SAMPLE VOLLEYBALL PLAYER REPORT

Volleyball · Age 21 · 2.00 m · 98 kg · Test / Report Date: 07.09.2026

Athlete Information & Test Scope

Field	Information	Field	Information
Name	Sample Volleyball Player	Dominant Side	Not specified
Age	21	Injury History	Not reported
Sport	Volleyball	Test / Report Date	07.09.2026
Height / Weight	2.00 m · 98 kg	Test System	VALD ForceFrame, NordBord, ForceDecks

This assessment contains no body composition (InBody), gait/plantar pressure analysis or clinical examination data; dominant side and injury history were also not declared. Interpretations are based solely on VALD measurement data.

Balance & Landing Control (Stabilisation Time) — *VALD ForceDecks — Time to Stabilisation*

Test	Left	Right	Asymmetry
Single-Leg Land & Hold (single-leg landing)	1.40 s (37th pct.)	0.89 s (69th pct.)	**36% (left slower)**
Land & Hold (double-leg landing — bilateral total)	1.57 s (24th pct.)		**11% (left slower)**

Colour code: green ≤10% · orange 10–15% · red >15% asymmetry (Bishop 2018). In stabilisation tests a higher value means slower, i.e. the lagging side. ***Landing control is the weakest area in this report.*** *Single-leg stabilisation time is 1.40 s on the left (37th percentile) and 0.89 s on the right (69th percentile), a 36% asymmetry. In double-leg landing, bilateral total time is 1.57 s, 24th percentile — both slow and left-weighted. The left side lags in both tests; there is a consistent side deficit.*

Strength & Symmetry — *VALD ForceFrame & NordBord — Max Force*

Test	Left	Right	Asymmetry
Nordic Hamstring	462 N (82nd pct.)	495 N (90th pct.)	**6.7%**
Knee Extension — Supine (90°)	334 N (62nd pct.)	380 N (76th pct.)	**12%**

Muscle Balance Ratios	Left	Right	Reference
Hip Add : Abd (45°)	1.43	1.38	≥0.80 target
Shoulder IR : ER (supine 90°)	1.12	1.29	≈1.0–1.5 band

In strength tests the ***lower value*** *is the lagging side. Hip Add:Abd target ≥0.80 (Thorborg); shoulder IR:ER band ≈1.0–1.5 (Ellenbecker; ER:IR 0.66–0.75). Hamstring strength is high and symmetrical (462/495 N; 82nd–90th percentile). The 12% left deficit in knee extension is in the monitoring band and absolute level lags the Nordic (62nd–76th percentile). Hip Add:Abd ratio is well above target. Shoulder IR:ER ratios are within the reference band.*

Functional Performance — Jump & Power — *VALD ForceDecks*

Test	Value	Percentile / Comment
Countermovement Jump — Jump Height	51.4 cm	89th percentile — well above average

Jump capacity is very high (51.4 cm — 89th percentile). However, this power is not controlled in the landing phase: ***the gap between 89th percentile jump and 24th–37th percentile landing control is the key clinical finding of this report*** *and raises landing-related loading risk.*

Findings Summary & Risk Ranking

Priority	Finding	Value	Risk
1	Single-leg landing stabilisation asymmetry (left slower)	36%	**High**
2	Jump–landing control gap	89th vs 24–37th	**High**
3	Bilateral landing total time	1.57 s — 24th pct.	**Moderate-High**
4	Knee extension asymmetry (left deficit)	12%	**Moderate**
5	Nordic hamstring asymmetry	6.7%	**Within normal**

SAMPLE VOLLEYBALL PLAYER REPORT

Volleyball · Age 21 · 2.00 m · 98 kg · Test / Report Date: 07.09.2026

Specialist Assessments

PHYSICIAN / HEALTH ASSESSMENT

The athlete (21) reports no injury history. Strength and jump capacity are very good. However, **landing control clearly lags, with a consistent deficit on the left**. The combination of high jump and poor landing control warrants attention.

