Original Article

Small sided games in soccer training

YIANNIS MICHAELIDIS¹

¹ Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Democritus University of Thrace, GREECE

Published online: September 30, 2013

(Accepted for publication September 15, 2013)

DOI:10.7752/jpes.2013.03063;

Abstract:

The specificity of training has been associated with the effectiveness of the training process. Soccer coaches apply exercises based on the game which named as small-sided games. These kinds of games have a lot of characteristics (number of players, field size, rules of the game, coach encouragement), which can modify the effectiveness of the exercise. The purpose of this paper was to analyze record and report the physiological, technicotactical responses of soccer players when the above factors were modified in SSG. Although the different design of the studies in some cases we can infer safe conclusions but also in some variables needed more studies to clear them.

Key words: Small-sided games, conditioning, football, technique

Introduction

Soccer is one of the most popular sports in the world with millions of people involved in amateur and professional level. Over the decades this sport is becoming increasingly competitive and the players have to perform in a high level of physical, mental and technicotactical skills (Bangsbo, 1994). This change is a result of the development of sports science that makes more effective the trainings. However, there are several other factors that can affect the performance of players such as the field, the weather, the use of the ball and the opponent.

Large parts of the training process in soccer include exercises without ball to develop physical abilities of soccer players (Little and Williams, 2007). These exercises are non-specific exercises and need a lot of time. So the coaches relying on research data indicate that to maximize the performance should the training stimulus have similar characteristics to the race (Bompa, 1983; Mallo and Navarro, 2008) trying to implement exercises relating to the soccer match. For this purpose, the coaches use small-sided games (SSG) which can reproduce the physical and technicotactical requirements of a match (MacLaren, Davids, Isokawa, Mellor & Reilly, 1985; Miles, MacLaren, Reilly & Yamanaka, 1995; Hoff, Wisloff, Engen, Kemi & Helgerud, 2002; Reilly and White, 2004; Sassi, Reilly & Impellizzeri, 2004; Rampinini et al., 2007; Hill-Haas, Coutts, Rowsell & Dawson, 2008; Hill-Haas, Dowson, Coutts & Rowsell, 2010; Mallo and Navarro, 2008). Also, the use of SSG helps in saving time as a training stimulus simultaneously improves many factors associated with the performance of the players. Varying characteristics of the structure of SSG coaches have the ability to differentiate the factors of physical and technicotactical skills they want to develop. Such features are the number of players, the size of field, the rules of the match, the duration and the breaks and also the encouragement by the coaches (Bangso, 1994; Balsom, 2000; Hill-Haas, Dowson, Coutts & Rowsell, 2009).

The SSG in the last decades used a lot in training process. So this is the reason that a lot of investigators studied this kind of exercises in order to materialize their impact on physical and technicotactical abilities of athletes (Impellizzeri et al., 2006; Jones and Drust, 2007; Katis and Kellis, 2009). Heart rate and exercise intensity is affected by the number of players (Da Silva et al., 2011; Koklu, Asxexi, Kocxak, Alemdaroglu & Dundar, 2011; Owen, Wong, McKenna & Dellal, 2011; Abrantes, Nunes, Macxas, Leite & Sampaio, 2012), the rules of the match (Casamichana and Castellano, 2011; Abrantes et al., 2012), the size of the field (Owen et al., 2011) and the duration and breaks (Dellal, Hill-Haas, Lago-Penas, Wong & Chamari, 2011a). Also the frequency of the technical actions appears to be influenced by factors such as the number of players (Da Silva et al., 2011; Owen et al., 2011), the level of players (Dellal et al., 2011a) etc. From the above it obvious that coaches has to adjust the characteristics of the SSG to achieve their aims. The aim of this review was to analyze, record and report the physiological, technicotactical responses of soccer players when factors were modified in SSG.

Methods and data collection

Experimental approach to the problem

This study was a review of research that dealt with the SSG in soccer. In each section separately analyzed the characteristics of the SSG that can be changed and how these changes influence on physical factors and technicotactical elements. Understanding the management characteristics of SSG will help coaches to

specialize more the training contents increasing the performance of players. Also exercises with the ball are more pleasant for the soccer players.

