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## Overview



2. Methods

3. Insights


## Background

- Mathematical modelling in human performance
- Emerging technological innovation (e.g., power meters)
- Improvements in training prescription, testing and athlete profiling (Clarke \& Skiba, 2013; Leo et al., 2021)


## Anaerobic Power Reserve

 Model
## Short Durations <2 mins

## Critical Power (CP)/ W'

2-15 mins

Perronet \& Thibault Model

Long Durations >15 mins
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## The Omni-Domain Power Duration Model




- Developed using mean maximal power (MMP) data from trained cyclists (Puchowicz et al., 2020)

Leo et al., 2021

## Project Aims

## Aim

To determine whether the Omni-PD is an effective method to estimate the critical power (CP) and W' to characterise a swimmer's physiological capacity and quantify performance.

Objectives

1. Internal validation of model to compare goodness of fit for different equations of $\mathrm{CS} / \mathrm{D}^{\prime}$.
2. Determine level of agreement between Omni-PD and pre-existing methods of calculating $\mathrm{CS} / \mathrm{D}^{\prime}$.
3. External Validation of CS/D' calculated using the Omni-PD against race performances within a 1month window.
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## Data Collection

- Participants
- 15 athletes, male and female, age 16-24 years old.
- Members of the Swimming NSW Performance Pathway - Flippers Squad
- Highly trained / National Level (McKay et al., 2022)



## Pragmatic Data Analysis



How do the different CS equations/inputs differ?


Does a 2-parameter CS/D' agree with $12 \times 25$ 's test and 2000m velocity?


Can critical power/ omni-PD be used to predict race performance?

## Initial Findings

How do the different CS equations/inputs differ?

- $25 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{TT}, 200 \mathrm{~m}$ TT, 400 m TT and 1000 m TT used to fit $\mathrm{CS} / \mathrm{D}^{\prime}$ model
- Observations

1/time model using a combination of 200, 400 and 1000 m TT appears to give lowest RMSE

Combinations of only 2 TT's appear to give a similar CS value to the $1 /$ time model ( $+/-0.1 \mathrm{~ms}^{-1}$ )

| Critical Speed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inputs |  |  |  | Model | CS | D' | RMSE |
| 25 | 200 | 400 | 1000 | 3-hyp | 1.31 | 25.58 | 3.51 |
| 25 | 200 | 400 | 1000 | 2-hyp | 1.32 | 20.93 | 18.75 |
| 25 | 200 | 400 | 1000 | Lin | 1.33 | 13.75 | 6.72 |
| 25 | 200 | 400 | 1000 | 1/time | 1.38 | 6.58 | 0.04 |
| 25 | 200 | 400 |  | 2-hyp | 1.33 | 17.31 | 20.98 |
| 25 | 200 | 400 |  | Lin | 1.37 | 9.08 | 5.49 |
| 25 | 200 | 400 |  | 1/time | 1.4 | 6.26 | 0.04 |
| 25 | 200 |  | 1000 | 2-hyp | 1.32 | 19.05 | 22.91 |
| 25 | 200 |  | 1000 | Lin | 1.33 | 12.35 | 8.25 |
| 25 | 200 |  | 1000 | 1/time | 1.38 | 6.54 | 0.06 |
| 25 |  | 400 | 1000 | 2-hyp | 1.32 | 21.2 | 26.19 |
| 25 |  | 400 | 1000 | Lin | 1.34 | 10.78 | 7.36 |
| 25 |  | 400 | 1000 | 1/time | 1.35 | 6.82 | 0.02 |
|  | 200 | 400 | 1000 | 2-hyp | 1.32 | 21.39 | 7.12 |
|  | 200 | 400 | 1000 | Lin | 1.32 | 0.81 | 0.76 |
|  | 200 | 400 | 1000 | 1/tim | 1.32 | 20.19 | 0.01 |
| 25 | 200 |  |  | Lin | 1.43 | 5.85 |  |
| 25 | 200 |  |  | 1/time | 142 | 5.85 |  |
| 25 |  | 400 |  | Lin | 1. 7 | 6.59 |  |
| 25 |  | 400 |  | 1/time | 1. 7 | 6.59 |  |
| 25 |  |  | 1000 | Lin | 1. 4 | 7.03 |  |
| 25 |  |  | 1000 | 1/time | 74 | 7.03 |  |
|  | 200 | 400 |  |  |  | $19.42$ |  |
|  | 200 | 400 |  | $1 / \mathrm{timf}$ | $1.33$ | 9.42 |  |
|  | 200 |  | 1000 | Lin | 1.32 | 2. 29 |  |
|  | 200 |  | 1000 | 1/tim | 1.32 | 2. 29 |  |
|  |  | 400 | 1000 | Lin | 1.32 | 1.87 |  |
|  |  | 400 | 1000 | 1/time | 1.32 | 21.87 |  |

## Initial Findings

Level of Agreement with Pre-existing Methods

Does a 2-parameter CS/D' agree with $12 \times 25$ 's test and 2000 m velocity?

