

1 Article

## 2 Clinical methods to assess and profile shoulder 3 strength in competitive surfers

4 James Furness<sup>1,2</sup>, Ben Schram<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Tim Cottman-Fields<sup>2</sup> & Brendan Solia<sup>2</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> Water Based Research Unit, Bond Institute of Health & Sport, Bond University, Gold Coast, QLD, 4226;  
6 jfurness@bond.edu.au

7 <sup>2</sup> Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University, Gold Coast, QLD, 4226;

8 \* Correspondence: bschram@bond.edu.au; Tel.: +617-5595-5828; Fax: +617-5595-4480

9

10 **Abstract:** The shoulder region has the highest incidence of acute injuries in the sport of surfing.  
11 Little is known about the strength profile at the shoulder in a surfing cohort. The primary aim of  
12 this study was to establish the reliability of a rotator cuff strength testing procedure for surfers with  
13 a secondary aim of providing a profile of internal (IR) and external rotation (ER) strength in a  
14 competitive surfing cohort. Shoulder IR and ER isometric strength was measured using a hand-held  
15 dynamometer in 13 competitive surfers. Intra-class coefficient values ranged from 0.97 to 0.98 for  
16 intra rater reliability and were lower for inter rater reliability ranging from 0.80 to 0.91. Normalised  
17 force (N/Kg) for IR strength was significantly greater than ER strength bilaterally (dominant,  $p=$   
18 0.007, non-dominant,  $p<0.001$ ). No significant differences ( $p<0.79$ ) were found in IR strength (N/Kg)  
19 between the dominant and non-dominant arms. ER strength (N/Kg) was significantly weaker on  
20 the non-dominant arm compared with the dominant arm ( $p<0.02$ ). The non-dominant arm ER to IR  
21 ratio ( $0.82 \pm 0.15$ ) was significantly ( $p=0.025$ ) lower than the dominant ( $0.88 \pm 0.14$ ). The current  
22 procedure is reliable with the same clinician, results indicate musculature asymmetry specific to the  
23 external rotators.

24 **Keywords:** surfing, rotator cuff, shoulder, strength ratio, profiling, assessment

25

26

### 27 1. Introduction

28 Over the past 14 years, global involvement in the sport of surfing has more than tripled, from an  
29 estimated 13 million participants in 2002 [1] to 37 million recorded in 2013 [2]. It is proposed that this  
30 growth in participation will only continue now that surfing has been included for its inaugural  
31 appearance into the 2020 Olympics.

32

33 Inherently, due to the nature of the sporting environment and physical demands, injuries are  
34 often associated with participation with one in every 3 recreational surfers sustaining an acute injury  
35 per year [3]. An epidemiology study conducted by Furness, Hing, Walsh, Abbott, Sheppard and  
36 Climstein [3] found the primary acute injury prone location was the shoulder (16.4%). This high  
37 incidence of shoulder injuries could be attributed to the activity requirements of surfing. Several time  
38 motion analysis studies have reported paddling comprised up to 42 to 54% of the total time spent  
39 surfing with the average paddling time ranging from 16 to 25 seconds in duration [4-6]. This paddling  
40 requirement places significant demand on the shoulders, as the surfer uses an alternate arm action to  
41 propel the board forwards. It is proposed that this activity requirement would develop increased  
42 shoulder strength and more specifically in muscle groups which extend, abduct and internally rotate  
43 the shoulder over opposing muscle groups. However, to the authors knowledge, there is no evidence  
44 investigating strength profiles in a surfing cohort.

45 While strength profiles have not been investigated in a surfing cohort, there is increasing  
46 evidence to support the association between imbalance or weakness at the shoulder and injury risk

47 in upper limb dominant sports such as handball, baseball and swimming. A prospective study  
48 conducted by Edouard, *et al.* [7] investigated shoulder Internal Rotation (IR) and External Rotation  
49 (ER) strength using isokinetic dynamometry in a cohort of female handball players. The study  
50 identified that a player who presented with a dominant arm deficit of greater than 10% and a ER to  
51 IR strength ratio approximately below 0.65 was two and a half times more likely to suffer a shoulder  
52 injury than if that deficiency was not present. Furthermore, Clarsen, *et al.* [8] used a hand held  
53 dynamometer and determined that reduced isometric external rotation weakness was a significant  
54 predictor of increased average severity scores related to shoulder injury. Strength profiles have also  
55 been assessed in the sport of baseball, which, while being a completely different sport and  
56 environment, shares the repetitive internal rotation associated with paddling a surfboard. In  
57 baseball studies, reductions in external rotation strength and lower ER/IR ratios have been shown to  
58 be associated with shoulder injury [9].  
59

