# Salter, Jamie ORCID logoORCID:

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7375-1476, Cumming, Sean, Hughes, Jonathan and De Ste Croix, Mark (2021) Estimating somatic maturity in adolescent soccer players: Methodological comparisons. International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching. (In Press)

Downloaded from: https://ray.yorksj.ac.uk/id/eprint/5220/

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. Institutional Repository Policy Statement

# RaY

Research at the University of York St John For more information please contact RaY at <u>ray@yorksj.ac.uk</u>

1	Estimating somatic maturity in adolescent soccer players: Methodological comparisons		
2	Jamie Salter <sup>1,3</sup> , Sean Cumming <sup>2</sup> , Jonathan D. Hughes <sup>3</sup> and Mark De Ste Croix <sup>3</sup>		
3			
4	Affiliations:		
5	1. School of Science, Technology and Health, York St John University, York, England		
6	2. Department of Health, University of Bath, Bath, England		
7	3. School of Sport and Exercise, University of Gloucestershire, Gloucester, England		
8			
9	Running Head: Estimating somatic maturity in soccer		
10			
11	Corresponding Author:		
12	Jamie Salter		
13	School of Science, Technology and Health		
14	York St John University		
15	Lord Mayors Walk		
16	York, YO31 7EX		
17	j.salter@yorksj.ac.uk		
18	@jay_salter		
19	ORCiD: 000-0002-7375-147		
20			
21	Abstract Word Count: 182		
22	Main Text Word Count: 2855		
23	Tables: 3		
24	Figures: 1		
25			
26			
27			
28			

#### 29 Abstract

*Purpose:* Monitoring maturation facilitates effective talent development. Various methods of
 maturity estimation exist with limited knowledge of concordance between methods. This study
 aims to establish agreement between methods of varied constructs to predict maturity status
 and compare concordance of methods to categorise players using established thresholds.

34

*Methods:* This study compared four maturity equations using anthropometrical data from 113
male adolescent soccer players (mean ±SD; age, 14.3 ±1 years) from two academies.
Conservative (±1 year) and less conservative (±0.5 years) circa-PHV thresholds were
employed.

39

*Results:* Analysis indicates tight (±0.3 year) agreement between maturity offset methods (MO),
but broader agreement between MO and predicted adult height methods (-1.5 to 1 year).
However, Kappa Cohen *k* suggests moderate to substantial (44-67%) and fair to moderate (31-60%) concordance between methods when using the conservative and less conservative circaPHV thresholds respectively.

45

46 *Conclusion:* Despite MO equation iterations claiming to reduce systematic error, they provide 47 very similar estimations. Additionally, practitioners should not use maturity offset and 48 predicted adult height methods interchangeably and are encouraged to apply either method 49 consistently when looking to estimate maturity status or biologically calssify players.

50

51 *Keywords:* adolescence, growth, maturation, team-sports

52

#### 54 Introduction

55 The holistic and systematic identification and development of the physiological, psychosocial and/or biomechanical attributes that contribute to success, are a primary focus for team sport 56 practitioners (Bergeron et al., 2015). These attributes are often determined through observation 57 and/or assessment of 'elite' adult athletes, but talent development studies highlight speed, 58 59 endurance and decision making as prominent attributes (Murr et al., 2018; Roberts et al., 2019). Subsequently, youth athletes demonstrating these attributes are identified, recruited and 60 61 promoted towards excellence. However, development trajectories are complicated when 62 adolescents experience the non-linear, inter-individual variations in tempo and timing of development throughout maturation (Cumming et al., 2017). Towlson et al. (2018) reported 63 64 staggered asynchronous development trajectories of physical and performance characteristics 65 that were exposed to dynamic temporal changes across peak height velocity (PHV). Maturation varies substantially within chronological age-groups, particularly around PHV, with large 66 67 variations in physical characteristics such as body mass ( $\sim$ 50%), stature ( $\sim$ 29cm), percentage of predicted adult height (PAH: 10-15%) and fat free mass (3-8.6kg) not uncommon 68 69 (Figueiredo et al., 2010; Hannon et al., 2020). This level of diversity in maturity, even within 70 relatively homogenous groups, creates uncertainty surrounding relative talent and future 71 potential in young athletes, therefore confounding talent development processes.

