Journal of Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Research
Available Online at www.jbpr.in
CODEN: - JBPRAU (Source: - American Chemical Society)
(National Library of Medicine): ID: (101671502)
Research Article
Volume 10, Issue 5: September-October: 2021, 40-52
ISSN (Online): 2279-0594
ISSN (Print): 2589-8752

Comparison of Dynmic Push-up Training and Plyometric Push-up Training on the Performance of Body

Dr. Sumit Asthana[1], Dr. Arif Rizvi[2]

[1]Associate Professor & Head, Assistant dean, E.I.A.H.Sc. & R Era University, Lucknow
[2]Assistant Professor, E.I.A.H.Sc. & R, Era University, Lucknow

Article Info: Received 20 September 2021; Accepted 18 October. 2021
Address for Correspondence: Dr. Sumit Asthana, Associate Professor & Head, Assistant dean, Era University, Lucknow.
Conflict of interest statement: No conflict of interest

ABSTRACT

Objective: To compare the Comparison of dynmic push-up training and plyometric push-up training on the performance of Body.

Background: The push-up is a popular exercise among both young athletes and the general population. The advantages are its simplicity; no equipment or cost is involved, and it can be used for many different purposes. Shoulder, back and upper arm strengthening are among the main purposes of this exercise. In addition, it also trains neuromuscular coordination.

Study design: Comparison study

Methods: Thirty six healthy professional male Cricket players participated in this study. The subjects were randomly assigned to the dynamic push-up group (group A) and the plyometric push-up group (group B).

Results: sample t-test within Group A between Pre & post one arm hop test of right side (p=0.033), left side (p=0.003) both showed significant difference, the medicine ball put test also showed significance difference when compared pre &post test. Similarly within Group B between Pre & post one arm hop test of right side (p=0.004), left side (p=0.011) both showed significant difference, the medicine ball put test also showed significance difference when compared pre &post test. Paired sample t test was used to compare the data between the groups of one arm hop test in right side of pre test (p= 0.769), post test (p=0.295) and in left side of pre test (p=0.488), post test (p= 0.242) showed no significance differences. Similarly in medicine ball put test of pre test (p=0.174) and post test (p=0.168) also showed no significance.

Conclusion: It is concluded from this study that Dynamic Push-Up Training and Plyometric Push-Up Training, both are effective for improvement of upper body performance but neither regimens was superior over each other.

Key words: dynamic push up, plyometric, neuromuscular coordination, Medicine - Ball

INTRODUCTION

Today's sports and recreation activities have become more and more competitive, with this increased competitive nature comes an increase in the desire to improve performance. One of the most important aspects of performance enhancement, other than skill, is the ability to produce power.[1]

Plyometric exercise is a popular form of training commonly used to improve athletic performance.[2] Plyometric training has been

established as a training method that improves the muscle-tendon unit‟s ability to tolerate stretch loads and the efficiency of the stretch-shorten cycle (SSC).[3] Athletes preparing for explosive activities such as sprinting and jumping are recommended to include plyometric drills in their training programs. During a plyometric drill, also known as stretch – shortening cycle drill, a movement to an intended direction is achieved by starting it with a movement to the opposite direction.[4] Plyometrics is a nontraditional form of resistance training emphasizing the loading of muscles during an eccentric muscle action, which is quickly followed by a rebound concentric action.

Some authors have found plyometric exercises to be a beneficial adjunct to traditional training methods,while others have found plyometrics to be of no advantage.[5] Upper extremity rehabilitation programs have begun to incorporate plyometric activities to promote the restoration of comprehensive neuromuscular control and functional joint stability. Plyometric activities have received attention in the lower extremity for enhancing muscle performance characteristics. In the upper extremity there are limited data available exploring the specific neuromuscular adaptations sought by clinicians. However, traditional strength exercises are initiated only through voluntary muscle activation.[6] It has been reported that, when myotendinous tissue is stretched, energy is stored and then released during muscle shortening .This type of exercise (plyometric or jumping) causes higher muscle tension compared to conventional resistance training.[7]