60 The prospective studies discussed above provide the evidence that strength ratio's play a role in  
61 determining athletes at risk of shoulder injury. In addition to this, several studies have conducted  
62 shoulder rotator strength profiling to provide normative baseline data and as a means of tracking  
63 changes in muscle groups across a season. For example Ramsi, *et al.* [10] conducted isometric rotator  
64 strength profiling across a competitive swimming season and revealed increases in internal rotation  
65 strength without equal gains in ER from pre-season to post-season. Hurd, *et al.* [11] conducted a cross  
66 sectional study of 165 high school baseball pitchers, providing a strength profile for the internal and  
67 external rotators of the shoulder. The authors concluded that this information might be used by  
68 clinicians and researchers to interpret muscle strength performance in this population.  
69

70 It needs to be noted that when strength profiling is conducted at the shoulder it is done in a sport  
71 specific position meaning it is similar to how the contractile tissue is stressed during the required  
72 activity. For example, the study conducted by Hurd, Kaplan, Eiatrache, Jobe, Morrey and Kaufman  
73 [11] conducted on baseball pitchers utilised a position of testing where the individual was in an  
74 upright seated position with the shoulder abducted to 90 degrees, in line with the requirements of  
75 pitching. In contrast, the study conducted by Ramsi, Swanik, Swanik, Straub and Mattacola [10] on  
76 swimmers used a testing position in prone, with the shoulder abducted to 90 degrees.  
77

78 Despite shoulder strength ratio's being investigated in some sports, there are no studies which  
79 assesses shoulder internal or external rotation strength in a surfing cohort. At a minimum it would  
80 seem appropriate to establish a rotator strength profile at the shoulder for a competitive surfing  
81 cohort to aid clinicians in decision making when treating surfers. Therefore, the primary aim of this  
82 study was to establish the reliability of a rotator cuff strength testing procedure for surfers with a  
83 secondary aim of providing a profile of internal and external rotation strength in a competitive  
84 surfing cohort.

## 85 2. Materials and Methods

### 86 *Reliability Phase*

87 Reliability testing was conducted in a control group prior to implementing the testing procedure  
88 in an elite surfing cohort. A total of 21 (18 males and 3 females;  $25.29 \pm 2.67$  yrs,  $80.01 \pm 12.43$  kg and  
89  $177.10 \pm 9.02$  m) subjects were used to establish intra rater reliability and a subset of 12 (9 males and  
90 3 females;  $26.00 \pm 3.81$  yrs,  $78.10 \pm 12.57$  kg,  $177.68 \pm 9.47$  m) subjects were used to establish inter rater  
91 reliability of the testing procedure. The two physiological movements of IR and ER across the  
92 shoulder were examined. The testing order was computer randomized for examiner order, test side  
93 (right or left), and movement order. To avoid bias, both examiners and participants were blinded to  
94 their own results. A single examiner firstly conducted the entire test battery and was then followed  
95 by the alternate examiner. A 5-minute rest period was employed during the transition from one  
96 examiner to the next, as incorporated by Kelln, *et al.* [12]. The testing methodology including the

97 examiners, equipment and procedure is outlined in the preceding section and was replicated for the  
98 reliability portion of the study.

99

### 100 **Subjects**

101 A total of 13 competitive surfers (9 males and 4 females,  $24.1 \pm 6.9$  yrs,  $71.0 \pm 8.6$  kg and  $176.8 \pm$   
102  $5.7$  m) comprised the competitive surfing cohort. All surfers were either currently or previously  
103 competing at an international level (3 previously competing on the World Qualifying Series and 9  
104 currently competing on the World qualifying series and 1 currently competing on the World  
105 Championship Tour). All subjects were recruited from the Surfing Australia High Performance  
106 Centre and were asked to complete a subjective questionnaire detailing anthropometrics, training  
107 habits, surfing history, and injury history prior to undertaking the study. For inclusion within the  
108 study, subjects were required to be injury free at the time of testing, be currently engaged in surfing  
109 as a primary sport and currently engaged in competitive surfing.

