

Prediction of individual optimal drop height in drop jump from anthropometric and strength variables

Received: 10 August 2025

Accepted: 17 March 2026

Published online: 31 March 2026

Cite this article as: Xie Y., Peng F., Pan X. *et al.* Prediction of individual optimal drop height in drop jump from anthropometric and strength variables. *Sci Rep* (2026). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-45266-x>

Yongmin Xie, Fan Peng, Xinyu Pan & Qinchang Sun

We are providing an unedited version of this manuscript to give early access to its findings. Before final publication, the manuscript will undergo further editing. Please note there may be errors present which affect the content, and all legal disclaimers apply.

If this paper is publishing under a Transparent Peer Review model then Peer Review reports will publish with the final article.

Prediction of Individual Optimal Drop Height in Drop Jump from Anthropometric and Strength Variables

Yongmin Xie^{1*}, Fan Peng¹, Xinyu Pan¹, Qinchang Sun¹

1.School of Strength and Conditioning Training, Beijing Sport University, Haidian 100084, China.

*Corresponding author:

Yongmin Xie

School of Strength and Conditioning Training, Beijing Sport University, Haidian 100084, China.

E-mail: xieyongminbsu@163.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the associations between individual optimal drop height (ODH), as determined by the reactive strength index (RSI) method, and selected anthropometric and strength parameters, and to develop a prediction model for ODH based on these variables. A total of 49 participants were recruited, and measurements included body height, body mass, maximal muscle strength (MS_{max}), lower limb stiffness, reactive strength ratio (RSR), countermovement jump (CMJ) height, and ODH. Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships between ODH and the assessed variables. A multiple linear regression model was constructed in a stepwise manner to predict individual ODH. Significant correlations were observed between ODH and relative MS_{max} ($r = 0.827$, $P < 0.001$), RSR ($r = 0.703$, $P < 0.001$), body mass ($r = -0.481$, $P < 0.01$), body height ($r = -0.430$, $P < 0.01$), and CMJ height ($r = 0.487$, $P < 0.01$). Relative MS_{max}, CMJ height and RSR collectively explained 78.4% of the variance in ODH ($R^2 = 0.784$). The final prediction equation was: $ODH = -45.602 + 31.027 * \text{relative MS}_{\text{max}} + 0.548 * \text{CMJ height} + 5.549 * \text{RSR}$ ($R^2 = 0.784$, $F(3, 36) = 48.190$, $p < 0.001$). Coaches should consider body height, body mass, RSR, relative MS_{max}, and CMJ height when prescribing drop jump height. Moreover, an individual's ODH should be adjusted when changes in CMJ height or relative MS_{max} occur. Finally, this study provides a practical prediction equation for estimating individual ODH using relative MS_{max} and CMJ height as input variables.

Key words: plyometric training; training intensity; reactive strength; optimal drop height

27 INTRODUCTION

28 Drop jump (DJ), consisting of stepping or dropping from a raised platform and, upon landing,
29 immediately performing a vertical jump, has always been a popular training method to improve the
30 performance of stretch-shortening cycle (SSC) movements in the last few decades(Addie et al., 2019;
31 Barr & Nolte, 2014; Makaruk et al., 2010; Matic et al., 2015; Peng, Song, Wallace, et al., 2019). In DJ
32 training, one significant factor that can determine the training effects of DJ and that coaches need to
33 consider when designing the programs is the drop height, which is generally used as an effective way
34 to manipulate the intensity of DJ training(Byrne et al., 2016; Hubert & Tomasz, 2011). Based on
35 previous research, both excessively high and low drop heights are detrimental to plyometric
36 performance and depth jump (DJ) training adaptation. When the drop height is too great, the Golgi
37 Tendon Organ (GTO) may be activated by sudden and excessive braking forces, triggering the body's
38 protective mechanisms that reduce tension in muscles and tendons while suppressing stretch reflex
39 activity(Turner & Jeffreys, 2010). Concurrently, the amortization phase of the SSC is significantly
40 prolonged, leading to dissipation of elastic energy stored during the eccentric phase(Wilson & Flanagan,
41 2008). Both factors can negatively affect training outcomes.In contrast, if the drop height is too low,
42 the mechanical stress is not sufficient enough for the neuromuscular system, thereby leading to
43 inefficient exploitation of SSC and reducing the possible extent of adaptation(P. J. Byrne et al., 2010;
44 Schuster et al., 2019). Previous studies found that proper plyometric and heavy resistance training can
45 induce specific neural adaptations, most notably the desensitization of the GTO, which weakens this
46 inhibitory reflex (Cormie et al., 2010). This neural adaptation enables well-trained athletes to tolerate
47 greater eccentric forces and maintain potent stretch reflex facilitation at higher drop heights. Therefore,
48 the individual optimal drop height (ODH) that could produce the best performance should be identified
49 before DJ training to maximize the plyometric performance and prevent injury(Byrne et al., 2016).

50 To date, the reactive strength index (RSI) method has been extensively utilized by a several
51 researchers to prescribe the individual ODH, which is defined as the drop height eliciting the maximum
52 RSI. (Byrne et al., 2016; P. J. Byrne et al., 2010; Ramirez-Campillo et al., 2018). In this method,
53 athletes are required to perform an incremental DJ test, in which the RSI profiles are measured; and

54 then the respective height that can produce the maximum RSI value is considered the ODH(P. J. Byrne
55 et al., 2010). One reason the RSI method is considered effective in identifying the ODH may be its
56 requirement for testers to provide immediate feedback on both contact time and flight height for each
57 jump(Flanagan & Comyns, 2008). This is particularly relevant given that some researchers argue
58 optimal jump height has limited significance if ground contact time (GCT) is not concurrently
59 considered(Flanagan & Comyns, 2008; Walsh et al., 2004).In addition, the ODH identified by the RSI
60 method has been demonstrated to be effective in enhancing the transition capacity of muscles from
61 eccentric to concentric phases (i.e., fast SSC)(Flanagan & Comyns, 2008). Even though the RSI method
62 can individualize the DJ training intensity, it takes considerable time to identify ODH, especially when
63 testing large squads. A prediction model based on easily accessible variables (e.g., CMJ height, relative
64 strength) could serve as a time-efficient screening tool and also help coaches identify modifiable factors
65 to increase an athlete's ODH. Therefore, this paper believes that if the individual ODH could be
66 predicted by a model constructed based on athletes' training background and plyometric ability, the
67 testing process would be optimized and time saved.

