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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation was to compare 6 high intensity interval training (HIIT) sessions with predominately continuous training (CONT) over 11 days on highly trained rowers. Two groups (n=8) completed an incremental ramp test to determine Peak Aerobic Power (PAP), and a Critical Power test (CP). HIIT sessions consisted of 10 bouts of 10 s work (140% of PAP) with 5 s recovery, followed by 8 min of active recovery; repeated 6 times. 60 s power decreased in CONT (510±167–489±171W; p=0.02). CP increased in both groups (HIIT: 336±59-360±59W; CONT: 290±73-316±74W; p≤0.05). W’ decreased in CONT only (14256±7022-11303±7360J; p=0.01). Mean Power Output Measure (MPOM) (10s, 60s, CP, and PAP) showed an improvement for HIIT (464±158-496±184W; p=0.01) vs. CONT (433±186-433±181W; p≥0.05). This study has demonstrated that 6 sessions of a novel HIIT protocol will increase MPOM, while maintaining anaerobic capacity compared to a predominantly CONT training protocol in elite rowers.
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CHAPTER 1

1 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The goal of exercise physiologists and coaches is to develop conditioning programs whereby performance outcomes can be maximized. With athletes that are already highly trained and experienced, this objective becomes more complex. Considering that the difference between first and fourth place in the most recent international rowing events is 1% (Olympics, 2012; "World Rowing - The Official Site of World Rowing," 2014), the optimal training stimulus for performance enhancement could be minor adjustments to current training interventions. Moreover, training interventions performed by highly trained athletes within their training season are rare. The scarcity of these types of investigations has been attributed to the resistance by coaches and athletes to manipulate training regimens with previously untried protocols (Gibala, Little, Macdonald, & Hawley, 2012; Hawley, Myburgh, Noakes, & Dennis, 1997). Fortunately, the present authors have had excellent cooperation with international rowing coaches and their athletes to study this training intervention.

The purpose of this investigation was to compare the outcomes of a continuous training program (CONT) to a novel short work supramaximal intensity interval training (HIIT) program, during a real-time training schedule, performed by national and international level varsity rowers.

1.2 ENERGY SYSTEM DEMANDS OF A 2 km ROWING EVENT

The physiological demands of a 2 km rowing performance involve a complex interaction of oxidative and substrate phosphorylation energy systems. It has been
determined that the overall energy system contributions of the 2 km rowing event is 80-85% aerobic and 15-20% anaerobic (Hagerman, 1984; Laursen, 2010; Nolte, 2005; Peronnet & Thibault, 1989; Secher, 1983), with suggestions by Hagerman (1984) that the anaerobic contribution may be as high as 25-30%. It has also been observed that rowers attain close to 100% of their VO\(_2\)max after the first minute of this approximately six minute event, and this VO\(_2\) is sustained within this proximity until the completion of the race (Hagerman, 1984).

The traditional rowing pacing strategy has rowers start with a powerful sprint lasting approximately 30 to 40 seconds (Hagerman, 1984). This relies on approximately 71-78% anaerobic metabolism (Peronnet & Thibault, 1989) and utilizes both phosphocreatine [PCr] and glycolytic phosphorylation. A transition phase then occurs, lasting from 45 seconds to just under two minutes (Nolte, 2005), where VO\(_2\) is near maximal (Hagerman, 1984), and the anaerobic contribution declines from approximately 68% to approximately 30% (Nolte, 2005; Peronnet & Thibault, 1989). This is followed by the middle 1000 m in which power output is reduced and the energy system contribution is 90-95% aerobic. This duration of reduced power output enables an increase in power output for the last 500 m to the finish, manifested by a replenishment of [PCr] stores and a reliance of 10-15% anaerobic metabolism (Nolte, 2005; Peronnet & Thibault, 1989). Based on the energy demands of such an event, training interventions that include both anaerobic and aerobic energy systems would be appropriate (Seiler, 2010).

Training categories (Cat) were developed by Fritsch and Nolte (1981) to address the energy system demands during a 2 km rowing event. They range from the highest
intensity work (Cat 1) to the lowest intensity (Cat VI). Categories I to III include anaerobic energy system contributions as work intensity is above the anaerobic threshold. Category I is above the 2 km race pace and is generally only trained for approximately one minute intervals. Category II is close to race pace, with intervals of approximately five minutes. Whereas, Categories III and IV are in the vicinity of the anaerobic threshold, and sustainable for approximately 10 to 30 minute intervals respectively.

Intensities below lactate threshold are Category V and VI. These consist of long steady-state sessions lasting from 40 minutes to over 90 minutes (Fritsch & Nolte, 1981; Nolte, 2005).

1.3 AEROBIC TRAINING

As such, rowing success is highly correlated with a superior aerobic capacity (Cosgrove, Wilson, Watt, & Grant, 1999; Hagerman, 1984; Kramer, Leger, Paterson, & Morrow, 1994; Secher, 1983). Moreover, 80% of the rowers’ training volume is dedicated to long duration continuous steady state (CONT) intensities below the lactate threshold (Fiskerstrand & Seiler, 2004; Nolte, 2005; Steinacker, Lormes, Lehmann, & Altenburg, 1998). This high volume moderate intensity training is fundamental in order to improve cardiac functions such as increased cardiac output because of an increased stroke volume; and decreased peripheral resistance to blood flow, thereby increasing VO$_2$ max (Clausen, 1977; Wilmore, Costill, & Kenney, 2008). Other improvements from this intensity of training include an increase in number and size of muscle mitochondria, enhanced muscle myoglobin, a greater a-vO$_2$ difference, and an increase in enzymes associated with oxidative phosphorylation (Clausen, 1977; Holloszy & Booth, 1976; Scheuer & Tipton, 1977).
It appears that physiological improvements in VO$_2$max begin to plateau in well-trained experienced athletes (Laursen & Jenkins, 2002). This suggests that there is a maximal adaptation for improvement (Astrand & Rodahl, 1970). This was reflected in a study by Mikesell and Dudley (1984) who trained seven well-conditioned runners (mean VO$_2$max: 3.97 l/min; 61.0 ml/kg.min) for six weeks. For three days during the week, participants completed treadmill running for as hard as they could for 40 minutes. On three other days, the sessions consisted of five 5-minute cycle ergometer sessions at or near VO$_2$max, while maintaining an rpm of 85-90. The rest periods consisted of light jogging on a treadmill at 40-45% of VO$_2$max. There was a progressive overload of 11 watts per week on these cycling sessions. Aerobic capacity improved over the first five weeks. After this time, participants did not progress as exhibited by their inability to sustain further increases in intensity on the cycle ergometer. It was suggested that this was likely as a result of over training, and/or that they had reached their maximal genetic potential. Acevedo and Goldfarb (1989) concluded that over eight weeks of training, performance improvements could occur independently of VO$_2$max. Training consisted of one day per week of intervals at 90-95% of heart rate max (duration not given), followed by a rest period to a HR of 120 bpm. Two days per week consisted of Fartlek running near (above or below) 10 km pace, covering 6-10 miles. The other days consisted of regular running of 5-12 miles per day at moderate intensities. They observed no changes in VO$_2$max (mean VO$_2$max: 4.3 l/min; 65.3 ml/kg.min). However, running time to exhaustion improved (pre: 19:25 min; post: 23:18 min), as well as, 10 km race time (pre: 35:27 min; post: 34:24 min). Hawley et al. (1997) also observed that 90-120 second improvements in 40 km cycling time trials could occur without increasing VO$_2$max.
Twice per week over seven weeks, cyclists (mean VO₂max: 65 ml/kg.min) completed six to nine sets of five minutes at 80% of peak power output, followed by one minute rest. The authors linked the improvements to increased muscle buffering capacity and less reliance on carbohydrate as fuel.

