 21]. One time-efficient method of  
40 obtaining these velocity-time curves is through a laser distance measurement (LDM) device  
41 aimed at the back of the sprinter [4, 8]. These LDM devices have been found to produce  
42 valid and reliable static measures of distance at 10, 30, 50 and 70 m when several samples  
43 are averaged [13]. However, individual samples are less reliable [13] which could potentially  
44 be problematic for dynamic activities like sprinting. The reliability of LDM velocity data  
45 obtained during sprinting trials has previously been assessed [13], but was limited by  
46 comparison against linear hip velocities over a specific 3 m distance. This approach may  
47 have provided an artificially close match with the 'lower part of the runner's back' measured  
48 by the LDM device because the horizontal within-step mechanics of a single point on the  
49 lumbar region (similar to the hip) differ from those of the centre of mass (CM) during running  
50 [24]. This could be of particular importance if data from the acceleration phase of a sprint are  
51 required, as sprinters become more upright as they accelerate out of the starting blocks [19].  
52 Furthermore, horizontal velocity fluctuates during every step of a sprint due to the antero-  
53 posterior forces [18], and thus instantaneous velocity data, or velocity data averaged over a  
54 predefined distance, may not be from the same phases within a step. For example, at the  
55 exact distance of interest, one sprinter could be at the end of the braking phase whereas  
56 another is at the end of the propulsive phase [23]. This is clearly an important issue for  
57 applied sprint performance measurement, as velocity data at specific distances are only truly  
58 comparable between sprinters or trials if they are independent of fluctuations due to the  
59 phase of the step cycle.

60

61 In an attempt to reduce the fluctuations in velocity-time profiles due to both the genuine  
62 within-step fluctuations and the inherent noise (e.g. Figure 1), LDM device (and radar) data

63 have previously been fitted with mathematical functions [2, 8, 21]. However, these velocity  
64 curves have only been assessed against split times over 3 to 10 m intervals from video or  
65 photocell data [2, 8, 21], and the measurement error in velocity estimates at discrete  
66 distances during different phases of a sprint remains unknown. The aim of this study was  
67 therefore to determine the measurement error in velocity data obtained with an LDM device  
68 during different phases of a maximal sprint, and consequently to evaluate the usability of  
69 LDM devices in order to analyse sprinters' velocity profiles.

70

71

## 72 *Materials & Methods*

73 Seven male (mean  $\pm$  SD: age =  $23 \pm 4$  years, mass =  $78 \pm 5$  kg, height =  $1.78 \pm 0.03$  m,  
74 100 m personal best (PB) =  $10.76 \pm 0.64$  s) and three female (mean  $\pm$  SD: age =  $21 \pm 1$   
75 years, mass =  $64 \pm 2$  kg, height =  $1.66 \pm 0.02$  m, 100 m PB =  $12.48 \pm 0.35$  s) sprinters  
76 agreed to participate in this study and provided written informed consent following standard  
77 ethical procedures [14]. This cohort (incorporating both genders and a range of PBs) was  
78 selected so that the results would be applicable across all populations of sprinters. Whilst this  
79 would clearly affect the observed velocity magnitudes at different distances, the aim of this  
80 study was to assess the error associated with measurement equipment, and thus the nature  
81 of the cohort would not negatively influence the results [1, 3, 7].

82

83 Data were collected at outdoor track-based training sessions. The LDM device (LDM-300C,  
84 Jenoptik, Germany; 100 Hz) was positioned on a tripod at a height of approximately 1 m,  
85 20 m behind the start line. This exact distance was determined using a static object prior to  
86 each session and was used to provide the reference distance of 0 m (start line). A high-  
87 speed video camera (MotionPro HS-1, Redlake, USA; 200 Hz) was located perpendicular to  
88 the running lane, 35 m from the lane centre. At each session, the camera was perpendicular  
89 to a different distance from the start line so that video data were collected at 1, 5, 10, 30 and  
90 50 m. The camera field of view was approximately 5.0 m wide, and an area of  $4.50 \times 1.60$  m

91 (2.25 m either side of the distance of interest) was calibrated with four corner points in order  
92 to obtain displacement data using projective scaling. A shutter speed of 1/1000 s was used  
93 and images were captured at a resolution of 1280 × 1024 pixels. Each sprint commenced  
94 from starting blocks following standard 'on your marks' and 'set' commands before a sounder  
95 was activated to provide the starting signal. Video data collection was initiated manually just  
96 prior to the sprinter entering the field of view. LDM device data collection was initiated  
97 manually at the 'set' command, and the device was aimed at the lower part of the runner's  
98 back (hereafter termed 'lumbar point'). All laser data processing took place in Matlab™  
99 (v. 7.4.0, The MathWorks™, USA).

