



## Relative age, maturation, and physical biases on position allocation in elite-youth Soccer

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Sports Medicine</i>
Manuscript ID	IJSM-04-2016-5587-tt.R2
Manuscript Type:	Training & Testing
Key word:	Talent identification, Anthropometry, Fitness, Relative age effect, Maturity
Abstract:	<p>This study assessed the contribution of relative age, anthropometry, maturation, and physical fitness characteristics on soccer playing position (goalkeeper [GK], central-defender [CD], lateral-defender [LD], central-midfield [CM], lateral-midfielder [LM], and forward [FWD]) for 465 elite-youth players (U13-U18's). U13-14 CD were relatively older than LD and CM (likely small effects). CD and GK were generally taller and heavier (likely small to very-likely moderate effects) than other players at each developmental stage and were advanced maturers at U13-14 (very-likely small to likely moderate effects). GK had inferior agility (very-likely small to likely moderate effects), endurance (very-likely small to likely moderate effects), and sprint capacities (likely small-moderate effects) versus outfield positions at U13-14, but deficits in anaerobic phenotypes were diminished in U15-16 and U17-18. Position specific fitness characteristics were distinguished at U15-16 (likely small) and U17-18 (likely moderate), where LM were faster than their central counterparts. In summary, relative age, maturation and anthropometric characteristics appear to bias the allocation of players into key defensive roles from an early development stage, whereas position-specific physical attributes do not become apparent until the latter stages of talent development in outfield players. Given the inter-individual trajectories of physical development according to biological maturation, playing position allocation might be considered 'plastic' by selectors, until complete-maturity is achieved.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

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

1 **Relative age, maturation, and physical biases on position allocation in elite-**  
2 **youth Soccer**

3 **Original paper**

5 Number of Figures: 0

6 Number of Tables: 4

8 Chris Towlson<sup>1</sup>, Stephen Copley<sup>2</sup>, Adrian Wayne Midgley<sup>3</sup>, Andrew Garrett<sup>1</sup>, Guy Parkin<sup>4</sup>,  
9 Ric Lovell<sup>5</sup>

10 <sup>1</sup>Sport, Health and Exercise Science, The University of Hull, Hull, United Kingdom of Great  
11 Britain and Northern Ireland

12 <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

13 <sup>3</sup>Sport and Physical Activity, Edgehill University, Ormskirk, United Kingdom of Great  
14 Britain and Northern Ireland

15 <sup>4</sup>Pro Football Support, Huddersfield, Yorkshire, United Kingdom

16 <sup>5</sup>School of Science and Health, Sport and Exercise Science, Western Sydney University,  
17 Penrith, Australia

1  
2  
3 **Abstract**

4 This study assessed the contribution of relative age, anthropometry, maturation, and physical fitness  
5 characteristics on soccer playing position (goalkeeper [GK], central-defender [CD], lateral-defender  
6 [LD], central-midfield [CM], lateral-midfielder [LM], and forward [FWD]) for 465 elite-youth  
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

~~Linear marginal model analysis identified that~~ U13-14 CD were relatively older than LD and CM (likely small effects ES = 0.72). CD and GK were generally taller and heavier (likely small to very-likely moderate effects U13-14: ES = 0.49 – 1.19; U15-16: ES = 0.72 – 1.48; U17-18: ES = 0.96 – 1.58) and heavier (U13-14: ES = 0.64 – 1.40; U15-16: ES = 0.24 – 1.57; U17-18: ES = 0.51 – 1.32) than other players at each developmental stage and were advanced maturers at U13-14 (very-likely small to likely moderate effects ES = 0.63 – 1.22). GK had inferior agility (very-likely small to likely moderate effects), endurance (very-likely small to likely moderate effects), and sprint capacities (likely small-moderate effects) versus outfield positions at U13-14, but deficits in anaerobic phenotypes were diminished in U15-16 and U17-18. Position specific fitness characteristics were distinguished at U15-16 (likely small) and U17-18 (likely moderate), where ~~LD and~~ LM were faster than their central counterparts (10m: ES = 0.72 – 0.83; 20m: ES = 0.94 – 1.07). In summary, relative age, maturation and anthropometric characteristics appear to bias the allocation of players into key defensive roles from an early development stage, whereas position-specific physical attributes do not become apparent until the latter stages of talent development in outfield players. Given the inter-individual trajectories of physical development according to biological maturation, playing position allocation might be considered ‘plastic’ by selectors, until complete-maturity is achieved.

1  
2  
3 65 **Introduction**  
4

5 66 The English Premier League introduced the Elite Player Performance Plan (EPPP) in a bid to increase  
6  
7 67 the number and quality of 'home grown' players graduating from talent identification (TID)  
8  
9 68 programmes in the top four tiers of UK professional soccer (English Premier League, Championship,  
10  
11 69 League 1 and League 2) [30]. One of the EPPP directives is to develop co-ordinated service provision  
12  
13 70 of Sports Science and Medicine, and develop national protocols and minimum standards, with  
14  
15 71 particular reference to youth player development. Accordingly, accredited TID centres are required to  
16  
17 72 monitor anthropometric and physical fitness parameters each trimester, in an effort to better track  
18  
19 73 individual players' development trajectories, and to benchmark against a national database [30].  
20

21 74 In addition to periodic player audits of anthropometry and physical fitness, the EPPP  
22  
23 75 mandates systematic recordings of player somatic maturation status during 'Youth' (U12 to U16) and  
24  
25 76 'Professional' (U17 to U21) stages of development [30], using a cross-validated [2,3] predictive  
26  
27 77 algorithm that encompasses anthropometric measures (standing height, seated height, and leg length)  
28  
29 78 [25]. This inclusion is warranted on the basis that growth, development and maturation represent  
30  
31 79 consistent risks to the accurate determination of talented young soccer players. Advanced normative  
32  
33 80 growth and maturation related advantages are considered a significant factor - and problem - in the  
34  
35 81 systematic discrimination against players born in the latter months of the selection year, when  
36  
37 82 categorised chronologically into playing groups [7,11,16]. This is commonly referred to as the relative  
38  
39 83 age effect (RAE [8,32]). In soccer, relatively older players (i.e. born in the first quartile of the  
40  
41 84 selection year) are more often likely to be selected into TID programmes, exposed to more advanced  
42  
43 85 coaching expertise, and be able to access more match-play time [31] as a consequence of having  
44  
45 86 enhanced physical and anthropometrical characteristics; this is also known as the maturation-selection  
46  
47 87 hypothesis [8,15]. The hypothesis may also account for players' early positional role assignment  
48  
49 88 within TID programmes, particularly when competition and performance is integral [16]. Such biases  
50  
51 89 might threaten the efficacy of talent identification and selection processes, yet to our knowledge the  
52  
53 90 role of relative age and biological maturation in positional role allocation have not been explored in  
54  
55 91 youth Soccer.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 92 Previous research has identified that playing positions are often characterised by  
4  
5 93 anthropometric and physical fitness traits in pre- and circa-adolescent players [12]. For example,  
6  
7 94 players who exhibit superior anthropometric characteristics such as stature (and to a lesser extent  
8  
9 95 body-mass) are more likely to be selected for defensive roles (e.g., goalkeeper & central defence) that  
10  
11 96 involve frequent physical duels and aerial contests in both elite [6,12,23] and recreational youth  
12  
13 97 soccer. Attacking and midfield players are often characterized by their superior anaerobic [6,21] and  
14  
15 98 endurance attributes [21], respectively, whilst goalkeepers demonstrate a distinct fitness profile that  
16  
17 99 manifests as early as the Foundation phase (U5-U11), displaying inferior aerobic, sprint and agility  
18  
19 100 capacities versus other outfield positions [12]. Though previous studies have identified these biases  
20  
21 101 and may have informed TID processes, drawing broader and accurate inferences is challenging as  
22  
23 102 sample populations have typically represented fewer than two soccer development centres [6,7,12],  
24  
25 103 and findings could equally reflect localised playing and developmental philosophies. Moreover,  
26  
27 104 previous research has not distinguished between central and lateral positions in defensive and midfield  
28  
29 105 roles [12,21,27] which may mask relevant position-specific differences in player characteristics, and  
30  
31 106 this seems necessary given their distinct activity profiles during matches [9,10,13]. Thus, research on  
32  
33 107 a broader scale is warranted to determine the position-specific characteristics of elite-youth players,  
34  
35 108 and to determine whether a transient nature of these influences exists across the stages of the player  
36  
37 109 development pathway.

