

VRIJE BRUSSEL

The interaction of acute physical fatigue with three traditional functional performance tests and the reactive balance test

VERSCHUEREN JO¹, TASSIGNON BRUNO¹, VERHAGEN EVERT², MEEUSEN ROMAIN¹

1 Faculty of Physical Education and Physiotherapy, Human Physiology Research Group, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium. 2 Amsterdam Collaboration on Health and Safety in Sports, Amsterdam UMC, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Public and Occupational Health, Amsterdam Movement Sciences, The Netherlands.

Background

Physical fatigue is known to decrease an athlete's functional test performance (FPT), but less is known about the impact on the injury risk profile. Furthermore, adaptability and neurocognitive performance tests have been put forward as relevant concepts within injury prevention, but to date it is not known if acute physical fatigue affects functional and neurocognitive performance tests.

✓ Assess the impact of acute physical fatigue (APF) on lower extremity classic functional performance tests and the reactive balance test.

Methods

We included 20 participants in randomized counterbalanced cross-over design. APF was induced by a 30 second modified Wingate protocol.

Results	FATIGUE		CONTROL	
	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
CMJ (cm)	36.63 ± 1.26	35.32 ± 1.03	36.34 ± 1.35	35.06 ± 1.35
SLH (cm)	154.13 ± 4.56	145.70 ± 4.63*^	151.43 ± 5.13	152.00 ± 5.31
YBT – ANT (cm)	57.99 ± 1.16	58.60 ± 0.99	58.46 ± 1.25	60.33 ± 1.06
YBT – PL (cm)	85.13 ± 2.17	87.39 ± 2.28	86.81 ± 2.36	89.16 ± 2.00
YBT – PM (cm)	90.95 ± 2.03	93.36 ± 1.85	91.33 ± 2.17	93.78 ± 1.86
RBT – VMRT (ms)	767.57 ± 54.81	762.82 ± 55.82	798.05 ± 62.57	758.50 ± 57.66
RBT – ACC (%)	87.56 ± 2.01	81.22 ± 2.73*^	90.22 ± 1.17	89.89 ± 1.38

^{*} Significant difference between FATIGUE and CONTROL (P < 0.05).

^ Significant difference with preceeding outcome within intervention (P < 0.05)











