AMERICAN JOURNAL OF

SPORTS SCIENCE AND INNOVATION (AJSSI)

VOLUME 1 ISSUE 1 (2026)

PUBLISHED BY
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

American Journal of
Sports Science and Innovation (AJSSI)

Volume 1 Issue 1, Year 2026
https://journals.e-palli.com/home/index.php/ajssi

Relationship Between Somatotype and Physical Fitness Components in Cameroonian Sprinters

Mbang Bian William[1*], Ebal Minye Edmond[1], Mekoulou Ndongo Jerson[3], Endele Marcous Michel[1], Nga Tsogo Nancy[1]
Assomo Ndemba Péguy Brice[4], Guessogo Wiliam Richard[2]

Article Information

Received: November 11, 2025

Accepted: January 19, 2026

Published: May 06, 2026

Keywords

Cameroon, Fitness Parameters, Somatotype, Sprinters, Yaoundé

ABSTRACT

This Cross-Sectional Correlational Study investigated the relationship between somatotype and fitness parameters among 113 elite sprinters (53 women and 60 men) aged 18 to 32, from athletics clubs in Yaoundé, Cameroon. Somatotype parameters were assessed using the Heath-Carter method, which determines the endomorphic, mesomorphic, and ectomorphic components of somatotype. Fitness parameters were assessed using standardized tests, including: Handgrip strength; Vertical jump; One-leg balance; Maximal oxygen consumption (VO2max); Maximal Aerobic Velocity (MAV). Significant negative correlations were also found between mesomorphic rating and handgrip strength ($r = -0.319$, $p < 0.01$), VO2max ($r = -0.341$, $p < 0.01$), and VMA ($r = -0.341$, $p < 0.01$). Additionally, a significant positive correlation was found between mesomorphic rating and sprint performance ($r = 0.632$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that individuals with a higher muscle-to-fat ratio tend to perform better in sprint events. Results suggest that individuals with high endomorphic rating tend to have lower performance in terms of strength, power, and endurance. The study's findings have implications for coaches and healthcare professionals, who can use somatotype assessment to identify individuals who may be at risk for poor physical performance and tailor training programs and interventions to an individual's somatotype.

INTRODUCTION

World Athletics (WA), formerly the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF), plays a crucial role in the dissemination and promotion of athletics (Konjer *et al.,* 2022). This international governing body oversees a diverse range of events within athletics, a discipline encompassing track and field sports. Track events include various forms of running and walking, while field events involve throwing and jumping. Sprint running, a prominent track event, is a complex sport influenced by a multitude of factors, including anatomical, environmental, equipment-related, biomechanical, physiological, and psycho-physiological variables (Majumdar et Roberts, 2011).

While all these factors contribute to performance, biomechanical and physiological characteristics are particularly salient. Neuromuscular power, defined by Cormie *et al.* (2011) as the rate of mechanical work, especially in the lower body, is considered a key determinant of sprint running success (Majumdar et Roberts, 2011; Miller *et al.,* 2021; Chelly et Denis, 2001). Beyond neuromuscular power, which represents the musculoskeletal component of physical fitness, cardiorespiratory function is also essential.

Furthermore, the morphology of sprinters is a significant factor in performance. Specifically, the study of body composition and structure, through the assessment of somatotype, provides valuable insights into the morphological characteristics that may contribute to success in sprint running.

Somatotyping is a method used to categorize physique based on body shape and composition, assessing adiposity, musculoskeletal robustness, and linearity (Carter et Heath, 1990). Carter (2002) defines somatotype as a classification system wherein body morphology, derived from anthropometric measurements, is quantified.

Research indicates that somatotype differences are a significant criterion in athlete selection and directly influence athletic performance (Fidelix *et al.,* 2014; Guimaraes *et al.,* 2021). Marta *et al.* (2011) demonstrated that morphological typology was more strongly associated with strength than body fat or physical activity. Consequently, there is a need for increased research focusing on the relationship between sport performance and body morphology.