38  
39 110 The aim of this study was to determine the differences in relative age, anthropometry,  
40  
41 111 maturation, and physical fitness attributes associated with positional role allocation throughout the  
42  
43 112 EPPP ‘Youth’ and ‘Professional’ phases of development, examining a broad sample of players from  
44  
45 113 English soccer TID centres. Research of this nature is useful to national policy-makers as well as TID  
46  
47 114 practitioners, including professional club TID managers, coaches, selectors, and sport science support  
48  
49 115 staff involved in holistic and long-term player development. We hypothesised that goalkeepers and  
50  
51 116 central defenders would be taller and heavier, particularly in the early stages of the development  
52  
53 117 pathway, and that these advantages would be afforded by a combination of advanced somatic  
54  
55 118 maturation, and an earlier birth date within their selection year. We also theorised that position-  
56  
57 119 specific physical attributes would become apparent in the latter stages of talent development.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 120 **Methods**

4  
5 121 *Procedures*

6  
7 122 In accordance to the ethical standards outlined by IJSM [14] and with institutional ethical approval,  
8  
9 123 data on 465 young elite soccer players, participating in 1 of 16 elite youth soccer TID programmes  
10  
11 124 (governed by the EPPP) located within English league (Championship [n = 2]; League 1 [n = 6];  
12  
13 125 League 2 [n = 8]) clubs were obtained between February 2013 - April 2014. Players were categorised  
14  
15 126 in to 7 chronological age-groups (under [U] 13's [n = 96]; U14's [n = 122]; U15's [n = 78]; U16's [n=  
16  
17 127 31]; U17's [n = 55]; U18's [n = 83]). A reduced sample of U16 players was expected given that  
18  
19 128 development centres typically de-select players from progressing to the professional stage of  
20  
21 129 development during the latter months of the domestic soccer season. Players under 12 years of age  
22  
23 130 were excluded from the study, having been deemed to have insufficient playing experience to  
24  
25 131 establish a regular playing position in the normative game format (i.e., 11 vs. 11).

26  
27 132 In accordance with previous research [12], players were categorised in to the following  
28  
29 133 positional roles during the 2013-14 season: goalkeeper (GK, n = 44), central defender (CD, n = 79),  
30  
31 134 lateral defender (LD, n = 81), central midfield (CM, n = 117), lateral midfielder (LM, n = 66), and  
32  
33 135 forward (FWD, n = 78). Players performed a battery of three anthropometric and four physical fitness  
34  
35 136 assessments that replaced their regular training during that day. Each player was free from injury and  
36  
37 137 had previously been habituated to each separate component of the field test battery during previous  
38  
39 138 periodic assessments of their development. All players wore their usual training attire during the data  
40  
41 139 collection. The sequence of tests was selected based on previously outlined recommendations, with  
42  
43 140 players having anthropometric measures (stature, seated height and body-mass) taken in a rested state  
44  
45 141 followed by physical movement skill tests (vertical counter movement jump, T-test and linear sprints),  
46  
47 142 and finally the test inducing fatigue (Multi-Stage Fitness Test) [1].

48  
49 143

50  
51  
52 144 *Relative age distribution characteristics*

53  
54 145 Player decimal age was determined from club records and reported as the day number in which they  
55  
56 146 were born relative to the English soccer selection year (1<sup>st</sup> September to August 31<sup>st</sup>) to represent  
57  
58 147 relative age distribution (RAd).  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 148

4  
5 149 *Anthropometrics*

6  
7 150 Duplicate measures of stature, seated height (seca© 217,Chino, U.S.A), and body-mass (seca©  
8  
9 151 robusta 813, Chino, U.S.A) were recorded using previously outlined procedures [29]. If the  
10  
11 152 measurements varied  $\geq 0.4$  cm or 0.4 kg, a third measure was taken and the median value recorded.  
12  
13 153 Estimated leg length was recorded as stature minus seated height. In combination with  
14  
15 154 anthropometrical measures, decimal age was used to determine player somatic maturity. Predicted age  
16  
17 155 at peak height velocity (aPHV) was calculated using a cross-validated algorithm [2,3] using somatic  
18  
19 156 components (standing height, seated height, and leg length) and chronological age, with an accuracy  
20  
21 157 of  $\pm 0.24$  yr [25]. Taking into account the predictive nature of the anthropometric based algorithm used  
22  
23 158 to determine aPHV, we established the test-retest reliability of all anthropometric measures  
24  
25 159 encompassed in the equation (Table 1).

26  
27 160

28  
29 161 **\*\*\*Table 1 near here\*\*\***

30  
31 162

32  
33 163 *Physical fitness measures*

34  
35 164 Explosive leg power was assessed using a vertical counter movement jump (vCMJ) performed on a  
36  
37 165 digital contact mat (SmartJump©, Fusion Sport, Cooper Planes, Australia), according to procedures  
38  
39 166 outlined previously [29]. Players performed three vCMJs interspaced by 3 min passive recovery. If  
40  
41 167 the range of the best three jumps varied  $\geq 2$  cm, then repeated attempts were performed until this  
42  
43 168 criterion was achieved (up to a maximum of 8). The mean of the highest three jumps was used to  
44  
45 169 identify vCMJ height. Sound vCMJ reliability has been established in young elite youth (under 9 –  
46  
47 170 18s) soccer populations [18].

48  
49 171 Agility performance (Brower Timing System, Salt Lake City, Utah, U.S.A) was established  
50  
51 172 using the T-test [28]. Players were instructed to sprint forwards 9.14 m (10 yards), side shuffle left  
52  
53 173 4.75 m (5 yards) (maintaining a forward facing position), return to the mid-line and repeat for the  
54  
55 174 opposite side of the course before backward running 9.14 m (10 yards) to finish the course. Each  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 175 player completed the course four times (2 x left, 2 x right) interspaced by 3 min passive recovery. The  
4  
5 176 average of the fastest time for each direction was used to determine agility performance.

