

Analysis of tug of war competition.

A narrative complete review

Ruth Cayero¹, Valentín Rocandio¹, Julio Calleja-González¹, Inmaculada Martínez de Aldama¹

¹Physical Education and Sport Department, Faculty of Education and Sport University of Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Vitoria- Gasteiz, 01007 Spain.
ruth.cayero@ehu.eus; julio.calleja@ehu.eus; inmaculada.martinezdealdama@ehu.es

*Correspondence: Valentín Rocandio¹ email:valentin.rocandio@ehu.eus; Phone: +34- 945 01 3560

Abstract

Tug-of-war (TOW) is an internationally played activity including professional and amateur athletes and defined as early (4000 years ago as a rope less version) in the artwork on Egyptian tomb engravings and is played as per the rules laid out by TWIF, which has 73 member countries and administrative headquarters in the USA. Typically, two teams of “pullers” participate and apply enormous contra directional forces on the pulling rope. Originally, two types of competition are used: knockout and points. This narrative review describes the scientific state of the art about of TOW. For the best of the author’s knowledge no previous information has been published.

Key words: tug of war, anthropometrics, physical capacities, physiology, injuries, kinetics.

1. Introduction

Tug-of-war (TOW) is an internationally played activity and includes professional and amateur sport athletes [1, 3]. TOW is one of the oldest sports in current existence, and Egyptian tomb engravings depict boys participating in this sport over 4000 years ago [1] with a long tradition, dating back to approximately 2000 BC. The term originates from the German “*togga werra*” which denotes “a contest in tugging or pulling” [2]. In this way, TOW was recorded as a royal sport in several ancient civilizations such as China, Egypt and Greece. In particular, in ancient China, TOW was usually called ‘*hook pulling*’ and its history can be traced back to the Spring and Autumn Period, i.e; more than 2,500 years prior.

There is no specific time and place to pinpoint the origin of TOW. The contest of pulling a rope has also been described in histories from countries such as India, China, Korea, France, Scandinavia, Great Britain, and South America. Towards the end of 19th century, TOW became an organized sport in parts of Europe and it was also included in the Olympic Games held through 1900 to 1920 [2].

In recent decades, TOW has increasingly gained popularity on both national and international levels. The first Association was created in England in 1958, TOW International Federation (TWIF), which controls global practice of the competition, was founded in the early 1960s. The TWIF is a member of the World Games Association, and the sport of TOW has been part of the World Games since 1981, when was included for the first time in World Games held in USA [3].

More recently, the sport has become organized on a Worldwide basis. The TOW International Federation (TWIF) has 73 Member Association and has organize The International TOW competition since 1964 [2, 5].

2. Competition

TOW is played as per the rules laid out by TWIF administrative headquarters in the USA. Typically, 2 teams of “pullers” participate and apply enormous contra directional forces on the pulling rope [3]. In this type of competition, the 2 teams of eight, pulling against 1 another on a rope of not less than 33.5 m. The main target is to pull the opposing team towards a centerline for a distance of 4 m. Originally, two types of competition are used: knockout and points [2].

Teams are categorized based on body mass classes ranging from 480 to 720 kg per team and also as men, women or senior (>18 years old for males and >16 years old for females), U-23, and junior (15–18 years old) teams [4]. During the championships, is shot in the following body mass categories: Male: 560-600-

640-680-720 kg and female: 480, 500, 520, 540 and 560 kg. On the other hand, there is another category (started in 2012) which is the mixed, 580 kg senior, 560 kg. U-23 and 520 kg junior [5]. The teams can make a change in all competition, the person who enters must weight equal or less than that which is replaced [5].

Besides, if in each body mass category there are more than 11 teams, sub-groups are made. In groups, it throws twice against each opponent, one on one side and another, on the other side, can win or lose both or tie. In contrast, in the semi-finals there is no tie, if this happens, a third pull is made. The same happens in the finals and in the fight for the bronze medal [5].

Furthermore, the competitions are based on body mass categories. The individual athlete must “make weight” and the use of different body mass reduction strategies leading to acute dehydration is common [2]. The best of three pulls is the typical format [2], with a rest period of 2 minutes between the pulls. A maximum of 6 minutes may be claimed between trials, beginning when a team leaves the arena and ending when a team is in the marshall area ready to re-enter to the arena [5].

3. Performance characteristics

3.1 Anthropometrics

International scientific literature describes general characteristics of TOW athlete's comparing with a control group in an only one descriptive and transversal study, for the best of the authors knowledge [2]. In this sense, some interesting data about general anthropometrical parameters have been described recently. For example, body mass: 83.6 (3.0) kg; lean body mass (69.4 (2.1) and body fat: (16.7 (0.9) %).

3.2 Physical and physiological capacities

Related to conditional capacities, in terms of endurance performance, these types of athletes presented 55.8 (1.6) ml/kg/min in the $\text{VO}_{2\text{max}}$, measured by treadmill test [2]. Therefore, aerobic power was higher in the TOW group than age and sex described parameters for general population, but below values reported for elite endurance athletes [6].

Based on the scientific articles about strength, during either dynamic or static pulling in a TOW competition, the maximal pulling force on the rope might be higher than 150% of the participants' body mass [7]. Regarding relative strength, dynamic leg power was 4659.8 ± 151.6 N. In this sense, given that strength is a key attribute of TOW, high levels of grip, back, and leg strength being essential to resist the large forces generated by the opposing team [2].