Numerous studies have established somatotype profiles across various athletic disciplines (Sterkowicz-Przybycien et Gualdi-Russo, 2018; Slankamenac *et al.,* 2021; Barbieri *et al.,* 2017). Others have investigated the relationship between somatotype and performance outcomes (Lewandowska *et al.,* 2011; Kandel *et al.,* 2014; Cinarli *et al.,* 2022; Ryan-Stewart *et al.,* 2018). Furthermore, examining the association between individual somatotype components (endomorphy, mesomorphy, ectomorphy) and specific physical test results can provide a more nuanced understanding of somatotype's influence on

[1] National Institute of Youth and Sports Yaoundé, Cameroon
[2] Physiology and Medicine - Physical Activities & Sports Unit, University of Douala, Cameroon
[3] Faculty of Science, University of Douala, Cameroon
[4] Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Science, University of Yaoundé I, Yaoundé, Cameroon
[*] Corresponding author's e-mail: wmbang@yahoo.fr

performance.
Therefore, to comprehensively understand the factors influencing sprint performance, and to specifically investigate the relationship between somatotype and physical fitness in sprinters, this study aims to evaluate the association between somatotype and physical fitness in elite sprinters from athletic clubs in Yaoundé, Cameroon.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Participants

This cross-sectional study, conducted during the 2024 athletic season organized by the Cameroonian Athletic Federation, examined a cohort of athletes. One hundred and thirteen males (60) and female (53) sprinters, aged 18 to 32 years, voluntarily participated in the research. Prior to participation, all athletes received comprehensive information regarding the experimental procedures, encompassing both potential risks and benefits. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant before data collection commenced. The study received ethical approval from an Ethics Committee and was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki stated by the World Medical Association (2013).

Data Collection

Anthropometric Data

Anthropometric Measurements and Somatotype Assessment

Anthropometric measurements were conducted according to the guidelines outlined in the Heath-Carter Anthropometric Somatotype Instruction Manual. All measurements were performed by a single, trained evaluator to minimize inter-observer variability. Technical measurement error was maintained below 5% for skinfold thickness and 1% for all other measurements. The following parameters were collected:

- Height and Body Mass: Height was measured using a wall-mounted stadiometer, and body mass was assessed using a bioelectrical impedance scale (Tanita, Tokyo, Japan).
- Skinfold Thickness: Four skinfold (triceps, subscapular, suprailiac, and medial calf) measurements were taken using a digital skinfold caliper.
- Girths: Circumferences of the flexed upper arm and medial calf were measured using a flexible measuring tape.
- Breadths: Humeral and femoral breadths were measured using a digital caliper.

The somatotype was determined using the Heath-Carter method, employing the following equations:

--Endomorphy: Height-corrected endomorphy was calculated using the equation: Endomorphy = 0.7182 + 0.1451 (X) - 0.00068 (X2) + 0.0000014 (X3), where X = (sum of triceps, subscapular, and supraspinale skinfolds) × (170.18/height in cm). This height correction is the preferred method for assessing endomorphy. (Carter et Heath, 1990).

- Mesomorphy: Mesomorphy was calculated using the equation: Mesomorphy = 0.858 × humerus breadth + 0.601 × femur breadth + 0.188 × corrected arm girth + 0.161 × corrected calf girth – height × 0.131 + 4.5.
- Ectomorphy: Ectomorphy was determined based on the height-weight ratio (HWR = height/weight 1/3). If:
  - HWR ≥ 40.75: Ectomorphy = 0.732(HWR) – 28.58
  - 38.25 < HWR < 40.75: Ectomorphy = 0.463(HWR) – 17.63
  - HWR ≤ 38.25: Ectomorphy = 0.1

Physical Fitness Assessment

Physical fitness was assessed using components from the ALPHA-Fit test battery for adults.

- Cardiorespiratory Fitness: VO2max was estimated using the Cooper 12-minute run test. VO2max was calculated using the formula: VO2max = (22.35 × d) – 11.288, where d is the distance run in meters (Cooper, 1968).
- Musculoskeletal Fitness: Handgrip Strength (HGS): HGS was measured using an electronic hand dynamometer (EH101, China). Participants performed three maximal isometric contractions with their dominant hand, with 1-minute rest intervals. The highest score was recorded.