6  
7 177 Using an established method [29], three timed (Brower Timing System, Salt Lake City, Utah,  
8  
9 178 U.S.A) maximal 20 m sprints, interceded by 3 min passive recovery were used to record 10 and 20 m  
10  
11 179 sprint time. Our previous research has shown the test-retest typical error for 10m and 20m sprint  
12  
13 180 performance to be 0.05 (95% CI: 0.04-0.06 s) and 0.08 s (95% CI: 0.07-0.10 s) respectively [20]

14  
15 181 The Multi-Stage Fitness Test (MSFT) assessed endurance capacity, which has been deemed  
16  
17 182 reliable and valid for this purpose [19,26] and was adapted from a previously outlined methodology  
18  
19 183 [29]. An experienced test administrator acted as pacer to ensure players achieved the correct timings  
20  
21 184 during speeds 6-11 km.h<sup>-1</sup>. The test began thereafter with the speed being increased by 1.0 km.h<sup>-1</sup>  
22  
23 185 every ~1 min until test cessation. Failure to complete the 20 m track in the allotted time for the shuttle  
24  
25 186 resulted in a verbal warning from the test administrator, with test cessation deemed from a subsequent  
26  
27 187 failure. As maximal aerobic speed is underestimated by ~ 3 km.h<sup>-1</sup> [5] using the MSFT because of the  
28  
29 188 multiple accelerations, decelerations and changes of direction required for 20 m shuttle running, we  
30  
31 189 used total distance covered (m) as the outcome measure for endurance capacity.

32  
33 190

### 34 35 191 **Statistics**

36  
37 192

38  
39 193 Linear marginal models and pairwise comparisons were conducted (release 22; SPSS Inc., Chicago,  
40  
41 194 IL, USA) to determine differences in relative age distribution, anthropometric, maturation and  
42  
43 195 physical fitness characteristics according to positional role allocation (GK, CD, LD, CM, LM, FWD).  
44  
45 196 We also examined if these effects were moderated by the stage of development. Chronological  
46  
47 197 playing age groups were aggregated bi-annually (U13-14 [n = 218]; U15-16 [n = 109]; U17-18 [n =  
48  
49 198 138] to facilitate sufficiently powered contrasts between playing positions, in accordance with  
50  
51 199 previous research [11]. Adjusted effect estimates and sidak-adjusted p-values (for multiple  
52  
53 200 comparisons) were imputed into a customised spreadsheet [17] to derive magnitude-based inferences  
54  
55 201 [4] with 90% confidence limits used to represent the estimate uncertainty. Standardised thresholds for  
56  
57 202 small, moderate, and large (0.2, 0.6, and 1.2, respectively) position differences were determined from  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 203 the between-player standard deviation within each bi-annual age group. Mechanistic inferences were  
4  
5 204 qualified as *likely* (75-95%), *very-likely* (95-99.5%) or *most-likely* (>99.5%), but classified as unclear  
6  
7 205 where the confidence limits overlapped both positive and negative thresholds by 5% [4]. Data are  
8  
9 206 presented as the estimated marginal means and associated 95% confidence intervals.

10  
11 207

## 12 208 **Results**

### 13 14 209 *Relative age distribution characteristics*

15  
16 210 LD and CM were born later in the selection year than their CD counterparts in the U13-14 age group  
17  
18 211 (*likely* small effects; Table 2), but no differences were observed in U15-16 and U17-18.

19  
20  
21 212

### 22 213 *Anthropometric characteristics*

23  
24 214 As displayed in Tables 2-4, GK and CD were taller versus all other positions in each bi-annual age-  
25  
26 215 group (*likely* small to *very-likely* moderate effects), with the only exceptions being unclear differences  
27  
28 216 between GK vs. FWD in U13-14, and CD/GK vs. FWD in U15-16. GK and CD also had greater  
29  
30 217 body mass compared with all other positions at U13-14 (*likely* small to *very-likely* moderate effects).  
31  
32 218 LD and LM were leaner than GK and CD in U15-16 chronological age group (*likely* to *very-likely*  
33  
34 219 moderate effects). LM remained leaner than both GK (*likely* moderate effect) and CD (*very-likely*  
35  
36 220 moderate effect) in U17-18, with LD displaying a similar trend versus CD (*likely* small). CM were  
37  
38 221 also moderately leaner than GK and CD at U17-18 (*likely* effect).

39  
40  
41 222

### 42 223 *Maturity*

43  
44 224 GK and CD players were advanced maturers versus LD, CM, LM (*very-likely* small to *likely* moderate  
45  
46 225 effects; see Table 2) in U13-14, and CD were also advanced in comparison to FWD (*very-likely* small  
47  
48 226 effect). U15-16 CD were also moderately advanced in maturation in comparison to CM and LM  
49  
50 227 (*likely* effects), with GK displaying a greater estimated aPHV versus LD (*likely* moderate effect, see  
51  
52 228 Table 3). No between-position differences were identified in U17-18 (see Table 4).

53  
54 229

### 55 56 230 *Physical fitness characteristics*

57  
58  
59  
60

231 There were no differences in vCMJ performance owing to playing position across all chronological  
232 age groups.

233  
234 GK had inferior T-test performance versus all outfield positions (*very-likely* small to *likely* moderate  
235 effects), in the U13-14 chronological age group, but not in U15-16 and U17-18. With the exception  
236 of LD, GK also had slower sprint times than all other outfield positions over both 10 and 20 m  
237 distances in U13-14 (*likely* small-moderate effects), but their sprint performance was only inferior to  
238 LM in U15-16 (*likely* small effects over 10 and 20 m) and U17-18 (*likely* moderate effect for 20 m).  
239 LD demonstrated a *likely* small sprint performance advantage versus CD at U13-14. LM were faster  
240 than CM at U15-16 (*likely* small effect for 20 m), and both CM and CD at U17-18 (*likely* moderate  
241 effects for both 10 and 20 m). In U17-18, CM were slower than LD (10m: *likely* moderate effect;  
242 20m: *likely* small effect) and FWD (20m: *likely* small effect).

243  
244 MSFT performance in GK was inferior to CD, LD, CM and LM at U13-14 (*very-likely* small to *likely*  
245 moderate effects), and to CD, LD and FWD in U15-16 (*likely* moderate effects), but no differences  
246 were observed at U17-18.

247 \*\*\*Table 2 near here\*\*\*

248 \*\*\*Table 3 near here\*\*\*

249 \*\*\*Table 4 near here\*\*\*

250

## 251 Discussion

252 The aim of this study was to assess and quantify the differences in relative age distribution,  
253 anthropometry, maturation status and physical fitness characteristics on positional role allocation in an  
254 elite sample of youth soccer players enrolled in multiple development centres in England, spanning  
255 U13-18 years of age. A secondary aim was to assess whether these differences were transient and  
256 changing across the age-groups of player development. Key findings identified were: 1) At U13-14's,  
257 LD and CM were born later in the selection year than CD; 2) At U13-14, GK and CD were advanced  
258 maturers, and were taller and heavier versus other outfield players; ~~3) Irrespective of chronological~~

1  
2  
3 259 | ~~age, GK and CD were moderately taller and heavier than LD, CM and LM; 43)~~ GK had inferior  
4  
5 260 | endurance, agility and sprint capacities versus their outfield team-mates at U13-14, but anaerobic  
6  
7 261 | phenotypes ~~were inferior to only LM did not differ to outfield players~~ at U15-16 and U17-18; and, 45)  
8  
9 262 | At 17-18's, lateral defensive and midfield players were ~~moderately~~ faster sprinters than their centrally  
10  
11 263 | positioned counter-parts.

