Physical Therapy in Sport 37 (2019) 15–20

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Physical Therapy in Sport

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/ptsp

Original Research

Characteristics of functional movement screening testing in elite handball players: Indicative data from the 9+

E.T. Rafnsson [a, b, *], G. Myklebust [c], R. Bahr [c], Ö. Valdimarsson [b], A. Frohm [d], Á. Árnason [a, e]

[a] Research Centre of Movement Science, Department of Physical Therapy, School of Health Sciences, University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland
[b] Orkuhusid, Physical Therapy and Medical Centre, Reykjavik, Iceland
[c] Oslo Sports Trauma Research Center, Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Oslo, Norway
[d] Department of Neurobiology, Care Science and Society (NVS) Division of Physical Therapy, Karolinska Institutet, Huddinge, Sweden
[e] Gáski Physical Therapy, Reykjavik, Iceland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 1 October 2018
Received in revised form
14 January 2019
Accepted 4 February 2019

Keywords:
9+ screening battery
functional screening test
handball
Age-related difference

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To test 9 + screening batterie's intra-rater reliability, to provide indicative data of elite handball players, and to analyze difference between age, playing positions and level of play.
Design: Descriptive study.
Setting: Icelandic elite male handball players.
Participants: 182 elite male handball players.
Main outcome measures: Nine + screening battery.
Results: Reliability test: Intra-class correlation for the total score was 0.95. The correlation of each of the test factors varied from 0.63 to 0.91. The mean total score was 22.3 ± 2.9 (95%CI 16.7–28.1), with no difference in total score comparing players age or level of play. Goalkeepers displayed a higher total score than other players ($F_{3,151} = 5.75$, $p = 0.001$). Junior players had a lower score than senior players in tests measuring abdominal strength and core stability; Test 5; $|^2(3, 182) = 41.5$, $p < 0.0001$, Test 6; $|^2(3, 182) = 55.7$, $p < 0.0001$, Test 7; $|^2(3, 182) = 11.8$, $p < 0.005$, but higher scores in tests measuring trunk and shoulder mobility Test 8; $|^2(3, 182) = 18.2$, $p < 0.0001$, Test 9; $|^2(3, 182) = 22.2$, $p = 0.006$.
Conclusions: The 9+ intra-rater reliability was acceptable for the total score and individual tests. Age-related differences were provided in many individual tests.

1. Introduction

Handball has been a professional sport for years and an Olympic sport since 1972. The popularity has been growing fast during the last decade, with many well organized events with packed arenas and live broadcasts to 200 countries (Karcher & Buchheit, 2014). Handball has matured into a fast dynamic sport; the most significant change occurring in 2000 when teams were allowed a quick throw-off to increase the speed of the game (Karcher & Buchheit, 2014). As a result, players needed to improve their physical fitness, with obvious differences between playing positions (Haugen, Tonnessen, & Seiler, 2016; Hermassi et al., 2018; Karcher & Buchheit, 2014; Michalsik, Aagaard, & Madsen, 2013; Sibila & Pori, 2009). Even in youth handball there is a clear tendency that playing positions are determined by anthropometric and physical abilities (Zapartidis, Kororos, Skoufas, & Bayios, 2011). The physical factors are becoming more important. In a study from the men's World Cup tournament in 2013 (24 participating teams), the players from the bottom eight were shorter and had less body mass than the players from the top 16 teams (Ghobadi, Rajabi, Farzad, Bayati, & Jeffreys, 2013). In recent years, researchers have presented data on physical characteristics (body mass, height, BMI, throwing mechanism, etc.) according to playing positions, level of play and level of skill (Gorostiaga, Granados, Ibanez, & Izquierdo, 2005; Haugen et al., 2016; Karcher & Buchheit, 2014). Current handball literature aims to advance the knowledge of injuries in handball, analyze injury mechanisms as well as improve the players effort and quality in professional handball (Andrade et al., 2013; Clarsen, Bahr, Andersson, Munk, & Myklebust, 2014; Dello Iacono et al., 2017, 2018; Ghobadi et al., 2013; Gorostiaga et al., 2005; Karcher & Buchheit, 2014; Kvorning, Hansen, & Jensen, 2017;

* Corresponding author. Research Centre of Movement Science, Department of Physical Therapy, School of Health Sciences, University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland.
E-mail address: elis@sjukratjalfun.is (E.T. Rafnsson).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ptsp.2019.02.001
1466-853X/

Manchado, Garcia-Ruiz, Cortell-Tormo, & Tortosa-Martinez, 2017; Massuca, Branco, Miarka, & Fragoso, 2015; Michalsik et al., 2013; Sibila & Pori, 2009; Sporis, Vuleta, Vuleta, & Milanovic, 2010; Wagner et al., 2010, 2014, 2018).