68 Few studies have examined the factors influencing ODH in DJ training, despite extensive research
69 on ODH itself. Maximal muscle strength (MSmax) affects drop height(Barr & Nolte, 2014; Matic et
70 al., 2015), with athletes having higher relative MSmax performing better from greater heights ($p \leq$
71 0.05)(Beattie et al., 2017). Body mass and height should also be considered. Overweight athletes should
72 not jump from heights above 46 cm due to increased joint loading and injury risk(Kulas et al., 2008).
73 Taller athletes may face greater knee valgus angles during landing, suggesting higher injury risk
74 (Nilstad et al., 2015). Higher countermovement jump (CMJ) performance (Van Hooren & Zolotarjova,
75 2017), lower limb stiffness(Brazier et al., 2019; Walshe & Wilson, 1997), and reactive strength (Healy
76 et al., 2018; Matic et al., 2015) improve the muscle-tendon transition during SSC movements. Although
77 how these factors affect ODH is unclear, they likely contribute to identifying it. More research is needed
78 to identify reliable predictors of ODH.

79 Thus, the current investigation aimed to to identify the optimal set of predictors (model) that can
80 be used most accurately to estimate ODH. Specifically, we evaluated objective measures including

81 body mass, body height, MSmax, lower limb stiffness, and reactive strength. It is hypothesized that all
82 these parameters are related to individual ODH and the combination of these parameters could predict
83 ODH well.

84 **METHODS**

85 **Experimental Approach to the Problem**

86 A cross-sectional study was conducted to explore the associations of ODH with strength and
87 anthropometric variables. The formal tests were divided into three stages(Figure 1). At least a 48-hour
88 recovery period was arranged between each stage. Before the formal test, a familiarization session
89 was scheduled to inform the athletes of the testing procedures and requirements for each movement
90 involved. The interval between the familiarization session and the formal test was at least seven days.
91 Prior to the commencement of each strength variable test, participants were required to undergo a
92 standard warm-up protocol consisting of cycling (5 minutes), dynamic stretching of lower limbs, and
93 muscle activation. In this study, all test items were scheduled between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., and the
94 laboratory temperature was kept at 18–24°C.

95
96 Insert Figure 1 about here
97

98 **Subjects**

99 Forty male elite athletes with varying training backgrounds—specifically in basketball(N = 7),
100 volleyball(N = 4), sprinting(N = 5), gymnastics(N = 9), freestyle combat(N = 13), Rugby(N = 1) and
101 Trampoline(N = 1)—participated in this study (age: 20.35 ± 2.67 years; range: 18–26). "Elite" was
102 defined as competing at national-level championships or in professional leagues. All participants were
103 healthy and had no history of lower limb injury within the past six months. They were tested during the
104 off-season and were instructed to maintain their regular training routines throughout the testing period.
105 Inclusion criteria required at least two years of consistent strength training (weekly frequency ≥ 3

106 sessions) and prior experience in plyometric training, including drop jumps (DJ). Typical resistance
107 training exercises included barbell back squats, bench presses, deadlifts, power cleans, and snatches.
108 Characteristics of study participants are shown in Table 1.

109 Insert Table 1 about here

110 All participants were required to maintain a regular diet, refrain from any vigorous physical
111 activity within 24 hours prior to testing, and fast for at least 2 hours before each test session. All tests
112 were administered by the same instructor to minimize non-systematic measurement error. Participants
113 were fully informed of the study's objectives, potential risks, benefits, and procedures before providing
114 written informed consent. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and
115 was approved by the Ethics Review Committee of Beijing Sport University (No. 2024332H). All
116 participants read and understood the experimental instructions and provided written informed consent
117 prior to the commencement of the experiment.

118 **Procedures**

119 *Anthropometric and Maximal Strength Test*

120 A digital stadiometer (Inbody BSM170, Korea) and a digital scale (Model 05, G-Tech, China)
121 were used to measure the height (1 mm) and weight (0.1 kg) of the subjects, respectively. Each variable
122 was measured three times to obtain an average value for statistical analysis.

123 Participants underwent a standardized warm-up protocol comprising the following sequence: First,
124 foam rolling was applied to the quadriceps, hamstrings, glutes, and calves for 1 minute per muscle group
125 to alleviate muscle tension. Next, dynamic stretching was performed, including walking quad stretches
126 (30 seconds per leg), Superman stretches with contralateral limb reach (10 seconds per side), and the
127 world's greatest stretch (10 repetitions per leg with a thoracic rotation). This was followed by hip and
128 lower body activation exercises, consisting of glute bridges (15–20 reps), lateral band walks (20 steps
129 per side), and hip rotations (15 reps per side). Finally, neural activation was incorporated through depth
130 jumps (2 sets of 6 repetitions from a 30 cm platform). Following the warm-up, participants completed
131 the testing procedure, which consisted of CMJ and five hopping jumps, followed by a 2-minute rest

132 period. They then performed 3 CMJs on the force platform with 30 seconds between trials (Haff et al.,
133 2016; McGowan et al., 2015).

134 Lower body absolute MSmax was assessed using the barbell back squat (1RM) and normalized to
135 body weight (relative MSmax). Before testing, participants completed a standard warm-up and 10 back
136 squats with a barbell, followed by a 5-minute rest. During the test, they flexed hips and knees until
137 thighs were parallel to the ground, with controlled descent speed to avoid bouncing between phases. In
138 the concentric phase, participants stood up as quickly as possible. Three investigators provided spotting:
139 one behind the participant and two beside the barbell. The procedure, rest intervals, and load progression
140 followed the NSCA's true 1RM testing protocol (Haff et al., 2016).

141 *CMJ and Hopping test*

142 CMJ height was measured using the FD4000 Dual Force Platforms (ForceDecks, [Brisbane,](#)
143 [Australia](#)~~London, UK~~) at a sampling frequency of 1000 Hz. During each jump, participants placed their
144 hands on their hips, performed a rapid pre-squat, and executed a maximal vertical jump with full
145 extension of the hips, knees, and ankles. Pre-squat depth was self-selected to maximize jump height.
146 Knee and hip flexion during flight was not allowed. Participants performed 3 maximal CMJ trials with
147 30 seconds of rest between trials. A trial was discarded and repeated after 30 seconds of additional rest
148 if the participant: (a) removed hands from hips, (b) exhibited noticeable knee or hip flexion during the
149 flight phase, or (c) failed to land stably within the force platform boundaries. No participant required
150 more than 5 total attempts to complete 3 valid trials. CMJ height for each trial was automatically
151 calculated by the ForceDecks software ([VALD Performance, Windows v2.2.0, Brisbane,](#)
152 [Australia](#)~~ForceDecks, London, UK~~) using an impulse–momentum approach based on vertical ground
153 reaction force data, and the average of the three trials was used for statistical analysis. A 3-minute rest
154 followed the test.

