3	
4	Bone accrual over 18 months of participation in different loading sports
5	during childhood and adolescence
6	Runing title: Bone health and sport participation
7	
8	Ricardo Ribeiro Agostinete ¹ , Dimitris Vlachopoulos ² , André Oliveira Werneck ¹ ,
9	Santiago Maillane Vanegas ¹ , Kyle Robinson Lynch ¹ , Geraldine Naughton ³ , Romulo
10	Araújo Fernandes ¹
11	
12	1- Laboratory of InVestigation in Exercise (LIVE), Department of Physical
13	Education, Sao Paulo State University (UNESP), Presidente Prudente, Brazil.
14	2- Children's Health and Exercise Research Centre, Sport and Health Sciences,
15	University of Exeter, United Kingdom.
16	3- School of Exercise Science, Australian Catholic University, Fitzroy, VIC,
17	Australia.
18	
19	
20	Funding Sources and Financial Disclosure: This study was supported by the São Paulo
21	Research Foundation-FAPESP (Process 2013/06963-5, 2015/13543-8, 2016/06920-2,
22	2017/09182-5 and 2018/24164-6). AOW received a Grant from the FAPESP
23	(2017/27234-2). SMJ received a Grant from the FAPESP (2016/20354-0) and KRL
24	received a Grant from the FAPESP (2016/20377-0).
25	
26	Conflict of interest: Ricardo Agostinete, Dimitris Vlachopoulos, André Werneck,
27	Santiago Vanegas, Kyle Lynch, Geraldine Naughton, Romulo Fernandes declare that they
28	have no conflict of interest.
29	
30	Acknowledgements: Sao Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) and the effort of the
31	participants and their parents and coaches.
32 33 34 35	* Corresponding author: Ricardo Ribeiro Agostinete (ricardo.agostinete@unesp.br) 305 Roberto Simonsen – Presidente Prudente, SP, Brazil. 19060 -900

36 Bone accrual over 18 months of participation in different loading sports during

- 37 childhood and adolescence
- 38

39 Mini-abstract

This study investigated the association of impact and non-impact sports on bone mineral density accrual in adolescents for 18 months. The impact sports were beneficial for the bone health (accrual of bone density), on the other hand, swimmers had similar and lower bone mineral density compared to the control group.

44

45 Abstract

46 Purpose: To investigate the association of impact and non-impact sports on bone mineral 47 density (BMD) accrual in adolescents of both sexes over a period of 18 months. Methods: 48 The sample was composed of 71 children and adolescents, aged 9 to 17 years at baseline. 49 Bone outcomes were compared according to sports (impact, n=33 [basketball, karate, and judo], non-impact, n=18 [swimming], and control group, n=20). aBMD was measured by 50 51 Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) and bone mineral apparent density (BMAD) 52 estimated through equation. The statistics analysis was composed by Analysis of variance 53 (ANOVA and ANOVA repeated measures). Results: Adjusted aBMD at lower limbs, 54 whole body less head (WBLH) and adjusted BMAD at WBLH were significantly greater 55 in the impact sports group than the non-impact sport group at all time points, besides in 9 56 and 18 months in upper limbs and total spine at baseline. Non-impact sports group also 57 presented lower values of aBMD compared to control group in lower limbs and WBLH 58 at 9-months and at 9 and 18-months in BMAD WBLH. There was a significant interaction 59 (time x sports group) at upper limbs (p=0.042), WBLH (p=0.006) aBMD and BMAD 60 WBLH (p<0.001). Conclusion: Overall, impact sports were more beneficial on 61 accumulating BMD over a period of 18 months, while swimmers had similar and lower 62 BMD compared to the control group.

63

Keywords: Bone development; Longitudinal; Physical activity; Sports training Youth;
Bone density.

66 Introduction

The first two decades of life seem to be extremely important for bone acquisition for bone acquisition. According to the literature, around 50% of whole body bone mineral content (BMC) is acquired during childhood and adolescence [1], especially among from the years surrounding peak height velocity [2]. Increased gains in bone mineral density (BMD) during adolescence may decrease the risk of developing osteoporosis [3] by achieving the full potential of peak bone mass.

73 The growth of bone tissues is largely determined by non-modifiable factors, such 74 as genetics and hormones [4, 5]. However, environmental factors, such as physical 75 activity and nutrition, can alter BMC and BMD during growth [6–8]. The positive effects 76 of physical activity on bone health can be supported by an increased action of anabolic 77 hormones and proteins, such as growth hormone (GH) and insulin-like growth factor 1 78 (IGF-1) [9, 10]. Moreover, physical activity can induce positive bone adaptations via 79 muscle contractions performed during movements that can generate strain and stimulate 80 bone matrix by modifying geometry and strength of trabecular and cortical bones 81 according to muscle-bone unit theory [10, 11]

Among the different manifestations of physical activity, sports participation offers numerous physiological benefits [12] and accounts for a large part of physical activity during childhood and adolescence worldwide [13]. Sports can be considered as impact and non-impact based on the review developed by Tenforde & Fredericson (2011) [10], which characterizes modalities of impact, those that involve ground-reaction forces. In contrast, non-impact modalities are performed in "hypogravity" environments, without ground-reaction forces. 89 The loading of skeleton during specific sport practice is a key component of the 90 bone adaptations, but the magnitude of the stimuli depends on the training environment 91 (e.g., hard surface, such as basketball, or hypogravity environment, such as swimming) 92 [14, 15], the frequency (e.g., sessions and days per week), intensity (e.g., light, moderate, 93 vigorous) and volume (e.g., sets, repetitions) of each sport [16]. However, a recent review 94 by Bielemaan et al. (2013) indicated the lack of a consensus on which type of exercise 95 performed in early life can most effectively promote bone health [17]. Considering the 96 amount of bone mass acquired during childhood and adolescence [2], and that the 97 majority of children and adolescence engaged in different types of sports, it is of great 98 interest to determine the long-term association of different loading sports and bone 99 acquisition during this period of life.