1.4 INTERVAL TRAINING

Interval training has been defined by Gibala et al. (2012) as “physical exercise that is characterized by brief, intermittent bursts of vigorous activity, interspersed by periods of rest or low-intensity exercise”. The acronym for interval training has been expressed by many different formats. For this thesis, we will refer to any high intensity interval training with the acronym of HIIT.

There are essentially infinite combinations of the exercise to pause ratios (E : P) that can be derived. Generally, shorter work phases (< 30 s) can elicit higher power outputs (HPO). Conversely, lower power outputs (LPO) manifest themselves by allowing longer work phases (> 120 s) (Fox, Bartels, Klinzing, & Ragg, 1977; Sloth, Sloth, Overgaard, & Dalgas, 2013). Fox et al. (1977) suggested that with low power output, participants generally reached 70% of VO₂max during the first minute of the interval, and then attained 96% of VO₂max from one to two minutes within that same interval. With the high power output group (E: < 30 seconds), the participants reached only 66% of their VO₂max. Christensen, Hedman, and Saltin (1960) concluded that a 10s work period with a five-second pause, allowed a participant to reach VO₂max (n = 2), as VO₂ did not drop during the short recovery period (Belfry, Raymer, et al., 2012). When rest was increased to 10 seconds (for the same 10s work phase), VO₂max was not reached with subsequent intervals (Christensen et al., 1960).
Many studies have observed physiological improvements with short duration work intervals and long recovery periods. However, many have utilized recreationally active populations who have not undergone systematic training. For example, Burgomaster, Hughes, Heigenhauser, Bradwell, and Gibala (2005) investigated a training protocol consisting of four to seven bouts of “all-out” 30s Wingate tests on a cycling ergometer, alternating with four minutes of recovery. These sets were completed six times over two weeks. The participants (mean VO$_2$max: 3.7 l/min; 44.6 ml/kg.min) improved their time to fatigue on the cycling ergometer by 100% (pre: 26 min; post: 51 min). They also increased their peak power output (PPO) during the last training session by approximately 25%. No changes in VO$_2$max occurred. Their proposed enhancements were confirmed by data that demonstrated an increase in both citrate synthase reflecting an increase in mitochondrial density, and an increase in muscle glycogen content.

Others, McKay, Paterson, and Kowalchuk (2009), examined a 60 s : 60 s interval protocol, which consisted of eight sessions over 19 days on recreationally active males (mean VO$_2$max: 3.78 l/min; 47 ml/kg.min). Each session comprised of 8-12 sets of 60 seconds on a cycle ergometer at 120% of pre-training maximal work rate from an incremental ramp test (IRT), followed by 60 seconds of loadless cycling. The Endurance Group (END) completed 90-120 minutes of cycling at 65% of pre-training VO$_2$max. Both groups did not increase their absolute VO$_2$max. However, time to fatigue (TTF) performance on a cycle test (work rate set at 100% of WR during max text), increased significantly by 55% for the HIIT group, and 43% for the endurance group. No changes were observed in a control group who continued only with their regular activity. The
major finding of this study was faster VO₂ kinetics. Participants from both groups with initial faster O₂ kinetics at baseline testing showed less improvement. This may parallel previous statements that near-maximal training adaptations had already occurred and genetic limits imposed. In addition, data demonstrated that during each of the intervals, subjects either approached or reached VO₂max (McKay et al., 2009). It is difficult to extrapolate these training results performed on these cohorts to the elite athlete who has been exposed to years of systematic training (Londeree, 1997).

Moderately trained athletes have also been studied (mean VO₂max: 3.95 l/min; 57 ml/kg.min). Tabata et al. (1997) utilized a novel 20 s : 10 s protocol. They compared six to seven bouts of 20 seconds (at 170% of VO₂max) followed by 10 seconds rest (IE1), to four to five bouts of 30 seconds (at 200% of VO₂max) followed by a two-minute rest (IE2) on a cycle ergometer. Results showed that during the IE1 training session, participants did not attain their VO₂max until the last 10 seconds of the last interval. This was a result of the repeated drop in VO₂ over the 10s recovery period (Rossiter et al., 2002). In IE2, VO₂max was not attained at all during the 30s work intervals. Large fluctuations in VO₂ were observed in IE2, as a result of the much longer rest period. Oxygen deficit varied for both protocols. They observed that the oxygen deficit during IE1 was equal to the participants’ anaerobic capacity, demonstrating maximal demands from the anaerobic energy system. This was not the case for IE2. The authors concluded that IE1 stressed both the aerobic and anaerobic energy systems concurrently.

Belfry, Raymer, et al. (2012) compared the synergy of energy system contributions during intervals of 10 s: 5 s (HIIT) and continuous work (CONT) by quantifying levels of [H+] and [PCr] present in the muscle at specific times during
isotonic plantar flexion exercises Measurements were taking at four seconds and nine seconds of the ten-second work interval phase, as well as, at four seconds of the rest period. All data for this discussion were collected after the 4th minute of exercise to allow for a steady state level to be reached. The authors observed that during the first four seconds of the HIIT work interval, there was a decrease in [PCr] indicating that ATP was being formed by the ATP/PCr alactic system, along with some contribution from oxidative phosphorylation. At nine seconds of the work period, PCr continued to be utilized, and simultaneously, there became a greater reliance on glycolysis, as reflected by an increase in [H⁺]. During the five-second rest period, PCr resynthesis was occurring, thus contributing to higher [H⁺] levels. This appears to be the result of phosphate from oxidative phosphorylation binding with creatine in order to regenerate [PCr]. This creatine kinase reaction results in the release of [H⁺] thus contributing to the highest levels of [H⁺] for the entire interval. For this to occur, oxidative phosphorylation was required in order to contribute to ATP regeneration. Moreover, the [H⁺] during the rest period of the intervals were similar to the [H⁺] during the entire continuous duration.