110

### 111 **Examiners**

112 Participant testing was conducted by two Doctor of Physiotherapy students under the  
113 supervision of a physiotherapist with 10 years clinical experience. Both examiners underwent five  
114 hours of training to ensure familiarization of the testing technique and data collection device prior to  
115 reliability testing. Both phases of the study were approved by the University Human Research Ethics  
116 Committee (Approval No: RO1610) with verbal and written consent gained.

117

### 118 **Equipment**

119 For all strength testing a JTech PowerTrack™ II Commander HHD (JTECH Medical, Salt Lake  
120 City, UT, USA). The PowerTrack II™ apparatus includes a force transducer head and attached  
121 display panel to view real time data. For each repetition, a 'make test' was performed, whereby the  
122 examiner holds the dynamometer stationary while the subject exerts a maximal isometric force. Data  
123 obtained was then documented as an absolute value of force in Newton's (N).

124

### 125 **Testing Positions**

126 The testing position used to assess shoulder external and internal rotation isometric strength  
127 was adapted from the position used by Ramsi, Swanik, Swanik, Straub and Mattacola [10] (Figure 1).  
128 Subjects were positioned on a height adjustable plinth in the prone position with the upper arm of  
129 tested limb supported by the plinth. The shoulder was positioned in  $90^\circ$  of shoulder abduction and  
130  $90^\circ$  of elbow flexion with an open palm and neutral shoulder rotation. The prone position was  
131 employed, as it is representative of the body position utilized throughout the motion of paddling.

132 The examiner maintained a forward lunge position on the ground with the HHD placed in  
133 examiners hand closest to the plinth while testing, with the examiner's elbow fixed against the  
134 anterior aspect of the hip. This position reduces the possibility of the examiner being overcome by  
135 the subject and minimizing examiner fatigue. The non-testing hand of examiner was then used to  
136 stabilize the subjects elbow to limit compensatory abduction, adduction of the glenohumeral joint.  
137 The HHD was placed 2cm proximal to the ulnar styloid on either the ventral (internal rotation) or  
138 dorsal (external rotation) aspect of the subjects' distal forearm [13].

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146



**Figure 1.** Testing Position (a) Internal rotator strength of the right shoulder. (b) External rotator strength of the right shoulder.

### Testing Procedure

The physiological movement of shoulder IR and ER of was assessed in all subjects. The testing order was computer randomized for test side (right or left) and movement order to reduce the influence of fatigue on strength scores.

Standardized measures of moment arm lengths for the shoulder were employed and recorded as a means of further comparative torque (Nm) analysis. Moment arm landmarks and measurements for each movement were measured from the Lateral epicondyle to 2cm proximal to ulna styloid.

To familiarise the subject with the movement the examiner first passively moved the limb to be tested through the appropriate action and then reassessed the participant complete the movement actively without the HHD to ensure the correct movement was completed. A familiarization test was then performed, whereby subjects were exposed to identical conditions of a 'real' test, however were only required to perform at 50% of Maximal Voluntary Contraction (MVC). This was completed by instructing participants to contract at half of their maximal effort.

Subjects completed two repetitions for both internal and external rotation. Subjects were instructed to perform the movement and maintain a 3-second sustained maximal isometric contraction against the HHD transducer head. A rest period of 10 seconds was allowed between each repetition and a 30-second rest between testing of each individual movement (i.e. IR or ER). This protocol was adapted from previous research methods utilizing HHD at the shoulder [13,14].

Verbal instruction and encouragement was standardized across each test. The examiner performing the measurement initiated each test with a "1-2-3-go" count. Verbal encouragement of consistent tone and volume with the phrase "push-push-push-relax" was provided by the examiner performing the measurement.

### Data Analysis

Analysis of data was performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS Inc. Version 23.0, Chicago, IL, USA). The Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) was used to reflect the reliability of the measures. Lexell and Downham [15] recommended that ICC values  $>0.75$  represent "excellent reliability" and values between 0.5 and 0.7 indicate "fair to good reliability". For inter-rater reliability a two-way mixed model was used using average measures of rater 1 and rater 2 (ICC<sub>3,2</sub>). Similarly, intra-rater reliability was determined using a two way mixed model incorporating single measures obtained by rater 1 (ICC<sub>3,1</sub>). ICC values may be high despite poor trial-to-trial consistency if a high degree of inter-subject variability exists [15]. To negate this issue the Standard Error of

184 Measurement (SEM) was calculated using the formula  $= \sqrt{WMS}$ , where WMS represents the mean  
185 square error from the analysis of variance.