155 In the hopping jump test, RSR and lower limb stiffness were measured using the ForceDecks
156 platform at 1000 Hz (Comyns et al., 2019). Participants performed 11 consecutive maximal hops; the
157 first jump was excluded as it resembled a CMJ (Comyns et al., 2019). They were instructed to jump as

158 quickly and as high as possible during the landing-to-takeoff transition, minimizing contact time and
159 maximizing flight height. Hands were kept on hips, and landings occurred in the same position with
160 extended lower limbs. Contact and flight times from the five best jumps (shortest contact time, highest
161 jump height) were automatically recorded. Reactive strength ratio (RSR) was calculated as the ratio of
162 flight time to ground contact time:

$$163 \quad \text{RSR} = \frac{\text{FT}}{\text{CT}}$$

164 Where FT is flight time (s), CT is ground contact time (s). Lower-limb stiffness (K_{leg}) was
165 calculated using a time-based spring–mass model (Maloney & Fletcher, 2021):

$$166 \quad K_{\text{leg}} = [M \cdot \pi (T_f + T_c)] / [T_c^2 (\frac{T_f + T_c}{\pi} - \frac{T_c}{4})]$$

167 Where M is body mass (kg), T_f is flight time (s), and T_c is ground contact time (s). The average
168 values were used for statistical analysis.

169 *Drop Jump Test*

170 The individual ODH, defined as the height yielding maximal RSI, was determined using a depth
171 jump (DJ) test with wooden boxes at incremental heights (30–75 cm in 5 cm increments) and the
172 FD4000 Dual Force Platform sampled at 1000 Hz. DJ height for each trial was automatically calculated
173 by the ForceDecks software (ForceDecks, London, UK) using an impulse–momentum approach based
174 on vertical ground reaction force data, and the average of the three trials was used for statistical
175 analysis. Drop heights were selected based on previous research (P. J. Byrne et al., 2010). Participants
176 completed a standard warm-up, ankle hops, and submaximal DJs, followed by a 2-minute rest. They
177 performed three rebound-style DJs from each height in ascending order to minimize injury risk (P. J.
178 Byrne et al., 2010; Comyns et al., 2019; Kipp et al., 2018). It is worth noting that drop jumps can be
179 performed using different techniques—such as bounce, countermovement, or mixed styles—which may
180 influence reactive strength and stiffness outcomes (Struzik et al., 2016). In this study, participants were
181 instructed to perform a rebound-style (bounce) DJ with minimal knee and hip flexion during ground
182 contact, consistent with protocols used in prior RSI-based studies (Byrne et al., 2010; Comyns et al.,

2019). A 30-second rest separated jumps, and a 1.5-minute rest separated height changes. Adequate rest and real-time feedback helped reduce fatigue effects. During each DJ, participants minimized contact time and maximized jump height while maintaining landing stability. Additional requirements included: (a) hands on hips; (b) landing on the same spot with both feet; (c) minimal knee and hip flexion during first and second landings; (d) maintaining post-landing stability on the platform.; (e) contact time < 250 ms. Trials violating any requirement were repeated, with no more than five attempts per height. After each jump, jump height and contact time—automatically recorded by ForceDecks software—were provided immediately, allowing athletes to adjust and optimize performance for maximum RSI. RSI was calculated for each of the three jumps at all 10 heights using the equation:

$$RSI = \frac{\text{Height}}{CT}$$

Where Height is DJ Height, CT is ground contact time (s). The height producing the highest RSI was identified as the individual ODH.

Statistical Analysis

Participant characteristics are presented as mean \pm SD or number (%) as appropriate. Normality of variables was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Pearson's correlation was used to evaluate associations between ODH and independent variables: body height, body weight, MSmax, RSR, leg stiffness, and CMJ height. The effect sizes of Pearson's correlation coefficient were interpreted as almost perfect ($0.9 \leq r \leq 1$), very large ($0.7 \leq r < 0.9$), large ($0.5 \leq r < 0.7$), moderate ($0.3 \leq r < 0.5$), and low ($0.1 \leq r < 0.3$). A stepwise multiple linear regression model was built to predict individual ODH for drop jump training, using body weight, body height, CMJ height, absolute MSmax, relative MSmax, RSR, and LLS as candidate predictors. Multicollinearity among predictors was checked using variance inflation factor ($VIF < 5$) and tolerance (> 0.2) (Hair, 2010).

Residual diagnostics (including tests for normality and homoscedasticity) and influence statistics (Cook's distance) were examined to verify that the linear regression assumptions were met and to identify any influential outliers that could bias the model. Agreement between measured and estimated

208 values was examined using Bland–Altman analysis, reporting mean bias (measured – estimated) and
209 95% limits of agreement ($\text{Bias} \pm 1.96 \text{ SD}$). To assess the predictive performance and potential optimism
210 of the regression model, internal validation was performed using the predicted residual sum of squares
211 (PRESS) statistic with leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV).

212 All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS version 20.0 (IBM SPSS Inc., IL, USA), and
213 graphs were generated using GraphPad Prism 7.0 (GraphPad Software, La Jolla, CA). Statistical
214 significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

215 RESULTS

216 All continuous variables in this study were normally distributed with no outliers. Each participant's
217 ODH can be identified using the RSI method, and the RSI profiles of ten participants were selected
218 randomly and presented in Figure 2.

219
220 Insert Figure 2 about here

221
222 Pearson correlation analyses revealed that ODH was negatively associated with body height ($r =$
223 -0.43 , $p = .006$) and body weight ($r = -0.48$, $p = .002$), and positively associated with CMJ height ($r =$
224 0.49 , $p = .001$) relative MS_{max} ($r = 0.83$, $p < .001$), and RSR ($r = 0.70$, $p < .001$) (Table 2).

225 Insert Table 2 about here

226
227 Three stepwise multiple regression models were built to predict the individual ODH. The detailed
228 information of the models is shown in Table 3.

