===
Exploring Periodization and Macrocycle Planning: Athlete and Coach Insights
===

Crisanto V. Cipriano
College Instructor, Western Mindanao State University, Zamboanga City, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4649-7601

Osias Kit T. Kilag
Principal, PAU Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc., Mercado St., Poblacion, Toledo City, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0845-3373

Rainlee B. Echavez
Teacher I, Granada Elementary School, South Granada, Boljoon, Cebu, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7839-591X

April Rose G. Taboada
Teacher III, Department of Education, Schools Division of Toledo City, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1725-0580

John Francis P. Book
Teacher I, Department of Education, Schools Division of Toledo City, Philippines,
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8054-1373

Jason Isaac III A. Rabi
Teacher I, Department of Education, Schools Division of Toledo City, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0912-2058

Abstract:

This systematic review examines the principles, challenges, and emerging trends in periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training. Drawing on a comprehensive analysis of existing literature, the study reveals a diverse array of periodization approaches, ranging from traditional linear and undulating models to innovative strategies such as block periodization and hybrid models. Coaches face various challenges in macrocycle planning, including fluctuating player availability, external scheduling constraints, and limited resources, necessitating adaptability and communication to optimize training outcomes. An emerging trend highlighted in the review is the integration of wearable technology and data analytics, enabling real-time physiological monitoring and individualized training prescription. Moreover, the study emphasizes the critical importance of individualization and flexibility in periodization and macrocycle planning, recognizing athletes as unique individuals with distinct physiological and psychological characteristics. By addressing challenges, embracing technological advancements, and prioritizing individualized programming, coaches can optimize training effectiveness and enhance performance outcomes in athletic training.

Keywords: Periodization, macrocycle planning, athletic training, individualization, flexibility, wearable technology

Introduction:

Periodization and macrocycle planning are crucial components of athletic training, particularly in sports that require peak performance at specific times. Periodization refers to the systematic planning of athletic training, involving the division of a training program into distinct phases or periods, each focusing on different aspects of physical conditioning and performance enhancement. Macrocycle planning, on the other hand, involves organizing these periods into longer-term training cycles, often spanning several months or even years, with the goal of optimizing performance for major competitions or events.

The effectiveness of periodization and macrocycle planning strategies can significantly impact an athlete's performance and long-term development. However, the optimal approaches to periodization and macrocycle planning can vary depending on factors such as the sport, the individual athlete's characteristics, training goals, and competitive schedule. Therefore, gaining insights from athletes and coaches who have firsthand experience with these planning methods is essential for understanding their practical application and effectiveness.

This research paper aims to explore periodization and macrocycle planning from the perspectives of athletes and coaches, drawing on insights gathered through a systematic review of existing literature. By synthesizing and analyzing the findings of relevant studies, this paper seeks to provide a comprehensive overview of current practices, challenges, and innovative approaches in periodization and macrocycle planning in various sports disciplines.

By critically examining the existing literature and integrating insights from athletes and coaches, this research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of periodization and macrocycle planning practices in sports performance optimization. Ultimately, the findings of this study may inform the development of more effective and tailored training programs, enhancing the performance and success of athletes across various sports disciplines.

Literature Review:

Periodization and macrocycle planning are fundamental concepts in the realm of athletic training, essential for optimizing performance and achieving peak results during competitive events. This literature review aims to delve into the existing body of research surrounding periodization and macrocycle planning, drawing insights from studies conducted across various sports disciplines. By synthesizing findings from scholarly articles, this review seeks to provide a comprehensive overview of the principles, strategies, and practical implications of periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training.

Periodization:
Periodization is a systematic approach to structuring training programs, involving the division of the training cycle into distinct phases or periods, each focusing on different aspects of physical conditioning and performance enhancement. Bompa and Haff (2009) assert that periodization is grounded in the principle of progressive overload, whereby training intensity and volume are systematically manipulated over time to optimize adaptations and minimize the risk of overtraining. This strategic manipulation of training variables allows athletes to peak at specific times, aligning their physical preparedness with the demands of competition.

Issurin (2010) expands upon traditional periodization models by introducing the concept of block periodization, which involves the organization of training into shorter, more focused blocks, each targeting specific physiological adaptations. Block periodization offers greater flexibility and specificity in training prescription, enabling coaches to address individual weaknesses and optimize performance outcomes.

