

A systematic review of match-play characteristics in women's soccer

Short Title: A systematic review of women's soccer match-play

Systematic Review

Author information:

Alice Harkness-Armstrong*^{1,2}, Kevin Till², Naomi Datson³, Naomi Myhill^{2,4}, Stacey Emmonds²

¹*School of Sport, Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences, University of Essex, Colchester, UK*

²*Institute for Sport, Physical Activity and Leisure, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK*

³*Institute of Sport, University of Chichester, Chichester, UK*

⁴*The Football Association, Burton Upon Trent, UK*

*Corresponding author:

Alice Harkness-Armstrong

Email: a.harkness-armstrong@essex.ac.uk

ORCID: 0000-0002-7258-4469

Abstract

This review aimed to (1) systematically review the scientific literature evaluating the match-play characteristics of women's soccer, (2) determine the methods adopted to quantify match-play characteristics of women's soccer, and (3) present the physical, technical and tactical characteristics of women's soccer match-play across age-groups, playing standards and playing positions. A systematic search of electronic databases was conducted in May 2021; keywords relating to the population, soccer and match-play characteristics were used. Studies which quantified physical, technical or tactical performance of women's soccer players during match-play were included. Excluded studies included adapted match-play formats and training studies. Sixty-nine studies met the eligibility criteria. Studies predominantly quantified match-play characteristics of senior international (n=27) and domestic (n=30) women's soccer match-play, with only seven studies reporting youth match-play characteristics. Physical (n=47), technical (n=26) and tactical characteristics (n=2) were reported as whole-match (n=65), half-match (n=21), segmental (n=17) or peak (n=8) characteristics. Beyond age-groups, playing standard, and playing position, fourteen studies quantified the impact of contextual factors, such as environment or match outcome, on match-play characteristics. Distance was the most commonly reported variable (n=43), as outfield women's soccer players covered a total distance of 5480-11160 m during match-play. This systematic review highlights that physical match-performance increases between age-groups and playing standards, and differs between playing positions. However, further research is warranted to understand potential differences in technical and tactical match-performance. Coaches and practitioners can use the evidence presented within this review to inform population-specific practices, however, they should be mindful of important methodological limitations within the literature (e.g. inconsistent velocity and acceleration/deceleration thresholds). Future research should attempt to integrate physical, technical and tactical characteristics as opposed to quantifying characteristics in isolation, to gain a deeper and more holistic insight into match-performance.

1 Introduction

There has been substantial global growth and development of women's soccer within recent years. Global, continental and national governing bodies have implemented specific women's soccer strategies and increased investment, to support the development of the sport from grassroots to elite playing standards [1-5]. There has been an increase in participation rates [3], increased provision and support for developing talented youth players

29 (e.g. the English Football Association's regional talent centres and Women's Super League academies
30 programme), increased professionalisation of elite playing standards [6], and subsequently increased audiences
31 for elite senior competitions (e.g. FIFA Women's World Cup, UEFA Women's European Championships,
32 UEFA Champions League) [3, 5, 6]. Furthermore, recent research has suggested that observed increases in
33 physical match-play performances of elite senior players are consequential of the sport's growth and
34 development, and increased professionalisation of the game [7, 8].

35 Additionally, there has been a notable increase in the volume of literature focusing on women's soccer [9],
36 which is likely reflective of the sport's growth and development. The focus of the literature to date has
37 predominantly surrounded injury and strength and conditioning of women's soccer players, with limited
38 research quantifying the match-characteristics of women's soccer [9]. This is problematic, as knowledge and
39 understanding of the demands which players may experience during match-play is important for informing
40 population-specific practices for match-play and beyond. For example, coaching practice design and training
41 programme design in preparation for the demands of match-play within respective playing standards, preparing
42 players transitioning across playing standards, long-term athletic player development practices, talent
43 identification, or injury monitoring and rehabilitation processes.

44 Despite a relatively limited body of literature, there have previously been six narrative reviews summarising
45 match-play characteristics of women's soccer [10-15]. However, there are several important limitations
46 associated with these reviews. Firstly, without a comprehensive literature search and pre-defined, objective
47 study selection criteria, narrative reviews may involve subjective study selection bias [16]. Additionally, the
48 depth of information or choice of data extracted from respective studies may be limited or subjective.
49 Consequentially, narrative reviews may result in biased or subjective author interpretation and conclusions [16].
50 Therefore, there is a need for a systematic review, to provide a comprehensive, objective and scientifically
51 rigorous summary of the evidence-base on match-play characteristics of women's soccer. Secondly, all narrative
52 reviews to date have exclusively summarised the physical characteristics of match-play, neglecting the
53 important technical and tactical characteristics. This is problematic, as soccer performance is the combination of
54 physical, technical and tactical characteristics, and thus aspects of performance should not be considered in
55 isolation [17, 18]. Therefore, there is a need to review and summarise physical, technical and tactical
56 characteristics, to provide a holistic understanding of women's soccer match-play. Thirdly, narrative reviews
57 have highlighted methodological inconsistencies within the literature (e.g. methods of data collection, and
58 velocity or acceleration thresholds). However, no review has attempted to evaluate the methodologies adopted

59 to quantify match-play characteristics. Methods of data collection within recent research likely differ compared
60 to earlier studies, due to FIFA law changes permitting wearable technology (e.g. global positioning system
61 (GPS) units) within competitive match-play. Therefore, it is important that researchers and practitioners have an
62 awareness and understanding of the different methodologies utilised within the literature when interpreting
63 match-play characteristics and informing research or practice. Lastly, existing reviews neglected to summarise
64 the peak periods of women's soccer match-play characteristics [19, 20], which provide insight into the worst-
65 case scenarios players may face during matches. Understanding the peak periods of match-play players may
66 experience is important for informing coaching practice and training prescription for players, to ensure players
67 are optimally prepared for the most demanding periods of match-play.

68 Therefore, the aims of this review were to: (1) systematically review the scientific literature evaluating the
69 match-play characteristics of women's soccer, (2) determine the methods adopted to quantify match-play
70 characteristics of women's soccer, and (3) present the physical, technical and tactical characteristics of women's
71 soccer match-play across age-groups, playing standards and playing positions. This will be the first systematic
72 review of match-analysis within women's soccer, providing researchers and practitioners with a comprehensive,
73 critical and objective resource of the physical, technical, and tactical match-play research across women's
74 soccer populations, which can be used to inform respective population-specific practice.

75

76 **2 Methods**

77 **2.1 Design and search strategy**

78 The systematic review was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews
79 and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement [21]. A systematic search of electronic databases (CINAHL, Medline,
80 PubMed, Scopus and SPORTDiscus) was completed on the 18th May 2021, with no date restrictions applied.

81 The search strategy included the terms for the population ('female' OR 'women's' OR 'girls'), AND sport
82 ('soccer' OR 'football' OR 'association football'), AND match-play characteristics ('match characteristics' OR
83 'match demands' OR 'match performance' OR 'match play' OR 'match-play' OR 'match activities' OR
84 'activity profile' OR 'physical characteristics' OR 'physical performance' OR 'running characteristics' OR
85 'running demands' OR 'running performance' OR 'peak demands' OR 'movement characteristics' OR
86 'movement profiles' OR 'technical characteristics' OR 'technical demands' OR 'technical performance' OR

87 'tactical characteristics' OR 'tactical demands'). Additionally, the search strategy included NOT ('American
88 football' OR 'Australian football' OR 'Australian rules football' OR 'Gaelic football'). Additional manual
89 searches of selected study's reference lists were conducted for potentially eligible studies. A review protocol
90 was not prepared/registered prior to literature search.

91 **2.2 Study selection**

92 Duplicate studies were identified and eliminated prior to initial screening. Initial screening involved, two
93 researchers independently (AHA, NM) screening the title, abstract, and keywords against the eligibility criteria.
94 Selected studies' reference lists were manually searched for other potentially eligible papers and included for
95 further screening. Following initial screening, selected studies underwent full-text screening against the
96 eligibility criteria, with the selected studies following this further screening included within this review.
97 Disagreements by the two researchers following initial or full-text screening, were resolved through discussion.
98 Studies were included if they involved women's soccer players, participants could be of any age, standard or
99 playing position, and studies were included if they involved a physical, technical or tactical performance aspect
100 of friendly or competitive match-play. Only peer-reviewed studies were included, with abstracts, book chapters,
101 systematic reviews and theses excluded. Studies which only included; men, match-play characteristics of other
102 football codes (i.e. American football, Australian rules football, futsal, Gaelic football, rugby league, rugby
103 union, rugby sevens), quantification of training characteristics (i.e. did not include match-play), adapted match-
104 play formats (i.e. match-play not in accordance with official rules for the respective age-group, e.g. reduced
105 match duration or dimensions, small-sided games), or studies unavailable in English were also excluded.

106 **2.3 Methodological quality**

107 The methodological quality of the selected studies were assessed in line with previous systematic reviews
108 involving match performance of soccer players [22, 23]. The methodological quality criteria are shown in Table
109 1. A maximum score of 10 out of 9 criteria questions could be obtained. Where 'clearly' is included within
110 criteria, this required the relevant information to be explicitly detailed within the study. Methodological quality
111 was included for descriptive purposes as opposed to criteria for inclusion/exclusion within this review.

112

113 **Table 1** Methodological quality criteria for selected studies

Question No.	Criteria	Score
Q1	The study is published in a peer-reviewed journal	No=0, yes=1
Q2	The study is published in an indexed journal	No=0, yes=1
Q3	The study objective(s) is/are clearly set out	No=0, yes=1
Q4	Either the number of recordings is specified or the distribution of players/recordings used is known	No=0, yes=1
Q5	The duration of player recordings (an entire half, a complete match etc.) is clearly indicated.	No=0, yes=1
Q6	A distinction is made according to player positions	No=0, yes=1
Q7	The reliability/validity of the instrument is not stated, is mentioned or is measured	Not stated=0, mentioned=1, measured=2
Q8	Certain contextual variables (e.g. match status, match location, type of competition or the opponent) are taken into account in analysis or information is clearly specified	No=0, yes=1
Q9	The results are clearly presented	No=0, yes=1

114

115 **2.4 Data extraction**

116 Data were extracted by one author (AHA), and checked by a second (NM), with any disagreements resolved
117 through discussion. Data relating to participant and study characteristics (e.g. age, height, body mass, standard
118 of competition, number of teams, number of matches), methods of data collection and analysis (e.g. equipment
119 specification, adopted velocity thresholds, variable definitions), and match-play characteristics (e.g. physical,
120 technical or tactical variables, and match contextual information such as match outcome) were extracted. Where
121 data were presented as figures, WebPlotDigitizer v4.4 [24] was utilised to extract data. Where studies included
122 other data in addition to the relevant data, only the eligible data relating to match-play characteristics of
123 women's soccer players were extracted. For example, sex-differences [25-30], training and adapted match-
124 formats [29, 31-33], matches against men's soccer teams [34], or assessments of fitness or physiological
125 characteristics [35, 36]. Lastly, to facilitate comparisons between studies, metrics were converted to standard
126 units, including; player height (cm), distance covered (m), and relative distance covered ($\text{m} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$).

127 **2.5 Statistical analysis**

128 A meta-analysis was precluded within this systematic review due to the variation in methods of data collection
129 and analysis. Data are presented as mean \pm SD. Where possible, any data extracted as mean \pm SE or confidence
130 intervals were converted to SD [19, 37-42], however, where this was not possible due to insufficient
131 methodological information provided within studies, SE or confidence intervals were reported and noted [8, 26,
132 33, 43-46].

133

134 3 Results

135 3.1 Overview

136 Figure 1 presents a flow diagram of the study selection process. The electronic database search identified 1562
137 articles, with an additional 29 articles identified through other sources. A total of 69 articles remained for
138 analysis following removal of duplicates, initial and full-text screening [8, 19, 20, 25-90].

139 **Fig 1** Flow diagram of study selection process for qualitative synthesis

140

141 3.2 Study quality

142 The results for the methodological quality can be seen in Table 2. The mean score was 7.3 ± 1.4 , and scores
143 ranged between 4-10. The majority of studies lacked information regarding contextual variables (Q8 n = 28) of
144 matches, whilst only 33 of the 69 studies differentiated match-play characteristics by playing position (Q6).

145 **Table 2** Methodological quality of included studies

Study	Question number									Total score
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	
Alcock (2010) [47]	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	8
Althoff et al. (2010) [25]	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	6
Andersen et al. (2016) [31]	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Andersson et al. (2010) [43]	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	9
Beare & Stone (2019) [48]	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	8
Bendiksen et al. (2013) [35]	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
Benjamin et al. (2020) [36]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	7
Bohner et al. (2015) [49]	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	5
Bozzini et al. (2020) [50]	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
Bradley et al. (2014) [26]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	7
Casal et al. (2021) [27]	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	8
Datson et al. (2017) [51]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
Datson et al. (2019) [52]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
De Jong et al. (2020) [53]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	8
Gabbett et al. (2008) [34]	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	6
Gabbett et al. (2013) [54]	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	6
Garcia-Unanue et al. (2020) [55]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	8
Gentles et al. (2018) [56]	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	7
Gómez et al. (2008) [28]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	7
Griffin et al. (2021) [57]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Harkness-Armstrong et al. (2020) [37]	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	10
Harkness-Armstrong et al. (2021) [19]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Harriss et al. (2019) [58]	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	9
Hewitt et al. (2014) [38]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Hjelm (2011) [59]	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	6
Ibáñez et al. (2018) [60]	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	7
Ishida et al. (2021) [61]	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	6
Jagim et al. (2020) [62]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Julian et al. (2020) [63]	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	7

Konstadinidou & Tsigilis (2005) [64]	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	8
Krustrup et al. (2005) [65]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	7
Krustrup et al. (2010) [66]	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
Kubayi & Larkin (2020) [67]	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	9
Mara et al. (2012) [68]	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	9
Mara et al. (2017) [69]	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	9
Mara et al. (2017) [70]	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	9
McCormack et al. (2015) [71]	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	6
McFadden et al. (2020) [29]	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	6
Meylan et al. (2017) [72]	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	7
Mohr et al. (2008) [44]	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	6
Nakamura et al. (2017) [73]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
Ohlsson et al. (2015) [32]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	8
Panduro et al. (2021) [74]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	8
Park et al. (2019) [39]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	8
Paulsen et al. (2018) [45]	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	6
Peek et al. (2021) [75]	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	10
Póvoas et al. (2020) [76]	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	6
Principe et al. (2021) [77]	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	6
Ramos et al. (2017) [78]	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	7
Ramos et al. (2019) [33]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	6
Ramos et al. (2019) [79]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
Romero-Moraleda et al. (2021) [80]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	9
Sausaman et al. (2019) [81]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	7
Scott et al. (2020) [8]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
Scott et al. (2020) [82]	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	6
Soroka & Bergeir (2010) [83]	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	7
Tenga et al. (2015) [30]	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	7
Trewin et al. (2018) [20]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	7
Trewin et al. (2018) [84]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	8
Tscholl et al. (2007) [85]	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	6
Vescovi (2012) [86]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
Vescovi (2014) [40]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	7
Vescovi & Falenchuk (2019) [46]	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	6
Vescovi & Favero (2014) [41]	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	6
Wang & Qin (2020) [87]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Wang & Qin (2020) [88]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	8
Wells et al. (2015) [89]	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	6
Williams et al. (2019) [42]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Zubillaga et al. (2013) [90]	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	5
Total	69	69	69	48	56	33	60	28	69	7.3

146

147 3.3 Participant and study characteristics

148 Table 3 presents the participant and study characteristics of the 69 studies. The earliest study was published in
149 2005 [64,65]. There has been a notable increase in publications since 2015 (70%). Only 39 studies reported the
150 year(s)/season(s) data was collected, of which 13 and 21 studies' data were collected prior to- and since 2015,
151 respectively, whilst 5 studies involved data collected both prior to- and since 2015. Nationalities of
152 participants/locations of match-play included; Australia (n=8; 12%), Brazil (n=5; 7%), USA (n=21; 30%),
153 Canada (n=1; 1%), and various Asian countries (n=1; 1%), European countries (n=24; 35%), or countries

154 competing in the FIFA Women's World Cup Finals (n=9; 13%), whilst 3 studies did not report this information
155 [20, 72, 84]. Studies predominantly quantified match-play characteristics of senior players (n=63; 91%), and
156 included international (n=27; 39%), top tier domestic (n=28; 41%), lower tiers domestic (n=3; 4%), and
157 college/university (n=13; 19%) playing standards. Only seven studies involved youth players, including; U20
158 [78, 79], U17 [40, 75, 79], U16 [19, 37, 40, 75], U15 [40, 58, 75], U14 [19, 37, 58, 75] and U13 age-groups [58,
159 75]. Of the 53 studies which reported the number of teams, over half only involved a single team (n = 30; 57%).
160 The mean number of reported participants was 52 (6-518), with 7 studies involving more than 100 participants
161 (107-518) [8, 19, 37, 41, 51, 52, 55]. Of the 57 studies which reported number of matches, the mean number of
162 matches observed was 38 (1-695). However, when excluding the largest number of matches observed within a
163 single study (n=695) [53], the mean reduced to 27 (1-230) matches. The majority of studies involved
164 competitive match-play only, with two studies involving both competitive and friendly match-play [40, 57],
165 three studies involving only non-competitive match-play [31, 39, 72], and two studies not stating whether
166 match-play was competitive or friendly [20, 61]. Nineteen studies did not report the number of match files. The
167 mean number of reported match files was 200 (4-3268), however when discarding the study with the largest
168 number of match files (n=3268) [8], the mean was reduced to 138 (4-695) match files.