229 For the model 1, $\text{ODH} = -31.117 + 43.031 \cdot \text{relative MS}_{\text{max}}$; $R^2 = .676$, $F(1, 38) = 82.197$, $p < .001$.
230 The Bland-Altman presented in Figure 3

231 For the model 2, $ODH = -47.584 + 39.172 * \text{relative MS}_{\max} + 0.575 * \text{CMJ height}$; $R^2 = .758$, $F(2, 37)$
232 $= 62.008$, $p < .001$. Bland-Altman plots depicting agreement between measured and predicted ODH are
233 presented in Figure 3.

234 For the model 3, $ODH = -45.602 + 31.027 * \text{relative MS}_{\max} + 0.548 * \text{CMJ height} + 5.549 * \text{RSR}$; R^2
235 $= .784$, $F(3, 36) = 48.190$, $p < .001$. Multicollinearity diagnostics for Models 1–3 are reported in Table
236 4. The Bland-Altman presented in Figure 3

237 Across the final three-predictor model ($n = 40$), Cook's distance ranged from 0.000 to 0.237 ($M =$
238 0.032 , $SD = 0.050$). Using conventional cutoffs, four cases exceeded $D > 4/n = 0.10$ and three exceeded
239 the more stringent $D > 4/(n - k - 1) = 0.111$ ($k = 3$); no case exceeded 1. Residual diagnostics are shown
240 in Figure 4. To complement these in-sample checks with an out-of-sample estimate, internal validation
241 via PRESS (LOOCV) yielded $RMSE = 6.43$ and $R^2 = 0.675$, compared with the apparent in-sample
242 $SEE = 5.50$ and $R^2 = 0.810$, indicating modest optimism in the apparent estimates.

243 Insert Table 4 about here

244 Insert Figure 3 about here

245 Insert Figure 4 about here

246

247 DISCUSSION

248 This study systematically investigates the factors influencing individual optimal drop height by
249 integrating both anthropometric and strength parameters within a unified analytical framework. Forty
250 participants were enrolled in the experiment. Each participant's optimal drop height (ODH) for depth
251 jumps (DJ) was determined using the reactive strength index (RSI) method during an incremental DJ
252 protocol. This approach has been utilized in prior research (P. J. Byrne et al., 2010; Ramirez-Campillo
253 et al., 2018) and has demonstrated high intraday and interday reliability (D. J. Byrne et al., 2017;
254 Markwick et al., 2015).

255 However, the RSI trend observed in the current study (Fig. 2) resembles a parabolic curve,
256 although it does not perfectly follow a standard parabolic shape. This trend is consistent with

257 Schuster et al. (Schuster et al., 2019), who found that from low drop height to the optimal height, the
258 RSI value increased by 9% ($p < 0.001$) and decreased by 5% ($p < 0.008$) from optimal height to the
259 high drop height, also with Addie et al. (Addie et al., 2019), who observed that the RSI increased with
260 drop heights between 30-60cm and decreased when the height increased more than 60cm. However,
261 this trend of RSI in the current research (Figure 2) is approximately equal to a standard parabolic curve
262 instead of being a standard parabolic curve. This phenomenon may be caused by the increment of
263 boxes (i.e., 5cm) used in this study, smaller than those of previous studies (Byrne et al., 2016; Ramirez-
264 Campillo et al., 2018; Schuster et al., 2019). The participants were only instructed to jump as quickly
265 and as highly as possible during the test, so the jump performance mainly depended on their subjective
266 consciousness. Any slight differences in DJ techniques (such as more knee flexion and ground contact
267 time) may result in more significant changes in the RSI (Pedley et al., 2017). In other words, the smaller
268 increment of drop heights could easily cause the fluctuation of RSI. Considering Byrne's suggestions
269 that increments of 0.15 m or 0.2 m in drop heights may be too large (P. J. Byrne et al., 2010), it seems
270 that an increment of 10cm would be better in order to get a more standard parabolic curve.

271 According a serious of study, body weight is one of the factors that can determine the training
272 intensity of plyometric exercises (Haff et al., 2016; Kulkamp et al., 2012, 2015, 2020). Our data showed
273 that the individual ODH demonstrated a negative correlation with body weight ($r = -0.481$, $p < 0.01$),
274 which means that the ODH may decrease if the subject's body weight increases. This association may
275 be partly attributed to the rise in ground reaction force resulting from increased weight. Fowler et al.
276 (1994) observed that 0.26 m loaded DJs (8.5 kg) revealed higher ground reaction force than those
277 performed without any additional loads from the same height. The increased ground reaction force
278 would put excessive pressure on muscles, connective tissues, and joints, which is associated with the
279 increased injury risk (Kulas et al., 2008) Besides, if a subject's body weight increase but the strength
280 remains unchanged, the added load would also impair the transfer capability of the muscle from
281 eccentric contraction to concentric contraction. Makaruk et al. (Makaruk et al., 2010) observed that the
282 amortization time significantly increased, but the peak power and velocity at peak power decreased in
283 the loaded group (5% of body weight), which indicates that the efficacy of SSC may decrease. Therefore,

284 the NSCA suggested that athletes weighing over 100 kg should avoid the DJ from heights greater than
285 46 cm(Haff et al., 2016).

286 Participants' body height in a more extensive range (165.5–200.7 cm) was negatively correlated
287 with individual ODH. This link can be explained in part by increased knee valgus. Nilstad et al. (Nilstad
288 et al., 2015)proposed that taller individuals were more likely to have greater peak knee valgus in the
289 drop-jump landing because longer lever arms demanded more muscle strength to stabilize the knee joint.
290 This conclusion may be supported by our results, which showed that participants with higher body
291 height had lower MS_{max} ($r = -0.430$, $p < 0.01$), and lower strength can increase the knee valgus when
292 performing the dynamic movements(Claiborne et al., 2006). Besides, the subjects' body height in our
293 research is negatively correlated with body mass ($r = -0.613$, $p < 0.01$), which would also deteriorate
294 drop jump performance because of the increase of the landing force according to our previous analysis.
295 Thus, the drop height for taller athletes should be chosen carefully to prevent potential sports injury.
296 However, the exact mechanisms of how body height affects drop height and the suggested maximum
297 drop height (i.e., over which it should be forbidden) for tall athletes remain unknown.

