



**HAL**  
open science

## **Relationships Between Force-Time Curve Variables and Tennis Serve Performance in Competitive Tennis Players**

Loïc Fourel, Pierre Touzard, Maxime Fadier, Louis Arles, Kaies Deghaies, Simon Ozan, Caroline Martin

### ► **To cite this version:**

Loïc Fourel, Pierre Touzard, Maxime Fadier, Louis Arles, Kaies Deghaies, et al.. Relationships Between Force-Time Curve Variables and Tennis Serve Performance in Competitive Tennis Players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 2024, 38 (9), pp.1667-1674. <10.1519/jsc.0000000000004848>. <hal-04699075>

**HAL Id: hal-04699075**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04699075v1>**

Submitted on 18 Nov 2024

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

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



Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0 - Attribution - Non-commercial use - International License

# **Relationships between force-time curve variables and tennis serve performance in competitive tennis players**

Running head: Force time curve variables and tennis serve performance

Laboratory: Movement, Sport Science (M2S) Laboratory

*Authors: Loic Fourel<sup>1</sup>, Pierre Touzard<sup>1</sup>, Maxime Fadier<sup>1</sup>, Louis Arles<sup>1</sup>, Kaies Deghaies<sup>1,2</sup>,  
Simon Ozan<sup>1</sup>, Caroline Martin<sup>1\*</sup>*

Institutions:

<sup>1</sup>M2S Laboratory, Rennes 2 University, École Normale Supérieure de Rennes, Campus de Ker Lann, Avenue Robert Schuman, 35170 Bruz, France

<sup>2</sup>Research and Development Department, Volodalen, 39134 Chavéria, France

\* Corresponding author:

Caroline Martin

M2S Laboratory, Rennes 2 University, École Normale Supérieure de Rennes, Campus de Ker Lann, Avenue Robert Schuman, 35170 Bruz, France

02 90 09 15 80

[caroline.martin@univ-rennes2.fr](mailto:caroline.martin@univ-rennes2.fr)

**Disclosure of funding received for this work:** This work was conducted without any external funding support.

### 3 ABSTRACT

1  
2 4 Practitioners consider the role of the legs in the game of tennis as fundamental to achieve high  
3  
4  
5 5 performance. But, the exact link between leg actions and high speed and accurate serves still  
6  
7 6 lacks understanding. Here, we investigate the correlation between force-time curve variables  
8  
9 7 during serve leg drive and serve performance indicators. Thirty-six competitive players  
10  
11 8 performed fast serves, on two force plates, to measure ground reaction forces. Correlation  
12  
13 9 coefficients describe the relationships between maximal racket head velocity, impact height and  
14  
15 10 force-time curve variables. Among all the variables tested, the elapsed time between the instants  
16  
17 11 of maximal vertical and maximal anteroposterior ground reaction forces ( $r=-0.519$ ,  $p<0.001$ )  
18  
19 12 and the elapsed time between the instant of maximal anteroposterior ground reaction force and  
20  
21 13 ball impact ( $r=-0.522$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) are the best predictors of maximal racket velocity. Maximal  
22  
23 14 racket head velocity is not significantly correlated with the mean or maximal vertical ground  
24  
25 15 reaction forces, nor with the mean or maximum rate of vertical force development. The best  
26  
27 16 predictor for impact height is the relative net vertical impulse during the concentric phase  
28  
29 17 ( $r=0.772$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). This work contributes to a better understanding of the mechanical demands  
30  
31 18 of tennis serve motion and gives guidelines to improve players preparation and performance.  
32  
33 19 Trainers should encourage their players to better synchronize their upward and forward pushing  
34  
35 20 action during the serve to increase maximal racket head velocity. Players should also aim to  
36  
37 21 improve their relative net vertical impulse to increase impact height via strength training and  
38  
39 22 technical instructions.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 25 **Key-words:** impulse, power, biomechanics, ground reaction forces, racket velocity, impact  
54  
55 26 height  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 29 INTRODUCTION

30 In competitive tennis, the serve is commonly described as the most important stroke  
31 (21). For high-level players, the ability to produce the highest maximal racket velocity ( $V_R^{max}$ )  
32 to reach high ball speed at impact is a key element of successful play. The ball impact height  
33 ( $h_{impact}$ ) is also considered as a crucial factor affecting tennis serve performance, since the  
34 higher the impact, the greater the margin for error at the net. According to Brody (2006), only  
35 a small extra height above the ground is needed to increase the window of acceptance for the  
36 serve, that is the chance that it will go in (5). The capacity of reaching higher  $h_{impact}$  also  
37 correlates strongly with ball speed (46).

38  
39 The tennis serve motion is characterized by forceful flexion and extension of both legs  
40 that generate ground reaction forces (GRF) and initiate the **proximodistal** kinetic chain allowing  
41 the transfer of energy and linear and angular momentum from the ground to the racket (31,34).  
42 Consequently, the interaction between the body and the ground through the leg drive is  
43 considered fundamental to good serve mechanics (16,17). Although numerous studies have  
44 investigated the relationships between upper body kinematics/kinetics and racket velocity or  
45 ball speed (31,33,34,42), not much research has focused on the effects of the lower body ground  
46 reaction forces (GRF) on serve performance parameters (16,17).

47  
48 Previous studies instead described the **shape** of GRF **curves** during **the** serve (13,16),  
49 measured maximal vertical and **anteroposterior** values ( $F_z^{max}$  and  $F_y^{max}$ , respectively) (44,45),  
50 and compared these values between foot-up and foot-back serve techniques (2,13). During **the**  
51 serve, the largest maximal GRF were systematically recorded in the vertical direction ( $F_z^{max} =$   
52 1.68 - 2.12 bodyweight - BW: body mass x 9.81 m.s<sup>-2</sup>) while  $F_y^{max}$  approximated 0.2 BW in  
53 the forward direction and lateral GRF ( $F_x$ ) were negligible. A few studies analyzed the

54 relationship between serve performance parameters (serve speed and  $h_{impact}$ ) and the vertical  
55 GRF created by both legs, but with conflicting results. For example, Girard et al. (2007)  
56 reported that increases in  $F_z^{max}$  were significantly correlated with increases in serve speed for  
57 expert players only (17). However, in another study, the same authors showed no significant  
58 relationship between  $F_z^{max}$  and ball speed in beginners, intermediate and elite tennis players  
59 (16) but only obtained a positive significant correlation between  $F_z^{max}$  and  $h_{impact}$  in elite  
60 players. During a three-hour-long tennis match between expert players, Martin et al. (2016)  
61 found no association between  $F_z^{max}$ , ball speed and  $h_{impact}$  since  $F_z^{max}$  remained constant over  
62 the entire duration of the match while ball speed and  $h_{impact}$  significantly decreased (32). All  
63 these studies focused only on  $F_z^{max}$  as an independent variable.

64 The relationship between anteroposterior GRF and serve performance has never been  
65 investigated in tennis. Yet, in other sports literature, countermovement jumps analysis and/or  
66 reports on overhead sport motions (baseball pitch, volleyball spike or handball throwing)  
67 showed that much more valuable information can be extracted from the vertical and  
68 anteroposterior force-time curves such as time variables (timing of  $F_z^{max}$  and  $F_y^{max}$ ), force  
69 variables ( $F_z^{mean}$ ,  $F_y^{mean}$ ,  $F_z^{max}$  and  $F_y^{max}$ ), and variables linking both components (the mean  
70 and maximal rates of force development ( $RFD_z$ ,  $RFD_z^{max}$  respectively), the mean impulse, the  
71 maximal power or the maximal center of mass (CoM) velocity) (22,25,39). For example,  
72 relative net vertical concentric impulse ( $I_z^{net}|_C$ ), rate of vertical force development and maximal  
73 rate of vertical force development are better key performance indicators for dynamic motions  
74 (e.g., squat and countermovement jumps) than  $F_z^{max}$  (14,25,35,40). This strongly suggests that  
75 only taking  $F_z^{max}$  into account would not provide enough relevant information about the leg  
76 drive performance during the tennis serve. Instead, we expect the mechanical impulse that acts  
77 on the body to be especially relevant during the serve as players need to increase and decrease  
78 the rotations of their joints and segments very quickly to reach the highest ball speed (34).

