

BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF SMALL-SIDED GAMES AS A CONCLUSIVE PART OF WARM-UP ROUTINES IN YOUNG ELITE HANDBALL PLAYERS

ANTONIO DELLO IACONO,^{1,2} ANDREW D. VIGOTSKY,³ LIOR LAVER,^{4,5} AND ISRAEL HALPERIN⁶

¹Department of Health and Life Sciences, University of the West of Scotland, Hamilton, Scotland, United Kingdom; ²Sport Science Department, Maccabi Tel Aviv FC, Tel Aviv, Israel; ³Department of Biomedical Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois; ⁴Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel; ⁵Department of Trauma and Orthopaedics, University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire, Coventry, United Kingdom; and ⁶School of Human Kinetics and Recreation, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada

ABSTRACT

Iacono, AD, Vigotsky, AD, Laver, L, and Halperin, I. Beneficial effects of small-sided games as a conclusive part of warm-up routines in young elite handball players. *J Strength Cond Res* XX(X): 000–000, 2019—The aim of this study was to compare the effects of small-sided games (SSGs) and traditional warm-up strategies on the mechanical, physiological, and perceptual responses of handball players. Using a randomized and counterbalanced design, 12 elite male handball players completed a general 8-minute warm-up, which was concluded with an 8-minute section of either specific handball shooting drills or 3 × 2 minutes of 3 vs. 3 SSG with a passive recovery of 1 minute between bouts. Countermovement jumps (CMJs) and plyometric press-ups (PPs) were assessed before and immediately after the warm-up regimens using a force plate. Heart rate (HR) was assessed during the warm-up regimens, and rating of perceived exertion (RPE) was assessed after the regimens. Meaningful differences favoring SSG were observed in most of the kinetic variables in the CMJs and PPs ($|Hedges g| = 0.26–1.42$). Conversely, no meaningful differences were found between warm-up regimens in RPE or HR responses (z -scores = 0.45 and 1.88, respectively). These results indicate that concluding warm-ups with SSGs offer greater benefits compared with a more traditional warm-up routine, despite similar HR and RPE responses even when matched for duration among elite-level handball players.

KEY WORDS assessment, competition, neuromuscular, team sport, training

INTRODUCTION

Warm-up routines are widely implemented before athletic competition as means to optimize performance. A recent meta-analysis reported that 79% of the analyzed studies observed performance-enhancing effects after various warm-up protocols (12). The proposed mechanisms accounting for the benefits of warm-ups are physiological, mechanical, and psychological in nature (23). These mechanisms have been attributed to temperature-related and non-temperature-related processes, which facilitate and potentiate the effects of the warm-up (3). The temperature-related mechanisms include decreases in muscle stiffness, increases in nerve conduction rate, anaerobic energy provision, and altered force-velocity relationships. The non-temperature-related mechanisms include increases in oxygen delivery, postactivation potentiation (PAP) (3,23), and enhanced oxygen kinetics. Although the underpinning mechanisms and practical benefits of warm-ups are generally agreed upon, the implementation strategies are still debated (23). In team sports, warm-ups may last up to 40 minutes (27) and traditionally include sequences of moderate intensity to high intensity and generic to specific activities (23). However, evidence suggests that shorter-duration (10–15 minutes) activities, completed at 40–70% of maximal rate of oxygen consumption, may be sufficient to improve short-, intermediate-, and long-term performance (4). Reviewing the warm-up literature, McGowan et al. (23) concluded that prematch warm-up strategies for team sports that aim to optimize subsequent performances should use sport-specific activities, while keeping the total effective duration of less than 16 minutes. As such, shortening the duration of the warm-up and making it more sport-specific may further improve its benefits, both of which can be achieved by implementing small-sided games (SSGs) as a warm-up strategy.

Small-sided game can be defined as team-sport games, performed in small playing areas with a reduced number of players, variable rules, and technical constraints (5,8,17).

Address correspondence to Antonio Dello Iacono, antdelloiacono@virgilio.it.