Plyometrics, however, are now being used during the final stages of sports rehabilitation to assure an adequate preparation of an athlete's muscle power functions and performance skills for the demands of their specific sport.[8] Several studies used plyometric training and have shown that it improves power output and increases

explosiveness by training the muscles to do more work in a shorter amount of time.[9] Plyometric is a rapid pre-stretching of a muscle during an eccentricaction, followed immediately by a concentric action of same muscle and connectivetissue.[10] It is a formof exercise which links strength with speed of movement. There are basically twophases of muscle contraction during the running or jumping motion. Muscles gothrough a stretch phase, and then a contraction phase. These exercises are designed toshorten the cycle time between the two phases.[11] A rapid cycle time allows maximum energy transfer between stretch and contraction phases the stored elastic energy within muscle is used to produce more force than can be provided by a concentric action alone.[12,] [11]However, plyometric exercises for the upper body receive less attention. Certainly, the performance of many athletes would benefit from implementing upper body plyometric training into their routine.[12]

The push-up is a popular exercise among both young athletes and the general population. The advantages are its simplicity; no equipment or cost is involved, and it can be used for many different purposes. Shoulder, back and upper arm strengthening are among the main purposes of this exercise.In addition, it also trains neuromuscular coordination.[13]

Push up is a common strength training exercise performed in a prone position, lying horizontal and face down, raising and lowering the body using the arms. Various techniques of push-ups have been proposed, each claiming different advantages. Using different hand positions is one of the modifications that provide a significant difference in muscle activation. Freeman et al reported the benefit of more shoulder muscle activation with the dynamic push-up (push-up with the hands on a wobbly surface). However, despite the many advantages of this exercise, it may also cause some adverse outcomes, such as neck pain, back pain and palm and wrist pain.[13] Because throwing places so much stress on the upper extremity, the athlete must have adequate strength, stability, and mobility in order to return to activity after injury. If the athlete returns to activity too soon, re-injury may occur rather easily.[14]

A closed-kinetic chain activity is defined as an activity in which the terminal joint meets

considerable external resistance which prohibits or restrains free motion; whereas, an open-kinetic chain activity is defined as an activity in which the terminal joint is

free.[14, 15] However, an increase in the use of closed-kinetic chain activities in clinical rehabilitation has occurred to help return the athlete to their sport. Closed-kinetic chain activities may help improve dynamic stability through joint approximation and cocontraction. Compression from closed-kinetic chain activity also stimulates mechanoreceptors and helps improve proprioception. These improvements may be

important when determining if the patient is ready to return to activity. [14]

There are very few articles that provide information about effectiveness of plyometrics alone, because in most of the studies plyometrics are used in combination with some other training method. There are very few studies on comparison of dynamic push-up training and plyometric push-up training on upper body performance test.

Aim and objective

To compare the effect of dynamic push-up training and plyometric push-up training on the performance of upper body.

Hypothesis

Plyometric push-up is more effective than dynamic push-up for improvement in upper body performance.

Statement of question

Does 6 week of plyometric push-up training is more beneficial than dynamic push-up training to improve the performance of upper body among the professional athlete?

Operational definitions

Plyometric push-up

Plyometrics are high intensity and high velocity exercises in which a rapid eccentric muscle contraction is followed by a rapid concentric contraction producing a rapid movement.

Dynamic push-up

It is an exercise performed in prone position, lying horizontal and face down, raising and lowering the body using the arms.

Performance

Performance may be defined as an ability to complete a specific mental or physical task in a particular way in predefined conditions.

Methodology

Sample

Thirty six healthy professional male Cricket players participated in this study. The subjects were randomly assigned to the dynamic push-up group (group A) and the plyometric push-up group (group B).

Study design

Comparison study

Inclusion criteria

1. Normal healthy professional male athletes were included in this study. 2. No history of upper-extremity trauma or injury

Exclusion criteria

1. History of upper body and spine injuries

2. Participants involved in any type of neuromuscular training.

Instrumentation and outcome measures

The Step

A 10.2-cm Step was used, made-up of wood and has a rubber coated upper surface.

Medicine - Ball

3 Kg medicine ball was made - up of rubber by HRS company.

Stop Watch

The stop watch was used for time measurement. It is made by RACER Company.