12  
13 264 | Findings here confirm previous research [12,27], supporting the general hypothesis that  
14  
15 265 | playing positions of elite youth soccer players can be discriminated by anthropometric attributes. GK  
16  
17 266 | and CD were generally the tallest and heaviest players, adhering to prior studies [12,23], and was a  
18  
19 267 | trend ~~identified that somewhat persisted~~ across the age-groups, particularly versus those allocated to  
20  
21 268 | lateral roles (Tables 2-4). However, the magnitude of the standardised effects (*moderate*) for between  
22  
23 269 | position differences was typically greater than that reported in Belgian ~~and Qatari~~ elite youth soccer  
24  
25 270 | players (*small*; [6,12]). It is unclear whether the greater magnitude of anthropometric differences in  
26  
27 271 | the current study is due to cultural differences in talent selection and position allocation policy, or  
28  
29 272 | because we uniquely distinguished between lateral and central defenders. Nonetheless,  
30  
31 273 | anthropometrical advantages are largely explained by maturation status [11,20], and in the U13-14  
32  
33 274 | stage the taller and heavier GK and CD were earlier maturers. This suggests that positional allocation  
34  
35 275 | by TID practitioners in soccer centres is clearly being influenced by immediate anthropometrical  
36  
37 276 | factors from an early development stage.

38  
39 277 | The anthropometric advantages afforded to CD positions in this study may also be influenced  
40  
41 278 | by their relative age. U13-14 CD were born earlier in their selection year versus their LD and CM  
42  
43 279 | peers (Table 2). At this developmental stage in the English youth system, the relative age effect on  
44  
45 280 | selection is particularly strong [20], which likely reflects the onset of accelerated growth during  
46  
47 281 | puberty in combination with advanced normative growth of the relatively older players [8]. The  
48  
49 282 | findings of this study suggest that those fewer relatively younger players selected to representative  
50  
51 283 | level squads, tend not to be allocated to CD positions. Whilst Romann et al. [27] found that defenders  
52  
53 284 | were born earlier in their selection year versus other field positions, in this study we did not observe  
54  
55 285 | any other between-position differences in relative age, and the current study is the first to distinguish  
56  
57 286 | the positional role characteristics of lateral versus central developmental soccer players. The  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 287 observation that CD are relatively older, taller, heavier, and advanced in terms of maturation when  
4  
5 288 compared to LD is intuitive, given their tactical and physical differences during match-play. This also  
6  
7 289 reinforces the influence of anthropometric characteristics in talent selection and role allocation, and  
8  
9 290 suggests that future research should distinguish between these defensive roles, particularly when  
10  
11 291 development systems adopt an 11 vs. 11 match-play format. Further longitudinal research is  
12  
13 292 necessary to determine whether positional role allocation varies according to the within-squad rank of  
14  
15 293 players' body size, which likely varies throughout development stages owing to the variability of  
16  
17 294 biological maturation processes.

18  
19 295 In this study GK displayed inferior physical performance attributes in relation to most outfield  
20  
21 296 positions. GK endurance performance in particular was lower (small-moderate-~~large~~ effects) than  
22  
23 297 most outfield positions at U13-14. A lower endurance capacity reflects the typical activity profile of  
24  
25 298 GK in both matches and training [12], and is therefore likely to be considered a redundant physical  
26  
27 299 attribute to perform this role at the representative level. An interesting observation was that U13 and  
28  
29 300 U14 GK's were slower sprinters and less agile than players in all other positions (with the exception  
30  
31 301 of LD), yet older GK's from the U15-16 and U17-18 cohorts were inferior only to LM in terms of  
32  
33 302 sprint performance. U13-14 GK were more advanced maturers, which is typically associated with  
34  
35 303 enhanced sprint running performance in youth soccer players [24], perhaps mediated by  
36  
37 304 neuromuscular function and/or endocrine effects on muscle power during puberty [21]. Despite these  
38  
39 305 maturity-related advantages, GK's were slower at U13-14, which suggests that anthropometric  
40  
41 306 characteristics are stronger determinants of their role allocation, perhaps enabling them to dominate  
42  
43 307 aerial duels and reduce the shot-target available to opposition players. As the inferior sprint  
44  
45 308 performance of developmental GK's was somewhat transient, it is appealing to suggest that GK  
46  
47 309 coaches place greater emphasis on sprinting performance at later stages of the development process,  
48  
49 310 perhaps enabling them to quickly close down the space available to goal-bound attackers. However,  
50  
51 311 the cross-sectional nature of our study renders this speculation, and further longitudinal research is  
52  
53 312 warranted in GK to identify role allocation bias and athletic development priorities.

54  
55  
56 313 To our knowledge, this is the first study to demonstrate the physical fitness characteristics of  
57  
58 314 elite youth players in central versus lateral roles. Whilst ~~few~~ differences were observed between  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 315 | these roles in U13-14, LM ~~tended to be~~ faster sprinters versus CM at U15-16 (small effect), and  
4  
5 316 | ~~this trend attained statistical significance~~ the magnitude of this difference was greater at U17-18  
6  
7 317 | (moderate). ~~Similarly, a greater sprint capacity in LD compared to CD was observed in the U17-18~~  
8  
9 318 | ~~squads.~~ As this variation was not observed before PHV, it may reflect the development of position-  
10  
11 319 | specific physical attributes mirroring the professional match requirements of lateral players [13], as  
12  
13 320 | opposed to a selection phenomenon, but further work is warranted to confirm this hypothesis. The  
14  
15 321 | magnitude of sprint capacity differences between laterally- and centrally-orientated roles was greater  
16  
17 322 | than that reported in previous research for other outfield positional contrasts [12], further emphasising  
18  
19 323 | the requirement to distinguish between these field positions in future research and national  
20  
21 324 | benchmarking schemes. However, consideration of the tactical formations administered by coaches  
22  
23 325 | and/or TID systems are warranted (e.g. 4-4-2 vs. 4-3-3), given it is likely to influence positional role  
24  
25 326 | allocation.

26  
27 327 | This study's findings suggest that anthropometric characteristics influence the positional role  
28  
29 328 | allocation at the 'Youth' development stage of the EPPP, where GK and CD demonstrated body size  
30  
31 329 | advantages afforded by advanced maturation and chronological age. Whilst these advantages might  
32  
33 330 | be realized in competitive match-play scenarios involving frequent physical contests and aerial duels,  
34  
35 331 | they were not manifest in the physical fitness tests administered in the study. Body size advantages in  
36  
37 332 | these key defensive roles generally transcended the developmental stages surveyed, whereas the  
38  
39 333 | inferior physical performance capacities of GK (agility, sprinting, and endurance) were transient, and  
40  
41 334 | specific performance phenotypes in lateral outfield players emerged in the latter stages of the  
42  
43 335 | development process. Whether these trends are borne from position-specific conditioning or selection  
44  
45 336 | criteria is a matter for further study, nonetheless, they demonstrate the transitory nature of physical  
46  
47 337 | characteristics influenced by the individuals' rate and stage of biological maturation. ~~Hence, TID~~  
48  
49 338 | ~~practitioners should be cautious in positional role allocating due to transient physical characteristics~~  
50  
51 339 | [20], ~~and instead perhaps prioritizing tactical and technical development~~ Hence, TID practitioners  
52  
53 340 | should be cautious in positional role allocating due to transient physical characteristics [24], and  
54  
55 341 | instead perhaps prioritize players tactical and technical development via exposure to the range of  
56  
57 342 | positional roles, and by engaging in training practices that limit physical contests. The distinct  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 343 physical attributes of players selected into CD and GK roles from an early stage, might reflect the  
4  
5 344 competitive nature that exists between development centers in the match-play program, and may  
6  
7 345 actually become a barrier to long-term holistic development. With development centers operating  
8  
9 346 within the EPPP obligated to monitor growth and maturation trajectories, findings from this study  
10  
11 347 suggest that centres can reduce the impact of ~~this factor~~physicality up on positional role allocation. To  
12  
13 348 add and support, awareness and education regarding biological development bias maybe warranted for  
14  
15 349 TID practitioners.