In this sense, previous studies presented a significantly higher strength to body mass ratio when adjusted for body mass [2]. In particular, international level TOW male have an excellent strength and above average endurance relative to body size [2]. On the other hand, a group of researchers investigated gender differences in pulling strength during experimentally executed TOW for Japanese elementary school children [8]. This study concluded that pulling strength gender difference was large in 5th and 6th grade. However, no tendency was found from 1st to 4th grade. In addition, pulling strength tended to grow constantly. Regarding to female children, sum of pulling strength increases substantially when the grade changes from 2nd to 3rd and from 4th to 6th, sum of back strength and rope tension were very close to each other. The results suggested that though male children get grow for muscles and female children get motor function more than male [8].

Finally, another interesting study observed after 3-week specific training resulted in significant neuromuscular changes increasing muscular strength and strength endurance [9].

Concerning flexibility, little information was found. Leg flexibility was 25.4 (2.0) cm for the TOW group [2]. The sit and reach (goal standard) and forward flexion tests were performed as a measure of lower back and hamstring flexibility and back flexion test, as a measure of the flexibility of the back extensor muscles, presenting nearly 25.4 cm (2.0) in sit and reach, 8.0 cm (2.1) in forward flexion and 28.6 cm (1.4) in back flexion test [2]. The mean values for forward flexion (8 (2) cm) and back flexion (28.6 (1.4) cm) for the tug of war group were below the expected ranges that we use as standards for athletes: (10–25 cm) and (35–50 cm) respectively.

From holistic point of view. Rider and colleges examined the physiological effects of training and competition with 17-18 male pullers [10]. Participant's fitness was assessed (flexibility, power, muscular strength, and body composition) in 2 moments (Pre-Train) and (Post-Train) of training. The pullers mean hydration levels decreased during training, but hydration status returned to baseline levels 56 hours after the event. Elevated CK levels appear to reflect the intense nature of this practice. Besides, the data concluded that an endurance TOW elicits minimal muscle damage compared with pre-training, similar to other endurance activities in its physiological impact on the body.

4. Injuries

Trainers, athletes and researchers are concerned about injuries that may arise from exhausted muscle use caused by tremendous forces imposed on the rope during TOW games [11]. Given that, pullers participate and apply enormous

contra directional forces on the pulling rope [3], related to injuries, strains and sprains comprised have been described: over half of all injuries, the back (42%), shoulder–upper limb (23%), and knee (17%) were most commonly affected body parts. In both genders, injury patterns were similar [1]. Finally, in a previous survey study of 252 elite outdoor TOW pullers, the 35% of them, reported one or more previous injuries during TOW training or practice [1]. Actually, injuries in the UE (Upper extremity) and shoulder girdle accounted for 12 and 11% of the injured areas; the UE and shoulder girdle are reported as the third and fourth most frequently injured areas in the same study [1].

Anyway, there are several reports of medical complications such as hernias [11], retinal hemorrhage [12] and fractures [4, 13]. Finally, in addition one study published describing a tear of a biceps muscle [15].

5. Kinetics analysis

The description of pulling technique is important to understand this particular sport. The pulling position and the relationship among body inclination, holding height and pulling force has been studied [15, 16]. The elite TOW pullers produced the motion to pull by not only arm. Body as well. To hold arm to body, closed their side, extended their trunk, inclined their body and lower body heavily [16]. Analyzing the synchronize pulling timing and direction by a drone, all puller synchronized rightward and backward movement, caused synchronize pulling timing and direction, which culminated in lower the loss of the force [17]. In this way, a group directed by Tanaka, suggested the importance of timing skill of drop phase to avoid the loss of team pulling force in TOW, concluding that the smaller peak time differences are in two pullers, the smaller is the reduction of peak force in pair [18].

Pulling movement in TOW contest can be divided into three phases: namely "Drop", "Hold" and "Drive" phase: 1) Drop phase is the stage that pullers put pulling force rapidly right after start pulling. 2) Hold phase is the stage that pullers hold against pulling of opponent [16, 19], and 3) Drive phase is described like an exerting pulling force with backward walking and drawing opponent into own territory [7]. The elite team backward pulling distance of Drop phase is longer than normal team and anchor man pulled the rope shorter than other positions comparatively, given that they have a different role [19].

Concretely analyzing the Drive phase of elite indoor TOWers, the maximal pulling forces was: 1041.6 ± 123.9 N ranged from 792.3 to 1240.7 N. The percentage of dynamic pulling force in static maximal pulling force was: $75.5 \pm 14.4\%$ [7]. The dynamic pulling forces expressed as a percentage of body mass

was ranged from 106.4 to 182.5%. They also described the order of lower leg and lower limb movement [7].

Following with the team pulling force, the team resultant is smaller than the sum of individual players [20]. The factor of force vanishing was the coordination among athletes. The force vanishing percentage describes from 8.82 ± 5.59 for 2 contenders to 19.74 ± 2.22 for 8 athletes, ding 6.4 % the sum of 2 pullers [18]. However, in the Drop phase, for female elite TOW team, only the 0.5 % of them, pulling force was wasted [21].

Concreted kinetic analysis, provided information in the use of each UE muscle group during TOW movements [22]. In particular, the individual power hold (148.5 ± 31.7 kg) and the team power hold (1188 kg). In this sense, the gripping force, the force fluctuation and the force pulse variables were analyzed [23]. The results showed that the TOW athletes exhibited superior force-generating capacity and more economic force-grading as compared with the non-athletes, without additional costs to task accuracy and force steadiness, during a highly-demanding rhythmic force task.

