



## UWS Academic Portal

### **A comparative biomechanical analysis of the performance level on chasse step in table tennis**

Yu, Changxiao; Shao, Shirui; Baker, Julien S.; Awrejcewicz, Jan; Gu, Yaodong

*Published in:*  
International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching

*DOI:*  
[10.1177/1747954119843651](https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954119843651)

Published: 01/06/2019

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Yu, C., Shao, S., Baker, J. S., Awrejcewicz, J., & Gu, Y. (2019). A comparative biomechanical analysis of the performance level on chasse step in table tennis. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 14(3), 372-382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954119843651>

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [pure@uws.ac.uk](mailto:pure@uws.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications.

1 **A comparative biomechanical analysis of the performance**  
2 **level on chasse step in table tennis**

3  
4 **Changxiao Yu<sup>a</sup>, Shirui Shao<sup>a</sup>, Julien S Baker<sup>b</sup>, Jan Awrejcewicz<sup>c</sup>,**  
5 **Yaodong Gu<sup>a\*</sup>**

6  
7 a Faculty of Sports Science, Ningbo University, Ningbo, China

8 b **Institute of Clinical Exercise and Health Sciences**, School of **Health and Life**  
9 **Sciences**, University of the West of Scotland, **Lanarkshire**, UK

10 c department of Automation, Biomechanics and Mechatronics, Lodz University of  
11 Technology, Lodz, Poland

12  
13 \*Corresponding Author: Yaodong Gu

14 E-mail Address: [guyaodong@hotmail.com](mailto:guyaodong@hotmail.com)

15 Address: Faculty of Sports Science, Ningbo University, No. 818, Fenghua Road,  
16 Jiangbei District, Ningbo, Zhejiang Province, China.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28       **A comparative biomechanical analysis of the performance**  
29                               **level on chasse step in table tennis**

30       **Abstract**

31       Initial observations have indicated that each movement pattern or skill set has a  
32       fundamental mechanical structure. **The purpose of this study was to examine**  
33       **biomechanical characteristics in chasse step movement patterns between professional**  
34       **athletes (PA) and beginner players (BP). Large amounts** of data **were** obtained for  
35       comparison by capturing kinematic and kinetic information of the dominant foot using  
36       the Oxford Foot Model (OFM) during table tennis strokes. Nine male PA and nine BP  
37       (all with dominant right feet) participated in a table tennis footwork test. A Vicon motion  
38       analysis system and a Novel Pedar insole plantar pressure measurement system were  
39       used to record kinematic and kinetic data, respectively. Findings from the study  
40       indicated that PA not only showed significantly larger forefoot and rear-foot dorsiflexion,  
41       but also demonstrated larger hallux plantarflexion. In addition, they also showed  
42       significantly larger forefoot abduction and rear-foot internal rotation than BP at the  
43       chasse step end. Also, PA showed significantly larger forefoot inversion and abduction at  
44       the forward-end of the step. Peak pressure values were higher under the lateral forefoot,  
45       and the medial and lateral rear-foot with faster changes in angular velocity recorded for  
46       PA during the chasse step phase. Greater peak pressures were also recorded under the  
47       other toes, and in the central and lateral forefoot during the forward swing phase when  
48       compared to BP. In addition, PA showed significantly greater relative load on the other  
49       toes and on the lateral forefoot during the entire step motion. The results of the present  
50       study demonstrated that PA possessed greater foot drive technique. **These** findings might  
51       help coaches and beginners to comprehend the internal mechanisms of the chasse step  
52       technique and help **influence** beginner **players** to improve the mechanical efficiency of  
53       performance.