16  
17 350 The cross-sectional nature of our experimental design limits the generalisability of  
18  
19 351 conclusions drawn. That said we accept this limitation considerate of the broad representative sample  
20  
21 352 of youth soccer players, which we could draw from in the study. While our analysis was confined to  
22  
23 353 examining positioning allocation in relation to somatic and physical fitness characteristics, it is  
24  
25 354 probable that other factors contribute, and may also be more or less important at different  
26  
27 355 development stages. Technical and perceptual-cognitive attributes also likely contribute to positional  
28  
29 356 allocation by TID coaches/selectors. Lastly, we recognise that the longitudinal accuracy of the  
30  
31 357 maturation estimation procedure adopted in our study has been questioned [12,22], on the basis that  
32  
33 358 the predicted aPHV increases with chronological age (as observed in Tables 2-4). Accordingly we  
34  
35 359 acknowledge that the maturation offset technique used in the present study likely overestimated the  
36  
37 360 aPHV for players over the age of 16-. However, the purpose of this study was to examine positional  
38  
39 361 role differences in somatic maturation within development stages, which somewhat attenuates the  
40  
41 362 confounding influence of chronological age on the aPHV prediction. Nonetheless, practitioners  
42  
43 363 should be cognisant of the limitations that confound the accurate estimation of aPHV when  
44  
45 364 administering talent development and selection processes.

46  
47 365

## 48 49 366 **Conclusion**

50  
51 367 Findings identified that irrespective of chronological age group, specific anthropometrical  
52  
53 368 attributes characterised playing positions in English elite youth soccer development programmes, with  
54  
55 369 relatively older, maturer, taller, heavier, players being predominantly selected for GK and CD roles.  
56  
57 370 Distinguishing characteristics of defensive and midfield players allocated to either central or lateral  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 371 positions, also revealed position-specific differences in physical fitness attributes in the latter stages of  
4  
5 372 development programmes. Trends suggested that transient body size advantages conferred by relative  
6  
7 373 age and maturation status may influence positional role allocation in existing youth soccer  
8  
9 374 programmes. Since physical development trajectories are individual-specific and moderated by  
10  
11 375 biological maturation, the EPPP mandate to audit them may assist coaches and selectors in adopting a  
12  
13 376 'plastic' approach to positional role assignment until complete maturity is achieved.  
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

For Peer Review



399

400

401 **References**

- 402 1. Baechle TR, Earle RW. *Essentials of Strength Training and Conditioning: Human*  
403 *Kinetics*; 2008
- 404 2. Bailey D. The Saskatchewan Pediatric Bone Mineral Accrual Study: bone mineral  
405 acquisition during the growing years. *Int J Sports Med* 1997; 18: S191-S194
- 406 3. Bailey D, McKay H, Mirwald R, Crocker P, Faulkner R. A six-year longitudinal study  
407 of the relationship of physical activity to bone mineral accrual in growing children:  
408 the university of Saskatchewan bone mineral accrual study. *J Bone Miner Res* 1999;  
409 14: 1672-1679
- 410 4. Batterham AM, Hopkins WG. Making meaningful inferences about magnitudes.  
411 *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 2006, DOI:
- 412 5. Berthoin S, Gerbeaux M, Turpin E, Guerrin F, Lensele-Corbeil G, Vandendorpe F.  
413 Comparison of two field tests to estimate maximum aerobic speed. *J Sports Sci* 1994;  
414 12: 355-362
- 415 6. Buchheit M, Mendez-Villanueva A, Simpson B, Bourdon P. Match running  
416 performance and fitness in youth soccer. *Int J Sports Med* 2010; 31: 818-825
- 417 7. Carling C, Le Gall F, Reilly T, Williams A. Do anthropometric and fitness  
418 characteristics vary according to birth date distribution in elite youth academy soccer  
419 players? *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2009; 19: 3-9
- 420 8. Cogley SP, Baker J, Wattie N, McKenna J. Annual age-grouping and athlete  
421 development. *Sports Med Open* 2009; 39: 235-256
- 422 9. Dellal A, Chamari K, Wong DP, Ahmaidi S, Keller D, Barros R, Bisciotti GN,  
423 Carling C. Comparison of physical and technical performance in European soccer  
424 match-play: FA Premier League and La Liga. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2011; 11: 51-59
- 425 10. Dellal A, Wong DP, Moalla W, Chamari K. Physical and technical activity of soccer  
426 players in the French First League-with special reference to their playing position:  
427 original research article. *Int SporMed J* 2010; 11: 278-290
- 428 11. Deprez, Coutts A, Franssen J, Deconinck F, Lenoir M, Vaeyens R, Philippaerts R.  
429 Relative age, biological maturation and anaerobic characteristics in elite youth soccer  
430 players. *Int J Sports Med* 2013; 34: 897-903
- 431 12. Deprez, Franssen J, Boone J, Lenoir M, Philippaerts R, Vaeyens R. Characteristics of  
432 high-level youth soccer players: variation by playing position. *J Sports Sci* 2014, DOI:  
433 1-12
- 434 13. Di Salvo V, Baron R, Tschann H, Calderon Montero F, Bachl N, Pigozzi F.  
435 Performance characteristics according to playing position in elite soccer. *Int J Sports*  
436 *Med* 2007; 28: 222
- 437 14. Harriss D, Atkinson G. Ethical standards in sport and exercise science research: 2016  
438 update. *Int J Sports Med* 2015; 36: 1121-1124
- 439 15. Helsen WF, Van Winckel J, Williams AM. The relative age effect in youth soccer  
440 across Europe. *J Sports Sci* 2005; 23: 629-636
- 441 16. Hirose N. Relationships among birth-month distribution, skeletal age and  
442 anthropometric characteristics in adolescent elite soccer players. *J Sports Sci* 2009;  
443 27: 1159-1166
- 444 17. Hopkins WG. A spreadsheet for deriving a confidence interval, mechanistic inference  
445 and clinical inference from a P value. *Sportscience* 2007; 11: 16-21