298 As previous research investigated, subjects with greater relative MS_{max} of the lower limb tended to
299 have higher ODH(Beattie et al., 2017; Dymond et al., 2011; Matic et al., 2015), which is in accordance
300 with our results that the relative MS_{max} is highly correlated with individual ODH ($r=0.827$, $p<0.001$).
301 However, no association between absolute maximum strength and the ODH was not found in this
302 research. Matthew et al.(Barr & Nolte, 2014) revealed that the peak eccentric force relative to body
303 weight for DJs nearly doubled when the drop height increased from 24 to 84 cm ($4.15\pm0.91\sim8.18\pm0.99$),
304 and at a height of 84 cm it reached more than eight times body weight. Similarly, Peng et al.(Peng,
305 2011) pointed out that the peak vertical ground reaction force (vGRF) and the landing impulse during
306 the contact phase significantly increased with the drop height and the peak vGRF of the dominant leg
307 even exceeded three times the body weight during DJ from the height of 50 and 60cm. Both findings
308 indicate that individuals capable of performing better in depth jumps from greater heights should
309 possess superior eccentric strength to withstand the high eccentric loading (Cormie et al.,
310 2010).Specifically, strong eccentric strength would directly assist lower limb stiffness and reactive

311 strength, help to prevent the muscle from overstretching under high eccentric load; then facilitate the
312 concentric contraction at the next moment(Fukutani et al., 2017). Or else, the weaker had to increase
313 the contact time to overcome the increased stretching load, which led to the decrease of RSI(Barr &
314 Nolte, 2014). Even if the eccentric strength was not measured In this study, previous research has found
315 a very large correlation ($r = 0.90$) between concentric and eccentric strength (Spiteri et al., 2014).
316 Relative MSmax emerged as the most substantial predictor of optimal drop height (Std. $\beta = 0.596$).
317 Theoretically, higher relative strength indicates that the nervous system is better prepared to withstand
318 greater tension in the musculotendinous unit, which may potentially delay or attenuate the inhibitory
319 response of the GTO during sudden eccentric loading (Aagaard et al., 2002). Furthermore, the
320 contributions of CMJ height (Std. $\beta = 0.289$) and RSR (Std. $\beta = 0.237$) to the model likely reflect the
321 neuromuscular efficiency of the SSC. Specifically, these values suggest a superior capacity to utilize
322 the stretch reflex (e.g., muscle spindle excitation) to enhance concentric force production, allowing for
323 a rapid and forceful transition from the yielding phase (Taube et al., 2012). Therefore, compared with
324 the relatively weak athletes, subjects with larger relative MSmax tend to be more effective in plyometric
325 exercises and perform better in DJ from higher heights(Dymond et al., 2011) , which may mean their
326 ODH should be higher than that of Weaker individuals.

327 The findings also imply that CMJ height is moderately associated with the ODH ($r = 0.487$, $p <$
328 0.01) and can be used to predict individual ODH. As we know, CMJ belongs to SSC movements, which
329 usually involve a rapid eccentric contraction immediately before a fast concentric contraction(Van
330 Hooren & Zolotarjova, 2017). Accordingly, the CMJ height could reflect the muscle's ability to perform
331 SSC movements (i.e., the transition ability from eccentric contraction to concentric) to a certain
332 degree(Peng, 2011), which is also necessary for DJ performance. Therefore, the CMJ value indicates
333 better utilization of SSC, in particular the stretch reflex. Besides, the height of CMJ can also reflect the
334 relative force and power strength of the lower limbs(Ćopić et al., 2014). Matic et al. (Matic et al.,
335 2015)indicated that the drop height should be adjusted based on the individual neuromuscular capacity.
336 Therefore, individuals who achieve greater CMJ heights may demonstrate enhanced performance
337 during drop jumps from increased heights. That could explain why the percentage of CMJ height (e.g.,

338 100% of CMJ height) can be used as the ODH in DJ (Peng, Song, & Wallace, 2019). Furthermore, after
339 an athlete's CMJ height has been increased, the drop height may need to be adjusted.

340 Previous studies have indicated that better DJ performance requires athletes to have the ability to
341 bear large eccentric load and the ability to convert from eccentric to concentric contraction quickly
342 (Komi, 2000; Komi & Gollhofer, 1997). Thus, the metric reactive strength was introduced to assess the
343 muscle's ability to switch rapidly from eccentric to concentric muscle action under stretching
344 load(Healy et al., 2018). The rapid and powerful SSC of highly trained individuals in ground contact
345 phase is achieved by stronger quasi-isometric muscle movements (such as knee extensors and ankle
346 flexors), full utilization of elastic structures, and a higher rate of force development (RFD)(Douglas et
347 al., 2018). Reactive strength directly influences the lower limb stiffness, prompting athletes to hit the
348 ground with a more rigid lower limb during DJ (i.e., reducing elastic deformation)(Kipp et al., 2017).
349 Thus, individuals with better reactive strength are more likely to have a greater capacity to bear the
350 eccentric load caused by higher drop heights and show shorter ground contact times and larger flight
351 heights than their less capable peers(Matic et al., 2015).

352 At present, the association between lower limb stiffness and the drop height of DJ is still unclear.
353 Theoretically, athletes with higher lower limb stiffness can store more elastic energy during the
354 amortization phase and generate more force during the take-off phase when performing SSC
355 movements, which would help to increase jump height(Brazier et al., 2019). Conversely, Walshe et
356 al.(Walshe & Wilson, 1997) proposed that the stiffer the musculotendinous units (MTU) are, the lower
357 the performance is when executing deep DJ at higher drop heights. In current study, we didn't find any
358 relationship between the lower limb stiffness and the ODH. Perhaps this difference could be partly
359 explained by the measuring method utilized In this study, in which the lower limb stiffness was
360 calculated using Dalleau's formula (Dalleau, 2004). As Dalleau et al. (Dalleau, 2004) pointed out, the
361 formula might lead to discrepancies between computed and actual values, which could skew the study's
362 conclusions. Thus, more research into this relationship should be done using a formal method to
363 measure lower limb stiffness.