Measuring Tape

The measuring tape was used for distance measurement.

Protocol

On the basis of inclusion and exclusion criteria all Subjects were selected in this study. The subjects were randomly assigned in two groups that is Group A, dynamic push-up group and Group B, plyometric push-up. Both groups were participated in the study three days in a week for six weeks and collect the data prior to training program and after the end of training program. One arm hop test and Medicine ball put test were used to measure the improvement in performance. Adequate rest was provided between training programs in order to minimize the effect of fatigue. Progressions were made in each training group to challenge the adaptation in neuromuscular system.

Procedure

All subjects were informed about the purpose of the study and proper instructions were given about the procedure. Signed consent forms were collected from all subjects, prior to participation. The pretest and post test measurement were taken to measure the improvement in performance of upper body during six weeks training. 15 minute warmup exercises were performed before each training session. Subjects were completed 18 training sessions, at a frequency of 3 sessions per week and with an interval of at least 48 hours between sessions. The Dynamic Push – Up (DPU) and Plyometric Push - Up (PPU) training programs were matched for repetitions, sets, progression, and rest intervals between sets (Table 3.1). Instructions included safety issues and subjects were advised to use an exercise mat for all training sessions. Most subjects trained in groups of 3–6 at

"Eklavya Stadium, Agra, Uttar Pradesh on a grass playing field.

One Arm Hop Test

Prior to the test all subjects were given proper instruction and visual demonstration of one arm hop test. After instruction, subjects practiced the one-arm hop test for each upper extremity by assuming a one arm push-up position with his back flat, his feet and shoulders apart, and his weight-bearing upper extremity positioned perpendicular to the floor (Fig. 3.1) A 10.2-cm step was placed immediately lateral to the subject‟s test hand. The step has a rubber coated upper surface and the test was performed on ground. The subject used the weight-bearing arm to hop onto the step and landed on the rubber portion of the step with the entire hand and the return his hand to the start position to complete 1 repetition (Fig.3.1 and 3.2). Subject repeats those movement 5 times as quickly as possible. Time was measure with standard stopwatch when the subject‟s hand left the floor on the first hop and stopped when the hand landed back onto the floor after the fifth hop. All subjects were repeated the procedure three times with time interval of 5 minutes and the mean value of three trials was used for the data collection. If the subject performed the test with improper technique, he rested for 1 minute, and then performed another practice test. An acceptable test was defined as a test in which the subject fully hopped onto the rubber portion of the step, did not use the other hand, did not touch down with a knee, and kept his back flat and his feet in the same position. After a 1-minute rest, the same maneuver was then performed with the contra lateral upper extremity. Some authors reported that one arm hop test is a reliable upper extremity performance test.[38]

Medicine Ball - Put Test

The medicine ball put was performed using a medicine ball of three kilogram from a sitting position. Each subject was seated on an adjustable bench with his back oriented vertically against a back support, thighs horizontal, knees flexed at 90^0, and ankles fixed behind swivel pads at the base of the bench (Figure 3.3 and 3.4). Subjects were strapped to the bench in order to minimize trunk movements during the test. Subjects were instructed to hold the 3 Kg medicine ball (73 cm in diameter) in their laps with both hands, bring the ball up quickly to touch their chest at about nipple level, and then explosively perform a chest-type pass, pushing the ball outward and upward at an angle approximately 30^0 above horizontal. Distance was measured from the base of the bench to the closest edge of the medicine ball imprint. The

farthest put was marked on the floor, to be used as a target distance. To account for slight variation between each put, the mean of 3 trials was used as the measure. A visual demonstration and trial were given before the actual test.

Reliability of medicine ball put test has been established by Vossen J. F. et al[5] in their stdy as R=.97

Figure 3.1: Anterior view of subject positioned for the one-arm hop test.

Figure 3.2: Side view of subject positioned for the one-arm hop test.



Figure 3.3: Subject performing the medicine ball put test starting position.

Figure 3.4: Subject performing the medicine ball put test releasing position.