Table 3 Participant and study characteristics of studies quantifying match-play characteristics of women's soccer

Study	Year(s) of Data Collection	Nationality / Location	Age-Group	Playing Standard	No. of Teams	No. of Participants	No. of Matches	No. of Match Files	Data Inclusion	Age (yrs)	Height (cm)	Body Mass (kg)
Alcock (2010) [47]	2007	WWC	Senior	INT	NS	NS	32	32	All players	NS	NS	NS
Althoff et al. (2010) [25]	1999	WWC	Senior	INT	NS	NS	8	8	All players	NS	NS	NS
Andersen et al. (2016) [31]	NS	Denmark & Norway	Senior	DOM D1-3	3	27	1	NS	NS	21 ± 6	168.2 ± 1.5	61.0 ± 1.4
Andersson et al. (2010) [43]	NS	Denmark & Sweden	Senior	INT DOM D1	2 NS	17	3	54 3	WM	27 ± 1	170 ± 7	62 ± 7
Beare & Stone (2019) [48]	2017-2018	England	Senior	DOM D1	NS	NS	89	89	All players	NS	NS	NS
Bendiksen et al. (2013) [35]	NS	Norway	Senior	DOM D2	1	11	1	NS	NS	21.0 ± 4.5	169.3 ± 5.5	58.7 ± 6.0
Benjamin et al. (2020) [36]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	14	26	199	>60-min	20.6 ± 1.4	169 ± 6.1	64.7 ± 5.3
Bohner et al. (2015) [49]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	6	3	NS	>60-min	19.5 ± 1.0	165.2 ± 5.5	62.1 ± 6.4
Bozzini et al. (2020) [50]	2018	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	11	NS	NS	45-min	19.0 ± 1.0	NS	68.1 ± 5.4
Bradley et al. (2014) [26]	NS	Europe	Senior	DOM UEFA CL	NS	59	NS	NS	WM	NS	NS	NS
Casal et al. (2021) [27]	2016-2017	Spain	Senior	DOM D1	14	NS	68	68	All players	NS	NS	NS
Datson et al. (2017) [51]	2011-2013	Europe	Senior	INT	13	107	10	148	WM	NS	NS	NS
Datson et al. (2019) [52]	2011-2013	Europe	Senior	INT	13	107	10	148	WM	NS	NS	NS
De Jong et al. (2020) [53]	2011-2018	Europe & USA & WWC	Senior	INT & DOM D1	NS	NS	695	695	All players	NS	NS	NS
Gabbett et al. (2008) [34]	NS	Australia	Senior	INT DOM D1	1 1	13	12 9	NS NS	NS	21 ± 2	NS	NS
Gabbett et al. (2013) [54]	NS	Australia	Senior	INT DOM D1	1 1	13	5 10	15 19	NS	21 ± 2	NS	NS
Garcia-Unanue et al. (2020) [55]	2011 2015	WWC	Senior	INT INT	16 24	205 313	NS	NS	>90-min	26.7 ± 4.2 28.7 ± 5.2	NS	NS
Gentles et al. (2018) [56]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D2	1	25	17	305	NS	20.2 ± 1.1	166.3 ± 5.9	62.0 ± 7.0
Gómez et al. (2008) [28]	2007	WWC	Senior	INT	NS	NS	13	13	All players	NS	NS	NS
Griffin et al. (2021) [57]	2016-2018	Australia	Senior	INT DOM D1	1 1	18	15 15	97 85	WM	25.6 ± 3.7 25.7 ± 3.1	166.7 ± 8.4 167.5 ± 7.7	59.7 ± 6.8 61.3 ± 6.2
Harkness-Armstrong et al. (2020) [37]	2018-2020	England	U16 U14	DOM D1	6 5	108 81	21 24	210 239	Positional observation	15.0 ± 0.6 12.9 ± 0.7	162.4 ± 5.9 158.7 ± 6.4	56.1 ± 6.4 48.5 ± 8.9
Harkness-Armstrong et al. (2021) [19]	2018-2020	England	U16 U14	DOM D1	6 6	108 93	26 24	204 227	Positional observation	15.0 ± 0.6 12.9 ± 0.7	162.4 ± 5.9 158.7 ± 6.4	56.1 ± 6.4 48.5 ± 8.9
Harriss et al. (2019) [58]	NS	Canada	U13-15	DOM	3	NS	60	60	All players	NS	NS	NS
Hewitt et al. (2014) [38]	NS	Australia	Senior	INT	1	15	13	58	WM	23.5 ± 0.7	170 ± 1	64.9 ± 1.3
Hjelm (2011) [59]	2003, 2007	Sweden	Senior	INT	1	NS	14	14	All players	NS	NS	NS
Ibáñez et al. (2018) [60]	2015-2016	Spain	Senior	DOM D1	16	NS	230	230	All players	NS	NS	NS
Ishida et al. (2021) [61]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	12	1	12	NS	20.7 ± 2.3	164.5 ± 6.0	64.4 ± 7.2
Jagim et al. (2020) [62]	2019	USA	Senior	COL D3	1	25	22	241	WM	19.7 ± 1.1	161 ± 30	66.7 ± 7.5
Julian et al. (2020) [63]	2015-2016	Germany	Senior	DOM D1-2	NS	15	NS	NS	>75-min	23 ± 4	169 ± 80	64.3 ± 8.2

Konstadinidou & Tsigilis (2005) [64]	1999	WWC	Senior	INT	4	NS	20	20	All players	NS	NS	NS
Krustrup et al. (2005) [65]	NS	Denmark	Senior	DOM D1	NS	14	4	14	WM	24	167	58.5
Krustrup et al. (2010) [66]	NS	Denmark	Senior	DOM D1	NS	23	3	23	NS	23	169	60.1
Kubayi & Larkin (2020) [67]	2019	WWC	Senior	INT	NS	NS	48	48	All players	NS	NS	NS
Mara et al. (2012) [68]	2010-2011	Australia	Senior	DOM D1	7	NS	34	34	All players	NS	NS	NS
Mara et al. (2017) [69]	NS	Australia	Senior	DOM D1	1	12	7	49	WM	24.3 ± 4.2	171.9 ± 5.1	65.3 ± 5.1
Mara et al. (2017) [70]	NS	Australia	Senior	DOM D1	1	12	7	49	WM	24.3 ± 4.2	171.9 ± 5.1	65.3 ± 5.1
McCormack et al. (2015) [71]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	10	16	NS	>45-min	20.5 ± 1.0	166.6 ± 5.1	61.1 ± 5.8
McFadden et al. (2020) [29]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	9	23	NS	>45-min	19.3 ± 1.4	166.6 ± 5.3	63.9 ± 5.7
Meylan et al. (2017) [72]	NS	NS	Senior	INT	1	13	34	157	WM	27.0 ± 5.3	170.3 ± 6.1	65.7 ± 5.3
Mohr et al. (2008) [44]	NS	USA	Senior	Top-Class (INT & DOM D1)	NS	19	2	NS	WM	NS	NS	NS
		Denmark & Sweden	Senior	High-Level (DOM D1)	NS	15	2	NS				
Nakamura et al. (2017) [73]	2015	Brazil	Senior	DOM D1	1	11	10	61	WM	21.0 ± 3.0	163.8 ± 4.5	59.7 ± 8.0
Ohlsson et al. (2015) [32]	NS	Sweden	Senior	DOM D1	3	15	1	15	>45-min	24 ± 3	167 ± 6	60 ± 4
Panduro et al. (2021) [74]	2019-20	Denmark	Senior	DOM D1	8	94	NS	108	WM	22.5 ± 4.2	170 ± 6	64.0 ± 6.1
Park et al. (2019) [39]	2012-2015	USA	Senior	INT	1	27	52	277	>45-min	24.6 ± 3.8	168.9 ± 4.8	63.0 ± 4.2
Paulsen et al. (2018) [45]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	21	13	NS	NS	18 - 23	NS	NS
Peek et al. (2021) [75]	2019	Australia	U13-17	DOM D1	55	NS	50	55	NS	NS	NS	NS
Póvoas et al. (2020) [76]	NS	Europe	Senior	INT	3	48	12	NS	NS	26 ± 4	170 ± 4	63.4 ± 4.8
Principe et al. (2021) [77]	2019	Brazil	Senior	DOM D1	1	23	23	NS	NS	27.7 ± 4.7	15.4 ± 5.8	60.9 ± 5.3
Ramos et al. (2017) [78]	2015	Brazil	U20	INT	1	12	7	NS	NS	18.0 ± 0.7	167 ± 5.8	62.0 ± 6.2
Ramos et al. (2019) [33]	2016	Brazil	Senior	INT	1	21	6	NS	>45min	26 ± 3.6	167 ± 5.8	NS
Ramos et al. (2019) [79]	2016	Brazil	Senior	INT	1	17	6	47	WM	27 ± 4.5	186.9 ± 4.8	60.7 ± 4.5
	2015		U20		1	14	7	54		18.1 ± 0.8	165.9 ± 6.8	59.9 ± 6.2
	2016		U17		1	14	7	43		15.6 ± 0.5	164.6 ± 6.4	58.0 ± 4.3
Romero-Morleda et al. (2021) [80]	2017-2018	Spain	Senior	DOM D1	1	18	NS	94	≥85% WM	26.5 ± 5.7	164.4 ± 5.3	58.6 ± 5.6
Sausaman et al. (2019) [81]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	23	NS	375	WM	20.6 ± 1.0	163.5 ± 13.3	62.1 ± 7.1
Scott et al. (2020) [8]	2016-2017	USA	Senior	DOM D1 (INT)	10	78	NS	1375	WM	25.0 ± 3.3	166.7 ± 6.1	64.0 ± 6.4
				DOM D1 (non-INT)		142	NS	1893				
Scott et al. (2020) [82]	2016-2017	USA	Senior	DOM D1	10	36	NS	408	WM	24.4*	168.2*	62.9*
Soroka & Bergeir (2010) [83]	2005	Europe	Senior	INT	NS	NS	15	15	All players	NS	NS	NS
Tenga et al. (2015) [30]	2003-2005	Spain	Senior	DOM D1	4	NS	4	4	All players	NS	NS	NS
Trewin et al. (2018) [20]	2012-2016	NS	Senior	INT	1	45	55	172	WM	NS	NS	NS
Trewin et al. (2018) [84]	2012-2015	NS	Senior	INT	1	45	47	606	>75-min	15 - 34	NS	NS
Tscholl et al. (2007) [85]	1999-2000, 2002-2004	WWC & Olympics	Senior & U19	INT	NS	NS	24	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Vescovi (2012) [86]	NS	USA	Senior	DOM D1	NS	71	12	139	WM	NS	NS	NS
Vescovi (2014) [40]	NS	USA	U17	DOM	NS	15	NS	15	WM	NS	NS	NS
			U16	DOM	NS	63	NS	63		NS	NS	NS
			U15	DOM	NS	11	NS	11		NS	NS	NS

Vescovi & Falenchuk (2019) [46]	NS	USA	Senior	DOM D1	NS	28	NS	NS	WM	NS	NS	NS
Vescovi & Favero (2014) [41]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	9	113	NS	117	>One half	NS	NS	NS
Wang & Qi (2020) [87]	2019	WWC	Senior	INT	24	NS	52	52	All players	NS	NS	NS
Wang & Qi (2020) [88]	2019	Asia	Senior	INT	4	NS	50	50	All players	NS	NS	NS
Wells et al. (2015) [89]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	9	21	NS	≥55-min	21.3 ± 0.9	170.3 ± 5.7	64.0 ± 5.8
Williams et al. (2019) [42]	NS	USA	Senior	COL D1	1	25	21	94	WM	19.3 ± 1.1	167.6 ± 5.6	63.0 ± 6.4
Zubillaga et al. (2013) [90]	NS	Spain	Senior	DOM D1	4	NS	4	4	All players	NS	NS	NS

NS=not specified. Nationality: WWC=Women's World Cup. Age-Group: U=under. Playing Standard: COL=college, DOM=domestic, INT=international, D=division/tier. Match Files: WM=whole match. * mean calculated from available data

170
171

172 **3.4 Physical characteristics**

173 Studies predominantly quantified physical characteristics of women's soccer match-play (n=47; 68%). The
174 majority (n=35; 74%) quantified whole-match absolute characteristics, whilst 21 studies (45%) quantified half-
175 match absolute characteristics, 15 studies (32%) quantified segmental absolute values (e.g. 5-minutes, 15-
176 minutes), 16 studies (34%) quantified whole-match relative values, and 8 studies (17%) quantified peak values.
177 Distance was the most commonly quantified variable (n=43; 91%). Details of data collection and analysis
178 methods are presented in Table 4. Data collection methods for quantifying external load variables included; 5
179 Hz (n=9; 19%), 10 Hz (n=22; 47%) or 15 Hz (n=1; 2%) GPS units, time-motion analyses (n=5; 11%), 25 Hz
180 multi-camera match analysis system (n=3; 6%), 25 Hz optical player tracking system (n=2; 4%), and 20 Hz
181 radio-frequency tracking (n=2; 4%). Heart rate monitors were used in 11 studies (23%), and the respective
182 physical characteristics reported are presented in Table S1.

Table 4 Methods used to quantify physical characteristics of women's soccer match-play

Study	Data Collection	Comparative Groups	Time-Period				Physical Characteristics	
			W	H	S	P		
			A	R				
Andersen et al. (2016) [31]	20 Hz RF tracking (ZXY Sport Tracking System); HR monitor (Polar Team 2 System, Polar Electro OY)	N/A	Y	-	Y	Y	-	TD (km), TD (km) in velocity zones, accelerations (n), HIR and SPR bouts, mean and peak HR (BPM, % HR _{max})
Andersson et al. (2010) [43]	Video camera; time-motion analysis; HR monitor (Team System, Polar Electro OY)	<i>Playing Standard:</i> INT vs DOM D1 <i>Playing Position:</i> DEF vs MID vs FWD	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	TD (km), TD (km) in velocity zones, total time spent in velocity zones (%), frequency (n) and duration (s) of efforts, mean HR (BPM, % HR _{max})
Bendiksen et al. (2013) [35]	20 Hz RF tracking (ZXY Sport Tracking System)	N/A	Y	-	-	Y	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones
Benjamin et al. (2020) [36]	10 Hz GPS (Viper Pod, STATSports)	<i>Environmental Factors:</i> Low WBGT vs moderate WBGT vs high WBGT	-	Y	-	-	-	TD (m·min ⁻¹), HSR (%/TD), High Metabolic Load (%)
Bohner et al. (2015) [49]	10 Hz GPS (MinimaxX 4.3, Catapult)	<i>Environmental Factors:</i> Sea-level vs altitude	-	Y	Y	-	-	TD (m·min ⁻¹), TD (m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones
Bozzini et al. (2020) [50]	10 Hz GPS and HR monitor (Polar TeamPro; Polar Electro OY)	<i>Type of Competition:</i> In-conference vs out-of-conference	-	Y	Y	-	-	TD (m·min ⁻¹), TD (m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, SPR efforts (n·min ⁻¹), time in heart rate zones (min·min ⁻¹), energy expenditure (kcal·min ⁻¹)
Bradley et al. (2014) [26]	25 Hz multi-camera match analysis system (Amisco Pro)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs FB vs CM vs WM vs ATT	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones
Datson et al. (2017) [51]	25 Hz multi-camera match analysis system (STATS)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs WD vs CM vs WM vs ATT	Y	-	-	Y	Y	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, SPR; frequency (n), distance (m) and type (%)
Datson et al. (2019) [52]	25 Hz multi-camera match analysis system (STATS)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs WD vs CM vs WM vs ATT	Y	-	-	-	-	Frequency (n) of efforts and bouts, distance (m) of efforts, recovery duration (s) between efforts and bouts
Gabbett et al. (2008) [34]	Video camera; time-motion analysis	<i>Playing Standard:</i> INT vs DOM D1	Y	-	Y	-	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, time in velocity zones (%), frequency (n) and duration (s) of efforts. SPR; frequency (n), bouts (n), duration (s), recovery duration (s) and recovery movement (%)
Gabbett et al. (2013) [54]	Video camera; time-motion analysis	N/A	-	-	Y	Y	-	RHIA and RSA; frequency of bouts (n), efforts in bout (n), duration (s), recovery duration (s)
Gentles et al. (2018) [56]	5 Hz GPS (BT-Q1300ST, Qstarz International Co.)	N/A	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (km), TD (km) in velocity zones, impulse load (N·s), RPE
Griffin et al. (2021) [57]	10 Hz GPS (SPI HPU, GPSports; VX Live Log, VX Sport)	<i>Playing Standard:</i> INT vs DOM D1 <i>Playing Position:</i> DEF vs MID vs ATT	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, and deceleration duration (s)
Harkness-Armstrong et al. (2021) [19]	10 Hz GPS (Optimeye S5; Catapult)	<i>Age-Group:</i> U14 vs U16 <i>Position:</i> CD vs WD vs CM vs WM vs FWD	Y	Y	-	-	Y	TD (m, m·min ⁻¹), TD (m, m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, maximum velocity (m·s ⁻¹)
Hewitt et al. (2014) [38]	5 Hz GPS (MinimaxX v2.5; Catapult)	<i>Playing Position:</i> DEF vs MID vs ATT <i>Opposition Quality:</i> Ranked top 10 vs ranked 11-25 vs ranked >25	Y	-	Y	Y	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, time spent SPR (%/TD)
Ishida et al. (2021) [61]	10 Hz GPS (Optimeye S5; Catapult)	N/A	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, PlayerLoad (au)
Jagim et al. (2020) [62]	10 Hz GPS and HR monitor (Polar TeamPro; Polar Electro, OY)	<i>Playing Position:</i> GK vs CB vs CM vs FP vs FWD	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, energy expenditure (kcal), mean HR (BPM, % HR _{max}), SPR efforts (n), accelerations and decelerations (n)
Julian et al. (2020) [63]	5 Hz GPS (TT01, Tracktics GmbH)	<i>Stage of Menstrual Cycle:</i> follicular phase vs luteal phase	-	Y	-	-	-	TD (m·min ⁻¹), TD (m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, HSR and SPR bouts (n)
Krustrup et al. (2005) [65]	Video camera; time-motion analysis; HR monitor (Polar Vantage NC, Polar Electro OY)	N/A	Y	-	-	Y	-	TD (km), TD (km) in velocity zones, time spent in velocity zones (%), frequency (n) and duration (s) of efforts, mean HR (BPM)

Krustrup et al. (2010) [66]	HR monitor (Polar Vantage NC, Polar Electro OY)	N/A	Y	-	-	-	-	Mean HR (BPM, % HR _{max}), peak HR (BPM, % HR _{max})
Mara et al. (2017) [69]	25 Hz optical player tracking system (Australian Institute of Sport)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs WD vs MID vs WATT vs CATT	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Frequency (n), mean and maximum distance (m) per acceleration and deceleration effort, mean and maximum time (s) between efforts
Mara et al. (2017) [70]	25 Hz optical player tracking system (Australian Institute of Sport)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs WD vs MID vs WATT vs CATT	Y	-	Y	Y	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, frequency (n) mean and maximum distance (m) and duration (s) of HSR, RHSA, SPR, and RSPR efforts, recovery between efforts (s)
McCormack et al. (2015) [71]	10 Hz GPS (MinimaxX 4.0, Catapult)	<i>Match Congestion:</i> Previous match >42 hours vs <42 hours	-	Y	-	-	-	TD (m·min ⁻¹), TD (m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, HIR and SPR efforts (n)
McFadden et al. (2020) [29]	10 Hz GPS and HR monitor (Polar TeamPro; Polar Electro, OY)	N/A	Y	-	-	-	-	Average speed (km·h ⁻¹), TD (km), TD (m) in velocity zones, SPR efforts (n), time spent in HR zones (min), energy expenditure (kcal)
Meylan et al. (2017) [72]	10 Hz GPS, 100 Hz accelerometer (MinimaxX S4, Catapult)	N/A	-	Y	-	-	-	TD (m·min ⁻¹), TD (m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, high-intensity efforts (n·min ⁻¹), high inertial sensor count (n·min ⁻¹), accelerations (n·min ⁻¹)
Mohr et al. (2008) [44]	Video camera; time-motion analysis	<i>Playing Standard:</i> INT vs DOM D1 <i>Playing Position:</i> DEF vs MID vs FWD	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, time spent in velocity zones (%), frequency (n) and duration (s) of efforts
Nakamura et al. (2017) [73]	5 Hz GPS (SPI Elite, GPSports Systems)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs FB vs MID vs FWD	Y	-	Y	-	-	SPR; distance (m), frequency (n), duration (s), recovery between efforts (s)
Ohlsson et al. (2015) [32]	HR monitor (Polar Team 2 System, Polar Electro OY)	N/A	Y	-	Y	-	-	Mean HR (BPM, % HR _{max}), peak HR (BPM, % HR _{max}), time spent in HR _{max} zones (%)
Panduro et al. (2021) [74]	10 Hz GPS and HR monitor (Polar TeamPro; Polar Electro OY)	<i>Playing Position:</i> GK vs CD vs FB vs CM vs EM vs FWD	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, peak speed (km·h ⁻¹), mean and peak heart rate (BPM, % HR _{max}), time spent in HR zones (min/min), accelerations and decelerations (n)
Park et al. (2019) [39]	10 Hz GPS (MinimaxX S4, Catapult)	N/A	-	-	Y	-	-	TD (m)
Principe et al. (2021) [77]	10 Hz GPS (Polar TeamPro; Polar Electro OY)	<i>Playing Position:</i> DEF vs MID vs FWD	-	-	Y	-	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, accelerations and decelerations (n)
Paulsen et al. (2018) [45]	HR monitor (Polar Team 2 System, Polar Electro OY)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs OD vs MID vs FWD	Y	-	-	Y	-	Mean HR (BPM)
Ramos et al. (2017) [78]	10 Hz GPS (MinimaxX, Team S5, Catapult)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs WD vs MID vs FWD	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, accelerations (n), decelerations (n), Player Load (au)
Ramos et al. (2019) [33]	10 Hz GPS (MinimaxX, Team S5, Catapult)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs WD vs CM vs WM vs FWD	-	Y	-	-	-	TD (m·min ⁻¹), TD (m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, accelerations (n·min ⁻¹), decelerations (n·min ⁻¹), repeated accelerations/SPR (n·min ⁻¹)
Ramos et al. (2019) [79]	10 Hz GPS (MinimaxX, Team S5, Catapult)	<i>Age-Group:</i> U17 vs U20 vs senior <i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs WD vs MID vs ATT	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, accelerations (n), decelerations (n), Player Load (au)
Romero-Moraleda et al. (2021) [80]	5 Hz GPS (SPI Pro X, GPSports Systems)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CB vs WB vs CM vs WM vs ATT	Y	Y	-	-	-	TD (m, m·min ⁻¹), TD (m, m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, accelerations and decelerations (n), body load (au), RPE
Sausaman et al. (2019) [81]	10 Hz GPS (NS, Catapult)	<i>Playing Position:</i> DEF vs MID vs ATT	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones
Scott et al. (2020) [8]	10 Hz GPS (Optimeye S5, Catapult)	<i>Playing Standard:</i> DOM 1 (INT) vs DOM D1 (non-INT) <i>Playing Position:</i> GK vs CD vs WD vs CAM vs CDM vs WM vs FWD	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones, maximum velocity (km/h)
Scott et al. (2020) [82]	10 Hz GPS (Optimeye S5, Catapult)	N/A	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (m), TD (m) in velocity zones
Trewin et al. (2018) [20]	10 Hz GPS (Optimeye S5, Catapult)	<i>Playing Position:</i> CD vs FB vs MID vs FWD	Y	Y	-	-	Y	TD (m, m·min ⁻¹), TD (m, m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, accelerations (n), HSR and SPR efforts (n), Player Load (au)