364 To predict individual ODH, a stepwise multiple regression model was developed. Based on our
365 testing experience, it would take about 30 minutes for one participant to identify the ODH using the
366 RSI method due to the complicated process. Compared with the traditional method, our prediction
367 model can save time for athletes by using relative MS_{max} and CMJ height, which are easily accessible
368 in daily training. However, despite significant correlations between ODH and body height, weight, and
369 RSR, these variables were not included in the model, which could be attributed to high collinearity
370 (e.g., RSR and body height). The results revealed that only relative MS_{max} and CMJ height provided the
371 best explanation, explaining 78.4% of the observed variance in individual ODH (Table 3). As a result,
372 coaches and athletes should prioritize these two parameters while selecting the ODH before DJ training.
373 Furthermore, the moderate predictive power may also indicate that other indicators, such as the
374 eccentric strength, should be incorporated into the model in future research.

375 **Study Limitations**

376 The regression model explained 78.4% of the variance. Although key predictors were included,
377 this level of explanatory power may still be insufficient for precise practice-oriented guidance.
378 Moreover, the optimal drop height is influenced by multiple factors—such as an athlete's training status
379 and stress levels—that were not incorporated into the present model. Additionally, lower limb stiffness
380 was estimated using a kinematic formula (Dalleau, 2004), which, while practical, may not fully align
381 with values derived from force-time curve analysis (e.g., via force platforms). Future studies could
382 incorporate direct force-based stiffness calculations to enhance accuracy. A further limitation concerns
383 the estimation of drop jump performance using the reactive strength index (RSI). Jump height, and
384 consequently RSI, was derived from force- or flight-time-based methods, whose accuracy has been
385 previously questioned when initial drop height parameters are not directly quantified. Although

386 consistent procedures were applied across conditions, potential errors in jump height estimation may
387 have affected the precision of the predicted optimal drop height. Future studies should consider direct
388 kinematic measurement to improve estimation accuracy.

389 PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

390 This findings indicate that when prescribing drop jump training height, coaches should consider
391 an athlete's body height, body mass, RSR, CMJ height, and relative MSmax. The individual ODH
392 should be adjusted, particularly when changes occur in CMJ height or relative MSmax. Furthermore,
393 this study provides coaches and exercise scientists with a practical equation to estimate athletes' ODH
394 in DJ training: $ODH = -45.602 + 31.027 * \text{relative MS}_{\max} + 0.548 * \text{CMJ height} + 5.549 * \text{RSR}$. Given that
395 these two variables are widely used in training monitoring and readily accessible in routine practice,
396 the ODH can be determined more efficiently than with traditional methods. However, future research
397 should include additional variables to improve the model's predictive accuracy. Moreover, due to the
398 inherent design limitations of this study, the underlying mechanisms linking drop height to
399 anthropometric and neuromuscular characteristics warrant further investigation.

400 Funding

401 This works was not supported by any grants.

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409 REFERENCES

410 Aagaard, P., Simonsen, E. B., Andersen, J. L., Magnusson, P., & Dyhre-Poulsen, P. (2002). Neural adaptation to
411 resistance training: changes in evoked V-wave and H-reflex responses. *Journal of applied physiology (Bethesda, Md. :
412 1985)*, 92(6), 2309–2318. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.01185.2001>

413 Addie, C. D., Arnett, J. E., Neltner, T. J., Straughn, M. K., Greska, E. K., Cosio-Lima, L., & Brown, L. E. (2019). Effects
414 of Drop Height on Drop Jump Performance. *International Journal of Kinesiology and Sports Science*, 7(4), 28.
415 <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijkss.v.7n.4p.28>

416 Barr, M. J., & Nolte, V. W. (2014). The Importance of Maximal Leg Strength for Female Athletes When Performing
417 Drop Jumps. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 28(2), 373–380. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e31829999af>

418 Beattie, K., Carson, B. P., Lyons, M., & Kenny, I. C. (2017). The Relationship Between Maximal Strength and Reactive
419 Strength. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 12(4), 548–553. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2016-0216>

421 Brazier, J., Maloney, S., Bishop, C., Read, P. J., & Turner, A. N. (2019). Lower Extremity Stiffness: Considerations for
422 Testing, Performance Enhancement, and Injury Risk. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 33(4), 1156–1166.
423 <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002283>

424 Byrne, D., Browne, D., Byrne, P., & Richardson, N. (2016). The inter-day reliability of reactive strength index and
425 optimal drop height. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 31(3), 721–726.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000001534>

427 Byrne, D. J., Browne, D. T., Byrne, P. J., & Richardson, N. (2017). Interday Reliability of the Reactive Strength Index
428 and Optimal Drop Height. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 31(3), 721–726.
429 <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000001534>

430 Byrne, P. J., Moran, K., Rankin, P., & Kinsella, S. (2010). A Comparison of Methods Used to Identify ‘Optimal’ Drop
431 Height for Early Phase Adaptations in Depth Jump Training. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 24(8), 2050–
432 2055. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181d8eb03>

433 Claiborne, T. L., Armstrong, C. W., Gandhi, V., & Pincivero, D. M. (2006). Relationship between hip and knee strength
434 and knee valgus during a single leg squat. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*, 22(1), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jab.22.1.41>

435 Comyns, T. M., Flanagan, E. P., Fleming, S., Fitzgerald, E., & Harper, D. J. (2019). Interday Reliability and Usefulness
436 of a Reactive Strength Index Derived From 2 Maximal Rebound Jump Tests. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and
437 Performance*, 14(9), 1200–1204. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2018-0829>

438 Čopić, N., Dopsaj, M., Ivanović, J., Nešić, G., & Jarić, S. (2014). Body composition and muscle strength predictors of
439 jumping performance: Differences between elite female volleyball competitors and nontrained individuals. *Journal of Strength
440 and Conditioning Research*, 28(10), 2709–2716. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000000468>

441 Cormie, P., McGUIGAN, M. R., & Newton, R. U. (2010). Changes in the Eccentric Phase Contribute to Improved
442 Stretch-Shorten Cycle Performance after Training. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 42(9), 1731–1744.
443 <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181d392e8>

444 Dalleau, G. (2004). A simple method for field measurements of leg stiffness in hopping. *International Journal of Sports
445 Medicine*, 25(3), 170–176. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2003-45252>

446 Douglas, J., Pearson, S., Ross, A., & McGuigan, M. (2018). Kinetic determinants of reactive strength in highly trained
447 sprint athletes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 32(6), 1562–1570.
448 <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002245>

449 Dymond, C., Flanagan, E. P., & Turner, A. P. (2011). *THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MAXIMAL STRENGTH AND
450 PLYOMETRIC ABILITY IN RUGBY PLAYERS.*