54       Keywords: Oxford Foot Model, footwork, internal mechanisms, lower limb drive

## 1. Introduction

55

56 Table tennis is not only a complex and asymmetric sport, but is also one of the most  
57 popular sporting activities worldwide. According to a recent report by the International  
58 Sports Federation (ISF), the population of table tennis participants has reached over 300  
59 million in the world [34]. Playing table tennis is regarded as a pro-health sporting  
60 pastime, which is generally accepted by more and more people who engage in physical  
61 activity [3]. As a rational movement, agile footwork enables a player to rapidly change  
62 his/her position/direction and regulate his/her body for a particular stroke with maximal  
63 power and effect [22]. In addition, footwork is the fundamental closed skill that requires  
64 active movement and accurate control. **Therefore, table tennis footwork could provide**  
65 **an appropriate link for maximizing stroke performance.** There are five types of table  
66 tennis footwork that have been identified: one step, chasse step, slide step, cross step  
67 and turn step. The chasse step - if the ball is presented at the right side, the right foot is  
68 moved to **the** right in the first instance, followed by the left foot in a sliding action in the  
69 same direction – **and** is considered as one of the most frequently used attacking  
70 footwork movement patterns with a frequency of 15.2% in competitions [20]. As a  
71 complex task, table tennis requires a command of the necessary motor skills for the  
72 beginner to become proficient and progress through the developmental period [16]. The  
73 proper footwork is regarded as one part of the technical skills that can reflect the  
74 players' level [2]. The comparison of basic motion patterns between the professional  
75 athletes (PA) and beginner players (BP) using a specific foot model can be a valuable  
76 tool in understanding the internal mechanisms **involved in leaning the chasse step** and  
77 identifying the key factors underlying effective **performance**. Despite obvious  
78 differences that exist between PA and BP related to the lower limb contribution during  
79 the chasse step, coordinated motion patterns that produce better accuracy and faster  
80 connections with the next stage of performance, are of great importance for both **the**  
81 coaches and athletes.

82 The control of footwork patterns during table tennis performance requires a  
83 coordinated sequence of body segment interactions, and the optimum activation of all

84 the links has been defined as the “kinetic chain” [14], [17]. A forceful lower limb drive  
85 is considered as the “starting point” of the kinetic chain in sports [10]. The starting point  
86 is influential in the quality of stroke produced and is very important in the development  
87 of skills that influence match play (racquet and ball speed and a high degree of accuracy,  
88 etc.) [13], [14]. The lower limb is the source of energy that transfers optimum activation  
89 from the lower body segments to the upper limb through sequential movements of the  
90 kinetic chain [10], [24]. Therefore, high quality table tennis footwork not only requires  
91 greater upper limb co-ordination, but also needs support from the lower limbs' to  
92 provide accuracy and stability during competition and training. The powerful lower limb  
93 drive could contribute to increasing the translational and spinning velocity of the ball.  
94 Research by Qian et al. [24] concluded that the differences in motion of the intrinsic  
95 joints of the lower limb could influence the velocity of the table tennis bat during the  
96 table tennis forehand loop between the superior players and intermediate players.

97 A number of generic musculoskeletal models of the lower limb have been proposed to  
98 analyze the large joints such as the hip, knee and ankle. However, small joint  
99 musculoskeletal models of the foot were almost unobtainable until the development of  
100 the Oxford Foot Model (OFM). The lower-limb model using the OFM provides an  
101 increased level of detail in the foot, and it is a reliable multi-segment investigative foot  
102 analysis tool. Previous research has tended to focus on the analysis of the forefoot, hind  
103 foot and hallux motions [5], [19]. During a step forward task analysis, and other  
104 movement patterns, the model can be widely used in the motion analysis of performers  
105 in both sport and clinical environments. For initial analysis of foot models, marker  
106 placement error is a fundamental challenge due to the lack of rigorous anatomical  
107 coordinate definition. This could cause large errors in angular calculations even though  
108 the errors in marker locations are minimal [8], [21], [26]. Considering the characteristics  
109 of table tennis, players have to complete a series of complex spatial movements that  
110 include, acceleration, deceleration, direction change, moving quickly and balance  
111 control. All of these varied and different movement patterns help generate optimum  
112 stroke production [12]. Therefore, in order to study table tennis footwork, rigorous

113 research should be conducted using a reliable and objective foot model. As a  
114 multi-segment kinematic model, the OFM has recorded higher accuracy compared to  
115 other methodologies and has been used to measure inter-segmental angles of the foot [7].  
116 The methodologies used have been applied to a wide range of populations with different  
117 abilities [19], [31]. The OFM, however, has not been used to evaluate the footwork  
118 patterns of table tennis beginners. Therefore, the aim of this study was to compare the  
119 differences in forefoot, hind foot and hallux motions between PA and BP using the OFM  
120 during the chasse step movement patterns. Additionally, the use of the OFM will be used  
121 in conjunction with data obtained from a Visual three-dimensional (V3D). This will  
122 provide additional information to compare and contrast the chasse step movement  
123 patterns. This will be essential for detecting the internal mechanisms of lower limb  
124 movements between the two different levels of athletes participating in table tennis.

