

## The Biomechanics of Movement: The Secret behind More Effective Workouts

Aida Bendo<sup>1</sup>, Rando Kukeli<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

This study examines how biomechanical efficiency shapes the effectiveness of fundamental resistance-training movements, highlighting the importance of movement quality over external load. Five primary patterns squat, hinge, push, pull, and rotational or anti-rotational tasks were analyzed to determine how joint torque distribution, ground reaction forces, centre-of-mass control, and neuromuscular activation influence performance outcomes. An applied analytical methodology was used, integrating evidence from peer-reviewed studies published over the past 15 years, with particular emphasis on exercises commonly utilized in strength and conditioning. Biomechanical variables were mapped onto each movement category, and a three-day training micro cycle was used to contextualize mechanical demands in practical settings. The findings show that each movement pattern demonstrates a distinct mechanical profile. Squat variations promote balanced loading and lower-body symmetry, whereas hinge exercises generate the highest hip extensor torques and posterior-chain activation, making them essential for maximal strength and explosive power development. Upper-body push and pull patterns exhibit contrasting scapulothoracic mechanics and muscle recruitment strategies, underscoring the need for balanced programming. Rotational movements, despite using lower external loads, demand substantial trunk stiffness and coordinated segmental control, contributing to functional stability and movement transfer. Overall, the results emphasize that mechanical efficiency not simply the amount of load lifted plays the central role in shaping training adaptations. Integrating biomechanical principles into programmed design enables more targeted exercise selection, enhances motor control, reduces injury risk, and supports long-term performance development. These insights bridge the gap between biomechanics research and practical training application, providing a framework for more intelligent and sustainable resistance-training practice.

**Keywords:** *Biomechanics; Functional Exercise Patterns; Kinetic and Kinematic Analysis; Movement Efficiency; Neuromuscular Activation; Resistance Training.*

### Introduction

Biomechanics has become an essential scientific discipline in understanding human movement and optimizing exercise performance in both athletic and recreational fitness environments. Defined as the study of mechanical principles applied to biological systems, biomechanics examines how forces interact with the body and how these interactions influence movement efficiency, performance outcomes, and injury risk (Hall, 2021). As technological advancements have enhanced the precision of kinematic, kinetic, and electromyographic measurements, the relevance of biomechanics in exercise science has expanded significantly (Winter, 2009; Robertson et al., 2014).

In recent years, research has demonstrated that effective workout design requires a deeper understanding of joint mechanics, segmental coordination, motor control strategies, and tissue loading patterns. Priego-Quesada (2021) emphasize that biomechanical insight not only explains how movement occurs but also how it should be optimized for performance and safety. Similarly, Escamilla and Andrews (2009) & Zatsiorsky (2008) highlighted that complex multi-joint exercises such as squats, deadlifts, and lunges involve intricate interactions among joint torques, muscle forces, and ground reaction forces that must be understood for proper execution.

---

<sup>1</sup>Sports University of Tirana, Faculty of Physical Activity and Recreation, Department of Health and Movement, Tirana, Albania  
E-mail: [abendo@ust.edu.al](mailto:abendo@ust.edu.al), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0774-1552> (corresponding author).

<sup>2</sup> Sports University of Tirana, Faculty of Physical Activity and Recreation, Department of Sports management and Tourism, Tirana, Albania.

A substantial body of evidence shows that movement technique and mechanical efficiency strongly influence training effectiveness. Studies on resistance training exercises indicate that joint angles and moment arms significantly affect muscle activation and force production (Schoenfeld, 2010; Sundstrup et al., 2012; Chiu, 2018). For example, changes in squat stance width, bar position, and hip-knee coordination alter the distribution of mechanical loading between quadriceps, gluteals, and spinal extensors (Schoenfeld et al., 2017; Grgic et al., 2018)). Likewise, biomechanical modelling by Zatsiorsky and Prilutsky (2012) demonstrates how segmental alignment and centre-of-mass path efficiency can enhance lifting performance while reducing spinal stress.

Motor learning also plays a crucial role in biomechanical outcomes. A recent review by Wood et al. (2024) & Homayounnia Firouzjah et al. (2025) found that implicit learning strategies lead to more efficient joint coordination patterns compared to explicit cueing, showing positive effects on movement quality ( $g = 0.45$ ). This supports earlier work by Wulf and Lewthwaite (2016), which demonstrates that external focus of attention enhances mechanical efficiency and neuromuscular recruitment during exercise tasks.

Biomechanical research has also moved beyond traditional sagittal-plane movements. Parada et al. (2024) argue that lateral and multiplanar movements exhibit unique mechanical demands that cannot be understood through sagittal-dominant research alone. In agility-based training, for instance, chaotic and reactive movements require rapid modulation of ground reaction forces, braking strategies, and limb stiffness (Dos'Santos et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2025). These insights are increasingly important for fitness programs aiming to improve functional adaptability and multidirectional competence.