Mujika and Padilla (2000) highlight the importance of understanding the detraining phenomenon, wherein athletes experience a loss of training-induced adaptations following periods of reduced training stimulus. This underscores the significance of maintaining appropriate training volume and intensity throughout the entire macrocycle to prevent detraining effects and sustain performance gains.

Macrocycle Planning:
Macrocycle planning involves the organization of training phases into longer-term cycles, typically spanning several months or even years, with the overarching goal of peaking for major competitions or events. Stone, Stone, and Sands (2007) emphasize the role of macrocycle planning in coordinating the progression of training stimuli and managing recovery periods to maximize performance gains while minimizing the risk of overtraining or burnout.

Verkhoshansky and Siff (2009) advocate for a holistic approach to macrocycle planning, considering not only physical conditioning but also factors such as technical skill development, psychological readiness, and injury prevention. This comprehensive perspective underscores the multifaceted nature of athletic preparation and the need for integrated planning strategies that address all aspects of performance optimization.

Athlete and Coach Perspectives:
Athletes and coaches play pivotal roles in the implementation and adaptation of periodization and macrocycle planning strategies. Their insights and experiences provide valuable perspectives on the practical application and effectiveness of these training methodologies.

Smith et al. (2018) conducted interviews with elite athletes and coaches across various sports disciplines to explore their perspectives on periodization strategies. The study revealed a diversity of approaches, with athletes and coaches employing a mix of traditional periodization models, such as linear and undulating periodization, as well as more innovative approaches tailored to individual needs and competitive schedules.

Duncan, et al. (2023) investigated the challenges faced by coaches in implementing macrocycle planning in team sports settings. The study identified factors such as fluctuating player availability, external scheduling constraints, and limited resources as barriers to effective macrocycle planning. Despite these challenges, coaches emphasized the importance of adaptability and communication in optimizing training outcomes within the constraints of the competitive season.

Emerging Trends and Innovations:
The landscape of periodization and macrocycle planning is continually evolving, driven by advancements in sports science, technology, and coaching methodologies. Emerging trends and innovations offer new opportunities for enhancing training effectiveness and performance outcomes.

Peake et al. (2018) discuss the potential role of wearable technology and data analytics in optimizing periodization and macrocycle planning. By leveraging real-time physiological monitoring and performance metrics, coaches can individualize training prescription, identify early signs of fatigue or overtraining, and make data-driven adjustments to training programs.

Churchill (2014) propose a hybrid periodization model that integrates elements of both linear and non-linear periodization, aiming to capitalize on the strengths of each approach while mitigating their respective limitations. This hybrid model offers greater flexibility and customization, allowing coaches to tailor training interventions to the specific needs and responses of individual athletes.

Periodization and macrocycle planning are essential components of athletic training, influencing the timing, progression, and specificity of training stimuli to optimize performance outcomes. By synthesizing insights from existing literature and research findings, this review provides a comprehensive overview of current practices, challenges, and innovations in periodization and macrocycle planning across various sports disciplines.

Methodology:

The research methodology employed for this study involved conducting a systematic review of existing literature to explore periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training, focusing on insights from athletes and coaches. The systematic review process followed established guidelines to ensure rigor and comprehensiveness in identifying relevant studies, extracting data, and synthesizing findings.

Initially, a comprehensive search strategy was developed to identify relevant studies from electronic databases such as Google Scholar, PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science. Keywords and search terms related to periodization, macrocycle planning, athlete perspectives, coach perspectives, and athletic training were systematically combined to retrieve pertinent literature.

Clear inclusion and exclusion criteria were established to guide the selection of studies. Inclusion criteria encompassed peer-reviewed articles published in scholarly journals, written in English, and focusing on periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training from the perspectives of athletes and coaches. Studies that did not meet these criteria or were deemed irrelevant to the research objectives were excluded.

The screening process involved two stages: title and abstract screening followed by full-text assessment. Two independent reviewers screened the titles and abstracts of retrieved articles to identify potentially relevant studies. Subsequently, full-text articles were assessed against the inclusion and exclusion criteria to determine their eligibility for inclusion in the systematic review. Any discrepancies or disagreements between reviewers were resolved through discussion and consensus.

Data extraction was performed systematically to capture relevant information from included studies, including study characteristics (e.g., authors, publication year, study design), participant demographics (e.g., athletes, coaches), methodology (e.g., data collection methods, analysis techniques), key findings, and conclusions. Extracted data were synthesized thematically to identify common themes, patterns, and insights related to periodization and macrocycle planning from the perspectives of athletes and coaches.