In other way other studies investigated the influence of specific types of training programs. The first, analyzed the influence of specific types of muscle training, performed by previously well-trained competitive athletes, on the force-velocity of the arm flexors. In particular, 4 rowers, 5 athletes competing in TOW and 6 middle- and long-distance runners, were measured at different stages of their training program during the period of one training year [24]. The main conclusion described that variation in the type, intensity, and volume of arm training throughout a year hardly affected the course of the force-velocity curve of the arm flexors of well-trained athletes [24]. The second research analyzed the plyometric strength training effects of elite male tuggers, related to Defend Fast Break (DFB), and Attack Fast Break (AFB) before and after practice [25]. The Parameters of DFB, the time of the peak pull force, the minimal pull force, the action response time and the average of force before and after the training, presented significant level. In AFB parameter, the first peak and minimal pull force, the time of the first peak and the time of action responses, the average of force and the slope of force concluded significant level. There are some previous studies about the pulling force curves in DFB and AFB [26]. They suggested to take the DFB movements in order to produce powerful pulling force, then transform to the AFB movements to keep the team formation.

Concerning pulling stiles two are described [27], the “European Back-Step” (EBS) and the “Japanese Back-Step” (JBS) indoor TOW, attack movements. The kinetics parameters of these 2 different attacks, concluded to find out which movement style is more powerful and more efficient. JBS was more powerful than EBS both in the peak and the minimum GRF.

For the best of our knowledge, only one study has compared the ground reaction force between gripping styles. Defining that the same pullers exhibit a higher ground force when using indoor gripping (GS1) than when using outdoor gripping (GS2) [28], given that the GS1 group may have a better chance of winning in real competitions as the force level and the speed to achieve the peak force are both beneficial to dominate sports competitions [29]. Moreover, the more flexed elbow and more supinated forearm observed in the GS2 group might be better for the main strong elbow flexor (m. biceps brachialis) to generate its maximal contraction in an anatomical and tension length aspect [30]. A more supinated forearm was found to reduce the gripping force [31] and might have a negative impact on force performance in the GS1 group.

Based on joint movements, the lower activation in the proximal elbow muscles might be due to their poor joint position and muscle length for the generation of maximal contraction [30] during TOW pulling, i.e; muscles are in a lengthening position for flexing movements and shortening position for extending movements. Although higher co-contraction ratio (CCR) might help in providing joint stability and prevent injuries of peri-joint soft tissues during competition, previous studies suggested that higher joint stiffness from muscle co-contraction can result in higher mechanical and physiological stress on joint cartilages [3]. Avoidance of long-lasting UE training with closed chain or weight bearing exercises to reduce the excessive mechanical force [33] and sufficient resting between training activities might be helpful.

Besides, frictional forces are acting in the contact plane of two bodies and thus, one of them being the earth's surface, horizontal forces can be generated. The friction characteristics between surface and shoe in TOW were investigated. The measured the static coefficient of friction at each shoe on three different mats (English, European and Japanese) to determine a suitable shoe for indoor TOW. When tug-of-war is attempted on an English mat or a Japanese mat, the use of TOR 107 or TOR 109, shoe types, might be much preferable to the tennis shoe or running shoe. However, there were no significant differences among all shoes, on a European mat [34].

In relation to materials and in order to find the benefits of the waist belt (WB) in TOW, a study compare kinematic differences between two-handed (TH) and WB pulling backward exercises [35]. Since there was no significant difference between mean maximal forces of TH and WB trials in the Drive phase, it could be assumed that WB would produce a pulling force no less than during a TH trial without using upper limbs. In addition, the backward walking speed during WB trials was 1.5 times faster than that of TH. And also, the mean speed of COM during WB trials was 1.6 times faster than TH. These results suggest that the WB had the efficacy to accomplish a given task in the drive phase.

Related EMG technique, this concept has been widely used in studying muscle activation in sports research [36]. In TOE, the EMG describes a high activity of dorsal muscle during the pulling [22].

Finally, other studies going into the detail of measuring systems and machines, presented the experiment for constructing an it-tow, finding that to put IT-TOW into practice, the pulling force data must be exchanged and not be measured by a load cell, but defined by another system [37]. Analyzing TOW on condition of maximum friction and stable rope, achieves the sequence which can exert maximum energy [38]. Later, Bing Zhang in 2012, built an ideal and simple model with mechanical analysis. They study the maximum pressure and conduct force analysis of rope, concluding that if the sequence is arrayed from short to tall and only when the heights are the same the athletes with the greater weight should stand behind. In addition, Chun-ta Lin et al. (2016) proposes a theoretical biomechanical measurement and analysis system to evaluate the performance and consequently verify the effectiveness of the training process [39].