79 It is highly probable that restricting the relationship between GRF and serve  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65  
80 performance solely to  $F_z^{max}$  contributed to the lack of understanding about the primary role of  
81 the leg drive reported by scientists and practitioners (7,26). As far as scientists are concerned,  
82 on the one hand, several authors grant the lower body a main coordinating role in the service  
83 movement, providing a stable proximal base for distal mobility (7), while, on the other hand,  
84 other studies prefer to see the rapid vertical extension of the lower limbs as a primary  
85 contributor to racket speed and ball velocity (16,17). According to Elliott and Colette (1993),  
86 it is primordial to understand that power is not only developed by the trunk and the serving arm.  
87 The primary source of power is instead generated from the ground reaction forces (11). Within  
88 the kinetic chain, the legs are often considered as the start of the energy production from the  
89 lower limbs to the upper limbs (16). As far as practitioners are concerned, Lester et al. (2023)  
90 recently highlighted that tennis coaches are convinced that the contribution of the lower limbs  
91 in tennis performance can become an important framework for designing physical training  
92 programs but, at the same time, they regret that their understanding of this mechanism is still  
93 extremely limited (26). Understanding how both vertical and anteroposterior GRF components  
94 and their timing influence serve performance parameters could therefore provide important  
95 scientific and practical insight about the role of the lower limbs in achieving a powerful and  
96 accurate serve.

97  
98 The purpose of this study is to determine how the force-time curve variables during the  
99 leg drive correlate to serve performance parameters in competitive tennis players. We  
100 hypothesize that the usual variables extracted from the vertical force-time curve ( $F_z^{max}$ ,  $RFD_z$ ,  
101  $RFD_z^{max}$ ) are not relevant to predict maximum racket speed and impact height whereas  
102 temporal ground reaction force variables and relative net vertical impulse are. The results from

103 this study provide good insights for practitioners to design specific training programs and  
104 develop appropriate strategies to improve performance in competitive tennis players.

105

## 106 METHODS

### 107 Experimental approach to the problem

108 A cross-sectional study was performed to examine the correlations between the GRF  
109 characteristics during **the** leg drive and serve performance indicators ( $V_R^{max}$  and  $h_{impact}$ ) for  
110 competitive tennis players.

111

### 112 Subjects

113 Thirty-six competitive tennis players (twenty-five male, age:  $23.8 \pm 7.5$  years, range:  
114 from 15 to 42 years, height:  $1.84 \pm 0.07$  m, mass:  $78.4 \pm 6.5$  kg, Universal Tennis Rating:  $10.9$   
115  $\pm 3.1$ , range from 5.9 to 15.5; and eleven females, age:  $21.9 \pm 8.6$  years, range: from 15 to 44  
116 years, height:  $1.68 \pm 0.06$  m, mass:  $65.4 \pm 6.7$  kg, Universal Tennis Rating:  $9.5 \pm 2.3$ , range  
117 from 6.0 to 12.6), with at least 10 years of practice, participated voluntarily in this study. Nine  
118 of them were ATP or WTA professional top players. Thirty-three were right-handed and three  
119 were left-handed. Twenty-one players served with a foot-up technique: they brought their rear  
120 foot up to the front foot before pushing against the ground. Fifteen players served with a foot-  
121 back technique meaning that they kept their feet spread apart until take-off. At the time of  
122 testing, all the players were considered healthy, with no history of surgery on the lower or upper  
123 limbs. We expect the heterogeneity of our population to unravel macroscopic tendencies  
124 between force-time curve variables and serve performance.

125

126

### 127 Procedures

128 Before experimentation, the players were informed of the benefits and risks of the investigation  
129 prior to signing an institutionally approved informed consent document to participate in the  
130 study. Additionally, for minor players, parental or guardian signed consent was obtained. The  
131 study was approved by an Institutional Review Board and conducted under the 1975  
132 Declaration of Helsinki.

133 After the warm-up, players were equipped with 38 retro-reflective markers placed on  
134 anatomical landmarks determined in agreement with previously published data (43). Five  
135 additional landmarks were positioned on the racket as described in the literature (43).  
136 Participants used their own racket during the motion capture to ensure they felt as comfortable  
137 as possible during their serves. Prior to experiment, participants had as much time as needed to  
138 familiarize themselves with the testing environment and the landmarks set. Each player  
139 performed five flat serves with each foot on a distinct force platform to monitor the action of  
140 each leg (Figure 1). We asked players using a foot-up technique to bring their back foot close  
141 to their front foot, but without touching the front platform. Trials in which each foot did not  
142 remain completely on its respective platform until take-off were discarded from the study. It is  
143 worth mentioning that the force platforms were embedded in the ground inside the tennis court  
144 rather than behind the baseline. Thus, the serves were not performed in exact ecological  
145 conditions, but the subjects were asked to serve at their best speed as in an official tournament.  
146 A motion capture system with twenty-three cameras sampling at 300 Hz (Oqus, Qualisys AB.,  
147 Göteborg, Sweden) recorded the trajectories of the 3-dimensional (3D) anatomical landmarks  
148 Players were shirtless or wore a bra and a tight short to limit movement of the markers.

149  
150 \*\*\*\*\* Figure 1 near here \*\*\*\*\*

151

152 Among the validated serve trials, the performance and force-time curve variables were  
153 averaged over the 3 fastest serves for statistical analysis. 3D coordinates of the landmarks were  
154 then reconstructed with QTM software (Qualisys AB., Göteborg, Sweden) with a residual error  
155 of less than 1 mm. The 3D markers coordinates were expressed in a right-handed inertial  
156 reference frame whose origin was at the center of the baseline, X following the baseline to the  
157 right, Y pointing toward the net, and Z pointing upwards. The 3D markers coordinates were  
158 smoothed with a 2<sup>nd</sup>-order low-pass Butterworth filter with a cut-off frequency of 20 Hz,  
159 determined by residual analysis. The resultant velocity of the racket head, the trajectory and  
160 velocity of the CoM of each player were computed based on the filtered coordinates of the  
161 landmarks following previously published data (8). Ball impact height  $h_{impact}$  was measured  
162 as the height of the center of the racket head at impact and was made dimensionless using the  
163 standing body height (BH) of the player.

164  
165 During each serve, the lateral, anteroposterior and vertical GRF ( $F_x$ ,  $F_y$ , and  $F_z$ ,  
166 respectively) were recorded at 1200 Hz with two force platforms (60 x 120 x 5.7 cm, Advanced  
167 Mechanical Technology Incorporation, Watertown, MA, USA) that were embedded into the  
168 ground (Figure 1).  $F_z$  and  $F_y$  data were smoothed with a 2<sup>nd</sup>-order low-pass Butterworth filter  
169 with a cut-off frequency of 20 Hz and were normalized to participants' BW before analysis.  $F_x$   
170 probably plays an important role in coordination and balance maintaining but it was not  
171 analyzed in this study since it is negligible during the serve with respect to the vertical and  
172 anteroposterior forces (<0.1 N/BW) (29).  $F_z$  data from both force platform were combined to  
173 obtain the resultant vertical ground reaction force during the serve motion. The same procedure  
174 was done for  $F_y$  data. The resultant  $F_y$  and  $F_z$  were analyzed between ball release and take-off  
175 as before ball release, the lower limb action remains limited. Take-off threshold was defined as  
176 five times the standard deviation (SD) of the residual vertical force during flight (36). For each

177 trial analyzed, the leg motion was divided into two phases, namely eccentric and concentric, to  
 178 describe the specific relationships of each force-time curve variables on serve performance  
 179 parameters. These two phases were identified between critical instants of the CoM vertical  
 180 velocity and the force platforms recordings. The eccentric phase starts when the vertical  
 181 velocity of the CoM becomes negative and ends when the vertical velocity of the CoM becomes  
 182 positive. The concentric phase initiates when the vertical velocity of the CoM becomes positive  
 183 and lasts until the player takes off. The two main phases and most of the parameters are  
 184 described in Figure 2, which is an example of the temporal evolution of force-time curve  
 185 variables for a serve performed by one player.