Another growing area of interest concerns the relationship between biomechanics and injury risk. Bahr et al. (2018) emphasize that mechanical overload, poor movement technique, and compensatory strategies significantly contribute to musculoskeletal injury patterns. Similarly, some studies showed that biomechanical deficits such as excessive knee valgus, altered hip mechanics, and insufficient trunk control are strong predictors of injury risk particularly in physically active populations (Hewett et al., 2016, Penichet-Tomas, 2024; Dhahbi, 2025; Alahaidib et al., 2025). Integrating biomechanical assessment tools such as motion capture, wearable sensors, or force platform analysis in fitness environments has therefore become more feasible and valuable (Adesida et al., 2019).

Beyond injury prevention, biomechanical efficiency directly influences performance outcomes. Research on sprinting, jumping, and resistance training shows that optimal force application strategies, appropriate force-velocity profiles, and efficient energy transfer between segments contribute to superior performance metrics (van Oeveren et al., 2024; Suchomel et al., 2018). In resistance training, exercise variations that optimize joint torques and muscle-tendon dynamics can significantly improve hypertrophy and strength development (Schoenfeld, 2021; Kraemer & Ratamess, 2004; Kukeli & Bendo, 2024).

Despite the growing scientific evidence, a gap persists between biomechanical research and its practical application in general fitness settings. Most biomechanical insights remain concentrated in sports performance laboratories or elite athletic training contexts. As noted by Forte et al. (2023), there is a need for translating biomechanical principles into accessible training strategies for broader populations, including recreational exercisers, personal training clients, and individuals seeking movement efficiency to support long-term health.

Considering these developments, biomechanics stands as a critical foundation for improving workout effectiveness. By integrating an understanding of joint loading, movement sequencing, neuromuscular coordination, and external force management into fitness programming, exercise professionals and trainees can optimize performance, reduce injury risk, and enhance long-term training outcomes.

The aim of this study is to investigate how key biomechanical variables such as joint torque profiles, force trajectories, muscle activation patterns, and inter-segmental coordination affect the effectiveness of common workout movements, and to propose evidence-based strategies for integrating biomechanical optimization into fitness training.

## **Methodology**

This study adopts an applied analytical methodology aimed at evaluating how key biomechanical variables influence the effectiveness of commonly used workout movements. Unlike traditional laboratory-based experimental designs, this methodology integrates evidence from contemporary biomechanics research with structured analysis of exercise execution, movement patterns, and weekly

training structures relevant to practical fitness settings. The approach aligns with recent trends in applied sport sciences, where biomechanical insights are used to inform programmed design, movement optimization, and exercise prescription in real-world training environments (Schoenfeld et al., 2017; Adesida et al., 2019).

**Analytical Framework**

The analytical model used in this study integrates three core biomechanical constructs kinematic variables such as joint angles, segmental sequencing, and centre-of-mass trajectories; kinetic variables including ground reaction forces (GRF), joint torques, loading rates, and impulse characteristics; and neuromuscular variables derived from EMG-based activation patterns, coordination strategies, and temporal activation sequencing. Together, these constructs form a well-established framework in applied biomechanics, offering a robust basis for assessing movement efficiency and exercise effectiveness (Robertson et al., 2014; Hall, 2021). Their selection aligns with contemporary approaches in sport performance analysis, where simplified yet valid mechanical indicators are routinely used to inform decisions surrounding technique optimization, exercise selection, and programmed design (Suchomel et al., 2018; van Oeveren et al., 2024).

**Exercise Selection and Movement Categories**

To establish a representative structure of biomechanically relevant fitness training, the exercises in this study were organized into five fundamental movement patterns widely recognized in strength and conditioning squat, hinge, horizontal and vertical pushing, horizontal and vertical pulling, and rotational or anti-rotational movements reflecting contemporary evidence-based classifications in resistance training literature (Schoenfeld, 2021; Kraemer & Ratamess, 2004; Kukeli & Bendo, 2024). The selected exercises consisted primarily of multi-joint, free-weight movements such as back squats, deadlifts, lunges, bench presses, rows, overhead presses, and rotational cable variations, all of which possess strong functional relevance and well-documented biomechanical profiles. These exercises have been extensively analyzed in terms of kinematics and kinetics, enabling the incorporation of validated mechanical data into the present analysis and ensuring that the movement selection aligns with established biomechanical evidence (Escamilla & Andrews, 2009; Zatsiorsky, 2008; Sundstrup et al., 2012)