Pilot work in our lab has demonstrated that by performing a modified version of the Tabata and Belfry protocols (10 s seconds high intensity work at 140% VO₂max followed by a shorter five-second recovery period performed at light intensity for 2.5 min), will elicit a VO₂ in the proximity of VO₂max by approximately 60 seconds which is sustained for the remainder of the 2.5 minute interval (Figure 3). In addition, this modified 10 s : 5 s protocol of supra maximal work required substantial anaerobic contribution. This combination fulfilled the energy system demands of a 2 km rowing event by training both the aerobic and anaerobic energy systems concurrently.
1.5 INTERVAL TRAINING AND THE WELL-TRAINED ATHLETE

HIIT has been utilized successfully to enhance the performance of elite endurance athletes. For instance, a meta-analysis by Londeree (1997) proposed that trained athletes require greater intensities at lactate threshold or higher to demonstrate improvements. In addition, Laursen and Jenkins (2002) suggested that higher intensity training is the only method by which improvements in performance can be attained within this population, because plateaus in aerobic capabilities occur with submaximal training. A three-week study by Stepto, Hawley, Dennis, and Hopkins (1999) on provincial-level cyclists (mean VO$_2$max: 4.78 l/min) that had no prior high intensity training (HIIT) investigated five different interval training protocols of varying times (30 seconds to eight minutes), intensities (80 to 175% of peak power), and rest periods (one to 4.5 minutes). Six sessions of HIIT were completed over three weeks, in addition to regular aerobic conditioning. The authors concluded that the sessions consisting of eight bouts of four-minute work intervals followed by four minutes of rest, on a cycling ergometer at 85% of peak power, were most effective at increasing performances on 40 km cycling time trial. Similarly, Denadai, Ortiz, Greco, and de Mello (2006) investigated two different high intensity interval protocols on 17 well-trained runners (mean VO$_2$max: 3.73 l/min) that ran an average of 80 km per week. Their four-week study consisted of two high intensity interval (HIIT) sessions and four submaximal sessions per week on a treadmill. Both high intensity interval training protocols consisted of four to five bouts at intensities based on a percentage of velocity to time to exhaustion on a treadmill running test (100% velocity at VO$_2$max and 95% velocity at VO$_2$max). The submaximal sessions consisted of two bouts of 20 minutes at onset of blood lactate velocity with five minutes of active
recovery, and three sessions of 45-60 min at 60-70% velocity of VO$_2$max. Their results showed that despite no changes in VO$_2$max in either training regimes, the group training at 100% of velocity at VO$_2$max (the higher intensity group) improved their 1500 m running time (pre: 271 s; post: 266 s). The group training at 95% velocity at VO$_2$max group did not statistically improve (pre: 271 s; post: 269 s) their running time. The authors proposed that the improvements might have been a result from enhanced motor unit recruitment and contractile properties, as a consequence of the higher training intensity.

Interval training sessions, especially those of very high intensities with shorter durations accompanied with long recovery periods stress the anaerobic glycolytic system. The rapid production of ATP generated by anaerobic glycolysis results in the increase of blood and muscle lactate (Astrand & Rodahl, 1970), which eventually impedes performance (Klausen, Knuttgen, & Forster, 1972). Although lactate and [H$^+$] accumulation appear to be independent processes, both accrue at the same rate with increases in exercise intensity resulting in a negative effect on the working muscle (Juel, 2008). Intensities that produce increased muscle lactate also provide stimulus for muscle adaptations (A. R. Weston et al., 1997), specifically to pH regulation (Juel, 2008).

Pilegaard et al. (1999) investigated the muscle adaptations to high intensity exercise. Participants performed one-legged knee extensor training to fatigue. Three to five sets of 2 x 30 seconds, followed by 3 x 1 minute, each followed by a two-minute rest were completed over eight weeks. Mean and peak power during the maximal knee extensor exercise test increased 15-16% in the trained leg. Results also demonstrated that although lactate formation after exercise was the same in both legs, the trained leg had an increase
in lactate monocarboxylate transporters (MCT), specifically the MCT1 (70%) and MCT4 (10%) proteins, which resulted in a greater rate of sarcolemmal lactate/H+ transport in muscle. It is suggested that the MCTI are more predominant in oxidative (Type I) muscles fibres (Pilegaard et al., 1999). Interestingly, elite male rowers have a high proportion (70%) of slow twitch muscle fibres (Hagerman, 1984; Secher, 1983; Steinacker, 1993), therefore, this training would be of benefit to these rowers. A. R. Weston et al. (1997) conducted a HIIT study on well-trained cyclists (mean VO2max: 5.2 l/min) that had not completed any interval training in the previous three months, to assess muscle buffering capabilities and performance. Six HIIT sessions, in addition to regular endurance training, were completed over 28 days. The sessions consisted of six to eight repetitions of five minutes at 80% of peak power output, followed by one minute of rest. Muscle buffering capacity improved 16% over baseline. Furthermore, this increased muscle buffering capacity was correlated with an increase in time to fatigue at 150% peak power output on a cycling ergometer (pre: 59.3 s; post 72.5 s) and the 40 km time trial (pre: 57.1 min; post: 55.9 min). Parkhouse, McKenzie, Hochachka, and Ovalle (1985) examined elite varsity rowers (n=5; mean VO2max: 4.3 l/min) that had incorporated both endurance and high intensity interval training into their regular training regime (specific intensities and durations were not identified). On a running test (running as fast as possible) to exhaustion, the oarsmen accumulated 13.9 mMol.l⁻¹ blood lactate compared to 10 mMol.l⁻¹ in the marathon runners (mean VO2max: 4.2 l/min; training > 40 miles/week over previous six months) that did very little sprint training. In addition, the rowers were able to run 35 % longer than the marathoners (76 s vs. 53 s). It was suggested that the high buffering capacity of the rowers facilitate “enhanced capacity for
a muscle to function under conditions requiring high rates of anaerobic glycolytic energy” (Parkhouse et al., 1985).

Others, such as Hawley and Hopkins (1995) and Buchheit and Laursen (2013) also suggested that enhancing muscle buffering capacity with intervals with a high anaerobic component contribute to improvements in performance outcomes.

1.6 INTERVAL TRAINING AND ROWERS

Few training studies have been conducted on highly-conditioned rowers. Driller, Fell, Gregory, Shing, and Williams (2009), Akca and Aras (2015), Ingham, Carter, Whyte, and Doust (2008), Stevens, Olver, and Lemon (2015) examined different high intensity interval training protocols. In a four-week cross-over design, Driller et al. (2009), demonstrated that seven sessions of 8 x 2.5 minutes at 90% of velocity at VO$_2$max, alternating with a rest period to a target heart rate, elicited improvements in the 2 km time (CONT: pre: 7:14 min, post: 7:12 min; HIIT: pre: 7:17 min, post: 7:09 min), 2 km power, and relative VO$_2$max. The study by Akca (2014) was modeled from Driller et al. (2009) in that it included a similar protocol (8 session of 8 x 2.5 min at 90% peak power output) and compared it with 10 x 30 seconds at 150% peak power output. Eight sessions over four weeks improved the 2 km times significantly from pre- to post for both groups, but no differences were detected between groups (mean pre 2 km time: 6:49 min; post: 6:46 min). They also recorded improvements in VO$_2$max and peak power output, but with no differences between groups. There were no control participants in this study. This present study blends the Akca and Aras (2015); Driller et al. (2009); Tabata et al. (1997) protocols by utilizing intervals totaling 2.5 minutes at a supra maximal intensities of 140%. Ingham et al. (2008) compared a low intensity (LOW) protocol (all training
below lactate threshold) with a protocol consisting of 70% below lactate threshold along with 30% at Δ50 (MIX) which is training at a work rate corresponding to 50% between VO₂ at lactate threshold and maximal VO₂. Total training volume (in km) was the same for both interventions (1148 km). Both groups improved their 2 km times (LOW: pre: 6:41 min; post: 6:34 min; MIX: pre: 6:45 min, post: 6:36 min), as well as, their VO₂max (LOW: pre: 4.68 l/min, post: 5.18 l/min; MIX: pre: 4.59 l/min, post: 5.04 l/min).