Dynamic Push-Up

In the starting position the knees and toes were in the contact with the ground. The hands were positioned shoulder width apart over the ground and remain straight, supporting the body weight (Figure 3.5). From this position, the subject lowered his body until his chest almost touched the ground (Figure 3.6). Without pausing, the subjects straightened their arm and comeback in the starting position, by pushing the trunk upwards. During the exercise the knees and toes were remain in the contact with the ground. Subjects performed the push- ups approximately in 4 second (2 sec. down and 2 sec. up). Exercise protocol for dynamic push-up group is given in table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Time sequence and training program used by both the dynamic push-up and the plyometric pushup groups.

Week	Sets × repetitions
1	3 x10
2	3 x10
3	3 x11
4	3 x12
5	4 x10
6	4 x11

Plyometric Push-Up

Plyometric push-ups were performed with the kneeling position where the knees and feet remaining in contact with the floor .Subjects started with their trunk vertical and their arms relaxed and hanging at their sides (Figure 3.7). From this position they allowed themselves to fall forward, extending their arms forward with slight elbow flexion, in preparation for contact with the ground (Figure 3.8). At contact, the subject gradually absorbed the force of the fall by further flexing the elbows and gradually stopped the movement with the chest nearly touching the floor (Figure 3.9). Immediately after stopping the downward motion, the subject reversed the action by rapidly extending his arms and propelling his trunk back to the starting position (Figure 3.10). and the sets of repetition of exercises are given in (Table 3.1).

Figure 3.5:DynamicPush-up: Up position

Figure 3.6: Dynamic Push-up: Down position

Figure 3.7:Plyometric push-up: Starting position

Figure 3.9: Plyometric push-up: bottom position of push-up

Figure 3.10: Plyometric push up: extend arms position

Results:

Sample comprised of 18 of subjects recruited in each group. In the group A the mean and standard deviation of age, height and weight and in the group B, the mean and standard deviation of age, height and weight was calculated. (Table 5.1).

Table 5.1: Mean and SD of Age, Weight and Height for the subjects of group A and group B

Demographic data	GROUP A	GROUP B
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD
Age	18.34 ± 0.62	18.59 ± 0.95
Height	170.17 ± 11.30	167.80 ± 8.88
Weight	4.10 ± 55.38	56.97 ± 6.40

Data was analyzed using paired sample t-test within Group A between Pre & post one arm hop test of right side (p=0.033), left side (p=0.003) both showed significant difference, the medicine ball put test also showed significance difference when compared pre &post test. [Table 5.2]

Table5.2: Paired sample t-test within group A

VARIABLES	t- value	p – value
PRERTOAHT-PORTOAHT	2.319	0.033
PRELTOAHT-POLTOAHT	3.415	0.003
PREMBPT-POMBPT	6.616	0.0001

Similarly within Group B between Pre & post one arm hop test of right side (p=0.004), left side (p=0.011) both showed significant difference, the medicine ball put test also showed significance difference when compared pre &post test [Table 5.3]

Table5.3: Paired sample t-test within group B

VARIABLES	t- value	p – value
PRERTOAHT-PORTOAHT	3.297	0.004
PRELTOAHT-POLTOAHT	2.858	0.011
PREMBPT-POMBPT	4.621	0.0001

Paired sample t test was used to compare the data between the groups of one arm hop test in right side of pre test (p= 0.769), post test (p=0.295) and in left side of pre test (p=0.488), post test (p= 0.242) showed no significance differences. [Table 5.3]

Similarly in medicine ball put test of pre test (p=0.174) and post test (p=0.168) also showed non significance.

Table 5.4: Independent sample t-test between group A and group B

VARIABLES	t- value	p- value
PRERTOAHT	0.286	0.77
POSRTAOAHT	1.169	0.137
PRELTAOAHT	0.844	0.919
POSLTA –OAHT	1.512	0.934
PREMBPT	1.505	0.306
POSMBPT	1.484	0.966

Graphical representation of compared Pre-intervention and Post-intervention data for one arm hop test and medicine ball put test has shown significant differences within the group and non significant difference between the groups.

Figure 5.1: Comparison of Pre-intervention and Post-intervention data for right and left one arm test.



Figure 5.2:Comparison of Pre-intervention and Post-intervention data for medicine ball put test.