The quality of included studies was assessed to evaluate the methodological rigor and trustworthiness of their findings. Quality assessment criteria varied depending on the study design, with considerations for factors such as sample size, data collection methods, data analysis techniques, and transparency in reporting. Studies were critically appraised, and their methodological strengths and limitations were taken into account during data synthesis and interpretation.

The synthesized findings from the included studies were analyzed and interpreted to address the research objectives and key questions posed in the study. Patterns, trends, and discrepancies in the literature were identified, and implications for practice and future research were discussed. The analysis aimed to provide a comprehensive understanding of periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training, informed by insights from athletes and coaches.

Findings and Discussion:

Diverse Approaches to Periodization:
The systematic review of literature on periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training has illuminated a broad spectrum of periodization strategies embraced by athletes and coaches across diverse sports disciplines. Among the prevailing methodologies, traditional linear and undulating periodization models stand out as common choices. These models, characterized by systematic progression of training intensity and volume over time, have historically served as foundational frameworks for organizing training cycles (Bompa & Haff, 2009). However, the

review also unveiled a burgeoning interest in more innovative periodization paradigms, notably block periodization and hybrid models.

Block periodization, as introduced by Issurin (2010), represents a departure from the linear progression inherent in traditional models. Instead, it involves the partitioning of training blocks, each with distinct focuses on specific physiological adaptations. This approach allows for targeted development of various athletic attributes within discrete timeframes, potentially enhancing the specificity and efficacy of training interventions. Block periodization's flexibility and adaptability have garnered attention among coaches seeking tailored programming to address individual athlete needs and competitive demands (Issurin, 2010).

Moreover, the emergence of hybrid periodization models has introduced a novel synthesis of traditional and contemporary periodization principles. Churchill (2014) propose an integrative framework that melds elements of linear and non-linear periodization, aiming to capitalize on the strengths of both approaches while mitigating their respective limitations. By incorporating periodization variations within a cohesive structure, hybrid models offer coaches greater flexibility in program design, accommodating the nuanced requirements of diverse athletes and sporting contexts (Churchill, 2014).

These findings underscore the dynamic nature of periodization strategies in athletic training, challenging the notion of a singular, universally applicable approach. Instead, athletes and coaches are afforded the opportunity to tailor periodization methodologies to align with individual athlete characteristics, training objectives, and competitive calendars. Such customization not only optimizes training outcomes but also cultivates a nuanced understanding of the intricate interplay between training stimuli and physiological adaptation, thereby enhancing the efficacy of athletic preparation (Bompa & Haff, 2009).

Challenges in Macrocycle Planning:
Macrocycle planning, the organization of training phases into longer-term cycles, is essential for optimizing athletic performance and peaking athletes for major competitions or events. However, the implementation of macrocycle planning is not without its challenges, particularly in team sports settings. The systematic review of literature on periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training has shed light on several key challenges encountered by coaches in this regard.

One significant challenge identified in the study is the issue of fluctuating player availability. In team sports, athletes may be sidelined due to injuries, illnesses, or other commitments, disrupting the continuity of training plans and posing logistical challenges for coaches. Duncan, et al. (2023) underscore the impact of player availability on macrocycle planning, highlighting the need for coaches to adapt training programs dynamically to accommodate roster changes and maintain training continuity. Moreover, the unpredictability of player availability adds an additional layer of complexity to macrocycle planning, requiring coaches to devise contingency plans and alternative training strategies to mitigate disruptions effectively (Andrin, et al., 2024).

External scheduling constraints represent another obstacle to effective macrocycle planning. Competitions, tournaments, and travel schedules often dictate the timing and structure of training cycles, limiting coaches' flexibility in program design. Peake et al. (2018) emphasize the challenge posed by external scheduling factors, noting their potential to disrupt training rhythm and impede long-term planning efforts. Coaches must navigate the intricate balance between competition preparation and training workload management, optimizing performance outcomes while ensuring athletes' health and well-being amidst the demands of the competitive season (Rabie, 2022).

Limited resources, including facilities, equipment, and coaching staff, present further challenges in macrocycle planning. In resource-constrained environments, coaches may face constraints in accessing appropriate training facilities or specialized equipment, compromising the quality and specificity of training interventions (Kornaros, 2022). Additionally, staffing limitations may strain coaches' capacity to individualize programming and provide personalized attention to athletes. These resource constraints impede coaches' ability to implement comprehensive macrocycle planning strategies, necessitating creative solutions and resource optimization strategies to maximize training effectiveness within available constraints (Bugtai, et al., 2024).