However, this 12-week study was performed at the onset of their conditioning season, immediately after 25 days of an off-season period. Recent work by Stevens et al. (2015) compared a combined sprint interval (SIT) and endurance training protocol with an endurance-only protocol on trained rowers. Over four weeks, the participants completed 10 sprint interval training sessions of four to six sets of 60 seconds “all-out” rowing ergometer sprints. This was alternated with a 2.5-4 minute rest period. Results demonstrated improvements in the 2 km ergometer performance (CONT: pre: 6:53 min, post: 6:51 min; SIT: pre: 6:55 min, post: 6:50 min) and peak power output (average, in watts, of first three strokes). None of these training studies were performed on highly trained rowers during their training season.

A study of a high intensity training program that concurrently elicits VO₂max and supra-maximal work rates has not been studied on highly-trained rowers.

1.7 SUPRAMAXIMAL TRAINING

Participants in the present study were instructed to perform the 2.5 min (10 bouts of 10 s : 5 s) protocol at 140% of their peak aerobic power that was attained during the Incremental Ramp Test (IRT). This facilitated a maximal VO₂, as well as, a strong anaerobic stimulus during the training bouts (Fig. 3). This was repeated six times.
As described earlier, Tabata et al. (1997) utilized a work intensity of 170% of VO\textsubscript{2max} (6-7 bouts of 20 seconds work : 10 seconds recovery) in varsity athletes (mean VO\textsubscript{2max}: 3.95 l/min; 57 ml/kg.min). Their work to rest durations were not as effective in eliciting a VO\textsubscript{2} in the proximity of VO\textsubscript{2max} during each training bout as the 10 s : 5 s protocol utilized here.

1.8 MAXIMAL AEROBIC POWER

Oxygen uptake as defined by Astrand and Rodahl (1970) is the “volume of oxygen extracted from the inspired air”. Maximum oxygen uptake can be affected by age, health, fitness level, and other parameters (Astrand & Rodahl, 1970). In endurance-trained individuals, maximal oxygen uptake can be twice that of the average sedentary individual (approx. 3 l/min vs. 6 l/min). During laboratory testing, VO\textsubscript{2max} is said to be attained when there is no further increase in O\textsubscript{2} uptake even though the work load has increased, and when lactic acid values reach eight to nine mMol.l\textsuperscript{-1} (Astrand & Rodahl, 1970). As mentioned previously, there is a high correlation between high aerobic power and successful rowing performance. According to Kramer et al. (1994) and Secher (1983), VO\textsubscript{2max} is the most consistent variable to success in rowing. Considering that the rowing event utilizes 80-85% aerobiosis, it would be advantageous to train this physiological component maximally.

1.9 CRITICAL POWER AND W’

Critical Power (CP) is defined as the highest “constant-load work rate that can be sustained for prolonged durations and presumably represents an inherent characteristic of the aerobic energy supply system” (Gaesser & Wilson, 1988). A 3-minute critical power test was proposed by Vanhatalo, Doust, and Burnley (2007) in order to accommodate
laboratory testing. The participant is instructed to go “all out” for three minutes, on a cycle ergometer. The high power output at the beginning of the test is intended to deplete the anaerobic capacity. A steady state work output is maintained over the last min of the set in which aerobic metabolism is predominant. The work rate (W) is averaged over the last 30 seconds of the CP test. This work rate is considered to be in the heavy to severe intensity domain. This is approximately halfway between the lactate threshold and peak work rate attained in the Incremental Ramp Test (Vanhatalo et al., 2007).

W’ refers to the total work above Critical Power. It consists of finite energy stores limited to phosphocreatine [PCr], glycolysis, and myoglobin oxygen stores (Gaesser & Wilson, 1988). It is measured in Joules with the following equation:

Equation 1: \( W' \) (in Joules) = watts x seconds

There appears to be varying responses of CP and W’ depending on the mode of training. Jenkins and Quigley (1993) investigated a high intensity protocol consisting of five bouts of 60s cycling at a load based on a percentage of body mass on untrained males (mean VO\(_2\)max: 3.96 l/min) followed by five minutes of passive recovery. Their results demonstrated an increase in VO\(_2\)max, and a 49% increase in “non-aerobic work” (W’) but no change in CP. Conversely, Jenkins and Quigley (1992) performed an eight-week endurance training study. Their participants (Mean VO\(_2\)max: 3.69 l/min) training consisted of 30-40 minute cycling intervals at an intensity based on the mean intensity during a 40-minute cycling test at CP, three times per week. Their results demonstrated that VO\(_2\)max and CP both increased statistically, whereas W’ did not.

Critical Power however, has been correlated to performance. Black, Durant, Jones, and Vanhatalo (2014) investigated this hypothesis by comparing the 16.1 km time
trial road cycling race to a 3-minute Critical Power test. The participants (mean VO\textsubscript{2}max: 4.41 l/min) completed the race in an average time of 27.1 minutes. The authors postulated that since this type of event requires a high sustainable aerobic contribution, (critical power), as well as contribution from anaerobic metabolism (W’), that there would be a strong correlation between this type of event and CP. Their results produced a correlation co-efficient of r = -0.83. It would seem plausible to associate this theory to a six to seven-minute rowing event, which is also considered high intensity endurance, and relies on both aerobic and anaerobic contributions.

1.10 LACTATES

As exercise intensity increases, oxygen demand eventually becomes greater than oxygen delivery. This result is an increased reliance on glycolysis to produce ATP. As glucose and/or glycogen are broken down to pyruvate, lactic acid is produced in the muscle. Hydrogen ions [H\textsuperscript{+}] dissociate immediately from lactic acid forming lactate. As work intensity progresses more lactate is produced than can be eliminated. Some lactate can be utilized as substrate for oxidative phosphorylation in both slow and fast twitch fibers, as well as a precursor to gluconeogenesis (Gollnick, Bayly, & Hodgson, 1986). The associated [H\textsuperscript{+}] contributes to decreased muscle pH. This alters the contractile properties of muscle, and eventually muscle fatigue ensues (Gollnick et al., 1986).