Number of players: Physiological and kinematical effects

One of the first parameters that can change coaches is the number of players involved in the SSG. This change affects many physiological and performance parameters (Katis and Kellis, 2009; Hill-Haas et al., 2010). However, to study the effect of a parameter should the other factors being constant. So at the beginning will present research findings that maintained a constant ratio m²/player of the field and then cite the research findings did not keep this ratio stable. In the studies that the area ratio per player kept constant indicated that when the number of participants decreased, the heart rate increased (Rampinini et al., 2007; Hill-Haas et al., 2009; Dellal et al., 2011a; Abrantes et al., 2012). Brandes, Heitmann and Muller, (2012) confirmed the results above in two kinds of SSG 2vs2 and 3vs3.

The same results presented and by the most of the studies that didn't keep the ratio of space per player stable (Little and Williams, 2006; 2007; Hill-Haas et al., 2010; Impellizzeri et al., 2006; Katis and Kellis, 2009; Da Silva et al., 2011; Koklu et al., 2011; Owen, Twist, & Ford, 2004; Owen et al., 2011). However there are also studies that found no differences in heart rate with changes in the number of players (Hoff et al., 2002; Aroso, Rebelo, & Gomes-Pereira, 2004; Jones and Drust, 2007; Dellal et al., 2008; Hill-Haas et al., 2008; Koklu, 2012).

Also, another physiological parameter that has been studied is the concentration of lactate. This variable increased when the number of the players that participating to the game decreased. This finding referred by studies that kept the ratio stable (Rampinini et al., 2007; Hill-Haas et al., 2009; Brandes et al., 2012) and the others (Impellizzeri et al., 2006; Hill-Haas et al., 2008; Koklu et al., 2011; Koklu, 2012). Similar variation with lactate concentration had the parameter rating of perceived exertion (RPE). The values of increased when the number of the players decreased. The same finding presented from the studies that kept the ratio stable (Rampinini et al., 2007; Hill-Haas et al., 2009; Abrantes et al., 2012) and from the studies than didn't kept this ratio stable (Hill-Haas et al., 2008; 2010; Impellizzeri et al., 2006; Aroso et al., 2004).

On the total distance covered by players in the SSG Castellano et al. (2012) state a positive correlation with the number of players. They studied three formations 7vs7, 5vs5 and 3vs3 and they found that when the number of players increased the total distance increased also. The same researchers reported increase ratio work/rest when increased the number of players. In other studies no significant differences in the total distance observed (Jones and Drust, 2007; Hill-Haas et al., 2008; 2009; 2010). The effect of reducing the number of players is unclear in high intensity efforts (Jones and Drust, 2007; Hill-Haas et al., 2008).

Many times coaches use one of the two groups with more or fewer players. In one such study, Hill-Haas et al. (2010) reported that despite the greater value of the RPE groups with less players didn't appear differences in other physiological characteristics and performance parameters. Table 1 shows the differences in physiological parameters depending on number of players participating in SSG.

Table 1. Differences in physiological and kinematical parameters depending on number of players participating in SSG

For mat	% HR or mean HR	m ² / player	RPE (10or20)	Distance (m)	[La] (mmol/l)	Duration (set×min)	Sample (n+age)	Reference	
3:3 4:4	Rise at 3:3	100	16.6 16.0	369.7-435.4 465.2-535.3 462.8-559.9	6.7 2574 4.7 4.1	4×4	16yth 15.8y	Abrantes et al., 2012	
3:3 5:5	91.8-94.8 91.5-94.6	210				3×6	14sp 21.3y	Castellano et al., 2012	
7:7	93.2-94.9								
2:2 4:4	89 85	150	11.3 12.2			24	16yth 16.3y	Hill-Haas et al., 2009	
6:6	83		10.5	2590					
3:3 4:4	87.6-90.9 86.5-89.7	40-90 48-108	6.6-8.5 6.3-8.1	465.2-535.3 462.8-559.9	8.1 4.9 2.6	3×4 3×4 4×6	20a 24.5y	Rampinini et al., 2007	
5:5 6:6	86.0-88.8 83.8-86.9	56-126 64-144	5.9-7.6 4.8-7.3						
2:2 3:3	84 87	150 100	16.2 14.5				3×1.5	14yth 15.5y	Aroso et al., 2004
4:4	79	75	13.3						
1:1	177m	25-150							
2:2	167- 170m	38-125				3×4	10p 17.5y	Owen et al., 2004	
3:3	166- 176m	50-125							
4:4	155- 157m	63-131							
5:5	155- 165m	75-140							
2:2	90.8	125				4×2	23p		