100

101 The raw displacement data obtained with the LDM device were fitted with a fifth-order  
102 polynomial function. The polynomial order was selected to provide a close match to the  
103 known underlying trends of the displacement and velocity profiles whilst eliminating any  
104 within-step velocity fluctuations. The polynomial start point was identified from where the raw  
105 displacement values increased and remained greater than 2 SD above the mean noisy pre-  
106 start signal level, and the polynomial end point was 50 data points after displacement  
107 exceeded 60 m. This displacement polynomial was analytically differentiated with respect to  
108 time in order to yield a fourth-order representation of the velocity profile. Figure 1 shows an  
109 example of the noisy velocity data obtained from numerically differentiating the raw LDM  
110 device displacement data and the smooth fourth-order polynomial representation of the  
111 velocity profile from one trial. For each trial, the time at which displacement equalled or first  
112 exceeded the target distance was identified, and the corresponding velocity value was  
113 recorded.

114

115 \*\*\*\*Figure 1 near here\*\*\*\*

116

117 The raw video files were digitised in Peak Motus® (v. 8.5, Vicon, United Kingdom), exactly  
118 replicating previously reported procedures [6], before all subsequent video data processing

119 took place in Matlab™ (v. 7.4.0, The MathWorks™, USA). Whole-body CM displacements  
120 were calculated using segmental inertia data [10] and a summation of segmental moments  
121 approach [25]. Inertia data for the feet were taken from Winter [25] as they allowed the  
122 creation of a linked-segment model, and 0.2 kg was added to each foot to account for the  
123 mass of each spiked shoe [5, 15]. Raw high-speed video CM velocities were calculated using  
124 second central difference equations [20].

125

126 To determine the criterion high-speed video velocities at each of the target distances (i.e. 1,  
127 5, 10, 30 or 50 m) without any influence of the phase of the step cycle, the following  
128 procedure was undertaken. The first frame in which the raw CM displacement equalled or  
129 exceeded the target distance was identified. The phase of the step cycle (i.e. stance or flight)  
130 that the sprinter was in during this frame was identified, as was the closest adjacent  
131 contrasting phase (i.e. flight or stance). The combined duration of these stance and flight  
132 phases yielded the duration of the step cycle occurring at the target distance (at the 1 m  
133 mark, the sprinters were typically in mid-stance, and as the two adjacent flight times were  
134 often considerably different in length, the mean duration of the two flight phases was used in  
135 obtaining total step duration). The determined step duration was then applied so that it was  
136 evenly spaced either side of the frame in which the target distance was reached (e.g. if the  
137 determined step duration was 41 frames and the target distance was reached in frame  
138 number 67, the step cycle at the target distance was deemed to commence at frame 47 and  
139 terminate at frame 87). This yielded a complete step cycle starting from an arbitrary point, but  
140 in which the sprinter passed the specific target distance exactly halfway through the cycle.  
141 The mean value of all raw CM velocities during this step cycle thus provided a value  
142 representing the velocity of the sprinter at the target distance which was independent from  
143 the phase of the step cycle the sprinter was in. Although the raw digitised video data  
144 contained noise, this would likely have had minimal effect on these velocities over a  
145 complete step cycle due to its presumed random nature. To confirm this, one trial (from  
146 10 m) was redigitised on ten separate occasions to quantify any effects of noise in the video

147 data on the determined velocity value. Following a check for normality of these data, the  
148 reliability of the high-speed video velocity data was determined by calculating a co-efficient of  
149 variation (CV; standard deviation / mean [22]).

150

151 A Bland-Altman 95% limits of agreement approach [1, 7] was selected to assess the  
152 measurement error (separated into bias and random error) of the LDM device estimates  
153 relative to the criterion video data, as this approach would not be affected by the deliberately  
154 broad cohort [1, 3, 7]. These limits were calculated as the standard deviation of the  
155 difference scores between the video and LDM-based velocity data multiplied by the critical  $t$ -  
156 value for the sample size at each distance. Normality of the difference scores was checked,  
157 and a heteroscedasticity correlation coefficient was calculated between the difference scores  
158 and the mean score from both devices to assess for any proportional bias [3, 7].