100 Based on the absence of consensus about the role of different sports and bone 101 growth, cross-sectional studies have sought to identify the association between different 102 types of sports, such as volleyball [18], football [7], basketball [19], tennis [20], martial 103 arts [21] and bone outcomes compared to controls and other sports. Longitudinal studies 104 enable researchers to assess more appropriately causality than cross-sectional studies, but 105 there are only a few longitudinal studies focusing on the association of different loading 106 sports and bone development [22, 23]. Most of studies in the literature analyzing the 107 longitudinal impact of sports participation in bone density of adolescents were developed 108 up to 12-month of follow-up [24-26]. In fact, a smaller number of studies followed 109 adolescents over 12 months, but those studies have focused in comparisons based on "one 110 single sport versus control group", while comparisons according to weigh-bearing 111 characteristics (impact, non-impact sports and control group) were not presented by them 112 [27-29]. These studies also did not ponder a volumetric interpretation of BMD 113 considering the influence of body size, as proposed in the use of bone mineral apparent 114 density (BMAD) [30]. Therefore, it is important to understand more comprehensively the 115 long-term relation of sports participation in different levels of ground reaction force and 116 bone accrual during adolescence.

117 The purpose of this longitudinal study was to compare the long-term of impact 118 (basketball, karate, and judo) and non-impact (swimming) sports on aBMD and BMAD 119 accrual in children and adolescents over a period of 18 months. It was hypothesized that 120 impact sports will have greater bone accrual compared to non-impact sports.

121 Methods

122 Study design

123 This longitudinal study is part of a large cohort study that was conducted in the 124 city of Presidente Prudente from October 2013 to May 2015. The study was approved by 125 the Ethical Research Committee of the São Paulo State University-UNESP (Process 126 number 02891112.6.0000.5402).

127 At the beginning of the study in 2013, a cooperation agreement was formed 128 between the Laboratory of InVestigation in Exercise-LIVE and the municipal secretariat 129 of Education and Sports of Presidente Prudente. After explaining the proposal to school 130 principals and sports coaches, the researchers were given formal authorization to start 131 data collection. Children and adolescents not actively engaged in any sport and who were 132 enrolled in the schools of the Secretary of Education were invited to join such as the 133 control group. The athletic group comprised adolescents of the modalities representing 134 their municipality: judo, karate, basketball, and swimming. To participate in the study, 135 adolescents were required to provide informed consent signed by a parent or guardian.

136 **Participants**

The inclusion criteria to be eligible were: (1) chronological age between 9 and 17 years at baseline; (2) no current use of medication that could affect bone metabolism, and (3) regular participation in school physical education classes (two hours per week). For sports group: (1) a minimum of 6 months of participation in the specific sport (considering previous studies) [31, 32]; (2) non-involvement in other sports. For control group: (1) the absence of previous engagement in organized and supervised sports before baseline measures (3 months) and during the 18 months of the study.

144 At baseline, 184 children and adolescents (108 males and 76 females) of both 145 sexes were recruited, after 9 months 126 adolescents (78 males and 48 females) 146 completed the second visit and 71 (42 males and 29 females) children and adolescents 147 completed the third visit over 18 months. The drop out of 113 children and adolescents 148 was mainly due to disinterest in continuing as a volunteer in the study, absence in the 149 scheduled measurement, and moving to another city in control group and interrupting 150 sports participation or being transferred to another team in sports group. The present study 151 included only valid data from the 3-time points (no missing data). Potential selection bias 152 (71 children and adolescents who remained versus those 113 children and adolescents 153 who dropout) was assessed through the differences at baseline. The groups were similar 154 to chronological age (t test; p-value = 0.126), body mass (t test; p-value = 0.072), height 155 (t test; p-value = 0.112), years from PHV (t test; p-value = 0.097), age of PHV (t test; 156 p=value = 0.983), fat mass (t test; p-value = 0.335), lean soft tissue (t test; p-value = 157 (0.322), upper limbs aBMD (t test; p-value = (0.272)), lower limbs aBMD (t test; p-value = (0.322)). 158 (0.230), total spine aBMD (t test; p-value = (0.150)) and whole body aBMD (t test; p-value 159 = 0.124). Lastly, the drop out predominantly occurred in control group (76.5%) compared 160 to non-impact (40.0%) and impact sports (52.2%) (chi-squared with p value = <0.001).

161 The present study included only valid data from the 3-time points. The control 162 group comprised 20 children and adolescents (12 males and 8 females). Sports were 163 categorized according to potential osteogenic impact. The impact group comprised 33 164 children and adolescents: basketball (8 males) and martial arts (11 males and 14 females 165 in karate and judo). Finally, the non-impact group comprised 18 adolescent swimmers 166 (11 males and 7 females) (figure 1). Athletes from karate and swimming participated in 167 competitions at the national level and the basketball players participated in state 168 tournaments. The remaining athletes (judo) competed at the regional level.