- 1  
2  
3 446 18. Hulse M, Morris J, Hawkins R, Hodson A, Nevill A, Nevill M. A Field-Test Battery  
4 447 for Elite, Young Soccer Players. *Int J Sports Med* 2012, DOI:  
5 448 19. Leger LA, Lambert J. A maximal multistage 20-m shuttle run test to predict VO<sub>2</sub>  
6 449 max. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 1982; 49: 1-12  
7 450 20. Lovell, Towlson C, Parkin G, Portas M, Vaeyens R, Cobley S. Soccer Player  
8 451 Characteristics in English Lower-League Development Programmes: The  
9 452 Relationships between Relative Age, Maturation, Anthropometry and Physical  
10 453 Fitness. *PloS one* 2015; 10: e0137238  
11 454 21. Malina RM, Eisenmann JC, Cumming SP, Ribeiro B, Aroso J. Maturity-associated  
12 455 variation in the growth and functional capacities of youth football (soccer) players  
13 456 13–15 years. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2004; 91: 555-562  
14 457 22. Malina RM, Koziel SM. Validation of maturity offset in a longitudinal sample of  
15 458 Polish boys. *J Sports Sci* 2014; 32: 424-437  
16 459 23. Malina RM, Reyes MP, Eisenmann J, Horta L, Rodrigues J, Miller R. Height, mass  
17 460 and skeletal maturity of elite Portuguese soccer players aged 11–16 years. *J Sports Sci*  
18 461 2000; 18: 685-693  
19 462 24. Mendez-Villanueva A, Buchheit M, Kuitunen S, Douglas A, Peltola E, Bourdon P.  
20 463 Age-related differences in acceleration, maximum running speed, and repeated-sprint  
21 464 performance in young soccer players. *J Sports Sci* 2011; 29: 477-484  
22 465 25. Mirwald RL, Baxter-Jones A, Bailey DA, Beunen GP. An assessment of maturity  
23 466 from anthropometric measurements. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2002; 34: 689  
24 467 26. Ramsbottom R, Brewer J, Williams C. A progressive shuttle run test to estimate  
25 468 maximal oxygen uptake. *Br J Sports Med* 1988; 22: 141-144  
26 469 27. Romann M, Fuchslocher J. Relative age effects in Swiss junior soccer and their  
27 470 relationship with playing position. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2013; 13: 356-363  
28 471 28. Semenick D. Tests and measurements: The T-test. *Strength Cond J* 1990; 12: 36-37  
29 472 29. Stewart A. Physiological Tests for Elite Athletes. In: Taylor & Francis; 2002  
30 473 30. The English Premier League. Elite Player Performance Plan. In; 2011  
31 474 31. Vaeyens R, Philippaerts RM, Malina RM. The relative age effect in soccer: A match-  
32 475 related perspective. *J Sports Sci* 2005; 23: 747-756  
33 476 32. Wattie N, Cobley S, Baker J. Towards a unified understanding of relative age effects.  
34 477 *J Sports Sci* 2008; 26: 1403-1409  
35 478

**Table 1.** Summary of absolute and relative test-retest statistics for a battery of anthropometric field test measures for a sample of 45 elite youth (under 12 to 16 years) soccer players. Repeated measures were separated by 7 days.

	<b>Stature (cm)</b>	<b>Seated height (cm)</b>	<b>Body mass (kg)</b>	<b>aPHV (yrs)</b>
<b>ICC (CI)</b>	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)	0.97 (0.95 - 0.98)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)	0.96 (0.93 - 0.98)
<b>Typical error (CI)</b>	0.6 (0.5 - 0.7)	0.9 (0.8 - 1.1)	0.3 (0.3 - 0.4)	0.1 (0.1 - 0.2)
<b>CV% (CI)</b>	0.4 (0.3 - 0.5)	1.1 (0.9 - 1.4)	0.7 (0.6 - 0.9)	0.8 (0.7 - 1.0)

aPHV = predicted age at peak height velocity; ICC = intraclass correlation; CV% = percentage coefficient of variation; CI = 95% confidence interval.

For Peer Review

**Table 2.** Estimated marginal means (95% confidence intervals) of relative age, maturation, anthropometric, and physical fitness characteristics for elite youth (Under 13-14) soccer players according to playing position in English elite soccer development centres.

Variable	n	Cohort	n	GK	n	CD	n	LD	n	CM	n	LM	n	FWD	MBI positional difference
Age (yrs.)	218	13.8 (13.6-13.9)	24	13.7 (13.5 - 13.8)	33	13.8 (13.7 - 13.9)	38	13.6 (13.5 - 13.7)	57	13.7 (13.6 - 13.8)	30	13.8 (13.7 - 13.9)	36	13.8 (13.7 - 13.9)	
RAd (days)	218	139 (126-152)	24	138 (100-176)	33	98 (62 -132)	38	169 (138-199)	57	152 (127-177)	30	129 (94-162)	36	127 (96-158)	CD < LD <sup>S</sup> , CM <sup>S</sup>
Stature (cm)	191	164.6 (163.4-165.8)	20	168.5 (164.9-172.1)	29	171.1 (167.7-174.4)	33	159.9 (157.1-162.8)	52	162.8 (160.5-165.0)	26	160.7 (157.5-163.8)	31	164.3 (161.4-167.2)	GK > LD <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>S</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> CD > LD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> , FWD <sup>S</sup>
Body-mass (kg)	190	52.3 (50.7-53.8)	20	58.3 (55.2-61.7)	29	57.1 (54.1-60.1)	33	47.3 (44.7-49.8)	52	51.1 (49.0-53.1)	25	48.6 (45.6-51.5)	31	51.7 (49.1-54.3)	GK > LD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> , FWD <sup>S</sup> CD > LD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>S</sup> , LM <sup>S</sup> , FWD <sup>S</sup>
aPHV (yrs.)	189	14.1 (14.0-14.3)	20	13.8 (13.6-14.0)	29	13.7 (13.9-14.5)	33	14.4 (14.2-14.6)	51	14.3 (14.1-14.4)	25	14.4 (14.2-14.6)	31	14.2 (13.9-14.4)	GK < LD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>S</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> , CD < LD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> , FWD <sup>S</sup>
vCMJ (cm)	189	21.5 (17.5-25.2)	20	21.6 (17.3-25.9)	29	23.7 (19.4-27.9)	38	21.5 (17.3-25.7)	57	22.2 (18.1-26.3)	30	23.8 (19.5-28.0)	36	23.8 (19.5-28.0)	
T-Test (s)	218	10.40 (10.22-10.53)	24	10.84 (10.58-11.11)	33	10.36 (10.10-10.61)	32	10.45 (10.20-10.69)	52	10.30 (10.07-10.53)	26	10.37 (10.12-10.63)	30	10.43 (10.18-10.67)	GK > CD <sup>M</sup> , LD <sup>S</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>S</sup> , FWD <sup>S</sup>
10m sprint (s)	216	1.77 (1.73-1.80)	24	1.83 (1.78-1.89)	33	1.75 (1.69-1.80)	37	1.79 (1.74-1.85)	57	1.78 (1.72-1.83)	30	1.78 (1.72-1.83)	35	1.76 (1.70-1.81)	GK > CD <sup>S</sup> , CM <sup>S</sup> , LM <sup>S</sup> , FWD <sup>S</sup>
20m sprint (s)	213	3.21 (3.17-3.23)	24	3.34 (3.26-3.41)	32	3.15 (3.07-3.22)	37	3.26 (3.19-3.33)	57	3.22 (3.16-3.29)	29	3.19 (3.11-3.26)	34	3.17 (3.10-3.25)	GK > CD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>S</sup> , LM <sup>S</sup> , FWD <sup>M</sup> CD > LD <sup>S</sup>
MSFT (m)	215	1910 (1872-1947)	24	1712 (1600-1824)	33	1931 (1827-2035)	38	1936 (1846-2026)	57	1938 (1865-2012)	28	1982 (1878-2085)	35	1841 (1600-1824)	GK < CD <sup>S</sup> , LD <sup>S</sup> , *CM <sup>S</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup>

GK = goalkeeper, CD = central defence, LD = lateral defence, CM = central midfield, LM = lateral midfield, FWD = forward, RAd = number of days born in the selection year (September 1st to August 31st), aPHV = estimated age at peak height velocity, MSFT = distance achieved during the Multi-Stage Fitness Test, vCMJ = vertical counter movement jump, MBI = Magnitude-based inference. Small (S), moderate (M) and large (L) magnitudes of effect are presented where inference was *likely*, *very-likely*, or *most-likely*.