Trewin et al. (2018) [84]	10 Hz GPS (MinimaxX S4; Catapult)	<i>Environmental Factors:</i> Sea-level vs altitude, cold/mild vs warm/hot <i>Match Outcome:</i> Win vs draw vs loss <i>Opposition Quality:</i> 'Win vs higher ranked' vs 'draw vs higher ranked' vs 'loss vs higher ranked' vs 'win vs lower ranked' vs 'draw vs lower ranked' vs 'loss vs lower ranked' <i>Match Congestion:</i> Previous match >72 hours vs <72 hours	-	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (m·min ⁻¹), TD (m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, accelerations (n·min ⁻¹), HSR and SPR efforts (n·min ⁻¹)
Vescovi (2012) [86]	5 Hz GPS (SPI Pro, GPSports)	<i>Playing Position:</i> DEF vs MID vs FWD	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	SPR; distance (m, %/TD), duration (s), time between efforts (s), maximum velocity (km·h ⁻¹)
Vescovi (2014) [40]	5 Hz GPS (SPI Pro, GPSports)	<i>Age-Group:</i> U15 vs U16 vs U17 <i>Playing Position:</i> DEF vs MID vs FWD	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	TD (m, m·min ⁻¹), TD (m) in velocity zones, maximum velocity (m·min ⁻¹), SPR; frequency (n) and distance (m)
Vescovi & Falenchuk (2019) [46]	5 Hz GPS (SPI Pro, GPSports)	<i>Match Location:</i> Home vs away <i>Type of Surface:</i> Natural vs artificial <i>Match Outcome:</i> Win vs draw vs loss	-	Y	-	-	-	-	TD (m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, distance at Metabolic Power (m·min ⁻¹); low (<20 W·kg ⁻¹), high (20-35 W·kg ⁻¹), elevated (35-55 W·kg ⁻¹), maximal (>55 W·kg ⁻¹)
Vescovi & Favero (2014) [41]	5 Hz GPS (SPI Pro, GPSports)	<i>Playing Position:</i> DEF vs MID vs FWD	-	-	Y	-	-	-	TD (m, m·min ⁻¹), TD (m) in velocity zones
Wells et al. (2015) [89]	10 Hz GPS (MinimaxX 4.0, Catapult)	<i>Stage of Season:</i> Regular-season vs post-season	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	TD (m, m·min ⁻¹), TD (m, m·min ⁻¹) in velocity zones, time in velocity zones (min,%), maximum velocity (km·h ⁻¹), energy cost (kJ·kg ⁻¹), exertion index (au·min ⁻¹), PlayerLoad (au)
Williams et al. (2019) [42]	15 Hz GPS (SPI HPU, GPSports); HR monitor (T34, Polar Electro OY)	N/A	Y	-	-	Y	-	-	TD (m), High Metabolic Power (m), Speed Exertion (au), mean HR (BPM), HR exertion (au), Energy Expenditure (kJ/kg)

184 Data Collection: GPS=global positioning system; HR=heart rate; RF=radio-frequency. Comparative Groups: INT=international; DOM=domestic; D=division; U=under; GK= goalkeeper; DEF=defender; CB=centre
185 back; CD=central defender; OD=outside defender; WD=wide defender; FB=full-back; MID=midfield; CM=central midfield; CAM=central attacking midfield; CDM=central defensive midfield; WM=wide midfielder;
186 ATT=attacker; CATT=central attacker; WATT=wide attacker; FP=flank players; FWD=forward. WBGT=wet bulb-globe temperature. Time-period: W=whole-match; A=absolute; R=relative; H=half-match;
187 S=segmental; P=peak. Physical Characteristics: TD=total distance; HSR=high-speed running; HIR=high-intensity running; SPR=sprinting; RHIA=repeated high-intensity activity; RHSR=repeated high-speed running;
188 RSA=repeated-sprint activity; RSPR; repeated-sprinting; RPE=rate of perceived exertion.*Originally expressed as m·s⁻¹

189 The majority of studies involved comparative groups (n=34; 72%); playing position (n=25; 53%), playing
190 standard (n=5, 11%), and age-group (n=3; 6%). Whilst, 9 studies (19%) quantified the impact of contextual
191 variables on physical characteristics; environmental factors (e.g. altitude, temperature [36, 49, 84]), quality of
192 opposition [38, 84], match outcome [46, 84], type of competition [50], match location [46], congestion of
193 fixtures [71, 84], playing surface [46], stage of season [89], and stage of menstrual cycle [63].

194 Of the 26 studies which categorised players by playing position; 9 studies utilised high-level categorisation (i.e.
195 defenders vs midfielders vs forwards) [38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 57, 77, 81, 86]; 7 studies differentiated central and
196 wide defenders and midfielders (i.e. central defenders vs wide defenders vs central midfielders vs wide
197 midfielders vs forwards) [19, 26, 33, 51, 52, 74, 80]; 5 studies differentiated central and wide defenders only
198 (i.e. central defenders vs wide defenders vs midfielders vs forwards) [20, 45, 73, 78, 79]; 2 studies differentiated
199 central and wide defenders and forwards/attackers (i.e. central defenders vs wide defenders vs midfielders vs
200 central attackers vs wide attackers) [69, 70]; 1 study categorised wide players together (i.e. central defenders vs
201 central midfielders vs wide players vs forwards) [62]; and 1 study differentiated central midfielders (i.e. central
202 defenders vs wide defenders vs central attacking midfielders vs central defensive midfielders vs wide
203 midfielders vs forwards) [8]. Three studies included goalkeepers within analysis [8, 62, 74].

204 A variety of velocity thresholds have been adopted within the 40 studies which categorised movement into
205 velocity zones. The quantitative velocity thresholds are presented in Table 5. Four studies also quantified
206 backwards running ($>10 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$) [35, 43, 44, 65]. The methods for establishing or adopting velocity thresholds
207 included; arbitrary velocity thresholds which have previously been utilised in men's soccer literature [26, 35, 43,
208 44, 51, 52, 65, 81, 89], sample-mean or individualised velocity thresholds derived from physical performance
209 characteristics (e.g. sprint speed and maximal aerobic speed [20, 63, 72, 73, 84], velocity thresholds based on
210 physical performance characteristics of women's soccer players from existing literature [29, 33, 40, 41, 46, 57,
211 78, 79], derived velocity thresholds from match-play data of senior women's soccer players [8, 38, 39, 70, 82],
212 or a justification for velocity thresholds adopted was not provided [31, 49, 40, 56, 61, 62, 71, 73, 74, 77, 80, 86].
213 Additionally, 2 studies [34, 54], established velocity zones based on qualitative movement descriptors which
214 had previously been utilised in men's sports outside of soccer (e.g. hockey, rugby).

215
216

Table 5 Velocity thresholds (km·h⁻¹) adopted by selected studies utilising quantitative velocity zones to quantify physical characteristics of women's soccer match-play

Study	Standing	Walking	Jogging	Running	LSR / LIR	MSR / MIR	HSR / HIR	VHSR	Sprinting	No Descriptor	Additional
Andersen et al. (2016) [31]	-	< 7	7 - 12	12.1 - 16	-	-	16.1 - 20	-	>20	-	-
Andersson et al. (2010) [43]	0 - 6	6 - 8	8 - 12	-	12 - 15	15 - 18	18 - 25	-	>25	-	HIR >15
Bendiksen et al. (2013) [35]	-	0 - 8	8 - 12	-	12 - 15	15 - 18	18 - 21	-	>21	-	HIR >15
Bohner et al. (2015) [49]	0 - 2.02*	2.02 - 6.98*	6.98 - 9*	-	9 - 12.99*	13 - 15.98*	15.98 - 21.99	-	>22.0*	-	HIR >15.98
Bozzini et al. (2020) [50]	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.0 - 19.9	-	>20	-	-
Bradley et al. (2014) [26]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>15	-	-	0 - 12, 12 - 15, 15 - 18, 18 - 21, 21 - 23, 23 - 25, 25 - 27, >27	>12, >18
Datson et al. (2017) [51]	-	0.7 - 7.1	7.2 - 14.3	14.4 - 19.7	-	-	19.8 - 25.1	>19.8	>25.1	-	HSR >14.4
Datson et al. (2019) [52]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>19.8	-	>25.1	-	-
Gentles et al. (2018) [56]	1 - 4.99	5 - 9.99	-	-	10 - 14.99	-	15 - 19.99	20 - 24.99	>25	-	-
Griffin et al. (2021) [57]	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 - 20	-	>20	-	-
Harkness-Armstrong et al. (2021) [19]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>12.5	>19.0	>22.5	-	-
Hewitt et al. (2014) [38]	0 - 0.4	0.5 - 6	6 - 12	12 - 19	-	-	>12	-	>19	-	-
Ishida et al. (2021) [61]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>15	-	-	-	-
Jagim et al. (2020) [62]	-	<6.99	7.0 - 14.99	15.0-18.99	-	-	>15	-	>19	-	-
Juilian et al. (2020)	-	-	-	-	<13.2 ± 0.7	-	13.2 ± 0.7 - 16.69 ± 1.1	16.69 ± 1.1 - 19.94 ± 0.9	>19.94 ± 0.9	-	-
Krustrup et al. (2005) [65]	0 - 6	6 - 8	8 - 12	-	12 - 15	15 - 18	18 - 25	-	>25	-	HIR >15
Mara et al. (2017) [70]	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.24 - 19.44*	-	>19.44*	-	-
McCormack et al. (2015) [71]	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.99 - 21.99*	-	>21.99*	-	-
McFadden et al. (2020) [29]	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 - 18.99	-	>19	-	3 - 6.99, 7 - 10.99, 11 - 14.99
Meylan et al. (2017) [72]	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.5 - 19.9	-	>20	-	-
Mohr et al. (2008) [44]	0 - 6	6 - 8	8 - 12	-	12 - 15	15 - 18	18 - 25	-	>25	-	HIR >15
Nakamura et al. (2017) [73]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>20	-	IND SPR 19.37 ± 0.48

Panduro et al. (2021) [74]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>15	>18	>25	-	0 - 5.99, 6 - 11.99, 12 - 14.99, 15 - 17.99, 18 - 24.99
Park et al. (2019) [39]	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.5 - 19	19 - 22.5	>22.5	-	-
Principe et al. (2021) [77]	-	<11.99*	11.99 - 15.98*	15.99 - 19.98*	-	-	-	-	>19.98*	-	-
Ramos et al. (2017) [78]	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.6 - 20	-	>20	-	-
Ramos et al. (2019) [33]	0 - 6	-	-	6.1 - 8	8.1 - 12	12.1 - 15.5	15.6 - 20	-	>20	-	-
Ramos et al. (2019) [79]	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.6 - 20	-	>20	-	-
Romero-Moraleda et al. (2021) [80]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>15	-	-	-	-
Sausaman et al. (2019) [81]	0 - 0.1	0.1 - 6	6.1 - 8	-	8.1 - 12	12.1 - 15	15.1 - 18	-	18.1 - 25	-	HSR >15, SPR >18, Maximal SPR >25
Scott et al. (2020) [8]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>12.5	>19	>22.5	-	-
Scott et al. (2020) [82]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>12.5	>19	>22.5	-	-
Trewin et al. (2018) [20]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>16.48*	-	>19.98*	-	-
Trewin et al. (2018) [84]	-	-	-	-	-	-	>16.48*	-	>19.98*	-	-
Vescovi (2012) [86]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18 - 20.9, 21 - 22.9, 23 - 24.9, ≥25	-	>18 >21 >23
Vescovi (2014) [40]	-	0 - 6	6.1 - 8	-	8.1 - 12	12.1 - 15.5	15.6 - 20	-	>20	-	-
Vescovi & Falenchuk (2019) [46]	-	≤6	6.1 - 8	-	8.1 - 12	12.1 - 16	16.1 - 20	-	20.1 - 32	-	-
Vescovi & Favero (2014) [41]	-	0 - 6	6.1 - 8	-	8.1 - 12	12.1 - 15.5	15.6 - 20	-	>20	-	-
Wells et al. (2015) [89]	0 - 1.98*	1.99 - 6.95*	6.96 - 8.96*	-	8.97 - 12.99*	13 - 15.95*	15.96 - 21.9*	-	≥22.0	-	HIR: >13

217 LSR=low-speed running; LIR=low-intensity running; MSR=moderate-speed running; MIR=moderate-intensity running; HSR=high-speed running; HIR=high-intensity running; VHSR=very-high-speed running;
218 SPR=sprinting; IND=individualised. *Converted to km·h⁻¹ from m·s⁻¹
219

220 Fourteen studies quantified acceleration and/or deceleration, however, studies predominantly provided no
221 justification for the thresholds adopted ($>1 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$ [33, 79]; $>2 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$ [31, 77, 78]) [54, 64, 70]. Where a rationale
222 was provided, thresholds were either; derived from physical performance characteristics of the sample (e.g.
223 acceleration during a maximal sprint; $>2.26 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$) [20, 72, 84] or aligned to previous men's soccer literature (>2
224 $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$) [57, 69]. Five of these studies presented accelerations and/or decelerations within
225 acceleration/deceleration zones, however all studies adopted different thresholds (<1 , $>1 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$ [80]; 1-2, $>2 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}$
226 2 [77]; 0.5-1.99, 2-2.99, $>3 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$ [62]; 0.5-1.49, 1.5-2.99, $>3 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$ [74]; 1-2, 2-3, 3-4, $>4 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$ [57]).

227 **3.4.1 Whole-match physical characteristics**

228 The majority of studies quantifying physical characteristics quantified whole-match absolute values ($n=33$; [8,
229 20, 26, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 38 - 40, 42 - 45, 51, 52, 56, 57, 61, 62, 65, 66, 69, 70, 73, 74, 78 - 81, 86, 89]. Table 6
230 presents whole-match absolute values of the most frequently reported physical characteristics (i.e. total distance
231 (TD); TD in velocity zones (high-speed running (HSR), very-high-speed running (VHSR), and sprinting (SPR)),
232 maximum velocity, number of accelerations and decelerations). Whilst Tables S2 and S3 present the specific
233 HSR and SPR characteristics (i.e. number of efforts and repeated efforts, distance, duration, recovery duration),
234 and acceleration and deceleration characteristics (i.e. number of efforts, total duration), respectively. In addition
235 to the physical characteristics presented, studies quantified the number of game activities or (i.e. the total
236 number of individual efforts across all velocity zones; 1326-1641) [43, 44, 65], and percentage of game activity
237 for HSR (3.7 – 24%) [34, 43, 44, 51, 65] and SPR (0.54 – 2.7%) [34, 43, 44, 51] for senior international and
238 domestic players.

Table 6 Studies quantifying physical characteristics of women's soccer match-play per whole-match as absolute data

Study	Sample/Group	Velocity (km·h ⁻¹) and Acceleration (m·s ⁻²) Thresholds	Playing Position	TD (m)	HSR (m)	VHSR (m)	SPR (m)	Vmax (km·h ⁻¹)	ACC (n)	DEC (n)		
Andersen et al. (2016) [31]	DOM D1-D3	HSR: 16.1 – 20 SPR: >20 ACC: >2	All	10400 ± 800	1436 ± 308	-	498 ± 15	-	161 ± 31	-		
Andersson et al. (2010) [43]	INT	HSR: >15 SPR: >25	All	9900 ± 1800*	1530 ± 100*	-	256 ± 57*	-	-	-		
			DEF	9500 ± 900*	1310 ± 100*	-	221 ± 32*	-	-	-		
			MID	10600 ± 300*	1900 ± 200*	-	316 ± 51*	-	-	-		
	DOM D1		All	9700 ± 1400*	1330 ± 900	-	221 ± 45*	-	-	-		
			DEF	9500 ± 100*	1250 ± 130*	-	230 ± 33*	-	-	-		
			MID	10100 ± 300*	1480 ± 160*	-	221 ± 39*	-	-	-		
			FWD	9500 ± 500*	1360 ± 200*	-	191 ± 42*	-	-	-		
Bendiksen et al. (2013) [35]	DOM D2	HSR: >15 SPR: >21	All	9674 ± 191	1193 ± 115	-	372 ± 46	-	-			
Bradley et al. (2014) [26]	DOM UEFA CL	HSR: >15	All	10754**	777 ± 33	-	-	-	-	-		
			CD	10238**	602 ± 41	-	-	-	-	-		
			FB	10706**	756 ± 86	-	-	-	-	-		
			CM	11160**	778 ± 46	-	-	-	-	-		
			WM	10929**	931 ± 78	-	-	-	-	-		
			ATT	10766**	1051 ± 78	-	-	-	-	-		
Datson et al. (2017) [51]	INT	HSR: 19.8 – 25.1 VHSR: >19.8 SPR: >25.1	All	10321 ± 859	2520 ± 580	776 ± 247	168 ± 82	-	-	-		
			CD	9489 ± 562	1901 ± 268	534 ± 113	111 ± 42	-	-	-		
			WD	10250 ± 661	2540 ± 500	796 ± 237	163 ± 79	-	-	-		
			CM	10985 ± 706	2882 ± 500	853 ± 229	170 ± 69	-	-	-		
			WM	10623 ± 665	2785 ± 510	920 ± 260	220 ± 116	-	-	-		
			ATT	10262 ± 798	2586 ± 463	872 ± 161	221 ± 53	-	-	-		
			INT	In possession	All	-	-	313 ± 210	-	-	-	-
					CD	-	-	103 ± 48	-	-	-	-
					WD	-	-	309 ± 161	-	-	-	-
	CM	-			-	311 ± 197	-	-	-	-		
	Out of possession	All		-	-	399 ± 143	-	-	-	-		
		CD		-	-	371 ± 100	-	-	-	-		
		WD		-	-	418 ± 120	-	-	-	-		
		CM		-	-	485 ± 163	-	-	-	-		
	Gabbett et al. (2008) [34]	INT	Qualitative	All	9968 ± 1143	2461 ± 491	-	965 ± 305	-	-	-	

Gentles et al. (2018) [56]	DOM D1		All	9706 ± 484	2014 ± 301	-	NS	-	-	-
	COL D2	HSR: 15 - 19.99 VHSR: 20 - 24.99 SPR: >25	All	5480 ± 2350	460 ± 250	110 ± 80	20 ± 20	-	-	-
Griffin et al. (2021) [57]	INT	HSR: 16 - 20	All	9433 ± 263	766 ± 64	-	364 ± 53	-	-	-
	DOM D1	SPR: >20	All	8728 ± 283	609 ± 9	-	306 ± 56	-	-	-
Harkness-Armstrong et al. (2021) [19]	U16 DOM D1	HSR: >12.5 VHSR: >19 SPR: >22.5	All	7679 ± 2114	1696 ± 886	249 ± 143	53 ± 57	24.8 ± 1.5	-	-
			CD	6954 ± 1218	1308 ± 583	204 ± 136	41 ± 45	24.5 ± 1.6	-	-
			WD	7603 ± 1210	1729 ± 576	277 ± 134	62 ± 44	25.1 ± 1.6	-	-
			CM	8385 ± 1376	1689 ± 648	124 ± 153	17 ± 51	23.8 ± 1.8	-	-
			WM	7934 ± 1218	2023 ± 583	326 ± 136	75 ± 52	25.5 ± 1.6	-	-
			FWD	7516 ± 1020	1728 ± 505	316 ± 122	72 ± 36	25.3 ± 1.7	-	-
			All	7148 ± 2215	1530 ± 934	188 ± 151	29 ± 60	24.0 ± 1.6	-	-
	U14 DOM D1		CD	6603 ± 1195	1246 ± 576	188 ± 139	33 ± 44	24.3 ± 1.8	-	-
			WD	6905 ± 1288	1471 ± 609	183 ± 147	25 ± 49	23.9 ± 1.8	-	-
			CM	7790 ± 1429	1609 ± 672	116 ± 156	13 ± 62	23.0 ± 2.0	-	-
			WM	7472 ± 1210	1742 ± 583	202 ± 141	30 ± 45	24.2 ± 1.6	-	-
			FWD	6962 ± 1158	1584 ± 558	249 ± 132	43 ± 48	24.6 ± 1.9	-	-
			All	9631 ± 1332	2407 ± 952	-	338 ± 228	-	-	-
			DEF	8759 ± 1024	1744 ± 498	-	188 ± 112	-	-	-
Hewitt et al. (2014) [38]	INT	HSR: >12 SPR: >19	MID	10150 ± 1243	2797 ± 953	-	392 ± 252	-	-	-
			ATT	9442 ± 1379	2272 ± 794	-	388 ± 217	-	-	-
			All	10036 ± 5206	1049 ± 525	-	-	-	-	-
			All	9793 ± 2715	1019 ± 560	-	282 ± 205	-	74**	85**
			GK	5622 ± 1953	48 ± 31	-	7 ± 15	-	29**	26**
Ishida et al. (2021) [61] Jagim et al. (2020) [62]	COL D1 COL D3	HSR: >15 SPR: >19 ACC: >2	CD	9956 ± 2511	1004 ± 417	-	309 ± 163	-	78**	86**
			CM	10575 ± 511	1145 ± 388	-	266 ± 117	-	80**	88**
			FP	10056 ± 2763	1264 ± 613	-	403 ± 258	-	80**	90**
			FWD	7831 ± 2180	798 ± 308	-	140 ± 65	-	58**	65**
			All	10300	1310	-	160	-	-	-
			All	-	-	-	-	-	423 ± 126	430 ± 125
Krustrup et al. (2005) [65]	DOM D1	HSR: >15 SPR: >25	CD	-	-	-	-	-	342**	356**
			WD	-	-	-	-	-	431**	443**
			MID	-	-	-	-	-	465**	473**
			CATT	-	-	-	-	-	413**	409**
			WATT	-	-	-	-	-	475**	474**
			All	10025 ± 775	2452 ± 636	-	615 ± 258	-	-	-
Mara et al. (2017) [69]	DOM D1	ACC: >2 DEC: <-2	CD	9220 ± 590	1772 ± 439	-	417 ± 116	-	-	-
			WD	10203 ± 568	2569 ± 612	-	680 ± 278	-	-	-
			MID	10581 ± 221	2761 ± 417	-	484 ± 169	-	-	-
			CATT	9661 ± 602	2420 ± 405	-	841 ± 238	-	-	-
			All	10025 ± 775	2452 ± 636	-	615 ± 258	-	-	-
Mara et al. (2017) [70]	DOM D1	HSR: 12.24 – 19.44* SPR: >19.44*	CD	9220 ± 590	1772 ± 439	-	417 ± 116	-	-	-
			WD	10203 ± 568	2569 ± 612	-	680 ± 278	-	-	-
			MID	10581 ± 221	2761 ± 417	-	484 ± 169	-	-	-
			CATT	9661 ± 602	2420 ± 405	-	841 ± 238	-	-	-
			All	10025 ± 775	2452 ± 636	-	615 ± 258	-	-	-