125 Further to this, table tennis is a classic sport that typically needs upper limb, lower  
126 limb and abdominal simultaneous contractions to complete stroke performance  
127 instantaneously. The powerful forward swing of the upper limb demands the support  
128 from a forceful lower limb, and as the origin of the energy force, the foot drive impacts  
129 the accuracy and quality of strokes. Therefore, the “Foot (shoe)-ground” biomechanical  
130 characteristics should be taken into account. In order to investigate the mechanical basis  
131 of table tennis footwork patterns, both for better understanding of the mechanisms and  
132 performance improvement, the ability to use a Novel Pedar insole plantar pressure  
133 measurement system is essential. This system can provide accurate information about  
134 plantar pressure distribution patterns, compared to a force plate [13]. In addition, as a  
135 kinetic measuring method, the system has been applied successfully to study the  
136 characteristics of plantar kinetics in different sports. These include different  
137 soccer-specific movements of soccer players [9, 25, 28, 30], two types of tennis serve  
138 [13] and a comparison of the center of pressure (COP) trajectory in two different levels  
139 of table tennis players during topspin forehand loop [11] as well as the dynamic balance  
140 in table tennis [15].

141 Our primary aim was to compare the biomechanical characteristics of the chasse step  
142 between PA and BP, the findings would provide useful suggestions for coaches and  
143 athletes and contribute to an in-depth understanding of the performance characteristics.  
144 It was hypothesized that PA would show different plantar foot joint angles from BP at  
145 the two key **technical areas**, respectively. PA would also show larger joint angular  
146 changing rate (ACR) with a smaller joint range of motion (ROM) during chasse step.  
147 We also hypothesized that there would be significant differences for the two groups at  
148 the forward and swing phases during table tennis performance. In addition, we also  
149 wanted to examine if any differences in force distribution of in-shoe loading occurred  
150 between PA and BP during the entire motion phase.

151

152

## 2. Material and Methods

### 153 *Participants*

154 Eighteen male right-handed table tennis players from Ningbo University table tennis  
155 team (9 professional athletes age  $23.5 \pm 1.24$  years, weight  $74.68 \pm 2.54$  kg, height  $1.75$   
156  $\pm 0.05$  m, training experience  $14.8 \pm 1.57$  years; 9 beginners, age  $22.7 \pm 1.62$  years,  
157 weight  $73.75 \pm 3.1$  kg, height  $1.75 \pm 0.04$  m, training experience  $0.45 \pm 0.42$  years) were  
158 recruited into the study. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Ethics  
159 Committee of Ningbo University. All participants were informed of experimental  
160 procedures and requirements. All were free from any previous lower limb injuries,  
161 surgeries or foot diseases six months prior to experimental data collection.

162 In order to determine the dominant lower limb, the ball-kick test was adopted in this  
163 study [33]. In this test, each participant was asked to kick a football with arbitrary power  
164 and maximal accuracy through a set of obstacles placed 1 m apart and 10 m from the  
165 participants, the supporting leg was regarded as the non-dominant limb and the other  
166 side was the dominant limb when kicking the football. In addition, this study followed



167 the suggestions of Peters and Murphy [23] to determine the dominant hand, and selected  
168 right-handed athletes as the participants.

### 169 *Instrumentation*

170 Foot kinematics were captured using an eight-camera Vicon motion analysis system  
171 (Oxford Metrics Ltd., Oxford, UK) with a frequency of 200 Hz. In order to assess the  
172 three-dimensional motion of the lower limb, reflective markers (diameter: 14 mm) were  
173 used to define joint centre and motion axes in accordance with the OFM marker set. The  
174 marker locations included: for the forefoot segment, markers were placed on the head  
175 and base of the 1<sup>st</sup> metatarsal and the 5<sup>th</sup> metatarsal respectively, the base of the hallux,  
176 and the proximal end of the distal phalanx of the 1<sup>st</sup> metatarsal. The rear-foot segment  
177 was defined by placing markers on the medial malleolus, superior heel, posterior  
178 calcaneus wand marker, sustentaculum tali, inferior heel and lateral calcaneus. To define  
179 the tibial segment, markers were placed on the head of the fibula, tibial tuberosity,  
180 lateral shank, anterior aspect of the shin and lateral malleolus (Fig. 1). Kinetic data was  
181 recorded by the in-shoe plantar pressure measurement system (Novel GmbH, Munich,  
182 Germany) and was recorded at 50 Hz. As outlined in Fig. 6, the plantar was divided into  
183 nine anatomical areas including, medial rear-foot (MR), lateral rear-foot (LR), medial  
184 mid-foot (MM), lateral mid-foot (LM), medial forefoot (MF), central forefoot (CF),  
185 lateral forefoot (LF), hallux (H), and other toes (OT). Prior to testing, the pressure  
186 insoles had been regulated with a pressure pump and data recording was sampled  
187 through Bluetooth technical equipment. Kinematic and kinetic tests were conducted  
188 synchronously. In addition, a high-speed camera (Fastcam SA 3, Photron, Japan) was  
189 employed to record the entire motion with a frame rate of 1000 Hz.