**Table 3.** Estimated marginal means (95% confidence intervals) of relative age, maturation, anthropometric, and physical fitness characteristics for elite youth (Under 15-16) soccer players according to playing position in English elite soccer development centres.

Variable	n	Cohort	n	GK	n	CD	n	LD	n	CM	n	LM	n	FWD	MBI positional difference
Age (yrs.)	109	15.6 (15.4-15.7)	10	15.8 (15.5-15.9)	25	15.9 (15.7-16.0)	19	15.7 (15.5-15.9)	27	15.8 (15.6-15.9)	13	15.7 (15.5-15.9)	15	15.8 (15.6-15.9)	
RAd (days)	109	108 (90-126)	10	129 (63-194)	25	95 (54-136)	19	133 (79-186)	27	91 (50-131)	13	145 (71-218)	15	100 (49-149)	
Stature (cm)	97	174.8 (173.1-176.4)	8	182.1 (177.8-186.4)	21	180.9 (178.1-183.5)	17	171.2 (167.3-174.9)	27	172.3 (170.0-175.0)	11	172.3 (168.7-175.8)	13	176.0 (172.6-179.4)	GK > LD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> CD > LD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup>
Body-mass (kg)	97	64.5 (62.5-66.3)	8	72.5 (66.9-78.1)	21	70.0 (66.4-73.5)	17	60.4 (55.5-65.3)	27	64.5 (61.3-67.8)	11	59.0 (54.4-63.6)	13	67.8 (63.5-72.2)	GK > LD <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> , CD > LD <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup>
aPHV (yrs.)	97	14.2 (14.1-14.4)	8	13.9 (13.5-14.2)	21	14.0 (13.8-14.2)	17	14.5 (14.1-14.7)	27	14.4 (14.2-14.6)	11	14.4 (14.1-14.7)	13	14.2 (13.9-14.5)	GK < LD <sup>M</sup> CD < CM <sup>S</sup> , LM <sup>S</sup>
vCMJ (cm)	107	25.8 (21.8-29.8)	10	24.5 (19.1-29.9)	25	25.8 (20.8-30.8)	19	28.5 (23.2-33.7)	26	27.8 (22.8-32.7)	12	28.3 (23.1-33.6)	15	28.9 (23.7-34.1)	
T-Test (s)	95	9.71 (9.54-9.87)	8	9.80 (9.50-10.11)	20	9.61 (9.38-9.83)	17	9.71 (9.45-9.97)	27	9.67 (9.44-9.89)	10	9.57 (9.24-9.91)	13	9.60 (9.34-9.85)	
10m sprint (s)	105	1.64 (1.61-1.68)	10	1.68 (1.62-1.73)	24	1.65 (1.60-1.68)	19	1.62 (1.57-1.66)	26	1.66 (1.61-1.70)	12	1.59 (1.53-1.65)	14	1.62 (1.57-1.67)	GK > LM <sup>S</sup>
20m sprint (s)	105	2.96 (2.92-2.99)	10	3.01 (2.93-3.01)	24	2.94 (2.88-2.98)	19	2.91 (2.84-2.97)	26	2.99 (2.93-3.03)	12	2.85 (2.74-2.93)	14	2.91 (2.84-2.96)	LM < GK <sup>S</sup> , CM <sup>S</sup>
MSFT (m)	107	2181 (2127-2234)	10	1944 (1766-2121)	25	2235 (2125-2345)	18	2303 (2140-2465)	26	2184 (2074-2292)	13	2283 (2085-2480)	15	2283 (2148-2419)	GK < CD <sup>M</sup> , LD <sup>M</sup> , FWD <sup>M</sup>

GK = goalkeeper, CD = central defence, LD = lateral defence, CM = central midfield, LM = lateral midfield, FWD = forward, RAd = number of days born in the selection year (September 1st to August 31st), aPHV = estimated age at peak height velocity, MSFT = distance achieved during the Multi-Stage Fitness Test, vCMJ = vertical counter movement jump, MBI = magnitude-based inference. Small (S), moderate (M) and large (L) magnitudes of effect are presented where inference was *likely*, *very-likely*, or *most-likely*.

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

**Table 4.** Estimated marginal means (95% confidence intervals) of relative age, maturation, anthropometric, and physical fitness characteristics for elite youth (Under 17-18) soccer players according to playing position in English elite soccer development centres.

Variable	n	Cohort	n	GK	n	CD	n	LD	n	CM	n	LM	n	FWD	ES positional difference
Age (yrs.)	138	17.8 (17.6-17.9)	10	17.8 (17.4-17.9)	21	17.7 (17.5-17.8)	24	17.7 (17.5-17.9)	33	17.8 (17.7-17.9)	23	17.6 (17.4-17.8)	27	17.6 (17.4-17.8)	
RA <sub>d</sub> (days)	138	133 (117-149)	10	122 (57-187)	21	122 (76-158)	24	142 (101-183)	33	116 (82-149)	23	161 (121-200)	27	125 (80-163)	
Stature (cm)	133	178.7 (177.2-180.1)	10	184.7 (181.0-188.4)	20	184.3 (181.9-186.7)	23	176.6 (174.178.9)	31	176.8 (174.8-178.7)	22	175.6 (173.2-177.9)	27	178.9 (176.6-181.1)	GK > LD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> , FWD <sup>M</sup> CD > LD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> , FWD <sup>M</sup>
Body-mass (kg)	133	72.3 (70.6-74.0)	10	76.8 (72.6-81.0)	20	76.6 (73.9-79.3)	23	71.0 (68.2-73.6)	31	70.1 (67.9-72.3)	22	68.3 (65.6-70.8)	27	73.4 (70.8-75.8)	GK > CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> CD > LD <sup>S</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> , LM <sup>M</sup> FWD > LM <sup>S</sup>
aPHV (yrs.)	134	14.9 (14.8-15.0)	10	14.6 (14.1-14.9)	21	14.7 (14.5-14.9)	23	15.0 (14.7-15.1)	31	15.0 (14.8-15.2)	22	14.9 (14.7-15.1)	27	14.8 (14.6-15.1)	
vCMJ (cm)	123	32.5 (28.5-36.4)	9	30.8 (25.6-35.9)	20	30.4 (25.4-35.2)	20	31.6 (26.7-36.5)	30	30.5 (25.2-34.8)	19	31.1 (26.2-35.9)	25	31.6 (26.7-36.4)	
T-Test (s)	117	9.22 (9.10-9.40)	8	9.33 (9.08-9.57)	17	9.33 (9.12-9.48)	19	9.10 (8.94-9.30)	30	9.25 (9.09-9.42)	19	9.16 (8.98-9.34)	24	9.13 (8.95-9.30)	
30m sprint (s)	123	1.62 (1.58-1.66)	9	1.65 (1.61 - 1.67)	20	1.65 (1.63 - 1.64)	20	1.61 (1.59 - 1.63)	30	1.66 (1.64 - 1.68)	19	1.60 (1.58 - 1.63)	25	1.63 (0.10 - 0.22)	LM < CD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> LD < CM <sup>M</sup>
20m sprint (s)	123	2.89 (2.85-2.92)	9	2.94 (2.88-2.99)	20	2.92 (2.88-2.95)	20	2.86 (2.82-2.89)	30	2.93 (2.90-2.96)	19	2.84 (2.80-2.87)	25	2.87 (2.84-2.90)	LM < GK <sup>M</sup> , CD <sup>M</sup> , CM <sup>M</sup> CM > LD <sup>S</sup> , FWD <sup>S</sup>
MSFT (m)	123	2383 (2333-2433)	9	2223 (2060-2386)	20	2348 (2245-2450)	20	2370 (2264-2474)	30	2456 (2370-2542)	19	2472 (2365-2579)	25	2293 (2194-2392)	