McFadden et al. (2020) [29]	COL D1	HSR: 15 – 18.99 SPR: >19	WATT	10472 ± 878	2917 ± 545	-	850 ± 178	-	-	-
			All	8310 ± 900	812 ± 88	-	401 ± 158	-	-	-
Mohr et al. (2008) [44]	Top-class	HSR: >15	All	10330 ± 150*	1680 ± 90*	-	460 ± 20*	-	-	-
	High-level	SPR: >25	All	10440 ± 150*	1300 ± 100*	-	380 ± 50*	-	-	-
	Top-class & high-level		DEF	10200 ± 100*	1260 ± 110*	-	330 ± 50*	-	-	-
			MID	10610 ± 190*	1650 ± 110*	-	430 ± 40*	-	-	-
Nakamura et al. (2017) [73]	DOM D1	SPR: >20	ATT	10200 ± 200 *	1630 ± 100*	-	520 ± 30*	-	-	-
			All	-	-	-	285 ± 164	-	-	-
			CD	-	-	-	125 ± 61	-	-	-
			FB	-	-	-	359 ± 98	-	-	-
			MID	-	-	-	359 ± 174	-	-	-
		SPR: >19.37 ± 0.48	FWD	-	-	-	352 ± 145	-	-	-
			All	-	-	-	353 ± 206	-	-	-
			CD	-	-	-	150 ± 71	-	-	-
			FB	-	-	-	496 ± 136	-	-	-
			MID	-	-	-	372 ± 192	-	-	-
Panduro et al. (2021) [74]	DOM D1	HSR: >15 VHSR: >18 SPR: >25 ACC: >3 DEC: <-3	FWD	-	-	-	493 ± 179	-	-	-
			GK	5214 ± 949	99 ± 70	31 ± 31	1 ± 3	21.5 ± 1.2	2.8 ± 1.5	3.3 ± 1.3
			CD	9274 ± 762	1088 ± 261	442 ± 135	19 ± 17	27.5 ± 2.3	6.7 ± 3.7	13 ± 4.3
			FB	10053 ± 639	1529 ± 369	717 ± 242	46 ± 48	28.2 ± 3.2	8.0 ± 4.9	17 ± 4.6
			CM	10572 ± 880	1518 ± 499	623 ± 252	33 ± 31	27.8 ± 2.0	10 ± 6.8	16 ± 5.5
			WM	10519 ± 963	1786 ± 527	863 ± 299	91 ± 81	27.6 ± 2.1	7.1 ± 5.4	23 ± 6.7
			FWD	9745 ± 988	1561 ± 372	737 ± 223	56 ± 45	29.2 ± 3.2	12 ± 7.0	19 ± 3.9
Ramos et al. (2017) [78]	INT U20	HSR: 15.6 – 20 SPR: >20 ACC: >2 DEC: <-2	CD	8202 ± 514	509 ± 76	-	113 ± 44	-	13 ± 3	14 ± 3
			WD	9073 ± 475	859 ± 99	-	331 ± 94	-	15 ± 6	19 ± 7
			MID	8436 ± 703	552 ± 113	-	126 ± 48	-	14 ± 5	11 ± 4
			FWD	9056 ± 460	830 ± 191	-	323 ± 111	-	17 ± 6	25 ± 9
Ramos et al. (2019) [79]	INT	HSR: 15.6 – 20 SPR: >20 ACC: >1 DEC: <-1	CD	10003 ± 954	590 ± 104	-	199 ± 91	-	218 ± 22	161 ± 19
			WD	10238 ± 665	840 ± 137	-	379 ± 119	-	214 ± 35	182 ± 23
			MID	10377 ± 981	811 ± 207	-	299 ± 142	-	214 ± 17	178 ± 19
			FWD	9825 ± 894	783 ± 251	-	352 ± 125	-	210 ± 29	176 ± 27
	INT U20		CD	8202 ± 514	509 ± 76	-	113 ± 44	-	172 ± 10	108 ± 14
			WD	9073 ± 475	859 ± 99	-	331 ± 94	-	197 ± 19	138 ± 21
			MID	8486 ± 703	553 ± 113	-	126 ± 48	-	172 ± 19	111 ± 17
			FWD	9056 ± 460	830 ± 191	-	323 ± 111	-	193 ± 30	146 ± 25
	INT U17		CD	7899 ± 888	348 ± 61	-	129 ± 85	-	165 ± 22	86 ± 15
			WD	8575 ± 996	637 ± 226	-	283 ± 143	-	199 ± 32	122 ± 16
			MID	8546 ± 1260	434 ± 117	-	96 ± 46	-	150 ± 17	93 ± 14
			FWD	8062 ± 1407	520 ± 243	-	248 ± 143	-	168 ± 35	106 ± 27
Romero-Moraleda et al. (2021) [80]	DOM D1	HSR: >15 ACC: >1 & <1	All	9040 ± 938	1108 ± 294	-	-	-	255 ± 40	78 ± 16

Sausaman et al. (2019) [81]	COL D1	DEC: <-1 & >-1 HSR: >15 SPR: >18	All	9486 ± 300	1014 ± 118	-	428 ± 70	-	-	-	
			DEF	9039 (8527-9551)	868 (665-1071)	-	385 (265-504)	-	-	-	
			MID	9536 (8998-10034)	840 (626-1054)	-	267 (141-393)	-	-	-	
			ATT	9882 (9414-10349)	1333 (1147-1519)	-	633 (524-743)	-	-	-	
			GK	4743 (4370-4742)	222 (0-480)	17 (0-111)	3 (0-40)	-	-	-	
Scott et al. (2020) [8]	DOM D1 (INT)	HSR: >12.5 VHSR: >19 SPR: >22.5	CD	9398 (9110-9686)	1969 (1770-2168)	350 (277-422)	98 (70-127)	29.6 (28.8-30.3)	-	-	
			WD	9892 (9637-10147)	2520 (2292-2696)	589 (528-651)	192 (166-218)	30.1 (29.5-30.6)	-	-	
			CAM	10644 (10456-10931)	2749 (2551-2947)	487 (415-559)	129 (45-119)	28.7 (28.0-29.5)	-	-	
			CDM	10228 (9860-10596)	2264 (2011-2518)	384 (292-477)	82 (45-119)	29.4 (28.3-30.5)	-	-	
			WM	10375 (9942-10808)	2659 (2361-2958)	666 (559-773)	248 (204-291)	30.6 (29.5-31.6)	-	-	
			FWD	9738 (9500-9976)	2312 (2147-2476)	564 (506-622)	209 (185-232)	30.3 (29.8-30.8)	-	-	
			GK	4445 (4148-4742)	181 (0-385)	11 (0-85)	1 (0-31)	25.8 (25.0-26.6)	-	-	
	DOM D1 (non-INT)	CD	9408 (9203-9613)	1936 (1795-2078)	382 (331-433)	96 (75-116)	29.7 (29.1-30.2)	-	-		
		WD	10076 (9876-10276)	2430 (2292-2568)	512 (463-561)	154 (134-174)	29.8 (29.3-30.3)	-	-		
		CAM	10619 (10333-10905)	2648 (2451-2846)	375 (304-446)	59 (26-91)	29.2 (28.5-29.9)	-	-		
		CDM	10244 (9924-10566)	2345 (2124-2567)	316 (236-396)	59 (26-91)	28.9 (28.1-29.7)	-	-		
		WM	10338 (10060-10616)	2651 (2459-2843)	541 (472-610)	152 (124-180)	29.9 (29.1-30.7)	-	-		
		FWD	9867 (9679-10056)	2423 (2292-2553)	585 (539-631)	187 (168-206)	30.1 (29.6-30.5)	-	-		
		All	10068 ± 615	2401 ± 454	398 ± 143	122 ± 69	-	-	-		
		Scott et al. (2020) [82]	DOM D1	HSR: >12.5 VHSR: >19 SPR: >22.5	All	10068 ± 615	2401 ± 454	398 ± 143	122 ± 69	-	-
Trewin et al. (2018) [20]	INT	HSR: >16.48 SPR: >19.98 ACC: >2.26	All	10368 ± 952	930 ± 348	-	-	-	174 ± 33	-	
			CB	9533 ± 650	661 ± 221	-	-	-	-	187 ± 33	-
			FB	10496 ± 822	1191 ± 314	-	-	-	-	185 ± 27	-
			MID	10962 ± 750	973 ± 334	-	-	-	-	158 ± 33	-
			FWD	10380 ± 893	1037 ± 305	-	-	-	-	174 ± 27	-

Vescovi (2012) [86]	DOM D1	SPR: >18	All	-	-	-	-	21.8 ± 2.3	-	-	
			DEF	-	-	-	-	21.9 ± 2.1	-	-	
			MID	-	-	-	-	21.4 ± 2.1	-	-	
			FWD	-	-	-	-	22.1 ± 2.4	-	-	
Vescovi (2014) [40]	DOM U17	HSR: 15.6 – 20 SPR: >20	All	8558 ± 864	658 ± 209	-	235 ± 128	25.6 ± 1.9	-	-	
			DOM U16	All	8024 ± 802	611 ± 198	-	185 ± 119	25.6 ± 1.6	-	-
			DOM U15	All	6961 ± 789	458 ± 192	-	76 ± 116	24.3 ± 1.7	-	-
			DOM U15-U17	DEF	7779 ± 853	590 ± 201	-	188 ± 120	25.6 ± 1.5	-	-
				MID	8449 ± 850	600 ± 200	-	131 ± 120	24.7 ± 2.0	-	-
Wells et al. (2015) [89]	COL D1	Regular season Post-season HSR 15.96 - 21.9 SPR >22	All	7482 ± 959	557 ± 137	-	86 ± 80	23.3 ± 1.9	-	-	
			All	8201 ± 693	604 ± 139	-	85 ± 81	23.7 ± 2.4	-	-	
			All	9541 ± 178	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Williams et al. (2019) [42]	COL D1	NS	All	9541 ± 178	-	-	-	-	-		

240 Data presented as mean ± SD or mean (90% CI). *Data presented as mean ± SE. ** mean calculated from available data. TD=total distance; HSR=high-speed running; SPR=sprinting; Vmax=maximum velocity;
241 ACC=accelerations; DEC=decelerations. Qualitative VT = HSR “striding; movement is similar to jogging but involves a longer stride and more pronounced arm swing”; SPR “maximal effort with a greater extension
242 of the lower leg during forward swing and higher heel lift relative to striding”. NS=not specified. Sample/Group: COL=college; DOM=domestic; INT=international; U=Under; D=division, UEFA CL=UEFA
243 Champions League. Playing Position: GK=goalkeeper; DEF=defender; CB=centre back; CD=central defender; FB=full-back; MID=midfield; CM=central midfielder; WM=wide midfielder; FP=flank player;
244 ATT=attacker; CATT=central attacker; WATT=wide attacker; FWD=forward.

245 Whole-match relative physical characteristics are presented in Table 7. In addition to those presented, Ramos et
246 al. [33] also quantified relative repeated acceleration and SPR actions per playing position ($0.12 - 0.15 \text{ n}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$).
247 Only 14 studies quantified whole-match physical characteristics relative to match-duration [19, 20, 33, 36, 40,
248 46, 49, 50, 63, 71, 72, 80, 84, 89]. The majority of these studies reported relative values to explore the impact of
249 contextual factors on physical characteristics [36, 46, 49, 50, 63, 71, 84, 89].

250

251 **Table 7** Studies quantifying physical characteristics of women's soccer match-play per whole-match as relative data

Study	Sample / Group		Velocity (km·h ⁻¹) and Acceleration (m·s ⁻²) Thresholds	Playing Position	TD (m·min ⁻¹)	HSR (m·min ⁻¹)	VHSR (m·min ⁻¹)	SPR (m·min ⁻¹)	ACC (n·min ⁻¹)	DEC (n·min ⁻¹)
Benjamin et al. (2020) [36]	COL D1	Low WBGT	N/A	All	145 ± 13	-	-	-	-	-
		Moderate WBGT		All	134 ± 13	-	-	-	-	-
		High WBGT		All	138 ± 13	-	-	-	-	-
Bohner et al. (2015) [49]	COL D1	Sea-level	HSR: >15	All	120 ± 9	27 ± 10	-	-	-	-
		Altitude		All	106 ± 10	25 ± 8	-	-	-	-
Bozzini et al. (2020) [50]	COL D1	In-conference	HSR: 15 - 19.9 SPR: >20	All	103 ± 8.7	10.0 ± 2.1	-	3.1 ± 1.8	-	-
		Out-conference		All	105 ± 9.1	10.3 ± 2.8	-	3.2 ± 2.1	-	-
Harkness-Armstrong et al. (2021) [19]	U16 DOM D1		HSR: >12.5 VHSR: >19 SPR: >22.5	All	93 ± 24	20.5 ± 11.4	3.0 ± 1.4	0.6 ± 1.4	-	-
				CD	84 ± 15	15.8 ± 7.1	2.5 ± 1.9	0.5 ± 0.6	-	-
				WD	92 ± 15	20.8 ± 7.7	3.3 ± 1.9	0.7 ± 0.6	-	-
				CM	101 ± 16.7	20.3 ± 8.0	1.5 ± 2.2	0.2 ± 0.7	-	-
				WM	96 ± 15	24.4 ± 7.8	3.9 ± 1.9	0.9 ± 0.6	-	-
	U14 DOM D1			All	92 ± 26	19.8 ± 12.1	2.4 ± 1.5	0.4 ± 1.5	-	-
				CD	85 ± 15	16.1 ± 7.6	2.5 ± 1.9	0.4 ± 0.6	-	-
				WD	89 ± 15	19.0 ± 7.7	2.4 ± 2.1	0.3 ± 0.7	-	-
				CM	101 ± 17	20.8 ± 8.6	1.5 ± 2.3	0.2 ± 0.8	-	-
				WM	97 ± 15	22.7 ± 7.7	2.7 ± 1.9	0.4 ± 0.6	-	-
Julian et al. (2020) [63]	DOM D1 & D3	Follicular phase	HSR: 13.2 ± 0.7 – 16.69 ± 1.1 VHSR: 16.69 ± 1.1 – 19.94 ± 0.9 SPR: >19.9 ± 0.9	All	103 ± 7.7	11.4 ± 3.4	5.9 ± 2.2	3.7 ± 2.4	-	-
		Luteal phase		All	104 ± 6.8	11.6 ± 3.3	6.6 ± 2.7	4.0 ± 2.0	-	-
McCormack et al. (2015) [71]	COL D1	Previous match >42h	HSR: 12.99 – 21.99 SPR: >21.99	All	120 ± 8	25.4 ± 7.2	-	-	-	-
		Previous match <42h		All	116 ± 8	22.9 ± 5.7	-	-	-	-
Meylan et al. (2017) [72]	INT		HSR: 16.5 - 19.9 SPR: >20 ACC: >2.26	All	107 ± 16	6.0 ± 2.1	-	2.9 ± 1.2	1.78 ± 0.67	-
Ramos et al. (2019) [33]	INT		HSR: 12.1 - 15.5 VHSR: 15.6 - 20 SPR: >20 ACC: >1 DEC: <-1	CD	109 ± 5.2*	13.7 ± 1.0*	6.4 ± 0.8*	2.2 ± 0.6*	0.06 ± 0.02*	0.08 ± 0.02*
				FB	110 ± 5.4*	13.1 ± 1.1*	8.7 ± 0.8*	4.4 ± 0.6*	0.06 ± 0.03*	0.14 ± 0.02*
				CM	110 ± 5.4*	14.5 ± 1.1*	7.4 ± 0.8*	2.7 ± 0.6*	0.04 ± 0.03*	0.09 ± 0.02*
				WM	109 ± 5.5*	15.0 ± 1.1*	8.6 ± 0.8*	4.2 ± 0.6*	0.04 ± 0.03*	0.14 ± 0.02*
				ATT	101 ± 5.2*	12.8 ± 1.0*	7.7 ± 0.8*	3.4 ± 0.6*	0.06 ± 0.02*	0.16 ± 0.02*
Romero-Moraleda et al. (2021) [80]	DOM D1		HSR: >15 ACC: >1 & <1 DEC: <-1 & >-1	All	95 ± 9	12.1 ± 2.4	-	-	-	-
				CB	86	10	-	-	0.66	0.23
				WB	94	14	-	-	0.70	0.25
				CM	104	11	-	-	0.58	0.18
				WM	92	12	-	-	0.71	0.24

				ATT	99	15	-	-	0.86	0.30
Trewin et al. (2018) [20]	INT		HSR >16.48 SPR >19.98 ACC: >2.26	All	108 ± 10	9.7 ± 3.7	-	-	1.82 ± 0.35	-
				CB	100 ± 7.3	6.9 ± 2.3	-	-	1.96 ± 0.35	-
				FB	110 ± 9.2	12.5 ± 3.3	-	-	1.95 ± 0.29	-
				MID	115 ± 7.9	10.2 ± 3.5	-	-	1.65 ± 0.34	-
				FWD	108 ± 10	10.8 ± 3.2	-	-	1.81 ± 0.28	-
Trewin et al. (2018) [84]	INT	Sea-level (≤500m) Altitude (>500m) Cold/mild (<21°C) Warm/hot (≥21°C) Win Draw Loss Win vs higher ranked OPP Draw vs higher ranked OPP Loss vs higher ranked OPP Win vs lower ranked OPP Draw vs lower ranked OPP Loss vs lower ranked OPP Previous match >72h Previous match <72h	HSR: >16.48 SPR: >19.98 ACC: >2.26	All	108 ± 9.8	9.8 3.3	-	-	1.80 ± 3.8	-
				All	104 ± 7.8	9.3 ± 2.9	-	-	1.85 ± 0.40	-
				All	108 ± 9.5	9.8 ± 3.4	-	-	1.84 ± 0.35	-
				All	106 ± 9.9	9.5 ± 2.9	-	-	1.73 ± 0.44	-
				All	108 ± 9.7	9.5 ± 3.4	-	-	1.77 ± 0.36	-
				All	104 ± 9.6	9.2 ± 3.4	-	-	1.91 ± 0.45	-
				All	107 ± 9.4	10.3 ± 2.9	-	-	1.83 ± 0.38	-
				All	111 ± 9.0	9.9 ± 3.1	-	-	1.81 ± 0.27	-
				All	104 ± 9.9	8.2 ± 3.3	-	-	1.82 ± 0.47	-
				All	107 ± 10	10.1 ± 2.8	-	-	1.84 ± 0.39	-
				All	108 ± 9.7	9.4 ± 3.4	-	-	1.76 ± 0.37	-
				All	105 ± 9.0	11.1 ± 2.8	-	-	2.07 ± 0.35	-
				All	107 ± 7.7	10.9 ± 3.0	-	-	1.80 ± 0.33	-
				All	108 ± 9.5	9.7 ± 3.0	-	-	1.79 ± 0.36	-
				All	107 ± 9.7	10.0 ± 3.4	-	-	1.85 ± 0.39	-
Vescovi & Falenchuk (2019) [46]	DOM	Home Away Natural Turf Artificial Turf Win Draw Loss	HSR: 16.1 – 20 SPR: 20 - 32	All	112**	8.4 ± 0.4*	-	4.0 ± 0.4*	-	-
				All	110**	8.1 ± 0.4*	-	3.8 ± 0.3*	-	-
				All	108**	7.3 ± 0.4*	-	3.8 ± 0.4*	-	-
				All	112**	8.6 ± 0.4*	-	3.9 ± 0.4*	-	-
				All	111**	8.3 ± 0.5*	-	3.9 ± 0.5*	-	-
				All	112**	8.5 ± 0.5*	-	4.3 ± 0.4*	-	-
				All	111**	7.9 ± 0.5*	-	3.4 ± 0.3*	-	-
Vescovi (2014) [40]	DOM U17 DOM U16 DOM U15 DOM U15-U17		N/A	All	100 ± 12	-	-	-	-	-
				All	100 ± 8	-	-	-	-	-
				All	86 ± 10	-	-	-	-	-
				DEF	97 ± 15	-	-	-	-	-
				MID	105 ± 10	-	-	-	-	-
				FWD	99 ± 11	-	-	-	-	-
Wells et al. (2015) [89]	COL D2	Regular Season Post-season	HSR: 15.96-21.9 SPR: >22	All	105 ± 13	7.9 ± 2.5	-	1.2 ± 1.2	-	-
				All	98 ± 13	7.1 ± 1.7	-	1.0 ± 0.9	-	-

