ESTIMATED HAND’S PALM AND FOOT AREAS ARE NOT CORRELATED TO PERFORMANCE IN FRONT CRAWL SWIMMING
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SUMMARY
The objective of this study was to check the correlations among the hand’s palm area (HPA) and performance (PER), averages stroke length (SL), stroke rate (SR) and swimming velocity (SV) and among the foot area (FA) and PER, SV and average kick rate (KR) in 50 m front crawl. Methods: Eleven masters male swimmers (age: 25.8 ± 5.5 years, mass: 75.2 ± 5.5 kg, height: 177 ± 6.5 cm; HPA: 149 cm ± 10.9 cm² and FA: 388 ± 28.6 cm²) performed 50 m front crawl at maximum intensity. The HPA and FA were estimated using the DuBois and DuBois equation to calculate the total body area and, after, applied constants for HPA and FA. To obtain PER, SL, SR and SV three chronometers were used; for KR, underwater images from two camcorders operating at 60 Hz were analyzed. Pearson correlation test was applied among the variables. Results: No correlations between the areas and performance variables were found. Discussion: Parameters such as attack angles, length chord and vortices must contribute to propulsion performance. HPA and FA, alone, do not seem to contribute to understand performance in front crawl swimming. Conclusion: There was no significant correlation between HPA and FA with PER, SL, SR, SV and KR.

INTRODUCTION
When the front crawl stroke mechanics is analyzed, it is observed that upper and lower limbs are the primarily responsible for the body displacement of the swimmer. The produced propulsion is mainly explained by two forces: drag and lift, and by the vortices phenomenon. As hands and feet are the body segments which directly apply force against the water mass, the objective of this study was to check the correlations among the hand’s palm area (HPA) and performance (PER), averages stroke length (SL), stroke rate (SR) and swimming velocity (SV) and among the foot area (FA) and PER, SV and average kick rate (KR) in 50 m front crawl.

METHODS
Eleven master swimmers, highly experienced in swimming training (age: 25.8 ± 5.5 years, mass: 75.2 ± 5.5 kg, height: 177 ± 6.5 cm; HPA: 149 cm ± 10.9 cm² and FA: 388 ± 28.6 cm²) performed 50 m all-out front crawl stroke in a 25 m length swimming pool. Body mass and height were measured. Hand’s palm area (HPA) and hand’s palm area (HPA) were estimated with the proposed equation by DuBois and DuBois² (Equation 1), where body mass (x) and height (y) are used. Then, two constants (k) related, respectively, to the hand’s palm area (0.78%)³ and foot area (2.03%)⁴, were applied.

\[ \text{Hand’s palm or foot area} = (0.007184 \times x^{0.425} \times y^{0.725}) \times k \]

All the swimmers performed 800 m in front crawl as warm up, then the 50 m all-out and more 300 m in front crawl to warm down. Spatio-temporal parameters performance (PER, in sec), stroke length (SL, in m), stroke rate (SR in Hz), swimming velocity (SV, in m.s⁻¹) and kick rate (KR, in Hz) were measured from the 50 m trial. Two markers were placed in the lateral of the pool: in the 10 and in the 20 m, which demarcated 10 m, from the 25 to the 50 m, where SL, SR, SV and KR were obtained. It was observed that SL, SR, SV and KR data were obtained from the pure swimming (10 to 20 m), with no contribution from the push in the wall. PER was the time do cover the 50 m, performed with start from inside the pool and Olympic turning. The time to cover the 10 m in pure swimming, from 10 to 20 m markers, (swimmer’s head as the reference) was used to measure the SV. When the swimmer was in this area, the time to perform three complete strokes was used to calculate SR. SL was calculated by the quotient between SV and SR. KR was quantified by underwater video analysis. Images were obtained from two camcorders (one 30 cm under the water surface and other 10 cm above the water surface), both operating at 60 Hz and fixed in an arm which was displaced in a chariot over trails along the swimming pool. Both cameras allowed images from the swimmers sagittal plane. Frames were chosen when the swimmer was inside the 10 m and the amount of kick movements was quantified per stroke cycle. The software Virtual Dub 1.9.9 was used in video analysis.

Statistic analysis was performed by the application of Shapiro-Wilk Test, descriptive analysis and the Pearson Correlation Coefficient test. Alpha was determined as 0.05 and SPSS 17.0 was the software used for the calculations.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
No correlations were found among HPA and PER, SL, SR e SV and among FA and PER, SV e KR, as shown in Table 1. Hand’s palm and foot areas, for master swimmers, don’t seem to have decisive influence in performance (time to cover 50 m all out in front crawl stroke) as in spatio-temporal parameters. Propulsion, in swimming, is still a controversial subject in sport biomechanics. Two main theories, and its relation, try to explain how a swimmer can overcome drag and even generate propulsion: propulsive drag and lift. Both, probably, act together and are influenced by other phenomenon, as the vortex, the stall effect, angles of attack and orientation of the propulsive segments. So, the areas of the main propulsive segments, as the hand’s palm and foot, probably would be more associated to the propulsive drag theory: water mass which is accelerated in a contrary direction of the body displacement. If these segments are larger, more water would be accelerated. The findings of these study (no correlation among these areas and performance parameters) could indicate that the assesses swimmers would generating propulsion much more by the lift theory, which implies better attack angles and energy recovery from the water that is accelerated and generates vortex. As noted by Berger et al hand’s position during movement underwater, attack angle, displacement velocity and shape of the segment, appear to be decisive for the larger lift forces. Still, athletes of better technical level show higher lift forces by presenting optimal hand orientation relative to aquatic, higher body segment speed, hand, and therefore better performance in comparison to athletes of worst technical level. Furthermore, chord length, for instance, must be considered. Although, swimmers with larger body areas (and larger hands and foots) have to overcome more drag than smaller swimmers, so the hand’s palm and foots area, alone, cannot explain the performance in swimming and spatio-temporal parameters related to the performance in 50 m front-crawl all-out.

CONCLUSIONS
No correlation among performance, stroke length, stroke rate, swimming velocity and kick rate were and hand’s palm and foot’s area were found in masters swimmers. This area could advance including hydrodynamic models of the hand.
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Table 1: Correlation and p values of hand’s palm (HPA) and foot areas (FA) with performance (PER), average stroke length (SL), average stroke rate (SR), average swimming velocity (SV) and average Kick rate (KR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PER (HPA)</th>
<th>SL (HPA)</th>
<th>SR (HPA)</th>
<th>SV (HPA)</th>
<th>PER (FA)</th>
<th>SV (FA)</th>
<th>KR (FA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation (r)</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (p)</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>p &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>