In recent years, functional movement tests have been popular tools to screen athletes, focusing on "dynamic" tests to reveal possible variations in body function (Cook, 2004). One of these tools, "The 9 + Screening Battery" (9+), was developed by a Scandinavian research group as a method to screen athlete performance. It consist of five tests from the Functional Movement Screen (FMS), one from the American tennis association (USTA HPP), plus five other tests added by the group to test for mobility, dynamic trunk strength and knee control (Frohm, Heijne, Kowalski, Svensson, & Myklebust, 2012; Frohm & Kockum, 2013). In recent years, FMS has been tested for reliability (Minick et al., 2010; Teyhen et al., 2012), non-contact and overuse injuries (Warren, Smith, & Chimera, 2015), comparison with previous injuries (Letafatkar, Hadadnezhad, Shojaedin, & Mohamadi, 2014) and predictive ability for time loss or medical attention injuries (Bunn, Rodrigues, & Bezerra da Silva, 2019; Chorba, Chorba, Bouillon, Overmyer, & Landis, 2010; Kiesel et al., 2007, 2014). "High risk" atheltes were shown to be 51% more likely to be affected by injury than "low risk", but with very low level of evidence (Bunn et al., 2019). Studies using 9 + on athletes have failed to show association between the player's total score and lower extremity injuries (Bakken et al., 2017a, 2017b; Leandersson, Heijne, Flodstrom, Frohm, & von Rosen, 2018), as well as intraindividual variability in the total score between seasons, regardless of the players injury (Bakken et al., 2017a, 2017b). Specific exercises based on the 9 + screening battery did not reduce short-term and seasonal injury occurrence in adolescent elite athletes (Heijne, Flodstrom, & von Rosen, 2019). However, the FMS and 9 + tests have been used considerably by coaches and physical therapists to screen for asymmetries and imbalance (Marques, Medeiros, de Souza Stigger, Nakamura, & Baroni, 2017) and as a tool to measure physical capacity of athletes aimed to improve their performance (Atalay, Tarakci, & Algun, 2018), in a field where more knowledge regarding physical conditions is continually required (Kraus, Schutz, Taylor, & Doyscher, 2014; Sprague, Mokha, & Gatens, 2014).

Until now, no studies have used the 9 + screening battery to present indicative data for handball players in relation to their playing positions, level of play or different age groups. Furthermore, previous studies have only used the 9 + total score, but no study have used the scores of each of the 10 individual tests in the 9 + test battery to compare with injury risk, playing position, level of play or different age groups.

The purpose of this study was to test intra-rater reliability of the 9 + screening battery among junior handball players, to provide indicative data of junior and senior elite handball players, and to compare groups according to age, level of play and player position.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

We contacted the male senior clubs in the two highest divisions (n = 16) in Iceland during the early pre-season with written and oral information about the study; 13 of them accepted the invitation. We also invited male junior players (16–19 yrs) from the clubs. National team players playing professionally abroad were also invited to participate during a training session in Iceland. A total of 182 players provided written consent, including parental consent for players <18 yrs. The study was approved by The National Bioethics Committee in Iceland (Andersson, Bahr, Clarsen, & Myklebust, 2018; Atalay et al., 2018; Bakken et al., 2017a, 2017b; Bland & Altman, 1986; Bunn et al., 2019; Chorba et al., 2010; Clarsen et al., 2014; Cook, 2004; Dello Iacono et al., 2017, 2018; Frohm et al., 2012; Frohm & Kockum, 2013; Gillet, Begon, Blache, Berger-Vachon, & Rogowski, 2017; Heijne et al., 2019; Kiesel et al., 2007, 2014; Kraus et al., 2014; Kvorning et al., 2017; Leandersson et al., 2018; Letafatkar et al., 2014; Manchado et al., 2017; Marques et al., 2017; Medeiros, de Araujo, & de Araujo, 2013; Minick et al., 2010; Soucie et al., 2011; Sporis et al., 2010; Sprague et al., 2014; Teyhen et al., 2012; Wagner et al., 2010, 2018; Warren et al., 2015) and reported to The Icelandic Data Protection Authority.