169

170 **Previous Sports Participation and Training Routine**

The athletes reported the time (in months) of practice. Similarly, coaches provided information about the volume and frequency of training (minutes trained daily and the number of days trained in a week, respectively). Exposure to resistance training was also consulted with coaches and athletes and considered as a confounding factor.

175

176 Anthropometry

177 Stature and sitting height were measured using a stadiometer (Sanny, model 178 American Medical of the Brazil Ltda, Brazil, accurate to 0.1 cm) that permitted an 179 estimate of maturity offset. The body mass was measured using an electronic scale 180 (Filizzola PL 150, model Filizzola Ltda, Brazil with a precision of 0.1 kg). All measures 181 were assessed using standardized techniques by a single trained researcher. The technical 182 errors of measurement were 0.041%, 0.110% and 0.157% for body mass, height, and 183 sitting-height, respectively.

184

185 **Body Composition and Bone Mineral Density**

186 Areal Bone mineral density (aBMD, g/cm²), lean soft tissue (LST, kg) and fat 187 mass (FM, kg) were measured at the university laboratory in a temperature-controlled 188 room using dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry (Lunar DPX-NT; General Electric 189 Healthcare, Little Chalfont, Buckinghamshire, UK) with GE Medical System Lunar 190 software (version 4.7). A trained researcher performed all scans and tested the scanner 191 quality before the first exam of each day. The coefficient of variation for this device was 192 0.66% (in whole body BMD analysis, n=30 participants not involved in this study). The 193 scans were performed using a standardized protocol with the participants remaining in 194 the supine position and wearing only light clothing, without shoes. Regional analysis of 195 BMD in upper limbs, lower limbs, total spine (cervical, thoracic and lumbar) and WBLH 196 occurred off-line after the scans took place [33] following the recommendations of 197 manufacturer recommendations and previous studies [34, 35]:

-Upper Limbs: measured considering the position of the line passing through in
upper edge of the acromial extremity of the clavicle and the lateral and medial lines
defined comprising all soft tissues (the same for right and left sides).

-Lower Limbs: measured considering the position of the line passing through on
the lower edge of the ischium and the lateral and medial lines defined comprising all soft
tissues (the same for right and left sides).

-Total Spine: Measured from the posterior-superior edge of iliac crest (L4/L5 level) to the lower edge of the chin. The lateral cut positioned as close as possible to the spine.

The bone mineral apparent density (BMAD-g/cm³) was calculated by the equation: $BMAD_{TB} = BMC/(total body BA^2/body height)$ proposed by Katzman et al. [30]. It is an approach that involves the calculation of bone mineral apparent density

210	(BMAD) by dividing bone mineral content (BMC) by the three-dimensional bone volume
211	derived from its two-dimensional projected bone area (BA).
212	
213	
214	Somatic Maturation
215	Anthropometric measurements (body mass, stature, and sitting height) were used
216	to calculate years from the age of peak height velocity (PHV) through mathematical
217	formulas predicted by Moore et al. [36]. This measure denotes the time remaining (years)
218	to reach the age of PHV. Finally, by subtracting chronological age by years from the peak
219	height velocity, it is possible to find the age of the peak height velocity (APHV).
220	
221	Years from age of PHV for males= -8.128741 + [0.0070346 * (Age * Sitting
222	Height)]
223	Years from age of PHV for females= -7.709133 + [0.0042232 * (Age * Stature)]
224	Age of PHV= Chronological age – years from age at PHV.
225	
226	R^2 =0.896 (SEE+0.542) in boys and R^2 =0.898 (SEE+0.528) in girls.
227	
228	Consumption of vitamin D
229	Utilizing a questionnaire about foods rich in vitamin D (commonly observed in a
230	Brazilian diet) made by a nutritionist. The adolescents reported the frequency of
231	consumption (Likert scale) during the previous week the evaluations. The sum of the
232	generated score was considered proxy of vitamin D intake and inserted in the analysis as
233	utilized in previous studies[24, 31].
234	

235

236 Statistical Analyses

The sample was calculated considering bone density gains (sport participant versus non-sport participant) of 0.05 g/cm² [24], considering a standard deviation of 0.07 g / cm², 80% power and 5% error-alpha. Taking into account all these parameters, the minimum sample size was estimated in 15 children and adolescents in each group.

241 Following checks for data distribution, the descriptive analyses were reported in 242 mean and standard deviation (SD), as well as appropriate 95% confidence levels. Analysis 243 of Variance - ANOVA was performed for initial comparisons between groups using 244 Bonferroni post-hoc test. ANOVA- repeated measures (3 groups x 3 time points) was 245 used for comparisons in aBMD accrual at different skeletal sites after adjustment for 246 APHV, LST of the specific site, volume of training, practice of resistance training 247 (Categorical variable [yes or no]), sporting experience (months), fat mass, height, vitamin 248 D intake and sex [23, 37] and the differences among groups observed through confidence 249 interval. The statistical analyses were performed using BioEstat (version 5.0) and the 250 significance level was set at p-value<0.05.

251 **Results**

252 Table 1 shows participants' descriptive characteristics at baseline by sport. 253 Seventy-one children and adolescents (42 males and 29 females) with valid data on the 254 three-time points were included. Control group showed significantly lower values for 255 height (p=0.041) and LST (p=0.001) than the non-impact group and lower LST also 256 compared to the impact group (p = 0.014). In addition, the non-impact group presented a 257 higher volume of training than the impact group (weekly training) (p=0.001). Comparisons of aBMD showed similar values among all groups at the total spine. 258 259 However, the impact group had significantly higher aBMD at the upper limbs (p=0.033), lower limbs (p=0.019) and WBLH (p=0.019) than the control group (table 1). Lastly,
non-impact sports showed lower BMAD of WBLH than impact sports (p=0.038) and also
control group (p=0.027).