186

187 \*\*\*\*\***Figure 2 near here**\*\*\*\*\*

188

189 Force-time variables analyzed during the serve included:

- 190 - the maximal value of  $F_z$  ( $F_z^{max}$ ) and  $F_y$  ( $F_y^{max}$ ) calculated between ball release and take-  
 191 off (Figure 2b and 2d),
- 192 - the **anteroposterior**  $F_y$  value at the time of  $F_z^{max}$  ( $F_y|_{F_z^{max}}$ ) since this value can differ  
 193 from  $F_y^{max}$  (Figure 2d),
- 194 - the mean values of  $F_y$  and  $F_z$  during both eccentric and concentric phases (respectively  
 195 named  $F_y^{mean}|_E$ ,  $F_z^{mean}|_E$ ,  $F_y^{mean}|_C$  and  $F_z^{mean}|_C$ ),
- 196 - the rate of vertical force development ( $RFD_z$ ) from the beginning of the eccentric phase  
 197 ( $t_E^{start}$ ) to the instant of  $F_z^{max}$  ( $t|_{F_z^{max}}$ ) as shown on Figure 2b and defined as:

$$RFD_z = \frac{F_z^{max} - F_z|_{t_E^{start}}}{t|_{F_z^{max}} - t_E^{start}}$$

- 199 - the maximal rates of vertical and **anteroposterior** force development from the beginning  
 200 of the eccentric phase to the instants of  $F_z^{max}$  and  $F_y^{max}$  (Figure 2b and 2d) defined as:

$$RFD_z^{max} = \max_{t_E^{start} \leq t \leq t|_{F_z^{max}}} \left( \frac{\partial F_z}{\partial t} \right)$$

and

$$RFD_y^{max} = \max_{t_E^{start} \leq t \leq t|_{F_y^{max}}} \left( \frac{\partial F_y}{\partial t} \right)$$

$t|_{F_y^{max}}$  being the time of occurrence of  $F_y^{max}$ . They correspond to the highest increment between two consecutive vertical and **anteroposterior** force recordings.

- the maximal value of the vertical and **anteroposterior** power ( $P_z^{max}$  and  $P_y^{max}$ ). Power is calculated following:  $P_z = F_z V_z^{CoM}$  and  $P_y = F_y V_y^{CoM}$ ,
- the vertical and **anteroposterior** velocities of the CoM at the instant of  $P_z^{max}$  ( $V_z^{CoM}|_{P_z^{max}}$  and  $V_y^{CoM}|_{P_z^{max}}$ ) (Figure 2a and 2c),
- $F_z$  and  $F_y$  values at the instant of  $P_z^{max}$  ( $F_z|_{P_z^{max}}$  and  $F_y|_{P_z^{max}}$ ) (Figure 2b and 2d),
- the relative net vertical impulse during the concentric phase ( $I_z^{net}|_C$ ) (see Figure 2b for a graphical representation).  $I_z^{net}|_C$  was calculated by integrating  $F_z$  in the time domain during the concentric phase and by removing the vertical impulse due to bodyweight (23). Its mathematical expression is:

$$I_z^{net}|_C = \int_{t_C^{start}}^{t_{takeoff}} (F_z - mg) dt,$$

- the relative **anteroposterior** impulse during the concentric phase ( $I_y|_C$ ) (see Figure 2d for a graphical representation) defined as:

$$I_y|_C = \int_{t_C^{start}}^{t_{takeoff}} F_y dt,$$

where  $t_{takeoff}$  is the time of take-off.

We also measured the following temporal variables:

- 223 - the signed duration between the instants of  $F_z^{max}$  and  $F_y^{max}$  ( $t|_{F_z^{max}} - t|_{F_y^{max}}$ ) (Figure  
224 2d),
- 225 - the duration between the beginning of the eccentric phase and the instant of  $F_z^{max}$   
226 ( $t|_{F_z^{max}} - t_E^{start}$ ) (Figure 2a),
- 227 - the duration between the instant of  $F_z^{max}$  and ball impact ( $t_{impact} - t|_{F_z^{max}}$ ) and the  
228 duration between the instant of  $F_y^{max}$  and ball impact ( $t_{impact} - t|_{F_y^{max}}$ ) (Figure 2a and  
229 2d).

230

### 231 **Statistical analysis:**

232 Mean and SD were calculated for all variables. Reliability of the variables were calculated using  
233 confidence limits (95%) and standard error of the mean (SEM). Pearson's correlation  
234 coefficients were used to assess relationships between force-time curve variables and serve  
235 performance indicators ( $V_R^{max}$  and  $h_{impact}$ ). If normality assumption failed, Spearman's  
236 correlation coefficients were used instead. The correlation was considered weak, moderate, and  
237 strong, when the coefficient was 0.25–0.5, 0.5–0.75, and above 0.75, respectively (37). The  
238 level of significance was set at  $p \leq 0.05$ . Power analyses indicated that the minimum sample  
239 size to yield a statistical power of at least 0.80 with an alpha of 0.05 and a correlation coefficient  
240 of  $r = 0.75$  are 11 for a Pearson correlation and 14 in the case of a Spearman correlation. Our  
241 population sample of 36 tennis players should therefore be sufficiently large to identify  
242 correlations between GRF variables and performance. All statistical analyses were conducted  
243 using Jamovi software (The Jamovi project, version 1.6.23.0).

244

## 245 **RESULTS**

246 The mean, standard deviation and reliability of serve performance parameters and all force-  
 247 time variables are described in Tables 1 and 2. The correlation coefficients are shown in Tables  
 248 3 and 4.

249 \*\*\*\*\* Table 1 near here \*\*\*\*\*

250 \*\*\*\*\* Table 2 near here \*\*\*\*\*

251  $V_R^{max}$  was weakly and positively correlated with  $F_y|_{F_z^{max}}, F_y^{mean}|_C, P_z^{max}, P_y^{max}, V_z^{COM}|_{P_z^{max}},$   
 252  $F_y|_{P_z^{max}}$  and  $I_y|_C$ .  $V_R^{max}$  was weakly and negatively correlated with  $F_z^{mean}|_E$ .  $V_R^{max}$  was  
 253 moderately and positively correlated with  $V_y^{COM}|_{P_z^{max}}$  and negatively with  $(t|_{F_z^{max}} - t|_{F_y^{max}})$   
 254 and  $(t_{impact} - t|_{F_y^{max}})$ .

255  $h_{impact}$  was weakly and positively correlated with  $F_z^{max}, RFD_z, F_y^{mean}|_C, F_y|_{P_z^{max}}$  and  $I_y|_C$ .

256  $h_{impact}$  was moderately correlated with  $F_z^{mean}|_C, P_z^{max}, V_z^{COM}|_{P_z^{max}}, F_z|_{P_z^{max}}$  and strongly  
 257 correlated with  $I_z^{net}|_C$ .