3:3	90.6	167				4×3	22.8y	
4:4	90.2	157				5×3.3		
5:5	89.3	138				3×5		
6:6	87.5	167				3×6		
8:8	87.6	165				3×10		
3:3		47						
4:4	83-85	200		9527-9926		4×4	29yth	Impellizzeri
5:5				team			17.2y	et al., 2006
2:2	~88.8	125	16.2			4×2		
3:3	~91.2	150	15.4			4×3.3		
4:4	~90.2	125	15.3			4×4	28p	Little &
5:5	~88.8	113	14.5			4×6	24y	Williams
6:6	~87.5	105	13.5			3×8		2007
8:8	~88.3	165	14			4×8		
4:4	83	94		778			8yth	Jones &
8:8	79	150		693		1×10	7y	Drust 2007
2:2	80.8-83.7		14.1-17.1				8yth	Sampaio et
3:3	79.8-80.8		14.4-16.5				15y	al., 2007
1:1	77.6	50				4×1.3		
2:2	80.1	100				6×2.3	10p	Dellal et
8:8	71.7	169				4×4	26.3y	al., 2008
3:3	87.6	63						
6:6	82.8	100				10×4	34yth	Katis &
							13y	Kellis,
								2009
3:4	82.3-83.1		16.3-14.6	2543-2408	2.5-2.5			
3:3+	82.3-82.7	148	16.3-16.3	2543-2668	2.5-2.3		16yth	Hill-Haas
5:6	82.5-81.4		15.2-14.9	2526-2524	2.5-2.6	24	15.6y	et al.,
5:5+	82.5-82.5	149	15.2-16.3	2526-2610	2.5-2.8			2010
1:1	86.1	54			9.4	6×1		
2:2	88.0	72			8.0	6×2	16yth	Koklu et
3:3	92.8	90			7.5	6×3	15.7y	al., 2011
4:4	91.5	108			7.2	6×4		
3:3	89.8	150						
4:4	88.0	113				3×4	16yth	Da Silva
5:5	86.9	90					13.5y	et al.,
								2011
3:3	90	125					15p	Owen et
9:9	81	166.6				3×5	26.3y	al., 2011
2:2	93.3				5.5	3×4		
3:3	91.5	147		2:2 cover	4.3	3×5	17yth	Brandes et
4:4	89.7	150		more distance	4.4	3×6	14.9y	al., 2012

yth = youth; sp = semi-profesional; a = amateur; p = professional; y = years; m = mean HR; ~ = almost; += extra player

Number of players: Technical effects

The study of Abrantes et al. (2012) is the only one who studied the change in the number of players keeping constant the ratio of space per player. In their research found no differences in the various technical components (receive, dribble, shot, tackle) in both formations studied (3vs3 and 4vs4) with the exception of the efficiency of passes. In other studies (didn't keep the ratio stable) reported that the reduction of the number of players has the effect of increasing the observed technical actions. Da Silva et al. (2011) reported that in the formation 3vs3 reveals more cross, dribble and shoot compared with formations 4vs4 and 5vs5. Finally, Owen et al. (2011) found that in the formation 3vs3 performed fewer contacts, headers, passes, but more shoot and tackle compared to the formation 9vs9. In Table 2 presented all the technical effects.

Table 2. Differences in observed technical actions depending on parameters that changed in SSG

Format	m ² / player	Duration (set×min)	Sample (n+age)	Technical effects/Comment	Reference	Var.
1:1	25-150					
2:2	38-125					
3:3	50-125	3×3	10p	Less technical actions when increased the number of the players	Owen et al., 2004	
4:4	63-131		17.5y			
5:5	75-140					
4:4	94		8yth	Less participation with the ball when increased the number of the players	Jones & Drust, 2007	
8:8	150	1×10	7y			
3:3	63		34yth	In 3:3 more dribbles, tackles, goals, kicks & passes and less headers & long passes	Katis & Kellis, 2009	
6:6	100	10×4	13y			
3:3	150		16yth	In 3:3 observed more crosses, dribbles, shots than other formations – no differences to passes, tackles, headers	Da Silva et al., 2011	
4:4	113	3×4	13.5y			
5:5	90		15p	In 3:3 more dribbles, shots & tackles and less headers, interceptions & passes	Owen et al., 2011	
3:3	125	3×5	26.3y			
9:9	166.6		16yth	No differences except pass	Abrantes et al., 2012	
3:3	100	4×4	15.8y			
4:4			10p	No differences	Owen et al., 2004	
1:1	25	3	17.5y			
	75					