The non-impact group presented significantly lower values of aBMD at the upper limbs (**Figure 2, Panel A**), compared to the impact group at 9 months (mean of 0.751 in non-impact sports vs. 0.828 in impact sports) and 18 months (mean of 0.782 in nonimpact sports vs. 0.869 in impact sports). Furthermore, the control group presented lower of aBMD at the upper limbs compared to the impact group in baseline (mean of 0.699 in control group vs. 0.770 in impact sports) and 18 months (mean of 0.795 in control group vs. 0.869 in impact sports).

270 Furthermore, there were significant differences in aBMD at lower limbs between 271 groups (Figure 2, Panel B), the non-impact group had significantly lower values 272 compared to the impact group in the three moments (mean of 1.063 vs. 1.179 at baseline; 273 mean of 1.112 vs. 1.234 in 9 months and 1.153 vs. 1.295 in 18 months in non-impact and 274 impact sports, respectively) and lower values compared to the control group in 9-months 275 (mean of 1.112 in non-impact vs. 1.226 in control group). Regarding aBMD in total spine, 276 the impact group presented significantly higher values compared to the non-impact group 277 at baseline (mean of 0.891 in non-impact vs. 0.974 in impact sports) (Figure 2, Panel C). 278 The non-impact sports group had significantly lower aBMD adjusted values in the 279 WBLH when compared to both the control group and impact sports at 9 months (mean of 280 0.935 in non-impact vs. 1.037 in impact sports and 1.037 for control group) and with the 281 impact group at baseline (0.908 in non-impact vs. 0.992 in impact sports) and 18-months 282 (0.977 in non-impact sports vs. 1.096 in impact sports) (Figure 2, Panel D). There was 283 a significant interaction between "time*sport" at the upper limbs (p = 0.042) and the 284 WBLH (p = 0.006) aBMD. The sport practiced significantly affected all bone variables

(upper limbs, p = 0.001, lower limbs, p = 0.001; total spine, p = 0.013; WBLH, p = 0.001)
over the 18-month studied period.

287 When analyzing BMAD of whole body, more expressive differences were 288 observed between the groups. The non-impact group showed significant lower values 289 compared to the impact group and control group in 9 months (mean of 0.081 in non-290 impact sport vs. 0.094 in control group and 0.091 for impact sports) and 18 months (mean 291 of 0.081 vs. 0.091 and 0.031 for non-impact, control group and impact group, 292 respectively) and the impact group at baseline (mean of 0.085 in non-impact sport vs. 293 0.093 in impact group) (Figure 3). The time (p=0.002) and sport practiced (p<0.001) 294 significantly affected the BMAD, as well there was a significant interaction between 295 "time*sport (p<0.001).

296

297 Discussion

The main findings of the present study indicate that children and adolescents involved in impact sports, such as basketball and marital arts, over a period of 18-months have significantly higher adjusted aBMD and BMAD accrual compared to non-impact sports, such as swimming. Furthermore, swimmers also have a significantly lower aBMD and BMAD accrual at the WBLH and lower limbs compared to the control group.

These findings might be explained due to: 1) the specific training characteristics of each sport [11, 25]; 2) the different forces continuously applied to the skeleton over a long period of time [10, 38, 39].

306 Understanding the association of sports participation and bone health during 307 adolescence has been debated in the literature [24, 40, 41]. The findings of the present 308 study show that participation in impact sports, such as basketball and martial arts, affects 309 differently the aBMD and BMAD accrual of which they found to have higher aBMD and 310 BMAD compared to adolescents practicing non-impact sports, such as swimming. These 311 results confirmed our hypothesis that the impact sports are beneficial for aBMD accrual 312 [25]. Prolonged exposure in impact sports can increase the mechanical loading on the 313 bone matrix. Sports modalities, such as basketball and martial arts (modalities of our 314 study) involve movements, such as jumps, sprints, changes of direction, high impact and 315 start stops. These movements generate compressions and tensions in the bones [11, 39] 316 generating a process of metabolic stress and consequently stimulating bone formation 317 [10, 38].

318 A study of Zribi et al assessed bone outcomes in prepubescent adolescent 319 basketball athletes aged 11.1 years compared to controls [19]. It was found that basketball 320 players had significantly higher BMC at upper, lower limbs and WBLH than controls, 321 which is in accordance with the results of the current study. A different study of Ito et al 322 showed that 9-months of judo participation improved significantly aBMD accrual 323 compared to controls in males aged 12.9 years [42]. Furthermore, previous evidence 324 shows that bone adaptations are site-specific, according to the skeletal sites stimulated by 325 the sport specific patterns [43]. Previous studies indicate that the skeletal sites most 326 benefited by the practice of the specific sport are those directly stimulated, such as legs 327 aBMD in basketball players [24], arms BMD for judo fighters [21], dominant foot in 328 adolescent footballers [7] and dominant arm in tennis players [20].

Results from the current study are also supported by a recent cross-sectional study involving adolescent football, swimming and cycling adolescent male athletes [44]. The study concluded that adolescent males involved in weight-bearing sports, such as football, had higher bone mass, bone geometry, and bone stiffness than those involved in nonweight bearing sports, such as swimming and cycling. The same study found that swimming and cycling adolescent athletes presented similar bone status with an active control group, and the authors called for more longitudinal studies to understand the
association of the 'non-osteogenic' sports participation and bone accrual during growth,
which was investigated in the current study.