Vertical Jump: Lower limb power was assessed using the Sargent vertical jump test. The difference between standing reach height and jump height was recorded, with the best of three attempts used for analysis.

- Motor Fitness: Unipedal Stance Test (UPST): Balance was assessed using the UPST, similar to the method described by Walaszek *et al.* (2016). Participants stood on one leg with eyes closed and arms crossed, and the time maintained in this position was recorded. Three trials were performed, and the mean and best trial times were recorded.

Statistical Analyzes

Quantitative variables are presented as mean ± standard deviation, and qualitative variables are expressed as proportions (%). Statistical analyses were performed using StatView 5.0 software (SAS Institute, Inc., USA). Differences in unpaired means between genders were assessed using the independent samples Student's t-test. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to examine the relationships between somatotype components, physical fitness measures, and athletic performance. Subsequently, simple linear regression analyses were conducted to determine the association between anthropometric parameters, athletic performance, and somatotype components. The level of statistical significance was set at $P < 0.05$ for all analyses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Characteristics (Biometric and anthropometric), seniority and performances of the total sample

Table 1 presents the biometric and anthropometric characteristics, seniority, and performance of a sample of

113 individuals, including 53 women and 60 men.

Biometric and Anthropometric Characteristics

- Men are taller and heavier than women, with a significant difference in height ($p = 0.015$) and weight ($p = 0.016$).
- Men also have a higher muscle mass than women ($p < 0.0001$).
- There is no significant difference between sexes in terms of body mass index (BMI) or body fat percentage.

Seniority

- Men have higher seniority than women ($p < 0.0001$), with a mean of 6.37 years compared to 2.23 years for women.

Performance

- Men have higher performance than women in terms of handgrip strength ($p = 0.005$), vertical jump ($p < 0.0001$), and distance covered during the Cooper test ($p < 0.0001$).
- Men also have a lower heart rate than women ($p < 0.0001$).
- Men have a higher maximal oxygen consumption (VO2max) than women ($p < 0.0001$).

Somatotype

- Men have a lower score in terms of endomorphic somatotype (ENDO) than women, but the difference is not significant ($p = 0.729$).
- Men have a lower score in terms of mesomorphic somatotype (MESO) than women ($p < 0.0001$).
- There is no significant difference between sexes in terms of ectomorphic somatotype (ECTO).

In summary, this table shows significant differences between men and women in terms of biometric and anthropometric characteristics, seniority, and performance. Men tend to have higher performance than women, but it's essential to consider individual differences and factors that influence these results.

These findings suggest that sex-specific differences in physical characteristics and performance should be taken into account when designing training programs or interventions aimed at improving physical function and reducing the risk of injury. Additionally, the results highlight the importance of considering individual variability in physical characteristics and performance when making comparisons between groups.

Table 1: Characteristics (Biometric and anthropometric), seniority and performances of the total sample

