Effects of a six-week weighted-implement throwing program on baseball pitching velocity, kinematics, arm stress, and arm range of motion

Joseph A. Marsh[1], Matthew I. Wagshol[2], Kyle J. Boddy[3], Michael E. O'Connell[4], Sam J. Briend[5], Kyle E. Lindley[6], Alex Caravan[7]

[1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7] Driveline Baseball, Research & Development, Kent, WA USA

[5] Driveline Baseball, High Performance, Kent, WA USA

Corresponding Authors:

Kyle J. Boddy, Matthew I. Wagshol, Joseph A. Marsh
19612 70th Avenue South, Unit 2-4
Kent, WA 98032

Email address: kyle@drivelinebaseball.com, mwagshol@drivelinebaseball.com, joe@drivelinebaseball.com

Background. Weighted-baseball training programs are used at the high school, collegiate, and professional levels of baseball. The purpose of this study was to ~~compare~~ evaluate the effects of a six-week training period ~~using~~ consisting of weighted implements, manual therapy, weightlifting, and other modalities on ~~how they may affect~~ ~~arm stress, arm range of motion~~shoulder external rotation, elbow valgus stress, pitching velocity, and kinematics.

Hypothesis. A six-week training program ~~using~~that includes weighted implements may increase pitching velocity along with concomitant ~~There is a gain in pitching velocity with concomitant~~ increases in arm angular velocities, joint kinetics, and shoulder external rotation.

Methods. Seventeen collegiate and professional baseball pitchers (age range 18-23, average: 19.9) training at Driveline Baseball were ~~tested~~ evaluated ~~with~~ via a combination of an eight-camera motion-capture system, range-of-motion measurements~~,~~ and radar- and pitch-tracking equipment, both before and after a six-week training period. Each participant received individualized training programs ~~as standard protocol~~, with significant overlap in training methods for all athletes. In addition, it should be noted that individuals in this training program used training equipment sold out of Driveline Baseball (Kent, WA), which is owned by one of the primary authors of this study, Kyle J. Boddy, and followed prescribed training programs out of the aforementioned author's published book *Hacking the Kinetic Chain*. Twenty-eight biomechanical parameters were computed for each bullpen trial, four arm range-of-motion measurements were taken, and pitching velocities were recorded before and after the training period. Pre- and post-training period data were compared via post-hoc paired *t* tests.

Results. There was ~~a statistically insignificant~~no change in pitching velocity across the seventeen subjects (p value?). Four biomechanical parameters ~~for the holistic group were significantly~~ changed after the training period: ~~Among the biomechanical parameters computed, four were significantly different after the training period:~~ internal rotational velocity was higher (from 4527 to 4759 °~~degrees~~/second), shoulder abduction was lower at ball release (96 to 93°), the shoulder was less externally rotated at ball release (95 to 86°) and shoulder adduction torque was higher (from 103 to 138 N-m). Among the arm ~~arm laxity~~ range of motion measurements, four were significantly different after the training period: the shoulder internal rotation range of motion and total range of motion for both the dominant and non-dominant arm.

When the group was divided into those who gained pitching velocity and those who did not, the group that gained pitching velocity showed no significant increase in shoulder external rotation, or elbow valgus stress.

Conclusions. Following a six-week weighted implement program, pitchers did not show a ~~statistically~~ significant change in velocity, joint kinetics, or shoulder and elbow range of motion. When comparing pitchers who gained velocity versus pitchers who did not, no statistically significant changes were seen in joint kinetics and shoulder range of motion. ~~as a result of positive developments in kinematics and range of motion as demonstrated in the study.~~

Commented [MH1]: Was this an addition based on reviewer comments? I would suggest putting this at the end of the document as a "Disclosures" or "Conflicts" section.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Commented [MH2]: Avoid this.

Commented [MH3]: Keep consistent with above.

Commented [MH4]: Add SD or SE metrics.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Commented [MH5]: Confirm. Above you say shoulder internal rom and total rom was significant?

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Introduction

Studies on underweight and overweight baseballs have shown a positive training effect on the throwing velocity of regulation-weight baseballs (DeRenne et al., 2005; DeRenne et al., 1990; Egstrom et al., 1960; DeRenne, 1985). Additionally, studies have also shown no negative effects of throwing underweight and overweight implements on pitching control or injury risk (DeRenne et al., 2005; DeRenne et al., 1994).

A recent biomechanical study shows that pitching slightly underweight and overweight baseballs can produce variations in kinematics (specifically arm, trunk, pelvis, and shoulder velocities) without increased arm kinetics ~~<CAN SOMEONE INCLUDE THESE>~~ (Fleisig et al., 2016) and that maximum-effort crow-hop throwing with the same implements can increase shoulder internal rotation angular velocity and elbow varus torque (Fleisig et al., 2017)~~; Fleisig et al., 2016)~~. Additionally, ~~another , while a study under current reviewpublished study (Reinold, M. 2017) indicates~~ weighted-baseball throwing can increase shoulder external rotation in a six-week training period on high school athletes (Reinold, M. 2017).

Commented [MH6]: Be careful with statements like this. "another published study". Most readers will assume a peer reviewed scientific piece. You cite a website/blog. I get that this appears to be a solid study. Was it ever published? Can you cite that?

There is also published research on heavier-weighted plyometric throws ~~as~~ used in training and rehab programs, including but not limited to two handed chest passes and side throws of 8-pound "plyoballs" or the more traditionally-named medicine balls (Wilk, Meister & Andrews, 2002). Further research has found eight weeks of plyometric training can improve shoulder internal rotation power and throwing distance (Fortun, Davies & Kernozck, 1998). A different study using plyoballs~~s~~ and "The Ballistic Six" found a significant improvement in throwing velocity (Carter et al., 2007). While there is also research suggesting that throwing weighted plyos from 2–8 lb. may improve proprioception (Swanik et al., 2002).

Commented [MH7]: What does this mean? Increase power?

Commented [MH8]: Increase….

Major League Baseball teams have increasingly adopted the use of weighted-implement training and have seen a large uptick in drafted players with prior experience using weighted baseballs as amateurs. No conclusive evidence exists that truly explains the mechanism of the velocity gains, but claims that weighted-ball training can increase "arm strength" may be false (Cressey, E. 2013).

Commented [MH9]: ?

Commented [MH10]: Is this anecdotal?

Commented [MH11]: Is this an opinion piece?

Increases in throwing shoulder external rotation and loss of throwing shoulder internal rotation are potentially deleterious (Wilk et al., 2011), but, to our knowledge, no weighted-implement training program ~~in existing research~~ combines a throwing program with other training modalities to potentially reduce negative adaptive effects on the arm. There is evidence that certain mobility programs can reduce the negative adaptive effects of throwing (Laudner et al., 2008), and it is theorized that heavy resistance training and manual therapy ~~can potentially~~may aid in this regard ~~as well~~.

Commented [MH12]: Such as?

~~In addition, collegiate and professional pitchers participating in Driveline Baseball's summer training programs have on average increased pitching velocity 2.7 MPH in 2016 and 3.3 MPH in 2017 (Driveline Baseball, 2016 and 2017.).~~ ~~Driveline Baseball's summer training periods show~~

Commented [MH13]: Out of place. Avoid 1 sentence paragraphs.

~~documented increases of 2.7 MPH in 2016 and 3.26 MPH in 2017 pitching velocity (Driveline Baseball, 2016 and 2017), so there is anecdotal case study support for the programs' effectiveness.~~

The purpose of ~~the~~this study ~~is~~was to evaluate the ~~training~~ effects of a weighted-implement throwing program ~~The purpose of this study was to see what the positive training effects on throwing weighted implements would be and~~plus individualized training routines ~~geared~~focused on ~~around~~ combating the negative effects of~~if~~ throwing on pitching velocity, external rotation and elbow varus torque that is demonstrated ~~shown~~ in other studies ~~-on pitching velocity, external rotation and elbow varus torque~~. ~~to see if the negative effects of throwing shown in other studies could be replicated or if the secondary exercises included in the training program could effectively combat these adaptations.~~ We hypothesize the previously described program will increase external rotation, ~~It was hypothesized that the standard effects would be shown—increased external rotation, increased~~ ball velocity, and ~~increased~~ elbow varus torque.

Methods

Participants and Informed Consent

Healthy and asymptomatic college and professional pitchers ~~-~~were recruited from the Driveline Baseball 2017 training group via opt-in forms. ~~Before each pitcher was scheduled for their initial test~~Prior to being included in the study, investigators asked the pitchers about their current injury status. Pitchers were excluded if they had current symptoms of arm or shoulder pain or fatigue, or any other pain or discomfort that would prohibit completion of the ~~testing period~~study. Additionally, a prerequisite to train in the Driveline Baseball spring-summer group required medical clearance and a certified athletic trainer's sign-off before throwing pitches off a mound. Pitchers were not excluded based on previous history of injuries that did not currently manifest themselves. Pitchers were not excluded based on previous training history, although a few had trained at Driveline Baseball right before the study and most had experimented remotely with Driveline methods; the average time spent at Driveline right before the study's start was ~~around~~ 16 ± 10 days, with a ~~standard deviation of 10, a~~ maximum of 41 and a minimum of 3 days.