### 190 *Insert Fig. 1. Oxford Foot Model marker placement*

### 191 *Experimental setup*

192 All tests and experiments evaluating table tennis footwork were conducted at Ningbo  
193 University table tennis training gymnasium. Prior to data collection, all participants  
194 were given a standardized warm-up of 20 min in the experimental environment. All

195 participants were required to wear unified training footwear that contained Pedar insoles.  
196 Subjects were fully familiarized with the insoles in preparation for data collection.  
197 Participants practiced multi-ball training for 10 min using the chasse step. During the  
198 test, each participant was first required to return the ball back at the neutral position (Fig.  
199 2, a-c). Using the chasse step movement, then they were asked to perform a single  
200 forehand loop, accurately at a  $0.15 \times 0.15$  m target area bordering the net of the right  
201 serve box at match pace, with maximal power against a topspin ball that was projected  
202 by a table tennis ball machine placed 1.3 m away from the player' court (Fig. 2, d-f).  
203 The devices used did not influence or interfere with any of the recorded motions.

204 *Insert Fig. 2. The technique performance of the participant during the test*

#### 205 *Data processing*

206 A complete motion of the chasse step was recorded from the former stroke end to the  
207 backswing end, during the backswing phase. **In order to study the motion in detail, two**  
208 **distinct phases of the table tennis performance were observed backswing phase (I) and**  
209 **forward swing phase (II).** Moreover, in this study we selected two key events  
210 (backward-end, BE; forward-end, FE) from the entire motion. All joint angles in three  
211 planes were time-normalized to 100 data points. Kinematic analyses of the two stages  
212 were conducted on the following dependent variables: ROM and ACR. As kinetics  
213 parameter, peak pressures were determined for the nine selected areas. **In addition, the**  
214 **force-time in each foot region was calculated and defined as the relative load for the**  
215 **individual region** [9], [13].

#### 216 *Statistical analysis*

217 SPSS 19.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was utilized for statistical analysis. Prior to  
218 statistical analysis, **Shapiro-Wilks** normality test was conducted **to ensure that all data**  
219 **sets** were normally distributed. Between group differences in kinematics, kinetics and  
220 time variables were evaluated using independent *t*-tests. The significance level for all  
221 tests was set at  $p < 0.05$ . Cohen's *d* was used to compare the differences in the average  
222 of the two groups, and it is often represented by the effect size [6]. Effect size (ES) is

223 evaluated as trivial ( $\geq 0.19$ ), small ( $\geq 0.2$  and  $\leq 0.49$ ), medium ( $\geq 0.50$  and  $\leq 0.79$ ) and  
224 large ( $\geq 0.80$ ), respectively [6].

225

### 226 3. Results

#### 227 *Time*

228 The time to perform each phase for PA and BP is shown in Table 1 with significance  
229 levels, respectively. Compared with BP, PA showed significantly shorter time to  
230 complete the phase I and demonstrated longer time to complete phase II.

231 *Insert Table 1. Mean  $\pm$  standard deviations (Mean  $\pm$  SD), standard error of measurement*  
232 *(SEM), 95% confidence intervals (CI), effect sizes (ES) for the time at phase I, phase II*

233 *Insert Fig. 3. Changes of plantar foot joints during one motion cycle in three planes*