159

160 In order to allow the determined measurement error to be considered in a practical context,  
161 the range in criterion velocity data was calculated at 1, 10 and 50 m (the distances when all  
162 athletes completed more than two trials at a single distance). A single mean within-session  
163 range was then calculated from all athletes at each of these three distances. This provided  
164 an example of the typical levels of within-session performance variation that could be  
165 expected and thus allowed an acceptable level of measurement error to be determined for  
166 application in similar coach-led training settings [3, 7]. As the data from 1 m were collected at  
167 four different sessions for one subject, these data were also used to provide an example of  
168 the expected variation between sessions across six months of the season as training  
169 progressed through different phases.

170

## 171 *Results*

172 A total of 89 trials were recorded and analysed, with at least ten trials obtained from each of  
173 the individual distances. The amount of trials at each distance was not even due to the  
174 number of athletes present and number of trials completed at each of the training sessions.

175 The bias and random errors associated with the calculation of instantaneous velocities at 1,  
176 5, 10, 30 and 50 m from the LDM device are presented in Table 1 and Figure 2. Bias was  
177 highest at 1 m (+0.41 m/s) and lowest at 30 m (+0.06 m/s) and the magnitude of random  
178 error at the five distances ranged from  $\pm 0.11$  m/s to  $\pm 0.21$  m/s. All data were normally  
179 distributed and free from heteroscedasticity (all  $r < 0.10$ ; Figure 2). The ten redigitisations of  
180 one trial revealed the criterion velocity data to be highly reliable (velocity =  $7.66 \pm 0.01$  m/s;  
181 CV = 0.15%). This confirmed that the noise due to operator error in the digitising process  
182 was random, and that averaging the values from the duration of an entire step cycle provided  
183 a highly repeatable measure of average step velocity at a specific distance. This therefore  
184 also allowed the expected performance variation data (Table 2) to be considered with  
185 confidence. The within-session individual variation in criterion data was low at 1 and 10 m  
186 (average range in velocities = 0.09 and 0.14 m/s, respectively) but considerably higher  
187 (0.75 m/s) at 50 m. The between-session variation in performance was higher (range =  
188 0.47 m/s at 1 m) than the within-session variation.

189

190 \*\*\*\*Table 1 near here\*\*\*\*

191 \*\*\*\*Table 2 near here\*\*\*\*

192 \*\*\*\*Figures 2a-e near here\*\*\*\*

193

194

## 195 *Discussion*

196 This study determined the measurement error associated with LDM estimates of velocity  
197 during different phases of a maximal effort sprint to evaluate how useful LDM devices are for  
198 analysing sprint velocity profiles. It was found that the measurement error varied between  
199 different phases of a sprint, with a general trend for the magnitude of the bias to decrease as  
200 the measurement distance increased (Table 1). The random error exhibited a slightly  
201 unexpected trend, with the 95% limits of agreement being highest during the first 5 m before  
202 decreasing considerably at 10 m and then gradually increasing thereafter (Table 1). Finally,



203 the lack of heteroscedastic data at any of the five distances (Figure 2) demonstrates that the  
204 magnitude of measurement error is not affected by any proportional bias across the range of  
205 velocities at any given distance. Therefore, although LDM measurement error appears to be  
206 influenced by how far away the sprinter is from the device (Table 1), it does not appear to be  
207 affected by the velocity of the sprinter at each given distance.

208

209 The large bias during the early part of a sprint (particularly at 1 m) was not measurement  
210 artefact. This bias was systematic and highlights the limitations of using an LDM device to  
211 estimate velocity during early acceleration as it records the displacement of the lumbar point  
212 instead of the CM. A retrospective analysis of synchronised video and LDM data from four  
213 trials of a single sprinter revealed that the horizontal motion of the lumbar point differed from  
214 that of the CM during the first second of a sprint (Figure 3). In the 'set' position the lumbar  
215 point was on average 0.40 m behind the CM, but as the sprinter began to accelerate his  
216 posture became more upright. One second after movement onset (at which point the sprinter  
217 had typically covered just over 2 m), the lumbar point was only on average 0.15 m behind the  
218 CM. The lumbar point was therefore covering a greater horizontal distance in the same  
219 amount of time, thus explaining why the velocities from the LDM device were higher than the  
220 criterion CM velocities (Table 1). There were also clear differences in the distance between  
221 the CM and the lumbar point between these four trials during this first second of a sprint, and  
222 as these were from a single sprinter and inter-athlete variation will likely exceed this (e.g.  
223 Table 2), applying a fixed offset to account for any bias is not a feasible solution.