252 Data presented as mean ± SD. TD=total distance; HSR=high-speed running; VHSR=very-high speed running; SPR=sprinting; ACC=accelerations; DEC=decelerations. NS=not specified. Sample/Group: COL=college;
253 DOM=domestic; INT=international; U=Under; D=division; OPP=opponent; WGBT=wet bulb-globe temperature. Playing Position: DEF=defender; CB=centre back; CD=central defender; FB=full-back;
254 MID=midfield; CM=central midfielder; WM=wide midfielder; ATT=attacker; FWD=forward. *Data presented as mean ± SE. ** mean calculated from available data

255 **3.4.2 Half-match physical characteristics**

256 Eighteen studies reported half-match physical characteristics [26, 31, 32, 34, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 49, 50, 54, 69,
257 70, 73, 74, 77, 78, 86, 89], with the reported data presented in Table S4. In addition to the data presented, Mara
258 et al. [69] identified players performed a total of 226 and 221 decelerations during the first and second half of
259 elite senior match-play, respectively. Furthermore, Mara et al. [69] analysed six different accelerations and
260 decelerations by intensity, categorising accelerations/decelerations dependent upon starting and final velocity.
261 Only six studies reported half-match data according to playing position [26, 40, 41, 74, 77, 86], whilst the
262 remaining studies presented sample or group averages.

263 **3.4.3 Segmental physical characteristics**

264 Fifteen studies quantified physical characteristics by 15-minute segmental time-periods (i.e. 0-15, 15-30 minutes
265 etc.) [31, 35, 38, 42 - 45, 51, 54, 65, 69, 70, 74, 78], however, four studies selectively reported 15-minute time-
266 periods [35, 43, 65, 74]. For example, Panduro et al. [74] presented only the initial and final 15-minute time-
267 periods. Additionally, four studies reported physical characteristics as a mean of all 5-minute segmental periods
268 within match-play [26, 43, 51, 78]. The data presented by segmental time-periods are presented in Table S5.

269 **3.4.4 Peak physical characteristics**

270 Eight studies quantified the peak physical characteristics of women's soccer match-play [19, 20, 26, 43, 44, 51,
271 74, 78]. The reported peak data are presented in Table 8. Panduro et al. [74] also quantified mean heart rate, and
272 observed values between 181 and 183 beats per minute (BPM) dependent upon playing position. All studies
273 quantified peak data in 5-minute durations except for Harkness-Armstrong et al. [19] who quantified 1-10-
274 minute durations for TD, HSR and VHSR. Only two studies [19, 20] adopted a moving average analysis to
275 determine peak durations, whilst the remaining studies adopted a pre-determined segmental analysis approach
276 (i.e. 0-5 minutes, 5-10 minutes etc.).

277

Table 8 Peak physical characteristics of women's soccer match-play

Study	Sample/ Group	Velocity (km·h ⁻¹) and Acceleration (m·s ⁻²) Thresholds	Absolute/ Relative	Playing Position	TD		HSR		VHSR	SPR		ACC		DEC	
					Peak 5- min	Next 5-min	Peak 5- min	Next 5- min	Peak 5- min	Peak 5- min	Next 5- min	Peak 5- min	Next 5- min	Peak 5- min	Next 5- min
Andersson et al. (2010) [43]	INT	HSR: >15 SPR: >25	Absolute (m)	All	-	-	151 ± 7*	79 ± 11*	-	43 ± 3*	13 ± 3*	-	-	-	-
	DOM D1			All	-	-	134 ± 6*	67 ± 8*	-	35 ± 3*	13 ± 3*	-	-	-	-
Bradley et al. (2014) [26]	DOM D1	HSR: >15	Absolute (m)	All	-	-	149 ± 6*	83 ± 5*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Datson et al. (2017) [51]	INT	HSR: >14.4	Absolute (m)	All	-	-	223 ± 47	135 ± 47	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harkness- Armstrong et al. (2021) [19]	U16 DOM D1	HSR: >12.5 VHSR: >19	Relative (m·min ⁻¹)	All	122 ± 23	-	41 ± 16	-	12 ± 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
				CD	112 ± 15	-	34 ± 12	-	11 ± 5	-	-	-	-	-	-
				WD	120 ± 14	-	41 ± 11	-	13 ± 5	-	-	-	-	-	-
				CM	127 ± 16	-	40 ± 13	-	8 ± 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
				WM	127 ± 15	-	48 ± 11	-	14 ± 5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	U14 DOM D1				All	120 ± 25	-	40 ± 17	-	10 ± 6	-	-	-	-	-
					CD	112 ± 15	-	34 ± 12	-	10 ± 5	-	-	-	-	-
					WD	118 ± 16	-	40 ± 12	-	10 ± 6	-	-	-	-	-
					CM	126 ± 17	-	42 ± 13	-	8 ± 6	-	-	-	-	-
					WM	125 ± 15	-	45 ± 12	-	14 ± 5	-	-	-	-	-
Mohr et al. (2008) [44]	Top-Class	HSR: >15	Absolute (m)	All	-	-	183 ± 9*	77 ± 6*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	High-Level			All	-	-	138 ± 8*	88 ± 10*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panduro et al. (2021) [74]	DOM D1	HSR: >15 VHSR: >18 SPR: >25 ACC: >3 DEC: <-3	Absolute (m)	CD	625 ± 27	-	132 ± 36	-	74 ± 20	12 ± 9	-	2.4 ± 1.2	-	2.7 ± 0.8	-
				FB	664 ± 47	-	169 ± 37	-	101 ± 28	21 ± 14	-	2.3 ± 1.0	-	3.2 ± 0.9	-
				CM	683 ± 57	-	165 ± 42	-	91 ± 27	19 ± 14	-	2.3 ± 1.1	-	3.3 ± 1.0	-
				EM	658 ± 52	-	177 ± 37	-	110 ± 24	29 ± 20	-	1.9 ± 1.6	-	3.7 ± 1.0	-
				FWD	639 ± 74	-	167 ± 32	-	104 ± 28	24 ± 18	-	2.6 ± 1.4	-	3.6 ± 1.0	-
Ramos et al. (2017) [78]	INT U20	HSR: 15.6 – 20 SPR: >20 ACC: >2 DEC: <-2	Absolute (m)	CD	601 ± 57	459 ± 126	69 ± 16	27 ± 19	-	37 ± 15	6 ± 8	2.1 ± 0.6	1.1 ± 0.8	2.6 ± 0.5	0.7 ± 0.7
				WD	653 ± 41	530 ± 66	100 ± 16	47 ± 25	-	57 ± 17	21 ± 19	3.0 ± 0.9	0.7 ± 0.5	3.4 ± 0.8	0.9 ± 0.5
				MID	594 ± 51	470 ± 83	71 ± 17	33 ± 17	-	36 ± 14	5 ± 8	2.4 ± 0.8	1.0 ± 0.7	2.2 ± 0.6	1.1 ± 0.9
				FWD	623 ± 58	504 ± 82	92 ± 28	48 ± 23	-	61 ± 15	18 ± 15	3.4 ± 1.1	1.2 ± 0.8	3.9 ± 1.1	0.9 ± 0.8

Trewin et al. (2018) [20]	INT	HSR: >16.48 ACC: >2.26	Absolute (m)	All	704 ± 59	540 ± 84	123 ± 41	38 ± 24	-	-	-	17 ± 3	10 ± 3	-
				CB	658 ± 49	498 ± 64	101 ± 45	24 ± 19	-	-	-	17 ± 3	11 ± 3	-
				FB	718 ± 46	551 ± 88	153 ± 39	48 ± 25	-	-	-	18 ± 3	11 ± 2	-
				MID	732 ± 50	512 ± 21	126 ± 34	43 ± 25	-	-	-	15 ± 3	9 ± 3	-
				FWD	707 ± 61	543 ± 82	127 ± 31	44 ± 22	-	-	-	17 ± 4	10 ± 3	-
			Relative (m·min ⁻¹)	All	141 ± 12	108 ± 16	25 ± 8	7.7 ± 4.9	-	-	-	3.3 ± 0.6	2.0 ± 0.6	-
				CB	132 ± 9.8	100 ± 13	20 ± 9	4.8 ± 3.7	-	-	-	3.4 ± 0.6	2.2 ± 0.6	-
				FB	144 ± 9.1	110 ± 18	31 ± 8	9.7 ± 4.9	-	-	-	3.6 ± 0.5	2.2 ± 0.4	-
				MID	146 ± 9.9	113 ± 17	25 ± 7	8.5 ± 5.0	-	-	-	3.0 ± 0.5	1.8 ± 0.5	-
				FWD	141 ± 12	109 ± 16	25 ± 6	8.7 ± 4.4	-	-	-	3.4 ± 0.7	2.0 ± 0.6	-

279 NS=not specified. TD=total distance; HSR=high-speed running; SPR=sprinting; Vmax=maximum velocity; ACC=accelerations; DEC=decelerations. Group/Sample: INT=international; DOM=domestic, D=Division,
280 CL=Champions League, U=under. Playing Position: CB=centre back; CD=central defender; WD=wide defender; FB=full-back; MID=midfield; FWD=forward. *Data presented as mean ± SE.

281

282 3.5 Technical characteristics

283 Of the twenty-six studies (38%) which included technical characteristics [25-28, 31, 34, 37, 44, 47, 48, 50, 53,
 284 55, 58-60, 64, 65, 67, 68, 75, 76, 83, 85, 87, 88], six studies quantified technical characteristics in addition to the
 285 quantification of physical characteristics [26, 31, 34, 44, 50, 65], two studies predicted the impact of technical
 286 characteristics [53] and situational variables [60] on match outcome, and three studies further analysed heading
 287 [58, 75] or tackling actions [85] to explore frequency, characteristics, and incidence of associated injuries to
 288 understand potential areas of risk. Whilst four studies [28, 64, 68, 87] explored the technical-tactical
 289 characteristics of shooting and the respective play prior to shots by elite senior players.

290 The whole-match technical characteristics reported as player or team averages in these studies are presented in
 291 Table 9. In addition to the data presented, studies also presented characteristics as season or tournament totals
 292 [27, 31, 48, 59, 64, 67, 75, 83, 85, 87, 88] or position-specific characteristics (defenders vs midfielders vs
 293 forwards [44, 55, 58, 75, 87, 88] or central defenders vs wide defenders vs central midfielders vs wide
 294 midfielders vs forwards [37]), selected technical characteristics by pitch location (e.g. ball possession, touches,
 295 passes, ball recoveries, headers, shots [25, 27, 28, 55, 58, 64, 67, 68, 76, 87, 88], technical-tactical offensive
 296 characteristics [27, 28, 64, 68, 87], team set-piece characteristics [27, 31, 37, 47, 48, 67] and reported yellow or
 297 red cards [27, 55, 67]. Technical characteristics were predominantly quantified as whole-match characteristics,
 298 however three and two studies also presented results by halves [26, 44, 87] and 15-minute segmental periods
 299 [85, 87], respectively. Eleven studies included contextual factors within analysis; playing standard [34, 44], age-
 300 group [37, 58, 75], match outcome [60, 67, 83], team or opposition ranking [60, 68, 76], match location [60],
 301 competition type [50], and playing surface [55,60]. Lastly, only 9 studies [27, 37, 50, 53, 67, 68, 75, 76, 85]
 302 either included or provided a reference for the definition of technical characteristics.

303

304 **Table 9** Whole-match technical characteristics of women’s soccer match-play, presented as player or
 305 team averages

Study	Data Collection	Sample/ Group	Technical Variable	Player Average
Andersen et al. (2016) [31]	Video camera; InStat	DOM D1-D3	Shots	1.4 ± 1.8
			Shots on target	0.8 ± 1.3
			Total passes (successful)	44 ± 13 (68 ± 11%)
			Short passes (0-10m; successful)	11 ± 4 (70 ± 18%)
			Medium passes (10-40m; successful)	32 ± 12 (68 ± 12%)
			Long passes (>40m; successful)	1 ± 1 (38 ± 42%)
			Crosses	20
			Tackles	6 ± 3

			Headers	4 ± 3	
			Interceptions	8 ± 5	
Bradley et al. (2014) [26]	25 Hz multi-camera match analysis system (Amisco Pro)	DOM D1	Touches per possession	2.1 ± 0.1*	
			Time in possession (s)	67 ± 3*	
			Total balls lost	17 ± 1*	
			Successful passes (%)	72 ± 2*	
Krustrup et al. (2005) [65]	Video camera	DOM D1	Duels Won (%)	51 ± 2*	
			Headers	8 (3 – 19)	
			Tackles	14 (7 – 21)	
Team Average					
Althoff et al. (2010) [25]	Video camera	INT	Ball control	225	
			Short pass (<25 m)	243	
			Long pass (>25 m)	57	
			Shots	201	
			Goals	3	
			Dribbles	44	
			Tackles	8	
Casal et al. (2021) [27]	Video camera; InStat	DOM D1	Shots	1	
			Shots on target	11	
			Goals	4	
			Crosses (successful)	11 (3)	
			Dribbles (successful)	33 (17)	
			Passes (successful)	393 (276)	
			Tackles (successful)	44 (26)	
			Aerial challenge (successful)	43 (22)	
			Interceptions	64	
			Fouls	12	
			Recovered balls	68	
Gómez et al. (2008) [28]	Video camera; Infotbol	INT	Shots	15 ± 8	
			Shot on target	9	
			Goals	2 ± 2	
Hjelm (2011) [59]	Video camera	INT	Ball actions	614	
Ibáñez et al. (2018) [60]	NS	DOM D1	Goals	2 ± 2	
Konstadinidou & Tsigilis (2005) [64]	Video camera	INT	Shots from combination (%)	23 – 37	
			Shots from individual attempt (%)	12 – 20	
			Shots from cross (%)	11 – 27	
			Shots from set-play (%)	19 – 31	
			Shots from opponent error (%)	10 – 21	
Tscholl et al. (2007) [85]	NS	INT	Tackles	147 ± 5 (139 – 158)	
Wang & Qin (2020) [87]	NS	INT	Shots on target (% shots)	35	
			Rate of goal scoring (% shots)	11	
Wang & Qin (2020) [88]	Video camera	INT	Passes (successful)	347 – 410 (72 – 74%)	
			Through passes (successful)	127 – 142 (58 – 63%)	
			Dribble successful (%)	48 – 59	
			Shots	10 – 15	
			Shots on target	2 – 7	
			Goals	1 – 2	
Playing Standard				INT	DOM D1
Gabbett et al. (2008) [34]	Video camera	INT & DOM	Dribbling contacts	14 ± 6	17 ± 5
			Passing contacts	29 ± 9	28 ± 8
			Trapping contacts	24 ± 8	22 ± 6
			Tackling contacts	10 ± 5	10 ± 5
			Other contacts	11 ± 5	19 ± 16
Mohr et al. (2008) [44]	Video camera	INT & DOM		Top-Class	High-Level
			Headers	11 ± 1*	8 ± 1*
			Tackles	16 ± 1*	14 ± 1*
Age-Group				U16	U14
Harkness-Armstrong et al. (2020) [37]	Video camera; Nacsport Pro+	DOM	Number of Possessions	35 ± 33	32 ± 36
			Total possession (s)	45 ± 82	39 ± 96
			Average possession (s)	1.2 ± 1.0	1.1 ± 1.2
			Touches per possession	2 ± 1	2 ± 1
			Offensive touch	74 ± 99	68 ± 102
			Pass (successful)	25 ± 28 (65 ± 30%)	22 ± 28 (63 ± 32%)
			First touch pass (successful)	8 ± 4 (64 ± 29%)	7 ± 3 (62 ± 31%)
			Dribble (successful)	4 ± 7 (33 ± 15%)	4 ± 8 (31 ± 16%)
			Cross	0.7 ± 0.0	0.8 ± 0.0
			Shot	1 ± 3	1 ± 3

			Defensive touch	14 ± 12	17 ± 15
			Aerial challenge	3 ± 3	2 ± 3
			Block	1 ± 3	1 ± 3
			Clearance	0.9 ± 4	0.7 ± 3
			Interception	4 ± 4	5 ± 5
			Tackle	3 ± 4	4 ± 5
			Foul	0.5 ± 1	0.5 ± 2
Harris et al. (2019) [58]	Video camera	DOM		U15	U13-U14
			Headers	0 – 9	0 – 9
Peek et al. (2021) [75]	Video camera	DOM		Team Average	
				U15 – U17	U13 – U14
			Headers	30 – 53 (15 – 69)	20 – 25 (13 – 68)
			Heading Duels (%)	15 – 23%	5 – 9%
Contextual Factors – Type of Competition				In-Conference	Out-Conference
Bozzini et al. (2020) [50]	InStat	COL D1	Passing accuracy (%)	74 ± 6	76 ± 5
			Dribble success (%)	46 ± 14	53 ± 23
			Tackle success (%)	65 ± 11	53 ± 15
			Challenges won (%)	58 ± 11	56 ± 9
Contextual Factors – Team Ranking				High	Low
Póvoas et al. (2020) [76]	InStat	INT	Successful tackles	1 ± 1	2 ± 1
			Recoveries	6 ± 4	7 ± 3
			Accurate passes (%)	75 ± 9	77 ± 8
			Challenges (won)	13 ± 3 (55 ± 9%)	20 ± 6 (55 ± 15%)
Contextual Factors – Type of Playing Surface				Grass	Turf
Garcia-Unanue et al. (2020) [55]	OPTA Sports	INT	Goals	0.1 ± 0.2	0.1 ± 0.3
			Shots	1 ± 1	1 ± 1
			Passes (successful)	38 ± 11 (67 ± 9%)	36 ± 13 (69 ± 10%)
			Touches**	59	54
			Crosses	1 ± 2	1 ± 2
			Dribbles (successful)	3 ± 3 (62 ± 26%)	2 ± 2 (40 ± 29%)
			Tackles	3 ± 2 (77 ± 20%)	2 ± 1 (85 ± 20%)
			Clearances	2 ± 2	2 ± 2
			Interceptions	2 ± 2	2 ± 2
			Fouls	1 ± 1	1 ± 1
Contextual Factors – Match Outcome				Team Average	
				Win	Loss
Kubayi & Larkin (2020) [67]	InStat	INT	Passes (successful)	526 ± 114 (80 ± 5%)	393 ± 108 (74 ± 7%)
			Shots	16 ± 6	8 ± 5
			Shots on target	6 ± 4	3 ± 2
			Dribbles (successful)	39 ± 9 (52 ± 12%)	26 ± 9 (50 ± 13%)
			Aerial challenges (successful)	39 ± 11 (57 ± 10%)	39 ± 11 (43 ± 10%)
			Lost balls	81 ± 12	85 ± 12
			Tackles (successful)	35 ± 10 (63 ± 12%)	40 ± 9 (62 ± 11%)
			Fouls	10 ± 4	10 ± 5
			Ball recoveries	65 ± 10	59 ± 10

NS = not specified. Playing standard: INT = international; DOM = domestic; COL = college. *Data presented as mean ± SE and/or (range)**Mean calculated from available data.