- 451 Flanagan, E. P., & Comyns, T. M. (2008). The Use of Contact Time and the Reactive Strength Index to Optimize Fast
452 Stretch-Shortening Cycle Training. *Strength & Conditioning Journal*, 30(5), 32–38.
453 <https://doi.org/10.1519/SSC.0b013e318187e25b>
- 454 Fukutani, A., Misaki, J., & Isaka, T. (2017). Both the elongation of attached crossbridges and residual force enhancement
455 contribute to joint torque enhancement by the stretch-shortening cycle. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4(2), 161036.
456 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.161036>
- 457 Fowler, N. E., Lees, A., & Reilly, T. (1994). Spinal shrinkage in unloaded and loaded drop-jumping. *Ergonomics*, 37(1),
458 133–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139408963631>
- 459 Haff, G., Triplett, N. T., & National Strength & Conditioning Association (Eds.). (2016). *Essentials of strength training
460 and conditioning* (Fourth edition). Human Kinetics.
- 461 Hair, J. F. (Ed.). (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7. ed). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- 462 Healy, R., Kenny, I. C., & Harrison, A. J. (2018). Reactive Strength Index: A Poor Indicator of Reactive Strength?
463 *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 13(6), 802–809. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2017-0511>
- 464 Hubert, M., & Tomasz, S. (2011). The effect of drop height and body mass on drop jump intensity. *Biology of Sport*,
465 28(1), 63–37.
- 466 Kipp, K., Kiely, M. T., Giordanelli, M. D., Malloy, P. J., & Geiser, C. F. (2017). The reactive strength index reflects
467 vertical stiffness during drop jumps. *International Journal of Sports Physiology & Performance*, 13(1), 1–20.
468 <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2017-0021>
- 469 Kipp, K., Kiely, M. T., Giordanelli, M. D., Malloy, P. J., & Geiser, C. F. (2018). Biomechanical Determinants of the
470 Reactive Strength Index During Drop Jumps. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 13(1), 44–49.
471 <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2017-0021>
- 472 Komi, P. V. (2000). Stretch-shortening cycle: A powerful model to study normal and fatigued muscle. *Journal of
473 Biomechanics*, 33(10), 1197–1206. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290\(00\)00064-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290(00)00064-6)
- 474 Komi, P. V., & Gollhofer, A. (1997). Stretch reflexes can have an important role in force enhancement during ssc exercise.
475 *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*, 13(4), 451–460.
- 476 Kulas, A., Zalewski, P., Hortobagyi, T., & DeVita, P. (2008). Effects of added trunk load and corresponding trunk position
477 adaptations on lower extremity biomechanics during drop-landings. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 41(1), 180–185.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2007.06.027>
- 479 Kùlkamp, W., Borges, N. G., Ache Dias, J., Domenech, S. C., Sagawa, Y., & Gevaerd, M. S. (2015). Modeling the
480 influence of body mass on resistance exercise performance of non-athletes. *Science & Sports*, 30(5), 275–282.
481 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scispo.2015.02.007>
- 482 Kùlkamp, W., Dal Pupo, J., & Ache-Dias, J. (2020). A novel index to classify vertical jump performance of athletes
483 according to the body mass. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, 16(4). <https://doi.org/10.14198/jhse.2021.164.14>
- 484 Kùlkamp, W., Dias, J. A., Domenech, S. C., Borges Jr, N. G., & Gevaerd, M. D. S. (2012). Comparação do desempenho
485 de praticantes de exercícios resistidos por diferentes métodos de ajuste pela massa corporal. *Revista Brasileira de
486 Cineantropometria e Desempenho Humano*, 14(3), 313–323. <https://doi.org/10.5007/1980-0037.2012v14n3p313>
- 487 Makaruk, H., Sacewicz, T., Czaplicki, A., & Sadowski, J. (2010). Effect of Additional Load on Power Output during
488 Drop Jump Training. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, 26(2010), 31–37. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10078-010-0045-y>
- 489 Maloney, S. J., & Fletcher, I. M. (2021). Lower limb stiffness testing in athletic performance: A critical review. *Sports
490 Biomechanics*, 20(1), 109–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2018.1460395>
- 491 Markwick, W. J., Bird, S. P., Tufano, J. J., Seitz, L. B., & Haff, G. G. (2015). The Intraday Reliability of the Reactive
492 Strength Index Calculated From a Drop Jump in Professional Men’s Basketball. *International Journal of Sports Physiology
493 and Performance*, 10(4), 482–488. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2014-0265>