Table 1: Studies published related to Tug of War

INJURIES						
TITLE	AUTHORS	YEAR	N	METHOD	VARIABLES	RESULTS
Tug-of-War Injuries: A Case Report and Review of the Literature	Pranit, N. C. and Abdelgawad, A. A.	2002	1 10 years man	Case Report		Measures should be taken to increase the awareness about these safety rules and prevention of consequent injuries
Tug of war: introduction to the sport and an epidemiological injury study among elite pullers	Smith, J. and Krabak, B	2002	252 31 ±9.5 years 187 males 65 females	Survey during World TOW Championships in 1998.	Demographic data Participation history Injury history during TOW Injury number	Strains: >50% Sprains: 42% Shoulder–upper limb: 23% Knee: 17% Similar between males and

					Injury type	females.
Trauma resulting from tug-of war.	Ferguson, A. and Kierkegaard, E.	1981	1	Case Report	No data has been found	No data has been found
Adult bochdalek hernia after playing at a tug of war.	Liai et al.	1997	1 38 years Female	Case Report	No data has been found	Hernia repair with direct suturing through a thoracotomy
Tug-of-war hand: transforearm amputation by an unusual mechanism	Bruce W. And Hayes C.W.	1999	1 21 years man	Case Report	No data has been found	Amputation below elbow Rehabilitation Prostheses
Extensive retinal hemorrhage after a game of tug-of-war	Moran M.	1984	1	Case Report	No data has been found	Extensive retinal hemorrhage
Injuries During a Massive Tug-of-War Game	Pei-Hsin Lin et al.	2003	1 64 year man	Case Report	No data has been found	Comprised liver and spleen rupture with C5-6 spinal cord Bilateral brachial plexus injuries.
Arm Pain from Tug of War	Khosravi et al.	2006	1 16 year man	Case Report	No data has been found	Tear of the biceps muscle

PHISIOLOGY

Effects of 3-weeks intense training on physiological capacities of tug-o-war team	Northuis, M. E. and Cook, B	1998	9 males 6 males (control)	3-week training period Pre period Post period	Muscular strength Strength endurance, Power; Body composition; Lower back and hamstring flexibility; Body water volume Blood lactate	3-week training resulted ns. Neuromuscular changes↑muscular strength and ↑strength endurance. ↑lactate clearance time indicate sig. systemic metabolic changes.
Physiological and metabolic characteristics of elite tug of war athletes	Warrington et al.	2001	16 male 34 ± 2 years	Collected data were comparing with a group of rugby forwards from the international squad.	VO ₂ MAX Body composition, Strength, Muscular power, Flexibility, Biochemical profile	BM: TOW < RF VO ₂ MAX: TOW < RF Relative VO ₂ MAX: TOW > RF Max HR: TOW = RF Bf: TOW < RF Composite strength: TOW > RF CMJ: TOW < RF Leg flexibility: TOW > RF

							Bag flexibility: Erythrocyte volume:TOW < RF
The Strain of The Pull: Examining the Physiological Effects of An Endurance Tug of-War	Rider et al.	2017	15 male	3 weeks to prepare. Pre-Train and Post Train test. Blood and urine were collected at four time points (PreTrain, PostTrain, PullDay, and PostPull)	Flexibility Power Muscular strength Body composition Blood Urine SG CK.	Flexibility↑ (24.42 ± 5.2 vs. 31.03 ± 6.1 cm, p<0.05) CK: Pre-Train (2113.7 ± 1207.6) > Post Train (598 ± 73) Pull Day (1384.8 ± 936.6) > Post Pull (910.7 ± 244.7) Hydration levels ↓during training (PreTrain:1.02 ± 0.01 vs. PostTrain:1.03 ± 0.01 vs. PullDay:1.03 ± 0.01,	

KINETICS

Influence of Training on the Force-Velocity Relationship of the Arm Flexors of Active Sportsmen	de Koning et al.	1984	15 National level: 4 rowers (20–28 years) 6 runners (17–36 years) 5 athlete's TOW (27–42 years).	1 training year 3 measured stages	FVC Max. mechanical power Torques Angular velocities	Force-velocity characteristics of muscle of previously well-trained sportsmen can hardly be influenced.
Biomechanical analysis on tug of war	Yamamoto et al.	1988	16	Hold session during 10s.	Body mass Grip strength Back strength Power hold Power stroke EMG	EMG: high activity of dorsal muscle Ind. Power hold 148.5+31.7kg Calculated Team Power hold: 1188kg. Real Team Power hold:792kg
Influences of some sports shoes on the strength of pulling exercise in Indoor Tug-of-War,	Yamamoto, et al.	1997	8 males 28.1± 2.95 years 176.3 ± 4.65cm 77.6 ± 5.39kg	4 types of shoes 3 different mats Maximal pull on each shoe for 5 seconds	Static Coefficient of friction PF at each shoe	English or Japanese mat: TOR 107/ TOR 109 European mat: ns differences
Biomechanical considerations of pulling force in tug of war with computer simulation	Kawahara et al.	2001	1 21 years active college student.	Biomechanical model of human body: 5-segmented 3 joints	Segment center of gravity (CG) Synthesis center of gravity (SCG). Height Weight Holding height	Holding height vs PF pulling force. sig. correlation Body inclination vs PF sig. correlation