306
307
308

309 3.6 Tactical characteristics

310 Table 10 presents the two studies which explored tactical characteristics of women's soccer match-play. Both
311 studies [30, 90] quantified playing length and playing width (m), which were defined as the range of all 20
312 outfield players' longitudinal positioning, and the range of all 20 outfield players' lateral positioning,
313 respectively. Zubillaga et al. [90] included additional tactical variables; distance from defender to goal-line (m;
314 distance between least longitudinally advanced opposition defender and opposition goal-line, only when in
315 possession), distance from attacker to goal-line (m; distance between most longitudinally advanced opposition
316 attacker and opposition goal-line, only when in possession), distance between goalkeeper and defender (m; least
317 longitudinally advanced defender), distance between goalkeeper and attacker (m; most longitudinally advanced

318 attacking opponent), and individual playing area (m^2 ; derived from dividing playing length and playing width by
319 20). Only open-play data, collected at 5-second intervals was included within Zubillaga et al. [90], whilst Tenga
320 et al. [30] included ball-in-play data collected at 5 Hz frequency, excluding the initial 5-seconds following set-
321 pieces.

Table 10 Studies quantifying tactical characteristics of women's soccer match-play

Study	Data Collection	Tactical Variable	Ball Location (zones by pitch length)					
			Zone 1 (defensive third)	Zone 2 (defensive third)	Zone 3 (middle third, defensive half)	Zone 4 (middle third, offensive half)	Zone 5 (offensive third)	Zone 6 (offensive third)
Tenga et al. (2015) [30]	25 Hz multi-camera match analysis system (Amisco Pro)	Playing length (m)	43.3 ± 7.6	39.4 ± 5.5	37.4 ± 5.7	36.7 ± 4.1	40.4 ± 4.3	48.1 ± 3.9
	Data utilised 5 Hz sampling	Playing width (m)	39.2 ± 8.1	42.4 ± 8.5	42.9 ± 20.3	41.8 ± 8.0	40.9 ± 7.1	40.4 ± 8.4
Zubillaga et al. (2013) [90]	25 Hz multi-camera match analysis system (Amisco Pro)	Playing length (m)	43.3 ± 7.6	39.4 ± 5.5	37.1 ± 5.3	36.4 ± 4.2	40.2 ± 4.2	48.1 ± 4.0
		Playing width (m)	39.2 ± 8.1	42.7 ± 8.5	43.8 ± 18.4	42.8 ± 17.6	40.5 ± 7.0	39.8 ± 7.7
	Data utilised 5-second intervals	Distance from defender to goal-line (m)	45.8 ± 7.6	43.8 ± 6.9	36.9 ± 13.4	28.0 ± 7.5	16.9 ± 6.7	6.9 ± 7.5
		Distance from attacker to goal-line (m)	16.5 ± 11.1	22.0 ± 7.4	31.5 ± 7.4	40.8 ± 7.5	48.6 ± 6.6	52.2 ± 8.0
		Distance between goalkeeper and defender (m)	26.6 ± 4.4	26.4 ± 4.5	24.3 ± 9.9	20.8 ± 9.3	14.5 ± 4.9	7.2 ± 4.7
		Distance between goalkeeper and attacker (m)	12.4 ± 7.4	16.1 ± 5.3	20.8 ± 4.8	25.3 ± 4.5	28.3 ± 4.9	28.7 ± 5.7
Individual playing area (m ²)	85.0 ± 23.4	84.4 ± 21.7	81.6 ± 39.2	77.9 ± 32.7	81.3 ± 16.1	96.2 ± 22.6		

324 **4 Discussion**

325 This is the first systematic review to summarise women's soccer match-play, including the technical, tactical
326 and physical characteristics. A total of 69 studies were included, predominantly quantifying physical
327 characteristics (68%), whilst 38% quantified technical characteristics, and only 3% quantified tactical
328 characteristics. Studies reported whole-, half-, segmental and/or peak match characteristics for physical data,
329 however studies reporting technical and tactical characteristics were predominantly limited to whole-match
330 analysis. There has been an increase in the number of studies quantifying women's soccer match-play
331 characteristics in recent years, however, studies predominantly involved senior international (39%) and
332 domestic players (43%), with only 10% quantifying match-play characteristics of youth (age-group) soccer
333 players. Physical characteristics appear to increase between age-groups and playing standards, and are
334 dependent upon playing position. Furthermore, there are between-half decrements in physical performance, with
335 the opening 15-minutes of match-play the most physically demanding. Further research quantifying the
336 technical and tactical characteristics is required to understand differences within and between age-groups and
337 playing standards. The results of this review provide insight into the current match-play characteristics across
338 different playing standards and playing positions, which will be beneficial for researchers and practitioners
339 implementing evidence-based practice with women's soccer players.

340 **4.1 Methodologies for quantifying match-play characteristics**

341 There are important methodological limitations to acknowledge when interpreting and comparing the extracted
342 data. Firstly, over half of the included studies which reported number of teams involved only a single-team or
343 single-club. This is problematic, as results may not be reflective of the population due to individual team/club
344 strategies, tactics or playing styles, which may influence players' physical, technical and tactical performance.
345 Future research should adopt multi-club data collection approaches to overcome this issue. Secondly, positional
346 categorisation was inconsistent, which may be a consequence of small sample size within studies. Only nine of
347 the twenty-six studies [8, 19, 26, 33, 37, 51, 52, 74, 80] quantifying position-specific characteristics
348 differentiated both central and wide defenders and midfielders. High-level positional categorisations (i.e.
349 defender or midfielder) may not provide accurate insights into match-play characteristics, given the positional
350 differences observed when central and wide players are compared [19, 37, 51, 74]. Thus, in addition to adopting

351 a multi-club approach, future research should ensure sufficient sample size (participants and match
352 observations) to differentiate central and wide playing-positions.

353 Thirdly, comparing physical characteristics quantified by different equipment requires caution due to between-
354 system differences (i.e., video-based time-motion analyses vs GPS units vs optical tracking; 5 vs 10 vs 15 Hz
355 GPS) [91-94]. Furthermore, where studies have adopted the same data collection method (e.g. 10 Hz GPS units),
356 differences exist between manufacturers' hardware, firmware, data filtering and data processing methods [95,
357 96]. Therefore, direct comparison of findings between studies adopting different data collection methods may
358 not be appropriate, and this further limits the potential insights which can be gained regarding the physical
359 characteristics.

360 Lastly, a range of velocity and acceleration/deceleration thresholds have been adopted, with methods for
361 establishing or adopting thresholds also differing between studies (e.g. arbitrary thresholds within men's soccer,
362 derived from physical performance characteristics, derived from match-play data of senior women's soccer
363 players). This has resulted in varying velocity and acceleration/deceleration zones, impacting comparisons
364 between studies. There is a need for future research to establish a standardised approach for adopting velocity
365 and acceleration/deceleration thresholds within women's soccer to facilitate comparisons between studies.

366 However, practitioners and researchers should also have an awareness and understanding of the potential impact
367 thresholds may have on physical characteristics. For example, recent research found adopting senior-derived
368 velocity thresholds for youth match-play, resulted in an underestimation of higher-speed distances as senior-
369 derived thresholds are too excessive to accurately reflect the physical characteristics of youth players [97]. In
370 this instance, adoption of senior-derived velocity thresholds may lead to misleading data and subsequently
371 erroneous interpretations of the physical characteristics of youth match-play. Therefore, we recommended that
372 researchers and practitioners make an informed-decision, depending upon their study aim or intended use of the
373 data, as to whether it may be more appropriate to adopt senior-derived velocity thresholds or population-specific
374 velocity thresholds.

375 The underpinning methodological limitations within the body of literature limits the insights which can be
376 gained across women's soccer populations. Consequently, researchers and practitioners using the match-play
377 characteristics presented within this review, particularly the physical characteristics should be cautious in their
378 interpretation and application of the data. Furthermore, subsequent discussion within this systematic review, is
379 reflective of the limitations highlighted.

380 **4.2 Whole-match characteristics**

381 **4.2.1 Absolute physical characteristics**

382 The TD covered during match-play by (outfield) women's soccer players ranged between 5480 – 11160 m, and
383 appeared to increase between playing standards, with similarities between senior international and domestic
384 match-play. When considering the most common velocity thresholds implemented across respective velocity
385 zones, HSR distance and percentage of TD also increased between playing standards ($>15 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$: international
386 = 13.8 – 17.9%; domestic = 5.9 – 17.0%; college = 10.1 -13.5%) [26, 35, 43, 61, 62, 65, 74, 80, 81]. Whilst,
387 VHSR distance and percentage of TD increased between youth and senior playing standards ($>19 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$:
388 domestic = 3.5 – 6.4%; youth = 1.5 – 4.2%) [8, 19, 82]. Similar SPR distances were covered by senior
389 international and domestic players when considering the most commonly applied SPR threshold ($>20 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$)
390 [31, 40, 57, 73, 78, 79]. Whilst Ramos et al. [78] and Vescovi [40] observed a progressive increase in SPR
391 distances covered by youth players, between U17, U20 and senior international age-groups, and U15, U16 and
392 U17 domestic age-groups, respectively. The progressive increase in distances covered across playing standards
393 and age-groups may be consequential of increasing physical capacities, greater match-specific fitness, reflective
394 of increased technical-tactical demands or potentially differing contextual factors within playing standards.
395 Furthermore, the increase in absolute distances between age-groups may be consequential of differing match-
396 durations between youth and senior match-play [19, 37, 40].

397 The number of HSR and SPR efforts performed, differed between studies (HSR = 44 – 376; SPR = 4 – 70) [20,
398 29, 31, 40, 43, 44, 52, 63, 65, 69, 71, 73] which is likely due to differing methodological approaches (i.e. data
399 collection, velocity thresholds). However, the mean distance per HSR and SPR efforts was predominantly <10
400 m [52, 63, 69] and <20 m [31, 40, 43, 52, 63, 65, 86], respectively, which suggests that acceleration ability is
401 important within women's soccer [12]. Yet, the number of accelerations differed vastly between studies [20, 31,
402 57, 62, 69, 74, 78, 79, 80], which may also be due to the different methods adopted. For example, the largest
403 discrepancy was observed in studies adopting $>2 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$ thresholds (i.e., 20 Hz radio frequency tracking = 161
404 accelerations [31]; 10 Hz GPS = 13 – 80 accelerations; [62, 78]; 25 Hz optical tracking = 342 – 475
405 accelerations [69]). Future research may aim to quantify acceleration and decelerations into zones or the starting
406 and finishing velocities [69], to further understand the intensities of these movements [57, 62, 64, 77]. In
407 comparison to distances covered in match-play, there is limited understanding of the accelerations and
408 decelerations, across all playing standards. Therefore, future research should aim to further investigate these

409 actions within match-play, particularly considering the associated high metabolic and mechanical loads [57],
410 this information will be useful for preparing players for match-play, or informing player load monitoring, and
411 injury prevention and rehabilitation practices.

412 **4.2.2 Absolute technical characteristics**

413 There were consistent findings in technical characteristics across studies. Unsurprisingly, passes were the most
414 frequent technical action in possession across playing standards, with an increasing pass success rate from youth
415 (63 - 65%) [37] to senior match-play (67 - 80%) [26, 27, 31, 50, 55, 67, 76]. Tackles and interceptions were the
416 most common defensive actions in senior and youth match-play [27, 31, 37, 55]. However, given the limited
417 number of technical characteristics quantified across studies, it is difficult to explore potential differences in
418 playing styles across playing standards. Additionally, the technical data presents on-the-ball technical actions for
419 both in-possession (e.g. passing, crosses, or shots) and out-of-possession (e.g. clearances, interceptions, or
420 tackles), which can be useful for practitioners informing coaching practice. However, given the small duration
421 of time spent on the ball (senior = 67 ± 3 s; youth = 32 – 35 s) [26, 37] and low frequency of these technical
422 actions, future research should aim to quantify off-the-ball technical actions, technical-tactical or physical-
423 technical actions [17], such as pressing, pass effectiveness or sequences/patterns of play [47, 83], to gain better
424 understanding of technical performance.

425 **4.2.3 Absolute tactical characteristics**

426 Tactical characteristics referred to players' positioning which provide insight to teams' playing length and
427 width, and players' individual playing area, dependent upon ball location [30, 90]. The data presented may help
428 practitioners determine appropriate dimensions for training drills, conditioned or small-sided games. However,
429 the reported data lacks physical, technical and situational context. Therefore, further research is required to
430 better understand team behaviours, and how physical and technical characteristics may interact with tactical
431 strategies [27, 28, 68]. Furthermore, tactical characteristics are often dynamic, thus future research should aim to
432 improve our understanding of the tactical characteristics across match-play, or prior-to and following key
433 moments in match-play, and how contextual factors (e.g. match status) may affect tactical performance.
434 However, it is important to acknowledge the challenges and complexities associated with this research and
435 within practice [98, 99]. For instance, collecting sufficient data for appropriate analyses, the advanced
436 theoretical and computational underpinning knowledge required for analyses, ability to work with complex
437 datasets, and multidisciplinary collaboration. We anticipate that as the involvement of big data technologies

438 within the women's game increases, and more commercial data providers provide readily-available access to
439 physical and technical data [53, 55], the body of literature exploring tactical characteristics in senior
440 international and professional playing standards will grow accordingly.

441 **4.2.4 Position-specific absolute characteristics**

442 Senior goalkeepers cover 4445 – 5622 m during match-play [8, 62, 74], predominantly at lower speeds.
443 Unsurprisingly, goalkeepers covered less TD, HSR, VHSR and SPR distances, than outfield players. However,
444 given the different movements and technical-tactical skills associated with goalkeeping, position-specific
445 characteristics (e.g. number, intensity, and direction of movements such as diving, jumping or kicking) [100]
446 would be more appropriate than distances covered. Future research should aim to improve our very limited
447 understanding of women's soccer goalkeeper match-play characteristics, to help inform goalkeeper-specific
448 training and coaching practice.

449 When studies differentiated central and wide players, central defenders typically covered the lowest TD, HSR,
450 VHSR, and SPR distances [8, 19, 20, 26, 51, 70, 74, 78, 79], performed the least HSR and SPR efforts [20, 52,
451 73], and had the least total and average duration of possession, touches per possession, and offensive touches
452 during youth match-play [37]. Central midfielders covered the most TD [8, 19, 26, 51, 62, 74], and had the
453 lowest maximum velocity [8, 19]. Furthermore, Harkness-Armstrong et al. [37] reported central midfielders had
454 the greatest active involvement in youth match-play with the most offensive touches and passes, as well as the
455 most tackles. Considering HSR distance, three studies reported wide midfielders covered the most [8, 19, 74],
456 whilst Bradley et al. [26] and Datson et al. [51] reported forwards and central midfielders covered the most,
457 respectively. Forwards and wide midfielders consistently covered the most VHSR and SPR distances [8, 19, 51,
458 74], and attempted the most dribbles, crosses and shots during youth match-play [37]. There was a discrepancy
459 in position-specific accelerations and decelerations between studies, however this may be due to respective
460 samples adopting notably different acceleration and/or deceleration thresholds. Although comparison of
461 physical and technical characteristics are limited due to methodological differences, clear differences exist
462 between playing positions and the data reported within the current review can be used to inform position-
463 specific training drills and coaching practice to prepare players accordingly for match-play.

464 **4.2.5 Relative characteristics**

465 Between playing standards, college players covered the highest relative TD [36, 49, 50, 71, 89], whilst senior
466 international players covered more relative TD [20, 33, 72, 84] than senior domestic players [46, 63, 80], and

467 youth players covered the least relative TD [19, 40]. Where similar SPR thresholds ($>20 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$) were adopted,
468 the data suggests an increase in relative SPR distance between playing standards [33, 46, 50, 72].

469 Quantifying relative characteristics normalises data to minutes played, removing potential differences in data
470 due to match-duration across match observations, which is particularly useful for comparisons between groups,
471 especially age-groups with differing match durations [19]. However, it is important to acknowledge that relative
472 whole-match data includes ball out of play time, which has been found to be between 38.0 and 41.6% of the
473 time in women's soccer [37, 51]. Whilst inclusion of ball out of play time has been found to underestimate
474 physical characteristics in men's soccer populations [101, 102], the effect on women's soccer players is yet to be
475 quantified. Therefore, future research across women's soccer populations should explore the differences
476 between ball in play and whole-match characteristics, to better understand the physical and technical
477 characteristics, and to ensure practitioners can implement coaching practice and training drills which better
478 represent match-play demands.

479 **4.2.6 Influence of contextual factors**

480 Excluding playing standard, age-group and playing position, only fourteen studies [36, 38, 46, 49, 50, 55, 63,
481 67, 68, 71, 76, 83, 84, 89] quantified the influence of contextual factors on match-play characteristics. Studies
482 predominantly reported whole-match characteristics, with physical characteristics primarily presented as relative
483 values. Whereas technical data were either presented as absolute or relative to match duration, which may lead
484 to erroneous interpretation when comparing the effect of contextual factors. For example, Póvoas et al. [76]
485 found international low-ranking teams performed more successful tackles, recoveries and challenges than high-
486 ranking teams. However, this may be due to low-ranking teams having less possession, and thus more
487 opportunity to perform defensive actions than high-ranking teams. Therefore, future research should present
488 possession-dependent technical characteristics relative to possession status [37]. Additionally, studies quantified
489 contextual factors in isolation (i.e. match location, match congestion, or opposition quality), with only Trewin et
490 al. [84] combining contextual factors (i.e. match outcome and opposition quality; win vs higher ranked
491 opponent). Quantifying contextual factors in isolation may be consequential of limited sample size or match
492 observations. However, caution should be taken when interpreting the influence of isolated contextual factors
493 given the complex, multifaceted nature of match-play performances [103].

494 Acknowledging these limitations; high temperatures [36, 84], altitude [49, 84], match congestion ($<42\text{h}$) [71,
495 84], playing against lower ranked opposition [38, 84], playing on grass rather than artificial turf [46], in-

496 conference matches as opposed to out-of-conference fixtures (type of competition) [50], and competing in
497 matches post-season compared to regular-season (seasonal changes) [89], resulted in reduced physical
498 characteristics. However, all studies were conducted with a single-team, thus further research with a multi-club
499 approach, larger sample size and greater number of match observations is required to identify whether these
500 findings are generalizable to the wider women's soccer population. Four studies quantified match characteristics
501 according to match outcome [46, 67, 83, 84]. Differences in physical and technical performances were observed
502 in teams who won, drew or lost across studies, however caution should be taken when interpreting this data.
503 Grouping match observations by match outcome can be an overly-simplistic approach, which does not reflect
504 the fluidity of match status during observations, and may subsequently lead to erroneous categorisation. For
505 example, a team may score within the final minutes of match-play after drawing for the majority of the match,
506 yet be categorised as a win. Therefore, we recommend future research explores the influence of match status
507 (i.e. drawing, winning or losing) as opposed to match outcome on match-play characteristics. Finally, one study
508 [63] attempted to explore sex-specific considerations on match-play performance. The authors compared
509 physical characteristics during match-play between the follicular and luteal phase of the menstrual cycle.
510 However, due to the complexities of data collection (e.g. small sample size due to strict participant inclusion
511 criteria, individual and match-to-match variability) the authors could not attribute changes in performance to the
512 menstrual cycle. Whilst there are considerable complexities to conducting such research [104], further work is
513 warranted to explore the influence of sex-specific considerations on match-play performances.

514 **4.3 Half-match characteristics**

515 The twenty-two studies which quantified half-match characteristics [26, 31, 32, 34, 38 - 41, 43, 44, 49, 50, 54,
516 69, 70, 73, 74, 77, 78, 86, 87, 89] predominantly reported between-half decrements in performances. Reductions
517 in TD (0.2 – 29.7%), HSR (0.9 – 26.6%), VHRS (4.6 – 12.0%) and SPR (4.6 – 29.5%) distances were observed
518 between-halves, across all playing standards. Only two instances of increased HSR distance between-halves
519 were observed [26, 40]. Whilst Vescovi & Favero [41] were the only authors to report an increase in SPR
520 distance (college = 3.1 – 32.2%) between-halves. This inconsistency may be consequential of the authors' data
521 inclusion of half-match observations as opposed to whole-match, which resulted in differing numbers of player
522 observations which may have involved different player samples in each half, and thus may not be a true
523 reflection of between-half differences in performance. Fewer HSR and sprint efforts were performed during the
524 second-half, whilst, the sprint characteristics (e.g. mean distance per sprint, mean duration per sprint) [40, 69,

525 73] also reduced between halves, as the interval between sprint efforts increased (10 – 15%) [70, 73].
526 Additionally, senior domestic players performed fewer accelerations (5.5 – 52.1%) and decelerations (2.2 –
527 29.5%) during the second-half [69, 74, 77].