72

Professionalisation of the academy system (Premier League, 2011) now requires monitoring and evaluation of maturation to inform individual talent development decisions (Cumming et al., 2017). Skeletal age is a 'clinical' method of assessing maturity status, but is regarded as impractical within academy soccer (Fransen et al., 2018). As a result, surrogate 'non-invasive' somatic equations to estimate maturity status using anthropometric proportionality differences alongside longitudinal growth data are now common (Fransen et al., 2018; Khamis & Roche, 1994; Malina & Kozieł, 2014; Moore et al., 2015). These methods offer an indication of biological age either by predicting the age of PHV onset, whilst informing on the proximity of
this in time (years) in the form of a maturity offset (MO), or estimate current percentage of
adult height (PAH%) (Khamis & Roche, 1994). If standardised and routinely assessed, these
methods can estimate both the timing and tempo of maturation and have been used with
adolescent team sports players previously (Johnson et al., 2020; C. Towlson et al., 2018; van
der Sluis et al., 2015).

Each method has received critical review surrounding their ecological validity (see Mills et al., 87 88 2017 for a detailed appraisal). The original offset equation (Mirwald et al., 2002) was claimed to predict the timing of PHV to within 1-year 95% of the time which was applicable to 89 90 individuals aged between 10 and 18 years. Malina and Koziel (2014) longitudinally applied 91 this method to Polish boys in an attempt to re-validate the equation but identified a systematic 92 discrepancy between predicted and observed PHV. The timing of PHV was underestimated at younger ages and overestimated in older age groups. This was also supported by Mills et al. 93 94 (2017) who added that the equation overestimated the timing of PHV when assessed 95 immediately preceding PHV. Malina and Koziel noted that the magnitude of error tended to be accentuated in early- and late-maturing males, both of which are of particular prevalence in 96 youth sports programmes. Moore et al. (2015) then attempted to simplify and externally 97 98 validate the equation to cater for this overfitting, but still reported an increase in prediction 99 error the further removed from PHV the individual is. A further iteration of this equation has 100 since been validated with academy soccer players (Fransen et al., 2018). Authors claim that it 101 appears to better account for the systematic error by adopting a polynomial model and 102 estimating a maturity ratio to better reflect the non-linear growth process. However, subsequent critique by Nevill and Burton (2018) outlined potential flaws in the equation and the increased 103

<sup>86</sup> 

104 likelihood of spurious findings due to chronological age appearing on both sides of the maturity

105 ratio, with similar concerns over accuracy also reported by Teunissen et al (2020).

106

107 A PAH% developed by Khamis and Roche is also widely used within adolescent soccer (Salter 108 et al., 2020). Utilising several of the same anthropometric variables and the addition of birth 109 parent stature to ascertain mid-parent stature, the equation can predict the progress towards 110 adult stature as a percentage. If measured accurately the equation is reported to predict the adult stature to within 2.2 and 5.3 cm for the 50th and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile respectively, although this error 111 112 may increase to 2.8-7.2 cm when applied only to the age groups where it relates to the adolescent growth spurt (11-15 years) (Malina et al., 2019). Objectively measuring parent 113 114 stature is logistically difficult and therefore equation often uses self-reported parent stature and 115 should therefore be corrected for overestimation (Epstein et al., 1995). In some cases 116 adolescent athletes are not in contact with one or both birth parents, or for whatever reason an 117 accurate stature is not accessible. In such cases the equation suggests using mean national 118 values for male and females, likely reducing the data fidelity via regression to the mean, 119 particularly for those with birth parents with stature significantly different from the mean which 120 may cause additional error.

121

Peak-height velocity has been suggested to coincide with increased risk and incidence of noncontact and training related injury in team sports (Bult et al., 2018; Monasterio et al., 2020; Chris Towlson et al., 2020) which is concerning for practitioners. It is common within literature to di-, or tri-chotomise the maturation process into periods, often termed pre-, circa- or post-PHV to categorise individuals (Meyers et al., 2017; Radnor et al., 2020; Ryan et al., 2018; van der Sluis et al., 2015). In the applied setting, this categorisation may be utilised to implement maturity specific interventions, produce reports or inform talent (de)selection decisions 129 (Cumming et al., 2017). Several studies have used such classifications to assess the impact of 130 maturation on performance, such as speed (Meyers et al., 2017), neuromuscular performance (De Ste Croix et al., 2019) and aerobic endurance (Buchheit & Mendez-Villanueva, 2014). Due 131 132 to error, typical bandwidth thresholds of  $\pm$  1-year, or  $\pm$  0.5-years have been utilised to determine whether individuals are pre-, circa- or post-PHV. Similar conservative (85-96%) and 133 less conservative thresholds (88-93%) exist for PAH%, based on longitudinal data (Cumming 134 135 et al., 2017; Sanders et al., 2017). Despite each method having this categorisation capacity, it is unclear as to the agreement between the various approaches, which potentially differs based 136 137 on the nuances between estimation equations.