| CS Comparison |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | TT CS | $\mathbf{1 2 2 5}$ CS | 2000m Vel. |
| Athlete 1 | 1.32 |  | 1.31 |
| Athlete 2 | 1.35 |  | 1.33 |
| Athlete 3 | 1.48 |  | 1.38 |
| Athlete 4 | 1.22 |  | 1.21 |
| Athlete 5 | 1.36 | 1.71 | 1.44 |
| Athlete 6 | 1.29 |  |  |
| Athlete 7 | 1.29 | 1.74 |  |
| Athlete 8 | 1.43 |  |  |
| Athlete 9 | 1.37 | 1.72 |  |
| Athlete 10 | 1.33 | 1.64 | 1.38 |
| Athlete 11 | 1.35 | 1.85 | 1.43 |
| Athlete 12 | 1.33 |  | 1.32 |
| Athlete 13 | 1.41 |  | 1.45 |
| Athlete 14 | 1.34 | 1.63 |  |
| Athlete 15 | 1.34 | 1.70 |  |


| D' $^{\prime}$ Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | TT D' | $\mathbf{1 2 2 5} \mathbf{D}^{\prime}$ |
| Athlete 1 | 20.19 |  |
| Athlete 2 | 26.6 |  |
| Athlete 3 | 23.61 |  |
| Athlete 4 | 27.71 |  |
| Athlete 5 | 37.56 | 21.21 |
| Athlete 6 | 28.16 |  |
| Athlete 7 | 28.16 | 12.03 |
| Athlete 8 | 9.25 |  |
| Athlete 9 | 36.46 | 27.27 |
| Athlete 10 | 27.2 | 12.19 |
| Athlete 11 | 39.24 | 21.63 |
| Athlete 12 | 19.39 |  |
| Athlete 13 | 26.22 |  |
| Athlete 14 | 34.52 | 24.69 |
| Athlete 15 | 36.45 | 22.51 |
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## Initial Findings

Level of Agreement with Pre-existing Methods

Does a 2-parameter CS/D' agree with $12 \times 25$ 's test and 2000 m velocity?

| CS Comparison |  |  |  |
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| Athlete 3 | 1.48 |  | 1.38 |
| Athlete 4 | 1.22 |  | 1.21 |
| Athlete 5 | 1.36 | 1.71 | 1.44 |
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| Athlete 12 | 1.33 |  | 1.32 |
| Athlete 13 | 1.41 |  | 1.45 |
| Athlete 14 | 1.34 | 1.63 |  |
| Athlete 15 | 1.34 | 1.70 |  |


| D' $^{\prime}$ Comparison |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | TT D' | $\mathbf{1 2 2 5} \mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{\prime}}$ |
| Athlete 1 | 20.19 |  |
| Athlete 2 | 26.6 |  |
| Athlete 3 | 23.61 |  |
| Athlete 4 | 27.71 |  |
| Athlete 5 | 37.56 | 21.21 |
| Athlete 6 | 28.16 |  |
| Athlete 7 | 28.16 | 12.03 |
| Athlete 8 | 9.25 |  |
| Athlete 9 | 36.46 | 27.27 |
| Athlete 10 | 27.2 | 12.19 |
| Athlete 11 | 39.24 | 21.63 |
| Athlete 12 | 19.39 |  |
| Athlete 13 | 26.22 |  |
| Athlete 14 | 34.52 | 24.69 |
| Athlete 15 | 36.45 | 22.51 |

## Initial Findings

## Can Critical Power / Omni-PD be used to predict race performance?

- Best race performance from NSW Senior State Champs
- Determined by World Record Ratio (WRR)
- Transformed all data into metabolic power (Capelli et al., 1998)
- N.B. Including TT Results
- Used CP/W' values to predict metabolic power for best event
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## Initial Findings

## Can Critical Power / Omni-PD be used to predict race performance?

| Case Study A: Middle Distance Athlete |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Best Event: | 200m FS |  |  |  |
| Time(s): | 127.82 |  |  |  |
| Power (w): | 414 |  |  |  |
| Model Inputs | CP <br> watts | W' kJ | 200m FS Pred. watts | $\Delta$ Actual vs pred. |
| Time Trial Data | 246 | 16.3 | 374 | -10\% |
| Race Result Data | 301 | 15.3 | 420 | 1\% |


| Case Study B: Sprint Athlete |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Best Event: | 100m FS |  |  |  |
| Time(s): | 50.58 |  |  |  |
| Power (w): | 831 |  |  |  |
|  | CP | W' | 100m FS Pred. | $\Delta$ Actual vs pred. |
| Model Inputs | watts | kJ | watts | \% |
| Time Trial Data | 269 | 28.1 | 826 | -1\% |
| Race Result Data | 455 | 14.5 | 741 | -11\% |

## Initial Findings

## Can Critical Power / Omni-PD be used to predict race performance?

## Case Study B: Sprint Athlete

| Best Event: | 100 m FS |
| :---: | :--- |
| Time(s): | 50.58 |
| Power (w): | 831 |
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## Limitations