There is a delay from the onset of muscle lactate to when it accumulates in the blood (Gollnick et al., 1986). Consequently, blood lactate measurements are usually done two to five minutes post-exercise, in order to get a maximal value (Astrand & Rodahl, 1970; Farrell, Joyner, Caiozzo, & Medicine, 2012; Gollnick et al., 1986).
Resting blood lactate values are generally one to two mMol.l\(^{-1}\). At the end of intense exercise, they can exceed 20 mMol.l\(^{-1}\) (Gollnick et al., 1986). Lactates of four mMol.l\(^{-1}\) have been suggested to be the average concentration at which further increases in work rate lead to a non-linear increase in blood lactate concentration (Nolte, 2005). In untrained individuals this will begin at work rates of approximately 50% of VO\(_2\)max. Conversely, trained individuals may reach work intensities of 75% of VO\(_2\)max before lactate threshold is reached (Gaesser & Wilson, 1988). Well-trained individuals also can tolerate higher blood lactate concentrations during exercise compared to untrained (Astrand & Rodahl, 1970). Cosgrove et al. (1999), have suggested that there is a correlation between the VO\(_2\) at lactate threshold and rowing performance. The authors suggest that rowers that attain a higher velocity at four mMol.l\(^{-1}\) of lactate are able to work at higher work rates before lactate accumulation becomes a limiting factor to performance (Gaesser & Wilson, 1988).

Although lactate levels will increase with high intensity intermittent work, it appears that with rest periods as short as five seconds, PCr will be resynthesized aerobically, thus decreasing reliance on glycolysis and its eventual accumulation of lactate (Belfry, Raymer, et al., 2012).
CHAPTER 2
EFFECTS OF NOVEL HIGH INTENSITY INTERVAL TRAINING PROTOCOL VERSUS CONTINUOUS TRAINING ON NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CLASS COLLEGIATE ROWERS ON INDICES OF AEROBIC AND ANAEROBIC POWER

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The energy system contributions of a 2 km rowing race are 80-85% aerobic and 15-20% anaerobic (Hagerman, 1984; Laursen, 2010; Nolte, 2005; Peronnet & Thibault, 1989; Secher, 1983). Moreover, VO₂ is at or near maximal from the first minute to the completion of the race (Hagerman, 1984). Concomitantly, rowing success is highly correlated with a high aerobic capacity (Hagerman, 1984; Kramer et al., 1994; Secher, 1983). To this end, 80% of the elite rower’s training is of long duration and below lactate threshold (Fiskerstrand & Seiler, 2004; Nolte, 2005; Steinacker et al., 1998). This low intensity high volume training increases cardiac output, by increasing stroke volume, and decreases peripheral resistance to blood flow (Clausen, 1977; Wilmore et al., 2008). Additionally, increases in muscle mitochondria, muscle myoglobin, oxidative metabolic enzymes, and a wider a-vO₂ difference have been observed (Clausen, 1977; Holloszy & Booth, 1976; Jones & Carter, 2000; Scheuer & Tipton, 1977). It has also been suggested that optimal performance enhancements in predominantly aerobic events require training protocols that elicit sustained VO₂ in the proximity of VO₂max (L. V. Billat, 2001; Gaesser & Wilson, 1988; Hickson, Hagberg, Ehsani, & Holloszy, 1981; Laursen & Jenkins, 2002; Smith, Coombes, & Geraghty, 2003; Stepto et al., 1999).

Shorter work: recovery intervals have also been studied. Tabata et al. (1997) compared multiple cycles of a 20 s (170% VO₂max): 10 s protocol to continuous training performed at 70% of VO₂max in trained individuals. The 20 s: 10 s group did not reach
the proximity of VO2max until the last 10 seconds of the last cycle. The authors concluded that the 20 s: 10 s training bouts stressed both the aerobic and anaerobic systems concurrently. This lab has developed a modified version (10 s : 5 s) of the Tabata et al. (1996) intermittent exercise protocol (20 s : 10 s) that provokes both the suggested high and sustained VO2 while maintaining a strong anaerobic stimulus. This novel 10 s: 5 s protocol reduces the fluctuations in VO2, as a consequence of the much shorter recovery period (Belfry, Paterson, Murias, & Thomas, 2012). Furthermore it has been shown that the anaerobic energy system contributions during the work period of these 10 s: 5 s intervals (HIT) is higher than the same work rate performed continuously (Belfry, Raymer, et al. (2012). Pilot work in this lab has demonstrated that performing a supramaximal VO2 work rate (140% VO2max) during this 10 second work followed by five seconds of light recovery, repeated for 2.5 min, elicits a non-oscillating VO2 in the proximity of VO2max (Fig 2.). This training bout configuration elicits a strong stimulus for both the anaerobic and aerobic energy systems.

Training studies that have been conducted on well conditioned rowers include Driller et al. (2009) which demonstrated that seven sessions of 8 x 2.5 min at 90% of velocity at VO2max with a rest period to a pre-determined target heart rate (HIT), elicited greater improvements in 2 km performance compared to Continuous (CT) (CT: pre: 7:14 min, post: 7:12 min; HIT: pre: 7:17 min, post: 7:09 min, p = 0.02). Recent work by Stevens et al. (2015) compared a combined sprint interval (60 s work : ~3 min recovery) and endurance training (SIT) to an endurance-only training (EBT) program. They observed improvements in 2 km rowing ergometer performance times in both groups (EBT: pre: 6:53 min, post: 6:51 min, p = 0.06; SIT: pre: 6:55 min, post: 6:50 min, p =
A 12-week study by Ingham et al. (2008) compared a low intensity training regimen (below lactate threshold) to a combination of 70% below lactate threshold, with 30% above lactate threshold intensity. Although both groups improved their VO₂ max and 2 km times (mean pre: 6:44 min; mean post: 6:35 min), there were no statistical differences between groups. The added value of the protocol of the present study compared to these aforementioned studies on rowers, is that a strong anaerobic stimulus is accompanied by a sustained and maximal stimulus of oxidative phosphorylation within the same training bout.

It has been suggested that studying training interventions after the initial training phase of the season has been completed is optimal, as the initial period of accelerated physiological adaptation and performance adaptations is removed, and a more accurate reflection of the efficacy of a particular training protocol is possible (Godfrey, Ingham, Pedlar, & Whyte, 2005). Actively manipulating the athlete’s training regimen has, understandably, been resisted by coaches (Gibala et al., 2012; Hawley et al., 1997). Subsequently, training studies performed on more elite rowers has not been undertaken. Fortunately, our lab group has had excellent cooperation with international level rowing coaches and the athletes under their tutelage. The Canadian rowers in the present study ranged from collegiate, to national, to international competitors (Table 1).