138

Validation of these methods have generally used large scale reference samples from mostly 139 140 white-Caucasian, middle-class backgrounds, leading to questions surrounding the applicability 141 of this to modern elite soccer environments. In addition, these methods are applied widely and almost interchangeably within adolescent soccer (Salter et al., 2020) and academic literature. 142 143 This lack of commonality complicates comparisons and generates uncertainty within the field. Therefore, this study has two main aims; a) to observe the agreement of maturity status 144 estimations between methods using the same anthropometric data and b) compare concordance 145 between methods when looking to categorise players as circa-PHV using established 146 147 thresholds. It is hoped that findings provide grounding for practitioners to select which method 148 to accurately monitor growth and maturation and to encourage consistency within 149 organisations when looking to track biological maturation.

150

151 Methodology

152 *Participants* 

Male adolescent academy soccer players (N = 113) (mean  $\pm$  SD; age, 14.3  $\pm$  1.1 years; stature 153 154  $170.1 \pm 10.6$  cm; body mass,  $58.7 \pm 10.5$  kg) were recruited from two Elite Player Performance 155 Plan academies. Players were predominantly from White British ethnicity, although some 156 participants were from more diverse ethnic minorities (<10%). Data from 57 participants was collected from a single assessment during the 2017-18 season, with the remaining 55 157 participants providing three repeated measurements during the 2018-19 season, resulting in 158 159 222 total estimations. Participants were eligible to take part if they were registered with the 160 academies and free from time-loss injury prior to the stratified random recruitment process to ensure a relatively homogenous sample. Ethical approval was granted by the University ethics 161 162 committee (REC 17.71.5.2).

163

#### 164 *Procedures*

Following International Society for the Advancement of Kinanthropometry (ISAK) 165 recommendations (Stewart et al., 2011) anthropometric measurements were obtained from all 166 167 participants wearing light sportswear to facilitate maturity estimations (Fransen et al., 2018; 168 Khamis & Roche, 1994; Malina & Kozieł, 2014; Moore et al., 2015). A portable stadiometer (Seca<sup>©</sup> 217, Chino, USA) was used to measure standing stature when participants stood 169 170 barefoot with feet together and their head in the Frankfort plane. The participants were required 171 to take a deep breath and hold their head still whilst duplicate measures of standing stature were recorded to an accuracy of 0.1cm and subsequently the mean was calculated with a third 172 173 taken if necessary (>4mm difference) and the median recorded. Following similar procedures, 174 participants seated stature was measured whilst sat on a standardised plinth (40cm high) with 175 feet together and hands rested on thighs. Body-mass was recorded using portable weighing scales (Seca<sup>©</sup> robusta 813, Chino, USA) whilst participants were stood barefoot wearing 176 177 normal training attire. Duplicate readings were taken and if measurements varied by 0.2kg a third measure was taken and the median recorded. All measurements were taken by the same
researcher to minimise error, with typical error (coefficient of variation [CV]) for both stature
(0.13% CV) and seated stature (0.21% CV) comparable with reported norms (Massard et al.,
2019). Mid-parental height was calculated using self-reported values corrected for
overestimation (Epstein et al., 1995; Malina et al., 2019).

183

#### 184 Maturity Equations

Estimations of MO and PAH% were calculated using anthropometric measures (standing 185 186 stature, seated stature & body-mass) and decimal age (years). Typical error (coefficient of 187 variation; CV%) for both stature and seated stature was 0.2% and therefore comfortably within accepted levels. The Fransen et al. (2018) method initially calculates a ratio which was 188 189 subsequently converted to MO for comparison. The Khamis-Roche (PAH%) equation required 190 the addition of birth parent height which was self-reported and corrected for overestimation 191 (Cumming et al., 2017). Exact equations are available in the supplemnatry material to this 192 study.