A three-dimensional motion analysis of two-handed and waist belt pulling backward exercises in elite tug of war athletes	Tanaka et al.	2004	20 Males 28.3 ± 3.3 years 174.4 ± 4.3 cm 71.9 ± 6.0 kg	Each subject performed TH and WB pull in the DF at his maximal effort.	Static maximal pulling forces Stride length Stride frequency Walking speed	TH vs WB sig. correlation The speeds of backward walking: 0.2ms-1 in TH 0.3 ms-1 in WB The stride lengths: 0.2m in TH and WB Stride frequency: 1.4steps/s TH 1.6steps/s WB.
Dynamical Analysis of Indoor Eight People Make Tug of War Attack Movements- 'European Back-Step' and 'Japanese Back-Step'	Fong-Wei Wang and Chien-Lu Tsai	2005	8 22.1 ± 2.4 years 174.1 ± 3.6 cm 72.7 ± 2.4 kg	The 3D data EBS & JBS attack movements were analyzed.	Peak an minimum of GRF	Peak backward GRF: JBS ($1.9bw$) > EBS ($1.85bw$). Minimum backward GRF: JBS ($1.55bw$) > EBS ($1.47b$ w)
The analysis of pulling force curves in tug-of-war	Jui-Hung Tu et al.	2005	11 Female 17.8 ± 0.99 years 163.9 ± 2.98 cm, 59.1 ± 4.21 kg,	3 trials of pulling force curves in DFB and AFB movement The rest time: more than 10 min	MaxF MinF AveF RT FS	MaxF, MinF, and FS sig. different in DFB and AFB Time-related parameters ns.
The study of team resultant force vanishing percentage in elite tug of war players.	ChunHui Liou et al.	2005	9 female 16.9 ± 0.6 years 163.8 ± 2.7 cm, 58.7 ± 4.3 kg senior	6 kinds of team pulling: (A) two players (B) three players (C) four players (D) five players; (E) six (F) seven players (G) eight players.	Sum of individual maximal PF(kqf) Team maximal PF Force vanishing %	The sum of maximal individual PF > team maximal PF. More number of players ↑ vanishing %
Characteristics of pulling movement for Japanese elite tug of war athletes	Nakagawa et al.	2005	16 2 teams Elite team Average team.	2 cameras recorded 2 trials. 2D motion analysis system was used.	Analysis points on body: 8 points 6 angles	Produced the motion to pull by arm and body. To hold arm to body: closed their side, Trunk, inclined their body and lower body Inclined their upper body slightly in comparison with average team
Biomechanical Analysis on dynamic pulling skill in elite indoor	Tanaka et al.	2005	20 Male	Each subject performed TH pull in the DF at his maximal effort.	Maximal PF Dynamic PF Static PF	Maximal PF: 1041.6 ± 123.9 N Maximal PF: $201.8 \pm 38.2\%$ relative BM Dynamic PF: 149.0 ± 23.1 %

tug of war athletes					Anatomical landmarks of the body	divided by the weight
Analysis of timing skill of drop exercise in elite indoor tug of war athletes	Tanaka et al.	2006	30 male 22 World Indoor TOW 2004 Champions 8 novice male students	Load cells with a strain amplifier connected to a pen oscillograph, in paper speed of 25mm/sec, A strobe light synchronized with a pen oscillograph	PT PT exerted by two pullers. Individual PeF PeF exerted by two pullers.	The sum of individual PeF in two pullers was 305.9 ± 41.4 kgw and PeF exerted by the two pullers was 286.3 ± 38.8 kgw, 93.6% of the sum PeF in skilled pullers. 6% loss of PeF in skilled pair. Smaller PT differences are in two pullers The smaller is the reduction of PeF in pair
Fundamental experiment for constructing it-tow bio	Nakagawa et al.	2006	1 A healthy female participant no experience with TW 22 yrs 162 cm 529.2 N	PF measured in 3 tests and 3 trials per one test: -Drive phase -Hold phase	PF	PF data must be exchanged and not be measured by a load cell.
Backward pulling distance in drop phase for Japanese elite Tug-of-war athletes	Nagahama et al.	2007	80. 5 elite teams (finalists) and 5 normal teams (non finalists) Women Lightweight division	Pulling distance on 1 sg of DF The BDP distance on DF was measured	BPD	Elite team pulled the rope longer than normal team Anchorman pulled the rope shorter than other positions comparatively
The biomechanical analysis for plyometric strength training effect of elite male tuggers	Lin, J. D et al.	2007	11 male high school 16.8 ± 0.99 year 171.59 ± 3.18 cm 70.14 ± 2.65 kg	Plyometric strength training machine of TOW for 8 weeks Pre-training and Post-training FC.	DFB AFB PF AveF MaxT MinF RT/ FS	DFB: MaxT, MinF, RT AveF sig. differences pre-post training AFB: the first peak MinF, Max] and RT, AveF, F] sig. differences
Team pulling technique of the Tug-of-war -A birds eye analysis of TOW	Mukwaya et al.	2007	10 teams matches were recorded in All Japan women's Tug of War Championship	2D motion analysis system Angles 1 st line 2 nd line	PF Loss of force The slanting angles (Sum of 7 angles)	0.5 % of team PF was wasted in first DF The lateral slanting has very little relation with the loss of the force in DF
A cross-sectional study of gender differences in pulling strength of tow for Japanese	Sato et al.	2009	16 children 8 male	The subjects performed 1 trial for each parameter. The pulling mini game (4vs4) was set for 30	Back strength PF	Difference between rope tension and sum of pulling strength in male > females.