258 \*\*\*\*\* Table 3 near here \*\*\*\*\*

259 \*\*\*\*\* Table 4 near here \*\*\*\*\*

## 260 DISCUSSION

261 The purpose of this study was to investigate how GRF variables relate to serve  
 262 performance parameters in competitive tennis players. Our results showed that the best  
 263 predictors of  $V_R^{max}$  were  $V_y^{COM}|_{P_z^{max}}$  and temporal variables related to  $F_y^{max}$  occurrence  
 264  $((t|_{F_z^{max}} - t|_{F_y^{max}})$  and  $(t_{impact} - t|_{F_y^{max}}))$ .  $F_z^{mean}|_C, P_z^{max}, V_z^{COM}|_{P_z^{max}}$

270  $F_z|_{P_z^{max}}$  and  $I_z^{net}|_C$  were the variables best correlated with  $h_{impact}$ . The novel contribution of  
271 these results suggests that it is not relevant to focus on the variables usually extracted from the  
272 vertical force-time curve ( $F_z^{max}$ ,  $RFD_z$ ,  $RFD_z^{max}$ ,  $(t|_{F_z^{max}} - t_E^S \text{ tart})$ ) to predict and explain  
273 serve performance parameters, and that it is essential to extend the analysis to other variables  
274 related to anteroposterior and vertical force-time curves.

275

276 The general characteristics of the GRF observed in this study were consistent with what  
277 was reported in previous work (2,16,27,32,44). Even if the values of the vertical variables  
278 extracted from the force-time curve are much greater than the anteroposterior ones during the  
279 tennis serve, our results show that  $V_R^{max}$  is not significantly correlated with  $F_z^{max}$ , nor with  
280  $F_z^{mean}|_C$ ,  $RFD_z$ ,  $RFD_z^{max}$  or  $(t|_{F_z^{max}} - t_E^S \text{ tart})$ . All these results confirm our first hypothesis:  
281 the common variables extracted from the vertical force-time curve are not relevant to predict  
282  $V_R^{max}$  and consequently ball speed. These results are in agreement with previous studies that  
283 observed no relationship between  $V_R^{max}$  and ball speed in beginners, intermediate or elite tennis  
284 players (16,32). While the findings of Baiget et al. (2022) suggest that the capability to develop  
285 force ( $RFD_z$ ) in short periods of time (<250 ms) in the upper limb during isometric tests of  
286 joints and movements leads to high serve speed in competition tennis players (3), the absence  
287 of significant correlation between  $RFD_z$ ,  $RFD_z^{max}$  and  $V_R^{max}$  in our study shows that it is not  
288 the case for the lower limbs during the dynamic execution of the serve. Similar results have  
289 been obtained by Ramasamy et al. (2021) who reported that  $F_z^{max}$  and  $RFD_z$  were not correlated  
290 with the shuttlecock speed of a forehand jump smash in elite badminton players. In our study,  
291  $F_z^{mean}|_E$ ,  $P_z^{max}$  and  $V_z^{CoM}|_{P_z^{max}}$  are the only vertical variables correlated with  $V_R^{max}$  (-0.444,  
292 0.419 and 0.492 respectively). However, these correlations are weak and do not appear  
293 meaningful.

294

295 performance Our results show that  $V_R^{max}$  is significantly correlated with a greater number of  
 296 anteroposterior force-time variables than vertical ones confirming our second hypothesis. This  
 297 could mean that the player's forward leg drive is more important to generate high racket head  
 298 speed than the vertical one. However, we need to be cautious in this interpretation because  
 299  $F_y|_{F_z^{max}}$ ,  $F_y^{mean}|_C$ ,  $P_y^{max}$ ,  $I_y|_C$ ,  $F_y|_{P_z^{max}}$  and  $V_y^{CoM}|_{P_z^{max}}$  are only weakly correlated with  $V_R^{max}$   
 300 (Table 3).  $V_y^{CoM}|_{P_z^{max}}$  is the only anteroposterior variable to be moderately correlated with  
 301  $V_R^{max}$ . This suggests that a faster CoM velocity in the forward direction may increase the  
 302 generation of racket head velocity. The forward CoM velocity during the concentric phase  
 303 influences the production of forward body momentum and contributes to increasing the forward  
 304 velocities of the dominant shoulder and racket head (10). Consequently, conditioning programs  
 305 and technical instructions aiming to improve the forward CoM velocity constitute an  
 306 interesting option to increase  $V_R^{max}$  and serve speed.

307  
 308 In the end, our findings demonstrate that among all our variables,  $(t|_{F_z^{max}} - t|_{F_y^{max}})$  and  
 309  $(t_{impact} - t|_{F_y^{max}})$  are the best predictors of  $V_R^{max}$ . These results demonstrate the importance  
 310 of the coordination between the vertical and the forward leg drive within the serve motion.  
 311 The players with the highest  $V_R^{max}$  have the shortest duration between  $F_y^{max}$  and  $F_z^{max}$   
 312 ~~in other words~~, the most performant players are able to synchronize their forward and vertical  
 313 push. Additionally, the shorter the delay between  $F_y^{max}$  and impact, the greater the magnitude  
 314 of  $V_R^{max}$ . This last result is in agreement with a previous study in baseball which found that  
 315 pitchers with slower ball velocities had maximal ground reaction forces occur earlier in the  
 316 pitch cycle than pitchers with faster velocities (12). Similarly, MacWilliams et al. (1983)  
 317 showed that pitchers with slower wrist velocities had earlier  $F_y^{max}$  (30).

319 Our results also show that  $h_{impact}$  is weakly correlated with  $F_z^{max}$  ( $r=0.39$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and  
1  
2 320  $RFD_z$  ( $r=0.37$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). As a consequence, the ability to develop vertical force rapidly ( $RFD_z$ )  
3  
4  
5 321 and to some extent maximal vertical force ( $F_z^{max}$ ) does not appear to strongly influence  $h_{impact}$ .  
6  
7 322 Once again, this finding underlines the fact that  $F_z^{max}$  and  $RFD_z$  are not the best variables to  
8  
9  
10 323 describe tennis serve performance. In the literature, the relationship between  $F_z^{max}$  and  $h_{impact}$   
11  
12  
13 324 is unclear. On the one hand, Martin et al. (2016) observed a reduced serve  $h_{impact}$  at the end of  
14  
15 325 a prolonged tennis match between competitive players while no significant difference was  
16  
17  
18 326 observed for  $F_z^{max}$  in the same period of time (32). On the other hand, Girard et al. (2005)  
19  
20 327 reported that  $h_{impact}$  was correlated with  $F_z^{max}$  in elite tennis players but not in intermediate  
21  
22  
23 328 and beginner players (16). Even if tennis players aim is not to jump as high as possible but  
24  
25 329 rather to hit the ball as high as possible while being able to be efficient in terms of precision  
26  
27  
28 330 and speed, our results can still be discussed within the framework of vertical jumping literature.  
29  
30 331 The influence of  $F_z^{max}$  on vertical jump height remains inconsistent (35). While Dowling and  
31  
32  
33 332 Vamos (1993) found that  $F_z^{max}$  was significantly correlated with vertical jump height ( $r =$   
34  
35 333  $0.519$ ) (9), Kirby et al. (2011) obtained negative but significant correlations between  $F_z^{max}$  and  
36  
37  
38 334 jump height (23) in countermovement and static jumps performed to varying squat depths. In a  
39  
40 335 volleyball spike task performed by 15 elite female players,  $F_z^{max}$  was not correlated with jump  
41  
42  
43 336 height (15). Concerning  $RFD_z$ , our results are in agreement with McLellan et al. (2011) who  
44  
45 337 showed that this variable was weakly correlated ( $r=0.49$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) with vertical jump  
46  
47  
48 338 displacement during countermovement jump but they diverge from other studies that found no  
49  
50 339 correlations between  $RFD_z$  and countermovement jump performance factors (19).