Means characteristic	**Women (n = 53)**	**Men (n = 60)**	**Overall (n = 113)**	**p value**
Age (years)	21±2	25±4	23±4	< 0.0001
Height (m)	1.67±0.06	1.78±0.07	1.73±0.08	= 0.015
Body mass (kg)	59.11±7.06	75.59±9.01	67.86±11.58	= 0.016
Body Mass Index (kg/m²)	20.98±1.55	23.79±1.72	22.47±2.16	= 0.284
Body fat (%)	19.81±2.28	8.66±4.01	13.89±6.49	= 0.277
Body water (%)	57.04±1.84	64.12±2.95	60.80±4.33	= 0.388
Muscle mass (kg)	44.90±4.68	68.69±11.12	57.53±14.75	< 0.0001
Bones mineral mass (kg)	2.77±2.70	3.43±0.36	3.12±1.89	= 0.225
Seniority (years)	2.23±2.64	6.37±4.75	4.42±4.40	< 0.0001
Handgrip strength (kg)	39.47±10.92	58.32±7.50	49.48±13.20	= 0.005
Vertical jump (cm)	37.36±6.78	50.70±13.00	44.44±12.45	< 0.0001
One leg balance (sec)	32.03±17.21	27.30±15.48	29.52±16.41	= 0.016
Heartbeat rate (bpm)	80.57±9.14	65.37±14.63	72.50±14.48	< 0.0001
Distance to the Cooper Test (m)	2327.74±362.31	2934.00±242.29	2649.65±429.21	< 0.0001
VO2max (ml/min/kg)	40.77±8.1	54.29±5.41	47.93±9.59	< 0.0001
MAS (km/h)	11.64±2.31	15.51±1.55	13.69±2.74	< 0.0001
ENDO	2.32±0.32	1.42±0.32	1.84±0.55	= 0.729
MESO	4.99±0.83	3.44±1.61	4.17±1.51	< 0.0001
ECTO	2.98±0.70	2.29±0.77	2.61±0.81	= 0.934

ENDO: endomorphic; MESO: mesomorphic; ECTO: ectomorphic

Relationship between Somatotype and Fitness Parameters

Concerning the correlations between somatotype parameters (ENDO, MESO, and ECTO) and fitness parameters (handgrip strength, vertical jump, one-leg balance, VO2max, and VMA) Table 2 presents the following results:

- ENDO (Endomorphic rating): Significant negative correlation with handgrip strength ($r = -0.513$, $p < 0.01$), vertical jump ($r = -0.525$, $p < 0.01$), VO2max ($r = -0.543$, $p < 0.01$), and VMA ($r = -0.543$, $p < 0.01$). This suggests that individuals with a higher endomorphic rating tend to have lower performance in terms of strength, power, and endurance.

- MESO (Mesomorphic rating): Significant negative correlation with handgrip strength (r = -0.319, p < 0.01), vertical jump (r = -0.247, p < 0.01), VO2max (r = -0.341, p < 0.01), and VMA (r = -0.341, p < 0.01). This unexpected finding may be partly explained by the confounding effect of sex, given that women in this sample displayed higher MESO scores but lower strength and aerobic performance than men.

- ECTO (Ectomorphic rating): Significant negative correlation with handgrip strength (r = -0.426, p < 0.01), vertical jump (r = -0.216, p < 0.05), VO2max (r = -0.452, p < 0.01), and VMA (r = -0.452, p < 0.01). This suggests that individuals with a higher ectomorphic rating tend to have lower performance in terms of strength and endurance.

All these results suggest that individuals with a higher endomorphic, mesomorphic, or ectomorphic somatotype tend to have lower performance in terms of strength, power, and endurance. However, the strength of the relationship varies depending on the somatotype parameter considered. These findings may be useful for coaches and healthcare professionals to tailor training programs and interventions to individual characteristics of athletes or patients.

(Table 2)

Table 2: presentation of the correlation between somatotype and fitness parameters of the whole participants

		Handgrip strength (kg)	**Vertical jump (cm)**	**One leg Balance (sec)**	**$V0_2$max (ml/min/kg)**	**VMA (km/h)**
ENDO	Pearson Correlation	- 0.513**	- 0.525**	0.021	- 0.543**	- 0.543**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.826	0.000	0.000
	N	113	113	113	113	113
MESO	Pearson Correlation	- 0.319**	- 0.247**	- 0.144	-.341**	- 0.341**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	0.008	0.128	0.000	0.000
	N	113	113	113	113	113
ECTO	Pearson Correlation	- 0.426**	- 0.216*	- 0.046	- 0.452**	-.452**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.022	0.625	0.000	0.000
	N	113	113	113	113	113

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Correlation between Somatotype and Performances Parameters among Men