186 Torque (Nm) was calculated by multiplying the absolute force (N) by average moment arm  
187 length for left and right sides (m). Normalized forces (N/kg) and torques (Nm/kg) were determined  
188 by dividing the absolute force and torque values by respective participant bodyweights (kg).  
189 Shoulder rotation ratios were determined by dividing average internal rotation force by average  
190 external rotation force. A single average value for each variable was obtained for the surfing group  
191 with males and females combined as a single cohort. Both genders were combined due to the small  
192 sample size and were normalised by body weight. Previous research using HHD in overhead athletes  
193 has revealed gender differences are absent once normalised to body weight [16].

194 To test for normality, both a Shapiro-Wilks test ( $p > 0.05$ ) [17] and visual inspection of resulting  
195 histograms were conducted within the surfing group. A paired t-test was conducted to determine  
196 significant differences within the surfing group's dominant and non-dominant limbs respectively. A  
197 cohens  $d$  effect size was also calculated to reflect the magnitude of any differences identified, with  
198 scores greater than 0.8 representing a large effect, 0.5 – 0.79 representing a moderate effect and 0.2 –  
199 0.49 a weak effect [18]. Scores between 0.00 and 0.49 represented a trivial effect [19].

### 200 3. Results

#### 201 3.1 Reliability Phase

202 Reliability analysis was conducted using ICC and SEM and are presented within Table 1.  
203 Relative reliability was expressed using ICC values which were all within the excellent ranges  
204 according to Lexell and Downham [15]. Values ranged from 0.97 to 0.98 for intra rater reliability and  
205 were lower for inter rater reliability ranging from 0.80 to 0.91. Absolute relative reliability was  
206 expressed using SEM which ranged from 7.08 to 7.35 newtons for intra rater reliability and were  
207 higher for inter rater reliability ranging from 8.88 to 24.00 newtons  
208

209 **Table 1.** Intra and Inter-rater reliability for both IR and ER for the non-dominant and dominant  
210 arms.

	Intra-rater Reliability (n=21)	SEM	Inter-rater Reliability (n=21)	SEM
<b>Dom IR</b>	0.98 (0.96-0.99)	7.12	0.80 (0.32-0.94)	24.00
<b>Non-Dom IR</b>	0.98 (0.95-0.99)	7.35	0.91 (0.70-0.97)	12.55
<b>Dom ER</b>	0.98 (0.94-0.99)	7.08	0.96 (0.86-0.99)	8.88
<b>Non-Dom ER</b>	0.97 (0.94-0.99)	7.21	0.85 (0.46-0.96)	15.43

211 <sup>1</sup> n refers to the number of subjects, Reliability measures are expressed as Intraclass Correlation Coefficient  
212 (95% Confidence Intervals), SEM refers to Standard Error of Measurement, IR refers to Internal Rotation, ER  
213 refers to External Rotation, Dom refers to Dominant arm, Non-Dom refers to Non-Dominant arm

#### 214 *Surfing Cohort*

##### 215 3.2 Demographics

216 Additional information pertaining to surfing experience and training was obtained for the  
217 surfing cohort. The average surfing experience, weekly time spent surfing and weekly time spent  
218 conducting land-based training was  $16.5 \pm 7.15$  years,  $12.0 \pm 4.5$  hours and  $4.85 \pm 2.66$  hours  
219 respectively.  
220

##### 221 3.3 Isometric strength testing in an elite surfing cohort

222 Mean results for both the absolute strength (N) and torque values (Nm) and the normalized  
223 force (N/kg) and torque values (Nm/kg) are presented in Table 2. A comparative analysis was  
224 conducted between arm dominance for all normalized values using a paired samples t-test. When  
225 comparing the IR values against the ER values for the same arm, the IR values are significantly higher