193

### 194 Statistical Analysis

195 Raw data are presented in Table 1. Agreement between measures was assessed using Bland-196 Altman plots with 95% limits of agreement, using Prism 9 software (9.1.0, GraphPad Software 197 LLC). The Mirwald equation (Malina & Kozieł, 2014) was used as a surrogate reference as this is most widely reported in literature. Due to measuring different constructs, both MO 198 (APHV+MO) and PAH% (using growth reference charts (Wright, 2002)) were both 199 200 subsequently converted to represent an estimation of biological age to facilitate analysis. Concordance analysis was conducted using Cohen's Kappa (k) coefficients derived from 201 202 contingency tables. Two evidence informed thresholds to categorise circa-PHV for MO and

203	PAH% were applied, a) conservative $\pm$ 1-year and 85-96%; and b) less conservative $\pm$ 0.5-years
204	or 88-93% (Cumming et al., 2017; Sanders et al., 2017).
205	***Insert Table 1 around here***
206	
207	Results
208	Descriptive analysis indicates minimal variation between all methods, particularly
209	between those that predict MO, with the closest agreement between the Moore and Fransen
210	methods (±0.05 years). (Table 1). Bland-Altman analysis indicates that MO methods typically
211	agree within <0.3 years 95% of the time, but Khamis-Roche PAH% offers broader limits of
212	agreement (-1.65-0.87 years) (Figure 1). Bias indicates that Khamis-Roche estimates
213	biologival age to be ~0.6 years higher than MO methods (Table 2).
214	
215	***Insert Figure 1 around here***
216	***Insert Table 2 around here***
217	
218	Concordance between methods is presented in Table 3. When conservative ( $\pm 1$ year) there was
219	substantial agreement (64-67%) between MO methods with moderate agreement (44-50%)
220	between MO and PAH% methods. There was a decline to moderate agreement (58-60%)
221	between MO methods and fair-moderate between MO and PAH% (31-43%) when utilising the
222	less conservative threshold.
223	***Insert Table 3 around here***
224	
225	Discussion
226	This study observed agreement between methods of estimating maturity status, aiming to
227	inform practitioners of differences and interchangeability feasibility between them. All

methods of MO produce a similar estimate of biological age (14.3-14.7 years). Findings suggest there are tight limits of agreement between MO methods ( $\pm$  0.3 years) despite methodological nuances. However, biological age estimations derived from Khamis-Roche calculations offer a much broader agreement window (approx. -1.5 to 1 year) with the MO methods. Unsurprisingly, there is greater concordance when using conservative thresholds (44-67%) than when using less conservative bandwidth thresholds (31-60%).

234

235 The tight agreement thresholds of biological age between MO is initially unsurprising based 236 on them being inherent iterations of the original regression equation. Moore et al. (2015) aimed 237 to reduce prediction error by removing seated stature from the equation. The almost perfect 238 agreement observed here (particularly between Moore-Fransen) is interesting based on 239 reported error associated with seated stature, which is historically greater than other 240 components of the equation (Mills et al., 2017). However, typical error for both seated and standing stature in the current study was low (0.2%), which is comparable with reported error 241 242 (Massard et al., 2019). This suggests that the inclusion/exclusion of seated stature has little 243 impact on the outcome of the equation if measurement error is adequately controlled. This may alleviate some of the concerns raised by Massard et al (2019) who indicated that failure to pay 244 close attention to sitting height protocol may influence the outcomes for PHV estimation. This 245 246 suggests that practioners have flexibility to utilise MO methods with or without sitting height, 247 based on logistical constraints within their setting. However, considering the tight agreement 248 between the methods, the Fransen calculation was validated in adolescent soccer, and therefore 249 likely reflects the true population (i.e., ethnicity, maturation tempo) compared with other 250 methods validated in predominantly white-caucasian school children. Additionally, this method offers a maturity ratio preceding MO, which is suggested to help model fit (Fransen et 251

al., 2018). Therefore, for practitioners working in youth team-sports, the Fransen MO method 253 may offer the most value, whilst maintaining agreement with other approaches.