Key findings

- **CMJ 51.4 cm (89th percentile) — single-leg landing 1.40/0.89 s (37th/69th percentile):** the athlete produces high force but struggles to absorb it in the landing phase. This profile creates loading risk for the knee and ankle.
- **Single-leg landing 36% and double-leg landing 11% asymmetry — both against the left;** accompanied by the 12% left deficit in knee extension. There is a consistent left-side cluster.
- **Nordic 462/495 N** — hamstring strength and symmetry are good; the picture does not stem from the posterior chain.

Clinical advice

- Past injury, pain, giving way and swelling of the left knee and ankle should be questioned in detail; **an unreported history is possible.**
- If symptoms are present, a clinical exam of the left knee and ankle should be done.
- Given the high-jump / poor-landing-control profile, high-intensity plyometric volume should be limited until landing control improves.

Conclusion

- **No barrier to participation; however, high-volume jump-landing load should be progressed gradually.** Priority is landing control; a follow-up test is advised after 6–8 weeks.

Physician (MD) _____

Name / Signature

PHYSIOTHERAPIST ASSESSMENT

Priority order: (1) left single-leg landing control, (2) overall landing/eccentric absorption capacity, (3) left knee extension strength, (4) maintaining current jump level.

Interpretation of findings

- Force and power production are sufficient; the deficit lies entirely in force absorption and neuromuscular control.
- Left-side deficits in landing (36%), bilateral landing (11%) and knee extension (12%) all pointing the same way is not coincidental.
- A bilateral total time of 1.57 s (24th percentile) shows the issue is not only asymmetry but overall absorption capacity.

Programme recommendation (8–12 weeks)

- **Eccentric/landing block:** controlled drop landing (starting from low height), single-leg landing, hop & stick, slow-eccentric-tempo squat/split squat; 3 sessions per week.
- **Left single-leg control:** perturbation balance, lateral and rotational landing progression.
- **Left knee extension:** single-leg leg press, split squat; 4–6 rep range, 2 sessions per week.
- **Plyometric volume management:** end the set as soon as landing quality drops; quality takes priority over volume.

Follow-up criteria

- Repeat landing test at weeks 6–8. Targets: **single-leg landing asymmetry <20%**, left-side time <1.00 s.
- Full VALD battery at week 12. Targets: bilateral landing time <1.10 s, knee extension asymmetry <10%, CMJ maintained.

PT _____

Name / Signature

SAMPLE VOLLEYBALL PLAYER REPORT

Volleyball · Age 21 · 2.00 m · 98 kg · Test / Report Date: 07.09.2026

Field Recommendations for the Coach

TRAINING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE COACH (FIELD)

Priority: Landing control — jump 89th percentile, landing control 24th–37th percentile; this gap should be closed.

Weekly field application

- **Before every session (8–10 min):** controlled landing block — drop landing from low height, with a 2-second hold (stick).
- **3 sessions per week:** left single-leg hop & stick, lateral and rotational landing progression 3×5.
- **2 eccentric sessions per week:** slow-tempo (3–4 s) squat and split squat 3×6 — for force absorption.
- **Strength day:** left-leg-first single-leg leg press 4×6.

Volleyball-specific application

- At 98 kg and 200 cm, landing loads are high; **equal two-foot contact on spike and block landings should be applied as a technical rule.**
- Landing quality deteriorates quickly with fatigue; maximal-jump repetitions at the end of sessions should be reduced.

Load management & points to watch

- **Plyometric and maximal jump volume should be limited for the first 6 weeks;** increase it as landing control improves.
- Jump capacity is already high; aim to maintain it, not increase it.

Note: These assessments are general interpretations based on test data; they do not replace an in-person clinical examination, physiotherapy assessment or individual nutrition counselling. This document is a sample volleyball player report prepared to introduce the SPV GEN AI reporting format; athlete identifying details have been removed.