Discussion:

In this study, we investigated the comparative effect of dynamic push-up training and plyometric push-up training on the performance of upper body. Subjects were devided in to two groups: Group A and Group B. Group A was given with dynamic pushup training. Group B was given plyometric push – up training only. The training was given six week. The performance was measured by one arm hop test for each extremity and medicine ball put test.

The result of the study showed a positive relationship between dynamic push-up training and both outcome measures i.e. One arm hop test and Medicine ball put test within the group. The similar significant changes for OAHT and MBPT were also demonstrated by Plyometric push-up training, when the results were compared within the group.

As the result suggests that the plyometric training is beneficial to improve performance is attributed to important factors that contribute to force production and rate of force development in plyometric push-up training program. As the muscle is rapidly stretched and then undergoes a powerful concentric action, additional force is derived from the storage of elastic energy and facilitation of the muscle contraction due to stretch reflex.[39] The increased force production due to stretch reflex is directly proportional to rate of stretch rather than the amount of stretch applied to the muscle. It has been reported in the previous studies that muscle length change is restrained due to an increase in the level of activity during the muscle tendon complex stretch phase, increasing the change of the length of tendons in relation to the length of the muscle tendon complex. This mechanism has been shown as one in which muscles can exert great

force during movement by enabling the tendons to store and reuse much of their elastic energy.[40]

The training principle of specificity is an important consideration when designing resistance training programs. It is well known that different resistance training programs elicit different neuromuscular adaptations that are specific to the type of stimuli applied to the neuromuscular system in terms of muscle action type, movement pattern,

magnitude and rate of force production, velocity of movement, and range of movement.[41]

In this study training was performed using free body weight rather than speed-controlled Isokinetic apparatuses, so that velocity of each lift may vary with each repetition performed as the weight of athlete's own body was maximally accelerated during upward movement phase of plyometric push-up exercise.

The findings of significant improvement in the plyometric push-up group may be credited to a greater workload experienced in the Plyometric push-up program. This greater workload is attributable to the momentum of the falling trunk, which contributes to the resistance provided by the individual‟s body weight and must be overcome by the upper extremities during the plyometric push-up. Because the kinetic energy the participant must overcome is a function of mass and velocity, the greater velocity of the falling trunk results in greater work to decelerate and then accelerate the body during the plyometric push-up.[5] As per SAID principle imposed demand leads to adaptation against to training stimulus, thereby improvement in performance. A finding of this study is in agreement with observations of a study, [5] in which authors studied plyometric and isotonic push-ups added to a weight training program.They used the medicine ball put as their test, and found the plyometric group demonstrated superior gains. However, the combined weight training program makes it difficult to isolate the contributions of plyometric push-up and isotonic push-up training to upper-body power.

In this study the dynamic push-up group has demonstrated an increase in performance is result of increase in power and strength. It has been reported in several studies that isotonic exercise programs are suitable to improve muscular endurance. During a resistance training program, training stimuli trigger certain neuromuscular adaptations, which can then manifest themselves in increased strength and power. A study suggested that the principal stimuli that elicit high-velocity-specific training adaptations are (a) the motor command and characteristic motor unit activation pattern associated with the intention to move explosively and (b) the high rate of force development of ensuing muscle actions.[41]

Unlike hypothesized, comparison of results between the groups showed statistically insignificant improvement. Results of this study support the findings of Heiderscheit‟s work[42] in which they had concluded that neither plyometric training nor isokinetic training is more effective over each other for increasing power output and functional throwing performance. In comparing plyometric push-up training and dynamic push-up training, the main difference is that of application of load i.e. athlete‟s own body weight. Both training programs involve stretch shortening cycle but group B performing plyometric push-up exercise, involves relatively more rapid stretch shortening cycle and faster velocity of body movement during push-ups.

Group A was instructed to complete the repetitions using relatively slow and controlled movements. This slow movement pattern used in dynamic push-up training program is unable to elicit stretch reflex, hence not able to get the benefit of stretch shortening cycle. Unlike group A, the plyometric group was expected to perform the push-ups in explosive and relatively in fast manner to get improvement in performance, over group A, because of advantages gained through stretch shortening cycle. But results of this study indicate no significant changes between groups. One probable reason behind such result may be long coupling phase (transition from eccentric to

concentric contractions). The benefits of prestretching a muscle are lost if the movement continues over a longer time period characterized by long stretching phase and loss of elastic energy. Another reason for such the result may be the use of trained athletic population, because the training stimulus used in this study may not able to impose a greater demand to cause further adaptations.