254

255 The PAH% equation presented much broader agreement with MO estimations (Table 2). This 256 may be explained by them initially calculating two separate constructs (PAH% and MO) but 257 both can be converted to biological age using known growth trends, as employed in this study. 258 The PAH% mean biological age of 14.7 years and Bland-Altman analysis suggest the PAH% 259 offers a ~0.6 year bias compared to MO methods. This bias is more substantial than any of the 260 MO compared with one another, therefore suggesting that practitioners should use either a MO 261 method, or PAH%, but not both interchangeably. Parr et al. (2020) conducted longitudinal analysis to observe timing of PHV, and illustrated that PAH% was accurate 96% of the time, 262 263 with MO correct 61% of the time. This, combined with other studies (Malina & Kozieł, 2014; 264 Teunissen et al., 2020) highlight potential limitations with MO methods having a tendency to regress towards the mean which may limit their efficacy when differentiating between stages 265 266 of maturation. Data from the current study would suggest that PAH% is a useful indicator of 267 maturity status in youth team-sport players, however, it does provide maturity estimations that differ from MO methods. Based on the aforementioned limitations of MO methods, and in 268 conjunction with previous findings, PAH% may offer increased accuracy (Parr et al., 2020; 269 270 Teunissen et al., 2020), but is not reliably comparable to MO methods. Therefore, practitioners 271 should employ either a MO or PAH% method of maturity estimation consistently across the 272 various facets of application (e.g., time to PHV and/or bio-banding). Failure to obtain accurate 273 parental heights, or appropriately correcting the equation (Malina et al., 2019), will ultimately 274 undermine its accuracy and inflate error beyond that reported, reducing fidelity of predictions 275 and thus leave MO approaches more efficacious.

277 Despite the agreement discussed, discrepency exists when categorising players as circa-PHV 278 using both MO thresholds. The 64-67% concordance leaves a disagreement (i.e. players categorised differently) of approximately 30-35% and up to 50% when using conservative or 279 stringent thresholds respectively. This disagreement further increases when comparing MO to 280 281 PAH% to 31-50% respectively. Therefore, a third to two-thirds of the data would potentially disagree and lead to categorisation error, potentially influencing on the practices these 282 283 individuals are exposed to. For example, a player may be categorised as circa-PHV using one 284 method, but pre-PHV in another, potentially exposing them to different training stimulus or 285 reducing/increasing their perceived level of risk incorrectly. This has implications for 286 practioners who may use both MO and PAH% methods synonymously for different purposes 287 (i.e. time to PHV and bio-banding), and are therefore encouraged to identify the most feasible 288 and logical method within their context and apply this consistently.

289

290 The absence of a criterion value to compare maturity estimations limits confidence in the 291 conclusions from this study, and prevents formal conclusions about which method may be 292 superior, if any. Previous work has attempted to address this (Mills et al., 2017; Parr et al., 293 2020) but further studies are required to corroborate these findings. However, this multicentre dataset offers insight into the interchangeability (or lack of) of the common approaches, and 294 295 highlights how the same anthropoemrtical data may be interpreted differently based on the 296 approach used. Further work surrounding somatic maturity estimation accuracy is required, 297 and where possible should include longitudinal data obtained from multi-ethnic groups.

298

Findings indicate tight agreement between MO equations, but broader agreement thresholds for MO and PAH% methods. Additionally, concordance between methods to categorise players is moderate at best and may be misleading if multiple methods are employed. Therefore, we 302 conclude that although MO methods are interchangeable with each other, they are not interchangeable with PAH% which may provide different biological categorisation of players. 303 304 Academies are consequently encouraged to implement an informed approach to apply either 305 MO or PAH% consistently for both research and applied purposes, based on the resources and constraints of their environment. Previously cited limitations (Malina & Kozieł, 2014) of MO 306 307 methods and the observed bias here would suggest that a PAH% approach may offer increased accuracy when looking to monitor maturity status and timing (Parr et al., 2020; Teunissen et 308 309 al., 2020). It is further recommended that practitioners monitor both height and weight velocity 310 and plot their respective growth curves over time. With consideration of these findings practitioners can have greater confidence in maturity estimations, leading to appropriate 311 312 maturity-specific development and evaluation of talent.