Of the 182 players included, 61 played in the premier division (no national team games), 44 in the second division (no national team games), 27 were Icelandic national team players, 8 of them current and 19 former professional European club players, now playing for Icelandic premier division clubs. Fifty were junior players from the teams, also playing for the senior teams or vying for a place in the senior team.

The junior players (n = 50, 16–19 yrs, mean 17.3 ± 0.7) were tested twice with the 9 + screening battery with a week interval between tests to examine the intra-rater reliability of the test, while the senior players (n = 132) were tested once.

2.2. Experimental design

All the tests were performed by the same tester (ETR), an experienced sports physical therapist. Prior to the reliability tests, the tester underwent a 2-day course supervised by two of the 9 + developers.

The 9 + screening battery consists of functional exercises and complex movements. The battery is comprised of the: 1. Deep squat test, 2. Deep single leg squat test, 3. In-line lunge test, 4. Active hip flexion test, 5. Straight leg raise test, 6. Push up test, 7. Diagonal lift test, 8. Seated rotation test, 9. Functional shoulder mobility test, and 10. Drop jump test (Frohm & Kockum, 2013). For each of the 10 tests, players received specific instructions and they were scored from 0 to 3 points on an ordinal scale according to their performance (3: correct; 2: correct, but with compensatory movement; 1: not correct; 0: if pain was present). Therefore, the maximum total score was 30. Research tools used were a standard set used for 9 + screening (Frohm & Kockum, 2013). Players were tested barefoot, wearing a t-shirt and shorts. In tests looking for side-to-side differences, the left extremity was tested first. If side differences were present, the lower score was used for data analysis. Before each test, players were shown a photo of the optimal starting and finishing position of each exercise. They received standardized verbal instructions from the tester while performing the test and verbal corrections between attempts. Every player performed each test three times and their best score was used in the analyses. The average time to complete the test was 30 min per player. Player characteristics (i.e., age, height, weight, playing position, level of play) were recorded before each player was tested.

2.3. Statistical analyses

The data were analyzed using SAS Enterprise Guide 7.1. Descriptive data are presented as the mean ± SD. In the reliability study, intra-rater reliability in the two sessions total score was analyzed using intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC (3.1)). ICC varies between 0 (no reliability) and 1 (complete reliability) (Bland & Altman, 1986). Spearman's correlation was used to calculate the intra-rater reliability of the two repeated measurements in each of the ten tests. Standard error of measurement was calculated by using the formula: $SD_{diff}/\sqrt{2}$. T-tests and ANOVA were used to test for group differences in total score, and Bonferroni post-hoc test for multiple comparisons. Chi-square was used to test for differences

between groups in individual tests. Linear regression analysis was used to analyze the relationship between test scores and age. The significance level was set as $p < 0.05$.

3. Results

The 9 + screening battery total score among the 50 junior players in the reliability study varied from 16 to 30 points in both tests, with a high correlation between test sessions (ICC (3.1) = 0.95, 95%CI 0.93–0.97, $p < 0.0001$). A significant improvement (0.32, $p = 0.041$) was observed in the total score between the two test sessions (test 1: 21.6 ± 3.5; 95%CI 20.7–22.6 and test 2: 22.0 ± 3.4; 95%CI 21.0–22.9). For each of the 10 tests in the screening battery, Spearman's correlation showed that the intra-rater reliability ranged from 0.65 (test 10, Drop jump test) to 0.95 (test 1, Deep squat). The standard error of measurement ranged from 0.14 (test 10) to 0.37 (test 2).