	150							
	38							
2:2	75							
	125							
	50							
3:3	83							
	125							
	63							
4:4	94							
	131							
	75							
5:5	105							
	140							
6:6	100	3+8	9a	No differences	Tessitore et al., 2006			
	167							
	919							
4:4	459	4×5	8p 20y	In smaller field observed more contacts, shots, goals and no correct passes	Ispirlidis et al., 2009			
	165							
	75							
4:4	150	4×4	8p 18y	In smaller field observed more tackles and shots	Kelly & Drust, 2009			
	250							
	273							
5:5	175	8	10yth 15.5y	In small field observed more interceptions, controls, dribbles & shots	Casamichana et al., 2010			
	74							
				Situations: Possession-2+- 2 GK				
3:3	110	1×5	10yth 18.4y	In ball possession observed more contacts with the ball-With GK less passes	Mallo & Navarro, 2008			Orie ntati on
				Situations: Free-Only offense-Only defense				
4:4	75	4×4	20p 27.4y	In free play better passes and less misses of the ball	Dellal et al., 2011			
3:3	100	4×4	16yth 15.8y	No differences except passes	Abrantes et al., 2012			Rules
3:3	191	1×2 1×4 1×6	19p+a 24y	No differences at technical actions per minute	Fanchini et al., 2011			Dura tion

yth = youth; a = amateur; p = professional; y = years; GK = goalkeepers; += extra player

Field size: Physiological and kinematical effects

The size of the field is a parameter that can be changed easily and change the objectives of the training. In the literature seems to be no clear picture of the effect of increasing the size of the field on physiological parameters. More specifically, some studies indicate that increasing the pitch increases heart rate exercise (Owen et al., 2004; Rampinini et al., 2007; Casamichana and Castellano, 2010), others do not report differences (Ispirlidis, Gourgoulis & Galanis, 2009) and others report mild decrease in heart rate (Kelly and Drust, 2009). However it should be noted that Kelly and Drust (2009) found no significant differences.

For the parameter of lactic acid the findings are in consensus. All of them referred that increasing the size of the field increases the concentration of lactic acid (Tessitore, Meeusen, Piacentini, Demarie & Capranica, 2006; Rampinini et al., 2007; Ispirlidis et al., 2009). This suggests the activation of anaerobic mechanism, probably because the players perform more intense tries.

For the parameter RPE, the two studies that examined the effect of the size of the field, they found that in large and medium fields the players mentioned higher values compared with small fields (Rampinini et al., 2007; Casamichana and Castellano, 2010). Finally on the total distance covered by players Casamichana and Castellano, (2010) reported a positive correlation with the size of the field. All relative studies with the field size presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Differences in physiological and kinematical parameters depending on field size of SSG

Format	% HR or meanHR	m ² / player	RPE (10)	Distance (m)	[La] (mmol/l)	Duration (set×min)	Sample (n+age)	Reference
1:1	176m 180m 183m	25 75 150				3	10p 17.5y	Owen et al., 2004
2:2	174m 178m 180m	38 75 125				3	10p 17.5y	Owen et al., 2004
3:3	167m 168m 173m	50 83 125				3	10p 17.5y	Owen et al., 2004
	87.6-89.5 88.6-90.5 89.1-90.9	40 63 90	6.6-8.1 7.0-8.4 7.2-8.5		4.4-6.0 4.6-6.3 5.0-6.5	3×4	20a 24.5y	Rampinini et al., 2007
4:4	178-183	919			9.7-11.3	4×5	8p	Ispirlidis et

	176-182	459		8.2-9.4	20y	al., 2009
	176-182	165		6.0-6.7		
	175m	75			8p	Kelly & Drust, 2009
	173m	150			18y	
	169m	250				
	146m	63			10p	Owen et al., 2004
	160m	94			17.5y	
	157m	131				
	86.5-88.7	48	6.3-7.6	4.2-5.3		
	86.7-89.4	75	6.6-7.9	4.3-5.5	3×4	Rampinini et al., 2007
	87.2-89.7	108	6.8-8.1	4.7-6.0		
	94.6	273	6.7	999.6		
	94.6	175	6.7	908.9	8	Casamichana et al., 2010
	93	74	5.7	695.8		
5:5	155m	75			10p	Owen et al., 2004
	161m	105			17.5y	
	163m	140				
	86.0-87.8	56	5.9-7.2	3.9-5.2		
	86.1-88.8	88	6.2-7.6	4.1-5.0	3×4	Rampinini et al., 2007
	86.9-88.8	126	6.2-7.5	4.6-5.8		
6:6	83.8-86.4	64	4.8-6.8	3.4-4.5		
	85.1-87.0	100	6.0-7.3	3.9-5.0	3×4	Rampinini et al., 2007
	85.0-86.9	144	5.9-4.2	3.6-4.8		
		100				
		167			3+8	Tessitore et al., 2006