**Table 1.** Summary of Exercise Categories, Biomechanical Focus, and Primary Training Outcomes.

<b>Exercise Category</b>	<b>Example Movements</b>	<b>Key Biomechanical Variables</b>	<b>Primary Training Effect</b>
<b>Squat Pattern</b>	Back squat, front squat, goblet squat	Hip-knee coordination, GRF profile, COM displacement	Strength, hypertrophy, force production
<b>Hinge Pattern</b>	Deadlift, Romanian deadlift, hip thrust	Hip extensor torque, spinal shear load, posterior chain activation	Power development, posterior chain strength
<b>Push Movements</b>	Bench press, overhead press, push-ups	Joint moment distribution, scapular mechanics	Upper-body strength, shoulder stability
<b>Pull Movements</b>	Bent-over row, pull-ups, lat pulldown	Scapulothoracic rhythm, grip-force kinetics	Back strength, posture control
<b>Rotational / Anti-Rotational</b>	Cable rotation, Pallof press	Trunk stiffness, rotational torque control	Core stability, transfer to athletic tasks

**Weekly Training Structure for Biomechanical Evaluation**

To align with contemporary fitness practices, a three-day weekly training micro cycle was analyzed. This structure is consistent with literature supporting moderate-frequency strength training as optimal for neuromuscular adaptation and motor learning (Grgic et al., 2019; Schoenfeld, 2021). Each training day emphasizes a balanced combination of functional movement patterns, allowing for holistic biomechanical analysis across planes of motion.

**Table 2.** Weekly Training Micro Cycle Used for Applied Biomechanical Analysis.

Day	Primary Focus	Movement Patterns Included	Rationale (Biomechanical Basis)
Day 1	Lower-body strength	Squat + Hinge + Anti-rotation	Highest mechanical loading; prioritizes hip-knee torque optimization and GRF management
Day 2	Upper-body push-pull	Push + Pull + Rotational work	Enables analysis of scapular mechanics and upper-body force symmetry
Day 3	Full-body power	Hinge + Squat variations + Push/Pull	Assesses force-velocity adaptations, RFD enhancement, and inter-segmental coordination

This weekly structure facilitates biomechanical comparison across diverse loading types, movement strategies, and functional demands. It mirrors frameworks commonly used in applied strength and conditioning environments (Suchomel et al., 2018).

**Data Sources and Selection Criteria**

Biomechanical data for this study were sourced exclusively from peer-reviewed research published within the past 15 years, with priority given to studies employing motion-capture technology, electromyography (EMG), or force-plate analysis, as well as investigations conducted in applied settings such as fitness, strength and conditioning, and functional training environments. Emphasis was placed on multi-joint, compound exercises and studies demonstrating high ecological validity to ensure that the evidence reflected real-world movement demands. Conversely, research characterized by limited methodological transparency, non-functional laboratory tasks, or low biomechanical relevance was excluded to maintain the rigor and practical applicability of the analytical framework.

**Analytical Procedure**

The applied biomechanical analysis followed a four-stage process in which each exercise was first deconstructed into its eccentric, transition, and concentric phases to identify key mechanical markers such as ground reaction force peaks, torque maxima, and centre-of-mass shifts. Next, relevant kinematic, kinetic, and neuromuscular variables from the literature were systematically mapped onto each exercise category to ensure alignment with established biomechanical frameworks (Hall, 2021; Robertson et al., 2014). The third stage involved evaluating the evidence linking mechanical optimization to performance outcomes including strength development, hypertrophy, and rate of force development (RFD), synthesizing findings from recent applied research (van Oeveren et al., 2024; Schoenfeld, 2021). Finally, the insights were integrated into a weekly training micro cycle to enhance ecological validity and practical applicability, ensuring the analytical outcomes reflected programming standards commonly used in contemporary fitness and strength-conditioning environments.

**Results**

The analysis of the selected movement categories revealed clear biomechanical patterns that differentiate exercise effectiveness, loading strategies, and neuromuscular involvement. Across all movement types, the relationships between joint torque sequencing, ground reaction force (GRF) profiles, and muscle activation patterns were central to understanding how specific exercises influence training outcomes. Multi-planar loading, segmental coordination, and the efficiency of force transfer emerged as primary determinants of mechanical effectiveness, consistent with previous literature (Schoenfeld et al., 2017; Grgic et al., 2018; Chiu, 2018)). The findings below synthesize these biomechanical characteristics across squat, hinge, push, pull, and rotational patterns.

### Biomechanical Characteristics of Movement Patterns

A systematic comparison of movement categories demonstrated that squatting and hinging patterns exhibited the highest GRF magnitudes due to axial loading, with hinge patterns producing greater hip extensor torque, whereas squat patterns produced higher knee extensor demands—an observation supported by Escamilla & Andrews (2009). Push and pull movements showed distinct differences in scapulothoracic rhythm and shoulder joint stress, with horizontal pulling displaying superior posterior chain activation compared to vertical pulling variations (Feser et al., 2022). Rotational and anti-rotational patterns demonstrated lower total external load but higher trunk stiffness and neuromuscular coordination demand, aligning with findings from Dos’Santos et al. (2021) regarding transverse-plane control.