#### 234 *Kinematics*

235 The changes of plantar foot joints are shown as Fig. 3, which were generally  
236 comparable for both PA and BP in the three planes during one entire motion cycle. As in  
237 Table 2 and 3, significant kinematic differences in all three planes of RHFTBA (right  
238 hindfoot with respect to tibia angles), RFFHFA (right forefoot with respect to hindfoot  
239 angles) and RHXFFA (right hallux with respect to forefoot) have been detected between  
240 phase I and II in the two groups. The details as listed: (1) compared with BP, PA  
241 demonstrated significantly greater rear-foot dorsiflexion, smaller rear-foot inversion and  
242 greater rear-foot internal rotation at BE. (2) PA demonstrated significantly greater  
243 forefoot dorsiflexion, smaller forefoot eversion and greater forefoot abduction with  
244 greater hallux plantarflexion compared to BP at BE. (3) At FE, PA showed increased  
245 rear-foot dorsiflexion and internal rotation with greater forefoot inversion and abduction  
246 than BP. For the BP, ROM of the plantar foot joints in the three planes showed to be  
247 significantly larger at phase I (Table 4), while it was significantly smaller than the PA at  
248 phase II (Table 5). Concerning ACR of plantar foot joints, ACR at the RHFTBA for PA

249 showed significantly larger in the sagittal and frontal planes, while ACR at RHXFFA  
250 was significantly smaller than BP during phase I (Fig. 4). Compared with BP, ACR at  
251 the RFFHFA for PA represented significantly larger in the frontal plane during the entire  
252 motion (Fig. 4).

253 *Insert Table 2. Mean  $\pm$  standard deviations (Mean  $\pm$  SD), standard error of measurement*  
254 *(SEM), 95% confidence intervals (CI), effect sizes (ES) for the comparison of plantar foot*  
255 *joint angles at key events in three planes between the PA and BP at the phase I*

256 *Insert Table 3. Mean  $\pm$  standard deviations (Mean  $\pm$  SD), standard error of measurement*  
257 *(SEM), 95% confidence intervals (CI), effect sizes (ES) for the comparison of plantar foot*  
258 *joint angles at key events in three planes between the PA and BP at the phase II*

259 *Insert Table 4. Mean  $\pm$  standard deviations (Mean  $\pm$  SD), standard error of measurement*  
260 *(SEM), 95% confidence intervals (CI), effect sizes (ES) for the plantar foot joints ROM of*  
261 *the motion of PA and BP at the phase I*

262 *Insert Table 5. Mean  $\pm$  standard deviations (Mean  $\pm$  SD), standard error of measurement*  
263 *(SEM), 95% confidence intervals (CI), effect sizes (ES) for the plantar foot joints ROM of*  
264 *the motion of PA and BP at the phase II*

265 *Insert Fig. 4. Angular changing rate of plantar foot joints (upper: PA; lower: BP) during*  
266 *one entire motion in three planes*

#### 267 *Kinetics*

268 Peak pressures were higher under the LF, MR and LR areas in PA than BP, while the  
269 regions of the H, MF and CF were shown to be significantly smaller for PA at phase I  
270 (Fig. 5). Higher peak pressure was observed on the OT, LF and CF areas for PA, but the  
271 H area was smaller than BP during phase II (Fig. 5). In general, relative loads were  
272 higher on the OT and LF areas but lower on the MF and MR areas for PA compared with  
273 BP (Fig. 6). No main effect was observed for peak pressure and relative load between  
274 the PA and BP at MM and LM areas.

275 *Insert Fig. 5. Peak pressure for phase I and II between the PA and BP in each of the nine*

276 *areas of interest*

277

278 *Insert Fig. 6. Mean and standard deviation relation load (%) for dominant foot between the*  
279 *PA and BP in each of the nine areas of interest during one entire motion*

280

281

## 4. Discussion

282 The main aim of this experiment was to study the differences of foot biomechanics  
283 between PA and BP during **the** chasse step. The analysis of foot mechanics in some  
284 sports has been a major challenge for many years. Based on the moderate scientific  
285 evidence, qualitative interpretations are most often used for current paradigms and  
286 concepts of foot functions in general. Combining with OFM, the V3D technology can  
287 measure *in vivo* foot kinematics to solve **many** practical questions. Two key phases  
288 (chasse step and forward swing) were identified for in-depth analysis. A thorough  
289 understanding of lower-limb movement patterns of different level players has important  
290 implications on the enhancement of technical performance and the prevention of  
291 potential sport injuries. The findings of this study indicate that there were significant  
292 differences in the three-plane movement of the dominant foot between PA and BP. For  
293 BP, greater ROM were found in phase I, while it was smaller in phase II compared with  
294 PA. In addition, for PA, the joints ACR of RHFTBA during phase I increased  
295 significantly in **the** sagittal and frontal planes than BP, and ACR at RFFHFA showed to  
296 be larger during **the** entire motion. Significant differences in kinetics were found in LF,  
297 MF and LR areas **in** peak pressure between PA and BP during phase I. With respect to  
298 plantar relation load of the entire motion, significant differences were observed in OT,  
299 ME, LF and MR areas between PA and BP. When performing **the** chasse step, PA could  
300 take less time than BP. However, forward swing **was executed** in more time, which  
301 suggests that PA had enough time to accelerate the racket rapidly and regulate the body  
302 balance.