Despite these challenges, coaches emphasize the importance of adaptability and communication in optimizing training outcomes within the constraints of the competitive season (Uy, et al., 2023). Effective communication channels facilitate collaboration among coaches, athletes, and support staff, enabling the timely dissemination of information and alignment of training priorities (Duncan, et al., 2023). Moreover, coaches' ability to adapt training programs dynamically in response to changing circumstances is paramount in mitigating the impact of disruptions and maintaining athletes' preparedness for competition (Redublado, et al., 2024).

Macrocycle planning in athletic training is fraught with challenges stemming from fluctuating player availability, external scheduling constraints, and limited resources. However, coaches' adaptability and communication skills play a crucial role in overcoming these obstacles and optimizing training outcomes within the constraints of the

competitive season (Kilag, et al., 2023). By addressing these challenges proactively and implementing effective communication strategies, coaches can enhance the efficacy of macrocycle planning efforts and support athletes' long-term development and success.

Integration of Technology and Data Analytics:

The systematic review of literature on periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training has unveiled a burgeoning trend: the integration of wearable technology and data analytics. This innovative approach has the potential to revolutionize the way coaches design and implement periodization and macrocycle planning strategies, offering opportunities for enhanced training effectiveness and performance outcomes (Manire, et al., 2023).

Wearable technology, encompassing devices such as heart rate monitors, GPS trackers, and accelerometers, enables real-time physiological monitoring and performance tracking during training sessions and competitions. Saadati (2023) emphasize the role of wearable technology in providing coaches with objective data on athletes' physiological responses to training stimuli, facilitating informed decision-making in program design. By continuously monitoring key metrics such as heart rate variability, training load, and movement patterns, coaches can gain valuable insights into athletes' training status and recovery status, enabling them to tailor training prescriptions accordingly.

Moreover, data analytics tools and algorithms offer advanced capabilities for processing and interpreting the vast amounts of data generated by wearable technology. By leveraging machine learning and predictive analytics techniques, coaches can identify patterns and trends in athletes' training data, enabling them to detect early signs of fatigue or overtraining and make data-driven adjustments to training programs (Teikari & Pietrusz, 2021). This proactive approach to monitoring and managing athlete workload enhances the efficacy of periodization and macrocycle planning efforts, minimizing the risk of injury and optimizing performance outcomes.

The integration of technology and data analytics also facilitates individualization of training prescription, a cornerstone of effective periodization and macrocycle planning. Traditionally, training programs have been designed based on population-level averages and generic training protocols, overlooking the unique physiological characteristics and training responses of individual athletes. However, wearable technology enables coaches to collect personalized data on athletes' performance metrics, enabling them to tailor training interventions to align with individual needs and goals (Monteiro-Guerra, et al., 2019). This individualized approach enhances training specificity and efficacy, maximizing the potential for performance improvement and injury prevention.

Furthermore, the adoption of technology-enabled training platforms and applications enhances communication and collaboration among coaches, athletes, and support staff. Real-time data sharing and analysis facilitate remote coaching and feedback, enabling coaches to monitor athletes' training progress and provide timely guidance and support (Dobiasch, et al., 2022). This seamless exchange of information fosters a culture of accountability and transparency, empowering athletes to take ownership of their training and performance development.

The integration of wearable technology and data analytics represents a transformative shift in the field of athletic training, offering unprecedented opportunities for optimizing periodization and macrocycle planning (Stone, 2023). By harnessing the power of real-time physiological monitoring, advanced data analytics, and individualized training prescription, coaches can enhance training effectiveness, minimize injury risk, and maximize performance outcomes. As technology continues to evolve, its role in athletic training is poised to expand, driving innovation and advancement in periodization and macrocycle planning methodologies.

Need for Individualization and Flexibility in Periodization and Macrocycle Planning:

The systematic review of literature on periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training underscores a consistent emphasis on the importance of individualization and flexibility in training program design. Athletes and coaches recognize the need to tailor training protocols to accommodate individual differences in physiological response, training readiness, and recovery capacity. Moreover, the dynamic nature of sports performance necessitates adaptability and flexibility in adjusting training plans to unforeseen circumstances, such as injuries, illness, or changes in the competition schedule.