528 Interestingly, alongside the observed reductions in physical performances, senior domestic players had less
529 individual time in possession in the second half (-7.8%; 34.6s vs 31.9s) [26]. The remaining technical
530 characteristics show similar technical performances between-halves. However, only a small number of technical
531 characteristics were quantified, which were predominantly infrequent on-the-ball technical actions (e.g. duels,
532 headers and tackles) [26, 44], therefore limited insight can be gained as to potential differences in technical
533 performances between-halves. Additionally, no position-specific technical characteristics were quantified which
534 is problematic, as player averages may provide limited insight into technical performances, given that technical
535 characteristics differ between positions for whole-match [37, 55, 88]. Furthermore, position-specific differences
536 and between-half decrements were observed in physical half-match characteristics [26, 74, 77]. Therefore,
537 future research across playing standards should aim to quantify half-match physical, technical and tactical
538 characteristics according to playing position. This information will enable practitioners to design and deliver
539 position-specific practices to prepare players for match-play and improve their ability to sustain performances
540 between-halves.

541 **4.4 Segmental characteristics**

542 The opening 15-minutes of match-play was consistently the most demanding period across all physical
543 characteristics quantified. Reductions in TD (4.9 – 26.2%) [35, 38, 44, 70, 74, 78], HSR (15.5 – 41.0%) [31, 35,
544 38, 43, 44, 51, 65, 70, 74, 78], VHSR (25.5 – 35.7%) [74], and SPR (7.8 – 73%) [31, 38, 43, 44, 70, 74, 78]
545 distances, number of accelerations and decelerations (3.8 – 66.7%) [74, 78], alongside an increase in mean
546 interval between HSR and SPR efforts (45.5%; 48.5%) [70], were observed across studies from the opening and
547 final 15-minutes of match-play. Only four instances of contrasting data were reported [35, 78], with increased
548 performances observed between the first and last 15-minute period. However, these inconsistencies may also be
549 explained by the studies' samples. For instance, Bendiksen et al. [35] only observed one team for one match,
550 and Ramos et al. [78] only included 12 players from one team. Consequently, data may be influenced by small
551 sample size and specific team strategies, and therefore may not be representative of the wider populations.

552 The observed reductions in physical characteristics across match-play (half-match and segmental), may be
553 consequential of reduced physical performance capacities due to physical fatigue, pacing strategies, or an

554 increased perception of effort due to mental fatigue [18, 44, 66]. Furthermore, technical-tactical performance,
555 situational and contextual variables may also contribute to these reductions, however physical characteristics
556 have predominantly been quantified in isolation. Thus, future research should aim to quantify technical and
557 tactical characteristics alongside physical characteristics, as well as exploring the influence of situational and
558 contextual factors, to understand their influence in reductions in physical performance across match-play. For
559 example, playing styles, team strategies or formation may differ over the duration of match-play but also in
560 response to match status [105], substitution strategies influence on observed players' physical characteristics
561 [106, 107], or whether ball-in play time differs across the match and thus influences physical performances [96,
562 108]. This information would be important for practitioners when informing technical-tactical drills or
563 conditioned games to prepare players for the fluctuating demands of the game, or training prescription which
564 aims to increase players' physical capabilities to sustain physical performances throughout match-play, but also
565 for informing tactical coaching interventions during match-play.

566 **4.5 Peak characteristics**

567 All eight studies reporting peak characteristics, quantified physical characteristics for a 5-minute period [19, 20,
568 26, 43, 44, 51, 74, 78]. TD covered appeared to increase with increasing playing standards [19, 20, 74, 78].
569 However, comparison of HSR, VHSR and SPR distances and number of accelerations and decelerations, during
570 peak-periods is limited, given the different methods adopted across the eight studies (e.g. five HSR velocity
571 thresholds, three accelerations/ decelerations thresholds). Furthermore, two studies [19, 20] quantified peak
572 periods by a moving-averages approach, whilst the remaining studies adopted a pre-determined segmental
573 analysis approach. Previous research within other sporting populations (e.g. men's soccer, men's rugby union)
574 found adopting segmental periods can underestimate peak TD and HSR distances by up to 25% in comparison
575 to moving average analysis [109, 110, 111, 112]. Therefore, it is likely peak-data quantified via segmental
576 analysis [26, 43, 44, 51, 74, 78] underestimates the peak characteristics of women's soccer players. Therefore, it
577 is not possible to determine whether differences across playing standards is reflective of the increased demands,
578 or a consequence of different methods. Thus, practitioners utilising peak data to inform coaching practice and
579 training programme design to prepare players for the worst-case scenarios in match-play should be aware of the
580 methods of analysis adopted. Furthermore, future research should adopt a moving average analysis when
581 quantifying peak periods of women's soccer.

582 Only one study [19] quantified peak periods at differing durations (1-10 minutes), and observed youth players
583 covered the greatest distances during the 1-minute period, whilst relative distances reduced as duration
584 increased, with the least distances covered during the 10-minute period. This is consistent with previous
585 research in men's soccer [110, 111]. Whilst underlying reasons why this reduction may occur is not known (e.g.
586 reduction in physiological capacity; differing technical-tactical demands between peak periods) [96], duration-
587 specific peak characteristics can be used to inform duration-specific training programme design or coaching
588 practice. However, it is not appropriate to inform duration-specific training drills when duration-specific data
589 does not align (i.e. 5-minute data to inform 3-minute training drills) [110]. This is problematic, as only 5-minute
590 peak periods have been quantified for senior populations. Therefore, future research should quantify peak
591 characteristics of 1-10-minute durations, to understand the duration-specific worst case scenarios within senior
592 match-play, which can be used to inform duration-specific practices to optimally prepare players for the most
593 physically demanding periods of match-play.

594 Four studies [19, 20, 74, 78] quantified position-specific peak physical characteristics. During 5-minute peak
595 periods, central defenders typically covered the least TD [19, 20, 74], and HSR distance [19, 20, 74, 78], whilst
596 central defenders and central midfielders covered the least VHSR [19, 74], and SPR [74, 78] distances. Where
597 studies differentiated central and wide defenders and midfielders [19, 74], central midfielders covered the
598 greatest TD, and wide midfielders covered the greatest HSR, VHSR and SPR distances. Furthermore, Harkness-
599 Armstrong et al. [19] reported position-specific differences in TD, HSR and VHSR across 1-10 minute peak
600 durations. The data indicates that peak physical characteristics are position-dependent, thus practitioners should
601 implement position-specific practices to prepare players accordingly for the varying worst case scenarios in
602 match-play. Additionally, the data highlights the need for research to quantify peak characteristics beyond TD
603 (e.g. distances in velocity zones, number of accelerations) to facilitate position-specific differentiation of
604 specific worst-case scenarios

605 Consistent with other areas within this review, peak characteristics have quantified physical characteristics in
606 isolation, which provides limited insight into the true demands and context of these worst-case scenarios within
607 match-play [17]. Additionally, recent research in elite men's soccer [113] found physical peak characteristics
608 lack context due to the multifaceted nature of worst case scenarios, which consequently results in high
609 variability. Therefore, future research should; quantify the associated technical and tactical characteristics
610 during peak physical periods, to understand how technical-tactical roles may influence worst case scenarios;
611 attempt to quantify the peak technical and tactical periods of match-play and the associated physical

612 characteristics; explore how contextual factors (e.g. match status, formation, opposition quality, ball possession)
613 influence worst case scenarios [111, 114], and quantify the variability of peak characteristics in women's soccer
614 match-play. As previously discussed, attempting to integrate the physical, technical and tactical characteristics,
615 and understand the variation within and between matches will provide greater insight into these worst-case
616 scenarios, and enable evidence-informed design and prescription of coaching practice and training programmes
617 to optimally prepare players for the most demanding periods of match-play.

618 **4.6 Limitations**

619 This review has presented study limitations throughout, and the caution required when interpreting results or
620 informing practical applications. For example, this review has identified key methodological limitations within
621 the literature which limits comparisons between studies, including; single-team samples; differing data
622 collection methods; and no standardised velocity and acceleration/deceleration thresholds. Consequently,
623 researchers and practitioners should be cautious in their interpretation of the reported data, whilst future research
624 requires greater consistency in the methods adopted to facilitate comparisons between studies. For example,
625 multi-club samples to ensure findings are generalizable to the population, positional-categorisation of players
626 which differentiate central and wide players as opposed to high-level categorisation (i.e. defenders vs
627 midfielders vs forwards), and to establish and adopt standardised velocity, acceleration and deceleration
628 thresholds/zones for women's soccer, to facilitate comparisons between and within playing standards.

629 The heterogeneity of the included studies' samples and methodologies prevented the inclusion of a meta-
630 analyses within the current systematic review. Given the extent of the current review in summarising all
631 physical, technical, and tactical characteristics during match-play, across all playing standards of women's
632 soccer, there is a very large breadth of results which may be overwhelming. However, given the recent growth,
633 development, and investment within women's soccer, the authors strongly believe there is a timely need for the
634 current review; to collate all current evidence regarding women's soccer match-play characteristics, and provide
635 practitioners with a critical resource which can be utilised to develop evidence-informed practice within
636 women's soccer populations.

637 **5 Conclusions**

638 The quantification and understanding of match-play characteristics is important for informing practices across
639 women's soccer populations. This is the first systematic review to summarise the scientific literature evaluating

640 the match-play characteristics of women's soccer, and presents the physical, technical and tactical
641 characteristics of women's soccer match-play across age-groups, playing standards and playing positions.
642 Furthermore, this review provides a critical evidence-based resource which can be used to inform population-
643 specific practices across women's soccer playing standards.

644 The current review has identified that physical characteristics appear to increase between playing standards and
645 differ between playing positions. Furthermore, between-half reductions in physical characteristics were
646 apparent, whilst the opening 15-minutes of match-play was consistently the most physically demanding.
647 Additionally, peak physical characteristics were primarily quantified via a segmental analysis, which may
648 underestimate the true worst-case scenarios of match-play. Therefore, research which quantifies the peak
649 demands for differing durations via a moving-averages method is warranted across women's soccer playing
650 standards. Additionally, further research is needed to understand technical and tactical characteristics of
651 women's soccer match-play, and how performances may differ across playing standards. Furthermore, research
652 should aim to integrate physical, technical and tactical characteristics rather than quantifying characteristics in
653 isolation, to gain a holistic understanding of match-performance. In addition, further evidence is required
654 regarding contextual factors within match-play, to understand how the characteristics players face during match-
655 play may vary. Future research may also attempt to better our understanding of the match-to-match variation
656 within women's soccer populations. As currently only two studies have quantified match-to-match variation of
657 physical characteristics utilising single-team samples, this is therefore not generalizable to the wider population
658 [20, 72]. Finally, there is a heavy bias towards research quantifying match-play characteristics of senior players.
659 The lack of research and subsequent knowledge and understanding of youth match-play characteristics (<U17)
660 is problematic. Thus, further research is necessary within youth populations, to inform long-term talent
661 development, transition of youth players across the talent pathway, and talent identification processes.

662 **References**

- 663 1. Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). Women's football strategy. 2018.
664 <https://digitalhub.fifa.com/m/baafcb84f1b54a8/original/z7w21ghir8jb9tguvbcq-pdf.pdf>
- 665 2. Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). Women's football member associations survey
666 report 2019. 2019. <https://digitalhub.fifa.com/m/231330ded0bf3120/original/nq3ensohyxpuxovcovj0-pdf.pdf>

667 3. Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). The vision 2020-2023. 2020.
668 <https://publications.fifa.com/en/vision-report-2021/>

669 4. Union of European Football Associations (UEFA). Together for the future of football: UEFA strategy 2019-
670 2024. 2019.
671 https://www.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/uefaorg/General/02/59/06/32/2590632_DOWNLOAD.pdf

672 5. Union of European Football Associations (UEFA). Time for action: UEFA strategy 2019-2024. 2019.
673 https://www.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/uefaorg/Womensfootball/02/60/51/38/2605138_DOWNLOAD.pdf
674 [D.pdf](https://www.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/uefaorg/Womensfootball/02/60/51/38/2605138_DOWNLOAD.pdf)

675 6. Union of European Football Associations (UEFA). Women's football across the national associations 2017.
676 2017.
677 https://www.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/OfficialDocument/uefaorg/Women%27sfootball/02/51/60/57/2516057_DOWNLOAD.pdf
678 [/2516057_DOWNLOAD.pdf](https://www.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/OfficialDocument/uefaorg/Women%27sfootball/02/51/60/57/2516057_DOWNLOAD.pdf)

679 7. Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). Physical analysis of the FIFA Women's World Cup
680 France 2019. 2019. <https://digitalhub.fifa.com/m/4f40a98140d305e2/original/zijqly4oednqa5gffgaz-pdf.pdf>

681 8. Scott D, Haigh J, Lovell R. Physical characteristics and match performances in women's international versus
682 domestic-level football players: a 2-year, league-wide study. *Sci Med Football*. 2020; 4(3): 211-215. doi:
683 10.1080/24733938.2020.1745265

684 9. Okholm Kryger K, Wang A, Mehta R, Impellizzeri FM, Massey A, McCall A. Research on women's
685 football: a scoping review. 2021. *Sci Med Football*. doi: 10.1080/24733938.2020.1868560 (epub ahead of print)

686 10. Datson N, Hulton A, Andersson H, Lewis T, Weston M, Drust B, et al. Applied physiology of female
687 soccer: an update. *Sports Med*. 2014; 44(9), 1225-1240. doi: 10.1007/s40279-014-0199-1

688 11. Davis JA, Brewer J. Applied physiology of female soccer players. *Sports Med*. 1993; 16(3), 180-189. doi:
689 10.2165/00007256-199316030-00003

690 12. Griffin J, Larsen B, Horan S, Keogh J, Dodd K., Andreatta M, et al. Women's football: An examination of
691 factors that influence movement patterns. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2020; 34(8), 2384-2393. doi:
692 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003638

- 693 13. Martinez-Lagunas V, Niessen M, Hartmann U. Women's football: Player characteristics and demands of the
694 game. *J Sport and Health Sci.* 2014; 3(4), 258-272. doi: 10.1016/j.jshs.2014.10.001
- 695 14. Randell RK, Clifford T, Drust B, Moss SL, Unnithan VB, De Ste Croix, MBA, et al. Physiological
696 characteristics of female soccer players and health and performance considerations: a narrative review. *Sports*
697 *Med.* 2021; 51(7); 1377-1399. doi: 10.1007/s40279-021-01458-1
- 698 15. Vescovi JD, Fernandes E, Klas A. Physical demands of women's soccer matches: a perspective across the
699 developmental spectrum. *Front Sports Act Living.* 2021; 3. doi: 10.3389/fspor.2021.634696
- 700 16. Pae CU. Why systematic review rather than narrative review?. *Psychiatry Investig.* 2015; 12(3), 417-419.
701 doi: 10.4306/pi.2015.12.3.417
- 702 17. Bradley PS, Ade JD. Are current physical match performance metrics in elite soccer fit for purpose or is the
703 adoption of an integrated approach needed?. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2018; 13(5), 656-664. doi:
704 10.1123/ijsp.2017-0433
- 705 18. Paul DJ, Bradley PS, Nassis GP. Factors affecting match running performance of elite soccer players:
706 shedding some light on the complexity. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2015; 10(4), 516-519. doi:
707 10.1123/IJSPP.2015-0029
- 708 19. Harkness-Armstrong A, Till K, Datson N, Emmonds S. Whole and peak physical characteristics of elite
709 youth female soccer match-play. *J Sports Sci.* 2021; 39(12), 1320-1329. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2020.1868669
- 710 20. Trewin J, Meylan C, Varley MC, Cronin J. The match-to-match variation of match-running in elite female
711 soccer. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2018; 21(2), 196-201. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2017.05.009
- 712 21. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Prisma Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic
713 reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* 2009; 6(7), e1000097.
- 714 22. Castellano J, Alvarez-Pastor D, Bradley PS. Evaluation of research using computerised tracking systems
715 (Amisco® and Prozone®) to analyse physical performance in elite soccer: a systematic review. *Sports Med.*
716 2014; 44(5), 701-712. doi: 10.1007/s40279-014-0144-3
- 717 23. Trewin J, Meylan C, Varley MC, Cronin J. The influence of situational and environmental factors on match-
718 running in soccer: a systematic review. *Sci Med Football.* 2017; 1(2), 183-194. doi:
719 10.1080/24733938.2017.1329589

- 720 24. Rohatgi A. WebPlotDigitizer: Version 4.4. 2020. <https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer>
- 721 25. Althoff K, Kroihner J, Hennig EM. A soccer game analysis of two World Cups: playing behavior between
722 elite female and male soccer players. *Footwear Sci.* 2010; 2(1), 51-56. doi: 10.1080/19424281003685686
- 723 26. Bradley PS, Dellal A, Mohr M, Castellano J, Wilkie A. Gender differences in match performance
724 characteristics of soccer players competing in the UEFA Champions League. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2014; 33, 159-171.
725 doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2013.07.024
- 726 27. Casal CA, Maneiro R, Ardá A, Losada JL. Gender differences in technical-tactical behaviour of La Liga
727 Spanish football teams. *J Hum Sport Exerc.* 2021; 16(1). doi: 10.14198/jhse.2021.161.04
- 728 28. Gómez MÁ, Álvaro J, Barriopedro M. Behaviour patterns of finishing plays in female and male
729 soccer. *Kronos.* 2008. 8(15), 5–14.
- 730 29. McFadden BA, Walker AJ, Bozzini BN, Sanders DJ, Arent SM. Comparison of internal and external
731 training loads in male and female collegiate soccer players during practices vs. games. *J Strength Cond Res.*
732 2020; 34(4), 969-974. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003485
- 733 30. Tenga A, Zubillaga A, Caro O, Fradua L. Explorative study on patterns of game structure in male and
734 female matches from elite Spanish soccer. *Int J of Perf Anal Sport.* 2015; 15(1), 411-423. doi:
735 10.1080/24748668.2015.11868802
- 736 31. Andersen TB, Krstrup P, Bendiksen M, Ørntoft C, Randers MB, Pettersen SA. Kicking velocity and effect
737 on match performance when using a smaller, lighter ball in women's football. *Int J Sports Med.* 2016; 37(12):
738 996-972. doi: 10.1055/s-0042-109542
- 739 32. Ohlsson A, Berg L, Ljunberg H, Södermann K, Stålnacke BM. Heart rate distribution during training and a
740 domestic league game in Swedish elite female soccer players. *Ann Sport Med Res.* 2015; 2(4), 1025.
- 741 33. Ramos GP, Datson N, Mahseredjian F, Lopes TR, Coimbra CC, Prado LS, et al. Activity profile of training
742 and matches in Brazilian Olympic female soccer team. *Sci Med Football.* 2019; 3(3), 231-237. doi:
743 10.1080/24733938.2019.1615120
- 744 34. Gabbett TJ, Mulvey MJ. Time-motion analysis of small-sided training games and competition in elite
745 women soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2008; 22(2), 543-552. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181635597