- 494 Matic, M. S., Pazin, N. R., Mrdakovic, V. D., Jankovic, N. N., Ilic, D. B., & Stefanovic, D. L. J. (2015). Optimum Drop
495 Height for Maximizing Power Output in Drop Jump: The Effect of Maximal Muscle Strength. *Journal of Strength and*
496 *Conditioning Research*, 29(12), 3300–3310. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000001018>
- 497 McGowan, C. J., Pyne, D. B., Thompson, K. G., & Rattray, B. (2015). Warm-Up Strategies for Sport and Exercise:
498 Mechanisms and Applications. *Sports Medicine*, 45(11), 1523–1546. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0376-x>
- 499 Nilstad, A., Krosshaug, T., Mok, K.-M., Bahr, R., & Andersen, T. E. (2015). Association Between Anatomical
500 Characteristics, Knee Laxity, Muscle Strength, and Peak Knee Valgus During Vertical Drop-Jump Landings. *Journal of*
501 *Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*, 45(12), 998–1005. <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2015.5612>
- 502 Pedley, J. S., Lloyd, R. S., Read, P., Moore, I. S., & Oliver, J. L. (2017). Drop jump: A technical model for scientific
503 application. *Strength and Conditioning Journal*, 39(5), 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1519/SSC.0000000000000331>
- 504 Peng, H.-T. (2011). Changes in biomechanical properties during drop jumps of incremental height. *Journal of Strength*
505 *and Conditioning Research*, 25(9), 2510–2518. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e318201bcb3>
- 506 Peng, H.-T., Song, C.-Y., & Wallace, B. J. (2019). Effects of relative drop heights of drop jump biomechanics in male
507 volleyball players. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 40(13), 863–870. <https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0969-8623>
- 508 Peng, H.-T., Song, C.-Y., Wallace, B. J., Kernozek, T. W., Wang, M.-H., & Wang, Y.-H. (2019). Effects of Relative
509 Drop Heights of Drop Jump Biomechanics in Male Volleyball Players. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 40(13), 863–
510 870. <https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0969-8623>
- 511 Ramirez-Campillo, R., Alvarez, C., Garcia-Pinillos, F., Sanchez-Sanchez, J., Yanci, J., Castillo, D., Loturco, I., Chaabene,
512 H., Moran, J., & Izquierdo, M. (2018). Optimal Reactive Strength Index: Is It an Accurate Variable to Optimize Plyometric
513 Training Effects on Measures of Physical Fitness in Young Soccer Players? *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*,
514 32(4), 885–893. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002467>
- 515 Schuster, R. W., Paternoster, F. K., & Seiberl, W. (2019). High-density electromyographic assessment of stretch reflex
516 activity during drop jumps from varying drop heights. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology: Official Journal of the*
517 *International Society of Electrophysiological Kinesiology*, 50, 102375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2019.102375>
- 518 Struzik, A., Juras, G., Pietraszewski, P., & Rokita, A. (2016). Effect of drop jump technique on the reactive strength
519 index. *Journal of human kinetics*, 52, 157–164. <https://doi.org/10.1515/hukin-2016-0003>
- 520 Spiteri, T., Nimphius, S., Hart, N. H., Specos, C., Sheppard, J. M., & Newton, R. U. (2014). Contribution of strength
521 characteristics to change of direction and agility performance in female basketball athletes. *Journal of Strength and*
522 *Conditioning Research*, 28(9), 2415–2423. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000000547>
- 523 Taube, W., Leukel, C., & Gollhofer, A. (2012). How neurons make us jump: the neural control of stretch-shortening
524 cycle movements. *Exercise and sport sciences reviews*, 40(2), 106–115. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JES.0b013e31824138da>
- 525 Turner, A. N., & Jeffreys, I. (2010). The Stretch-Shortening Cycle: Proposed Mechanisms and Methods for Enhancement.
526 *Strength & Conditioning Journal*, 32(4), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1519/SSC.0b013e3181e928f9>
- 527 Van Hooren, B., & Zolotarjova, J. (2017). The Difference Between Countermovement and Squat Jump Performances: A
528 Review of Underlying Mechanisms With Practical Applications. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 31(7), 2011–
529 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000001913>
- 530 Walsh, M., Arampatzis, A., Schade, F., & Brüggemann, G.-P. (2004). The Effect of Drop Jump Starting Height and
531 Contact Time on Power, Work Performed, and Moment of Force. *The Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 18(3),
532 561. [https://doi.org/10.1519/1533-4287\(2004\)18%253C561:TEODJS%253E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1519/1533-4287(2004)18%253C561:TEODJS%253E2.0.CO;2)
- 533 Walshe, A. D., & Wilson, G. J. (1997). The Influence of Musculotendinous Stiffness on Drop Jump Performance.
534 *Canadian Journal of Applied Physiology*, 22(2), 117–132. <https://doi.org/10.1139/h97-010>
- 535 Wilson, J. M., & Flanagan, E. P. (2008). The Role of Elastic Energy in Activities with High Force and Power
536 Requirements: A Brief Review. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 22(5), 1705–1715.
537 <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e31817ae4a7>

Table 1. Characteristics of study participants (n=49)

	Mean (\pm SD)	Minimum	Maximum
Body height (cm)	182.82 \pm 9.72	166.5	200.7
Body weight (kg)	79.74 \pm 15.83	50.3	122.4
Absolute MS _{max} (kg)	140.38 \pm 24.01	88.0	193.0
Relative MS _{max}	1.78 \pm 0.21	1.44	2.29
CMJ height (cm)	40.61 \pm 5.94	26.70	52.90
RSR	2.45 \pm 0.48	1.60	3.66
Lower limb stiffness (KN/M)	29.09 \pm 6.61	16.79	44.29
Optimal drop height (cm)	45.5 \pm 11.28	20	75

SD-standard deviation; MS_{max}-maximal muscle strength; CMJ height-counter movement jump height; RSR-reactive strength ratio

Table 2. Pearson correlation coefficients matrix between individual ODH and selected variables

	BH	BW	AMS _{max}	RMS _{max}	CMJH	RSR	LLS	ODH
BH	1							
BW	0.578**	1						
AMS _{max}	0.316*	0.809**	1					
RMS _{max}	-0.543**	-0.459**	0.134	1				
CMJH	0.055	-0.259	-0.081	0.245	1			
RSR	-0.567**	-0.619**	-0.206	0.675**	0.221	1		
LLS	-0.062	0.397*	0.577**	0.205	-0.100	0.323*	1	
ODH	-0.430**	-0.481**	-0.019	0.827**	0.487**	0.703**	0.126	1

BH-body height; BW-body weight; AMS_{max}-absolute maximal muscle strength; RMS_{max}-relative maximal muscle strength; CMJH-CMJ height; RSR-reactive strength ratio; LLS-lower limb stiffness; ODH-optimal drop height.
 **p<0.01; *p<0.05.

Table 3. Summary of stepwise multiple regression models of individual ODH^a

model		Regression coefficients			R ²	Adj.R ²	p
		β	Std. β^*	p			
1	Constant	-31.117		<.001	0.684	0.684	<.001
	relative MS _{max}	43.031	.827	<.001			
2	Constant	-47.584		<.001	0.770	0.758	<.001
	relative MS _{max}	39.172	.753	<.001			
	CMJH	.575	.303	<.001			
3	Constant	-45.602	8.145	<.001	0.801	0.784	<.001
	relative MS _{max}	31.027	0.596	<.001			
	CMJH	0.548	0.289	<.001			
	RSR	5.549	0.237	0.025			

a-Dependent Variable: optimal drop height (cm); relative MS_{max}-relative maximal muscle strength; CMJH-counter movement jump height; RSR-reactive strength ratio.

Table 4 Multicollinearity diagnostics for Models

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Tolerance	VIF
1	Constant	1.993	1.000		
	relative MS _{max}	0.007	16.487	1.000	1.000
2	Constant	2.979	1.000	0.940	1.064
	relative MS _{max}	0.014	14.561	0.940	1.064
	CMJH	0.007	20.789		
3	Constant	3.958	1.000		
	relative MS _{max}	0.025	12.523	0.535	1.869
	CMJH	0.011	18.706	0.934	1.070
	RSR	0.005	27.739	0.541	1.847

relative MS_{max}-relative maximal muscle strength; CMJH-counter movement jump height; RSR-reactive strength ratio.