224

225 \*\*\*\*Figure 3 near here\*\*\*\*

226

227 The horizontal distance between the CM and the lumbar point will never be likely to reach  
228 zero because the CM should remain in front of the lumbar point throughout the duration of a  
229 sprint. However, this distance will likely plateau as sprinters adopt a relatively consistent, and  
230 more upright, posture as the sprint progresses. This was confirmed in the current study by

231 the considerably lower biases observed at distances beyond 1 m, particularly at 30 and 50 m  
232 (Table 1). This also concurred with previous video-based data [24], whereby it was found that  
233 although there is a temporal shift in the individual within-step fluctuations in horizontal  
234 velocity between the CM and the lumbar point during constant velocity running, overall  
235 changes in displacement and velocity across one step were similar. Therefore, by smoothing  
236 out the within-step fluctuations in the raw LDM device data, a non-biased representation of  
237 the motion of a sprinter can be obtained once they have adopted a more upright stance  
238 beyond the early parts of a sprint.

239

240 The higher random error at 1 and 5 m ( $\pm 0.18$  and  $\pm 0.21$  m/s, respectively) may be related to  
241 the aforementioned inconsistency in tracking the lumbar point as the sprinter rises out of the  
242 blocks. When these random errors are combined with the high bias during the early part of a  
243 sprint, LDM device estimates of velocity prior to 10 m (i.e. the initial acceleration phase [11])  
244 appear to contain unacceptably high levels of error relative to the expected levels of variation  
245 in performance (Table 2). By the 10 m mark, random error had decreased ( $\pm 0.11$  m/s),  
246 before increasing slightly at the 30 and 50 m marks ( $\pm 0.13$  and  $\pm 0.15$  m/s, respectively). This  
247 gradual increase in random error from 10 to 50 m is likely due to the divergence of the laser  
248 beam as the sprinter moved further from the start line because a greater area of the sprinter  
249 was measured by the wider laser beam at these distances (beam diameter = 0.06 m at the  
250 start line, 0.21 m at the 50 m mark). Movement of any segments near to the lumbar point,  
251 any clothing movement, or even a large leg retraction and thus high foot displacement  
252 behind the sprinter could therefore all have affected these velocity estimates. Also, any  
253 movements of the LDM device itself by the operator have a larger pointing effect (deviation)  
254 the further from the device the athlete travels.

255

256 The measurement error associated with the LDM device generally compares well against  
257 other time-efficient devices used to obtain velocity estimates during sprinting. Based on  
258 published differences in velocity estimates between tested devices and a criterion,

259 measurement errors comparable to those presented in the current study (i.e. 95% limits of  
260 agreement using the standard deviation of the differences and the appropriate critical *t*-value)  
261 can be calculated. Commonly used photocell systems have been found to possess random  
262 errors of  $\pm 0.14$  m/s over a range of speeds from 5 to 9 m/s, with photocells positioned on  
263 average 4.0 m apart [26]. However, it must be considered that photocell systems are limited  
264 to providing average velocities over a set distance and the measurement error increases as  
265 the distance between a pair of photocells decreases (e.g. to  $\pm 0.36$  m/s at an average of  
266 2.0 m apart [26]). Photocells are thus limited in their use for obtaining a velocity profile,  
267 particularly during acceleration. A radar system, based on the Doppler effect but used  
268 similarly to the LDM device to obtain a continuous velocity-time profile, has been found to be  
269 associated with random errors of  $\pm 0.70$  m/s at a range of distances from 10 to 45 m [12]  
270 (criterion velocities from 7.23 to 10.09 m/s). More recently, a large-scale light-sensor network  
271 system being developed for use in a sprint coaching context [9] was shown to currently  
272 possess random measurement errors in velocity of  $\pm 0.56$  m/s.