- 746 35. Bendiksen M, Pettersen SA, Ingebrigtsen J, Randers MB, Brito J, Mohr M, et al. Application of the
747 Copenhagen Soccer Test in high-level women players—locomotor activities, physiological response and sprint
748 performance. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2013; 32(6), 1430-1442. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2013.07.011
- 749 36. Benjamin CL, Hosokawa Y, Curtis RM, Schaefer DA, Bergin RT, Abegg, MR, et al. Environmental
750 conditions, preseason fitness levels, and game workload: analysis of a female NCAA DI national championship
751 soccer season. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2020; 34(4), 988-994. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003535
- 752 37. Harkness-Armstrong A, Till K, Datson N, Emmonds S. Technical characteristics of elite youth female
753 soccer match-play: position and age group comparisons between under 14 and under 16 age groups.
754 *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport.* 2020; 20(6), 942-959. doi:
755 10.1080/24748668.2020.1820173
- 756 38. Hewitt A, Norton K, Lyons K. Movement profiles of elite women soccer players during international
757 matches and the effect of opposition's team ranking. *J Sports Sci.* 2014; 32(20), 1874-1880. doi:
758 10.1080/02640414.2014.898854
- 759 39. Park LA, Scott D, Lovell R. Velocity zone classification in elite women's football: where do we draw the
760 lines? *Sci Med Football.* 2019; 3(1), 21-28. doi: 10.1080/24733938.2018.1517947
- 761 40. Vescovi JD. Motion characteristics of youth women soccer matches: Female Athletes in Motion (FAiM)
762 Study. *Int J Sports Med.* 2014; 35(02), 110-117. doi: 10.1055/s-0033-1345134
- 763 41. Vescovi JD, Favero TG. Motion characteristics of women's college soccer matches: Female Athletes in
764 Motion (FAiM) study. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2014; 9(3), 405-414. doi: 10.1123/ijsp.2013-0526
- 765 42. Williams JH, Hoffman S, Jaskowak DJ, Tegarden D. Physical demands and physiological responses of extra
766 time matches in collegiate women's soccer. *Sci Med Football.* 2019; 3(4), 307-312. doi:
767 10.1080/24733938.2019.160969443. Andersson HÅ, Randers MB, Heiner-Møller A, Krstrup P, Mohr M. Elite
768 female soccer players perform more high-intensity running when playing in international games compared with
769 domestic league games. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2010; 24(4), 912-919. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181d09f21
- 770 44. Mohr M, Krstrup P, Andersson H, Kirkendal D, Bangsbo J. Match activities of elite women soccer players
771 at different performance levels. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2008; 22(2), 341-349. doi:
772 10.1519/JSC.0b013e318165fef6

- 773 45. Paulsen KM, Butts CL, McDermott BP. Observation of women soccer players' physiology during a single
774 season. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2018; 32(6), 1702-1707. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000002025
- 775 46. Vescovi JD, Falenchuk O. Contextual factors on physical demands in professional women's soccer: female
776 athletes in motion study. *Eur J Sport Sci.* 2019; 19(2), 141-146. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2018.1491628
- 777 47. Alcock A. Analysis of direct free kicks in the women's football World Cup 2007. *Eur J Sport Sci.* 2010;
778 10(4):279-84. doi: 10.1080/17461390903515188
- 779 48. Beare H, Stone JA. Analysis of attacking corner kick strategies in the FA women's super league 2017/2018.
780 *Int J Perf Anal Sport.* 2019; 19(6), 893-903. doi: 10.1080/24748668.2019.1677329
- 781 49. Bohner JD, Hoffman JR, McCormack WP, Scanlon TC, Townsend JR, Stout JR, et al. Moderate altitude
782 affects high intensity running performance in a collegiate women's soccer game. *J Hum Kin.* 2015; 47, 147-154.
783 doi: 10.1515/hukin-2015-0070
- 784 50. Bozzini BN, McFadden BA, Walker AJ, Arent SM. Varying demands and quality of play between in-
785 conference and out-of-conference games in Division I collegiate women's soccer. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2020;
786 34(12), 3364-3368. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003841
- 787 51. Datson N, Drust B, Weston M, Jarman IH, Lisboa PJ, Gregson W. Match physical performance of elite
788 female soccer players during international competition. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2017; 31(9), 2379-2387. doi:
789 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001575
- 790 52. Datson N, Drust B, Weston M, Gregson W. Repeated high-speed running in elite female soccer players
791 during international competition. *Sci Med Football.* 2019; 3(2), 150-156. doi: 10.1080/24733938.2018.1508880
- 792 53. de Jong LM, Gastin PB, Angelova M, Bruce L, Dwyer DB. Technical determinants of success in
793 professional women's soccer: a wider range of variables reveals new insights. *PloS One.* 2020; 15(10),
794 e0240992. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0240992
- 795 54. Gabbett TJ, Wiig H, Spencer M. Repeated high-intensity running and sprinting in elite women's soccer
796 competition. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2013; 8(2), 130-138. doi: doi: 10.1123/ijsp.8.2.130
- 797 55. Garcia-Unanue J, Fernandez-Luna A, Burillo P, Gallardo L, Sanchez-Sanchez J, Manzano-Carrasco S, et al.
798 Key performance indicators at FIFA Women's World Cup in different playing surfaces. *Plos One.* 2020; 15(10),
799 e0241385. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0241385

- 800 56. Gentles JA, Coniglio CL, Besemer MM, Morgan JM, Mahnken MT. The demands of a Women's college
801 soccer season. *Sports*. 2018; 6(1), 16-27. doi: 10.3390/sports6010016
- 802 57. Griffin J, Newans T, Horan S, Keogh J, Andreatta M, Minahan C. Acceleration and high-speed running
803 profiles of women's international and domestic football matches. *Front Sports Act Living*. 2021; 3. doi:
804 10.3389/fspor.2021.604605 (epub ahead of print)
- 805 58. Harriss A, Johnson AM, Walton DM, Dickey, JP. The number of purposeful headers female youth soccer
806 players experience during games depends on player age but not player position. *Sci Med Football*. 2019; 3(2),
807 109-114. doi: 10.1080/24733938.2018.1506591
- 808 59. Hjelm J. The bad female football player: women's football in Sweden. *Soccer Soc*. 2011; 12(2), 143-158.
809 doi: 10.1080/14660970.2011.548352
- 810 60. Ibáñez SJ, Pérez-Goye JA, Courel-Ibáñez J, García-Rubio J. The impact of scoring first on match outcome
811 in women's professional football. *Int J Perf Anal Sport*. 2018; 18(2), 318-326. doi:
812 10.1080/24748668.2018.1475197
- 813 61. Ishida A, Bazyler CD, Sayers AL, Mizuguchi S, Gentles JA. Acute effects of match-play on neuromuscular
814 and subjective recovery and stress state in Division I collegiate female soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res*.
815 2021; 35(4), 976-982. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003981
- 816 62. Jagim AR, Murphy J, Schaefer AQ, Askow AT, Luedke, JA, Erickson JL, et al. Match demands of women's
817 collegiate soccer. *Sports*. 2020; 8(6), 87-97. doi: 10.3390/sports8060087
- 818 63. Julian R, Skorski S, Hecksteden A, Pfeifer C, Bradley PS, Schulze E, et al. Menstrual cycle phase and elite
819 female soccer match-play: influence on various physical performance outputs. *Sci Med Football*. 2020. doi:
820 10.1080/24733938.2020.1802057
- 821 64. Konstadinidou X, Tsigilis N. Offensive playing profiles of football teams from the 1999 Women's World
822 Cup Finals. *Int J Perf Anal Sport*. 2005; 5(1), 61-71. doi: 10.1080/24748668.2005.11868316
- 823 65. Krstrup P, Mohr M, Ellingsgaard H, Bangsbo J. Physical demands during an elite female soccer game:
824 importance of training status. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2005; 37(7), 1242-1248. doi:
825 10.1249/01.mss.0000170062.73981.94

- 826 66. Krstrup P, Zebis M, Jensen JM, Mohr M. Game-induced fatigue patterns in elite female soccer. *J Strength*
827 *Cond Res.* 2010; 24(2), 437-441. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181c09b79
- 828 67. Kubayi A, Larkin P. Technical performance of soccer teams according to match outcome at the 2019 FIFA
829 Women's World Cup. *Int J Perf Anal Sport.* 2020; 20(5), 908-916. doi: 10.1080/24748668.2020.1809320
- 830 68. Mara JK, Wheeler KW, Lyons K. Attacking strategies that lead to goal scoring opportunities in high level
831 women's football. *Int J Sport Sci Coach.* 2012; 7(3), 565-577. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.7.3.565
- 832 69. Mara JK, Thompson KG, Pumpa KL, Morgan S. The acceleration and deceleration profiles of elite female
833 soccer players during competitive matches. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2017; 20(9), 867-872. doi:
834 10.1016/j.jsams.2016.12.078
- 835 70. Mara JK, Thompson KG, Pumpa KL, Morgan S. Quantifying the high-speed running and sprinting profiles
836 of elite female soccer players during competitive matches using an optical player tracking system. *J Strength*
837 *Cond Res.* 2017; 31(6), 1500-1508. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001629
- 838 71. McCormack WP, Hoffman JR, Pruna GJ, Scanlon TC, Bohner JD, Townsend JR, et al. Reduced high-
839 intensity-running rate in college women's soccer when games are separated by 42 hours. *Int J Sports Physiol*
840 *Perform.* 2015; 10(4), 436-439. doi: 10.1123/ijsp.2014-0336
- 841 72. Meylan C, Trewin J, McKean K. Quantifying explosive actions in international women's soccer. *Int J Sports*
842 *Physiol Perform.* 2017; 12(3), 310-315. doi:10.1123/ijsp.2015-0520
- 843 73. Nakamura FY, Pereira LA, Loturco I, Rosseti M, Moura FA, Bradley, PS. Repeated-sprint sequences during
844 female soccer matches using fixed and individual speed thresholds. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2017; 31(7), 1802-
845 1810. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001659
- 846 74. Panduro J, Ermidis G, Røddik L, Vigh-Larsen JF, Madsen EE, Larsen MN, et al. Physical performance and
847 loading for six playing positions in elite female football: full-game, end-game, and peak periods. *Scand J Med*
848 *Sci Sports.* 2021; doi: 10.1111/sms.13877 (epub ahead of print)
- 849 75. Peek K, Vella T, Meyer T, Beaudouin F, McKay M. The incidence and characteristics of purposeful heading
850 in male and female youth football (soccer) within Australia. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2021; 24(6), 603-608. doi:
851 10.1016/j.jsams.2020.12.010

- 852 76. Póvoas S, Ascensão A, Magalhães J, Silva P, Wiig H, Raastad T, et al. Technical match actions and plasma
853 stress markers in elite female football players during an official FIFA Tournament. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*.
854 2020. doi: 10.1111/sms.13878 (epub ahead of print)
- 855 77. Principe VA, Seixas-da-Silva IA, Vale RGDS, Nunes RDAM. GPS technology to control of external
856 demands of elite Brazilian female football players during competitions. *Retos*. 2021; 40, 18-26. doi:
857 10.47197/retos.v1i40.81943
- 858 78. Ramos GP, Nakamura FY, Pereira LA, Junior WB, Mahseredjian F, Wilke CF, et al. Movement patterns of
859 a U-20 national women's soccer team during competitive matches: influence of playing position and
860 performance in the first half. *Int J Sports Med*. 2017; 38(10), 747-754. doi: 10.1055/s-0043-110767
- 861 79. Ramos GP, Nakamura FY, Penna EM, Wilke CF, Pereira LA, Loturco I, et al. Activity profiles in u17, u20,
862 and senior women's Brazilian national soccer teams during international competitions: are there meaningful
863 differences?. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2019; 33(12), 3414-3422. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000002170
- 864 80. Romero-Moraleda B, Nedergaard NJ, Morencos E, Casamichana D, Ramirez-Campillo R, Vanrenterghem J.
865 External and internal loads during the competitive season in professional female soccer players according to
866 their playing position: differences between training and competition. *Res Sports Med*. 2021. doi:
867 10.1080/15438627.2021.1895781 (epub ahead of print)
- 868 81. Sausaman RW, Sams ML, Mizuguchi S, DeWeese BH, Stone, MH. The physical demands of NCAA
869 division I women's college soccer. *J Funct Morphol Kinesiol*. 2019; 4(4), 73. doi: 10.3390/jfmk4040073
- 870 82. Scott D, Norris D, Lovell R. Dose–response relationship between external load and wellness in elite
871 women's soccer matches: do customized velocity thresholds add value?. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*. 2020;
872 15(9), 1245-1251. doi: 10.1123/ijsp.2019-0660
- 873 83. Soroka A, Bergier J. Actions with the ball that determine the effectiveness of play in women's football. *J*
874 *Hum Kin*. 2010; 26, 97-104.
- 875 84. Trewin J, Meylan C, Varley MC, Cronin J, Ling D. Effect of match factors on the running performance of
876 elite female soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2018; 32(7), 2002-2009. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000002584

- 877 85. Tscholl P, O’Riordan D, Fuller CW, Dvorak J, Junge A. Tackle mechanisms and match characteristics in
878 women’s elite football tournaments. *Br J Sports Med*, 2007; 41(1 Suppl), i15-i19. doi:
879 10.1136/bjism.2007.036889
- 880 86. Vescovi JD. Sprint profile of professional female soccer players during competitive matches: Female
881 Athletes in Motion (FAiM) study. *J Sports Sci*. 2012; 30(12), 1259-1265. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2012.701760
- 882 87. Wang SH, Qin Y. Analysis of shooting and goal scoring patterns in the 2019 France Women’s World Cup. *J*
883 *Phys Ed Sport*. 2020; 20(6), 3080-3089. doi: 10.7752/jpes.2020.s6418
- 884 88. Wang SH, Qin Y. Differences in the match performance of Asian women's football teams. *J Phys Ed Sport*.
885 2020; 20(3 Suppl), 2230-2238. doi: 10.7752/jpes.2020.s3299
- 886 89. Wells AJ, Hoffman JR, Beyer KS, Hoffman MW, Jajtner AR, Fukuda DH, et al. Regular-and postseason
887 comparisons of playing time and measures of running performance in NCAA Division I women soccer players.
888 *App Physiol, Nutr Metab*. 2015; 40(9), 907-917. doi: 10.1139/apnm-2014-0560
- 889 90. Zubillaga A, Gabbett TJ, Fradua L, Ruiz-Ruiz C, Caro Ó, Ervilla R. Influence of ball position on playing
890 space in Spanish elite women's football match-play. *Int J Sports Sci Coach*. 2013; 8(4), 713-722. doi:
891 10.1260/1747-9541.8.4.713
- 892 91. Buchheit M, Allen A, Poon TK, Modonutti M, Gregson W, Di Salvo V. Integrating different tracking
893 systems in football: multiple camera semi-automatic system, local position measurement and GPS technologies.
894 *J Sports Sci*. 2014; 32(20), 1844-1857. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2014.942687
- 895 92. Buchheit M, Simpson BM. Player-tracking technology: half-full or half-empty glass?. *Int J Sports Physiol*
896 *Perform*. 2017; 12(2 Suppl), S2-35. doi: 10.1123/ijsp.2016-0499
- 897 93. Harley JA, Lovell RJ, Barnes CA, Portas MD, Weston M. The interchangeability of global positioning
898 system and semiautomated video-based performance data during elite soccer match play. *J Strength Cond Res*.
899 2011; 25(8), 2334-2336. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181f0a88f
- 900 94. Scott MT, Scott TJ, Kelly VG. The validity and reliability of global positioning systems in team sport: a
901 brief review. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2016; 30(5), 1470-1490. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001221

- 902 95. Malone JJ, Lovell R, Varley MC, Coutts AJ. Unpacking the black box: applications and considerations for
903 using GPS devices in sport. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*. 2017; 12(suppl 2), 18-26. doi: 10.1123/ijssp.2016-
904 0236
- 905 96. Whitehead S, Till K, Weaving D, Jones B. The use of microtechnology to quantify the peak match demands
906 of the football codes: a systematic review. *Sports Med*. 2018; 48(11), 2549-2575. doi: 10.1007/s40279-018-
907 0965-6
- 908 97. Harkness-Armstrong A, Till K, Datson N, Emmonds S. Determining age-specific velocity thresholds for
909 elite youth female soccer players. *Sci Med Football*. 2021. doi: 10.1080/24733938.2021.1991585 (epub ahead of
910 print)
- 911 98. Rein R, Memmert D. Big data and tactical analysis in elite soccer: future challenges and opportunities for
912 sports science. *Springerplus*. 2016; 5(1), 1410-1423. doi: 10.1186/s40064-016-3108-2
- 913 99. Goes FR, Meerhoff LA, Bueno MJO, Rodrigues DM, Moura FA, Brink MS, et al. Unlocking the potential of
914 big data to support tactical performance analysis in professional soccer: a systematic review. *Eur J Sport Sci*.
915 2021; 21(4): 481-496. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2020.1747552
- 916 100. White A, Hills SP, Cooke CB, Batten T, Kilduff LP, Cook CJ, et al. Match-play and performance test
917 responses of soccer goalkeepers: A review of current literature. *Sports Med*. 2018; 48(11), 2497-2516. doi:
918 10.1007/s40279-018-0977-2
- 919 101. Mernagh D, Weldon A, Wass J, Phillips J, Parmar N, Waldron M, et al. A comparison of match demands
920 using ball-in-play versus whole match data in professional soccer players of the English Championship. *Sports*.
921 2021; 9(6), 76. doi: 10.3390/sports9060076
- 922 102. Wass J, Mernagh D, Pollard B, Stewart P, Fox W, Parmar N, et al. A comparison of match demands using
923 ball-in-play vs. whole match data in elite male youth soccer players. *Sci Med Football*. 2020; 4(2), 142-147. doi:
924 10.1080/24733938.2019.1682183
- 925 103. Dalton-Barron N, Whitehead S, Roe G, Cummins C, Beggs C, Jones B. Time to embrace the complexity
926 when analysing GPS data? A systematic review of contextual factors on match running in rugby league. *J Sports*
927 *Sci*. 2020; 38(10), 1161-1180. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2020.1745446

- 928 104. Elliott-Sale KJ, Minahan CL, de Jonge XAJ, Ackerman KE, Sipilä S, Constantini NW, et al.
929 Methodological considerations for studies in sport and exercise science with women as participants: a working
930 guide for standards of practice for research on women. *Sports Med.* 2021; 51(5), 843-861. doi: 10.1007/s40279-
931 021-01435-8
- 932 105. Moalla W, Fessi MS, Makni E, Dellal A, Filetti C, Di Salvo V, et al. Association of physical and technical
933 activities with partial match status in a soccer professional team. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2018; 32(6), 1708-1714.
934 doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000002033
- 935 106. Coelho DB, Coelho LGM, Morandi RF, Ferreira Junior JB, Marins JCB, Prado LS, et al. Effect of player
936 substitutions on the intensity of second-half soccer match play. *Rev Bras Cineantropometria Desempenho Hum.*
937 2012; 14(2), 183-191. doi: 10.5007/1980-0037.2012v14n2p183
- 938 107. Hills SP, Barwood MJ, Radcliffe JN, Cooke CB, Kilduff LP, Cook CJ, et al. Profiling the responses of
939 soccer substitutes: a review of current literature. *Sports Med.* 2018; 48(10), 2255-2269. doi: 10.1007/s40279-
940 018-0962-9
- 941 108. Lago-Peñas C, Rey E, Lago-Ballesteros J. The influence of effective playing time on physical demands of
942 elite soccer players. *Open Sports Sci J.* 2012; 5(1), 188-192. doi: 10.2174/1875399X01205010188
- 943 109. Cunningham DJ, Shearer DA, Carter N, Drawer S, Pollard B, Bennett M, et al. Assessing worst case
944 scenarios in movement demands derived from global positioning systems during international rugby union
945 matches: rolling averages versus fixed length epochs. *PloS One.* 2018; 13(4), e0195197. doi:
946 10.1371/journal.pone.0195197
- 947 110. Doncaster G, Page R, White P, Svenson R, Twist C. Analysis of physical demands during youth soccer
948 match-play: Considerations of sampling method and epoch length. *Res Q Exerc Sport.* 2020; 91(2), 326-334.
949 doi: 10.1080/02701367.2019.1669766
- 950 111. Fereday K, Hills SP, Russell M, Smith J, Cunningham DJ, Shearer D, et al. A comparison of rolling
951 averages versus discrete time epochs for assessing the worst-case scenario locomotor demands of professional
952 soccer match-play. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2020; 23(8), 764-769. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2020.01.002
- 953 112. Varley MC, Elias GP, Aughey RJ. Current match-analysis techniques' underestimation of intense periods
954 of high-velocity running. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2012; 7(2), 183-185. doi: 10.1123/ijsp.7.2.183

- 955 113. Novak AR, Impellizzeri FM, Trivedi A, Coutts AJ, McCall A. Analysis of the worst-case scenarios in an
956 elite football team: Towards a better understanding and application. *J Sports Sci.* 2021. doi:
957 10.1080/02640414.2021.1902138 (epub ahead of print)
- 958 114. Riboli A, Semeria M, Coratella G, Esposito F. Effect of formation, ball in play and ball possession on peak
959 demands in elite soccer. *Biol Sport.* 2021; 38(2), 195-205. doi: 10.5114/biol sport.2020.98450
- 960

961 **Supporting Information**

962 **Checklist S1** PRISMA 2020 Checklist

963 **Table S1** Whole-, half-, segmental- and peak-match characteristics of women's soccer players, quantified via
964 heart rate monitors.

965 **Table S2** Whole-match high-speed running and sprinting match-play characteristics of women's soccer players

966 **Table S3** Whole-match acceleration and deceleration characteristics of women's soccer players

967 **Table S4** Half-match physical characteristics of women's soccer match-play

968 **Table S5** Segmental physical characteristics of women's soccer-match-play

969