51  
52 340  
53  
54  
55 341 If we focus on the vertical force-time curve variables, our results reveal that it is more  
56  
57 342 relevant to measure  $F_z |_{P_z^{max}}$ ,  $F_z^{mean} |_C$ ,  $P_z^{max}$  and  $V_z^{CoM} |_{P_z^{max}}$  which are moderately correlated  
58  
59  
60 343 with  $h_{impact}$ . Once again, our results can be discussed in the light of the jumping tasks  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

344 literature. They are consistent with Laffaye and Wagner (2013) who showed that maximal  
1  
2 345 vertical performance during countermovement jumps in skilled male athletes (football,  
3  
4 346 basketball and baseball) is primarily determined by  $F_z^{mean}|_C$  ( $r=0.54, p<0.001$ ) (24). It is worth  
5  
6  
7 347 noticing that several studies showed strong correlation between jump height and  $P_z^{max}$  (4,9,18).  
8  
9 348 However, it is well known that the correlation between jump height and mechanical power is  
10  
11 349 artificially inflated by the near-perfect correlation between jump height and the CoM velocity  
12  
13 350 at maximal vertical power (28). Indeed, the way mechanical power is calculated from force and  
14  
15 351 velocity induces an artefact. This artefact is present in our results since the correlation between  
16  
17 352  $h_{impact}$  and  $P_z^{max}$  ( $r = 0.685, p<0.001$ ) appears largely determined by the correlation between  
18  
19 353  $h_{impact}$  and  $V_z^{CoM}|_{P_z^{max}}$  ( $r = 0.702, p<0.001$ ) and less related to the correlation between  $h_{impact}$   
20  
21 354 and  $F_z|_{P_z^{max}}$  ( $r = 0.523, p<0.001$ ).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 355  
28  
29  
30 356

In fact, jump height depends on impulse and not power (40). We found that the best  
31  
32 357 predictor of  $h_{impact}$  is the relative net vertical impulse during the concentric phase ( $I_z^{net}|_C$ ) ( $r$   
33  
34 358 = 0.772;  $p<0.001$ ). This significant relationship means that the players who reach higher  
35  
36 359  $h_{impact}$  are those who generated the higher net vertical impulse during the concentric phase.  
37  
38  
39 360 This result is consistent with previous investigations demonstrating that relative net vertical  
40  
41 361 impulse is correlated with jump height in squat and countermovement jumps (35) and that the  
42  
43 362 positive impulse explains 77% of the countermovement jump height (14). Positive impulse  
44  
45 363 during the concentric phase of a jump (static or countermovement) is also a strong predictor of  
46  
47 364 jump height ( $r=0.93$  and  $r=0.92$ ) for competitive basketball and volleyball players (23).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52 365

53  
54 366 This strong relationship between jump height and vertical impulse is explained by the  
55  
56 367 fact that the ability to jump vertically is mainly dependent on the vertical velocity at take-off.  
57  
58  
59 368 From Newton's second law of motion, this velocity is attributable to the preceding vertical  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

369 impulse and is enshrined in the impulse–momentum relationship (40). In our study, the  
1  
2 370 correlation coefficient between  $I_z^{net}|_C$  and  $h_{impact}$  for the tennis serve is weaker than those  
3  
4  
5 371 obtained between the jump height and relative net vertical impulse in jumping tasks. Indeed,  
6  
7 372 tennis players ability to hit the ball as high as possible on serve depends not only on their take-  
8  
9  
10 373 off height, but also on the segmental organization of their upper body, which is mostly  
11  
12 374 determined by the angles of trunk lateral flexion, shoulder abduction and elbow extension.  
13

14 375

16  
17 376 Impulse is an indicator of the accumulation of force during a given period (1). Since  
18  
19 377  $I_z^{net}|_C$  is the product of amount of force generated during the concentric phase by its duration  
20  
21  
22 378 of application, tennis players have logically three ways to increase  $I_z^{net}|_C$  and consequently  
23  
24 379  $h_{impact}$ : they can increase the amount of force applied, the duration of force application, or  
25  
26  
27 380 both. From a physical conditioning point of view, impulse is known to improve with resistance  
28  
29 381 training as it leads to increase the amount of force generated (1). Based on our results, we  
30  
31  
32 382 recommend basic strength training methods and stretch-shortening cycle enhanced exercises  
33  
34 383 such as plyometrics **as they increase the specific strength and power characteristics required for**  
35  
36  
37 384 **a better impulse during the tennis serve** (6). Colomar et al. (2023) advised to target plyometrics  
38  
39 385 exercises that mimic the serve technical execution (6). From a technical point of view, the  
40  
41  
42 386 duration of force application during **the** serve can be longer by increasing the leg flexion depth  
43  
44 387 and consequently, the vertical CoM displacement during leg flexion and extension. Indeed, for  
45  
46  
47 388 squat and countermovement jumps, previous studies showed that decreasing squat or knee  
48  
49 389 flexion depth led to a decrease in relative net vertical impulse, maximal CoM vertical velocity  
50  
51  
52 390 and jump height (35,41). However, it is important to note that the reduction in jump height was  
53  
54 391 only observed when the leg flexion depth was drastically reduced (41). For example, Hornestam  
55  
56 392 et al. (2021) showed that a mean difference of  $19^\circ$  in maximal knee flexion between two groups  
57  
58  
59 393 of junior tennis players ( $55.6 \pm 9^\circ$  vs.  $74.7 \pm 6^\circ$ ) was not enough to see an influence on serve  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

394  $h_{impact}$  (20). Liang et al. (2023) reported that larger range of hip, knee and ankle motions, and  
1  
2  
3 395 consequently higher leg flexion depth, were associated with an increased jump height during  
4  
5 396 **the** serve in female college players (27). Girard et al. (2007) also showed that a very strong  
6  
7 397 restriction of knee flexion depth (only 10° of leg flexion) significantly reduced  $h_{impact}$  (17).  
8  
9  
10 398 When comparing the leg flexion between a tennis serve and a countermovement jump, it is  
11  
12 399 worth keeping in mind that the height of impact not only depends on the lower limbs action but  
13  
14  
15 400 also on the upper limbs' organization.

16  
17 401  
18  
19 402 Another fundamental difference between a countermovement jump and a tennis serve  
20  
21  
22 403 is the time constraint that players have to face due to the height of the ball toss. Regarding  
23  
24 404 countermovement jumps, correlations between squat flexion depth and relative net vertical  
25  
26 405 impulse were obtained in the context of unlimited time to produce the highest vertical velocity  
27  
28  
29 406 peak. Participants were not subjected to any time restriction to reach their maximum jump  
30  
31  
32 407 height. Elite tennis **players** instead regulate the duration of their serve motion by taking into  
33  
34 408 account the ball toss (48). In other words, elite tennis players seemingly use information from  
35  
36 409 the ball toss to determine the appropriate times to initiate appropriate body movements (leg  
37  
38  
39 410 flexion and extension). As a result, if the ball toss is low, the server may be forced to choose a  
40  
41 411 shallower flexion depth than if there was no time **constraint** to obtain the best possible impact  
42  
43  
44 412 height. Future work is needed to investigate the influence of leg flexion depth and ball toss  
45  
46 413 height on  $I_z^{net}|_C$  and  $h_{impact}$  in tennis. In any case, players and coaches should note the  
47  
48  
49 414 theoretically important contribution of leg flexion depth to vertical jump and  $h_{impact}$ . The same  
50  
51 415 force impulse can be generated through a lower force applied over a longer time, or higher force  
52  
53  
54 416 applied over a shorter time. Future studies based on the shape of the force-time curve could  
55  
56 417 perhaps reveal different strategies and cluster player profiles in terms of how impulse is  
57  
58  
59 418 developed and efficiently used during **the** serve.