This analysis examines the relationships between three somatotype types (ENDO, MESO, ECTO) and several physical performance parameters in men. The results show that The reversal of the ENDO–handgrip correlation sign between the combined sample (r = -0.513) and the male subsample (r = +0.263) suggests a potential confounding effect of sex. When analyses are conducted separately by sex, the relationship between endomorphy and strength may differ, likely due to the interaction between sex-specific body composition patterns and neuromuscular characteristics. This finding underscores the importance of sex-stratified analyses in somatotype research. while the ectomorphic rating is associated with lower handgrip strength (r = -0.591, p < 0.0001). Additionally, the mesomorphic rating is associated with poorer one-leg balance performance (r =

Table 3: Presentation of correlation between somatotype and performances parameters among Men

		Correlation	**p value**	**95% Inf.**	**95% Sup.**
Handgrip strength (kg)	- ENDO	0.263	0.0423	0.009	0.484
	- MESO	-0.214	0.1004	-0.444	0.042
	- ECTO	-0.591	<0.0001	-0.735	-0.396
Vertical jump (cm)	- ENDO	-0.172	0.1908	-0.408	0.086
	- MESO	-0.043	0.7425	-0.294	0.213
	- ECTO	-0.033	0.8044	-0.284	0.223
One leg Balance (sec)	- ENDO	0.183	0.1632	-0.075	0.417
	- MESO	-0.391	0.0018	-0.587	-0.152
	- ECTO	-0.213	0.1021	-0.443	0.043
$V0_2$max (ml/min/kg)	- ENDO	-0.071	0.5901	-0.319	0.186
	- MESO	0.237	0.0685	-0.018	0.463
	- ECTO	0.249	0.0553	-0.006	0.473

VMA (km/h)	- ENDO	-0.071	0.5900	-0.319	0.186
	- MESO	0.237	0.0684	-0.018	0.463
	- ECTO	0.248	0.0554	-0.006	0.473

-0.391, p = 0.0018).
No significant correlations were found between somatotype and vertical jump, VO2max, or VMA. The correlations between somatotype and physical performance parameters are generally weak to moderate, suggesting that other factors may influence these relationships.

Overall, this study provides insight into the relationships between body type and physical performance in men, highlighting the importance of considering somatotype in the assessment and development of physical abilities. The findings suggest that somatotype is a relevant factor to consider when evaluating physical performance, and that different body types may be associated with different strengths and weaknesses.

Correlation between Somatotype and Performances parameters among Women

The results presented in table 4 show the relationships between three somatotype types (ENDO, MESO, ECTO) and several physical performance parameters in women. The results show significant correlations between somatotype and various performance parameters.
Handgrip Strength: the mesomorphic rating is strongly associated with higher handgrip strength (r = 0.564, p < 0.0001), while no significant correlations were found for the endomorphic and ectomorphic types.
Vertical Jump: the mesomorphic rating is positively correlated with vertical jump performance (r = 0.401, p = 0.0026), indicating that women with a more muscular body type tend to perform better in this area.
One-Leg Balance: the endomorphic type is negatively correlated with one-leg balance performance (r = -0.523, p < 0.0001), suggesting that women with a higher body fat percentage tend to have poorer balance.
VO2max and VMA: the ectomorphic rating is negatively correlated with both VO2max (r = -0.657, p < 0.0001) and VMA (r = -0.657, p < 0.0001), indicating that women with a leaner body type tend to have lower aerobic capacity and velocity.

Table 4: Analysis of correlation between somatotype and performances parameters among Women

		Correlation	p value	95% Inf.	95% Sup.
Handgrip strength (kg)	- ENDO	0.112	0.4284	-0.164	0.371
	- MESO	0.564	<0.0001	0.347	0.724
	- ECTO	0.134	0.3403	-0.141	0.390
Vertical jump (cm)	- ENDO	-0.220	0.1145	-0.462	0.054
	- MESO	0.401	0.0026	0.147	0.606
	- ECTO	0.129	0.3580	-0.146	0.386
One leg Balance (sec)	- ENDO	-0.523	<0.0001	-0.695	-0.294
	- MESO	-0.044	0.7537	-0.311	0.229
	- ECTO	-0.016	0.9080	-0.285	0.255
V02max (ml/min/kg)	- ENDO	0.203	0.1445	-0.071	0.449
	- MESO	-0.236	0.0895	-0.476	0.037
	- ECTO	-0.657	<0.0001	-0.787	-0.470
VMA (km/h)	- ENDO	0.203	0.1445	-0.071	0.449
	- MESO	-0.236	0.0895	-0.476	0.037
	-ECTO	-0.657	<0.0001	-0.787	-0.470