00(00)/1–8

Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research
© 2019 National Strength and Conditioning Association

These games are designed to simulate both the technical/tactical and physical/physiological demands of a particular discipline (15). By replicating real game scenarios, SSG targets not only physiological aspects of training, but also forces players to make decisions under pressure and in constrained conditions. In view of this, SSG may offer additional benefits if implemented as a warm-up strategy in comparison with traditional warm-up activities. Most investigations of SSG examined the long-term training effects, with only 2 studies examining SSG as a warm-up regimen reporting mixed results.

Gabbett et al. (14) investigated the effects of open-skill activities as a warm-up strategy for basketball players and observed no differences in comparison with a traditional warm-up, as measured by reactive agility, vertical jump, and sprint performance. The open-skill activities included a variety of technical high-intensity actions performed individually, which progressed into 4 vs. 4 SSG. Conversely, Zois et al. (34) found that using 3 vs. 3 SSG improved counter-movement jump (CMJ), repeated sprint, reactive agility, and 40-m sprint performance among soccer players compared with a traditional warm-up. These conflicting effects could stem from the different durations of the warm-up periods. While the overall duration of the warm-up in Gabbett's study was 22 minutes, with the SSG part lasting 15 minutes, the warm-up duration in Zois's study lasted approximately 12 minutes in total, with only 6 minutes dedicated for the SSG. The long duration of high-intensity warm-ups in Gabbett's study may have compromised the enhancement of subsequent performance (14).

Considering the potential SSGs have as a warm-up strategy and the dearth of studies on this topic, there is a need to further explore and compare the inclusion of SSG in warm-up regimens to traditional warm-ups. Accordingly, the aim of this study was to compare the acute effects of SSG-based warm-up and a traditional warm-up on upper-body and lower-body athletic performances and the associated mechanical, physiological, and perceptual outcomes in elite handball players.

METHODS

Experimental Approach to the Problem

A randomized, cross-over study design was used, in which mechanical, physiological, and perceptual responses (11) were monitored before and immediately after either traditional or SSG-based warm-up protocols. Athletes completed 2 experimental trials 5 days apart in a random order. The first half of the warm-up protocol was similar in both conditions and was composed of standardized handball pre-match warm-ups lasting roughly 8 minutes. Subsequently, athletes completed a baseline CMJ and plyometric press-up (PP) assessment, followed by either handball-specific shooting drills or 3 vs. 3 handball SSG for 8 minutes. The same CMJ and PP tests were then repeated 7 minutes after the completion of the warm-up regimens (4), during which

the athletes stood or walked. The order in which the tests were completed was counterbalanced for each participant and the order of conditions was determined by block randomization (28) using an online randomization tool. Two weeks before the study, participants performed 2 familiarization sessions 5 days apart. On these occasions, the exact experimental sequences, including baseline assessment, either traditional or handball-specific SSG-based warm-up protocols, and post warm-up assessment were followed.

Subjects

A convenience sample of 12 elite male handball players belonging to a U-21 national handball team (age 19.3 ± 0.4 years; height 186.5 ± 8.4 cm; and body mass 86.8 ± 8.4 kg) participated in the study. All the measures are reported as mean $\pm SD$. The participants had 8.2 ± 1.5 years of training experience, and practiced 8 times per week for a total of 11.5 ± 1.1 hours of weekly handball activities. Athletes who suffered from an upper-limb or lower-limb injury in the past 6 months in any were excluded. This study was conducted in accordance with the recommendations of the Declaration of Helsinki after being approved by the ethical committee for human research of the Academic College at Wingate, Israel. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant after receiving an explanation of the purpose, benefits, and potential risks of the study.

Procedures

Five days before the first experimental trial, measurements of height and body mass (SECA model 284; 22089, Hamburg, Germany) were taken. On the same day, the Yo-Yo intermittent recovery test level 1 (YYIRTL1) (29) was performed to determine the maximum heart rate (HRmax) values, which were used for the calculation of exercise intensity during the 2 experimental warm-up sessions. All testing sessions were performed on a regular indoor court and completed at the same time of the day (11:00 AM–13:00 PM) and in similar ambient conditions of temperature ($20.5 \pm 0.5^\circ$ C) and relative humidity ($60 \pm 4.5\%$). To prevent unnecessary fatigue, players and coaches were instructed to avoid intense training 24 hours before each testing day. In addition, participants were also asked to avoid eating 2 hours before each testing sessions.