419

1  
2 420 In our study, we analyzed the relationships between GRF-time curve variables and serve  
3  
4 421 performance indicators for a mixed-sex population. The heterogeneity of our population  
5  
6 422 unraveled macroscopic tendencies between force-time curve variables and serve performance.  
7  
8  
9 423 The gender influence on GRF-time curve variables during the tennis serve is unknown because  
10  
11 424 no study has examined this issue. Liang et al. (2023) obtained a mean  $F_z^{\max}$  value of  $2.02 \pm 0.32$   
12  
13 425 N/BW for a group of national female college tennis players during the tennis serve (27). This  
14  
15 426 value appears close to the one measured by Girard et al. (2005) for national male tennis players  
16  
17 427 ( $2.11 \pm 0.41$  N/BW) (16). Concerning sex differences in GRF-time curve variables during the  
18  
19 428 CMJ, contradictory results have been obtained (25,38). Consequently, future research should  
20  
21 429 focus on comparing tennis serve GRF-time curve variables between male and female players  
22  
23 430 and separately assessing their impact on tennis serve performance. Later investigation will also  
24  
25 431 focus on the specific differences due to age and level of expertise but is beyond the scope of  
26  
27 432 this study.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 433

35  
36 434 A possible limitation of the current work is that the different serve stance techniques  
37  
38 435 (the foot-up and the foot-back techniques) were not distinguished. Future studies should  
39  
40 436 compare force-time curve variables between these two stance techniques and analyze their  
41  
42 437 relationships with tennis serve performance within each stance technique group. We recall that  
43  
44 438 our experiment was conducted inside a research laboratory facility where force plates were built  
45  
46 439 into the ground and located not behind the baseline but inside the tennis court of the laboratory.  
47  
48  
49 440 We also asked players using a foot-up technique to bring their back foot close to their front foot,  
50  
51 441 but without crossing the limit between the two platforms. Both the force plates location and the  
52  
53 442 given instructions may have affected the way players hit their serves and limited the ecological  
54  
55 443 validity of our study.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

444

1  
2 445 Finally, it is worth acknowledging that this study did not directly quantify the lower  
3  
4 446 limbs physical capacities that may differentiate the players and their performance. In tennis, leg  
5  
6  
7 447 drive is not a maximal effort skill but rather an optimal one in order to meet the ball at a height  
8  
9  
10 448 both defined by ball toss and the will to transfer as much kinetic energy as possible to the ball  
11  
12 449 (47). Further work could also evaluate the relationships between lower limbs physical capacities  
13  
14 450 and force-time curve variables during the serve to provide an even finer understanding of serve  
15  
16  
17 451 performance.

452

## 453 PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

24 454 The results presented here contribute to a better understanding of the mechanical  
25  
26 455 demands of tennis serve motion and can be used by coaches to improve player preparation and  
27  
28  
29 456 performance. Our results do not support the value of strength training to improve  $RFD_z$ ,  
30  
31 457  $RFD_z^{max}$  or  $F_z^{max}$  in expert tennis players to increase serve performance parameters. On the  
32  
33  
34 458 contrary, it is important for players to develop high vertical and forward CoM velocities near  
35  
36 459 take-off to improve  $h_{impact}$  and  $V_R^{max}$ , respectively. Coaches should also encourage their  
37  
38  
39 460 players to synchronize their upward and forward pushing action during the serve to increase  
40  
41 461  $V_R^{max}$  (i.e. reducing the elapsed time between the maximal value of  $F_z$  and the maximal value  
42  
43  
44 462 of  $F_y$ ). Moreover, it seems interesting to improve the players' relative net vertical impulse during  
45  
46  
47 463 the concentric phase ( $I_z^{gt}|_C$ ) to improve  $h_{impact}$ . From a physical conditioning point of view,  
48  
49 464 basic resistance strength training methods and stretch-shortening cycle enhanced exercises such  
50  
51  
52 465 as plyometrics can be planned to increase the amount of force generated and consequently  
53  
54 466  $I_z^{gt}|_C$ . From a biomechanical point of view, players and coaches need to be aware of the  
55  
56  
57 467 theoretically important contribution of leg flexion depth to vertical jump and  $h_{impact}$  and to  
58  
59 468 examine their self-selected depth, especially if it is quite shallow, as it may not be the best

469 approach for improving maximum vertical CoM displacement,  $I_z^{net}|_C$  and therefore  $h_{impact}$ .

470 Because correlations do not necessarily prove causation, future experimentations should use a

471 longitudinal (pretest-posttest) protocol design to determine if the abilities 1) to develop high

472 vertical and forward CoM velocities near take-off, 2) to improve relative net vertical impulse

473 during the concentric phase and 3) to synchronize the upward and forward pushing action

474 during the serve could be trained or improved, and whether these improved abilities could

475 actually enhance tennis serve performance indicators.

476

477

## 478 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

479 The authors would like to thank the players who participated in the study. The authors

480 declare that they have no conflict of interest. The results of this study do not constitute

481 endorsement of the product by the authors or the NSCA.

482

## 483 REFERENCES

484 1. Aagaard, P, Simonsen, EB, Andersen, JL, Magnusson, P, and Dyhre-Poulsen, P.  
485 Increased rate of force development and neural drive of human skeletal muscle following  
486 resistance training. *J Appl Physiol Bethesda Md* 1985 93: 1318–1326, 2002.

487 2. Bahamonde, R and Knudson, D. Ground reaction forces and two types of stances and  
488 tennis serves. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 33: 102, 2001.

489 3. Baiget, E, Colomar, J, and Corbi, F. Upper-limb force–time characteristics determine  
490 serve velocity in competition tennis players. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 17: 358–366, 2022.

491 4. Barker, LA, Harry, JR, and Mercer, JA. Relationships between countermovement  
492 jump ground reaction forces and jump height, reactive strength index, and jump time. *J*  
493 *Strength Cond Res* 32: 248–254, 2018.

494 5. Brody, H. Unforced errors and error reduction in tennis. *Br J Sports Med* 40: 397–400,  
495 2006.

496 6. Colomar, J, Corbi, F, and Baiget, E. Improving tennis serve velocity: review of  
497 training methods and recommendations. *Strength Cond J* 45: 385–394, 2023.

498 7. Colomar, J, Corbi, F, Brich, Q, and Baiget, E. Determinant physical factors of tennis  
499 serve velocity: a brief review. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 17: 1159–1169, 2022.

500 8. De Leva, P. Joint center longitudinal positions computed from a selected subset of  
501 Chandler’s data. *J Biomech* 29: 1231–1233, 1996.

502 9. Dowling, JJ and Vamos, L. Identification of kinetic and temporal factors related to  
503 vertical jump performance. *J Appl Biomech* 9: 95–110, 1993.