Pitchers were scheduled to come into the Driveline Baseball Research Facility (Kent, WA) for one visit. Upon arrival, participants were provided a verbal explanation of the study and asked to read and sign an Informed Consent document before beginning. The investigator verbally confirmed the major bullet points of the Informed Consent document in addition to obtaining a witnessed, legal signature from the pitcher, only proceeding if the pitcher submitted both a valid signature *and* verbally confirmed acceptance of all the risks contained within the Informed Consent document.

Commented [MH14]: You can be exact.

The study was approved by Hummingbird IRB, who granted ethical approval to carry out the study at the author's facilities (Hummingbird IRB #: 2017-29, Protocol WB-DLR-115).

Twenty-one baseball pitchers (age range: 18-23) with high school and college pitching experience met these criteria and agreed to participate. Four were excluded bringing the final number to seventeen. The data on these pitchers is recorded in Table 1.

[TABLE 1]

~~[TABLE 2]~~

~~Testing~~ Procedure and Measurements

During the testing period, range of motion measurements were taken using a goniometer to measure shoulder internal and external rotation in both the dominant and non-dominant arms. The same investigator was used for each individual in the initial and final tests; previous research has shown high intra-reliability ~~in~~ for goniometer measurements (Boone et al., 1978). Each pitcher was measured on the same day as the biomechanical screening.

Measurements were taken with each athlete lying in the lateral decubitus position (~~. The specific testing position is displayed below in~~ Figure 1). Testing was done in this position due to the fact that when lying supine, the humeral head is more likely to glide forward in the socket, causing irritation in the anterior shoulder and leading to more inaccurate measurements as the athlete can compensate for a lack of range of motion by rolling ~~his~~ the shoulder ~~forward~~ anterior? or ~~backward~~posterior?. In the lateral decubitus plane, the humeral head is in a more advantageous position to externally (Part A of Figure 1) and internally rotate (Part B of Figure 1) without humeral head glide (Reinold et al., 2004).

[Figure 1]

The investigator performing this part of the study was a certified strength and conditioning coach with seven years of experience and specifically trained in measuring range of motion of the shoulder using standard tools. Once the athlete was in the appropriate position, the investigator passively moved the arm until tension was reached and the measurement was taken. The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) of a trained clinician performing total range of motion tests of the shoulder have shown to be very reliable (Wilk et al., 2009).

The pitchers ~~were allowed to throw~~ threw as many warm up pitches as they liked ~~until they signalled~~~~signaled to the main study investigators that they were ready to pitch~~prior to beginning.~~.~~ Next, ~~P~~pitchers were fitted with reflective markers in preparation for three-dimensional motion capture. ~~portion of the pre-test and post-test for later kinematic and kinetic analyses.~~ Forty-eight reflective markers were attached bilaterally on the third distal phalanx, lateral and medial malleolus, calcaneus, tibia, lateral and medial femoral epicondyle,

Commented [MH15]: ?

femur, anterior and posterior iliac spine, iliac crest, inferior angle of scapula, acromial joint, midpoint of the humerus, lateral and medial humeral epicondyle, midpoint of the ulna, radial styloid, ulnar styloid, distal end of index metacarpal, parietal bone, and frontal bone, as well as on the C7 and T10 vertebrae, the sternal end of the clavicle, and the xiphoid process.

Pitchers then threw between 3-8 maximum effort throws, with approximately 30-60 seconds of rest between pitches. Fatigue was assumed to be negligible with such a low pitch count. Throws were made using a 5-oz. (142g) regulation baseball off the mound to a strike zone target (Oates Specialties, LLC, Huntsville, TX) located above home plate, which was 60' 6'' (18.4 m) away. Testing concluded when the investigators were satisfied they had recorded three successful throws ~~at least three clean takes~~ for analysis. Sample photographs and high-speed videos (Sanstreak Corp., San Jose, CA) of the setup and pitches ~~in motion~~ are shown in Supplemental Photos and Videos 1-3.

Commented [MH16]: Why?

For each trial, ball velocity was measured by a Doppler radar gun (Applied Concepts; Stalker Radar, Richardson, Texas). ~~Additionally, for all trials, the t~~Three-dimensional kinematics ~~motions of the reflective markers~~ were tracked ~~with~~ using an 8-camera automated motion-capture system, sampling at 240 Hz (Prime 13 System, Natural Motion / Optitrack, Corvallis, Oregon), shown in research to be comparable to more commonly-used high-end motion-capture systems (Thewlis et al., 2013). ~~A total of 8 c~~Cameras were placed symmetrically around the capture volume, approximately ~~8 feet~~2.4 meters from the center of the pitching mound, at roughly ~~8 feet~~2.4 meters high. ~~One camera was lowered on the throwing-arm side to avoid collisions, and an additional camera was lowered to aid in marker tracking.~~

In total, 28 kinematic and kinetic ~~values~~ measures (11 position, 6 velocity, and 11 kinetic) were calculated ~~using our personal code based~~using the ISB recommended model of joint coordinate systems (Wu et al. 2005) with code based on Fleisig methods (Fleisig et al., 2017) in Visual3D (C-Motion Inc., Germantown MD). Marker position data was filtered using a ~~20 Hz~~ Butterworth low-pass filter . The mean values for all variables were calculated for each participant based ~~up~~on their 3 ~~best~~ clearest throws, based upon marker and motion readability (Escamilla et al., 1998).

Commented [MH17]: Specify order? Dual pass? 20 hz cutoff.

Commented [MH18]: ? does this mean there was marker drop out? Was there any gap filling or other procedures performed other than filtering the data?

Five joint angles ~~positional kinematic values~~ were ~~found~~ calculated at the events of~~both~~ foot contact (FC) and ball release (BR), including: elbow flexion, shoulder horizontal abduction, shoulder abduction, shoulder external rotation, and wrist extension.~~,~~ Additionally,~~as well as~~ maximum dynamic shoulder external rotation was measured ~~as well~~. All kinematic measures ~~Measurements~~ were all taken as their local joint angles, using local coordinate systems.

Commented [MH19]: ....measured as.....

Expand. What is maximum dynamic shoulder external rotation?

~~The s~~Six velocity parameters included mean pelvis angular velocity at FC and BR, and ~~the~~ maximum ~~values of of~~ pelvis angular velocity, upper torso angular velocity, elbow extension velocity, and shoulder internal rotation velocity. Pelvis and upper torso angular velocities were measured ~~by~~ as ~~their~~ rotations in the global ~~reference~~ coordinate system.~~frame.~~ Elbow,

Commented [MH20]: Why are some called "angular velocity" and others just "velocity"? Are they all the same?

shoulder, and wrist velocities were calculated as the rate of change in the joint angle and is expressed as °/sec.

Maximum ~~values for~~ elbow and shoulder kinetics were calculated~~. Values were reported~~ as either a force or a torque applied ~~on~~to the joint, ~~applied~~ by the proximal segment onto the distal segment ~~at the joint~~. Six forces were calculated, including medial, anterior, and compression forces on the elbow, and superior, anterior, and compression forces on the elbow. Five joint torques were ~~also~~ computed: elbow flexion torque, elbow varus torque, shoulder horizontal adduction torque, shoulder adduction torque, and shoulder internal rotation torque.

Commented [MH21]: External force?

Commented [MH22]: ?

Commented [MH23]: Expand. How was this done? Inverse kinematics? Specify parameters.

What is a shoulder torque? Is it a resultant shoulder moment that was calculated?

Training Methods

In between the ~~two~~ pre and post tests, pitchers were exposed to a six-week training program, slightly individualized for each ~~person~~ athlete based on their strengths and weaknesses, which were determined ~~vis a vis~~from a ~~their~~ biomechanical and performance assessment ~~results~~. Pitchers were ~~slotted~~placed into one of three ~~different~~ categories for throwing programing. These were velocity development, mound development, or a hybrid version of the two. All athletes performed their training program six days a week with the seventh day being an off day.

Each pitcher ~~began h~~completed~~is~~ a warm-up ~~by~~ using foam rollers and lacrosse balls for self-myofascial release (SMR) of various lower body and throwing arm muscles. Another option was rolling out the forearm with Arm Aid Extreme devices (The Armaid Company, Inc., Blue Hill, ME). Athletes were allowed ~~to roll out~~SMR for a period of time that they determined necessary and were able to use SMR on other body parts if necessary. The standard SMR exercises can be found in the supplemental materials pages 1-7 of HTKC1.