yth = youth; a = amateur; p = professional; y = years; m = mean HR

Field size: Technical effects

The reduction of the dimensions of the SSG has the effect of increasing the frequency of observed tackle, shot (Ispirlidis et al., 2009; Kelly and Drust, 2009), receiving, dribbling (Casamichana and Castellano, 2010), contacts, goals but also the error in small passes (Ispirlidis et al., 2009). However, there are studies that do not report significant differences (Owen et al., 2004; Tessitore et al., 2006) (Table 2).

Orientation task: Physiological and kinematical effects

Another consideration is the orientation of the game (without goalpost, with mini goalpost and with goalpost with goalkeepers). Most studies that made this differentiation found that SSG with goalkeepers reduce the heart rate and exercise intensity (Mallo and Navarro, 2008; Casamichana and Castellano, 2011; Castellano et al., 2012). However Dellal et al. (2008) observed an increase in heart rate in game 8 vs 8 with goalkeepers. On the total distance Castellano et al. (2012) reported no differences. Duarte et al. (2010) studied the change of heart rate in three situations: a) line goal, b) double mini lateral goals and c) one central goal. The results showed that heart rate variability associated with the line goal task constraint is lower than that associated with both double goal and central goal constraints.

Orientation task: Technical effects

The presence goalpost with goalkeepers in SSG seems to constrain the actions with the ball (Mallo and Navarro, 2008). However there are not enough studies that studied this parameter so we can reach a conclusion (table 2).

Coach encouragement: Physiological and kinematical effects

The encouragement by the coaches for greater effort and participation seem to increase heart rate exercise (Hoff et al., 2002; Rampinini et al., 2007), the concentration of lactic acid and the RPE (Rampinini et al., 2007).

Rules: Physiological and kinematical effects

Changing the rules in games by coaches may cause changes in physiological parameters of soccer players and performance indicators. Examples of rules that cause an increase in heart rate exercise are a) all players of the attacking team have to be at the opponent's size when they team achieve a goal (Hill-Haas et al., 2010), b) the groups have to pressure half switch (Little and Williams, 2006), c) using defense man to man (Ngo et al., 2012) and d) play freely instead of only performing attack or defense (Abrantes et al., 2012). The concentration of lactic acid increased with use defense man to man (Aroso et al., 2004) and with free play without restrictions on contacts (Dellal et al., 2011b). The RPE increases when teams play free instead of only performing attack or defense (Abrantes et al., 2012), when playing with 2 contacts (Sampaio et al., 2007) and when used defense man to man (Ngo et al., 2012). Finally, the total distance covered increases when teams play with one touch (Dellal et al., 2011b). Definitely can be changed in various ways the rules of SSG and are difficult to study all these variations.

Rules: Technical effects

A lot of rules in SSG can be used to enhance the technical skills. Dellal et al., (2011b) studied the effect of the rules on SSG technical actions and observed that when teams play without restrictions contacts were making more accurate passes and had fewer losses of the ball. But also in this case in the literature don't exist enough studies to elicit safe conclusions (table 2).

Duration/Continuous or intermittent SSG: Physiological and kinematical effects

In the literature appears that only four studies have dealt with this parameter. Fanchini et al. (2011) reported a decrease in exercise intensity when the 4 minutes playing time in SSG increased to 6 minutes. In another study, Hill-Haas et al. (2009) reported higher heart rate and largest value in the index RPE in continuous rather than interval form of the SSG. As for the total distance by players, Casamichana et al., (2013) reported that in interval form (2×8 min) covered a greater distance in comparison with the continuous form (16 min). However Koklu (2012) found no significant differences in physiological indicators (HR, La) between intermittent and continuous form of the SSG.