338 In the present study, the swimmers presented significantly lower aBMD and 339 BMAD compared to the impact sports athletes in most skeletal sites and at all three time 340 points (except at baseline at the upper limbs) and in BMD of lower limbs (9-months), 341 WBLH (9-months) and BMAD of WBLH (9-months and 18-months) compared to control 342 group. Interestingly, in a systematic review and meta-analysis by Gomez-Bruton et al 343 [45], analyzed the effect of swimming during childhood and adolescence and found lower 344 values of BMD in swimmers compared to weight-bearing sports. These results 345 corroborate our findings, however, the systematic review also concluded that swimmers 346 show similar values of BMD compared to the control group, unlike the results of our 347 study. Considering that the meta-analysis counted only one longitudinal study, due to the 348 absence of longitudinal studies in the literature, the long-term swimming practice during 349 adolescence may cause lower bone development compared to controls, as found in the 350 present study.

351 Interestingly, the study of Vlachopoulos et al. (2018) [25] found similar results of 352 BMD among swimmers and control group, however, this study was developed with a 353 shorter duration (12 months) and the average weekly training of swimmers was 9.4 hours 354 at baseline while our swimmers practiced 16.6 hours per week. The longer time in training 355 (without impact) could explain the lower values of aBMD and BMAD (WBLH) 356 compared to the control group in our study. Finally, it is important to highlight that the 357 use of bone mineral apparent density (BMAD) allows a more precise analysis of the 358 results, mainly because considers the height of the adolescents, variable which affects 359 comparisons using the areal bone mineral density.

360 In our sample, swimmers presented significantly higher values of lean mass than 361 controls and the literature has emphasized a positive relationship between lean mass and 362 aBMD, even in swimmers [16, 46]. For this reason, adjustments were made by lean mass 363 in order to specifically analyze the association of sports participation and aBMD/BMAD 364 by removing the effect of lean mass. Thus, the present findings indicate that participation 365 in "hypogravity" environment without gravitational loading, such as swimming, may 366 have negative association with WBLH bone development despite the higher lean mass 367 values [40].

368 The results of our study were similar with the literature in terms of bone 369 adaptations in skeletal segments (upper and lower limbs) and it highlights the hypothesis 370 that swimming has a non-osteogenic effect in both upper and lower limbs. A recent study 371 by Agostinete et al. [16] focusing on the impact of the training load on the bone health of 372 swimmers, found a negative relationship between lower aBMD at limbs and total body 373 with training load, but not in upper limbs in adolescent swimmers of both sexes. During 374 swimming practice, most of the movements are produced in the horizontal plane, 375 producing forces mainly from the upper limbs, thus reducing the function of the lower 376 limbs only for stabilizing [47]. The forces concentrated in the upper limbs might activate 377 muscle-bone unit to respond differently. Another study developed by Greene et al. [48] 378 in female adolescent water polo athletes strengthens this hypothesis by indicating that 379 there were no significant benefits in bone structure in water polo athletes compared with 380 controls at the lower limbs while in the upper limbs, adolescent female water polo athletes 381 had greater bone strength index at the distal radius compared to non-active girls. The 382 swimming training routine may be related to inhibition of the GH / IGF-1 axis and 383 increased inflammatory markers in the bloodstream generating catabolic responses in 384 bone tissue [49].

385 The strengths of this study include the longitudinal follow-up of 18 months in 386 different sports groups. The limitations should also be acknowledged. Firstly, we adopted 387 as inclusion criteria the non-engagement in organized and supervised sports for a 388 minimum period of three months, which is sufficient detraining for significant reductions 389 in physical capacities [50], however, it is plausible that this period should be not sufficient 390 for deficits in exercise's adaptations on BMD. In addition, the minimum sample size was 391 reached only when both sexes are gathered, limiting sex-specific analyses, as well as 392 analysis considering specific sports (impact sports group gathered different sports 393 assuming they have similar mechanical loading [basketball, karate, and judo]). Finally, 394 prolonged exposure in intensive training sessions during growth can be associated with a 395 reduced habitual physical activity practice compared to non-active adolescents as 396 previously analyzed by the literature in swimmers [51], which was not assessed in the 397 present study.

In summary, the present study indicates that children and adolescents engaged in impact sports (basketball and martial arts) accumulate significantly higher aBMD and BMAD compared to children and adolescents engaged in non-impact sports (swimming) over a period of 18 months. Moreover, swimmers had similar values compared to the control group in upper, total spine, and significantly lower limbs, aBMD and BMAD of WBLH compared to the control group. These findings suggest that long-term participation in swimming may not be beneficial for bone health.

405 Most studies in the literature focusing on analysis of different sports modalities 406 on bone health are cross-sectional in design. This cohort study followed children and 407 adolescents for 18 months and indicates that those who were engaged in non-impact 408 sports presented lower aBMD and BMAD accrual compared to those one who were 409 engaged in impact sports. These findings hint that it is important of weight-bearing410 exercises on training routines in order to promote bone health.