Following SMR, athletes completed a set of exercises using Jaeger Band surgical tubing (Jaeger Sports, Los Angeles, CA). Pitchers performed a forward fly to overhead reach, reverse fly to overhead reach, bicep curl with supination, tricep extension with pronation, internal and external rotations with elbow at shoulder height. Further details on the exercises can be found on pages 8-12 of the supplemental materials of HTKC1

Although Jaeger bands use a wrist cuff, surgical-tubing exercises with a handle have been shown to result in low to moderate EMG activation of the rotator cuff and surrounding musculature (Myers et al., 2005). ~~A thesis has also stated s~~Surgical tubing exercises can improve velocity and shoulder internal and external strength (Baheti, 2000).

Following band work, pitchers performed a series of exercises with an Oates Specialties shoulder tube (info on product?). The tube is designed ~~as~~ for oscillation work to warm up the rotator cuff muscles. Pitchers performed shoulder flexion ~~in front~~, shoulder abduction ~~to the side~~, external/internal rotations, pronation/supination ~~twirls~~, and stride-length forward shoulder rotations. More detail on these exercises can be found on pages 13-16 of the supplemental materials of HTKC1.

Commented [MH24]: Reference?

The pitchers then performed a series of four exercises with 10-lb~~.~~ wrist weights. The goals of these exercises ~~are~~ were to warm up the muscles of the forearm and ~~work~~ the back of the shoulder eccentrically. The exercises were Pronated Swings (with two-arms), Two-Arm Throws, modified Cuban Press, and Pivot-Pickoff Throws. Further details of the exercises can be found on pages 17-24 in the supplemental materials of HTKC1.

Athletes then moved to a specific series of throws using plyometric PlyoBalls (custom made soft sand-filled weighted balls ranging from 100-2000 grams~~;, sold out of Driveline Baseball, Kent, WA)~~). There ~~are~~ were five exercises performed; each exercise ~~is~~ was unique within the constraints of the body's position to focus on different mechanical elements. Pitchers performed Reverse Throws, Pivot Pickoffs, Roll-in Throws, Rockers, and Walking Windups.

The ball weights, sets, and reps were all standard across the participants, depending on the training day. Pitchers completed the above warm-up six days a week with the volume and intensity of PlyoCare throws varying on the day. The throwing schedules and explanations on how to perform the exercises are listed on pages 25-36 in the supplemental materials of HTKC1.

On certain days pitchers were scheduled to long-toss. ~~This occurred either off-site at a local park or inside while throwing into a net. Driveline utilizes t~~Two different types of long toss days were implemented. The first ~~is~~was a lower intensity day. Rate of perceived exertion (RPE) ~~is~~was ~~around~~ 60-70% for the athlete accompanied by loose, relaxed throwing with a large arc as the athlete backs up in distance. Maximum distance ~~is~~was determined by throwing ability and RPE and as such will vary from athlete to athlete. This day ~~does~~did not include any high intensity compression throws.

The second type of long toss day ~~is~~was similar to the first, except ~~it is~~ performed at an RPE of 80-90% and the athlete ~~will~~ carr~~y~~ies the extension throws out to ~~roughly~~ maximum throwing distance. Upon reaching maximum throwing distance in as many or as few throws as required, the athlete ~~will come in and~~then performs eight to twelve high intensity compression throws. These compression throws remove the arc from the throw and are thrown roughly parallel to the ground from the throwers release point. Number of throws will vary day to day for each individual athlete as they are instructed to be ~~extremely~~ receptive to their body's response and ~~own~~ personal comfort level.

Research on long-toss has largely focused on throws at max distance while throwing hard on-a-line, with one study finding max distance throws resulted in more torque than in pitching (Fleisig et al., 2011). Another study found that max distance, hard on-a-line throws resulted in similar loads to pitching (Slenker et al., 2014).

Long-toss as described in the programming did not solely consist of max distance, hard on-a-line throws. Most consisted of high-arc (extension) throws to a tolerable distance for the day, otherwise described as catch-play to a distance that is tolerable. Certain training days did consist of hard on-a-line (compression) throws, which are marked in the supplemental

Commented [MH25]: kg

Commented [MH26]: posterior?

Commented [MH27]: More specific.

materials. It is important to note these distinctions since a recent study showed that many coaches, ATCs, and players define long-toss differently (Stone et al., 2017).

Each pitcher completed a post-throwing exercise circuit after each day of throwing workouts. The circuit consisted of standing rebounders; the pitchers threw a 4- and 2-lb. PlyoCare ball at a trampoline on the ground and were told to "stick" the catch of the ball or stop its upward momentum right away.

~~Following rebounders~~Next, ~~were~~ reverse scap pull-aparts, anterior band pull-aparts, and the no money drill. After band exercises, pitchers performed waiter walks. The pitchers held a kettlebell with their humerus at shoulder height and forearm facing vertically while walking. The kettlebell ~~is~~ was gripped by the handle with the weight facing the ceiling. More details of the post throwing circuit can be found in the supplemental materials of HTKC2.

After the exercise circuit, each pitcher was able to use the Marc Pro EMS device (Marc Pro, Huntington Beach, CA). The Marc Pro has been shown to improve muscle performance, recovery, and reduce Delayed Onset Muscle Soreness (~~or~~ DOMS) caused by exercise (Westcott et al., 2011, Westcott et al., 2013). It has been hypothesized that these results come from and increase in blood flow (DiNubile et al., 2011).

In conjunction with the throwing program athletes were ~~also~~ involved in a strength and conditioning program. This program included lifting weights, medicine ball throws, and mobility work. This program was individualized to each athlete depending on a separate physical and athletic screening.

Pitchers ~~also~~ saw a physical therapist during the training period. Trainers are also certified in Functional and Kinetic Treatment with Rehabilitation (~~or~~ FAKTR), cupping, and other manual therapy techniques. Athletes were able to receive treatment on an as-needed basis.

Each pitcher ~~in this study~~ had five- to six-throwing days scheduled a week. The throwing days were classified as high-intent days, hybrid days (medium intent days), and recovery days (low intent days), with the intensity and volume of throws changing per day. Athletes typically performed two high intensity days, one moderate intensity day and three recovery days within a given seven day cycle.

To be included in the ~~final study~~post data collection, pitchers had to ~~have~~ participate~~d~~ in at least 90% of the training days ~~laid out for them, or they were dropped from the study~~. Four of the twenty-one pitchers initially chosen for the study failed ~~were chosen for failing to~~ to meet ~~this criteria~~this criterion.

Data from the training periods—including schedules, workloads, lifting programs, and intermediate progress—can be found in the supplemental data as spreadsheets for all pitchers ~~involved in the study.~~.

Commented [MH28]: Scapular?
Pull aparts? Technical term? Scapular retraction?

Commented [MH29]: They held the kettlebell with their hand, not humerus.
what is humerus at shoulder height? Shoulder flexed to 90deg? Parallel with floor? What for how long?

Commented [MH30]: Able to. Did they? All?

Commented [MH31]: I would be careful with this. Mechanisms of DOMS are widely debated.

All statistical analyses were performed using R (RStudio Team, Boston, MA). After cleaning and preprocessing each individual athlete's data (the initial and post biomechanical parameters, the range of motion measurements, the range of motion strength numbers, and velocity data), means and standard deviations were calculated for each ~~single~~ ~~metric~~measure, and then the differences were computed, along with the subsequent t metric and p-value. A paired t-test was used due to a relatively small sample size and unknown true population variances. To calculate the t metric, the mean differences between observations were divided by the standard error of these differences, which was calculated by the standard deviation of differences divided by the square root of the sample size, n. An n-1 degree of freedom was used, along with an alpha level of 0.05, leaving the pure probabilistic chance of any metric being highlighted as a false positive as 5% or less. A post-hoc analysis with similar statistical methods was also performed on both the subgroup of pitchers who saw a velocity increase during the training period and those who saw a velocity decrease.

Commented [MH32]: This isn't outlined above at all. See my comment about the filter used.

Commented [MH33]: Rom strength?

Commented [MH34]: Ref?

Results

Pre- and post-range of motion tests are shown in Table 2~~3~~. Four arm range of motion ~~arm laxity~~ measurements were significantly different after the training period: internal rotation range of motion and total range of motion were higher (p values) for both dominant and non-dominant arms. You say 4 were significant. What about the other 2 measures?

~~Perhaps notably, s~~Shoulder external-rotation range of motion did not ~~was not~~ significantly increase~~d~~ after the training period. ~~Of the entire sample size, passive external rotation saw a gain of 1 degrees in the dominant arm, which was not significant.~~

Commented [MH35]: Why?

Commented [MH36]: 1 degree, given variability and no SD given, it probably is noise.

[TABLE 2~~3~~]

Splitting the groups ~~post hoc~~ into ~~the~~ pitchers that gained velocity and those who did not gain velocity did not ~~did not may~~ yield ~~interesting~~ ~~results~~~~additional~~ significant ~~results~~differences between the groups. For instance, when those who gained throwing velocity were split into their own group~~, we might have expected to see the group that gained velocity~~ (n=9) ~~to have statistically significant increases in post-training passive shoulder external-rotation range of motion, but~~ the gain in post-training passive shoulder external-rotation range of motion was 2.8 +-? degrees, which was not statistically significant.