Duration / Continuous or intermittent training: Technical effects

As regards the effect of the duration on the technical skills, Fanchini et al., (2011) reported that the change of the course of the game (2 minutes, to 4 minutes and 6 minutes) did not affect the frequency of technical actions of the players (table 2).

Discussion

Different research findings on the effect of the number of players on physiological parameters related to the different methodology followed. Factors which may alter the results are the participants, which in some cases involved the professionals and in some other teenagers players (Da Silva et al., 2011; Owen et al., 2011), the ratio field per player etc. However in general the findings indicate that the reduction of the number of players increases heart rate, the concentration of lactic acid and index RPE (Rampinini et al., 2007; Brandes et al., 2012). This can be explained by the fact that in small groups each player takes more initiatives that cause the raising of physiological indicators. The small number of players also increases their ability to come into contact with the ball and perform more technical actions (Abrantes et al., 2012).

For the field size effect the majority of research indicates that increasing the dimensions of the field the heart rate increased (Owen et al., 2004; Casamichana and Castellano, 2010). This may be due to the fact that players are forced to cover greater distances to help their teams. This is supported by findings showing that with the increase of the field increases the concentration of lactic acid (Rampinini et al., 2007). This observation indicates that in larger fields activated the anaerobic mechanism presumably because the players perform more intense tries and for longer distances (Casamichana and Castellano, 2010). The observed frequency of technicotactical actions increased when the field size reduced (Kelly and Drust, 2009; Casamichana and Castellano) but there is no clear consensus among researchers (Tessitore et al., 2006). The small sided fields forcing athletes in more contacts with the ball but the efficiency performance of exercises depends on other factors such as the level of soccer players (Dellal et al., 2011a).

The presence of goalkeepers at SSG have negative and positive effects on heart rate and exercise intensity of the game (Dellal et al., 2008; Mallo and Navarro, 2008; Castellano et al., 2012). The uses of goalkeepers cause changes in technicotactical behavior of soccer players. The players have to protect their goalpost and also they have trying to score. These differences may be due to the fact that the goalpost with goalkeepers may be an incentive for some players while others do not. Also this formation probably leads the team's best defensive organization and this is reducing the intensity of the game (Aguiar, Botelho, Lago, Marcas & Sampaio, 2012). The encouragement of coaches can increase the physiological parameters (Hoff et al., 2002; Rampinini et al., 2007). This probably relates to the training age of the players, their level and generally intrinsic motivation they have for what they perform. Younger age and players with little experience may be more influenced by this factor. Changing the rules in the SSG can lead to increased physiological parameters of soccer players (Hill-Haas et al., 2010; Ngo et al., 2012) and the observed technical actions (Dellal et al., 2011b). However because there is too much variation in the rules more research is needed with as much as possible controlled conditions. On the duration of the SSG and use continuous or intermittent form findings are not unanimous (Fanchini et al., 2011; Hill-Haas et al., 2009). In general, the continuous form caused a greater increase in heart rate and value of index RPE (Hill-Haas et al., 2009), while the interval format helped to cover longer distances by the players (Casamichana, Castellano & Dellal, 2013). However the Koklu (2012) did not observe differences in physiological indicators. One possible explanation for the reduced normal rates at the interval form is breaks between sets which allow players to rest. On the other side in continuous form of SSG athletes may reduce the pace of the game in order to correspond and this reduces the intensity.

Conclusions

Due to the large variety in the methodology used in the studies for SSG is difficult to group results and draw more reliable conclusions. Based on this limitation more research is needed with the use as much as possible standardized conditions. From the above presentation of research it seems that the change characteristics of exercise can alter physiological and technicotactical parameters. For this reason, coaches

should carefully choose exercises that are going to use as the main objective set (Clemente, Couceiro, Martins & Mendes, 2012). Even the differentiation that observed in technicotactical actions they can use to benefit their teams. More specifically they can organize SSG so offensive players perform more shots and final actions, the lateral midfielders more crosses and contacts etc. Also for the selection of SSG should be taken seriously into account technical ability of the players and their fitness (Koklu et al., 2011). So for example, players with limited technical skills should be practiced on larger fields to be more effective in their actions, and when they have good technical level can increase the number of players or reducing the field dimensions.