- 504 10. Elliott, B (ed.). Biomechanics of advanced tennis. London: ITF, 2005.
- 1 505 11. Elliott, B and Colette, D. Biomechanics. *ITF Coach Sport Sci Rev* 1: 11, 1993.
- 2 506 12. Elliott, B, Grove, JR, and Gibson, B. Timing of the lower limb drive and throwing
- 3 507 limb movement in baseball pitching. *Int J Sport Biomech* 4: 59–67, 1988.
- 4 508 13. Elliott, B and Wood, G. The biomechanics of foot-up and foot-back tennis service
- 5 509 techniques. *Aust J Sports Sci* 3: 3–6, 1983.
- 7 510 14. Ferragut, C, Cortadellas, J, Arteaga, RY, and Calbet, AL. Prediccion de la altura de
- 8 511 salto vertical, importancia del impulso mecanico de la masa muscular de las extremidades
- 9 512 inferiores. *Rev Mot* 10: 7–22, 2003.
- 10 513 15. Fuchs, PX, Fusco, A, Bell, JW, et al. Movement characteristics of volleyball spike
- 12 514 jump performance in females. *J Sci Med Sport* 22: 833–837, 2019.
- 13 515 16. Girard, O, Micallef, J, and Millet, G. Lower-limb activity during the power serve in
- 14 516 tennis: effects of performance level. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 37: 1021–1029, 2005.
- 15 517 17. Girard, O, Micallef, J, and Millet, G. Influence of restricted knee motion during the
- 16 518 flat first serve in tennis. *J Strength Cond Res* 21: 950–957, 2007.
- 18 519 18. González-Badillo, JJ and Marques, MC. Relationship between kinematic factors and
- 19 520 countermovement jump height in trained track and field athletes. *J Strength Cond Res* 24:
- 20 521 3443–3447, 2010.
- 22 522 19. Hernandez-Davo, J-L and Sabido, R. Rate of force development: reliability,
- 23 523 improvements and influence on performance. A review. *Eur J Hum Mov* 33: 46–49, 2014.
- 24 524 20. Hornestam, JF, Souza, TR, Magalhães, FA, et al. The effects of knee flexion on tennis
- 25 525 serve performance of intermediate level tennis players. *Sensors* 21: 5254, 2021.
- 26 526 21. Johnson, C, McHugh, M, Wood, T, and Kibler, B. Performance demands of
- 27 527 professional male tennis players. *Br J Sports Med* 40: 696–699, 2006.
- 29 528 22. Kabacinski, J, Dworak, LB, Murawa, M, et al. A comparison of take-off dynamics
- 30 529 during three different spikes, block and counter-movement jump in female volleyball players.
- 31 530 *J Sports Med Phys Fitness* 56: 1482–1487, 2016.
- 32 531 23. Kirby, TJ, McBride, JM, Haines, TL, and Dayne, AM. Relative net vertical impulse
- 33 532 determines jumping performance. *J Appl Biomech* 27: 207–214, 2011.
- 34 533 24. Laffaye, G and Wagner, P. Eccentric rate of force development determines jumping
- 35 534 performance. *Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin* 16: 82–83, 2013.
- 36 535 25. Laffaye, G, Wagner, PP, and Tombleson, TIL. Countermovement jump height: gender
- 37 536 and sport-specific differences in the force-time variables. *J Strength Cond Res* 28: 1096–
- 38 537 1105, 2014.
- 41 538 26. Lester, M, Peeling, P, Girard, O, et al. From the ground up: expert perceptions of
- 42 539 lower limb activity monitoring in tennis. *J Sports Sci Med* 133–141, 2023.
- 43 540 27. Liang, Z, Wu, J, Yu, J, et al. Comparison and analysis of the biomechanics of the
- 44 541 lower limbs of female tennis players of different levels in foot-up serve. *Front Physiol* 14:
- 45 542 1125240, 2023.
- 47 543 28. Linthorne, NP. The correlation between jump height and mechanical power in a
- 48 544 countermovement jump is artificially inflated. *Sports Biomech* 20: 3–21, 2021.
- 49 545 29. Lo, KC, Wang, LH, Wu, CC, and Su, FC. The role of ground reaction force between
- 50 546 different tennis serves. Zurich, Switzerland, 2001.
- 52 547 30. MacWilliams, BA, Choi, T, Perezous, MK, Chao, EYS, and McFarland, EG.
- 53 548 Characteristic ground-reaction forces in baseball pitching. *Am J Sports Med* 26: 66–71, 1998.
- 54 549 31. Martin, C, Bideau, B, Bideau, N, et al. Energy flow analysis during the tennis serve:
- 55 550 comparison between injured and noninjured tennis players. *Am J Sports Med* 42: 2751–2760,
- 56 551 2014.
- 58 552 32. Martin, C, Bideau, B, Delamarche, P, and Kulpa, R. Influence of a prolonged tennis
- 59 553 match play on serve biomechanics. *PloS One* 11: e0159979, 2016.

- 554 33. Martin, C, Bideau, B, Ropars, M, Delamarche, P, and Kulpa, R. Upper limb joint  
1 555 kinetic analysis during tennis serve: Assessment of competitive level on efficiency and injury  
2 556 risks. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 24: 60–75, 2014.
- 3 557 34. Martin, C, Kulpa, R, Delamarche, P, and Bideau, B. Professional tennis players' serve:  
4 558 correlation between segmental angular momentums and ball velocity. *Sports Biomech* 12: 2–  
5 559 14, 2013.
- 7 560 35. McBride, JM, Kirby, TJ, Haines, TL, and Skinner, J. Relationship between relative net  
8 561 vertical impulse and jump height in jump squats performed to various squat depths and with  
9 562 various loads. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 5: 484–496, 2010.
- 10 563 36. Pérez-Castilla, A, Fernandes, JFT, Rojas, FJ, and García-Ramos, A. Reliability and  
12 564 magnitude of countermovement jump performance variables: influence of the take-off  
13 565 threshold. *Meas Phys Educ Exerc Sci* 25: 227–235, 2021.
- 14 566 37. Portney, LG and Watkins, MP. Foundations of clinical research: applications to  
15 567 practice. 3rd edition, [revised]. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2015.
- 16 568 38. Rice, PE, Goodman, CL, Capps, CR, et al. Force– and power–time curve comparison  
18 569 during jumping between strength- matched male and female basketball players. *Eur J Sport  
19 570 Sci* 17: 286–293, 2017.
- 20 571 39. Rousanoglou, E, Noutsos, K, Bayios, I, and Boudolos, K. Ground reaction forces and  
21 572 throwing performance in elite and novice players in two types of handball shot. *J Hum Kinet*  
23 573 40: 49–55, 2014.
- 24 574 40. Ruddock, AD and Winter, EM. Jumping depends on impulse not power. *J Sports Sci*  
25 575 34: 584–585, 2016.
- 26 576 41. Sánchez-Sixto, A, Harrison, A, and Floría, P. Larger countermovement increases the  
27 577 jump Height of countermovement jump. *Sports* 6: 131, 2018.
- 29 578 42. Tanabe, S and Ito, A. A three-dimensional analysis of the contributions of upper limb  
30 579 joint movements to horizontal racket head velocity at ball impact during tennis serving. *Sports  
31 580 Biomech* 6: 418–433, 2007.
- 32 581 43. Touzard, P, Kulpa, R, Bideau, B, Montalvan, B, and Martin, C. Biomechanical  
34 582 analysis of the “waiter’s serve” on upper limb loads in young elite tennis players. *Eur J Sport  
35 583 Sci* 19: 765–773, 2019.
- 36 584 44. Tubez, F, Forthomme, B, Croisier, J-L, et al. Biomechanical analysis of abdominal  
37 585 injury in tennis serves. A case report. *J Sports Sci Med* 14: 402–412, 2015.
- 38 586 45. Van Gheluwe, B and Hebbelinck, M. Muscle actions and ground reaction forces in  
40 587 tennis. *Int J Sport Biomech* 2: 88–99, 1986.
- 41 588 46. Vaverka, F and Cernosek, M. Association between body height and serve speed in  
42 589 elite tennis players. *Sports Biomech* 12: 30–37, 2013.
- 43 590 47. Whiteside, D, Elliott, B, Lay, B, and Reid, M. The effect of age on discrete kinematics  
45 591 of the elite female tennis serve. *J Appl Biomech* 29: 573–582, 2013.
- 46 592 48. Whiteside, D, Elliott, BC, Lay, B, and Reid, M. Coordination and variability in the  
47 593 elite female tennis serve. *J Sports Sci* 33: 675–686, 2015.
- 48 594  
49 595  
50 596  
51  
52 596  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

597 **Figure legends**

1  
2 598 Figure 1. Example of a subject performing a tennis flat serve on the two force platforms  
3  
4