Lower-Body Mechanical Assessment. Lower-body mechanical capabilities were assessed by a CMJ test according to the protocol previously described by Dello Iacono et al. (9). Each subject performed a bilateral CMJ on a force plate (Kistler Biomechanics, Winterthur, Switzerland) starting from a stationary position with their hands on the waist and knees fully extended, squatting down to $\sim 90^\circ$ of knee flexion before starting an explosive, upward motion, with the intent to jump as high as possible. Knowledge of jump performance was provided to the athletes after each jump, and verbal encouragement was provided before each trial by 2 research assistants, who were blinded to which group each subject was assigned. Subjects performed 3 maximal CMJ with 30–45 seconds' rest between each jump to avoid fatigue.

TABLE 1. Performance and exertional outcomes between SSG and control warm-ups.*†

Outcome	Effect	95% CI	Hedges <i>g</i>	z-score	<i>p</i>
Jump height (cm)	2.67	1.99–3.33	1.23		<0.001
Eccentric displacement (cm)	−2.19	−3.45 to −0.74	−0.26		0.010
CMJ $F_{\text{peak-ecc}}$ (N·kg ^{−1})	3.05	2.12–3.85	1.30		<0.001
CMJ $F_{\text{peak-con}}$ (N·kg ^{−1})	2.45	2.01–2.89	1.42		<0.001
CMJ $P_{\text{peak-con}}$ (W·kg ^{−1})	3.02	2.29–3.71	1.42		<0.001
PP $F_{\text{peak-ecc}}$ (N·kg ^{−1})	1.52	1.20–1.85	1.21		<0.001
PP $F_{\text{peak-con}}$ (N·kg ^{−1})	1.73	1.18–2.28	1.20		<0.001
PP $P_{\text{peak-con}}$ (W·kg ^{−1})	2.06	1.28–2.86	1.06		<0.001
RPE (AU)	0.08	−0.25 to 0.42		0.45	0.997
Mean HR (%)	1.42	0.08–2.58		1.88	0.077

*SSG = small-sided game; CI = confidence interval; CMJ = countermovement jump; PP = plyometric press-up; RPE = rating of perceived exertion; HR = heart rate.

†Effect represents the estimate of the effect of performing an SSG warm-up relative to a control warm-up (i.e., effect = SSG – Control).

The vertical ground reaction force signal (F_z) was acquired from the Kistler amplifier to a 12-bit A/D converter at 1,000 Hz sampling rate and stored on a PC (Dell Inspiron 9100; Dell, London, United Kingdom). Data were filtered through a fourth-order, low-pass Butterworth digital filter, with a cutoff frequency of 100 Hz. The F_z signal was later analyzed according to the methods described by Caserotti et al. (6), and the following parameters were calculated: peak eccentric force ($F_{\text{peak-ecc}}$), peak concentric force ($F_{\text{peak-con}}$), peak concentric power ($P_{\text{peak-con}}$), jump height (JH), and displacement of the body center of mass during the eccentric (S_{ecc}) phase. Specifically, jump power was calculated as the instantaneous product between the F_z and the vertical velocity (v) of the center of mass; force and velocity in other planes were assumed to be negligible. The latter was obtained by time integration of the instantaneous acceleration:

$$v(t) = \int_0^T a_{\text{net}}(t) dt = \int_0^T [F_z(t)/m - g] dt,$$

where a_{net} is the vertical acceleration, F_z is the vertical force measured by the platform, m is the body mass of the subject, and g is the acceleration due to the gravity (9.81 m·s^{−2}). Center of mass position was plotted throughout the whole movement by time integration of the velocity signal. Finally, JH was measured from the value of vertical velocity at takeoff point (v_{takeoff}):

$$\text{jump height} = \frac{v_{\text{takeoff}}^2}{2g}$$

Upper-Body Mechanical Assessment. Upper-body mechanical capabilities were assessed by PP according to the protocol of

Johnston et al. (18). Players were asked to start in a press-up position with their hands on the force platform in a self-selected position and arms extended. On the experimenter's signal, the players lowered their body by flexing their elbows to a self-selected depth before extending the elbows as quickly as possible so that their hands left the platform. Subjects performed 2 self-chosen trials without data being recorded before completing 3 PP with 30–45 seconds of rest between them. The same procedural methods described above for the lower-body mechanical responses assessment were applied (9). All PP trials were analyzed for the eccentric and the concentric phases and the kinetic parameters selected for further analysis were: peak eccentric force ($F_{\text{peak-ecc}}$), peak concentric force ($F_{\text{peak-con}}$), and peak concentric power ($P_{\text{peak-con}}$).