Range-of-motion changes ~~of~~ for the ~~increase and decrease~~ velocity groups can be found in tables 3 and 4 ~~below~~.

[TABLE 3~~4~~]

[TABLE 4~~5~~]

Mean kinematics ~~values of~~ for the pre and post-test are shown in Table 5. At front-foot contact, there were no significant differences in any of the joint positions and velocities. During arm cocking, maximum internal rotation velocity was higher. At ball release, shoulder abduction was

Commented [MH37]: How much? Give the data.

lower and external rotation decreased. ~~Meaning the arm was more fully internally rotated towards the target at the moment of ball separation in the delivery.~~

[TABLE 5~~6~~]

For the increased velocity group, no values were ~~statistically~~ significantly different at front foot contact (~~, as displayed below in~~ Table 6). Maximum internal rotation velocity and maximum elbow extension velocity were significantly higher in the arm cocking phase. External rotation was significantly lower at ball release. No values were different for the velocity decrease group at front foot contact, arm cocking, or ball release (~~, as depicted in~~ Table 7).

[TABLE 6~~7~~]~~f~~

~~No values were different for the velocity decrease group at front foot contact, arm cocking, or ball release, as depicted in Table 7.~~

[TABLE 7~~8~~]

Maximum shoulder adduction torque was the only parameter to significantly increase during the arm cocking phase for all athletes (~~, as recorded in~~ Table 8). ~~No values significantly changed in the deceleration phase.~~ For the velocity increase group, no ~~value~~kinetic measures were ~~was~~ significantly ~~change~~different in the arm cocking phase. Maximum shoulder superior force was the only variable significantly higher in the deceleration phase (~~, with full detail in~~ Table 9). Maximum shoulder adduction torque was significantly higher in the velocity decrease group at arm cocking. Elbow anterior force, elbow compressive force, elbow flexion torque, and shoulder compressive force were all significantly lower in the arm deceleration phase (Table 10).

[TABLE 8~~9~~]

~~For the velocity increase group, no value was significantly change in the arm cocking phase. Maximum shoulder superior force was the only variable significantly higher in the deceleration phase, with full detail in Table 9.~~

[TABLE 9~~10~~]

~~Maximum shoulder adduction torque was the only value significantly higher in the velocity decrease group at arm cocking. Elbow anterior force, elbow compressive force, elbow flexion torque, and shoulder compressive force were all significantly lower in the arm deceleration phase, as displayed in Table 10.~~

Commented [MH38]: How much? Give the data.

Commented [MH39]: Not results. Discussion.

Commented [MH40]: P value. How much? Give #s.

Commented [MH41]: Same. Give #'s. p-value.

Commented [MH42]: Give #'s.

[TABLE 10~~1~~]

Discussion

This study investigated the effects of……….The hypothesis that a baseball training program ~~that~~ featuring~~es~~ weighted implements would significantly increase shoulder external-rotation range of motion was not supported by the current study. This was consistent for ~~—not in~~ the entire subject pool ~~nor~~ as well as ~~in taking just those~~ the sub grouping who gained velocity, ~~—~~despite this phenomenon being posited as a way to enhance ball velocity (Matsuo et al., 2001).

It has generally been hypothesized ~~in research~~ that weighted balls work along the speed-strength spectrum. One study found significant differences in maximal internal rotation (IR) and elbow extension (EE) velocity when throwing different ball weights (Tillaar & Ettema, 2011). With a second study finding 67% of ball velocity at release could be accounted for by internal rotation and elbow extension (van den Tillaar & Ettema, 2004). In our work, for ~~Of~~ the entire study sample, there was a significant change in IR velocity, ~~-~~but not EE velocity.

When our sample was ~~B~~broken ~~up~~ into those who increased- and decreased -velocity ~~groups~~, we ~~see~~ found that the velocity-increase group saw ~~statistically~~ significant increases in both internal-rotation velocity and elbow-extension, whereas the velocity-decrease group saw no significant change in either metric.

There was no significant change in elbow valgus torque, and the values reported in this study are similar to previous studies (Feltner & Dapena, 1986; Fleisig et al., 2015)

No metrics were significantly different at front foot contact in any group.

A previous study found shoulder abduction angle at stride foot contact to be one of four variables that could explain 97% of variance in valgus stress through a regression analysis (Werner et al., 2002). In ~~this~~ our study, when comparing pre- and ~~post~~post-training we ~~-analysis~~ found no significant decrease in shoulder abduction angle at stride foot contact but a significant change of abduction angle at ball release.

It has been suggested ~~previously~~ that the most optimal abduction angle at release is close to 90 degrees but may vary slightly depending on the individual~~.~~ (Fortenbaugh, Fleisig & Andrews, 2009; Matsuo et al., 2002). The pitchers in ~~this~~ our study saw a significant change in shoulder abduction angle at release (from xx to xx), moving closer to 90 degrees.

Notably, none of our sub-~~-~~groups had significant changes in elbow valgus torque or shoulder internal rotation torque as a result of the training. The increase velocity group had a significant increase in shoulder superior force, while the decrease velocity group had a significant increase in shoulder adduction torque, and significant decreases in elbow anterior force, elbow compressive force, elbow flexion torque, and shoulder compressive force.

Commented [MH43]: Increases? Decreases?

Commented [MH44]: How much?

Commented [MH45]: Abbreviated above. Consistency.

Commented [MH46]: This is not a paragraph.

Commented [MH47]: This is a statement. Tie it all together with a section on forces and or torques.

Commented [MH48]: Who's study? Werner or yours?

~~The amount of e~~External rotation was not significantly different at front foot contact, but ~~was~~ significantly decreased at ball release, which may be a novel finding. This change was present and significant in the combined and velocity increase group.

Maximum shoulder adduction torque was significantly higher in the post-training group. ~~Research has found that s~~Shoulder adduction torque ~~was~~ is one of two variables related to elbow valgus torque, along with maximum internal rotation torque (Sabick et al., 2004). Sabick and colleagues ~~The study~~ stated that maximum shoulder adduction torque and maximum internal rotation torque were negatively correlated with elbow valgus torque, so as those two values increased, elbow valgus torque tended to decrease.

Interestingly, in our study, shoulder adduction torque only significantly increased in the group that lost velocity. The group that increased velocity had an increase in shoulder adduction torque, but it was not found to be significant.

Maximum torso angular velocity and maximum pelvis angular velocity were not significantly different in the pre- and post-group analysis. Split into increase and decrease velocity groups, there were no significant changes in torso angular velocity or pelvis angular velocity.

Previous research has shown mixed results on the relationship between pelvis- and torso-angular velocity and throwing velocity, though none compared pre- and post-training periods (Matsuo et al., 2001; Young, 2014; Dowling, 2016; Stodden et al., 2001). Theoretically, increasing the rotational forces of the pelvis and torso allows energy to be transferred from the trunk to the throwing arm and then to the ball, which should result in higher velocities.

These studies would also suggest that peak torso and pelvis velocities play a role in increasing velocity, but the timing of these forces is also vitally important. While the timing was not examined in this study, further studies should examine the possible changes of constraint training and weighted balls of the timing of hip and torso rotation. More research should also be attempted at pre- and post-group analysis to look at hip and torso velocities.

~~The degree of e~~Elbow flexion at ball release did not significantly change, even though a previous study found significant differences in the angle of the elbow at ball release, depending on ball weight (van den Tillaar & Ettema, 2004).

It has also been postulated that training with weighted balls causes ~~gains~~ increases in external rotation, both passive and dynamic. Dynamic maximum shoulder ER has been associated with ball velocity (Matsuo et al., 2001; Werner et al., 2008), but research looking within pitcher variation found no significant association between maximum external rotation and ball velocity (Stodden et al., 2005). The theory holds that weighted-ball use may result in velocity gains from excess glenohumeral external rotation, which may be linked to increased elbow valgus load (Aguinaldo & Chambers, 2009; Sabick et al., 2004).

Commented [MH49]: Expand. Bring in other literature discuss why this may be novel and important.

Commented [MH50]: If it wasn't significant, can you really say they had an increase? Give p value. Was there a trend? If the increase was small and not significant be careful with your wording.

Commented [MH51]: This doesn't contribute to the paper. Its just your results section repeated. At least combine it with below.

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 8 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Commented [MH52]: What forces? You are talking about torso and pelvis velocity.

Commented [MH53]: Of what?

Commented [MH54]: More is needed in this section. You can't just state your findings, then list a study that found something similar (or different). Expand. Based on this, what do you guys think. Was the lack of differences all a result of your training program? Give some speculation.

Commented [MH55]: Again, expand on this. Why didn't you find a difference? What was different in the vanden Tillaar study that may have led to the discrepancy? Dig deeper.