**Table 3.** Comparative Mechanical Demands Across Movement Categories.

Movement Pattern	Peak GRF	Primary Torque Demand	Key Muscles Activated	Mechanical Efficiency Indicators
<b>Squat</b>	High	Knee + Hip Extensors	Quadriceps, gluteus maximus	COM vertical stability, symmetrical force production
<b>Hinge</b>	Very High	Hip Extensors	Hamstrings, gluteus maximus, erector spinae	Efficient hip hinge angle, reduced lumbar shear
<b>Push</b>	Moderate	Shoulder + Elbow Extension	Pectoralis major, triceps, deltoids	Scapular upward rotation, bar path efficiency
<b>Pull</b>	Moderate–High	Scapular Retraction + Elbow Flexion	Latissimus dorsi, rhomboids, biceps	Spine neutrality, vertical/horizontal pulling alignment
<b>Rotational/ Anti-Rotational</b>	Low–Moderate	Trunk Rotators or Stabilizers	Obliques, transverse abdominis	Trunk stiffness, rotational torque control

### Ground Reaction Forces and Load Distribution

The results indicated that hinge movements such as deadlifts, produced the highest peak GRFs, averaging 15–25% higher than squat variations at comparable loads, confirming earlier findings by Suchomel et al. (2018). Squats, however, displayed superior uniformity in lower-limb load distribution, evidenced by smoother GRF waveforms and more symmetrical force curves between limbs. Rotational exercises demonstrated the lowest GRF amplitudes, but the highest rates of change in trunk angular velocity a key performance determinant in functional and athletic movement (van Oeveren et al., 2024).

Across movement categories, exercises that promoted optimal torso alignment and stable COM trajectories showed higher mechanical efficiency, suggesting a strong link between movement economy and improved performance outcomes (Hall, 2021; Robertson et al., 2014).

### Muscle Activation and Neuromuscular Strategies

Electromyographic (EMG) evidence from the literature revealed clear activation differences. Squat patterns activated quadriceps significantly more than hinge patterns, while hinge movements elicited higher hamstring and gluteal activation, particularly during late eccentric phases. Push movements showed strong anterior deltoid and triceps activity, whereas pull movements favored latissimus dorsi and scapular retractors (Sundstrup et al., 2012; Chiu, 2018); Kraemer & Ratamess, 2004). Rotational and anti-rotational exercises consistently generated the highest trunk stiffness values, consistent with findings from Parada et al. (2024).

These neuromuscular strategies indicate that exercise effectiveness is not solely dependent on load magnitude but also on the efficiency of muscle sequencing and synergistic coordination patterns.

### Mechanical Efficiency and Performance Outcomes

Exercises that demonstrated higher mechanical efficiency characterized by an optimal centre-of-mass trajectory, coordinated joint torque sequencing, and stable force vectors were associated with superior performance outcomes, including increased strength gains, enhanced rate of force development, improved motor control, and a reduced risk of injury. These results support the view that

refined movement mechanics facilitate more effective hypertrophic and neuromuscular adaptations, as described by Schoenfeld (2021), and further show that exercises exhibiting favorable torque profiles and ground reaction force patterns transfer more effectively to athletic tasks, strengthening the link between biomechanical efficiency and functional performance (van Oeveren et al., 2024).

**Table 4.** Summary of Biomechanical Indicators and Training Outcomes.

<b>Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Associated Training Outcome</b>	<b>Biomechanical Indicator</b>
Hall (2022)	Increased movement economy	Efficient COM trajectory
Schoenfeld (2020)	Higher strength output	Optimal joint torque sequencing
Suchomel et al. (2018)	Better force transfer	Robust GRF profile
Parada et al. (2024)	Improved stability + injury prevention	High trunk stiffness
Vigotsky et al. (2018)	Enhanced hypertrophy and longevity	Balanced muscle activation

Overall, the results indicate that squat patterns provide the greatest joint loading symmetry, hinge patterns elicit the highest peak external forces and posterior-chain activation, and push–pull movements differ mainly in scapulothoracic mechanics and upper-body activation strategies. Additionally, rotational exercises require heightened neuromuscular control despite involving lower external loads. Collectively, these findings demonstrate that mechanical efficiency rather than load magnitude alone is the most influential predictor of training effectiveness, reinforcing the value of integrating biomechanical principles into fitness programmed design to enhance movement quality, performance outcomes, and long-term training adaptations.

**Discussion**

The findings of the present analysis reinforce the central role of biomechanical efficiency in shaping the effectiveness of common resistance-training movements. Across all five functional patterns squat, hinge, push, pull, and rotational/anti-rotational clear mechanical signatures emerged that influenced joint loading profiles, neuromuscular activation strategies, segmental coordination, and overall force-production demands. These distinctions are consistent with established models of functional movement mechanics emphasizing how the interplay between torque distribution, force-vector alignment, and coordinated segmental timing governs performance outcomes and long-term adaptation (Hall, 2021; Robertson et al., 2014). The combined evidence from both contemporary applied biomechanics and neuromuscular science further supports the premise that movement effectiveness is primarily determined by mechanical efficiency rather than load magnitude alone (Del Vecchio et al., 2020; Cruz, 2002; Myrtos, 2012).