411

412 **REFERENCES**

- Pérez-López FR, Chedraui P, Cuadros-López JL (2010) Bone mass gain during
 puberty and adolescence: deconstructing gender characteristics. Curr Med Chem
 17:453–66. doi: 10.2174/092986710790226138
- 416 2. Baxter-Jones ADG, Faulkner RA, Forwood MR, et al (2011) Bone mineral
 417 accrual from 8 to 30 years of age: an estimation of peak bone mass. J Bone Miner
 418 Res 26:1729–39 . doi: 10.1002/jbmr.412
- 419 3. Rizzoli R, Bianchi ML, Garabédian M, et al (2010) Maximizing bone mineral
 420 mass gain during growth for the prevention of fractures in the adolescents and the
 421 elderly. Bone 46:294–305 . doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2009.10.005
- 422 4. Smith DM, Nance WE, Kang KW, et al (1973) Genetic factors in determining
 423 bone mass. J Clin Invest 52:2800–8. doi: 10.1172/JCI107476
- 424 5. Vasikaran S, Cooper C, Eastell R, et al (2011) International Osteoporosis
 425 Foundation and International Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory
 426 Medicine position on bone marker standards in osteoporosis. Clin Chem Lab
 427 Med 49:1271–4. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2011.602
- Mouratidou T, Vicente-Rodriguez G, Gracia-Marco L, et al (2013) Associations
 of Dietary Calcium, Vitamin D, Milk Intakes, and 25-Hydroxyvitamin D With
 Bone Mass in Spanish Adolescents: The HELENA Study. J Clin Densitom
 16:110–117. doi: 10.1016/j.jocd.2012.07.008
- Vlachopoulos D, Barker AR, Williams CA, et al (2017) The Impact of Sport
 Participation on Bone Mass and Geometry in Male Adolescents. Med Sci Sports
 Exerc 49:317–326. doi: 10.1249/MSS.000000000001091
- 435 8. Eisman JA (1999) Genetics of osteoporosis. Endocr Rev 20:788–804 . doi:
 436 10.1210/edrv.20.6.0384
- 437 9. Kohrt WM, Bloomfield SA, Little KD, et al (2004) American College of Sports

		18
438 439		Medicine Position Stand: physical activity and bone health. Med Sci Sports Exerc 36:1985–96. doi: 10.1249/01.mss.0000142662.21767.58
440 441 442	10.	Tenforde AS, Fredericson M (2011) Influence of sports participation on bone health in the young athlete: a review of the literature. PM R 3:861–7 . doi: 10.1016/j.pmrj.2011.05.019
443 444	11.	Rauch F, Bailey DA, Baxter-Jones A, et al (2004) The "muscle-bone unit" during the pubertal growth spurt. Bone 34:771–5 . doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2004.01.022
445 446 447	12.	Strong WB, Malina RM, Blimkie CJR, et al (2005) Evidence based physical activity for school-age youth. J Pediatr 146:732–7 . doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2005.01.055
448 449 450	13.	Patel DR, Yamasaki A, Brown K (2017) Epidemiology of sports-related musculoskeletal injuries in young athletes in United States. Transl Pediatr 6:160– 166 . doi: 10.21037/tp.2017.04.08
451 452 453	14.	Ubago-Guisado E, Gómez-Cabello A, Sánchez-Sánchez J, et al (2015) Influence of different sports on bone mass in growing girls. J Sports Sci 33:1710–1718 . doi: 10.1080/02640414.2015.1004639
454 455 456	15.	Ubago-Guisado E, García-Unanue J, López-Fernández J, et al (2017) Association of different types of playing surfaces with bone mass in growing girls. J Sports Sci 35:1484–1492 . doi: 10.1080/02640414.2016.1223328
457 458 459 460	16.	Agostinete R, Maillane-Vanegas S, Lynch KR, et al (2017) The impact of training load on bone mineral density of adolescent swimmers: A structural equation modeling approach. Pediatr Exerc Sci 29:520–528 . doi: 10.1123/pes.2017-0008
461 462 463 464	17.	Bielemann RM, Martinez-Mesa J, Gigante DP (2013) Physical activity during life course and bone mass: a systematic review of methods and findings from cohort studies with young adults. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 14:77 . doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-14-77
465 466 467	18.	Nikander R, Kannus P, Rantalainen T, et al (2010) Cross-sectional geometry of weight-bearing tibia in female athletes subjected to different exercise loadings. Osteoporos Int 21:1687–94 . doi: 10.1007/s00198-009-1101-0