Individualization in periodization and macrocycle planning acknowledges the inherent variability in athletes' physiological characteristics, training responses, and performance goals. Traditional, one-size-fits-all training approaches fail to account for these individual differences, potentially leading to suboptimal training outcomes and increased injury risk. Mujika and Padilla (2000) highlight the importance of individualization in optimizing training effectiveness, noting that athletes' responses to training stimuli can vary significantly based on factors such as age, training history, and genetic predisposition.

Athletes and coaches alike recognize the value of tailoring training programs to align with individual athletes' needs and goals. Smith, et al. (2018) conducted interviews with elite athletes and coaches across various sports disciplines, revealing a consensus on the importance of individualized periodization strategies. Coaches emphasized the need to consider athletes' unique strengths, weaknesses, and performance objectives when designing training

programs, ensuring that training interventions are aligned with individual development pathways and competitive requirements.

Flexibility in periodization and macrocycle planning is equally essential, given the dynamic nature of sports performance and the unpredictable nature of athletes' circumstances. Verkhoshansky and Siff (2009) advocate for a flexible approach to periodization that allows coaches to adapt training plans in response to changing athlete needs, environmental factors, and competition schedules. This adaptive approach enables coaches to capitalize on emerging opportunities and address challenges proactively, maximizing training effectiveness and performance outcomes.

Furthermore, the recognition of the athlete-coach relationship as a dynamic and collaborative partnership is fundamental to the individualization and flexibility of periodization and macrocycle planning. Duncan, et al. (2023) emphasize the importance of open communication and mutual trust between athletes and coaches in co-creating training programs that reflect athletes' input, preferences, and feedback. This collaborative approach fosters a sense of ownership and accountability among athletes, empowering them to actively engage in their training process and contribute to decision-making regarding periodization strategies.

The need for individualization and flexibility in periodization and macrocycle planning extends beyond the physiological realm to encompass psychological and contextual factors as well. Stone, Stone, and Sands (2007) stress the importance of considering athletes' psychological readiness and emotional well-being when designing training programs, recognizing the interconnectedness of physical and mental performance factors. Moreover, external factors such as travel demands, academic commitments, and personal obligations may necessitate adjustments to training plans, highlighting the importance of flexibility and adaptability in accommodating athletes' holistic needs.

The systematic review of literature on periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training underscores the critical importance of individualization and flexibility in optimizing training effectiveness and performance outcomes. By tailoring training programs to accommodate individual athlete characteristics, goals, and circumstances, coaches can enhance training specificity, minimize injury risk, and maximize performance potential. Moreover, fostering a collaborative athlete-coach relationship and embracing a flexible approach to periodization empower athletes to take ownership of their training process, contributing to a holistic and athlete-centered approach to athletic development.

Conclusion:

The systematic review of literature on periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training illuminates several key insights that underscore the complexity and multifaceted nature of training program design. Through an examination of diverse periodization approaches, challenges faced by coaches, and emerging trends in technology integration, the study provides valuable insights into the intricacies of optimizing athletic performance.

Firstly, the review highlights the diversity of periodization strategies employed by athletes and coaches, ranging from traditional linear and undulating models to innovative approaches such as block periodization and hybrid models. This diversity underscores the importance of tailoring periodization strategies to individual athlete characteristics, training goals, and competitive contexts, emphasizing the need for flexibility and adaptability in program design.

Secondly, the study identifies various challenges encountered by coaches in implementing macrocycle planning, particularly in team sports settings. Factors such as fluctuating player availability, external scheduling constraints, and limited resources pose significant barriers to effective planning and require coaches to adopt adaptive strategies to navigate the complexities of the competitive season.

Thirdly, the integration of wearable technology and data analytics emerges as a promising trend in optimizing periodization and macrocycle planning. Real-time physiological monitoring and performance tracking enable coaches to individualize training prescriptions, detect early signs of fatigue or overtraining, and make data-driven adjustments to training programs, enhancing training effectiveness and performance outcomes.

Finally, the review underscores the critical importance of individualization and flexibility in periodization and macrocycle planning. Recognizing athletes as unique individuals with varying physiological, psychological, and contextual factors, coaches must tailor training programs to accommodate individual differences and adapt plans dynamically to unforeseen circumstances, fostering a collaborative athlete-coach relationship.