References

- Abrantes, C.I., Nunes, M.I., Macxas, V.M., Leite, N.M., & Sampaio, J.E. (2012). Effects of the number of players and game type constraints on heart rate, rating of perceived exertion, and technical actions of small-sided soccer games. *J Strength Cond Res*, 26(4), 976–981.
- Aguiar, M., Botelho, G., Lago, C., Marcas, V., & Sampaio, J. (2012). A review of the effects of soccer small-sided-games. *J Hum Kinet*, 33, 103–113.
- Aroso, J., Rebelo, A.N., & Gomes-Pereira, J. (2004). Physiological impact of selected game-related exercises. *J Sports Sci*, 22, 522.
- Balsom P., (2000), *Precision Football*, Kempele, Polar Electro Oy.
- Bangsbo, J. (1994). The physiology of soccer with special reference to intense intermittent exercise. *Acta Physiol Scand*, 619, 1-155.
- Bompa, T., (1983), *Theory and methodology of training*, Dubusque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.
- Brandes, M., Heitmann, A., & Muller, L. (2012). Physical responses of different small-sided game formats in elite youth soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res*, 26(5), 1353–1360.
- Casamichana, D., & Castellano, J. (2010). Time-motion, heart rate, perceptual and motor behaviour demands in small-sides soccer games: Effects of field size. *J Sports Sci*, 28(14), 1615-1623.
- Casamichana, D., Castellano, J., & Dellal, A. (2013). Influence of different training regimes on physical and physiological demands during small-sided soccer games: Continuous vs. intermittent format. *J Strength Cond Res*, 27(3), 690–697.
- Casamichana, D.G., & Castellano, J.P. (2011). Physiological demand in small-sided games on soccer with different orientation of space. *RICYDE*, 23, 141-154.
- Castellano, J., Casamichana, D., & Dellal, A. (2012). Influence of a game format and number of players on heart rate responses and physical demands in small-sided soccer games. *J Strength Cond Res*, 2012 In press.
- Clemente, F., Couceiro, M.S., Martins, F.M.I., & Mendes, R. (2012). the usefulness of small-sided games on soccer training. *J Phys Edu Sport*, 12(1), 93-102.
- Da Silva, C.D., Impellizzeri, F.M., Natali, A.J., de Lima, J.R.P., Bara-Filho, M.G., Silami-Garcxia, E., & Marins, J.C.B. (2011). Exercise intensity and technical demands of small-sided games in young Brazilian soccer players: effect of number of players, maturation, and reliability. *J Strength Cond Res*, 25(10), 2746–2751.
- Dellal, A., Chamari, K., Pintus, A., Girard, O., Cotte, T., & Keller, D. (2008). Heart rate responses during small-sided and short intermittent running training in elite soccer players: a comparative study. *J Strength Cond Res*, 22(5), 1449-1457.
- Dellal, A., Hill-Haas, S., Lago-Penas, C., & Chamari, K. (2011a). Small-sided games in soccer: Amateur vs professional players' physiological responses, physical and technical activities. *J Strength Cond Res*, 25(9), 2371-2381.
- Dellal, A., Lago-Penas, C., Wong Del, P., & Chamari, K. (2011b). Effect of the Number of ball contacts within bouts of 4 vs. 4 small-sided soccer games. *Int J Sports Physiol & Perf*, 6, 322-333.
- Duarte, R., Araújo, D., Fernandes, O., Travassos, B., Folgado, H., Diniz, A., & Davids, K. (2010). Effects of Different Practice Task Constraints on Fluctuations of Player Heart Rate in Small-Sided Football Games. *Open Sports Sci J*, 3, 13-15.
- Fanchini, M., Azzalin, A., Castagna, C., Schena, F., Mcall, A., & Impellizzeri, F. (2011). Effect of bout duration on exercise intensity and technical performance of small-sided games in soccer. *J Strength Cond Res*, 25, 453- 458.
- Hill-Haas, S., Coutts, A., Rowsell, G., & Dawson, B. (2008). Variability of acute physiological responses and performance profiles of youth soccer players in small-sided games. *J Sci Med Sport*, 11, 487-490.
- Hill-Haas, S., Dowson, B.T., Coutts, A.J., & Rowsell, G.J. (2009). Physiological responses and time-motion characteristics of various small-sided soccer games in youth players. *J Sports Sci*, 27(1), 1-8.
- Hill-Haas, S.V., Dowson, B.T., Coutts, A.J., & Rowsell, G.J. (2010). Time-motion characteristics and physiological responses of small-sided games in elite youth players: the influence of player number and rule changes. *J Strength Cond Res*, 24(8), 2149-2156.
- Hoff, J., Wisløff, U., Engen, L.C., Kemi, O.J., & Helgerud, J. (2002). Soccer specific aerobic endurance training. *Brit J Sports Med*, 36(3), 218-221.