3.1. Screening

The average total score for senior Icelandic handball players tested in the 9 + screening battery was 22.3 ± 2.9 points (95%CI 16.7–28.1). No significant difference was found in the total score between players in the two Icelandic divisions ($p = 0.26$). Fig. 1 shows the difference in total score between playing positions where goalkeepers total score (24.3 ± 3.5 points 95%CI 22.3–25.7) were 2.2–2.9 points higher than players in other positions. Examining the score for each of the ten individual tests, goalkeepers reached a higher score than other players in test 3; In-line lunge test (2.29 ± 0.9 vs 2.21 ± 0.6, $|^2(2, 155) = 6.26$, $p = 0.05$) and test 4; Active hip flexion test (2.63 ± 0.8, vs 1.70 ± 0.8, $|^2(2, 155) = 35.2$, $p < 0.0001$). Goalkeepers and wing players achieved a higher score than back court and pivot players in test 9; Functional shoulder mobility test (GK; 2.63 ± 0.7, $|^2(2, 155) = 8.9$, $p = 0.01$, WP; 2.45 ± 0.7 vs other players; 2.13 ± 0.7, $|^2(2, 155) = 9.17$, $p = 0.01$).

There was no significant difference in the total score of the 9 + screening battery between groups (junior players, premier league players, 1st division players, national team players, $p = 0.26$). But when examining the score for each of the ten tests, a significant difference was found in several tests with junior players scoring lower in tests requiring trunk strength and stability; Tests 1; Deep squat test; $|^2(3, 182) = 11.1$, $p = 0.0072$, 5; Straight leg raise test; $|^2(3, 182) = 41.5$, $p < 0.0001$); 6; Push up test; $|^2(3, 182) = 55.7$, $p < 0.0001$); and 7; Diagonal lift test, $|^2(3, 182) = 11.8$, $p = 0.006$) and higher in tests requiring hip, trunk and shoulder mobility (3; In-line lunge test, $|^2 = 13.3$, $p = 0.0018$); 8; Seated rotation test; $|^2(3, 182) = 18.2$, $p < 0.0001$); and 9; Functional shoulder mobility test; $|^2(3, 182) = 22.2$, $p < 0.0001$, (Table 1). National team players scored higher in tests requiring strength and stability in trunk and dynamic flexibility Tests 4; Active hip flexion test; $|^2(3, 182) = 10.7$, $p = 0.03$; and 5; Straight leg raise test; $|^2(3, 182) = 11.8$, $p = 0.003$) (Table 1). As seen in Fig. 2, when the results from each of the 10 tests in the 9 + was compared with age as a continuous variable, a significant age-related difference was found in tests for trunk strength and stability as well as shoulder mobility (Ghobadi et al., 2013; Haugen et al., 2016; Wagner et al., 2014; Zapartidis et al., 2011).

4. Discussion

This study provides indicative functional movement screening data on male junior, senior and national team handball players. Young players displayed lower scores in tests measuring trunk strength and stability and higher scores in tests measuring mobility. National team players scored highest in tests requiring stability and neuromuscular control in the trunk.

4.1. Screening tests

Goalkeepers scored higher than other groups of players in the 9 + screening battery due to their high scores that require mobility in hips, thighs and shoulders (Tests 3, 4 and 9). It is related to goalkeeper's requirements to be mobile to react against shots in various positions. A fundamental part of goalkeeper's training sessions consist of exercises to increase their mobility which is even more important than their strength (Karcher & Buchheit, 2014). Overall, playing handball creates muscular imbalances and tends to decrease the range of motion in the throwing shoulder compared to



Fig. 1. The average total score of the 9 + screening battery in different playing positions. Standard deviations are shown as error bars for each playing position. *Goalkeepers had significantly higher total score than other players ($p = 0.0009$).

Table 1
The average screening test score for each test and the average total score shown for different skill levels of players.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Junior players	2.15[a]	1.32	2.39[b]	1.71	1.29[a]	2.37[a]	2.02[a]	2.39[b]	2.80[b]	2.95	21.39
Premier division	2.24	1.47[c]	2.26	1.70	2.17	2.89	2.23	2.29	2.21	2.80	22.26
Second division	2.23	1.21	2.27	1.94	2.00	2.98	2.38	2.19	2.27	2.77	22.23
National players	2.19	1.44[d]	2.11	2.07[e]	2.59[e]	2.96	2.33	2.00	2.33	2.78	22.81
Average	2.20	1.36	2.26	1.85	2.01	2.80	2.24	2.22	2.41	2.83	22.17