273

274 Although the LDM device clearly compares well with other non-video-based measures, when  
275 put in the context of typical within-subject performance variation (Table 2), LDM device  
276 measurement error in estimates of velocity is relatively high. Velocity data obtained using an  
277 LDM device during the first 5 m of a sprint possess an unacceptable level of error due to both  
278 the over-estimation of velocity and considerable random error as sprinters become  
279 increasingly upright during this early acceleration phase. However, the levels of  
280 measurement error during the mid-acceleration and maximum velocity phases of a sprint (i.e.  
281 10, 30 and 50 m) suggest that the LDM device can be used to obtain estimates of velocity  
282 from these phases, provided only differences in excess of 0.22 to 0.30 m/s (i.e. twice the  
283 random errors presented in Table 1) are regarded as genuine. Combining this with the typical  
284 performance variation data presented in Table 2, the LDM may therefore be useful for  
285 comparing between sprinters or across sessions as training progresses during a season,  
286 particularly at further distances in a sprint. However, it appears to be of limited use for

287 determining within-sprinter variation in maximal effort sprint performance during a single  
288 session.  
289

290 *References*

291 <sup>1</sup> *Altman DG, Bland JM.* Measurement in medicine: the analysis of method comparison  
292 studies. *Stat* 1983; 32: 307-317

293

294 <sup>2</sup> *Arsac LM, Locatelli E.* Modeling the energetics of 100-m running by using speed curves of  
295 world champions. *J Appl Physiol* 2002; 92: 1781-1788

296

297 <sup>3</sup> *Atkinson G, Nevill AM.* Statistical methods for assessing measurement error (reliability) in  
298 variables relevant to sports medicine. *Sports Med*; 26: 217-238

299

300 <sup>4</sup> *Berthoin S, Dupont G, Mary P, Gerbeaux M.* Predicting sprint kinematic parameters from  
301 anaerobic field tests in physical education students. *J Strength Cond Res* 2001; 15: 75-80

302

303 <sup>5</sup> *Bezodis IN, Kerwin DG, Salo AIT.* Lower-limb mechanics during the support phase of  
304 maximum-velocity sprint running. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2008; 40: 707-715

305

306 <sup>6</sup> *Bezodis NE, Salo AIT, Trewartha G.* Choice of sprint start measure affects the  
307 performance-based ranking within a group of sprinters: which is the most appropriate  
308 measure? *Sports Biomech* 2010; 9: 258-269

309

310 <sup>7</sup> *Bland JM, Altman DG.* Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods  
311 of clinical measurement. *Lancet* 1986; 8: 307-310

312

313 <sup>8</sup> *Chelly SM, Denis C.* Leg power and hopping stiffness: relationship with sprint running  
314 performance. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001; 33: 326-333

315

316 <sup>9</sup> Cheng L, Tan H, Kuntze G, Bezodis IN, Hailes S, Kerwin DG, Wilson A. A low-cost  
317 accurate speed-tracking system for supporting sprint coaching. Sports Eng Tech 2010; 224:  
318 167-179  
319

320 <sup>10</sup> de Leva P. Adjustments to Zatsiorsky-Seluyanov's segment inertia parameters. J Biomech  
321 1996; 29: 1223-1230  
322

323 <sup>11</sup> Delecluse CH, van Coppenolle H, Willems E, Diels R, Goris M, van Leemputte M,  
324 Vuytsteke M. Analysis of 100 meter sprint performance as a multi-dimensional skill. J Hum  
325 Mov Stud 1995; 28: 87-101  
326

327 <sup>12</sup> Gander RE, McClements JD, Sanderson LK, Rostad BA, Josephson KE, Pratt AJ. Sprint  
328 start instrumentation. IEEE Trans Instr Meas 1994; 43: 637-643  
329

330 <sup>13</sup> Harrison AJ, Jensen RL, Donoghue O. (2005). A comparison of laser and video techniques  
331 for determining displacement and velocity during running. Meas Phys Educ Exerc Sci 2005;  
332 9: 219-231  
333

334 <sup>14</sup> Harriss DJ, Atkinson G. Update - Ethical standards in sport and exercise research. Int J  
335 Sports Med 2011; 32: 819-821  
336

337 <sup>15</sup> Hunter JP, Marshall RN, McNair PJ. Segment-interaction analysis of the stance limb in  
338 sprint running. J Biomech 2004; 37: 1439-1446  
339

340 <sup>16</sup> Jacobs R, van Ingen Schenau GJ. Intermuscular coordination in a sprint push-off. J  
341 Biomech 1992; 25: 953-965  
342

343 <sup>17</sup> *Johnson MD, Buckley JG.* Muscle power patterns in the mid-acceleration phase of  
344 sprinting. *J Sports Sci* 2001; 19: 263-272  
345

346 <sup>18</sup> *Mero A, Komi PV.* Reaction-time and electromyographic activity during a sprint start. *Eur J*  
347 *Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 1990; 61: 73-80  
348