226 (dominant,  $p= 0.007$ , non-dominant,  $p<0.001$ ). No significant differences were found in IR scores  
 227 between the dominant and non-dominant arms for normalized force (N/Kg) ( $p< 0.79$ ) and normalized  
 228 torque (Nm/kg) ( $p< 0.81$ ). Significant differences were identified when comparing ER values between  
 229 the dominant and non-dominant arms with the non-dominant arm being significantly weaker for  
 230 both normalized force (N/kg) ( $p<0.02$ ) and normalized torque (Nm/kg) ( $p<0.01$ ). Further side to side  
 231 differences were also identified when comparing the ER to IR ratio between the dominant ( $0.88 \pm$   
 232  $0.14$ ) and non-dominant arm ( $0.82 \pm 0.15$ ) with the non-dominant arm revealing a significantly lower  
 233 ratio when compared to the dominant arm ( $p=0.025$ ). Table 3 reflects these results for normalized  
 234 force (N/Kg) with the magnitude of the differences expressed as effect sizes. This section may be  
 235 divided by subheadings. It should provide a concise and precise description of the experimental  
 236 results, their interpretation as well as the experimental conclusions that can be drawn.  
 237

238 **Table 2.** Actual and relative mean scores (SD) for both IR and ER for the dominant and non-  
 239 dominant arms

Movement	Force (N)	Torque (Nm)	Normalized Force (N/kg)	Normalized Torque (Nm/kg)
IR Dom	148.23 (44.43)	36.56 (12.47)	2.05 (0.43)	0.50 (0.12)
IR Non-Dom	148.50 (34.57)	35.91 (9.64)	2.07 (0.34)	0.50 (0.10)
ER Dom	130.46 (37.84)	32.12 (10.63)	1.81 (0.40)	0.44 (0.11)
ER Non-Dom	118.12 (31.65)	28.55 (8.45)	1.65 (0.34)	0.40 (0.09)

240 N refers to newtons, Nm refers to newton metres, N/kg refers to newtons per kilogram, Nm/kg  
 241 refers to newtons metres per kilogram  
 242  
 243

244 **Table 3.** Normalized force (N/Kg) comparison between dominant and non-dominant arms with  
 245 associated effect sizes

	<i>P</i> value	Effect size	Magnitude of effect
IR Dom compared to IR Non-Dom	0.79	-0.07	Trivial
ER Dom compared to ER Non-Dom	0.02	0.76	Medium
IR Dom compared to ER Dom	0.007	0.90	Large
IR Non-Dom compared to ER Non-Dom	0.000	1.68	Large
ER/IR Ratio Dom compared to ER/IR Ratio Non-Dom	0.02	0.73	Medium

246 IR refers to Internal Rotation, ER refers to External Rotation, Dom refers to Dominant arm,  
 247 Non-Dom refers to Non-Dominant arm  
 248

#### 249 4. Discussion

250 The aim of this study was to establish the reliability of a rotator cuff strength testing procedure  
 251 for surfers and to subsequently provide a profile of internal and external rotation strength in a  
 252 competitive surfing cohort. The results of this study suggest that this surf specific measure  
 253 procedure displays excellent intra rater reliability enabling a rotator cuff strength profile to be  
 254 developed.

255 The reliability of the testing procedure was assessed to ensure repeatability prior to  
256 implementation of the testing procedure in a surfing population. A prone position was utilized as  
257 this is a primary position that surfers produce shoulder movement and strength in and can spend  
258 up to 54% of a session paddling [5]. The ICC scores produced in the current study for both intra  
259 (0.97-0.98) and inter-rater (0.80-0.96) reliability were all above the excellent threshold of 0.75  
260 recommended by Lexell and Downham [15]. The intra rater ICC scores from the current study are  
261 comparable to a study by Holt, Raper, Boettcher, Waddington and Drew [14] who also used hand  
262 held dynamometry and assessed IR and ER isometric strength and revealed scores ranging from  
263 0.92-0.96. With regards to inter rater reliability of the current study the ICC scores (0.80-0.96) were  
264 slightly lower than previous research [13,14] and indicated wider variability with regards to the  
265 95% confidence intervals ranging from 0.32-0.99 and larger SEM scores ranging from 9 to 24  
266 newtons. Previous research by Holt, Raper, Boettcher, Waddington and Drew [14] revealed higher  
267 ICC scores for inter rater reliability 0.88 to 0.96 and lower SEM scores. Possible rationale to lower  
268 ICC scores in the current study could be associated with the level of experience as the current study  
269 utilized two Doctor of Physiotherapy students and the study by Holt, Raper, Boettcher,  
270 Waddington and Drew [14] utilized sports physiotherapist with up to 15 years of experience, thus  
271 experience may have assisted with improvements in repeatability. Given the inter rater results the  
272 authors recommend that the when using the protocol described within the current study that the  
273 same clinician should both assess and monitor an athlete over time.