Commented [MH56]: ER. Be consistent.

Although previous research on high-school pitchers did not find a significant correlation between passive external rotation and pitch velocity (Keller, 2015), other research did see a significant moderate correlation between passive external rotation and the degree of external rotation seen in a throw (Miyashita et al., 2008).

It should be noted that the biomechanical measurement of external rotation cannot be attributed only to changes of the glenohumeral joint. There can be changes in thoracic extension or scapula position that can affect measurements. In addition, the possibility of measurement error may also play a role, although the process was standardized in our work during both the pre and post ~~training~~testing.

~~The~~ Our subjects ~~in this study~~ did see a passive range-of-motion increase of 1.7 degrees in the dominant arm, but the findings were ~~statistically~~ not ~~in~~significant. ~~The non-dominant arm saw a lesser, but still statistically insignificant, finding of 0.1 degrees.~~

Having broken up velocity into ~~into~~ increase and decrease groups, we can see the increase group had an increase in external rotation of 2.8 ± SD degrees while the decrease velocity group saw an increase of 0.6 ± SD degrees. Interestingly, there were wide swings in the non-dominant arm external rotation. The velocity-increase group saw an increase in non-dominant external rotation of 7.8 ± SD degrees while the velocity decrease group saw a decrease of 8.6 ± SD degrees. This may bring into question what part of the changes in the dominant arm can be attributed to throwing and what parts can be attributed to non-throwing work, such as mobility or strength work, as it seems the change in non-dominant ROM came from mobility or strength work.

Although the ~~finding of~~ increased ~~external rotation~~ER in the dominant arm was not statistically significant, it should still be considered an interesting finding since it has been suggested that humans have adapted to having more ~~external rotation~~ER in order to better store elastic energy and increase power (Roach et al., 2013).

It has been hypothesized that training with weighted baseballs would result in negative anatomical effects, such as increased ~~external rotation~~ER on top of other effects similar to pitching. ~~The~~ Our findings ~~of this study~~ are interesting because the range-of-motion ~~findings~~ results ~~are dissimilar~~reject our ~~to that~~ hypothesis and to most short- and long-term range-of-motion studies.

Many of the pitchers in the study performed training days, which were either bullpens or training with weighted balls, designed to replicate high-intent pitching. The acute effects of range-of-motion on weighted balls have not been studied, but there has been research on acute changes of pitching and bullpens. It has been hypothesized that range-of-motion changes

Commented [MH57]: SD?

Formatted: Space Before: 10 pt, After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Commented [MH58]: Measurement error and likely no need to discuss.

Commented [MH59]: What does this mean? Large variability?

Commented [MH60]: Good. This type of thinking should be sprinkled throughout.

Commented [MH61]: Elbow? Shoulder?

Commented [MH62]: By who?

Commented [MH63]: ?

Commented [MH64]: By who?

that occur in the short-term may be exacerbated over the long-term. But the research conclusions of both short- and long-term ROM changes vary.

Two studies ~~looking~~ investigating ~~at~~ the acute effects of pitching on range of motion found a loss of internal rotation that was sustained for 24 or 72 hours (Reinold et al., 2008; Kibler, Sciascia & Moore, 2012).

Commented [MH65]: Make sure all abbreviations are consistent through paper.

Counter to these ~~above~~ studies, Freehill et al. (2014) found that a single start resulted in no significant change in IR but rather a significant increase in passive external rotation after pitching in a game.

Another study on minor league pitching starts found both a significant decrease in internal rotation, significant gain in external rotation, and significant gain in total arm range of motion (Case et al., 2015). Twenty-four hours after pitching, IR returned to pre-game baseline while ER was still significantly greater.

Long-term studies examining range of motion have also found conflicting results in internal rotation and external rotation when compared to ~~this~~ our work~~study~~. Freehill et al. (2011) found an increase in external rotation and internal rotation that was not statistically significant. This study has a similar sample size (21 pitchers, over 29 individual seasons) compared to the 17 pitchers in our study. Freehill et al. (2011) study ~~lasted~~ was four months in duration, ~~over the course of a baseball season, four months long,~~ compared to ~~the~~ six weeks ~~that~~ in our study ~~lasted~~. Freehill and colleagues also had their pitchers ~~These pitchers also~~ performed a capsule-stretching program during the season. Stretching programs have been seen to have positive effects on pitchers, such as reducing the ~~chance~~ likelihood of a loss ~~of~~ in internal rotation (Lintner et al., 2007).

Commented [MH66]: So, they found no increase…..

Considering stating is like this….

Freehill et al. (2011) found no significant increases in ER and IR.

Additionally, in a follow up study, Freehill and colleagues ~~A different study~~ found that preseason and postseason measurements resulted in significantly more ER, significantly less IR, and significantly less total range of motion (Freehill et al., 2014).

A study on baseball and softball athletes found no change in internal rotation over the course of a season but did find increased external rotation and total range of motion (Dwelly et al., 2009).

These long-term studies align with the acute studies, to the extent ~~in~~ that the most common adaptations to throwing are a loss of internal rotation and a gain of external rotation, though the ~~degree~~ magnitude of change varies.

It is unknown exactly why these long-term studies differ, but it could likely be attributed to ~~something~~ differences in the training program outside of throwing. It should be noted that none of these long-term studies found a significant increase in internal rotation in the throwing arm.

This ~~w~~could suggest that range of motion is a fluid measurement. Further research should attempt to examine if there is an acceptable range of internal and external measurements.

Commented [MH67]: What does this mean?

~~It has been hypothesized that t~~A ~~he~~ loss of internal rotation may be caused by the eccentric muscle contraction that occurs in the posterior shoulder during the follow-through of pitching (Proske & Morgan, 2001). It is possible that no decreases were seen in our work for dominant arm internal range of motion because of the daily soft-tissue work that each pitcher completed. Although the exact causes of self-myofascial release are unknown, research has suggested SMR has positive short-term effects on range of motion without negatively affecting muscle performance (Cheatham et al., 2015).

Commented [MH68]: Great work.

As mentioned previously, the pitchers had access to instrument-assisted soft-tissue mobilization (IASTM) on an as-needed basis. Previous research on baseball players found that some acute ROM losses could be attributed to muscular/rotator-cuff stiffness, and IASTM plus stretching displayed greater gains in internal rotation than in self-stretching alone (Bailey et al., 2015). The gains in that study were attributed to decreased rotator-cuff stiffness and humeral retrotorsion, but not joint translation.

More specifically, one study comparing IASTM and self-stretching saw a greater increase in shoulder internal rotation and total range of motion when compared with self-stretching alone; ~~gains~~ which is similar to those found in ~~this~~ our study (Bailey et al., 2017). This would suggest that soft-tissue work such as IASTM played a role in the increase in internal rotation and total range of motion that was seen in ~~this~~ our study.

Proske & Morgan (2001) also hypothesized that because injuries can occur from eccentric exercise, a way to combat injury risk would be to perform an eccentric-exercise program to strengthen and, therefore, protect the muscles. Eccentric training in this program occur~~s~~ed while using wrist weights, j-band external and internal rotations, rebounders, and upward tosses. ~~But~~ However, to our knowledge, wrist-weight exercises, and the other exercises, have not been studied in the literature for their effects on strength or range-of-motion effects.

Pitchers also performed daily exercises in the warm-up and throwing program that are designed to work the posterior shoulder concentrically: specifically, Jaeger band exercises and reverse throws with PlyoCare balls. The effects that long-term concentric exercise has on posterior shoulder strength and range of motion have also not been studied.

A previous study found that performing a series of short-duration stretching/calisthenics drills (titled the Two-Out drill) resulted in short-term deficits in range of motion caused by pitching to be restored to their pre-pitching levels (Rafael et al., 2017). The post-throwing exercise circuit used in ~~this~~ our study did not contain the same exercises; the exercises in ~~this~~ our study ~~were~~was strength-based, not stretching/calisthenic based. However, ~~it~~ we do~~does~~ show evidence that possible deficits created by throwing may ~~be brought back to~~return to baseline by stretching or exercise. Further studies should examine the effect that the post-throwing exercise circuit and the use of concentric and isometric exercise ~~on the shoulder used in this study have~~might have on shoulder ~~on~~ range of motion.

It is unlikely that the use of the Marc Pro EMS device had an effect on range of motion. ~~Since i~~It has been ~~seen~~ suggested that pitchers see reduced blood flow in their throwing arms, and the Marc Pro is used to encourage blood flow, but that increase ~~in blood flow~~ would not likely ~~may not~~ result in changes in range of motion (Laudner et al., 2014). A study comparing different recovery techniques found that EMS resulted in a lower rating of perceived exertion and blood-lactate concentration, but no change in range-of-motion ~~testing~~ (Warren, Szymanski & Landers, 2015). It's unknown whether the different EMS devices used in the Warren et al. (2015) would result in similar results.

Commented [MH69]: This is out of place. You discuss IR and ER above. Then bring in this discussion. Follow up paragraph goes back to IR.