Warm-up Protocols. Proceeding each experimental session, participants underwent an 8-minute standardized warm-up: 3 minutes of locomotor activities including jogging, running, and multidirectional changes of direction (COD); 3 minutes of dynamic stretching exercises for the upper and lower extremities; and 2 minutes of jumping drills and press-up exercises, accelerations, and short-sprint drills over a distance of 20 m. Shortly after an active recovery (~2 minutes), participants completed baseline assessment including the CMJ and PP (~3 minutes). Immediately after, the players completed either handball-specific shooting warm-up drills or SSG for additional 8 minutes. The handball-specific shooting warm-up was composed of:

- Short-distance (5 m) to long-distance (20 m) passes (both with 1 and 2 arms performed as overhead or side ones), completed in couples;
- Five free shots performed from the 9-m line with increasing intensity up to maximal shooting effort; and




Figure 1. Plot of the CMJ mechanical responses' changes following the traditional (CON) and SSG-based (SSG) warm-up protocols. CMJ = countermovement jump; SSG = small-sided game.

- Five jump shots performed from the players' own position and preceded by a run-in of about 5 m (32).

Finally, about 7 minutes after the shooting warm-up, the assessment procedures were repeated.

The SSG warm-up was composed of: regular small-sided handball matches and were organized in 3-a-side teams including goalkeepers (8–10,17). The SSG warm-up consisted of 3×2 -minute bouts with a passive recovery of 1 minute between bouts played on a regular handball court (40×20 m). Some playing rules were created to avoid game breaks, ensuring continuity and high-exercise intensity. For instance, standing and dribbling were not allowed, defense stops due to regular fouls were sanctioned with ball turnover, and the maximum time to complete an attack before losing ball possession was constrained to 20 seconds. In addition, several balls were placed around the sided games' area for immediate availability to avoid game pause. Finally, penalties

were considered to be a regular goal and no free shot was given. To avoid any bias due to the players' anthropometric, physiological, and positional role characteristics, the 4 teams were equally matched, including one wing player, one line player/pivot, and one back player (7).

Heart Rate Responses. Heart rate responses were monitored during both the traditional and the specific SSG-based warm-up to provide the mean HR percentage (%HRmean), which is more indicative of what occurs over the entire warm-up as compared to HRmax. Heart rate responses were recorded using a telemetry system (Hosand Technologies Srl, Verbania, Italy) at 5-second intervals throughout each SSG, and then filtered using a software-embedded proprietary algorithm (Hosand MC Software, Verbania, Italy). The %HRmean and the HRmax were those measured during and at the end of the YYIRTL1 test.




Figure 2. Plot of the PP mechanical responses' changes following the traditional (CON) and SSG-based (SSG) warm-up protocols. PP = plyometric press-up; SSG = small-sided game.

Rating of Perceived Effort. Players reported their rating of perceived exertion (RPE) using the category rating 10 (CR-10) scale modified by Foster et al. (11) at the end of the experimental session, using a standardized questionnaire. All players were familiarized with this method as it was used by the coaching staff as a load monitoring tool.

Statistical Analyses

To assess the effects of the warm-ups, all data were imported to R (version 3.4.3) for analyses (26). For data that consisted of pre- and post-testing (JH; S_{ecc} during the CMJ; $F_{peak-con}$ and $F_{peak-ecc}$ during the CMJ and PP; and $P_{peak-con}$ during the CMJ and PP), linear mixed-effects models were used (2). Using the effect of condition (i.e., the effect of SSG relative to control), Hedges g effect sizes were calculated to estimate a conservative standardized mean difference (16,21). Finally,

95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated for the condition effects.