		19
468 469 470	19.	Zribi A, Zouch M, Chaari H, et al (2014) Enhanced bone mass and physical fitness in prepubescent basketball players. J Clin Densitom 17:156–62 . doi: 10.1016/j.jocd.2013.04.001
471 472 473	20.	Ireland A, Maden-Wilkinson T, McPhee J, et al (2013) Upper limb muscle-bone asymmetries and bone adaptation in elite youth tennis players. Med Sci Sports Exerc 45:1749–58 . doi: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e31828f882f
474 475 476	21.	Ito IH, Mantovani AM, Agostinete RR, et al (2016) Practice of martial arts and bone mineral density in adolescents of both sexes. Rev Paul Pediatr (English Ed 34:210–215 . doi: 10.1016/j.rppede.2015.09.003
477 478 479	22.	Tervo T, Nordström P, Nordström A (2010) Effects of badminton and ice hockey on bone mass in young males: a 12-year follow-up. Bone 47:666–72 . doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2010.06.022
480 481 482	23.	Vlachopoulos D, Ubago-Guisado E, Barker AR, et al (2017) Determinants of Bone Outcomes in Adolescent Athletes at Baseline: The PRO-BONE Study. Med Sci Sports Exerc 49:1389–1396 . doi: 10.1249/MSS.00000000001233
483 484 485 486	24.	Agostinete RR, Lynch KR, Gobbo LA, et al (2016) Basketball Affects Bone Mineral Density Accrual in Boys More Than Swimming and Other Impact Sports: 9-mo Follow-Up. J Clin Densitom 19:375–81 . doi: 10.1016/j.jocd.2016.04.006
487 488 489 490	25.	Vlachopoulos D, Barker AR, Ubago-Guisado E, et al (2018) The effect of 12- month participation in osteogenic and non-osteogenic sports on bone development in adolescent male athletes. The PRO-BONE study. J Sci Med Sport 21:404–409 . doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2017.08.018
491 492 493	26.	Zouch M, Vico L, Frere D, et al (2014) Young male soccer players exhibit additional bone mineral acquisition during the peripubertal period: 1-year longitudinal study. Eur J Pediatr 173:53–61 . doi: 10.1007/s00431-013-2115-3
494 495 496	27.	Collins AC, Ward KD, McClanahan BS, et al (2019) Bone Accrual in Children and Adolescent Nonelite Swimmers: A 2-Year Longitudinal Study. Clin J Sport Med 29:43–48 . doi: 10.1097/JSM.0000000000484
497	28.	Behringer M, Gruetzner S, McCourt M, Mester J (2014) Effects of weight-

		20
498		bearing activities on bone mineral content and density in children and
499		adolescents: a meta-analysis. J Bone Miner Res 29:467-78 . doi:
500		10.1002/jbmr.2036
501	29.	Zouch M, Zribi A, Alexandre C, et al Soccer increases bone mass in
502		prepubescent boys during growth: a 3-yr longitudinal study. J Clin Densitom
503		18:179-86 . doi: 10.1016/j.jocd.2014.10.004
504	30.	Katzman DK, Bachrach LK, Carter DR, Marcus R (1991) Clinical and
505		anthropometric correlates of bone mineral acquisition in healthy adolescent girls.
506		J Clin Endocrinol Metab 73:1332–9 . doi: 10.1210/jcem-73-6-1332
507	31.	Maillane-Vanegas S, Agostinete RR, R Lynch K, et al (2018) Bone Mineral
508		Density and Sports Participation. J Clin Densitom (in press). doi:
509		10.1016/j.jocd.2018.05.041
510	32.	Petit MA, McKay HA, MacKelvie KJ, et al (2002) A randomized school-based
511		jumping intervention confers site and maturity-specific benefits on bone
512		structural properties in girls: a hip structural analysis study. J Bone Miner Res
513		17:363-72 . doi: 10.1359/jbmr.2002.17.3.363
514	33.	International Society for Clinical Densitometry (2013) Skeletal Health
515		Assessment In Children from Infancy to Adolescence
516	34.	Moreira OC, Oliveira CEP de, De Paz JA (2018) Dual energy X-ray
517		absorptiometry (DXA) reliability and intraobserver reproducibility for segmental
518		body composition measuring. Nutr Hosp 35:340-345 . doi: 10.20960/nh.1295
519	35.	GE Healthcare Lunar (2010) enCORE-Based X-ray Bone Densitometer: User
520		Manual
521	36.	Moore SA, McKay HA, Macdonald H, et al (2015) Enhancing a somatic maturity
522		prediction model. Med Sci Sports Exerc 47:1755–1764 . doi:
523		10.1249/MSS.000000000000588
524	37.	Wilkinson K, Vlachopoulos D, Klentrou P, et al (2017) Soft tissues, areal bone
525		mineral density and hip geometry estimates in active young boys: the PRO-
526		BONE study. Eur J Appl Physiol 117:833-842 . doi: 10.1007/s00421-017-3568-2
527	38.	Seeman E (2002) An exercise in geometry. J Bone Miner Res 17:373-80 . doi:

		21
528		10.1359/jbmr.2002.17.3.373
529 530 531	39.	Hind K, Burrows M (2007) Weight-bearing exercise and bone mineral accrual in children and adolescents: a review of controlled trials. Bone 40:14–27 . doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2006.07.006
532 533 534 535	40.	Ferry B, Duclos M, Burt L, et al (2011) Bone geometry and strength adaptations to physical constraints inherent in different sports: Comparison between elite female soccer players and swimmers. J Bone Miner Metab 29:342–351 . doi: 10.1007/s00774-010-0226-8
536 537 538	41.	Dias Quiterio AL, Carnero EA, Baptista FM, Sardinha LB (2011) Skeletal mass in adolescent male athletes and nonathletes: relationships with high-impact sports. J strength Cond Res 25:3439–47 . doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e318216003b
539 540 541 542	42.	Ito IH, Kemper HCG, Agostinete RR, et al (2017) Impact of Martial Arts (Judo, Karate, and Kung Fu) on Bone Mineral Density Gains in Adolescents of Both Genders: 9-Month Follow-Up. Pediatr Exerc Sci 29:496–503 . doi: 10.1123/pes.2017-0019
543 544 545 546	43.	Duckham RL, Baxter-Jones ADG, Johnston JD, et al (2014) Does physical activity in adolescence have site-specific and sex-specific benefits on young adult bone size, content, and estimated strength? J Bone Miner Res 29:479–86 . doi: 10.1002/jbmr.2055
547 548 549 550	44.	Vlachopoulos D, Barker AR, Ubago-Guisado E, et al (2017) Longitudinal Adaptations of Bone Mass, Geometry, and Metabolism in Adolescent Male Athletes: The PRO-BONE Study. J Bone Miner Res 32:2269–2277 . doi: 10.1002/jbmr.3206
551 552 553 554	45.	Gomez-Bruton A, Montero-Marín J, González-Agüero A, et al (2016) The Effect of Swimming During Childhood and Adolescence on Bone Mineral Density: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Sports Med 46:365–79 . doi: 10.1007/s40279-015-0427-3
555 556 557	46.	Ubago-Guisado E, Vlachopoulos D, Ferreira de Moraes AC, et al (2017) Lean mass explains the association between muscular fitness and bone outcomes in 13- year-old boys. Acta Paediatr 106:1658–1665 . doi: 10.1111/apa.13972