274 The secondary aim of this study was to provide a profile for internal and external rotation  
275 strength in a competitive surfing cohort. To the authors knowledge this is the first study to provide  
276 information specific to isometric strength at the shoulder in a surfing cohort and given the activity  
277 requirements and high incidence of shoulder injuries, this information may be useful for both  
278 enhancing performance and reducing injuries.

279 The current results revealed normalised strength values of IR and ER isometric strength  
280 ranging from 1.6 to 2.1 N/Kg within a competitive surfing cohort of both males and females. There  
281 are similarities in the current results to previously published normative data studies using HHD.  
282 Cools, Vanderstukken, Vereecken, Duprez, Heyman, Goethals and Johansson [16] assessed  
283 isometric shoulder ER and IR with the shoulder in 90 degrees of abduction and neutral humeral  
284 rotation (as per the current study) on 201 upper limb dominant athletes (tennis, volley ball,  
285 handball) and determined normalised values ranging from 1.7 to 2.1 N/Kg. When closely analysing  
286 the data by Cools, Vanderstukken, Vereecken, Duprez, Heyman, Goethals and Johansson [16] and  
287 inspecting the cohorts with an age range of 18 to 33 years (similar to the current study) the results  
288 ranged from 1.8 to 2.1 N/Kg for both ER and IR isometric shoulder strength respectively. While the  
289 isometric IR values appear to be identical to the current study the ER results are consistently lower  
290 regardless of limb dominance (1.8 for non-dominant limbs and 1.9 for dominant limbs compared  
291 with 1.6 in the non-dominant limb to 1.8 in the dominant limb in the surfing cohort).

292 When further analysing the current study's ER isometric strength results there are several  
293 similarities to previous research. Firstly, ER results are significantly lower than IR results regardless  
294 of limb dominance. This has been previously reflected in upper limb dominant athletes such as  
295 handball, tennis, volleyball [16], baseball [7] and swimming [10]. When analysing the side to side  
296 differences in ER strength, the non-dominant side was significantly weaker (medium magnitude of  
297 effect). The Previous research reveals mixed results with respect to ER strength and arm  
298 dominance, with some studies [11,16] reporting stronger ER in the dominant limb and other studies  
299 reporting no difference in ER strength between arms [10,20,21]. It could be argued that this  
300 difference is unique to a surfing cohort, however a larger sample size is needed to confirm this  
301 finding.

302 The IR isometric strength results within the surfing cohort were revealed to be significantly  
303 stronger than ER values representing the largest effect sizes (cohens *d* of 1.68 for the non-dominant

304 side and a cohens  $d$  of 0.90 for the dominant side). This finding of significantly stronger IR values  
305 compared with ER values regardless of limb dominance is in agreement with a large portion of  
306 research specific to upper limb dominant athletes [10,11,16,21] and in non-athletic populations [21].  
307 This study revealed no differences in IR isometric strength between sides (2.1 N/Kg dominant  
308 versus 2.1 N/Kg non-dominant). This finding is unique to this study as a large portion of evidence  
309 has revealed significant strength differences between sides in upper limb and non-athletic  
310 populations [11,16,20,21]. Even in sports such as swimming where a symmetrical action is  
311 performed differences in IR strength between limbs has been identified [10]. The authors propose  
312 that this symmetry in IR isometric strength values could be attributed to the activity requirements  
313 of paddling, with the surfer utilizing more of a pulling motion and consequently developing  
314 musculature which assists with shoulder adduction, extension and internal rotation.