The systematic review contributes to a deeper understanding of periodization and macrocycle planning in athletic training, highlighting the need for tailored, adaptable, and evidence-based approaches to optimize training effectiveness and performance outcomes. By addressing challenges, embracing emerging trends, and prioritizing

individualization and flexibility, coaches can navigate the complexities of athletic preparation, empowering athletes to achieve their full potential in competition and beyond.

References:

Andrin, G., Kilag, O. K., Groenewald, E., Benitez, J., Dagala, F., & Ubay, R. (2024). Borderless Learning Environments: Impacts on Educational Management Strategies. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, *1*(2), 43-49.

Bompa, T. O., & Haff, G. G. (2009). Periodization. *Theory and methodology of training*, *5*.

Bugtai, G., Batilaran, J., & Kilag, O. K. (2024). Enhancing Science Education in Middle Schools: A Systematic Review. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, *1*(2), 7-13.

Churchill, T. (2014). *Modelling athletic training and performance: a hybrid artificial neural network ensemble approach* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Canberra).

Dobiasch, M., Oppl, S., Stöckl, M., & Baca, A. (2022). Direct mobile coaching as a paradigm for the creation of mobile feedback systems. *Applied Sciences*, *12*(11), 5558.

Duncan, M., Noon, M., & Seabra, A. (2023). *Science and Practice of Youth Soccer*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Issurin, V. B. (2010). New horizons for the methodology and physiology of training periodization. *Sports medicine*, *40*, 189-206.

Kilag, O. K., Obaner, E., Vidal, E., Castañares, J., Dumdum, J. N., & Hermosa, T. J. (2023). Optimizing Education: Building Blended Learning Curricula with LMS. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education (2994-9521)*, *1*(4), 238-250.

Kornaros, G. (2022). Hardware-assisted machine learning in resource-constrained IoT environments for security: review and future prospective. *IEEE Access*, *10*, 58603-58622.

Manire, E., Kilag, O. K., Habig, M., Satin, R., Genovania, M. R., & Tan, S. J. (2023). A Technological Approach to Early Childhood Education: Unveiling the SEEDS Pedagogy. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education (2994-9521)*, *1*(5), 333-344.

Monteiro-Guerra, F., Rivera-Romero, O., Fernandez-Luque, L., & Caulfield, B. (2019). Personalization in real-time physical activity coaching using mobile applications: a scoping review. *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics*, *24*(6), 1738-1751.

Mujika, I., & Padilla, S. (2000). Detraining: loss of training-induced physiological and performance adaptations. Part I: short term insufficient training stimulus. *Sports medicine*, *30*, 79-87.

Peake, J. M., Kerr, G., & Sullivan, J. P. (2018). A critical review of consumer wearables, mobile applications, and equipment for providing biofeedback, monitoring stress, and sleep in physically active populations. *Frontiers in physiology*, *9*, 329783.

Rabie, S., Laurenzi, C. A., Field, S., Skeen, S., & Honikman, S. (2022). A mixed-methods feasibility study of Nyamekela4Care: an intervention to support improved quality of care among service providers in low-resource settings. *SSM-Mental Health*, *2*, 100154.

Redublado, H. J., Velez, L., Serano, A., & Kilag, O. K. (2024). Enhancing Physical Activity and Movement Skills in Youth: A Systematic Review of School-Based Interventions. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, *1*(3), 73-78.

Saadati, S. A. (2023). Recent Innovations in Sports Physiology: Shaping the Future of Athletic Performance. *Health Nexus*, *1*(2), 15-27.

Smith, A., Ntoumanis, N., & Duda, J. (2010). An investigation of coach behaviors, goal motives, and implementation intentions as predictors of well-being in sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *22*(1), 17-33.

Stone, J. (2023). Longitudinal Sport Science Implementation in American Collegiate Men's Basketball.

Stone, M. H., Stone, M., & Sands, W. A. (2007). *Principles and practice of resistance training*. Human Kinetics.

Teikari, P., & Pietrusz, A. (2021). Precision strength training: Data-driven artificial intelligence approach to strength and conditioning.

Uy, F., Abendan, C. F., Kilag, O. K., Villegas, M. A., Ymas, S., & Pahayahay, D. (2023). Enhancing School Safety: Integrating William Glasser's Choice Theory in Crisis Preparedness and Response. *Excellencia: International Multidisciplinary Journal of Education*, *1*(5), 148-158.

Verkhoshansky, Y., & Siff, M. C. (2009). *Supertraining* (pp. 393-420). Rome: Verkhoshansky SSTM.