K = goalkeeper, CD = central defence, LD = lateral defence, CM = central midfield, LM = lateral midfield, FWD = forward, RA<sub>d</sub> = number of days born in the selection year (September 1st to August 31st), aPHV = estimated age at peak height velocity, MSFT = distance achieved during the Multi-Stage Fitness Test, vCMJ = vertical counter movement jump, MBI = magnitude-based inference. Small (S), moderate (M) and large (L) magnitudes of effect are presented where inference was *likely, very-likely, or most-likely*.

## EDITOR COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR

Please consider the comments of reviewer 1 carefully, especially in relation to the clarity of the results and the consistent interpretation of the findings

**Response: We sincerely thank the editor for providing us the opportunity to revise our manuscript. As highlighted in the response to the reviewer below, we have heeded their suggestions and adopted the magnitude-based inferences approach, which in our opinion simplifies the tables and provides a consistent interpretation of the findings.**

## REVIEWER COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR

Reviewer: 1

## Comments to the Author

The biggest issue for me are that the results lack clarity and interpretation of the results seems to flit between choosing to focus on significance or effect size. For the effect size there would be 15 pairwise comparisons for each variable for each age group. However, only a handful of ES comparisons are presented in Tables 2-4 and in the text and it is not clear why. Is the reader to assume all other comparisons are trivial? Or are the authors using their discretion to report ES that help them to present a story? For instance, in your response you told me:

“Although the results section does confer an absence of a significant main effect for relative age according to playing position across all chronological age groups (Page 8, Lines 207 – 210), careful consideration of the results tables (2 – 4) generally shows numerous moderate effect magnitudes between key defensive roles (GK, CD) versus other outfield positions (LD, CM, LM, FWD).”

To me this is not clear from the Tables. In table 3 there is no reference to CD in the “ES positional differences” column, other than to state they have a moderately greater RAd than CM. Firstly this seems unlikely as the difference is 95 versus 91 days (with very broad CI). Secondly and more importantly, nothing else appears in the ES differences column between CD and other positions or GK and other positions. I may be missing something obvious here as to why only some comparisons are shown in that final column of your tables, but if I am missing what is going on I am sure other readers will too. Nothing in the statistical analysis, results or tables explains the reporting in the final column of the Tables. The fact you suggest the tables need “careful consideration” to “generally show” an effect gives the impression the findings are well hidden and quite vague. If you are happy to allow the reader to draw their own conclusions based on this approach then that is fine. If you think there is compelling evidence for your interpretations and conclusions then it would make sense to make this clear in the paper.

You point to the work of Deprez and suggest you are using the same approach to reporting. Again I do not see this. For instance, in Deprez et al. (2013, published in IJSM) there is a separate section on practical/clinical significance in the result,

1  
2  
3 making a clear distinction between findings based on significance and clinical  
4 relevance. Only two comparisons are made (BQ1 v 4) and so exact ES are given in  
5 tables and the ES are supported by inference based magnitudes to qualify the  
6 meaningfulness of any differences. The current paper does not take any of these  
7 approaches. Certainly identifying the smallest worthwhile effect and inferences  
8 would help qualify the meaningfulness of the observed differences.  
9

10  
11 **Response:** We sincerely thank the reviewer for their insight and  
12 recommendations. Upon reflection we agree that adopting a hybrid approach  
13 between p-values from mixed-linear models in combination with raw effect sizes  
14 can lead to both confusion and selective interpretation. After much deliberation,  
15 we elected to remove all p-values from our manuscript and adopt the magnitude-  
16 based inferences approach. As can be seen from the revised submission, tables  
17 2-4 are much easier to interpret.  
18

19  
20 We feel that this clarify has greatly enhanced our manuscript and with hindsight  
21 we are very grateful for the reviewers persistence on this criticism. Accordingly,  
22 we have completely re-drafted the statistics narrative in the methods section,  
23 together with the results (including tables). We elected not to use track changes  
24 for these sections in our revised manuscript in the interests of clarity.  
25

26  
27 As one may expect, the differences in our key findings were relatively modest,  
28 and so the general themes of the discussion section remain. We have made the  
29 relevant changes to both the abstract and the discussion and these can be  
30 identified using the track changes facility in Microsoft word.  
31

32  
33  
34  
35 Reviewer: 2

36  
37 Comments to the Author

38 Thank you for your detailed responses and revisions to the document.  
39

40 **Response:** Many thanks for your efforts in reviewing our manuscript  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Christopher Towlson,  
7 The University of Hull,  
8 Department  
9 Hull, HU67RX,  
10 United Kingdom,

11  
12 Office: +44 (0)1482 466047  
13 Mobile: +44 (0)7974489288  
14 Email: [c.towlson@hull.ac.uk](mailto:c.towlson@hull.ac.uk)  
15

16  
17 21 September 2016

18  
19 **RE: Manuscript ID IJSM-04-2016-5587-tt**

20 **Relative age, maturation, and physical biases on position allocation in elite-youth**  
21 **Soccer**  
22  
23

24 Dear Editor(s),  
25

26 Please find enclosed our revised, above named manuscript re-submitted to your journal,  
27 International Journal of Sports Medicine.  
28

29 We sincerely thank the editor(s) and reviewers for their feedback on our manuscript. We  
30 have responded to each of the comments in turn and have paid particular attention to  
31 Reviewer 1 comments and adopted the magnitude-based inferences approach, which in  
32 our opinion simplifies the tables and provides a consistent interpretation of the findings.  
33 We hope that the modifications have improved our paper.  
34

35 We look forward to receiving feedback from the editorial team in due course, and thank  
36 them in advance for reviewing and considering our manuscript.  
37

38 Kind Regards,  
39

40 Christopher Towlson  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60