313

## 314 Disclaimer

315 The authors note no conflict of interest involved with this study.

#### 317 **References**

318 Bergeron, M. F., Mountjoy, M., Armstrong, N., Chia, M., Côté, J., Emery, C. A., Faigenbaum, A., Hall, G., Kriemler, S., Léglise, M., Malina, R. M., Pensgaard, A. M., Sanchez, A., Soligard, 319 320 T., Sundgot-Borgen, J., van Mechelen, W., Weissensteiner, J. R., & Engebretsen, L. (2015). 321 International Olympic Committee consensus statement on youth athletic development. British 322 Journal of Sports Medicine, 49(13), 843-851. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-094962 Buchheit, M., & Mendez-Villanueva, A. (2014). Effects of age, maturity and body dimensions on 323 324 match running performance in highly trained under-15 soccer players. Journal of Sports 325 Sciences, 32(13), 1271–1278. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2014.884721 326 Bult, H. J., Barendrecht, M., & Tak, I. J. R. (2018). Injury Risk and Injury Burden Are Related to Age 327 Group and Peak Height Velocity Among Talented Male Youth Soccer Players. Orthopaedic 328 Journal of Sports Medicine, 6(12), 232596711881104. 329 https://doi.org/10.1177/2325967118811042 Cumming, S. P., Lloyd, R. S., Oliver, J. L., Eisenmann, J. C., & Malina, R. M. (2017). Bio-banding in 330 331 Sport: Applications to Competition, Talent Identification, and Strength and Conditioning of 332 Youth Athletes. Strength and Conditioning Journal, 39(2), 34–47. 333 https://doi.org/10.1519/SSC.00000000000281 334 De Ste Croix, M., Lehnert, M., Maixnerova, E., Zaatar, A., Svoboda, Z., Botek, M., Varekova, R., & 335 Stastny, P. (2019). Does maturation influence neuromuscular performance and muscle 336 damage after competitive match-play in youth male soccer players? European Journal of 337 Sport Science, 19(8), 1130–1139. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2019.1575913 338 Epstein, L. H., Valoski, A. M., Kalarchian, M. A., & McCurley, J. (1995). Do Children Lose and 339 Maintain Weight Easier Than Adults: A Comparison of Child and Parent Weight Changes 340 From Six Months to Ten Years. *Obesity Research*, 3(5), 411–417. 341 https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1550-8528.1995.tb00170.x

- 342 Figueiredo, A. J., Silva, M. J. C. e, Cumming, S. P., & Malina, R. M. (2010). Size and Maturity
- 343 Mismatch in Youth Soccer Players 11- to 14-Years-Old. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 22(4),
  344 596–612. https://doi.org/10.1123/pes.22.4.596
- 345 Fransen, J., Bush, S., Woodcock, S., Novak, A., Deprez, D., Baxter-Jones, A. D. G., Vaeyens, R., &
- 346 Lenoir, M. (2018). Improving the Prediction of Maturity From Anthropometric Variables
- **347** Using a Maturity Ratio. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, *30*(2), 296–307.
- 348 https://doi.org/10.1123/pes.2017-0009
- Hannon, M. P., Close, G. L., & Morton, J. P. (2020). Energy and Macronutrient Considerations for
  Young Athletes. *Strength & Conditioning Journal*, 42(6), 109–119.
- **351** https://doi.org/10.1519/SSC.00000000000570
- Johnson, D., Williams, S., Bradley, B., Sayer, S., Fisher, J. M., & Cumming, S. (2020). Growing
  pains: Maturity associated variation in injury risk in academy football. *European Journal of*

**354** *Sport Science*, 20(4), 544–552. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2019.1633416

- Khamis, H. J., & Roche, A. F. (1994). Predicting Adult Stature Without Using Skeletal Age: The
  Khamis-Roche Method. *Pediatrics*, *94*(4), 504–507.
- 357 Malina, R. M., Cumming, S. P., Rogol, A. D., Coelho-e-Silva, M. J., Figueiredo, A. J., Konarski, J.
- 358 M., & Kozieł, S. M. (2019). Bio-Banding in Youth Sports: Background, Concept, and
- 359 Application. *Sports Medicine*, 49(11), 1671–1685. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-019360 01166-x
- Malina, R. M., & Kozieł, S. M. (2014). Validation of maturity offset in a longitudinal sample of
  Polish boys. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32(5), 424–437.
- 363 https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2013.828850
- Massard, T., Fransen, J., Duffield, R., Wignell, T., & Lovell, R. (2019). *Comparison of sitting height protocols used for the prediction of somatic maturation*. 4.
- 366 Meyers, R. W., Oliver, J. L., Hughes, M. G., Lloyd, R. S., & Cronin, J. B. (2017). Influence of Age,
- 367 Maturity, and Body Size on the Spatiotemporal Determinants of Maximal Sprint Speed in
- **368** Boys: *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, *31*(4), 1009–1016.
- 369 https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.00000000001310

- Mills, K., Baker, D., Pacey, V., Wollin, M., & Drew, M. K. (2017). What is the most accurate and
  reliable methodological approach for predicting peak height velocity in adolescents? A
  systematic review. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 20(6), 572–577.
- **373** https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2016.10.012
- Mirwald, R. L., G. Baxter-Jones, A. D., Bailey, D. A., & Beunen, G. P. (2002). An assessment of
  maturity from anthropometric measurements: *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*,