Conclusion and Clinical Significance

Conclusion:

It is concluded from this study that Dynamic Push-Up Training and Plyometric Push-Up Training, both are effective for improvement of upper body performance but neither regimens was superior over each other.

Clinical Significance

As the result suggests both dynamic push-up and plyometric push-up programs are equally effective for improvement in performance, athletes and coaches can use these training with proper care and precaution to get significant improvement in performance.

References:

1. WilkK. E.,Current Concepts in the Rehabilitation of the Athletic Shoulder. *J.Orthop Sports PhysTher,* 1993 July ; I8(1):365-378
2. Chmielewski T. L, Myer G D, Kauffman D. Plyometric Exercise in the Rehabilitation of Athletes: Physiological Responses and Clinical Application. *J Orthop Sports PhysTher*, 2006 May; 36 (5): 308-319.
3. Sankey S. P., Effects of two plyometric training programmes of different Intensity on vertical jump performance in High school athletes. *Serb J Sports Sci,*2008; 2(4): 123-130
4. Bobbert M. F., Drop jumping. I. The influence of jumping technique on the biomechanics of jumping. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise,* 1987 March; 19(4): 332-338.
5. Vossen J.F, Comparison of Dynamic Push-Up Training and Plyometric PushUp Training on Upper-Body Power and Strength. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 2000;14 (3): 248 253
6. Swanik Kathleen A.,The effects of shoulder plyometric training on proprioception and selected muscle performance characteristics . *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*, 2002 November; 11(6):579-585
7. Kotzamanidis C, Effect of plyometric training on running Performance and vertical jumping in Prepubertal boys**.** *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 2006;20(2): 441-445
8. Timm K.E .Clinical Applications of Eccentric ExerciseiIsokinetics and Plyometrics. *Hong Kong Physiother. J*. 1992; 13: 1-4
9. Rahimi1 R, Behpur N. The Effects of Plyometric, Weight and PlyometricWeight Training On Anaerobic Power and Muscular Strength. *Physical Education and Sport,* 2005; 3 (1): 81-91.
10. Miller M.G. The Effects of A 6-Week Plyometric Training Program on Agility. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 2006; (5): 459-465
11. Shaji J. Comparative Analysis of Plyometric Training Program and Dynamic Stretching on Vertical Jump and Agility in Male Collegiate Basketball Player. *Al Ame en J Med Sci,*2 00 9; 2 (1) :3 6 -4 6
12. Warpeha J. M. Upper Body Plyometrics. *NSCA's Performance Training Journal.* 2007;6(5): 6-8
13. B .Chuckpaiwong, T .H. Palmar pressure distribution during push-up exercise. *Singapore Med J*. 2009; 50 (7): 702
14. Roush James. R. Reference Values for the Closed Kinetic Chain Upper Extremity Stability Test (CKCUEST) for Collegiate Baseball Players. *North American Journal Of Sports Physical Therapy,* 2007 August; 2(3):159-163
15. Heiderscheit B. C. Biomechanical and Physiologic Basis of Closed Kinetic Chain Exercises in the Upper Extremities. *Orthopaedic Physical Therapy Clinics of*