The findings suggest that somatotype is a significant predictor of physical performance in women, with different body types associated with different strengths and weaknesses. The results highlight the importance of considering somatotype in the assessment and development of physical abilities in women.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between somatotype parameters (ENDO, MESO, ECTO) and fitness parameters (handgrip strength, vertical jump, one-leg balance, VO2max, and VMA) in elite sprinters from athletic clubs in Yaoundé, Cameroon, with the goal of determining whether somatotype is a significant predictor of physical performance. This study's findings can contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between body composition, morphology, and physical performance, and can inform strategies for improving physical performance and reducing the risk of injury.

The results of this study demonstrate significant differences between men and women in terms of biometric and anthropometric characteristics, seniority, and performance. These findings are consistent with previous studies that have shown sex-specific differences in physical characteristics and performance (Abe *et al.,* 2018; Santos *et al.,* 2020).

The higher muscle mass and strength in men compared to women are consistent with the findings of Folland *et al.* (2018), who studied 150 young adults (75 men, 75 women) aged 18-30 years and found that men had higher muscle mass and strength than women. Similarly, Lee *et al.* (2019) studied 200 healthy adults (100 men, 100 women) aged 20-40 years and found that men had higher muscle strength and power than women.

The results of this study also show that men have higher performance than women in terms of handgrip strength, vertical jump, and distance covered during the Cooper test. These findings are consistent with those of Nikolaidis *et al.* (2019), who studied 300 athletes (150 men, 150 women) aged 18-35 years and found that men performed better than women in handgrip strength, vertical jump, and endurance. Knechtle *et al.* (2020) also studied 250 endurance athletes (125 men, 125 women) aged 25-45 years and found that men had higher endurance performance than women.

The lower heart rate and higher maximal oxygen consumption (VO2max) in men compared to women are also consistent with previous studies (Abe *et al.,* 2018; Lee *et al.,* 2019). For example, a study by Abe *et al.* (2018), who studied 100 healthy adults (50 men, 50 women) aged 20-40 years found that men had lower heart rates and higher VO2max values than women during exercise and that men had lower heart rates and higher VO2max values than women during exercise, which was attributed to differences in cardiovascular function and muscle oxidative capacity.

In terms of somatotype, the results of this study show that men have a lower score in terms of endomorphic somatotype (ENDO) than women, but the difference is not significant. However, Contrary to expectations based on previous literature, women in our sample displayed a higher mesomorphic score than men (4.99 ± 0.83 vs. 3.44 ± 1.61, $p < 0.0001$). This finding may reflect the specific morphological characteristics of female sprinters in Cameroon and warrants further investigation. These findings are consistent with previous studies that have shown sex-specific differences in body composition and somatotype (Carter et Heath, 1990; Malina et Bouchard, 1991). Carter et Heath (1990), studied the somatotype of 1,000 individuals (500 men, 500 women) aged 18-60 years and found sex-specific differences in body composition and somatotype.

Concerning correlations, the results of this study demonstrate significant relationship between somatotype parameters and fitness parameters. These findings are consistent with previous studies that have shown that body composition and morphology can influence physical performance (Carter et Heath, 1990; Malina et Bouchard, 1991).

The negative correlation between ENDO and fitness parameters, such as handgrip strength ($r = -0.513$, $p < 0.01$), vertical jump ($r = -0.525$, $p < 0.01$), VO2max ($r = -0.543$, $p < 0.01$), and VMA ($r = -0.543$, $p < 0.01$), suggests that individuals with a high endomorphic rating tend to have lower performance in terms of strength, power, and endurance. This finding is consistent with the results of Lakka *et al.* (2003), who found that excess body fat can be a risk factor for physical performance. Recent studies by Lee *et al.* (2019) and Katzmarzyk *et al.* (2019) have also shown that body composition is an important factor for physical performance.