A significant increase in internal rotation of the dominant arm may be seen as a positive since it has been suggested that losses of internal rotation in the throwing arm may lead to a higher risk of injury (Wilk et al., 2011; Myers et al., 2006; Dines et al., 2009). A study on pitchers in Japan ~~did find~~found a relationship between more IR range of motion in their dominant arms and injury (Sueyoshi et al., 2017). Sueyoshi et al. included a wider range of athletes (Little League to college age) than in this study, and younger athletes have been seen to have greater IR ROM than older athletes, which may have affected the results (Astolfi et al., 2015). The injured group in Sueyoshi et al. also pitched in more games and more innings than the no-injury group.

The pitchers in both the pre and post measurements of ~~this~~ our study would not qualify for either measurement of GIRD, even though the difference between non-dominant and dominant arms increased (Burkhart, Morgan & Kibler, 2003). This increase in the difference between internal rotation of the non-dominant and dominant arms was driven by larger increases in internal rotation range of motion in the non-dominant arm than in the dominant arm.

Commented [MH70]: Glenohumeral Internal Rotation Deficit? This has not been defined yet.

The concept of total range of motion (TROM) has also been introduced to examine whether differences between arms may lead to injuries (Wilk, Meister & Andrews, 2002). In this study, TROM saw significant increases in both the dominant and the non-dominant arm. Both arms saw larger ~~gains~~ increases in internal rotation compared to external rotation.

Furthermore, neither the pre- or post-ROM measurements qualify for either external rotation deficit (external rotation at least 5 degrees more in the dominant arm when compared to the non-dominant arm) or TROM deficit (when TROM of the non-dominant arm is at least 5 degrees more than that the dominant arm). Pitchers with insufficient external rotation (<5 greater external rotation in throwing shoulder than non-dominant shoulder) have been seen to be more likely to have a shoulder injury (Wilk et al., 2015). Pitchers with deficits equal to or greater than 5 degrees in total rotation in their throwing shoulders compared to their non-dominant arms have been viewed as at higher risk of injuries (Wilk et al., 2014).

One thing unknown about these prospective studies is if the problem of deficits, by comparing the dominant to non-dominant arm, holds under longer term tracking and possible changes in the non-dominant arm. For example, a pitcher may qualify for a deficit while having no change of ROM in the dominant arm but see a significant change in the non-dominant arm. Even though both dominant and non-dominant TROM gained in this study, the non-dominant arm had a greater range of motion than the dominant arm post training.

Commented [MH71]: Who? Wilk?

When examining bilateral differences in range of motion over time, researchers should take note of whether the changes are coming from the dominant or non-dominant arm. Many of the changes in range of motion are focused on comparing from throwing and the dominant arm, but significant changes in range of motion in the non-dominant arm, as seen in this study, show that there can be large changes that don't come from throwing.

Humeral retroversion was not measured in this study, although ~~it has been said that~~ this could partially explain the range-of-motion differences between the dominant and non-dominant arm (Chant et al., 2007). There is also research suggesting that humeral torsion adaptations occur pre-high school, suggesting that changes in this study came from soft tissue adaptations (Oyama, Hibberd & Myers, 2013). Further research examining range-of-motion changes and weighted-ball training should attempt to measure humeral retroversion, as well as range of motion.

This study is one of only a few that have included training programs, ~~the first papers to be considered for publication regarding a training period,~~ and as such, there is little data to compare~~ it to~~. The throwing velocity ~~of~~ for our~~this~~ group ~~is~~ was ~~very competitive with studies comparing similar subject pools~~comparable to other work, with ~~the~~ an average initial pitching velocity ~~of the seventeen pitchers being~~of 35.1 +/- 1.8 m/s~~ (78.6 mph)~~. ~~;~~ Fleisig et al. (2017) had a group of similar amateur pitchers (n=25) with an average pitching velocity of 34.2 +/- 2.0 m/s ~~(76.5 mph)~~. Fleisig et al.'s study of underweight and overweight baseball throwing showed variations in arm kinetics, variations in angular velocities, and relatively small changes in body positions. ~~;~~ T~~t~~hese changes could be reflective of ~~could be considered~~ reasonable training modalities for pitchers (Fleisig et al., 2017).

Commented [MH72]: You can't say things like this.

~~This~~ Our data ~~study would~~ also suggests that pitching mechanics can be changed over a six-week training period. A previous study by Flesig et al. (2017b) found that pitchers can change their mechanics based off a biomechanical observation over periods of time ranging from 2-48 months. In ~~this~~ our study, the initial screenings were not given to players with specific direction to change mechanics; the screening was purposefully observatory.

Commented [MH73]: More details here. You say your data suggests that pitching mechanics can be hanged over a 6-week period. Why do you think this? How was it changed?

This paper included fourteen right-handed and three left-handed pitchers. Further research should examine the differences of weighted-ball training between right- and left-handed pitchers, as previous research has suggested differences in range of motion, humeral retroversion, and biomechanics depending on the dominant throwing arm (Solomito, Ferreira &

Nissen, 2017; Werner et al., 2010; Takenaga et al., 2017). It is therefore possible that pitchers should have different throwing, mobility, and strength programs depending on which arm is dominant.

Limitations

The pitchers in this study were asked to throw as hard as comfortable on ~~their~~ testing days. That, combined with the unfamiliarity of wearing biomechanical markers, resulted in lower velocities than what would be seen in a game or training environment.

Range-of-motion measurements were taken during the training period, so there could be unknown effects from measurements taken at different times. Range-of-motion measurements were also taken in a way that differs from other ~~papers~~studies. Since the same subject measured every range-of-motion test, the results ~~are~~should be reliable ~~to each other~~, but may not be directly comparable to other ~~papers~~studies.

In addition, not every pitcher in our study had the same training background. ~~; s~~Some had been training in-person at our facility ~~Driveline~~ for a few weeks while others were assessed within their first week. However, the vast majority of ~~them~~participants had previous experience training with weighted balls so, while hard to quantify, previous training was less of a potential confounding variable than it ~~would~~might have been ~~in other situations.~~ for other research questions.

~~Lastly, this study involved a small sample size of seventeen pitchers and references smaller groups of velocity increase and velocity decrease groups.~~

Commented [MH74]: Was your study under powered?

Conclusion

This study contradicts the original hypothesis, which proposed ~~involved speculation~~ that ~~the~~a 6-week training program would increase pitching velocity, arm angular velocities, joint kinetics, and arm range of motion. There were few changes comparing the pre- and post- groups, most notably there was no significant increases in elbow valgus or shoulder internal rotation torque and no significant increase in external rotation of the dominant arm. When sub-groups were created based on velocity, ~~T~~the velocity increase group had ~~statistically~~ significant increases in internal rotation and elbow extension angular velocities.

This study contradicts the premise that weighted-implement training leads to rapid gains in shoulder external range of motion (Reinold, M. 2017). Literature on the topic of restoring shoulder internal rotation range of motion is supported (Laudner et al., 2008), but further research is required into individual modalities that may be contributing to these physical adaptations.

~~*Limitations*~~

The pitchers in this study were asked to throw as hard as comfortable on their testing days. That, combined with the unfamiliarity of wearing biomechanical markers, resulted in lower velocities than what would be seen in a game or training environment.

Range-of-motion measurements were taken during the training period, so there could be unknown effects from measurements taken at different times. Range-of-motion measurements were also taken in a way that differs from other papers. Since the same subject measured every range-of-motion test, the results are reliable to each other but may not be directly comparable to other papers.

In addition, not every pitcher had the same training background; some had been training in-person at Driveline for a few weeks while others were assessed within their first week. However, the vast majority of them had previous experience training with weighted balls so, while hard to quantify, previous training was less of a potential confounding variable than it would have in other situations.

Lastly, this study involved a small sample size of seventeen pitchers and references smaller groups of velocity increase and velocity decrease groups.

References

Aguinaldo AL., Chambers H. 2009. Correlation of Throwing Mechanics With Elbow Valgus Load in Adult Baseball Pitchers. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 37:2043–2048. DOI: 10.1177/0363546509336721.

Astolfi MM., Struminger AH., Royer TD., Kaminski TW., Swanik, CB. 2015. Adaptations of the Shoulder to Overhead Throwing in Youth Athletes. *Journal of Athletic Training* 50:726–732. DOI: 10.4085/1062-6040-50.1.14.

Baheti N. 2000. The Effectiveness of a Surgical Tubing Strengthening Program in the Maintenance of Performance Among High School Pitchers. Masters Thesis Thesis. Oregon State.

Bailey LB., Shanley E., Hawkins R., Beattie PF., Fritz S., Kwartowitz D., Thigpen CA. 2015. Mechanisms of Shoulder Range of Motion Deficits in Asymptomatic Baseball Players. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 43:2783–2793. DOI: 10.1177/0363546515602446.