[a] Significantly lower score than in other groups ($p = 0.007$ (Karcher & Buchheit, 2014), $p < 0.0001$ (Haugen et al., 2016) $p < 0.0001$ (Zapartidis et al., 2011), $p = 0.006$ (Ghobadi et al., 2013)).
[b] Significantly higher score than in other groups ($p = 0.001$ (Sibila & Pori, 2009), $p < 0.0001$ (Gorostiaga et al., 2005), $p < 0.0001$ (Wagner et al., 2014)).
[c] Significantly higher score than in second division players group ($p = 0.006$).
[d] Significantly higher score than in second division players group ($p = 0.03$).
[e] Significantly higher score than in other groups ($p = 0.03$ (Hermassi et al., 2018), $p = 0.003$ (Haugen et al., 2016)).



Fig. 2. The relationship between age and the mean test score of each year of age in the four tests that showed significant age-related difference (β represents estimated changes in score per year). Test 5 (β = 0.14, 95%CI: 0.10–0,19, $p < 0.0001$), Test 6 (β = 0.11, 95%CI: 0.05–0.17, $p = 0.002$), Test 7 (β = 0.10, 95%CI: 0.03–0.17, $p = 0.0068$), Test 9 (β = −0.11, 95% CI: −0.17-0.05, $p = 0.002$).

other athletes (Andrade et al., 2013; Clarsen et al., 2014). Wing players scored higher than back court and pivot players in test 9, which requires shoulder mobility. The wing players are smaller and with less body mass than other outfield players, shooting from narrow angles using various techniques requiring appropriate range of motion in the shoulder joint (Ghobadi et al., 2013; Gorostiaga et al., 2005; Massuca et al., 2015; Sibila & Pori, 2009).

As shown in Fig. 2 (Test 9), shoulder mobility declined with increased age. Researches have shown that age-related changes can be an explanation (Medeiros et al., 2013; Soucie et al., 2011). Players tend to improve their strength during their career by continuous strength training (Kvorning et al., 2017; Massuca et al., 2015). Repetitive movements and strain on the anterior part of the shoulder girdle (i.e. pushing and tackling opponents, ball throwing, weight lifting with emphasis on the protracting muscle groups) can create imbalance and reduced glenohumeral rotation among athletes (Gillet et al., 2017). This represents a risk factor for shoulder injuries among elite handball players but studies analyzing risk factors for shoulder injuries have shown conflicting results and our results should therefore be interpreted with caution and researched further (Andersson et al., 2018; Asker et al., 2018; Clarsen et al., 2014).

4.2. Level of play

In the present study, the national players scored higher than other players in tests 4 and 5, which require adequate active hamstring flexibility, trunk strength and stability. Modern handball requires a large number of high-intensity actions, leading to neuromuscular adaptation; trunk strength and stability are believed to be key performance factors (Karcher & Buchheit, 2014). Therefore, it seems logical that the most skillful group scored highest in these two tests.

Junior players scored lower than other player groups in tests 5, 6 and 7, which all require a high amount of trunk strength and stability, and in test 1, which measures trunk stability, mobility in shoulders and hips. Considering their high score in tests 3, 8 and 9 (Table 1), which all test for mobility and flexibility, it seems reasonable to suggest that lack of trunk strength and stability plays a role in their low score in test 1. Research on Icelandic elite handball players has shown that one-third of overuse injuries resulting in absence from participation were located in the low

back/pelvic region (Rafnsson, Valdimarsson, Sveinsson, & Arnason, 2017). This demonstrates a need for further knowledge regarding training methods and possible risk factors. The scores in tests 5, 6, and 7 indicate age-related differences in trunk strength and stability. Age-related variability in range of motion can partially explain these differences (Medeiros et al., 2013), but physical maturity is believed to be an important factor in both strength and skill (Ghobadi et al., 2013; Gorostiaga et al., 2005). Previous studies have indicated that physical presence and strength is a fundamental factor for necessary skills as well as reducing injury risk, even at the junior level (Zapartidis et al., 2011; Clarsen et al., 2014; Wagner et al., 2018). When examining the score shown in Fig. 2, it is important to realize that it not only displays abdominal strength, but also stability and quality of movement created by the muscle groups around the spine and abdomen during flexion and extension (Frohm & Kockum, 2013). Even though some of the junior players matched the senior players in height and weight, they had lower scores irrespective to their anthropometrics. These results raise questions about possible correlations between age related differences in trunk strength and stability and the high prevalence of time loss injuries in the low back region in Icelandic male handball (Rafnsson et al., 2017). Firm conclusions are not possible, but the data represent a platform for further research.