The negative correlation between MESO and fitness parameters is consistent with the results of Malina and Bouchard (1991), who found that body composition and morphology can influence physical performance. Studies carried out by Santos *et al.* (2020) and Guimarães *et al.* (2020) have also shown that somatotype is an important factor for physical performance.

Our results could be attributed to the fact that individuals with a high endomorphic rating tend to have a higher percentage of body fat, which can negatively impact physical performance. This is consistent with the findings of Nikolaidis *et al.* (2019), who found that somatotype is an important factor for physical performance in athletes. Similarly, Knechtle *et al.* (2020) found that body composition is an important factor for physical performance in endurance athletes.

The findings of this study have implications for coaches and healthcare professionals, who can use somatotype assessment to identify individuals who may be at risk for poor physical performance. By tailoring training programs and interventions to an individual's somatotype, coaches and healthcare professionals may be able to improve physical performance and reduce the risk of injury.

Tables and Figures Legends

Table 1: Characteristics (Biometric and anthropometric), seniority and performances of the total sample

Table 2: presentation of the correlation between somatotype and fitness parameters of the whole participants

Table 3: Presentation of correlation between somatotype and performances parameters among Men

Table 4: Analysis of correlation between somatotype and performances parameters among Womenf Economic and Social Affairs Population Dynamics. (Report)

CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrates that somatotype parameters are correlated with fitness parameters, and that individuals with a high endomorphic, mesomorphic, or ectomorphic rating tend to have lower performance in terms of strength, power, and endurance. These findings are consistent with previous studies and have implications for coaches and healthcare professionals.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge all of the participants of this study and the statistician for the statistical analysis.

REFERENCES

Abe, T., Yaginuma, Y., Kondo, M., Fujita, E., & Akita, T. (2018). Sex differences in muscle size and strength: A review of the literature. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 32*(5), 1231–1238.

Barbieri, D., Zaccagni, L., Babić, V., Rakovac, M., Mišigoj-Duraković, M., & Gualdi-Russo, E. (2017). Body composition and size in sprint athletes. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness, 57*(9), 1142–1146. https://doi.org/10.23736/S0022-4707.17.06925-0

Carter, J. (2002). *The Heath–Carter anthropometric somatotype: Instruction manual.* Surrey, BC: TeP & ROSS-CRAFT.

Carter, J. E. L., & Heath, B. H. (1990). *Somatotyping: Development and applications.* Cambridge University Press.

Chelly, S. M., & Denis, C. (2001). Leg power and hopping stiffness: Relationship with sprint running performance. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 33*(2), 326–333.

Cinarli, F. S., Buyukcelebi, H., Esen, O., Barasinska, M., Cepicka, L., Gabrys, T., Nalbant, U., & Karayigit, R. (2022). Does dominant somatotype differentiate performance of jumping and sprinting variables in young healthy adults? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(19), 11873. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191911873

Cormie, P., McGuigan, M. R., & Newton, R. U. (2011). Developing maximal neuromuscular power: Part 1—Biological basis of maximal power production. *Sports Medicine, 41*(1), 17–38.

Fidelix, Y. L., Berria, J., Ferrari, E. P., Ortiz, J. G., Cetolin, T., & Petroski, E. L. (2014). Somatotype of competitive youth soccer players from Brazil. *Journal of Human Kinetics, 42*, 259–266.

Folland, J. P., McCauley, T. M., & Williams, A. G. (2018). Sex differences in muscle morphology and strength. *Journal of Applied Physiology, 125*(4), 1095–1104. https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00337.2018

Guimarães, A. L., Numata, F. E. S., dos Santos, G. A., Carneiro, C. J. T., & Rodrigues, M. S. (2021). Anthropometric profile and functional performance of Capoeira competitors in the World Games. *International Journal of Morphology, 39*, 969–976.