315 This study was the first to document ER to IR isometric strength ratios at the shoulder with a  
316 ratio of 0.88 on the dominant side and 0.82 on the non-dominant side. These ratios appear to be  
317 slightly lower than previous research conducted on upper limb dominant athletes when using a  
318 HHD with similar positioning of the shoulder. Previous research has found ER to IR ratio's  
319 ranging from 0.86 to 1.05 in a cohort of volleyball, tennis and handball athletes [16]. Hurd, Kaplan,  
320 Eiatrache, Jobe, Morrey and Kaufman [11] analyzed baseball players and revealed ER to IR ratio's  
321 ranging from 0.96 to 1.05. Furthermore, the current study revealed the non-dominant arm to have a  
322 significantly ( $p<0.05$ ) lower ER to IR ratio when compared to the dominant arm. This is contrary to  
323 previous research conducted in upper limb dominant athletes, with the dominant arm having  
324 consistently higher ER to IR ratio's [10,11,16]. The lower IR to ER ratio on the non-dominant side in  
325 the current study is due to the weaker external rotators on the non-dominant side as no side to side  
326 differences were detected between internal rotators.

327 This study has identified symmetry between sides in the internal rotators and significantly  
328 weaker external rotators more specifically the non-dominant arm. Given these findings the authors  
329 recommend the described assessment methods to routinely assess athletes who surf. Where  
330 asymmetry is identified specific strengthening, exercises should be promoted to address the  
331 identified weaknesses. In the case of this study specific strengthening exercises should be targeted  
332 to the external rotators to promote a more symmetrical profile and a ER to IR ratio closer to 1, as  
333 asymmetry and lower ER to IR ratios have been identified as risk factors for injury [7,8]

334 A limitation of this study is the small sample size and the subsequent necessity to combine  
335 both females and males into one cohort. To negate the influence of gender differences on strength  
336 values data was normalized by weight. Previous research by Cools, Vanderstukken, Vereecken,  
337 Duprez, Heyman, Goethals and Johansson [16] who also analyzed upper limb dominant athletes  
338 and used a similar testing protocol revealed that while males were significantly stronger, when  
339 normalized to body weight, differences were absent. Given the small sample size the findings of  
340 this study should not be generalized outside of this current study cohort. Future research is needed  
341 within a larger surfing cohort to confirm the current findings and provide more robust  
342 recommendations.

## 343 5. Conclusions

344 This study has identified a reliable method to assess isometric ER and IR strength when used by  
345 the same clinician. The authors recommend this assessment method is used to profile and monitor  
346 athletes involved in competitive surfing to assist in their management. Competitive surfers appear to  
347 have greater strength in the internal rotator muscle groups compared with the external rotators.  
348 Asymmetry was also identified between sides for the external rotators only, with the non-dominant  
349 arm being significantly weaker. Coaches and clinicians dealing with surfers should routinely assess  
350 isometric strength and where appropriate provide strength training to minimize musculature  
351 asymmetry.



352 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization JF & BS; Methodology, JF, BS, TCF & BS, Formal Analysis, JF;  
 353 Investigation; JF, BS, TCF, BS, Data Curation, JF, BS; Writing-Original Draft Preparation, BS, TCF; JF, BS;  
 354 Supervision, JF & BS

355 **Funding:** "This research received no external funding"

356 **Acknowledgments:** Thank you to the surfers and staff from the High-Performance Center for their assistance in  
 357 this project.

358 **Conflicts of Interest:** "The authors declare no conflict of interest."