Bailey LB., Thingpen CA., Hawkins RJ., Beattie PR., Shanley E. 2017 Effectiveness of Manual Therapy and Stretching for Baseball Players with Shoulder Range of Motion Deficits *Sports Health* 9:320-237 DOI: 10.1177/1941738117702835

Boone DC., Azen SP., Lin CM., Spence C., Baron C., Lee L. 1978. Reliability of goniometric measurements. *Physical Therapy* 58:1355–1360.

Burkhart SS., Morgan CD., Kibler WB. 2003. The disabled throwing shoulder: Spectrum of pathology part I: Pathoanatomy and biomechanics. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery* 19:404–420. DOI: 10.1053/jars.2003.50128.

Carter AB., Kaminski TW., Douex Jr AT., Knight CA., Richards JG. 2007. Effects of high volume upper extremity plyometric training on throwing velocity and functional strength ratios of the shoulder rotators in collegiate baseball players. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research 21:208.

Case JM., Mannava S., Fallin JH., Stone AV., Freehill MT. 2015. Acute changes in glenohumeral range-of-motion following in-season minor league pitching starts. *The Physician and Sportsmedicine* 43:360–365. DOI: 10.1080/00913847.2015.1059249.

Chant CB., Litchfield R., Griffin S., Thain LMF. 2007. Humeral Head Retroversion in Competitive Baseball Players and Its Relationship to Glenohumeral Rotation Range of Motion. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 37:514–520. DOI: 10.2519/jospt.2007.2449.

Cheatham SW., Kolber MJ., Cain M., Lee M. 2015. THE EFFECTS OF SELF-MYOFASCIAL RELEASE USING A FOAM ROLL OR ROLLER MASSAGER ON JOINT RANGE OF MOTION, MUSCLE RECOVERY, AND PERFORMANCE: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW. *International Journal of Sports Physical Therapy* 10:827–838.

DeRenne C, Buxton BP, Hetzler RK, and Ho KW. 1994. Effects of under- and overweighted implement training on pitching velocity. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research 8: 247-250.

DeRenne C. 1985. Increasing throwing velocity. Athletic Journal 65: 36-39.

DeRenne C, Ho KW, and Blitzblau A. 1990. Effects of weighted implement training on throwing velocity. Journal of Applied Sports Science Research 4: 16-19.

Dines JS., Frank JB., Akerman M., Yocum LA. 2009. Glenohumeral Internal Rotation Deficits in Baseball Players with Ulnar Collateral Ligament Insufficiency. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 37:566–570. DOI: 10.1177/0363546508326712.

DiNubile N., Westcott WL., Reinl G., Bajaj A., Braverman ER., Madigan MA., Giordano J., Blum K. 2011. The Marc Pro Device is a Novel Paradigm Shift in Muscle Conditioning, Recovery and Performance: Induction of Nitric Oxide (NO) Dependent Enhanced Microcirculation Coupled with Angiogenesis Mechanisms. *Journal of Exercise Physiology Online* 14.

Dowling, Brittany & Pearl, Caitlin & Laughlin, Walter & Fleisig, Glenn. (2016). Relationship of pelvis and trunk kinematics to ball velocity in professional baseball pitchers.

Dwelly PM., Tripp BL., Tripp PA., Eberman LE., Gorin S. 2009. Glenohumeral Rotational Range of Motion in Collegiate Overhead-Throwing Athletes During an Athletic Season. *Journal of Athletic Training* 44:611–616. DOI: 10.4085/1062-6050-44.6.611.

Egstrom GH, Logan GA, and Wallis EL. 1960. Acquisition of throwing skill involving projectiles of varying weight. Res Q 31: 420-425.

Escamilla RF, Fleisig GS, Barrentine SW, Zheng N, Andrews JR. 1998. Kinematic Comparisons of Throwing Different Types of Baseball Pitches. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics* 14:1-23 DOI: 10.1123/jab.14.1.1

Escamilla RF, Speer KP, Fleisig GS, Barrentine SW, Andrews JR. 2000. Effects of throwing overweight and underweight baseballs on throwing velocity and accuracy. Sports Med. 2000; 29:259-272.

Feltner M., Dapena J. 1986. Dynamics of the shoulder and elbow joints of the throwing arm during a baseball pitch. *International Journal of Sport Biomechanics* 2:235–259.

Fleisig GS., Bolt B., Fortenbaugh D., Wilk KE., Andrews JR. 2011. Biomechanical Comparison of Baseball Pitching and Long-Toss: Implications for Training and Rehabilitation. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 41:296–303. DOI: 10.2519/jospt.2011.3568.

Fleisig GS., Diffendaffer AZ., Aune KT., Ivey B., Laughlin WA. 2017. Biomechanical Analysis of Weighted-Ball Exercises for Baseball Pitchers. *Sports Health: A Multidisciplinary Approach* 9:210–215. DOI: 10.1177/1941738116679816.

Fleisig GS., Diffendaffer AZ., Ivey B., Aune KT. 2017. Do baseball pitchers improve mechanics after biomechanical evaluations? *Sports Biomechanics*:1–8. DOI: 10.1080/14763141.2017.1340508.

Fleisig GS., Leddon CE., Laughlin WA., Ciccotti MG., Mandelbaum BR., Aune KT., Escamilla RF., MacLeod TD., Andrews JR. 2015. Biomechanical Performance of Baseball Pitchers With a History of Ulnar Collateral Ligament Reconstruction. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 43:1045–1050. DOI: 10.1177/0363546515570464.

Fortenbaugh D., Fleisig GS., Andrews JR. 2009. Baseball Pitching Biomechanics in Relation to Injury Risk and Performance. *Sports Health: A Multidisciplinary Approach* 1:314–320. DOI: 10.1177/1941738109338546.

Freehill MT., Ebel BG., Archer KR., Bancells RL., Wilckens JH., McFarland EG., Cosgarea AJ. 2011. Glenohumeral Range of Motion in Major League Pitchers. *Sports Health* 3:97–104. DOI: 10.1177/1941738110374627.

Freehill MT., Archer KR., Diffenderfer BW., Ebel BG., Cosgarea AJ., McFarland EG. 2014. Changes in Collegiate Starting Pitchers' Range of Motion After Single Game and Season. *The Physician and Sportsmedicine* 42:69–74. DOI: 10.3810/psm.2014.02.2049.

Fortun CM., Davies GJ., Kernozck TW. 1998. The effects of plyometric training on the shoulder internal rotators. *Phys Ther* 78:S87.

Keller R., Marshall N., Mehran N., Moutzouros V., 2015 Pitching Speed and Glenohumeral Adaptation in High School Pitchers. *Orthopedics* 38 e668-e672 DOI: 10.3928/01477447-20150804-52.

Kibler WB., Sciascia A., Moore S. 2012. An Acute Throwing Episode Decreases Shoulder Internal Rotation. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research* 470:1545–1551. DOI: 10.1007/s11999-011-2217-z.

Laudner KG., Selkow NM., Burke NC., Lynall RC., Meister K. 2014. Decreased blood flow in the throwing arm of professional baseball pitchers. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery* 23:1753–1756. DOI: 10.1016/j.jse.2014.03.007.

Laudner KG, Sipes RC, Wilson JT. 2008. The acute effects of sleeper stretches on shoulder range of motion. Journal of Athletic Training. 43:359-363. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-43.4.359

Lintner D., Mayol M., Uzodinma O., Jones R., Labossiere D. 2007. Glenohumeral Internal Rotation Deficits in Professional Pitchers Enrolled in an Internal Rotation Stretching Program. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 35:617–621. DOI: 10.1177/0363546506296736.

Matsuo T., Escamilla RF., Fleisig GS., Barrentine SW., Andrews JR. 2001. Comparison of Kinematic and Temporal Parameters between Different Pitch Velocity Groups. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics* 17:1–13. DOI: 10.1123/jab.17.1.1.

Matsuo T., Matsumoto T., Mochizuki Y., Takada Y., Saito K. 2002. Optimal Shoulder Abduction Angles during Baseball Pitching from Maximal Wrist Velocity and Minimal Kinetics Viewpoints. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics* 18:306–320. DOI: 10.1123/jab.18.4.306.

Miyashita K., Urabe Y., Kobayashi H., Yokoe K., Koshida S., Kawamura M., Ida K. 2008. Relationship Between Maximum Shoulder External Rotation Angle During Throwing and Physical Variables. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine* 7:47–53.

Myers JB., Pasquale MR., Laudner KG., Sell TC., Bradley JP., Lephart SM. 2005. On-the-Field Resistance-Tubing Exercises for Throwers: An Electromyographic Analysis. *Journal of Athletic Training* 40:15–22.

Myers JB., Laudner KG., Pasquale MR., Bradley JP., Lephart SM. 2006. Glenohumeral Range of Motion Deficits and Posterior Shoulder Tightness in Throwers with Pathologic Internal Impingement. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 34:385–391. DOI: 10.1177/0363546505281804.