303 Based on the observation of significantly smaller ROM for PA at the completion of  
304 chasse step compared with BP, it can be inferred that PA possessed a stronger ability of  
305 using foot control and better technological stabilization. Rear-foot movement of PA  
306 progressed to obvious internal rotation at BE, it could help players to better finish the  
307 chasse step motion. At the same time, the greater forefoot abduction would be of great  
308 benefit to maintain body balance. In addition, using high speed camera and V3D, we  
309 found that PA were accustomed to landing on the rear-foot area while BP were at  
310 forefoot area during phase I. This was in line with the observation that the peak pressure  
311 of PA was higher under MR, LR and LF areas, in contrast, that of BP was higher on H,  
312 MF and CF areas during this period. This suggests that PA were able to distribute body  
313 weight more evenly on the full plantar to provide a more stable base for the next phase.  
314 At the event of BE, PA showed significantly smaller rear-foot inversion and forefoot  
315 eversion as well as larger hallux plantarflexion than BP, it also contributed to greater  
316 balance and was a potential factor to rapidly link the next stage of the kinetic chain. All  
317 of the results of this study indicate that PA possessed a more stable center of mass shift  
318 for the chasse step. As expected, significant differences were observed between PA and  
319 BP in rear-foot and forefoot dorsiflexion. Based on the theory of the stretch-shortening  
320 cycle, that states prior stored elastic energy in a muscle-tendon stretching phase could  
321 increase concentric movement [10], [29], it can be suggested that PA presented a  
322 fuller-backswing for the increased dorsiflexion that may enhance muscle output for  
323 performing the following motion. The same standpoint was confirmed by Komi et al.  
324 [18], they found that there was significant elastic energy storage for a squat jump  
325 compared with drop jump and counter-movement jump at the starting position.  
326 Interestingly, in order to assess the ability of an efficient energy transfer in the kinetic  
327 chain, the faster joint angular velocity is considered as standard and can reflect the level  
328 of technical movements [24], [27]. According to the comparison in ACR of plantar foot  
329 joints during phase I between PA and BP, PA showed was faster for RHFTBA in the  
330 sagittal and frontal planes. Meanwhile, the ACR at RFFHFA for PA was remarkably  
331 larger in the frontal plane than that of BP at the same moment. The increased ACR of

332 RHFTBA and RFFHFA for PA in this study may be related to more skilled technique  
333 and more effective plantar foot drive during chasse step.

334 With longer time in phase II, PA showed greater ROM of plantar foot joints. Previous  
335 studies have corroborated that experienced racquet-sport players have a better  
336 anticipation ability that can predict the outcomes of the movements of their opponents  
337 and even the ball trajectory [1], [4], [32], [35]. Based on this finding, it can be  
338 speculated that PA possessed a better ability of flexible motions than BP which would be  
339 **beneficial** for themselves to improve the quality of stroke. Additionally, compared with  
340 BP at the event of FE, PA showed larger rear-foot internal rotation and forefoot  
341 abduction. This may suggest a more fully forward swing to enhance the racquet speed  
342 for PA when synthesizing the observations of greater peak pressure under OT, LF and  
343 CF at the period. The increased rear-foot dorsiflexion with greater forefoot inversion of  
344 PA at FE moment may **lead to quick return back to the starting position**. The results of  
345 the present study indicated that both the lateral and the medial **area of the** forefoot were  
346 loaded differently, due to the different level of performance. For PA, higher relative load  
347 was recorded on the OT and LF areas compared with BP - MF and MR areas showed  
348 higher relative load for BP - during one entire motion cycle.