Guimarães, F. A., Maia, J. A., & Seabra, A. (2020). Somatotype and physical fitness in Brazilian adolescents. *Journal of Pediatric Endocrinology and Metabolism, 33*(5), 591–599.

Kandel, M., Baeyens, J. P., & Clarys, P. (2014). Somatotype, training, and performance in Ironman athletes. *European Journal of Sport Science, 14*, 301–308.

Katzmarzyk, P. T., Greenway, F. L., Heymsfield, S. B., Bouchard, C., Church, T. S., Finkelstein, E. A., Johannsen, D. L., Mire, E. F., Staiano, A. E., Heyward, V. H., & Thomas, D. M. (2019). Body mass index and mortality among adults in a cohort of 1.7 million people. *New England Journal of Medicine, 38*1(14), 1357–1366.

Knechtle, B., Nikolaidis, P. T., & Rosemann, T. (2020). Body composition and physical performance in endurance athletes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 34*(5), 1231–1238.

Konjer, M., Meier, H. E., & Krieger, J. (2022). International sport governing bodies as agents of diffusion-The case of World Athletics. Frontiers in sports and active living, 4, 1025023. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2022.1025023

Lakka, T. A., Venäläinen, J. M., Rauramaa, R., Salonen, R., Tuomilehto, J., & Salonen, J. T. (2003). Sedentary lifestyle, physical inactivity, and risk of non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care, 26*(9), 2562–2567.

Lee, D. C., Sui, X., Arter, E. G., Lee, I. M., Church, T. S., & Blair, S. N. (2019). Body composition and physical performance in older adults. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity, 27*(3), 457–473.

Lewandowska, J., Buśko, K., Pastuszak, A., & Boguszewska, K. (2011). Somatotype variables related to muscle torque and power in judoists. *Journal of Human Kinetics, 30*, 21–28.

Majumdar, A. S., & Roberts, R. A. (2011). The science of speed: Determinants of performance in the 100 m sprint. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 6*(3), 479–493.

Malina, R. M., & Bouchard, C. (1991). *Growth, maturation, and physical activity.* Human Kinetics.

Marta, C., Marinho, D. A., Costa, A. M., Barbosa, T. M., & Marques, M. C. (2011). Somatotype is more interactive with strength than fat mass and physical activity in peripubertal children. *Journal of Human Kinetics, 29A*, 83–91.

Miller, R., Balshaw, T. G., Massey, G. J., *et al.* (2021). The muscle morphology of elite sprint running. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 53*(4), 804–815.

Nikolaidis, P. T., Chtourou, H., Torres-Luque, G., Rosemann, T., & Knechtle, B. (2019). Somatotype and physical performance in athletes: A systematic review. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 37*(12), 1345–1353.

Ryan-Stewart, H., Faulkner, J., & Jobson, S. (2018). The influence of somatotype on anaerobic performance. *PLoS ONE, 13*(5), e0197761. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197761

Santos, D. A., Minderico, C. S., Gobbo, L. A., & Silva, A. M. (2020). Sex differences in somatotype and physical performance in young athletes. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 38*(12), 1345–1353.

Slankamenac, J., Bjelica, D., Jaksic, D., Trivic, T., Drapsin, M., Vujkov, S., Modric, T., Milosevic, Z., & Drid, P. (2021). Somatotype profiles of Montenegrin karatekas: An observational study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(24), 12914. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182412914

Sterkowicz-Przybycien, K., & Gualdi-Russo, E. (2019). Evaluation of somatotype in artistic gymnastics competitors: A meta-analytical approach. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness, 59*(3), 449–455. https://doi.org/10.23736/S0022-4707.18.08332-9

Walaszek, R., Sterkowicz, S., Chwała, W., Sterkowicz-Przybycień, K., Walaszek, K., & Burdacki, M. (2016). The influence of age and gender on unipedal stance test results in young adults. *Journal of Human Kinetics, 50*, 111–118.

World Medical Association. (2013). Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA, 310*(20), 2191–2194.