Rating of perceived exertion and HR data were analyzed using permutation tests, which is a nonparametric testing paradigm that compares the observed effects to a simulated null distribution. By comparing the observed effects to the null distribution, a z -score and p -value could be calculated. Finally, 95% CIs were calculated around the observed effect.

To avoid dichotomous interpretations of the results, no *a priori* α -level was set. Rather than interpreting effects from a single test, or set of tests, the results were interpreted on a continuum using all statistical outcomes, in combination with theory and practical considerations (24). Due to the unconventional nature of these procedures in our field, a more thorough description of our analyses and R code can be found on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/327za/>).

RESULTS

Linear mixed-effects models revealed marked improvements in JH, S_{ecc} during the CMJ, $F_{peak-ecc}$ during the CMJ, $F_{peak-con}$ force during the CMJ, CMJ $P_{peak-con}$ PP $F_{peak-ecc}$ PP $F_{peak-con}$ and PP $P_{peak-con}$ relative to the control warm-up (Table 1 and Figures 1 and 2). Permutation tests did not reveal any remarkable differences between SSG and warm-up conditions in RPE or mean HR (Table 1).

DISCUSSION

The SSG warm-up led to superior outcomes for both upper-body and lower-body performance measures, even when considering that the duration, intensity, and perceptual responses of the 2 routines were similar. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to have examined mechanical responses and physiological mechanisms underlying changes in the assessed athletic performances of SSG warm-up.

The SSG-based warm-up enhanced CMJ height by 7.1% compared to the traditional warm-up routine and was associated with greater improvements in all the kinetic measures. Specifically, S_{ecc} , $F_{peak-ecc}$, $F_{peak-con}$, and $P_{peak-con}$ increased by 8.7, 13.8, 10, and 9.8% in the SSG compared to the traditional warm-up routine, respectively (Figure 1). These results are in line with some, but not all investigations. Although the results of the current study are in line with those reported by Zois et al. (34), which observed a similar 6% improvement in CMJ after the SSG warm-up, Gabbett et al. (14) did not observe an advantage of open-skill-based warm-up including SSG over a traditional warm-up routine on reactive agility, sprinting, COD, and jumping performances. This discrepancy could stem from dissimilar durations of the warm-up in these studies. Whereas the duration of the warm-up in this study and the study by Zois et al. (34) lasted 12–16 minutes, a duration that is in line with published recommendations, Gabbett et al. (14) implemented a 22-minute warm-up, which may have hindered subsequent

performance. That is, longer-duration warm-ups may lead to excessive muscular fatigue, thereby hindering physical performance.

The enhancement of the CMJ performance after the SSG-based warm-up may in part be explained by a PAP effect (30). The frequent “one-on-one” SSG-related playing situations involve dynamic actions such as accelerations, decelerations, COD, and jumps. These actions are ballistic in nature, and previous research has indicated that ballistic movements produce greater muscle activation and power output than nonballistic ones (20,25). As a consequence, they may have induced activation of high-threshold motor units, which have been proposed to underlie PAP (31). The improved jump ability observed after the SSG-based warm-up could stem from various biochemical and neuromuscular adaptations, such as an increase in the sensitivity of the actin-myosin myofilaments to Ca^{2+} , neural drive to the agonist muscles (1), improved intermuscular coordination (19), changes in the muscle-tendon mechanical-stiffness characteristics (13), and changes in single-fiber mechanics (1). Our results are also consistent with the observations of Wilson et al. (33); that is (1), multiple sets of the potentiating activities and (2) recovery intervals of 5–7 minutes between the conditioning activity and the subsequent performance induce large PAP effects. Therefore, we suggest that the short duration of the SSG-based warm-up protocol (8 minutes) organized in a multiple-set format (3×2 minutes) and the time scheduling relative to the functional performance (7 minutes) have likely influenced the magnitude of the effects on muscle mechanical enhancements. The lack of differences in the HR and RPE responses between the 2 warm-up regimens strengthens the possibility that increases in neural activation associated with the PAP effects accounted for the superior SSG warm-up performance.