349 There are some limitations **that** should be noted in this study. Firstly, due to  
350 restrictions in enrollment, this study lacked of the comparison of the relationship  
351 between skill level and gender in chasse step. Another potential limitation is that there  
352 were substantial differences in training years, although all PA had same skill level and  
353 they were from same university table tennis team, **this** may limit the external validity at  
354 some degree. Further, BP **possibly** had different **levels** of cognitive ability in nature,  
355 which could influence the degree of learning. Finally, the generalization and application  
356 of these findings to players from other **countries** may be treated cautiously, **due to the**  
357 **fact that the participants in** this study were from China.

358

359

## 5. Conclusion

360 This study aimed to investigate the differences in the biomechanical characteristics  
361 during the chasse step between professional athletes and beginner players. As the results  
362 of this study indicated, professional athletes performed the chasse step within less time,  
363 and were coupled with significantly smaller ROM of plantar foot joint as well as  
364 significantly higher angle changing rate at forefoot and rear-foot compared with  
365 beginner players. It confirmed that professional athletes possessed better ability of using  
366 foot drive in this technique. In addition, the significantly smaller forefoot eversion and  
367 rear-foot inversion as well as greater hallux plantarflexion were recorded for  
368 professional athletes, which is a possible strategy to maintain body stability at the  
369 backswing end. For professional athletes at the forward swing phase, higher peak  
370 pressure under OT, LF and CF areas were recorded. Additionally, relative load was  
371 higher on the OT and LF areas for professional athletes compared with beginner players.  
372 These results could provide quantitative evidence for coaches and beginner players of  
373 how to better manipulate foot motions for improving the quality of the chasse step and  
374 to increase the control of body stability during the entire motion period.

375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395



396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402

## References

403

- 404 [1] Aglioti SM, Cesari P, Romani M, et al. Action anticipation and motor resonance in  
405 elite basketball players. *Nat Neurosci* 2008; 11(9): 1109.
- 406 [2] Bańkosz Z and Winiarski S. Correlations between angular velocities in selected  
407 joints and velocity of table tennis racket during topspin forehand and backhand. *J*  
408 *Sports Sci Med* 2018; 17(2): 330.
- 409 [3] Biernat E, Buchholtz S and Krzepota J. Eye on the ball: table tennis as a  
410 pro-health form of leisure-time physical activity. *Int J Environ Res* 2018; 15(4): 738.
- 411 [4] Brown EC and Brüne M. The role of prediction in social neuroscience. *Front Hum*  
412 *Neurosci* 2012; 6: 147.
- 413 [5] Carson MC, Harrington ME, Thompson N, et al. Kinematic analysis of a  
414 multi-segment foot model for research and clinical applications: a repeatability  
415 analysis. *J Biomech* 2001; 34(10): 1299-1307.
- 416 [6] Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (Rev. ed). New  
417 York: Academic Press, 1988.
- 418 [7] Curtis DJ, Bencke J, Stebbins JA, et al. Intra-rater repeatability of the Oxford foot  
419 model in healthy children in different stages of the foot roll over process during gait.  
420 *Gait Posture* 2009; 30(1): 118-121.
- 421 [8] Dul J and Johnson GE. A kinematic model of the human ankle. *J Biomed Eng*  
422 1985; 7(2): 137-143.
- 423 [9] Eils E, Streyl M, Linnenbecker S, et al. Characteristic plantar pressure distribution  
424 patterns during soccer-specific movements. *Am J Sports Med* 2004; 32(1): 140-145.
- 425 [10] Elliott B. Biomechanics and tennis. *Br J Sports Med* 2006; 40(5): 392-396.
- 426 [11] Fu F, Zhang Y, Shao S, et al. Comparison of center of pressure trajectory  
427 characteristics in table tennis during topspin forehand loop between superior and  
428 intermediate players. *Int J Sports Sci Coach* 2016; 11(4): 559-565.
- 429 [12] Girard O and Millet GP. Neuromuscular fatigue in racquet sports. *Phys Med*  
430 *Rehabil Clin N Am* 2009; 20(1): 161-173.
- 431 [13] Girard O, Eicher F, Micallef JP, et al. Plantar pressures in the tennis serve. *J*  
432 *Sport Sci* 2010; 28(8): 873-880.
- 433 [14] Girard O, Micallef JP and Millet GP. Lower-limb activity during the power serve  
434 in tennis: effects of performance level. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2005; 37(6): 1021-1029.
- 435 [15] Gu Y, Yu C, Shao S, et al. (2019). Effects of table tennis multi-ball training on  
436 dynamic posture control. *PeerJ* 2019; 6: e6262.