## 359 References

- 360 1. Nathanson, A.; Haynes, P.; Galanis, D. Surfing injuries. *Am J Emerg Med* **2002**, *20*, 155-160.
- 361 2. Moran, K.; Webber, J. Surfing injuries requiring first aid in new zealand, 2007-2012. In *IJARE*, 2013;  
 362 Vol. 7, pp 192-203.
- 363 3. Furness, J.; Hing, W.; Walsh, J.; Abbott, A.; Sheppard, J.M.; Climstein, M. Acute injuries in recreational  
 364 and competitive surfers: Incidence, severity, location, type, and mechanism. *Am J Sports Med* **2015**, *43*, 1246-  
 365 1254.
- 366 4. Secomb, J.L.; Sheppard, J.M.; Dascombe, B.J. Time-motion analysis of a 2-hour surfing training  
 367 session. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* **2015**, *10*, 17-22.
- 368 5. Farley, O.; Harris, N.K.; Kilding, A.E. Physiological demands of competitive surfing. *J Strength Cond*  
 369 *Res* **2012**, *26*, 1887-1896.
- 370 6. Meir, R.A.; Lowdon, B.J.; Davie, A.J. Heart rates and estimated energy expenditure during  
 371 recreational surfing. *Aust J Sci Med Sport* **1991**, *23*, 70-74.
- 372 7. Edouard, P.; Degache, F.; Oullion, R.; Plessis, J.Y.; Gleizes-Cervera, S.; Calmels, P. Shoulder strength  
 373 imbalances as injury risk in handball. *International Journal of Sports Medicine* **2013**, *34*, 654-660.
- 374 8. Clarsen, B.; Bahr, R.; Andersson, S.H.; Munk, R.; Myklebust, G. Reduced glenohumeral rotation,  
 375 external rotation weakness and scapular dyskinesis are risk factors for shoulder injuries among elite male  
 376 handball players: A prospective cohort study. *Br J Sports Med* **2014**, *48*, 1327.
- 377 9. Byram, I.R.; Bushnell, B.D.; Dugger, K.; Charron, K.; Frank E. Harrell, J.; Noonan, T.J. Preseason  
 378 shoulder strength measurements in professional baseball pitchers: Identifying players at risk for injury. *Am*  
 379 *J Sports Med* **2010**, *38*, 1375-1382.
- 380 10. Ramsi, M.; Swanik, K.A.; Swanik, C.B.; Straub, S.; Mattacola, C. Shoulder-rotator strength of high  
 381 school swimmers over the course of a competitive season. In *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation*, Human Kinetics  
 382 Publishers, Inc: 2004; Vol. 13, p 9.
- 383 11. Hurd, W.J.; Kaplan, K.M.; Eiatrache, N.S.; Jobe, F.W.; Morrey, B.F.; Kaufman, K.R. A profile of  
 384 glenohumeral internal and external rotation motion in the uninjured high school baseball pitcher, part i:  
 385 Motion. In *J Athl Train*, National Athletic Trainers Association: United States, 2011; Vol. 46, pp 282-288.
- 386 12. Kelln, B.M.; McKeon, P.O.; Gontkof, L.M.; Hertel, J. Hand-held dynamometry: Reliability of lower  
 387 extremity muscle testing in healthy, physically active, young adults. *Journal of sport rehabilitation* **2008**, *17*,  
 388 160.
- 389 13. Cools, A.M.; De Wilde, L.; Van Tongel, A.; Ceysens, C.; Ryckewaert, R.; Cambier, D.C. Measuring  
 390 shoulder external and internal rotation strength and range of motion: Comprehensive intra-rater and inter-  
 391 rater reliability study of several testing protocols. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery* **2014**, *23*, 1454-1461.
- 392 14. Holt, K.L.; Raper, D.P.; Boettcher, C.E.; Waddington, G.S.; Drew, M.K. Hand-held dynamometry  
 393 strength measures for internal and external rotation demonstrate superior reliability, lower minimal  
 394 detectable change and higher correlation to isokinetic dynamometry than externally-fixed dynamometry  
 395 of the shoulder. *Physical Therapy in Sport* **2016**, *21*, 75-81.
- 396 15. Lexell, J.E.; Downham, D.Y. How to assess the reliability of measurements in rehabilitation. *Am J Phys*  
 397 *Med Rehabil* **2005**, *84*, 719-723.
- 398 16. Cools, A.M.J.; Vanderstukken, F.; Vereecken, F.; Duprez, M.; Heyman, K.; Goethals, N.; Johansson, F.  
 399 Eccentric and isometric shoulder rotator cuff strength testing using a hand-held dynamometer: Reference  
 400 values for overhead athletes. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* **2016**, *24*, 3838-3847.
- 401 17. Shapiro, S.S.; Wilk, M.B. An analysis of variance test for normality. *Biometrika* **1965**, *52*, 591.
- 402 18. Cohen, J. A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin* **1992**, *112*, 155-159.

- 403 19. Moran, R.W.; Schneiders, A.G.; Mason, J.; Sullivan, S.J. Do functional movement screen (fms)  
404 composite scores predict subsequent injury? A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* **2017**.  
405 20. Ellenbecker, T.; Roetert, E.P. Age specific isokinetic glenohumeral internal and external rotation  
406 strength in elite junior tennis players. *J Sci Med Sport* **2003**, *6*, 63-70.  
407 21. Riemann, B.L.; Davies, G.J.; Ludwig, L.; Gardenhour, H. Hand-held dynamometer testing of the  
408 internal and external rotator musculature based on selected positions to establish normative data and  
409 unilateral ratios. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery* **2010**, *19*, 1175-1183.  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414