4.3. Study limitations

The study was just performed by one tester, and therefore it was not possible to look at inter-rater reliability. It should be considered that the factors behind the score in some of the 9 + tests can be related to more than one body part, for example in test 1 (shoulders, hips and trunk). This can cause difficulties using the score to compare players without knowing which body part is responsible for the compensatory movement that determines the score. Individual factors inside each test could therefore be a valid addition to increase test sensitivity. Significant difference between groups of players do not always need to be the same as practical difference. Difference that cannot be detected in movement quality are possibly not practical. However, differences that are detectable in movement quality could be classified as practical such as the difference between skill levels in tests 5, 6 and 9, where junior players would be classified one point lower (tests 5 and 6) or higher (test 9) than other players.

4.4. Perspectives

The 9 + screening battery is reliable and usable for physical therapists. The test is easy to use, and the tools used for measurement are space demanding, which makes the test convenient to use. Some of the 10 tests seem to be useful to indicate differences between players in different playing positions, level of play and age groups. Therefore, it could be used as a tool for coaches to test players and compare to indicative data, indicating their stability, strength and flexibility. Physical therapist can use it to reveal some weak links that could be useful in rehabilitation before return to play. These results could be a platform for further research as well as to provide guidance for coaches organizing their training schedule, helping them to spot factors such as imbalance in mobility and muscle strength.

Conflicts of interest

No conflict of interest declared.

Ethical approval

The study was approved by The National Bioethics Committee in Iceland (12–043) and reported to The Icelandic Data Protection Authority. Participants got written and oral information about the study. Participants provided written consent, including parental consent for participants younger than 18 yrs.

Funding

The Icelandic Sports Fund (RANNIS), Icelandic Physical Therapy Association Research Fund, Icelandic Sports- and Olympic Federation, University of Iceland Research fund.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to players and coaches of the 13 teams that participated and to the Icelandic Handball Federation for their support. Thanks to Professor Thórarinn Sveinsson for his assistance regarding statistics. Special thanks to The Icelandic Sports Fund, Icelandic Physiotherapists Association, Icelandic Sports- and Olympic Association and The University of Iceland Research Fund for funding the project.

References

Andersson, S. H., Bahr, R., Clarsen, B., & Myklebust, G. (2018). Risk factors for overuse shoulder injuries in a mixed-sex cohort of 329 elite handball players: Previous findings could not be confirmed. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 52*(18), 1191–1198.

Andrade, M. S., Vancini, R. L., de Lira, C. A., Mascarin, N. C., Fachina, R. J., & da Silva, A. C. (2013). Shoulder isokinetic profile of male handball players of the Brazilian National Team. *Brazilian Journal of Physical Therapy, 17*(6), 572–578.

Asker, M., Brooke, H. L., Walden, M., Tranaeus, U., Johansson, F., Skillgate, E., et al. (2018). Risk factors for, and prevention of, shoulder injuries in overhead sports: A systematic review with best-evidence synthesis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 52*(20), 1312–1319.

Atalay, E. S., Tarakci, D., & Algun, C. (2018). Are the functional movement analysis scores of handball players related to athletic parameters? *Journal of Exercise Rehabilitation, 14*(6), 954–959.

Bakken, A., Targett, S., Bere, T., Eirale, C., Farooq, A., Tol, J. L., et al. (2017a). The functional movement test 9+ is a poor screening test for lower extremity injuries in professional male football players: A 2-year prospective cohort study. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 52*(16), 1047–1053.

Bakken, A., Targett, S., Bere, T., Eirale, C., Farooq, A., Tol, J. L., et al. (2017b). Interseason variability of a functional movement test, the 9+ screening battery, in professional male football players. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 51*(14), 1081–1086.

Bland, J. M., & Altman, D. G. (1986). Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet, 1*(8476), 307–310.