- 437 [16] Muelling K, Boularias A, Mohler B, et al. Learning strategies in table tennis  
438 using inverse reinforcement learning. *Biol Cybern* 2014; 108(5): 603-619.
- 439 [17] Kibler WB and Van Der Meer D. Mastering the kinetic chain. In: Roetert P and  
440 Groppe J, eds. *World-Class Tennis Technique*. Champaign: Human Kinetics, 2001, pp.  
441 99–113.
- 442 [18] Komi PV and Bosco C. Utilization of stored elastic energy in leg extensor  
443 muscles by men and women. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1978; 10(4): 261-265.
- 444 [19] Levinger P, Murley GS, Barton CJ, et al. A comparison of foot kinematics in  
445 people with normal-and flat-arched feet using the Oxford Foot Model. *Gait Posture*  
446 2010; 32(4): 519-523.
- 447 [20] Malagoli Lanzoni I, Lobietti R and Merni F. Footwork techniques used in table  
448 tennis: a qualitative analysis. In: *Proceedings Book of the 10th ITTF Sports Science*  
449 *Congress* (Eds.), 2007, pp. 401-408. Zagreb: University of Zagreb.
- 450 [21] Moseley L, Smith R, Hunt A, et al. Three-dimensional kinematics of the rearfoot  
451 during the stance phase of walking in normal young adult males. *Clin Biomech* 1996;  
452 11(1): 39-45.
- 453 [22] Nikolić I, Furjan–Mandić G and Kondrič M. The relationship of morphology and  
454 motor abilities to specific table tennis tasks in youngsters. *Coll Antropol* 2014; 38(1):  
455 241-245.
- 456 [23] Peters M and Murphy K. Cluster analysis reveals at least three, and possibly five  
457 distinct handedness groups. *Neuropsychologia* 1992; 30(4): 373.
- 458 [24] Qian J, Zhang Y, Baker JS, et al. Effects of performance level on lower limb  
459 kinematics during table tennis forehand loop. *Acta Bioeng Biomech* 2016; 18(3): 149.
- 460 [25] Queen RM, Haynes BB, Hardaker WM, et al. Forefoot loading during 3 athletic  
461 tasks. *Am J Sports Med* 2007; 35(4): 630-636.
- 462 [26] Saraswat P, Macwilliams BA and Davis RB. A multi-segment foot model based  
463 on anatomically registered technical coordinate systems: method repeatability in  
464 pediatric feet. *Gait Posture* 2012; 35(4): 547-555.
- 465 [27] Seeley MK, Funk MD, Denning WM, et al. Tennis forehand kinematics change  
466 as post-impact ball speed is altered. *Sport Biomech* 2011; 10(4): 415-426.
- 467 [28] Sims EL, Hardaker WM and Queen RM, Gender differences in plantar loading  
468 during three soccer-specific tasks. *Br J Sports Med* 2008; 42(4): 272-277.
- 469 [29] Walshe AD, Wilson GJ and Ettema GJ. Stretch-shorten cycle compared with  
470 isometric preload: contributions to enhanced muscular performance. *J Appl Physiol*  
471 1998; 84(1): 97-106.
- 472 [30] Wong PL, Chamari K, Chaouachi A, et al. Difference in plantar pressure between  
473 the preferred and non-preferred feet in four soccer-related movements. *Br J Sports*  
474 *Med* 2007; 41(2): 84-92.
- 475 [31] Wright CJ, Arnold BL, Coffey TG, et al. Repeatability of the modified Oxford  
476 foot model during gait in healthy adults. *Gait Posture* 2011; 33(1): 108-112.
- 477 [32] Xu H, Wang P, Ye ZE, et al. The role of medial frontal cortex in action  
478 anticipation in professional badminton players. *Front Psychol* 2016; 7: 1-9.
- 479 [33] Zakas A. Bilateral isokinetic peak torque of quadriceps and hamstring muscles in  
480 professional soccer players with dominance on one or both two sides. *J Sports Med*

481 *Phys Fitness* 2006; 46(1): 28.

482 [34] Zhang Z. *Biomechanical analysis and model development applied to table tennis*  
483 *forehand strokes*. Doctoral dissertation, Loughborough University, UK, 2017.

484 [35] Zhao Q, Lu Y, Jaquess KJ, et al. Utilization of cues in action anticipation in table  
485 tennis players. *J Sport Sci* 2018; 36(23): 2699-2705.