The changes in the mechanical responses after the SSG-based warm-up suggest small modifications in jumping strategy. During the eccentric phase of the CMJ, athletes reduced the downward displacement while developing greater force and power outputs during both the downward and the subsequent upward actions (Figure 1). The underlying mechanisms leading to these effects may be related to modifications in the characteristics of the joints involved and muscles recruited. After the SSG-based warm-up, the lower-limb kinematics may have changed, resulting in increased joint velocities and improved joint coupling (19,30). Such modifications of the jump strategy and the required motor control are presumably responsible for the reduced downward displacement during the CMJ after the SSG-based warm-up. In addition, parallel changes of muscle-related characteristics such as increases in motor unit recruitment and discharge rates, changes in muscle architecture (e.g., pennation angles) (13,22), and muscle stiffness (1,31) may have contributed to the increase in strength and power outputs. However, because no direct neurophysiological measurements were collected in this study, the 2 assumptions

accounting for the improved mechanical outputs are speculative and should be explored by future, mechanistic research. In addition, the size of the effect was small and, as such, it is not clear whether the identified differences in jump strategy represent a meaningful and replicable effect.

The SSG-based warm-up led to greater improvements in all the mechanical measures in the PP in comparison to the traditional warm-up protocol. $F_{\text{peak-ecc}}$, $F_{\text{peak-com}}$, and $P_{\text{peak-com}}$ increased by 12.9, 13.3, and 22.8%, respectively, in the SSG warm-up relative to the traditional warm-up (Figure 2). To the best of our knowledge, no other study examined and compared the effects of SSG and traditional warm-ups on explosive upper-body exercises, making direct and contrasting comparisons impossible. It can be assumed that common handball-specific physical contact actions such as hitting, blocking, pushing, and holding occurring between players in the SSG warm-up, in addition to shooting and passing, could have generated a PAP effect on the PP task. This is especially the case when considering that such actions are completed against heavy resistance, as represented by the opponent’s mass, a condition that was absent from the traditional warm-up routine. Accordingly, the high similarity between the upper-body actions demanded during handball SSG and the assessed PP task, together with a proper mechanical overloading, may have produced PAP.

There is clear evidence of the chronic effects of contact SSG on upper-body neuromuscular performance in handball players. Iacono et al. (17) observed that SSG training created a cumulative training stimulus that produced improvements in upper-body strength, as measured by a 1 repetition maximum bench press test over a period of 8 weeks. However, the same authors (9) recently demonstrated that an SSG lasting 15 minutes led to acute impairments in upper-body mechanical performances during the following PP task. The performance decrements reported by Dello Iacono et al. (9) are likely due to the longer duration of the SSG in comparison to the warm-up protocol used in the current study (15 vs. 6 minutes). These results indicate that the presence of an adequate number of actions associated with physical contact during SSG determines ergogenic effects on upper-body musculature.

These findings may have immediate implications for the implementation of SSG formats into a warm-up routine. Besides the observed positive effects on the subsequent CMJ and PP performances, the opportunity to easily schedule this warm-up protocol, using sport-specific drills, in the imminence of the competitive activity may likely improve both players’ compliance and coaches’ acceptance. Seven minutes after the completion of the SSG-based warm-up, considerable improvements in performance were noted in both upper-body and lower-body functional tasks. These results are in line with the literature (33) reporting that the greatest effects in the temporal profile of PAP strategies are commonly elicited 5–9 minutes after the conditioning activity. Accordingly, coaches are advised to consider this guideline

for effectively scheduling SSG-based warm-up strategies before daily training and before a match is expected to begin. The advantages of using sport-specific drills, such as SSG as warm-up means, are several. First, SSG could be easily administered on the field without the need of weight rooms, training equipment, or individually designed protocols. Second, the similarities between the SSG-based warm-up and the competitive activities may increase the chances to achieve greater transfer effects and mechanical adaptations. Finally, besides the positive physiological changes and the methodological rationale supporting the use of SSG-based warm-up strategies, it is possible that psychological mechanisms, associated with the players' and coaches' compliance and motivation, may contribute to greater improvements in the subsequent performances.