-
- Impellizzeri, F.M., Marcora, S.M., Castagna, C., Reilly, T., Sassi, A., Iaia, F.M., & Rampinini, E. (2006). Physiological and performance effects of generic versus specific aerobic training in soccer players. *Int J Sports Med*, 27, 483-492.
- Ispirlidis, I., Gourgoulis, V., & Galanis, N. (2009). 4 against 4 in soccer: effects of the fields' dimensions variation on physiological, technical and tactical aspects. *Exercise & Society- J Sports Sci*, 48, 29-38.
- Jones, S., & Drust, B. (2007). Physiological and Technical Demands of 4 v 4 and 8 v 8 games in elite youth soccer players. *Kinesiology*, 39(2), 150-156.
- Katis, A., & Kellis, E. (2009). Effects of small-sided games on physical conditioning and performance in young soccer players. *J Sports Sci Med*, 8, 374-380.
- Kelly, D.M., & Drust, B. (2009). The effect of field dimensions on heart rate responses and technical demands of small-sided soccer games in elite players. *J Sci Med Sport*, 12(4), 475-479.
- Koklu, Y., Asxcxi, A., Kocxak, F.U., Alemdaroglu, U., & Dundar, U. (2011). Comparison of the physiological responses to different small-sided games in elite young soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res*, 25(6), 1522-1528.
- Koklu, Y. (2012). A comparison of physiological responses to various intermittent and continuous small-sided games in young soccer players. *J Hum Kinet*, 31, 89-96.
- Little, T., & Williams, A.G. (2007). Measures of exercise intensity during soccer training drills with professional soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res*, 21(2), 367-371.
- Little, T., & Williams, A.G. (2006). Suitability of soccer training drills for endurance training. *J Strength Cond Res*, 20(2), 316-319.
- MacLaren, D., Davids, K., Isokawa, M., Mellor, S., & Reilly, T. (1985). Physiological strain in 4-a-side soccer. In: *Science and football*. Eds. Reilly T. Lees A. Davids K. Murphy WJ. London: E & FN Spon. pp. 76-80.
- Mallo, J., & Navarro, E. (2008). Physical load imposed on soccer players during small-sided training games. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness*, 48(2), 166-171.
- Miles, A., MacLaren, D., Reilly, T., & Yamanaka, K. (1995). An analysis of physiological strain in four-a-side women's soccer. In: *Science and Football II*. Ed: Reilly T. Clarys J. Stibbe, A. London: E & FN Spon. pp. 140-145.
- Ngo, J.K., Tsui, M.C., Smith, A.W., Carling, C., Chan, G.S., & Wong, D.P. (2012). The effects of man-marking on work intensity in small-sided soccer games. *J Sports Sci Med*, 11, 109-114.
- Owen, A., Twist, C., & Ford, P. (2004). Small-sided games: The physiological and technical effect of altering pitch size and player numbers. *Insight*, 7, 50-53.
- Owen, A.L., Wong, D.P., McKenna, M., & Dellal, A. (2011). Heart rate responses and technical comparison between small- vs. large sided games in elite professional soccer. *J Strength Cond Res*, 25(8), 2104-2110.
- Rampinini, E., Impellizzeri, F.M., Castagna, C., Abt, G., Chamari, K., Sassi, A., & Marcora, S.M. (2007). Factors influencing physiological responses to small-sided soccer games. *J Sports Sci*, 25(6), 659-666.
- Reilly, T., & White, C. (2004). Small-sided games as an alternative to interval-training for soccer players. *J Sports Sci*, 22, 559.
- Sampaio, J., Garcia, G., Maças, V., Ibanez, J., Abrantes, C., & Caixinha, P. (2007). Heart rate and perceptual responses to 2x2 and 3x3 small-sided youth soccer games. *J Sports Sci Med*, 6(suppl. 10), 121-122.
- Sassi, R., Reilly, T., & Impellizzeri, F. (2004). A comparison of small sided games and interval training in elite professional soccer players. *J Sports Sci*, 22, 562.
- Tessitore, A., Meeusen, R., Piacentini, M.F., Demarie, S., & Capranica, L. (2006). Physiological and technical aspects of "6-a-side" soccer drills. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness*, 46(1), 36-42.