**376** *34*(4), 689–694. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005768-200204000-00020

- 377 Monasterio, X., Gil, S. M., Bidaurrazaga-Letona, I., Lekue, J. A., Santisteban, J., Diaz-Beitia, G.,
- 378 Martin-Garetxana, I., Bikandi, E., & Larruskain, J. (2020). Injuries according to the
- percentage of adult height in an elite soccer academy. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, \$1440244020307362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2020.08.004
- 381 Moore, S. A., Mckay, H. A., Macdonald, H., Nettlefold, L., Baxter-Jones, A. D. G., Cameron, N., &
- Brasher, P. M. A. (2015). Enhancing a Somatic Maturity Prediction Model: *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 47(8), 1755–1764.
- 384 https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.000000000000588
- 385 Murr, D., Raabe, J., & Höner, O. (2018). The prognostic value of physiological and physical
- 386 characteristics in youth soccer: A systematic review. *European Journal of Sport Science*,
- **387** *18*(1), 62–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2017.1386719
- 388 Nevill, A., & Burton, R. F. (2018). Commentary on the Article "Improving the Prediction of Maturity
  389 From Anthropometric Variables Using a Maturity Ratio". *Pediatric Exercise Science*, *30*(2),

**390** 308–310. https://doi.org/10.1123/pes.2017-0201

- 391 Parr, J., Winwood, K., Hodson-Tole, E., Deconinck, F. J. A., Parry, L., Hill, J. P., Malina, R. M., &
- 392 Cumming, S. P. (2020). Predicting the timing of the peak of the pubertal growth spurt in elite
- 393 youth soccer players: Evaluation of methods. *Annals of Human Biology*, 0(ja), 1–23.
- **394** https://doi.org/10.1080/03014460.2020.1782989
- **395** Premier League. (2011). *The Elite Player Performance Plan*. English Premier League.

- Radnor, J. M., Oliver, J. L., Waugh, C. M., Myer, G. D., & Lloyd, R. S. (2020). The Influence of
- 397 Maturity Status on Muscle Architecture in School-Aged Boys. *Pediatric Exercise Science*,
  398 32(2), 89–96. https://doi.org/10.1123/pes.2019-0201
- Roberts, S. J., McRobert, A. P., Lewis, C. J., & Reeves, M. J. (2019). Establishing consensus of
  position-specific predictors for elite youth soccer in England. *Science and Medicine in*
- 401 *Football*, *3*(3), 205–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/24733938.2019.1581369
- 402 Ryan, D., McCall, A., Fitzpatrick, G., Hennessy, L., Meyer, T., & McCunn, R. (2018). *The influence*403 *of maturity status on movement quality among English Premier League academy soccer*404 *players.* 4.
- 405 Salter, J., De Ste Croix, M., Hughes, J., Weston, M., & Towlson, C. (2020). Monitoring practices of
  406 training load and biological maturity in UK soccer academies. *International Journal of Sports*407 *Physiology and Performance*, 28.
- 408 Sanders, J. O., Qiu, X., Lu, X., Duren, D. L., Liu, R. W., Dang, D., Menendez, M. E., Hans, S. D.,
- 409 Weber, D. R., & Cooperman, D. R. (2017). The Uniform Pattern of Growth and Skeletal
- 410 Maturation during the Human Adolescent Growth Spurt. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 16705.
- 411 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-16996-w
- 412 Stewart, A., Marfell-Jones, M., Olds, T., & De Ridder, J. (2011). International Standards for
  413 Anthropometric Assessment. In *Potchefstroom, South Africa, ISAK* (Vol. 137).
- 414 Teunissen, J. W., Rommers, N., Pion, J., Cumming, S. P., Rossler, R., D'Hondt, E., Lenoir, M.,
- 415 Malina, R. M., & Savelsbergh, G. (2020). Accuracy of maturity prediction equations in
  416 individal elite football players. *Annals of Human Biology, In press.*
- 417 Towlson, C., Cobley, S., Parkin, G., & Lovell, R. (2018). When does the influence of maturation on
- 418 anthropometric and physical fitness characteristics increase and subside? *Scandinavian*
- 419 *Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 28(8), 1946–1955.
- 420 https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13198
- 421 Towlson, Chris, Salter, J., Ade, J., Enright, K., Harper, L., Page, R., & Malone, J. (2020). Maturity-
- 422 associated considerations for training load, injury risk, and physical performance within youth