elementary school children			8 female	seconds and performed 3~5 games for each pairing		
Parametric analysis in tug of war based on ideal biomechanical model	Bing Zhang	2012	No data has been found	Parametric analysis in TOW ideal biomechanical model	Maximum pressure Conduct force analysis of rope	The sequence is arrayed from short to tall and only when the heights are the same the athletes with the greater weight should stand behind.
Team pulling technique of elite female indoor-tow athletes from a drone's point of view.	Nakagawa et al.	2016	16 2 women team	2 games were filmed the R side of the competition lane. 2D motion analysis system. Video camera at roof of gymnasium Analysis time was 10 second of drop phase	X, Y-axis for all puller Foot position.	Synchronized movement: rightward and backward, caused synchronize pulling timing and direction, which culminated in lower the loss of the force.
The novel biomechanical measurement and analysis system for tug-of-war	Chun-ta Linl et al.	2016	No data has been found	Digitizing system for collecting body segment parameters.	PF Force curve Joint Moment Trunk segment Thigh segment Leg segment	Theoretical methods for PF estimation and joint moment analysis modules have been derived. Experimental verification for the proposed system is being carried out
Differences in Force Gradation between Tug-of-War Athletes and Non-Athletes during Rhythmic Force Tracking at High Exertion Levels	Yen-Ting Lin et al.	2016	32 16 elite males 21.5 ± 0.6 years 177.3 ± 4 cm 82.1 ± 5.7 kg; 16 non athletes 21.3 ± 0.6 years 174.1 ± 3.3 cm 64.4 ± 7.7 kg;	Isometric handgrip (3 times of 20 sg)	Grip force Force fluctuation Force pulse variables	TOW athletes exhibited: \uparrow Fmean \uparrow ratio Fmean to body mass, \uparrow superior force-generating capacity \uparrow economic force-grading.
Contribution of upper limb muscles to two different gripping styles in elite indoor tug of war athletes	Wen-Tzu Tang et al.	2017	20 Athletes 1 group GS1 16.5 ± 0.7 years 172.0 ± 4.2 cm 68.0 ± 6.6 kg 2 group GS2 16.8 ± 0.3 years	Pulling on a tug machine, participants used GS1 or GS2 their own habitual gripping style to pull for 5 in 15 sg trials. 14-segment anthropometric Kwon3D system.	Max F, Max T, Avg T, Min T, Max T-Min T, PT COG	Force and kinematic measurements showed a significantly better force performance and higher centre-of-gravity tilting angle with the GS1 than with (GS2) Higher and more symmetrical muscle activation detected by normalized surface electromyography signal amplitude was found in the

			172.4 \pm 4.9cm 69.2 \pm 7.4kg		Body tilting posture Surface EMG signal of UE muscles.	GS2 group In both groups, the distal and flexor muscles were more activated than the proximal and extensor muscles, respectively
--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--	---	---

Legend: ↑: increase / ↓: decrease / AFB: Attack fast break/ AveF: Average Force / BF:Body Fat/ Bf: Back flexion/ BPD: Backward pulling distance / CK: creatine kinase / CMJ: Counter movement jump / COG: Center of gravity DFB: Defend fast break/ EBS: European Back-Step / FS: Force Slope / FVC: force-velocity curve/ FC: Force curve/ GS1: Gripping style one / GS2: Gripping style two / GRF: Ground Reaction Force / JBS: Japanese Back-Step/ Max HR: Maximal heart rate / MaxF: Maximal pulling Force / MaxT: Time of the peak pull force/ MinF: Minimum pulling force / ns: No significant /PeF: Peak Force / PF: Pulling Force / PT: Peak force time/ RF: Reference group / RT: Reaction Time/ SG: specific gravity/sig: significant / TH: Two handed / TOW: Tug of war / VO₂MAX: maximal oxygen uptake / WB: Waist belt.

Conclusion

In summary, TOW is an internationally played activity including professional and amateur sport athletes. Typically formed with 2 teams of "pullers" participate and apply enormous contra directional forces on the pulling rope. Originally, two types of competition are used: knockout and points. Anthropometric parameters are near 83.6, lean body mass 69.4, and body fat 16. The endurance values presented are 55.8 ml/kg/min. Regarding relative strength, the dynamic leg power was 4659.8 N. Endurance TOW elicits minimal muscle damage. The injured strains and sprains comprised over half of all injuries, and the back (42%), shoulder–upper limb (23%), and knee (17%) were most commonly. Some medical complications such as hernias, retinal hemorrhage and fractures have been described as well. Pulling movement in TOW contests can be divided into three phases: namely "Drop", "Hold" and "Drive" phase. The maximal pulling forces was 1041.6 \pm 123.9 N. The percentage of dynamic pulling force in static maximal pulling force was 75.5 \pm 14.4% and the dynamic pulling forces expressed as a percentage of weight was ranged from 106.4 to 182.5%. The force vanishing percentage goes from 8.82 \pm 5.59 for 2 contenders to 19.74 \pm 2.22. There are two gripping styles, indoor and outdoor. The friction characteristics between surface and shoe in TOW is important to determine a suitable shoe for indoor TOW. Waist Belt might be a useful piece of equipment for TOW sport. The EMG technique in Tow described a high activity of dorsal muscle during the pulling.

The factor of force vanishing was the coordination among athletes. The force vanishing percentage goes from 8.82 \pm 5.59 for 2 contenders to 19.74 \pm 2.22 for 8

athletes, 6.4 % in the sum of 2 pullers [18]. However, in the drop phase, for female elite TOW team, only the 0.5 % of them pulling force was wasted.

Practical Applications

Our narrative review provides an important first approach toward the progress of knowledge performance for TOW athletes. This first approach can be useful for practitioners in order to improve the performance in this particular traditional sport.

Future lines

This particular sport needs more research in order to understand better the holistic performance.

Author Contributions

R.C; V.R; J.C-G. and I.M. were involved in conceptualizing this research study. All authors were involved in study design and methodology development. All authors were involved in manuscript writing (review and editing). R.C. and I.M. supervised this research study. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement

No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Acknowledgments

The researchers would like to acknowledge to the all researchers who previously have published all articles about tug of war. Thanks to all of them, we have published this narrative review in this update knowledge about tug of war.