Oyama S., Hibberd EE., Myers JB. 2013. Changes in humeral torsion and shoulder rotation range of motion in high school baseball players over a 1-year period. Clinical Biomechanics 28:268–272. DOI: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2013.01.014.

Proske U., Morgan DL. 2001. Muscle damage from eccentric exercise: mechanism, mechanical signs, adaptation and clinical applications. *The Journal of Physiology* 537:333–345. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7793.2001.00333.x.

Rafael E., Kyle Y., Tony M., Jeff C., Keith L., James A. 2017. Effects of a Short-Duration Stretching Drill After Pitching on Elbow and Shoulder Range of Motion in Professional Baseball Pitchers. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 45:692–700.

Reinold, Mike & E Wilk, Kevin & Fleisig, Glenn & Zheng, Naiquan & W Barrentine, Steven & Chmielewski, Terri & C Cody, Rayden & G Jameson, Gene & Andrews, James. (2004). Electromyographic Analysis of the Rotator Cuff and Deltoid Musculature During Common Shoulder External Rotation Exercises. The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy. 34. 385-94. 10.2519/jospt.2004.34.7.385.

Reinold MM., Wilk KE., Macrina LC., Sheheane C., Dun S., Fleisig GS., Crenshaw K., Andrews JR. 2008. Changes in Shoulder and Elbow Passive Range of Motion after Pitching in Professional Baseball Players. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 36:523–527. DOI: 10.1177/0363546507308935.

Roach NT., Venkadesan M., Rainbow MJ., Lieberman DE. 2013. Elastic energy storage in the shoulder and the evolution of high-speed throwing in Homo. Nature 498:483–486. DOI: 10.1038/nature12267.

Robertson D., E Caldwell G., Hamill J., Kamen G., N Whittlesey S. *Research Methods in Biomechanics*. 2nd ed., Human Kinetics, 2014.

Sabick MB., Torry MR., Lawton RL., Hawkins RJ. 2004. Valgus torque in youth baseball pitchers: a biomechanical study. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery* 13:349–355. DOI: 10.1016/j.jse.2004.01.013.

Slenker NR., Limpisvasti O., Mohr K., Aguinaldo A., ElAttrache NS. 2014. Biomechanical Comparison of the Interval Throwing Program and Baseball Pitching: Upper Extremity Loads in Training and Rehabilitation. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 42:1226–1232. DOI: 10.1177/0363546514526152.

Solomito MJ., Ferreira JV., Nissen CW. 2017. Biomechanical differences between left- and right-handed baseball pitchers. *Sports Biomechanics* 16:143–151. DOI: 10.1080/14763141.2016.1186725.

Stodden DF., Fleisig GS., McLean SP., Andrews JR. 2005. Relationship of biomechanical factors to baseball pitching velocity: within pitcher variation. *Journal of applied biomechanics* 21:44–56.

Stodden DF., Fleisig GS., McLean SP., Lyman SL., Andrews JR. 2001. Relationship of pelvis and upper torso kinematics to pitched baseball velocity. *Journal of applied biomechanics* 17:164–172.

Stone AV., Mannava S., Patel A., Marquez-Lara A., Freehill MT. 2017. Defining the Long-Toss: A Professional Baseball Epidemiological Study. *Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine* 5. DOI: 10.1177/2325967116686773.

Sueyoshi T., Nakatani T., Tsuruta T., Emoto G. 2017. Upper Extremity Range of Motion and Pitching Profile of Baseball Pitchers in Japan. *Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine* 5. DOI: 10.1177/2325967117715436.

Swanik KA., Lephart SM., Swanik CB., Lephart SP., Stone DA., Fu FH. 2002. The effects of shoulder plyometric training on proprioception and selected muscle performance characteristics. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery* 11:579–586. DOI: 10.1067/mse.2002.127303.

Takenaga T., Goto H., Sugimoto K., Tsuchiya A., Fukuyoshi M., Nakagawa H., Nozaki M., Takeuchi S., Otsuka T. 2017. Left-handed skeletally mature baseball players have smaller humeral retroversion in the throwing arm than right-handed players. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery* 26:2187–2192. DOI: 10.1016/j.jse.2017.07.014.

Tillaar R. van den, Ettema G. 2004. A Force-Velocity Relationship and Coordination Patterns in Overarm Throwing. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine* 3:211–219.

Tillaar R van den., Ettema G. 2011. A comparison of kinematics between overarm throwing with 20% underweight, regular, and 20% overweight balls. *Journal of applied biomechanics* 27:252–257.

Thewlis D., Bishop C., Daniell N., Paul G. 2013. Next-generation low-cost motion capture systems can provide comparable spatial accuracy to high-end systems. *Journal of applied biomechanics* 29:112–117.

Warren CD., Szymanski DJ., Landers MR. 2015. Effects of Three Recovery Protocols on Range of Motion, Heart Rate, Rating of Perceived Exertion, and Blood Lactate in Baseball Pitchers During a Simulated Game. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research* 29:3016–3025.

Werner SL., Guido JA., Delude NA., Stewart GW., Greenfield JH., Meister K. 2010. Throwing Arm Dominance in Collegiate Baseball Pitching: A Biomechanical Study. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 38:1606–1610. DOI: 10.1177/0363546510365511.

Werner SL., Murray TA., Hawkins RJ., Gill TJ. 2002. Relationship between throwing mechanics and elbow valgus in professional baseball pitchers. Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery 11:151–155. DOI: 10.1067/mse.2002.121481.

Werner SL., Suri M., Guido JA., Meister K., Jones DG. 2008. Relationships between ball velocity and throwing mechanics in collegiate baseball pitchers. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery* 17:905–908. DOI: 10.1016/j.jse.2008.04.002.

Westcott WL., Chen T., Neric FB., DiNubile N., Bowirrat A., Madigan M., Downs BW., Giordano JMS., Chen A., Bajaj A. 2011. The Marc ProTM device improves muscle performance and recovery from concentric and eccentric exercise induced muscle fatigue in humans: A pilot study. *JEPonline* 14:55–67.

Westcott W., Han D., DiNubile N., Neric F., Loud RLR., Whitehead S., Blum K. 2013. Effects of Electrical Stimulation Using the Marc Pro TM Device during the Recovery Period on Calf Muscle Strength and Fatigue in Adult Fitness Participants. *Journal of Exercise Physiology Online* 16:40–50.

Wilk KE., Macrina LC., Fleisig GS., Porterfield R., Charles D. Simpson I., Harker P., Paparesta N., Andrews JR. 2011. Correlation of glenohumeral internal rotation deficit and total rotational motion to shoulder injuries in professional baseball pitchers. American Journal of Sports Medicine. 39:329-335. doi:10.1177/036354651038422325.

Wilk KE., Macrina LC., Fleisig GS., Aune KT., Porterfield RA., Harker P., Evans TJ., Andrews JR. 2014. Deficits in Glenohumeral Passive Range of Motion Increase Risk of Elbow Injury in Professional Baseball Pitchers: A Prospective Study. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 42:2075–2081. DOI: 10.1177/0363546514538391.

Wilk KE., Macrina LC., Fleisig GS., Aune KT., Porterfield RA., Harker P., Evans TJ., Andrews JR. 2015. Deficits in Glenohumeral Passive Range of Motion Increase Risk of Shoulder Injury in Professional Baseball Pitchers: A Prospective Study. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine* 43:2379–2385. DOI: 10.1177/0363546515594380.

Wilk KE., Meister K., Andrews JR. 2002. Current concepts in the rehabilitation of the overhead throwing athlete. The American journal of sports medicine 30:136–151.

Wilk KE., Reinold MM., Macrina LC., Porterfield R., Devine KM., Suarez K., Andrews JR. 2009. Glenohumeral Internal Rotation Measurements Differ Depending on Stabilization Techniques. *Sports Health* 1:131–136. DOI: 10.1177/1941738108331201.

Young J. 2014. Trunk Contributions to Baseball Pitching Velocity. PhD Thesis Thesis. The Ohio State University.

Unpublished Data

Cressey, E. 2013. It Needs to Be Said: Throwing Doesn't Build Arm "Strength." Accessed December 30th, 2017. https://ericcressey.com/it-needs-to-be-said-throwing-doesnt-build-arm-strength

Reinold, M. 2017. Are Weighted Baseball Velocity Programs Safe and Effective? Accessed December 10th, 2017. https://elitebaseballperformance.com/are-weighted-baseball-velocity-programs-safe-and-effective/

Driveline Baseball 2017. Driveline Baseball Review - College Summer Training Results 2017 Accessed April 1st, 2018. https://www.drivelinebaseball.com/2017/09/driveline-baseball-review-college-summer-training-results-2017/

Driveline Baseball 2016. Driveline Baseball Review - College Summer Training Results 2016 Accessed April 1st, 2018. https://www.drivelinebaseball.com/2016/08/college-summer-wrap/