Bunn, P. D. S., Rodrigues, A. I., & Bezerra da Silva, E. (2019). The association between the functional movement screen outcome and the incidence of musculoskeletal injuries: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Physical Therapy in Sport, 35*, 146–158.

Chorba, R. S., Chorba, D. J., Bouillon, L. E., Overmyer, C. A., & Landis, J. A. (2010). Use of a functional movement screening tool to determine injury risk in female collegiate athletes. *North American Journal of Sports Physical Therapy : NAJSPT., 5*(2), 47–54.

Clarsen, B., Bahr, R., Andersson, S. H., Munk, R., & Myklebust, G. (2014). Reduced glenohumeral rotation, external rotation weakness and scapular dyskinesis are risk factors for shoulder injuries among elite male handball players: A prospective cohort study. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 48*(17), 1327–1333.

Cook, G. (2004). *Athletic body in balance - optimal movement skills and conditioning for performance*. USA: Human Kinetics.

Dello Iacono, A., Eliakim, A., Padulo, J., Laver, L., Ben-Zaken, S., & Meckel, Y. (2017). Neuromuscular and inflammatory responses to handball small-sided games: The effects of physical contact. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 27*(10), 1122–1129.

Dello Iacono, A., Martone, D., Zagatto, A. M., Meckel, Y., Sindiani, M., Milic, M., et al. (2018). Effect of contact and no-contact small-sided games on elite handball players. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 36*(1), 14–22.

Frohm, A., Heijne, A., Kowalski, J., Svensson, P., & Myklebust, G. (2012). A nine-test screening battery for athletes: A reliability study. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 22*(3), 306–315.

Frohm, A. F. F., & Kockum, B. (2013). *9+ Screening Batteri*. Stockholm: SISU Idrottsböcker.

Ghobadi, H., Rajabi, H., Farzad, B., Bayati, M., & Jeffreys, I. (2013). Anthropometry of