North America.2000; June 9 (2): 1059-1516
16. Pontillo M., Shoulder Musculature Activity and Stabilization During Upper Extremity Weight-bearing Activities. *North American Journal of sports physical therapy* , 2007 May 2(2): 90-96
17. Kritz. M. Screening the Upper- Body Push and Pull Patterns Using Body Weight Exercises.*Strength and Conditioning Association Journal* , 2010; June 32(2)72-82
18. Levangie P.K, Norkin C.C. Joint Structure and function: A Comprehensive Analysis. 4th ed. P:98
19. Bunton E. E. The Role of Limb Torque, Muscle Action and Proprioception during Closed Kinetic Chain Rehabilitation of the Lower Extremity. *Journal of Athletic Training,* 1993; 28(1) :10-20
20. UhlT.L,Shoulder Musculature Activation during Upper Extremity Weight-Bearing Exercise. *J Orthop Sports PhysTher* • 2003;March 33(3):109-117
21. Kovaleski J.E. Reliability and Effects of Arm Dominance on Upper Extremity Isokinetic Force, Work, and Power Using the Closed Chain Rider System. *Journal of Athletic Training* 1999;34(4):358-361
22. B.Jason, Scapular-stabilization exercises: early-intervention prescription. *Athletic Therapy Today***,** 2006; Sept.11(5) : 15-18
23. Tucker W.S. Electromyography of 3 Scapular Muscles: A Comparative Analysis of the Cuff Link Device and a Standard Push-Up .*Journal of Athletic Training* 2008; 43(5): 464–469.
24. Kutz, M.R.Theoretical and Practical Issues for Plyometric Training. *National Strength and Conditioning Association Performance Training Journal.*2003; 2 (2) :10-12
25. RimmerE.andSleivert G. Effects of a Plyometrics Intervention Program on Sprint Performance. Journal of*Strength and Conditioning research,2000;14(3):295-301*
26. Barnes M. Introduction to Plyometric.*National Strength and Conditioning Association Performance Training Journal.* 2003; 2(2):13-20
27. Zachazewski J. E., Magee D. J. Athletic Injuries and Rehabilitation. WB.Saunders, Londan. p:220
28. Pezzullo D.J. Functional Plyometric Exercises for the Throwing Athlete. *Journal of athletic training.* 1995; 30 (1) 22-26.
29. Wilk K E, Voight M L. Stretch-Shortening Drills for the Upper Extremities: Theory and Clinical Application. . *J Orthop Sports PhysThe,* 1993 May; 17 (5): 225-239.
30. Tipett S. R. Functional progressions for sport rehabilitation. Human Kinetics p: 34-36
31. Mc Neely Ed. Introduction to Plyometrics: Converting Strength to Power. National Strength and Conditioning Association‟s Training Journal, 2007; 6 (5): 19-22
32. LaStayo P. C.Eccentric Muscle Contractions: Their Contribution to Injury, Prevention, Rehabilitation, and Sport. *J Orthop Sports PhysTher*, 2003 Oct; 33 (10): 557-571
33. Kawakami Y. In vivo muscle fiber behavior during counter – movement exercise in humans reveals a significant role for tendon elasticity. *Journal of physiology*, 2002;540 (2) 635-646
34. Newton R.U. Developing explosive muscular power: implications for a mixed methods training. *Strength and Condition;*1994 Oct.; 20-31
35. Marković G. et al. Effects of sprint and plyometric training on morphological characteristics in physically active men**.** *Kinesiology* (2005)*;*39:371:32
36. Behm D. G. Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology position paper: resistance training in children and Adolescents**.** *Appl. Physiol. Nutr. Metab*. (2008) 33: 547–561
37. Tan B. Manipulation resistance training program variables to optimize maximum strength in men: A review. *Journal of strength and conditioning research*,1999,13(3), 289-304
38. Falsone S. A.One-Arm Hop Test: Reliability and Effects of Arm Dominance.

Journal of Orthopaedic& Sports Physical Therapy, 2002 March; 32 (3) 98-103

39. Newton R.U. and McEvoy K.P. Baseball Throwing Velocity: A Comparison of Medicine Ball Training and Weight Training. *Jouranal of Strength and Conditining Association research,* 1994, 8 (3), 198-203
40. Tauchi K, Kubo Yasuyuki. A Mechanism for Power Output of the Upper Limbs during Overhead Throw with Strech – Shortening Cycle. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 2005; 3, 286-295
41. Kawamori N. Velocity Specificity of Resistance Training: Actual Movement Velocity Versus Intention to Move Explosively. *National Strength and Conditioning Association* 2006 April 28, (2), 86–91
42. Heiderscheit B. C.The Effects of Isokinetic Vs. Plyometric Training - on the Shoulder Internal Rotators.*Journal of Orthopedic S* 1996 February; 23(2) 125-13.