There are a number of limitations in this study worth noting. First, due to logistical constraints, only 2 outcome measures were collected, both of which are indirectly related to handball performance. Future studies should also measure more sport-specific tests, such as agility tests and ball-throwing velocities. Second, the 7-minute delay between the end of the warm-up routines and the initiation of the testing procedures may have washed out some of the warm-up effects. Despite this limitation, this testing procedure has a higher degree of ecological validity because it mimics the common behaviors of team sport associated with 5–10 minutes' delay between the end of the warm-up and beginning of a game (23). Finally, we did not conduct a power analysis to determine the sample size. This is because the population from which well-trained handball players can be drawn, belonging to the same team and with a common training background, is limited. To overcome this problem, we conducted a within-subject design, and attempted to reduce learning curves by including familiarization sessions.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Coaches should consider implementing SSG not only as a training strategy, but also as part of a warm-up strategy. Practically, we suggest using 3 vs. 3 SSG, played in 3 bouts of 2 minutes and 1 minute of passive recovery, as the conclusive part of a precompetition warm-up. To observe the greatest PAP effects, attempt to complete the SSG warm-up ~7 minutes before the match/training session. Finally, to optimize the PAP effects, practitioners should consider developing adequate strength levels because stronger individuals are more likely to express greater PAP responses.

REFERENCES

1. Aagaard, P, Simonsen, EB, Andersen, JL, Magnusson, P, and Dyhre-Poulsen, P. Increased rate of force development and neural drive of human skeletal muscle following resistance training. *J Appl Physiol (1985)* 93: 1318–1326, 2002.
2. Bates, D, Mächler, M, Bolker, B, and Walker, S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J Stat Softw* 67: 48, 2015.
3. Bishop, D. Warm up I: Potential mechanisms and the effects of passive warm up on exercise performance. *Sports Med* 33: 439–454, 2003.
4. Bishop, D. Warm up II: Performance changes following active warm up and how to structure the warm up. *Sports Med* 33: 483–498, 2003.
5. Buchheit, M, Laursen, PB, Kuhnle, J, Ruch, D, Renaud, C, and Ahmadi, S. Game-based training in young elite handball players. *Int J Sports Med* 30: 251–258, 2009.
6. Caserotti, P, Aagaard, P, Simonsen, EB, and Pugnaire, L. Contraction-specific differences in maximal muscle power during stretch-shortening cycle movements in elderly males and females. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 84: 206–212, 2001.
7. Chaouachi, A, Brughelli, M, Levin, G, Boudhina, NB, Cronin, J, and Chamari, K. Anthropometric, physiological and performance characteristics of elite team-handball players. *J Sports Sci* 27: 151–157, 2009.
8. Dello Iacono, A, Ardigo, LP, Meckel, Y, and Padulo, J. Effect of small-sided games and repeated shuffle sprint training on physical performance in elite handball players. *J Strength Cond Res* 30: 830–840, 2016.
9. Dello Iacono, A, Eliakim, A, Padulo, J, Laver, L, Ben-Zaken, S, and Meckel, Y. Neuromuscular and inflammatory responses to handball small-sided games: The effects of physical contact. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 27: 1122–1129, 2017.
10. Dello Iacono, A, Martone, D, Zagatto, AM, Meckel, Y, Sindiani, M, Milic, M, et al. Effect of contact and no-contact small-sided games on elite handball players. *J Sports Sci* 36: 14–22, 2018.
11. Foster, C, Florhaug, JA, Franklin, J, Gottschall, L, Hrovatin, LA, Parker, S, et al. A new approach to monitoring exercise training. *J Strength Cond Res* 15: 109–115, 2001.
12. Fradkin, AJ, Zazryn, TR, and Smoliga, JM. Effects of warming-up on physical performance: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *J Strength Cond Res* 24: 140–148, 2010.
13. Fukashiro, S, Hay, DC, and Nagano, A. Biomechanical behavior of muscle-tendon complex during dynamic human movements. *J Appl Biomech* 22: 131–147, 2006.
14. Gabbett, TJ, Sheppard, JM, Pritchard-Peschek, KR, Leveritt, MD, and Aldred, MJ. Influence of closed skill and open skill warm-ups on the performance of speed, change of direction speed, vertical jump, and reactive agility in team sport athletes. *J Strength Cond Res* 22: 1413–1415, 2008.
15. Halouani, J, Chtourou, H, Gabbett, T, Chaouachi, A, and Chamari, K. Small-sided games in team sports training: A brief review. *J Strength Cond Res* 28: 3594–3618, 2014.
16. Hedges, LV. Distribution theory for glass's estimator of effect size and related estimators. *J Educ Stat* 6: 107–128, 1981.
17. Iacono, AD, Eliakim, A, and Meckel, Y. Improving fitness of elite handball players: Small-sided games vs. high-intensity intermittent training. *J Strength Cond Res* 29: 835–843, 2015.
18. Johnston, RD, Gibson, NV, Twist, C, Gabbett, TJ, MacNay, SA, and MacFarlane, NG. Physiological responses to an intensified period of rugby league competition. *J Strength Cond Res* 27: 643–654, 2013.
19. Kawakami, Y, Muraoka, T, Ito, S, Kanehisa, H, and Fukunaga, T. In vivo muscle fibre behaviour during counter-movement exercise in humans reveals a significant role for tendon elasticity. *J Physiol* 540: 635–646, 2002.
20. Lake, J, Lauder, M, Smith, N, and Shorter, K. A comparison of ballistic and nonballistic lower-body resistance exercise and the methods used to identify their positive lifting phases. *J Appl Biomech* 28: 431–437, 2012.
21. Lakens, D. Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Front Psychol* 4: 863, 2013.
22. Mahlfeld, K, Franke, J, and Awiszus, F. Postcontraction changes of muscle architecture in human quadriceps muscle. *Muscle Nerve* 29: 597–600, 2004.