The number of HIIT sessions was set at six. This was due a limited window available to perform this study on these rowers and that previous research has demonstrated positive results with other high intensity training interventions (Burgomaster et al., 2005; Hawley et al., 1997; Stepto et al., 1999; A. R. Weston et al., 1997).
The purpose of this investigation was to compare the outcomes of a novel high intensity interval training (HIIT) protocol to the predominantly continuous training (CONT) program during the real-time training schedule of highly trained rowers. We hypothesized that six HIIT sessions integrated into the rowers training schedule would elicit superior adaptations in anaerobic power output measures while sustaining the aerobic improvements compared to a CONT training program.

2.2 METHOD

2.2.1 Participants

Sixteen members of Western University’s Rowing team gave written informed consent to participate in this study. All participants were healthy and presented with no musculoskeletal issues. All procedures were approved by The University of Western Ontario Research Ethics Board for Health Sciences Research Involving Human Subjects and conformed to the Declaration of Helsinki. See Table 1 for participant characteristics.

2.2.2 Experimental Protocol

The HIIT and CONT training sessions were performed over 11 days. Two days of testing were performed before and after this training period. The study began in mid-February, eight weeks after the onset of the 2014 training season. This delay was to enable the participants to perform an extended period of aerobic base training (five days per week, 90-100 min) and one session of longer higher intensity intervals (4-10 min) above lactate threshold (Table 2a). The subjects were randomized into two groups: a Continuous Group (CONT) (n = 8) and a High Intensity Interval Training Group (HIIT) (n = 8). Participants were advised to refrain from caffeine use 4 hours prior to testing. Two baseline tests were completed by all participants. Each test began with three minutes
at 30 W to determine a baseline value. An incremental ramp test (IRT) to volitional fatigue was completed (Women: 25 W/min; Men: 30 W/min). The peak work rate achieved (W) on this IRT was defined as their Peak Aerobic Power (PAP). The following day, a Critical Power (CP) (Vanhatalo et al., 2007) test was performed. The participants were instructed to row in an “all-out” effort for three minutes. During the CP test, the mean power outputs during the first ten seconds, the first 60 seconds, and the final 30 seconds were represented as Peak Power (PP), 60 seconds (60 s), and Critical Power (CP) (Vanhatalo et al., 2007) respectively. W’ (in Joules) was calculated as the total workload available above CP, also referred to as Anaerobic Capacity. It was calculated with the following equation:

Equation 1: \( W' \) (in Joules) = \( \text{watts} \times \text{seconds} \).

All testing was completed on the Dynamic Concept II Rowing ergometer, whereas, the training was done on a Standard Concept II Rowing ergometer (Concept II, Morrisville, VT, USA).

Following baseline testing, the CONT group remained with the nationally prescribed predominately moderate intensity, continuous training program. The HIIT consisted of 10 seconds of rowing at 140% of Peak Aerobic Power (PAP), followed by five seconds of easy rowing. The 10 s: 5 s intervals were repeated ten times for a total of 2.5 minutes. This was followed by eight minutes of active recovery rowing. The entire sequence was then repeated six times. In addition, the HIIT group also did high volume moderate intensity continuous training (Fig. 1). After two recovery days, post-tests were completed with the same incremental ramp test and CP test, respectively, on separate days. Warm up and cool down were similar between groups. Strength training,
prescribed by the athletic trainer, was identical between groups as well. It focused on core strength conditioning. Total training minutes were similar for both groups (Table 2b).

2.2.3 Data Collection

All power out data (in watts) were collected manually every 2.5 seconds.

Breath-by-breath gas-exchange measurements similar to those described by Pandit and Robbins (1992) were made continuously during each testing protocol. During each trial, subjects breathed through a mouthpiece and while wearing a noseclip. Inspired and expired volumes and flow rates were measured using a low dead space (90 ml) bidirectional turbine (Alpha Technologies, VMM 110) and pneumotach (Hans Rudolph, Model 4813) positioned in series from the mouthpiece; respired air was continuously sampled at the mouth by mass spectrometry (Innovision, AMIS 2000, Lindvedvej, Denmark) and analyzed for concentrations of O₂ and CO₂. The volume turbine was calibrated before each test using a syringe of known volume (3 litres) and the pneumotach was adjusted for zero flow. Gas concentrations were calibrated with precision-analyzed gas mixtures. The time delay between an instantaneous, square-wave change in fractional gas concentration at the sampling inlet and its detection by the mass spectrometer was measured electronically by computer. Respiratory volumes, flow, and gas concentrations were recorded in real-time at a sampling frequency of 100 Hz and transferred to a computer, which aligned concentrations with respiratory flow as measured by the pneumotach, using the measured delay of the mass spectrometer. Flow from the pneumotach was used to resolve inspiratory-expiratory phase transitions and the turbine was used for volume measurement. The computer executed a peak-detection program to determine end-tidal PO₂, end-tidal PCO₂ and inspired and expired volumes
and durations to build a profile of each breath. Breath-by-breath gas exchange at the pulmonary capillary was calculated using algorithms of Swanson (1980).

Blood lactates were taken 2 minutes prior to the start of the test and again 3 minutes post-test. Rubbing alcohol was swabbed on a left finger and blood was drawn using the ACCU-CHEK Safe-T-Pro Plus sterile, single-use lancing device. The first draw was wiped and the new droplet was measured with the SensLab GmbH Lactate SCOUT blood lactate analyzer.

2.2.4 Statistical Analysis

Data are presented as means ± SD. Paired t-tests were completed on all the pre- and post-testing means. All statistical analyses were calculated using SigmaPlot Version 12.3, (Systat Software Inc., San Jose, CA). Statistical significance was accepted at an alpha level less than or equal to 0.05.

2.3 RESULTS

All mean pre- and post-training power output (PO) measures in watts (W), are presented in Figure 2. Peak Aerobic Power and Peak Power showed no differences pre- to post- for both groups. However, the HIIT group demonstrated a noticeable increase approaching significance (PAP: p = 0.09; PP: p = 0.08). The 60-second (60 s) measure showed a statistically significant decrease in the CONT group (p = 0.03), whereas, it remained the same in the HIIT group. CP increased in both groups (CONT: p = 0.03; HIIT: p = 0.05). Mean Power Output Measure (MPOM) is described as the mean of all PO measures, in watts, for both the incremental and CP tests (excluding W’). MPOM demonstrated that the CONT group remained essentially unchanged (p = 0.97), whereas the HIIT group had a statistically significant increase (p=0.02). W’ (in Joules) is also
referred to as the work available above CP. It showed a decrease of 26% in the CONT group (p=0.008). W’ was preserved in the HIIT group (p=0.45).

Blood lactates were taken two minutes prior to the start of the tests and again three minutes post-test. There was a significant decline in lactate levels with the CONT group with pre- to post- training for the IRT (p = 0.02). All other pre-training and post-training differences were not significant (IRT: HIIT p = 0.23; CP: HIIT p = 0.70, CONT p = 0.57) (Table 3).