**Interpretation of Mechanical Differences Across Movement Patterns**

Across lower-body movement patterns, squat and hinge exercises demonstrated the most substantial kinetic outputs but differed significantly in torque distribution. Squats elicited more balanced hip–knee coordination, symmetrical ground reaction force (GRF) curves, and improved centre-of-mass (COM) control, mechanical qualities linked to joint health and long-term training sustainability (Escamilla & Andrews, 2009; Zatsiorsky, 2008; Schoenfeld et al., 2017). Conversely, hinge movements such as deadlifts generated markedly higher hip extensor torques, elevated posterior-chain activation, and sharper GRF peaks findings consistent with their well-established role in developing maximal strength and rate of force development (RFD) (Suchomel et al., 2018; Swinton et al., 2011; Lee et al., 2018).

Upper-body pushing and pulling movements also exhibited meaningful mechanical contrasts. Pushing exercises favored anterior-chain dominance, while pulling movements promoted scapular retraction, posterior shoulder activation, and thoracic extension. These patterns align with research suggesting that balanced push–pull programming is essential for maintaining scapulothoracic integrity and preventing chronic shoulder dysfunction (Kibler & McMullen, 2003; Saeterbakken et al., 2022; Struyf et al., 2014). Meanwhile, rotational and anti-rotational patterns produced lower external loads but higher demands on trunk stiffness and neuromuscular coordination, supporting McGill's (2016)

evidence that transverse-plane stability is essential for transferring forces between upper and lower extremities during dynamic tasks. Additionally, these exercises complement sagittal-plane-dominant programs by enhancing motor-control precision and improving functional transfer to athletic tasks requiring reactive or high-velocity movement (Parada et al., 2024).

**Integration of Torque, GRF, and EMG Patterns**

The integration of torque, GRF, and electromyographic (EMG) evidence demonstrates that exercise effectiveness cannot be evaluated through external load alone. Hinge patterns produced the highest peak hip torques, while squats exhibited more evenly distributed torque profiles across hip and knee joints. Push–pull comparisons were dominated more by differences in EMG activation than by torque magnitude, suggesting that neuromuscular strategies often dictate upper-body mechanics more strongly than external load.

These observations align with biomechanical research demonstrating that mechanical efficiency emerges from the coordinated interaction between force generation (GRF), joint moment production (torque), and neuromuscular activation sequencing (EMG) (van Oeveren et al., 2024; Chiu, 2018). Variations in technique have been shown to significantly influence these parameters: Lake et al. (2021) and Fessl et al. (2022) reported that small deviations in hip or knee angles meaningfully alter joint moments and cumulative tissue stress. Likewise, EMG data illustrate clear movement-specific neuromuscular strategies squats emphasize quadriceps activation, hinges emphasize hamstring–glute synergy, and rotational exercises require coordinated recruitment of deep trunk musculature (Calatayud et al., 2014; Schache et al., 2012).

**Advanced Table: Cross-Exercise Biomechanical Comparison**

**Table 5.** Comparative Biomechanical Outputs Across Key Exercises.

<b>Exercise Category</b>	<b>Example Movements</b>	<b>Key Biomechanical Variables</b>	<b>Primary Training Effect</b>
<b>Squat Pattern</b>	Back squat, front squat, goblet squat	Hip–knee coordination, GRF profile, COM displacement	Strength, hypertrophy, force production
<b>Hinge Pattern</b>	Deadlift, Romanian deadlift, hip thrust	Hip extensor torque, spinal shear load, posterior chain activation	Power development, posterior chain strength
<b>Push Movements</b>	Bench press, overhead press, push-ups	Joint moment distribution, scapular mechanics	Upper-body strength, shoulder stability
<b>Pull Movements</b>	Bent-over row, pull-ups, lat pulldown	Scapulothoracic rhythm, grip-force kinetics	Back strength, posture control
<b>Rotational / Anti-Rotational</b>	Cable rotation, Pallof press	Trunk stiffness, rotational torque control	Core stability, transfer to athletic tasks

This table illustrates that the mechanical effectiveness of each exercise arises from integrated mechanical qualities rather than from isolated variables, supporting multidimensional models of exercise programming and motor-control theory.

**Practical Implications for Training Design**

The synthesis of kinetic, kinematic, and neuromuscular findings suggests several key implications for evidence-based training design: squat variations should be prioritized when the goal is to improve symmetry, centre-of-mass stability, and evenly distributed lower-body loading mechanical traits linked to long-term training sustainability (Schoenfeld, 2021); hinge patterns are essential for developing

maximal strength and posterior-chain hypertrophy due to their capacity to generate high torque and enhance rate of force development (Grgic et al., 2019; Bendo et al., 2025) maintaining a balanced ratio of push and pull movements is critical for shoulder health, as these patterns impose opposing scapulothoracic demands that influence injury risk (Kibler & McMullen, 2003; Kibler et al., 2012; Struyf et al., 2014); rotational and anti-rotational exercises should be integrated consistently to improve trunk stiffness, stability, and functional movement transfer, particularly in sports requiring rapid changes of direction (Prieske et al., 2016); and throughout all programming decisions, mechanical efficiency should be prioritized over load magnitude, as efficient movement patterns are stronger predictors of positive adaptations and reduced injury risk. These recommendations are consistent with best-practice guidelines in resistance training and functional performance literature.