Ganio, M.S.; Klau, J.F.; Casa, D.J.; Armstrong, L.E.; Maresh, C.M. Effect of Caffeine on Sport-Specific Endurance Performance: A Systematic Review. *J. Strength Cond Res.* **2009**, *23*, 315-324.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Smith, J; Krabak, B. Tug of war: introduction to the sport and an epidemiological injury study among elite pullers. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* **2002**, *117-124*.
- [2] Warrington, G; Ryan, C; Murray, F; Duffy, P; Kirwan, J.P. Physiological and metabolic characteristics of elite tug of war athletes. *Br J Sports Med* **2001**, *35*: 396–401.
- [3] Pranit, N. C; Abdelgawad, A. A. Tug-of-War Injuries: A Case Report and Review of the Literature. *Case Rep Orthop* **2014**, *519-819*.
- [4] Ferguson, A; Kierkegaard, E. Trauma resulting from tug-of-war. *Ugeskrift for Laeger* **1981**, *vol. 143*, n°. 37, p. 2354.
- [5] Twif (2018). Tug of war international Federation Rules Manual. (http://tugofwar-twif.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/TWIF-Rules-Manual-2018_Single.pdf) accessed on 21 of March 2020.
- [6] Butts, N.K. Profiles of elite athletes: physical and physiological characteristics. In: *The elite athlete*. Butts, N. K; Gushiken, T. T; Zarins, B; Eds.; Spectrum Publications Inc: New York, 1985; pp. 183–207.
- [7] Tanaka, K; Ushizu, A; Minamitani, N; Fukushima, M; Yamamoto, H. (2005). Biomechanical Analysis on dynamic pulling skill for elite indoor tug of war athletes Proceedings of 23th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, August 22-27; Quing Wang Ed. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Beijing, China, 2005; *23*, 330-333.
- [8] Sato, T; Sodeyama, S; Nagahama, R; Shimizu, S; Sasaki, K; Nishitani, R; Yulin, C; Yamamoto, H. A cross-sectional study of gender differences in pulling strength of tow for Japanese elementary school children. Proceedings of 27th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, Limerick, August 17-21; Andrew J. Harrison, Ross Anderson Ian Kenny, Eds. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Ireland, 2009.
- [9] Northuis, M. E; Cook, B. Effects of 3-weeks intense training on physiological capacities of tug-o-war team. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise* **1998**, *Volume 30 - Issue 5* - p 108.
- [10] Rider, B. C; Coughlin, A. M; Carlson, C; Byoungjoon, J; Thomson, A. J; Campbell, C. N; Bouret, C. M; Hew-Butler, T. The Strain Of The Pull: Examining The Physiological Effects Of An Endurance Tug of-War. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise* **2017**, *Volume 49 - Issue 5S* - p 462.
- [11] Lai, T; Ohmori, K; Ohtaki, M; Mishina, T; Saitoh, H; Ishihara, R; Suzuki, N. Adult bochdalek hernia after playing at a tug of war. *The Japanese Journal of Thoracic Surgery*, **1997**, *50*, n° 11, 968–970.
- [12] Moran M. Extensive retinal hemorrhage after a game of tug-of-war. *Ceskoslovenska Oftalmologie*, **1984**, *40*, 375-80.
- [13] Pei-Hsin, Lin; Fang-Yao, Chiu; Nian-Chin Hsiao; Tien-Yow Chuang

(2003). Injuries During a Massive Tug-of-War Game. *J Chin Med Assoc* 2003, 66:436-439

[14] Lin P. H; Chiu, F. Y; Hsiao, N. C; Chuang, T. Y. Injuries during a massive tug-of-war game. *Journal of the Chinese Medical Association: JCMA* 2003, Jul;66(7):436-439.

[15] Khosravi, A; Blalock, R; Marra, G; McFarland, E; Martire, J. (2006). Arm Pain from Tug of War. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise* 2006, Volume 38 - Issue 5, p S161.

[16] Kawahara, S; Hosaka, M; Yutin, C; Yamamoto, H. Biomechanical considerations of pulling force in tug of war with computer simulation. Proceedings of 19th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports; John R. Blackwell, Ross H. Sanders Eds. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: San Francisco, CA, U.S.A; 2001; 19, 72-75.

[17] Nakagawa, M; Toryu, F; Tanaka, K; Kawahara, S; Yamamoto, H. Characteristics of pulling movement for Japanese elite tug of war athletes Proceedings of 23th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, August 22-27; Quing Wang Ed. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Beijing, China, 2005; Vol.2: 475-478.

[18] Nakagawa, M; Hagio, K; Tanaka, K; Yamamoto, H. Team pulling technique of elite female indoor-tow athletes from a drone's point of view. Proceedings of 34th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, July 18-22; Michiyoshi Ae, Yasushi Enomoto, Norihisa Fujii, Hideki Takagi, Eds. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Tsukuba, Japan, 2016; 883-886.

[19] Tanaka, K; Kawahara, S; Minamitani, N; Fukushima, M; Yulin, C; Yamamoto, H. Analysis of timing skill of drop exercise in elite indoor tug of war athletes. Proceedings of 24th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, July 14-18; H. Schwameder, G. Strutzenberger, V. Fastenbauer, S. Lindinger, E. Müller, Eds. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Salzburg, Austria, 2006; Vol.1,363-366.

[20] Nagahama, R; Nakagawa M, Yamamoto H. Backward pulling distance in drop phase for Japanese elite Tug-of-war athletes. Proceedings of 25th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, August 23-27; H.-J. Menzel, M. H. Chagas, Eds. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Ouro Preto, Brasil, 2007; 40-42.