The participants completed a 2 km time trial on the rowing ergometer three weeks prior to the beginning of the study, and again three weeks post study. Results are illustrated in Table 4. Pre- to post- times did show statistical significance for both groups (p ≤ 0.05), however; overall decreases in time favoured the HIIT group.
Table 1
Participant characteristics (n = 16) including gender, age, height, weight, competitive category, peak aerobic power (pre-training and post-training, and highest level of rowing competition achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Competitive Category</th>
<th>Peak Aerobic Power (Watts)</th>
<th>Highest Competitive Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ♀</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ♀</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ♀</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ♀</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ♂</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ♂</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ♂</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>195.5</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ♂</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean(SD)</td>
<td>21.5(2)</td>
<td>178.1(11.4)</td>
<td>74.4(13.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>350.4(83.3)</td>
<td>354.8(85.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ♀</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ♀</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ♂</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ♂</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>185.7</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ♂</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ♂</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ♂</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ♂</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean(SD)</td>
<td>21.9(3.8)</td>
<td>183.5(6.2)</td>
<td>79.3(11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>394(57.9)</td>
<td>404.4(69.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive Category: HW: Heavy Women (>59kg), LW: Light Women (<59kg), HM: Heavy Men (>72.5kg), LM: Light Men (<72.5kg). Actual weight may vary from competitive category since this study was completed prior to their competitive season. ♀: female. ♂ male.
### Table 2a

*Total Training Time (min) prior to beginning the study for both CONT and HIIT groups.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cat I</th>
<th>Cat II</th>
<th>Cat III</th>
<th>Cat IV</th>
<th>Cat V</th>
<th>Cat VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total minutes of cardiovascular training prior to the beginning of the study. Rowing categories defined as: Cat I: Anaerobic capacity; Cat II: Race Endurance; Cat III: Development of Aerobic Capacity; Cat IV: Anaerobic Threshold; Cat V: Utilization of Aerobic Capacity; Cat VI: Basic Endurance.

### Table 2b

*Total Training Time (min) during the study for CONT and HIIT groups.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cat I</th>
<th>Cat II</th>
<th>Cat III</th>
<th>Cat IV</th>
<th>Cat V</th>
<th>Cat VI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIIT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>1053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total minutes of cardiovascular training during the 11-day training portion of the study for each training category. Rowing categories defined as: Cat I: Anaerobic capacity; Cat II: Race Endurance; Cat III: Development of Aerobic Capacity; Cat IV: Anaerobic Threshold; Cat V: Utilization of Aerobic Capacity; Cat VI: Basic Endurance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-training</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-training</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRT Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>CP Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIIT</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lactate levels were taken 2 minutes prior to the beginning of the incremental VO₂max test and 3-minute Critical Power test, and again 3 minutes post-testing (pre- and post-training). IRT: Incremental Ramp Test. CP: Critical Power Test. *Statistically significant increase in lactates post-training on IRT for the CONT group.
Table 4
2 km rowing ergometer race times (in minutes and seconds).
3 weeks pre- and 3 weeks post-research training intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Pre-training</th>
<th>Post-training</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ♀ HW</td>
<td>7:57</td>
<td>7:48</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ♀ HW</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td>7:05</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ♀ LW</td>
<td>7:25</td>
<td>7:19</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ♀ LW</td>
<td>7:51</td>
<td>7:46</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ♂ LM</td>
<td>6:19</td>
<td>6:15</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ♂ HM</td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>6:13</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ♂ HM</td>
<td>6:17</td>
<td>6:09</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ♂ HM</td>
<td>6:47</td>
<td>6:43</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ♀ HW</td>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ♀ LW</td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>7:16</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ♂ HM</td>
<td>6:24</td>
<td>6:19</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ♂ HM</td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>6:17</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ♂ HM</td>
<td>6:24</td>
<td>6:21</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ♂ HM</td>
<td>6:06</td>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ♂ LM</td>
<td>6:37</td>
<td>6:33</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ♂ LM</td>
<td>6:39</td>
<td>injured</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both groups improved their times (p<0.05). ♀: female. ♂: male.
Competitive Category: HW: Heavy Women (>59kg), LW: Light Women (<59kg), HM: Heavy Men (>72.5kg), LM: Light Men (<72.5kg). Actual weight may vary from competitive category since this study was completed prior to their competitive season.
Figure 1. Study Design - HIIT Group
Daily training activity during entire study for the HIIT group. Cat I: Anaerobic capacity; Cat II: Race Endurance; Cat III: Development of Aerobic Capacity; Cat IV: Anaerobic Threshold; Cat V: Utilization of Aerobic Capacity; Cat VI: Basic Endurance.
**Figure 2. Power Output Summary**

Figure 3. High sustainable VO$_2$ with 10 s : 5 s work to rest intervals.
Pilot work demonstrating sustained high VO$_2$ during repeated bouts of 10 s : 5 s work, beginning at approximately 60 second into the intervals and sustained for the remainder of the 2.5 minute total work bout. Top horizontal line: indicates participant’s VO$_2$max (3.9 l/min). Vertical lines: beginning of 2.5 min work intervals.
2.4 DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to compare an original supramaximal high intensity training protocol to a predominately continuous training program in highly-trained collegiate rowers within their training season. It was hypothesized that six HIIT sessions over 11 days would elicit greater performance improvements over their predominantly continuously trained team-mates. Performance measures included peak power (PP), 60-second power (60 s), peak aerobic power (PAP), critical power (CP), and energy available above critical power (W’). The major findings included: 1) a maintenance of 60 s performance and W’ post-HIIT training, whereas continuous training resulted in a decrease in both these measures; and 2) an improvement in the mean power output from all metrics (MPOM), pre- to post-training in the HIIT group. In summary, HIIT preserved anaerobic and aerobic capacity, in addition to eliciting similar improvements in CP compared to predominantly continuously trained, elite rowers.

To our knowledge, this is the first training study performed on highly trained rowers after an initial, predominantly aerobic preparation phase (Nolte, 2005) within a competitive season. Studies by Ingham et al. (2008) and Stevens et al. (2015) were completed some one to three months after the conclusion of their competitive season. This present study began after seven weeks of preparatory training for the next competitive season. This prior conditioning for both groups was comprised primarily of steady state continuous training of various intensities, interspersed with one higher intensity interval training session per week. Total weekly time progressively increased over the first three weeks, and was comprised of approximately 77% Category VI and 14% Category V work intensities. Weeks four and five incorporated approximately 25%
of higher intensities (Category II and Category III) with reduced total hours. Week six and seven were of lower intensity (Table 2).

Despite this extended reconditioning period prior to the study, notable improvements from the HIIT intervention were observed. Sixty-second (60 s) performance was maintained in the HIIT group, whereas it decreased in the CONT group. This parameter reflects approximately 60% anaerobic and 40% aerobic contributions (Medbø & Tabata, 1989; Peronnet & Thibault, 1989). Others, utilizing very different predominantly anaerobic protocols have seen comparable results. A four-week study by Paton, Hopkins, and Cook (2009) compared two groups (mean V̇O₂max: 4.5 l/min) that completed three sets of 5 x 30 s cycling at max effort, with 30 seconds of recovery, followed by a two-minute rest period. This training session was performed twice per week. They observed an approximately 9% increase in power output for a 60 s performance test. The preserved 60 s PO in the HIIT group suggests that the anaerobic stimulus from the HIIT was responsible for preserving the anaerobic component of this variable.