### **Theoretical Contributions**

The integrated findings from both the kinetic and neuromuscular domains reinforce the argument that biomechanics must serve as a foundational element in modern training design. By demonstrating that exercise effectiveness emerges from the interaction of multiple mechanical and neuromuscular variables, this analysis helps bridge the divide between laboratory-based biomechanics and real-world fitness practice. The evidence supports a major conceptual transition from load-centric programming to mechanically intelligent training, where torque efficiency, force-path stability, and coordinated segmental control drive adaptation potential (Gou & Xiong, 2025; Souaifi et al., 2025; Hughes et al., 2018; Sánchez Pastor et al., 2023; Aslam et al., 2025)). This shift allows practitioners to improve training outcomes even with moderate external loads, provided movement mechanics are optimized.

### **Limitations and Considerations**

Despite the strengths of the analytical approach, several limitations must be acknowledged. Because the interpretation relies on previously published biomechanical data, differences in methodology such as variations in motion-capture systems, EMG placement protocols, or GRF sampling frequencies may introduce cross-study variability. Future research should implement standardized testing protocols across unified participant samples to validate cross-pattern comparisons. Additionally, the analysis focused primarily on multi-joint free-weight exercises, potentially limiting applicability for populations that predominantly utilize machine-based variations. Expanding biomechanical investigations to include guided-resistance equipment and unstable-surface modalities could enhance the generalizability of findings.

### **Conclusion**

The findings of this analysis emphasize that biomechanical efficiency is fundamental to effective resistance training. Each primary movement pattern squat, hinge, push, pull, and rotational or anti-rotational offers unique mechanical demands that influence how force is produced and controlled throughout the body. Squat variations enhance symmetrical loading and lower-body stability, while hinge patterns contribute strongly to posterior-chain strength and power. Push and pull exercises shape upper-body balance and shoulder integrity, and rotational tasks improve trunk stiffness and the transfer of force across multiple planes of movement. When training is guided by these biomechanical distinctions, programs become more purposeful and adaptable, allowing practitioners to select exercises that genuinely match the needs and goals of the individual. Prioritizing movement quality over load quantity encourages more efficient force production, supports long-term progress, and reduces the likelihood of injuries caused by poor technique or uneven loading. Although exercise responses vary across individuals and environments, integrating biomechanical principles into program design provides a clearer framework for achieving sustainable performance improvements. Ultimately, the evidence supports a shift toward training approaches that value coordination, stability, and efficient mechanics as key drivers of strength development and overall physical capability.

### **References**

- Adesida, Y., Papi, E., & McGregor, A. H. (2019). Exploring the Role of Wearable Technology in Sport Kinematics and Kinetics: A Systematic Review. *Sensors* (Basel, Switzerland), 19(7), 1597. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s19071597>
- Alahaidib A A, Alyousef H Y, Sharif M A, et al. (September 25, 2025) Biomechanical Assessment Tools for Injury Risk Prediction and Return-to-Sport Evaluation in Athletes: A Systematic Review. *Cureus* 17(9): e93210. doi:10.7759/cureus.93210
- Aslam, S., Habyarimana, J. D. D., & Bin, S. Y. (2025). Neuromuscular adaptations to resistance training in elite versus recreational athletes. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 16, Article 1598149. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2025.1598149>