23. McGowan, CJ, Pyne, DB, Thompson, KG, and Rattray, B. Warm-up strategies for sport and exercise: Mechanisms and applications. *Sports Med* 45: 1523–1546, 2015.
24. McShane, BB, Gal, D, Gelman, A, Robert, C, and Tackett, JL. *Abandon Statistical Significance*, 2017. *arXiv preprint arXiv:170907588*. Epub ahead of print.
25. Newton, RU, Murphy, AJ, Humphries, BJ, Wilson, GJ, Kraemer, WJ, and Häkkinen, K. Influence of load and stretch shortening cycle on the kinematics, kinetics and muscle activation that occurs during explosive upper-body movements. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 75: 333–342, 1997.
26. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. In: *R Foundation for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria. Available at: <https://www.R-project.org/>. Accessed June 12, 2018.
27. Romaratezabala, E, Nakamura, FY, Castillo, D, Gorostegi-Anduaga, I, and Yanci, J. Influence of warm-up duration on physical performance and psychological perceptions in handball players. *Res Sports Med* 26: 230–243, 2018.
28. Schulz, KF and Grimes, DA. Blinding in randomised trials: Hiding who got what. *Lancet* 359: 696–700, 2002.
29. Souhail, H, Castagna, C, Mohamed, HY, Younes, H, and Chamari, K. Direct validity of the yo-yo intermittent recovery test in young team handball players. *J Strength Cond Res* 24: 465–470, 2010.
30. Suchomel, TJ, Lamont, HS, and Moir, GL. Understanding vertical jump potentiation: A deterministic model. *Sports Med* 46: 809–828, 2016.
31. Tillin, NA and Bishop, D. Factors modulating post-activation potentiation and its effect on performance of subsequent explosive activities. *Sports Med* 39: 147–166, 2009.
32. Wagner, H and Muller, E. The effects of differential and variable training on the quality parameters of a handball throw. *Sports Biomech* 7: 54–71, 2008.
33. Wilson, JM, Duncan, NM, Marin, PJ, Brown, LE, Loenneke, JP, Wilson, SM, et al. Meta-analysis of postactivation potentiation and power: Effects of conditioning activity, volume, gender, rest periods, and training status. *J Strength Cond Res* 27: 854–859, 2013.
34. Zois, J, Bishop, DJ, Ball, K, and Aughey, RJ. High-intensity warm-ups elicit superior performance to a current soccer warm-up routine. *J Sci Med Sport* 14: 522–528, 2011.