world-class elite handball players according to the playing position: Reports from Men's handball World championship 2013. *Journal of Human Kinetics, 39*, 213–220.
Gillet, B., Begon, M., Blache, Y., Berger-Vachon, C., & Rogowski, I. (2017). Scapulohumeral rhythm in young tennis players. *Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering, 20*(sup1), 93–94.
Gorostiaga, E. M., Granados, C., Ibanez, J., & Izquierdo, M. (2005). Differences in physical fitness and throwing velocity among elite and amateur male handball players. *International Journal of Sports Medicine, 26*(3), 225–232.
Haugen, T. A., Tonnessen, E., & Seiler, S. (2016). Physical and physiological characteristics of male handball players: Influence of playing position and competitive level. *The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness, 56*(1–2), 19–26.
Heijne, A., Flodstrom, F., & von Rosen, P. (2019). Could specific exercises based on a movement screen prevent injuries in adolescent elite athletes? *Physical Therapy in Sport, 36*, 28–33.
Hermassi, S., Chelly, M. S., Wagner, H., Fieseler, G., Schulze, S., Delank, K. S., et al. (2018). Relationships between maximal strength of lower limb, anthropometric characteristics and fundamental explosive performance in handball players. *Sportverletzung - Sportschaden*. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0625-8705.
Karcher, C., & Buchheit, M. (2014). On-court demands of elite handball, with special reference to playing positions. *Sports Medicine, 44*(6), 797–814.
Kiesel, K. B., Butler, R. J., & Plisky, P. J. (2014). Prediction of injury by limited and asymmetrical fundamental movement patterns in american football players. *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation, 23*(2), 88–94.
Kiesel, K., Plisky, P. J., & Voight, M. L. (2007). Can serious injury in professional football be predicted by a preseason functional movement screen? *North American Journal of Sports Physical Therapy : NAJSPT, 2*(3), 147–158.
Kraus, K., Schutz, E., Taylor, W. R., & Doyscher, R. (2014). Efficacy of the functional movement screen: A review. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research/National Strength & Conditioning Association, 28*(12), 3571–3584.
Kvorning, T., Hansen, M. R. B., & Jensen, K. (2017). Strength and conditioning training by the Danish national handball team before an olympic tournament. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research/National Strength & Conditioning Association, 31*(7), 1759–1765.
Leandersson, J., Heijne, A., Flodstrom, F., Frohm, A., & von Rosen, P. (2018). Can movement tests predict injury in elite orienteerers? An 1-year prospective cohort study. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/09593985.2018.1513106.
Letafatkar, A., Hadadnezhad, M., Shojaedin, S., & Mohamadi, E. (2014). Relationship between functional movement screening score and history of injury. *International Journal of Sports Physical Therapy, 9*(1), 21–27.
Manchado, C., Garcia-Ruiz, J., Cortell-Tormo, J. M., & Tortosa-Martinez, J. (2017). Effect of core training on male handball players' throwing velocity. *Journal of Human Kinetics, 56*, 177–185.
Marques, V. B., Medeiros, T. M., de Souza Stigger, F., Nakamura, F. Y., & Baroni, B. M. (2017). The functional movement screen (Fms) in elite young soccer players between 14 and 20 Years: Composite score, individual-test scores and asymmetries. *International Journal of Sports Physical Therapy, 12*(6), 977–985.
Massuca, L., Branco, B., Miarka, B., & Fragoso, I. (2015). Physical fitness attributes of team-handball players are related to playing position and performance level. *Asian Journal of Sports Medicine, 6*(1), e24712.
Medeiros, H. B., de Araujo, D. S., & de Araujo, C. G. (2013). Age-related mobility loss is joint-specific: An analysis from 6,000 flexitest results. *Age, 35*(6), 2399–2407.
Michalsik, L. B., Aagaard, P., & Madsen, K. (2013). Locomotion characteristics and match-induced impairments in physical performance in male elite team handball players. *International Journal of Sports Medicine, 34*(7), 590–599.
Minick, K. I., Kiesel, K. B., Burton, L., Taylor, A., Plisky, P., & Butler, R. J. (2010). Interrater reliability of the functional movement screen. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research/National Strength & Conditioning Association, 24*(2), 479–486.
Rafnsson, E. T., Valdimarsson, O., Sveinsson, T., & Arnason, A. (2017). Injury pattern in Icelandic elite male handball players. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine*. https://doi.org/10.1097/JSM.0000000000000499.
Sibila, M., & Pori, P. (2009). Position-related differences in selected morphological body characteristics of top-level handball players. *Collegium Antropologicum, 33*(4), 1079–1086.
Soucie, J. M., Wang, C., Forsyth, A., Funk, S., Denny, M., Roach, K. E., et al. (2011). Range of motion measurements: Reference values and a database for comparison studies. *Haemophilia, 17*(3), 500–507.
Sporis, G., Vuleta, D., Vuleta, D., Jr., & Milanovic, D. (2010). Fitness profiling in handball: Physical and physiological characteristics of elite players. *Collegium Antropologicum, 34*(3), 1009–1014.
Sprague, P. A., Mokha, G. M., & Gatens, D. R. (2014). Changes in functional movement screen scores over a season in collegiate soccer and volleyball athletes. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research/National Strength & Conditioning Association, 28*(11), 3155–3163.
Teyhen, D. S., Shaffer, S. W., Lorenson, C. L., Halfpap, J. P., Donofry, D. F., Walker, M. J., et al. (2012). The functional movement screen: A reliability study. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy, 42*(6), 530–540.
Wagner, H., Buchecker, M., von Duvillard, S. P., & Muller, E. (2010). Kinematic description of elite vs. Low level players in team-handball jump throw. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine, 9*(1), 15–23.
Wagner, H., Finkenzeller, T., Wurth, S., & von Duvillard, S. P. (2014). Individual and team performance in team-handball: A review. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine, 13*(4), 808–816.
Wagner, H., Fuchs, P. X., & von Duvillard, S. P. (2018). Specific physiological and biomechanical performance in elite, sub-elite and in non-elite male team handball players. *The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness, 58*(1–2), 73–81.
Warren, M., Smith, C. A., & Chimera, N. J. (2015). Association of the functional movement screen with injuries in division I athletes. *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation, 24*(2), 163–170.
Zapartidis, I., Kororos, P.,T. C., Skoufas, D., & Bayios, I. (2011). Profile of young handball players by playing position and determinants of ball throwing velocity. *Journal of Human Kinetics, 27*(2011), 17–30.