- Bahr, R., Clarsen, B., & Ekstrand, J. (2018). Why we should focus on the burden of injuries and illnesses, not just their incidence. *British journal of sports medicine*, 52(16), 1018–1021. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2017-098160>
- Bendo, A., Brovina, F., Bushati, S., S., Sallaku, D., Bushati, M., & Papa, E. (2025). The effect of high-intensity interval training (HIIT) on the performance of 10- to 15-year-old basketball players. *Retos*, 62, 627–636. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v62.109315>
- Calatayud, J., Borreani, S., Colado, J. C., Martin-Rivera, F., Batalha, N., & Silva, A. (2014). Muscle activation differences between stable push-ups and push-ups with a unilateral v-shaped suspension system at different heights. *Motricidade*, 10(4), 84–93.
- Chiu L. Z. F. (2018). Biomechanical Methods to Quantify Muscle Effort During Resistance Exercise. *Journal of strength and conditioning research*, 32(2), 502–513. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002330>
- Del Vecchio, A., Holobar, A., Falla, D., Felici, F., Enoka, R. M., & Farina, D. (2020). Tutorial: Analysis of motor unit discharge characteristics from high-density surface EMG signals. *Journal of electromyography and kinesiology: official journal of the International Society of Electrophysiological Kinesiology*, 53, 102426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2020.102426>
- Dhabhi W. (2025). Editorial: Advancing biomechanics: enhancing sports performance, mitigating injury risks, and optimizing athlete rehabilitation. *Frontiers in sports and active living*, 7, 1556024. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2025.1556024>
- Dos'Santos, T., Thomas, C., McBurnie, A., Comfort, P., & Jones, P. A. (2021). Change of Direction Speed and Technique Modification Training Improves 180° Turning Performance, Kinetics, and Kinematics. *Sports*, 9(6), 73. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sports9060073>
- Escamilla, R. F., & Andrews, J. R. (2009). Shoulder muscle recruitment patterns and related biomechanics during upper extremity sports. *Sports Medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*, 39(7), 569–590. <https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-200939070-00004>
- Fessl, I., Wiesinger, H.-P., & Kröll, J. (2022). Power–force–velocity profiling as a function of used loads and task experience. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 17(5). <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsspp.2021-0325>
- Forte, P., & Teixeira, J. E. (2023). Exercise Biomechanics for Health: Evaluating Lifelong Activities for Well-Being. *Healthcare (Basel, Switzerland)*, 11(6), 900. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11060900>
- Gou, X., & Xiong, W. (2025). Research on the application of sports biomechanics in optimizing the effect of physical training. *Molecular & Cellular Biomechanics*, 22(2), 1133. <https://doi.org/10.62617/mcb1133>
- Grgic, J., Schoenfeld, B. J., & Latella, C. (2019). Resistance training frequency and skeletal muscle hypertrophy: A review of available evidence. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 22(3), 361–370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2018.09.223>
- Grgic, J., Schoenfeld, B. J., Davies, T. B., Lazinec, B., Krieger, J. W., & Pedisic, Z. (2018). Effect of Resistance Training Frequency on Gains in Muscular Strength: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*, 48(5), 1207–1220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-0872-x>
- Hall, S. J. (2021). *Basic biomechanics* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hewett, T. E., Ford, K. R., Xu, Y. Y., Khoury, J., & Myer, G. D. (2016). Utilization of ACL Injury Biomechanical and Neuromuscular Risk Profile Analysis to Determine the Effectiveness of Neuromuscular Training. *The American journal of sports medicine*, 44(12), 3146–3151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546516656373>
- Homayounnia Firouzjah, M., Nazari Kakvandi, S., & Ramezanzade, H. (2025). The effect of implicit and explicit motor learning on a targeting task in children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). *Acta Psychologica*, 253, 104731. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.104731>
- Hughes, D. C., Ellefsen, S., & Baar, K. (2018). Adaptations to Endurance and Strength Training. *Cold Spring Harbor perspectives in medicine*, 8(6), a029769. <https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a029769>
- Kibler, W. B., & McMullen, J. (2003). Scapular dyskinesis and its relation to shoulder pain. *The Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons*, 11(2), 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.5435/00124635-200303000-00008>
- Kibler, W. B., Sciascia, A., & Wilkes, T. (2012). Scapular dyskinesis and its relation to shoulder injury. *The Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons*, 20(6), 364–372. <https://doi.org/10.5435/JAAOS-20-06-364>
- Kraemer, W. J., & Ratamess, N. A. (2004). Fundamentals of resistance training: progression and exercise prescription. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 36(4), 674–688. <https://doi.org/10.1249/01.mss.0000121945.36635.61>
- Kukeli R, & Bendo A. (2024). Application of Resistance Training and Strength Exercises for Improving Explosive Force in Students of Sports University of Tirana. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(5), 4770–4777. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i5.2572>
- Lake, J. P., Mundy, P. D., Comfort, P., McMahon, J. J., Suchomel, T. J., & Carden, P. (2021). Effect of Barbell Load on Vertical Jump Landing Force-Time Characteristics. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 35(1), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002554>
- Lee, S., Schultz, J., Timgren, J., Staelgraeve, K., Miller, M., & Liu, Y. (2018). An electromyographic and kinetic comparison of conventional and Romanian deadlifts. *Journal of exercise science and fitness*, 16(3), 87–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesf.2018.08.001>
- Myrtos C. D. (2012). Low Back Disorders. Evidence-Based Prevention and Rehabilitation. *The Journal of the Canadian Chiropractic Association*, 56(1), 76.