349 <sup>19</sup> *Mero A, Luhtanen P, Komi PV.* A biomechanical study of the sprint start. *Scand J Sports*  
350 *Sci* 1983; 5: 20-28  
351

352 <sup>20</sup> *Miller D, Nelson R.* Biomechanics of sport: a research approach. Philadelphia: Lea &  
353 Febiger; 1973  
354

355 <sup>21</sup> *Morin JB, Jeannin T, Chevallier B, Belli A.* Spring-mass model characteristics during sprint  
356 running: correlation with performance and fatigue-induced changes. *Int J Sports Med* 2006;  
357 27: 158-165  
358

359 <sup>22</sup> *Sale DG.* Testing strength and power. In: MacDougall JD, Wenger HA, Green HJ (eds).  
360 *Physiological testing of the high-performance athlete.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1991:  
361 21-106  
362

363 <sup>23</sup> *Salo A, Bezodis I.* Which starting style is faster in sprint running - standing or crouch start?  
364 *Sports Biomech* 2004; 3: 43-54  
365

366 <sup>24</sup> *Slawinski J, Billat V, Koralsztejn JP, Tavernier M.* Use of lumbar point for the estimation of  
367 potential and kinetic mechanical power in running. *J Appl Biomech* 2004; 20: 324-331  
368

369 <sup>25</sup> *Winter DA.* Biomechanics and motor control of human movement. New York: Wiley; 1990  
370

371

372 <sup>26</sup> *Yeadon MR, Kato T, Kerwin DG. Measuring running speed using photocells. J Sports Sci*

373 *1999; 17: 249-257*

374



375 Table 1. Bias and random error (quantified by 95% limits of agreement) in velocity values  
 376 between the criterion video data and the LDM device data at each of the distances.

Distance (m)	Number of trials (and athletes)	Average velocity* (m/s)	Bias** (m/s)	Random error (m/s)
1	22 (3)	4.00 ± 0.15	+ 0.41	± 0.18
5	14 (7)	6.01 ± 0.23	+ 0.13	± 0.21
10	30 (7)	7.30 ± 0.29	+ 0.16	± 0.11
30	10 (5)	8.52 ± 0.62	+ 0.06	± 0.13
50	13 (3)	10.38 ± 0.31	+ 0.08	± 0.15

377 \*Velocities presented are the criterion values (mean ± standard deviation) from the high-  
 378 speed video data.

379 \*\*Positive bias indicates that the LDM device data gave a higher estimate of velocity than the  
 380 high speed video data.

381

382 Table 2. Ranges in criterion velocity data to illustrate the expected within-session and  
 383 between-session genuine performance variation.

Distance (m)	Athlete	Number of trials	Mean velocity (range) (m/s)	Average within- session range (m/s)	Maximum between-session range (m/s)
1	A1	4	4.16 (4.07 – 4.20)	0.09	0.47
	A2	4	3.94 (3.90 – 3.98)		
	A3	3	3.94 (3.91 – 3.95)		
	A4	4	3.77 (3.73 – 3.85)		n/a
	B	4	4.16 (4.12 – 4.21)		
	C	3	4.02 (3.95 – 4.05)		
10	D	4	7.47 (7.44 – 7.51)	0.14	n/a
	E	5	6.90 (6.80 – 7.06)		
	F	4	7.91 (6.97 – 7.05)		
	G	5	7.45 (7.38 – 7.52)		
	H	3	7.03 (6.99 – 7.10)		
	I	5	7.58 (7.45 – 7.63)		
50	J	4	7.58 (7.51 – 7.64)	0.75	n/a
	A	3	10.49 (10.24 – 10.61)		
	B	5	10.40 (9.76 – 10.91)		
	C	5	10.29 (9.80 – 10.49)		

384

385




Figure 1. An example of the fourth-order velocity profile from one trial (obtained following a fifth-order polynomial fit to the raw displacement data), plotted above the velocity data obtained from differentiating the raw LDM displacement data. This trial was selected for illustrative purposes because the athlete clearly decelerated prior to 60 m, which confirmed that the chosen polynomial order was also able to appropriately reflect any deceleration.




Figure 2 a-e. Bland-Altman plots to illustrate the bias and random error at each of the five distances.




Figure 3. The horizontal distance between the lumbar point (at which the LDM was aimed) and the centre of mass during the first second of four trials from one sprinter.