		22
558	47.	Gourgoulis V, Boli A, Aggeloussis N, et al (2014) The effect of leg kick on
559		sprint front crawl swimming. J Sports Sci 32:278-89 . doi:
560		10.1080/02640414.2013.823224
561	48.	Greene DA, Naughton GA, Bradshaw E, et al (2012) Mechanical loading with or
562		without weight-bearing activity: influence on bone strength index in elite female
563		adolescent athletes engaged in water polo, gymnastics, and track-and-field. J
564		Bone Miner Metab 30:580-7 . doi: 10.1007/s00774-012-0360-6
565	49.	Nemet D, Oh Y, Kim H-S, et al (2002) Effect of intense exercise on
566		inflammatory cytokines and growth mediators in adolescent boys. Pediatrics
567		110:681-689 . doi: 10.1542/peds.110.4.681
568	50.	Ormsbee MJ, Arciero PJ (2012) Detraining increases body fat and weight and
569		decreases VO2peak and metabolic rate. J strength Cond Res 26:2087-95 . doi:
570		10.1519/JSC.0b013e31823b874c
571	51.	Gómez-Bruton A, González-Agüero A, Gómez-Cabello A, et al (2016)
572		Swimming and bone: Is low bone mass due to hypogravity alone or does other
573		physical activity influence it? Osteoporos Int 27:1785-93 . doi: 10.1007/s00198-
574		015-3448-8

	Control Group	Non-Impact sport	Impact Sports	
	(n= 20, 12 males)	(n=18, 11 males)	(n=33, 19 males)	
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	p-value
Chronological age (years)	12.6 (2.6)	12.7 (1.2)	12.7 (1.3)	0.955
Body mass (kg)	46.6 (12.4)	53.7 (11.2)	53.7 (14.7)	0.134
Height (cm)	153.9 (11.6)	164.0 (10.5) ^a	159.8 (13.9)	0.049
Years from PHV (years)	-2.7 (1.2)	-1.9 (1.7)	-2.3 (1.6)	0.290
APHV (years)	15.4 (2.1)	14.8 (1.3)	15.0 (1.2)	0.459
Lean soft tissue (kg)	30.3 (6.7)	40.8 (8.6) ^a	37.5 (9.7) ^a	0.001
Fat mass (kg)	13.2 (7.4)	9.8 (4.8)	14.1 (9.8)	0.197
Fat mass (%)	27.2 (10.0)	18.1 (7.3) ^a	23.4 (9.7)	0.014
fat mass of trunk (%)	28.5 (10.7)	19.9 (8.0) ^a	25.4 (10.6)	0.032
Areal bone mineral density				
(g/cm ²)				
Upper limbs	0.685 (0.077)	0.750 (0.071)	0.766 (0.142) ^a	0.039
Lower limbs	1.085 (0.145)	1.115 (0.134)	1.197 (0.142) ^a	0.016
Total spine	0.894 (0.184)	0.957 (0.106)	0.996 (0.138)	0.055
WBLH	0.915 (0.118)	0.953 (0.094)	1.003 (0.115) ^a	0.023
BMAD-WBLH	0.091 (0.008)	0.085 (0.004) ^a	0.090 (0.007) ^b	0.016
Training parameters				
Weekly training (min/week)		1001 (196)	664 (369) ^b	0.001
Sporting experience (months)		56.2 (38.9)	39.9 (31.2)	0.139
RT (number athletes)		11	13	-

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of the sample stratified by sports at baseline (n=71)

Significant differences among the groups (ANOVA) in bold. a= denotes significant difference compared to Control; b= denotes significant different compared to Swimmers; SD (standard deviation); PHV= peak height velocity; APHV= age of peak height velocity; RT= resistance training; BMAD= Bone mineral apparent density; WBLH=Whole body less head.



Figure 1. Flowchart of the study design



601 602

Figure 2. Areal bone mineral density (aBMD, g/cm²) status among adolescents of impact sports, non-603 impact sport and control group adjusted by age of PHV, lean soft tissue, volume of training, practice of 604 resistance training, sporting experience, fat mass, height, vitamin D intake and sex. *significant difference 605 between non-impact and impact sports; " α significant difference between non-impact and control group; 606 [#]significant difference between impact sports and control group. Values between brackets represent the 607 percentage difference between the groups.



Figure 3. Bone mineral apparent density (,g/cm³) status among adolescents of impact sports, non-impact
 sport and control group adjusted by age of PHV, lean soft tissue, volume of training, practice of resistance

611 training, sporting experience, fat mass, height, vitamin D intake and sex. *significant difference between 612 non-impact and impact sports; α significant difference between non-impact and control group. Values

613 between brackets represent the percentage difference between the groups.