- Parada, L. A., Bona, R. L., & Biancardi, C. M. (2024). Biomechanics of lateral movements: A review. *Scientific Journal of Sport and Performance*, 3(4), 443–456. <https://doi.org/10.55860/XEXK5613>
- Penichet-Tomas, A. (2024). Applied Biomechanics in Sports Performance, Injury Prevention, and Rehabilitation. *Applied Sciences*, 14(24), 11623. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app142411623>
- Priego-Quesada, J. I. (2021). Exercise Biomechanics and Physiology. *Life*, 11(2), 159. <https://doi.org/10.3390/life11020159>
- Prieske, O., Muehlbauer, T., & Granacher, U. (2016). The Role of Trunk Muscle Strength for Physical Fitness and Athletic Performance in Trained Individuals: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*, 46(3), 401–419. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0426-4>
- Robertson, D. G. E., Caldwell, G. E., Hamill, J., Kamen, G., & Whittlesey, S. N. (Eds.). (2014). Research methods in biomechanics (2nd ed.). *Human Kinetics*. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781492595809>
- Saeterbakken, A. H., Stien, N., Pedersen, H., & Andersen, V. (2022). Core Muscle Activation in Three Lower Extremity Exercises With Different Stability Requirements. *Journal of strength and conditioning research*, 36(2), 304–309. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000003465>
- Sánchez Pastor, A., García-Sánchez, C., Marquina Nieto, M., & de la Rubia, A. (2023). Influence of Strength Training Variables on Neuromuscular and Morphological Adaptations in Prepubertal Children: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(6), 4833. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20064833>
- Schache, A. G., Dorn, T. W., Blanch, P. D., Brown, N. A., & Pandy, M. G. (2012). Mechanics of the human hamstring muscles during sprinting. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 44(4), 647–658. <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e318236a3d2>
- Schoenfeld B. J. (2010). The mechanisms of muscle hypertrophy and their application to resistance training. *Journal of strength and conditioning research*, 24(10), 2857–2872. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181e840f3>
- Schoenfeld, B. J. (2021). Science and development of muscle hypertrophy (2nd ed.). *Human Kinetics*.
- Schoenfeld, B. J., Grgic, J., Ogborn, D., & Krieger, J. W. (2017). Strength and Hypertrophy Adaptations Between Low- vs. High-Load Resistance Training: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 31(12), 3508–3523. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002200>
- Singh, U., Leicht, A. S., Connor, J. D., Brice, S. M., Alves, A., & Doma, K. (2025). Biomechanical Determinants of Change of Direction Performance: A Systematic Review. *Sports medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*, 55(9), 2207–2224. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-025-02278-3>
- Souaifi, M., Dhahbi, W., Jebabli, N., Ceylan, H. İ., Boujabli, M., Muntean, R. I., & Dergaa, I. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Sports Biomechanics: A Scoping Review on Wearable Technology, Motion Analysis, and Injury Prevention. *Bioengineering (Basel, Switzerland)*, 12(8), 887. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering12080887>
- Struyf, F., Nijs, J., Meeus, M., Roussel, N. A., Mottram, S., Truijen, S., & Meeusen, R. (2014). Does scapular positioning predict shoulder pain in recreational overhead athletes? *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 35(1), 75–82. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1343409>
- Suchomel, T. J., Nimphius, S., Bellon, C. R., & Stone, M. H. (2018). The Importance of Muscular Strength: Training Considerations. *Sports medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*, 48(4), 765–785. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-0862-z>
- Sundstrup, E., Jakobsen, M. D., Andersen, C. H., Zebis, M. K., Mortensen, O. S., & Andersen, L. L. (2012). Muscle activation strategies during strength training with heavy loading vs. repetitions to failure. *Journal of strength and conditioning research*, 26(7), 1897–1903. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e318239c38e>
- Swinton, P. A., Stewart, A., Agouris, I., Keogh, J. W., & Lloyd, R. (2011). A biomechanical analysis of straight and hexagonal barbell deadlifts using submaximal loads. *Journal of strength and conditioning research*, 25(7), 2000–2009. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181e73f87>
- van Oeveren, B. T., de Ruiter, C. J., Beek, P. J., & van Dieën, J. H. (2024). The biomechanics of running and running styles: A synthesis. *Sports Biomechanics*, 23(4), 516–554. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2021.1873411>
- Winter, D. A. (2009). *Biomechanics and motor control of human movement* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. DOI:10.1002/9780470549148
- Wood, J. M., Thompson, E., Wright, H., Festa, L., Morton, S. M., Reisman, D. S., & Kim, H. E. (2024). Explicit and implicit locomotor learning in individuals with chronic hemiparetic stroke. *BioRxiv: the preprint server for biology*, 2024.02.04.578807. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.04.578807>
- Wulf, G., & Lewthwaite, R. (2016). Optimizing performance through intrinsic motivation and attention for learning: The OPTIMAL theory of motor learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 23(5), 1382–1414. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0999-9>
- Zatsiorsky, V. (2008). Biomechanics of strength and strength training. In P. V. Komi (Ed.), *Strength and power in sport* (2nd ed., pp. 439–487). Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757215.ch23>
- Zatsiorsky, V. M., & Prilutsky, B. I. (2012). Biomechanics of skeletal muscles. *Human Kinetics*.