423	soccer: One size does not fit all. Journal of Sport and Health Science.
424	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2020.09.003
425	van der Sluis, A., Elferink-Gemser, M., Brink, M., & Visscher, C. (2015). Importance of Peak Height
426	Velocity Timing in Terms of Injuries in Talented Soccer Players. International Journal of
427	Sports Medicine, 36(04), 327-332. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0034-1385879
428	Wright, C. M. (2002). Growth reference charts for use in the United Kingdom. Archives of Disease in
429	Childhood, 86(1), 11–14. https://doi.org/10.1136/adc.86.1.11

Table 1. Descriptive comparisons between methods to estimate biological age (years)

Measure	Mirwald	Moore	Fransen	Khamis-Roche
Mean $\pm$ SD	$14.4\pm1.9$	$14.3\pm1.9$	$14.3\pm1.2$	14.7 ±1.1
Minimum	11.6	12.1	12.1	11.5
Maximum	16.7	16.6	16.6	18
Range	5.1	4.5	4.5	6.4
SEM	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
Variance	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.35

SD, Standard Deviation; SEm, Standard Error of Measurement

Measure	Mirwald	Moore	Fransen
Moore	0.17	***	***
	-0.31 - 0.37		
Fransen	0.16	0.03	***
	-0.30 - 0.36	-0.05 - 0.05	
Khamis-Roche	0.68	0.61	0.61
	-1.65 - 1.04	-1.53 - 0.87	-1.53 - 0.87

Table 2. Bland-Altman bias (SD) and 95% limits of agreement between biological age estimations

\*\*\* N/A

circa-PHV Threshold	Measure	Mirwald	Moore	Fransen
. 1	Moore	0.67	***	***
± 1 year 85-96% PAH	Fransen	0.66	0.64	***
	Khamis-Roche	0.49	0.50	0.44
	Moore	0.60	***	***
± 0.5 year 88-03% РАН	Fransen	0.59	0.58	***
00 <i>9 9 1 1</i> <b>1 1</b>	Khamis-Roche	0.31	0.43	0.39

Table 3. Concordance (Kappa Cohen k coefficient) between maturity status estimation thresholds for circa-PHV

\*\*\* N/A

450





453 Figure 1. Bland-Altman plots (with 95% limits of agreement) for estimated biological age for the different



457	Equation 1: (Malina & Kozieł, 2014) (MIRWALDMO)
458	Maturity Offset = -9.236 + (0.0002708 * (Leg Length * Sitting Height))
459	+ (-0.001663 * (Age * Leg length))
460	+ (0.007216 * (Age * Sitting Height))
461	+(0.02292 * (Body Mass by stature ratio * 100))
462	
463	Equation 2: (Moore et al., 2015) (MOOOREMO)
464	Maturity offset = -7.999994 + (0.0036124 * (age * standing stature))
465	
466	Equation 3: (Fransen et al., 2018) (FRANSENRatio)
467	Maturity ratio = 6.986547255416
468	+ (0.115802846632 * Chronological age)
469	+ (0.001450825199 * Chronological age (2))
470	+ (0.004518400406 * Body mass)
471	- (0.000034086447 * Body mass (2))
472	- (0.151951447289 * Stature)
473	+ (0.000932836659 * Stature (2))
474	- (0.000001656585 * Stature (3))
475	+ (0.032198263733 * Leg length)
476	- (0.000269025264 * Leg length (2))
477	- (0.000760897942 * [Stature * Chronological age])
478	
479	Equation 4: (Fransen et al., 2018) (FRANSENMO)
480	- Maturity Offset = Age / Maturity ratio

482	Equation 5: (Khamis & Roche, 1994) (PAH)
483	Predicated Adult Height = $\beta_0$ + stature* $\beta_1$ + body mass*( $\beta_2$ ) + corrected mid-parent stature
484	*β <sub>3</sub>
485	
486	Note: $\beta_0$ , $\beta_1$ , $\beta_2$ , and $\beta_3$ are the gender specific intercept and coefficients by which age, stature (in), body mass
487	(lbs) and mid-parent stature (in) respectively should be multiplied from the coefficients table available in
488	Khamis & Roche (1994). Correction factor for self-reported height in males is (Parental Height [cm]*0.955) +
489	2.316
490	