[21] ChunHui Liou, Tzu-Lin Wong, Jin-Cherng Wang and Jung-Chan Shin. The study of team resultant force vanishing percentage in elite tug of war players. Proceedings of 23th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, August 22-27; Quing Wang Ed. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Beijing, China, 2005; Vol.1:399-401.

[22] Mukaway, G; Nakagawa, M; Yamamoto, H. Team pulling technique of the Tug-of-war -A bird's eye analysis of TOW. Proceedings of 25th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, August 23-27; H.-J.

Menzel, M. H. Chagas, Eds. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Ouro Preto, Brasil, 2007; 95-97.

[23] Yamamoto, H; Kawahara, S; Wakayama, H. A biomechanical analysis on tug of war. *Studies in educational technology*, **1988**, *14*, 127-132.

[24] Yen-Ting Lin, Chia-Hua Kuo, Yi-Ching Chen. Differences in Force Gradation between Tug-of-War Athletes and Non-Athletes during Rhythmic Force Tracking at High Exertion Levels. *Chinese Journal of Physiology*, **2016**, *59*(5): 260-267.

[25] De Koning, Ft; Vos, J. A; Binkhorst, R. A; Vissers, A.C. Influence of Training on the Force-Velocity Relationship of the Arm Flexors of Active Sportsmen. *Int. J. Sports Med.* **1984**, *5* (01) 43–46

[26] Lin, J. D; TU, J. H; Wang, C. C. (2007). The biomechanical analysis for plyometric strength training effect of elite male tuggers. *Journal of Biomechanics* **2007**, *40*, S607.

[27] Jui-Hung Tu, Chien-Hsun Lee, Yung-Hsing Chiu. The analysis of pulling force curves in Tug-of-war. Proceedings of 23th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, August 22-27; Quing Wang Ed. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Beijing, China, 2005; Vol.2:487-490.

[28] Fong-Wei Wang and Chien-Lu Tsai (2005). Dynamical Analysis of Indoor Eight People Make Tug of War Attack Movements-'European Back-Step' and 'Japanese Back-Step'. Proceedings of XXth Congress of the International Society of Biomechanics- ASB 29th Annual Meeting, Cleveland, Ohio. 2005, 447.

[29] Wen-Tzu Tang, Wei-Chih Liao, Hsin-Min Lee. Contribution of upper limb muscles to two different gripping styles in elite indoor tug of war athletes, *Sports Biomechanics* **2017**, *17*:3,322-335.

[30] Young, W. B. Transfer of Strength and Power Training to Sports Performance. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* **2006**, *1*, 74–83.

[31] Hougum, P. A; Bertoti, D. B. *Brunnstrom's clinical kinesiology*, 6th ed.; F.A. Davis Company: Philadelphia, 2012; pp. 125–157.

[32] Mogk, J. P; Keir, P. J. The effects of posture on forearm muscle loading during gripping. *Ergonomics*, **2003**, *46*, 956–975.

[33] Lewek, M. D; Ramsey, D. K; Snyder-Mackler, L; Rudolph, K. S. Knee stabilization in patients with medial compartment knee osteoarthritis. *Arthritis and Rheumatism*, **2005**, *52*, 2845–2853.

[34] Bijlsma, J. W; Knahr, K. Strategies for the prevention and management of osteoarthritis of the hip and knee. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Rheumatology*, **2007**, *21*, 59–76.

[35] Yamamoto, H; Makitani, S; Yasuda, N; Watanabe, Y. Influences of some sports shoes on the strength of pulling exercise in Indoor Tug-of-War. Proceedings of 15th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, June 21-25; Jerry Wilkerson, Kathy Ludwig, Wayne Zimmermann, Eds.

International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Denton, TX, U.S.A. 1997; 15, 403-409.

[36] Tanaka, K. Yamaguchi, Y; Sodeyama, S; Sekino, R; Nishikawa, S; Konishi, M; Yulin, C; Yamamoto, H. A three-dimensional motion analysis of two-handed and waist belt pulling backward exercises in elite tug of war athletes. Proceedings of 22th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, August 8-12; Mario Lamontagne, D. Gordon, E; Robertson, Heidi Sveistrup, Eds. Ae, Yasushi Enomoto, Norihisa Fujii, Hideki Takagi, Eds. International: Ottawa, Canada, 2004; 22, 411-414.

[37] Criswell, E. Preface. In: *Cram's introduction to surface electromyography*, E. Criswell, Ed.; Jones & Bartlett Publishers: Sudbury, Massachusetts, 2010; pp. xv–xviii.

[38] Nakagawa M; Nagahama, R; Yamamoto H. Fundamental experiment for constructing it-tow. Proceedings of 24th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, July 14-18; H. Schwameder, G. Strutzenberger, V. Fasten Bauer, S. Lindinger, E. Müller, Eds. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Salzburg, Austria, 2006.

[39] Bing Zhang. Parametric Analysis in Tug-of-War Based on Ideal Biomechanical Model. *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, 2012, vol. 192, pp. 207–210.

[40] Chun-ta Lin, Kuei-Pin Kuo, HungSheng Hsieh and Jui-hung Tu. The novel biomechanical measurement and analysis system for tug-of-war. Proceedings of 34th International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sports, July 18-22; Michiyoshi Ae, Yasushi Enomoto, Norihisa Fujii, Hideki Takagi, Eds. International Society of Biomechanics in Sport: Tsukuba, Japan, 2016.