5 599 Figure 2: Description of the main phases and variables defined in the text. a) Vertical velocity  
6  
7  
8 600 of the CoM in time. b) Dimensionless vertical GRF in time. The vertical dashed lines delimit  
9  
10 601 the different phases. The grey and green dashdotted lines show the times of occurrence of  $F_z^{max}$   
11  
12  
13 602 and  $P_z^{max}$  respectively. Dashed and dashdotted lines are the same as in a). The grey shaded area  
14  
15 603 is  $I_z^{net}|_c$ . c) Forward velocity of the CoM in time. d) Dimensionless forward GRF in time. The  
16  
17  
18 604 vertical dashed lines delimit the different phases. The grey, green and blue dashdotted lines are  
19  
20 605 the times of occurrence of  $F_z^{max}$ ,  $P_z^{max}$  and  $F_y^{max}$  respectively. Dashed and dashdotted lines  
21  
22  
23 606 are the same as in c) except for the blue one only shown here for clarity. The grey shaded area  
24  
25 607 is  $I_y|_c$ . Mean values of  $F_y$  and  $F_z$  are averaged over the time domain of each phase shown at  
26  
27  
28 608 the top of a) and c).  
29  
30

31 609

32 610

33 611

34 612  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

613 Table 1. Reliability of the performance and force-time curve variables analyzed

	Units	Mean $\pm$ SD	SEM	Range	95 % Confidence limits	
					Lower	Upper
$V_R^{max}$	m.s <sup>-1</sup>	42.2 $\pm$ 3.6	0.61	32.1 – 46.8	40.9	43.4
$h_{impact}$	m/BH	1.47 $\pm$ 0.04	0.01	1.35 – 1.54	1.46	1.49
$F_z^{max}$	N/BW	2.04 $\pm$ 0.29	0.05	1.43 – 2.56	1.95	2.14
$F_y _{F_z^{max}}$	N/BW	0.13 $\pm$ 0.13	0.02	-0.14 – 0.34	0.08	0.17
$F_y^{max}$	N/BW	0.18 $\pm$ 0.10	0.02	0.03 – 0.35	0.15	0.22
$F_z^{mean} _E$	N/BW	0.99 $\pm$ 0.08	0.01	0.69 – 1.08	0.97	1.02
$F_z^{mean} _C$	N/BW	1.39 $\pm$ 0.18	0.03	0.92 – 1.75	1.32	1.45
$F_y^{mean} _E$	N/BW	0.01 $\pm$ 0.05	0.01	-0.17 – 0.10	0.00	0.03
$F_y^{mean} _C$	N/BW	0.04 $\pm$ 0.13	0.01	-0.15 – 0.15	0.01	0.07
$RFD_z$	N/BW. s <sup>-1</sup>	2.05 $\pm$ 0.89	0.15	0.87 – 4.45	1.75	2.35
$RFD_z^{max}$	N/BW. s <sup>-1</sup>	10.30 $\pm$ 4.45	0.74	3.36 – 26.40	8.77	11.80
$RFD_y^{max}$	N/BW. s <sup>-1</sup>	8.13 $\pm$ 3.62	0.60	3.76 – 17.6	6.90	9.35
$P_z^{max}$	W/BW	2.25 $\pm$ 0.67	0.11	0.63 – 3.84	2.02	2.48
$P_y^{max}$	W/BW	0.12 $\pm$ 0.09	0.02	0.01 – 0.30	0.09	0.16
$V_z^{CoM} _{P_z^{max}}$	m.s <sup>-1</sup>	1.23 $\pm$ 0.27	0.04	0.44 – 1.76	1.14	1.33
$V_y^{CoM} _{P_z^{max}}$	m.s <sup>-1</sup>	0.73 $\pm$ 0.22	0.04	0.25 – 1.17	0.65	0.80
$F_z _{P_z^{max}}$	N/BW	1.80 $\pm$ 0.22	0.04	1.30 – 2.19	1.72	1.87
$F_y _{P_z^{max}}$	N/BW	-0.00 $\pm$ 0.13	0.02	-0.25 – 0.24	-0.05	0.04
$I_z^{net} _C$	m.s <sup>-1</sup>	1.02 $\pm$ 0.41	0.07	-0.20 – 1.80	0.88	1.16
$I_y _C$	m.s <sup>-1</sup>	0.12 $\pm$ 0.20	0.03	-0.35 – 0.53	0.05	0.18

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

614  $h_{impact}$  = impact height;  $V_R^{max}$  = maximal racket head velocity;  $F_z$  = vertical force;  $F_y$  =  
615 anteroposterior force;  $RFD$  = rate of force development;  $P_z$  = vertical power;  $P_y$  =  
616 anteroposterior power;  $V_z$  = vertical velocity;  $V_y$  = anteroposterior velocity; CoM = center of  
617 mass;  $C = \frac{I_z^{net}}{I_C}$ : relative net vertical impulse;  $\frac{I_y}{I_C}$ : relative anteroposterior  
618 impulse; E = eccentric; BW = body weight; BH = body height; N = Newton; SD: standard  
619 deviation; SEM: standard error of the mean.

621 Table 2. Reliability of the temporal force-time curve variables analyzed

					95 % Confidence limits	
	Units	Mean $\pm$ SD	SEM	Range	Lower	Upper
$t _{F_z^{max}} - t _{F_y^{max}}$	ms	56 $\pm$ 73	12.20	-19 – 305	31	81
$t _{F_z^{max}} - t_E^{start}$	ms	676 $\pm$ 129	21.60	365 – 949	632	720
$t_{impact} - t _{F_z^{max}}$	ms	258 $\pm$ 33	5.51	203 – 339	247	269
$t_{impact} - t _{F_y^{max}}$	ms	315 $\pm$ 11	67.80	218 – 522	292	338

622  $F_z^{max}$  = maximal vertical force;  $F_y^{max}$  = maximal **anteroposterior** force,  $t_E^{start}$  = starting time

623 of the eccentric phase and  $t_{impact}$  = the time of impact.

624

625 Table 3. Correlation coefficients between serve performance parameters and force-time curve  
 626 variables during serve

	$V_R^{max}$	$h_{impact}$
$F_z^{max}$	0.153	0.394*
$F_y   F_z^{max}$	0.425*	0.301
$F_y^{max}$	0.247	0.202
$F_z^{mean}   E$	-0.444**	0.023
$F_z^{mean}   C$	0.204	0.693***
$F_y^{mean}   E$	-0.064	-0.237
$F_y^{mean}   C$	0.396*	0.461**
$RFD_z$	0.212	0.368*
$RFD_z^{max}$	0.102	0.201
$RFD_y^{max}$	0.215	0.002
$P_z^{max}$	0.419*	0.685***
$P_y^{max}$	0.351*	0.144
$V_z^{CoM}   P_z^{max}$	0.492**	0.702***
$V_y^{CoM}   P_z^{max}$	0.513***	0.134
$F_z   P_z^{max}$	0.224	0.523***
$F_y   P_z^{max}$	0.399*	0.404*
$I_z^{net}   C$	0.321	0.772***
$I_y   C$	0.413*	0.418*

627  $h_{impact}$  = impact height;  $V_R^{max}$  = maximal racket head velocity;  $F_z$  = vertical force;  $F_y$  =  
 628 **anteroposterior** force;  $RFD$  = rate of force development;  $P_z$  = vertical power;  $V_z$  = vertical

629 velocity; C = concentric;  $I_z^{net}|_C$ : vertical net impulse; E = eccentric; BW = body weight; N =

1

2 630 Newton. \*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

3

4

5 631

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

632 Table 4. Correlation coefficients between serve performance parameters and temporal ground  
 633 reaction force variables during serve

	$V_R^{max}$	$h_{impact}$
$t _{F_z^{max}} - t _{F_y^{max}}$	-0.519***	-0.101
$t _{F_z^{max}} - t_E^{start}$	0.058	0.059
$t_{impact} - t _{F_z^{max}}$	0.081	0.216
$t_{impact} - t _{F_y^{max}}$	-0.522***	-0.045

634  $h_{impact}$  = impact height;  $V_R^{max}$  = maximal racket head velocity;  $F_z^{max}$  = maximal vertical force;

635  $F_y^{max}$  = maximal **anteroposterior** force,  $t_E^{start}$  = starting time of the eccentric phase and

636  $t_{impact}$  = the time of impact.

637

638