Furthermore, W’ was also preserved in the HIIT group in the present study, yet decreased in the CONT group. It has been suggested that a decrease in W’ will impact performance in endurance events (Laursen, Shing, Peake, Coombes, & Jenkins, 2005). In their four-week study comparing three different interval training protocols on well-trained cyclists (mean V̇O₂max: 66.0 ml/kg.min) during their off-season, they observed greater improvements in 40 km time trials and V̇O₂ peak compared to the control group. The time trial improvement was attributed, in part, to the increased W’ from the supramaximal intensity training. Laursen et al. (2005) has suggested that this
supramaximal intensity’s reliance on glycolysis for ATP production provides the stimulus for adaptation of this energy system.

Previous research has also compared a similar short rest: shorter recovery interval training regime (20 s: 10 s) to an endurance protocol (Tabata et al., 1996). Their results demonstrated that the interval training group increased their anaerobic capacity by 28%, whereas, no change was observed in the endurance group. The key difference between the Tabata et al. (1996) protocol and the present study is the duration at which VO₂max is attained during the training bouts. The importance of training at VO₂max for maximal adaptations of aerobic power in well-trained athletes has been suggested previously (V. L. Billat et al., 2000; Spencer & Gastin, 2001). In the current study, VO₂max was reached by 60 s of the 2.5 min training bout and maintained for the duration (Fig. 3). This high and sustained VO₂ during training in the present study compared to the Tabata protocol is a function of coupling the shorter recovery period (5 s vs. 20 s) with a moderate intensity recovery (Belfry, Paterson, et al., 2012). Furthermore, the glycolytic contribution required for this supramaximal intensity during the 10 s work period is maintained into the 5 s recovery (Belfry, Raymer, et al., 2012). This combination of a high anaerobic contribution, and maximal VO₂ within the training bouts of the current HIIT protocol, underpins the preservation of W’.

The athletes in both training groups of the present study increased their CP (p < 0.05). Poole, Ward, and Whipp (1990) observed an increase in CP utilizing similar duration interval sessions as the current study (2 min vs 2.5 min) but were performed on recreational athletes. Their training consisted of 10 bouts of 2 min: 2 min at 105% of maximal watts achieved during an incremental ramp test. This intensity would elicit
similar high VO₂ as the present study. Jenkins and Quigley (1992) also observed an increase in CP; however, their participants were only active individuals. Their eight-week study had untrained participants (mean VO₂: 3.6 l/min) cycle for 30-40 minutes, three times per week, at the mean intensity calculated from a 40-minute CP ride.

Over the 11-day training period, peak aerobic power during the incremental ramp test did not improve significantly for both groups. It did however, approach significance for the HIIT group (p = 0.09). Studies have suggested that performance improvements can occur independently of increases in VO₂max. Daniels, Yarbrough, and Foster (1978) compared physical education (PE) students (mean VO₂max: 3.9 l/min) with well-trained runners (mean VO₂max 4.3 l/min) over eight weeks. Although training intensities were different for both groups, both had substantial increases in intensity and volume pre- to post- two months of training. The runners improved 4% on 805 metre and 3218 metre races, yet there was no increase in VO₂max. Whereas, a 9% increase in VO₂max by the 3rd week was observed in the PE students. No increases occurred thereafter despite further improvements in performance. Moreover, Barbeau, Serresse, and Boulay (1993) monitored and tested elite male cyclists (mean VO₂max: 5.53 L/min) over a training and competitive season. No significant changes in VO₂max occurred during this period, however, measures of heart rate and mechanical efficiency improved during a 16-minute cycling cadence-step test. Again providing evidence that performance may increase independent of VO₂max. Others (Bunc, Heller, Moravec, & Sprynaroa, 1989) followed endurance runners (mean VO₂max: 4.6 l/min) over a training and competitive season. Their training consisted of six to 12 high volume sessions per week along with
approximately 18-27% of training at, or above ventilatory threshold. They observed only modest changes (5%) over this 12-month training period.

The MPOM increased in the HIIT group only (p < 0.05). This improvement reflects adaptations in power from both anaerobic and oxidative phosphorylation. These adaptations match the energy system requirements for improvement in 2 km rowing performances. It is therefore recommended that this HIIT protocol be implemented at regular intervals to maintain peak performance.

The combination of aerobic and anaerobic contribution while eliciting such high power outputs during this type of training may also result in more efficient muscle buffering potentials, and thus the ability to sustain higher power outputs without compromising endurance performance. M. Weston, Taylor, Batterham, and Hopkins (2014) were successful at improving muscle buffering capacity by 16% with six to eight sets of five minutes at 80% peak power output, followed by one minute rest, in well-trained cyclists (mean VO₂: 5.1 l/min), six times over four weeks. This protocol also increased time to fatigue at 150% of peak power output, which is similar to the power output in our study (pre: 59.3 sec; post: 72.5 sec). A study by Edge, Bishop, Hill-Haas, Dawson, and Goodman (2006), compared muscle buffering capacity in female athletes engaged in different types of sport. One group participated in Team Sports such as soccer, hockey, netball and basketball with sprint type training two to four times per week, along with endurance type training one to two times per week (mean VO₂max: 2.86 l/min). The Endurance Training group (mean VO₂max: 3.03 l/min) consisted of cyclists, rowers, and tri-athletes that trained at or below lactate threshold two to three times per week. There was also a control group of physically active participants (mean
VO$_2$max: 2.27 l/min) that did walking, aerobics and dancing. Their testing protocol, on a cycling ergometer, consisted of five bouts of six seconds all-out, followed by 24 seconds rest. Measurements taken immediately after the testing confirmed that even though the Endurance Training group had a higher VO$_2$max, the Team Sports group had significantly higher muscle buffering capacity.

The recruitment of fast twitch muscle fibres, as a function of working at 140% of PAP will also improve performance. This is manifested by enhanced neural recruitment (Laursen, 2010), increased oxidative potential, and greater muscle buffering capabilities of fast twitch fibres (Burgomaster et al., 2005).

The highly trained status of the rowers in this study is exemplified by their 2 km performance times (mean: 6:25 min). Moreover, nine of the male and female’s current best 2 km times would have ranked them in the top 10 at the recent 2015 Indoor World Rowing Championships (IRC) (“World IRC Results 2015,” 2015). In contrast, Driller et al. (2009), Ingham et al. (2008), Stevens et al. (2015), and Akca and Aras (2015) who have described their male participants as “experienced”, “well-trained”, “trained” or “national level” had mean male 2 km performance times ranging from 6 min 43 s to 7 min 35 s.

The two top athletes in the HIIT group (Tables 1 and 3, participants 2 and 6) who would have ranked second at the 2015 IRC, realized increases on all performance metrics. According to Eynon et al. (2011) elite endurance athletes have a higher number of a specific endurance-related allele compared to well-trained athletes. They suggest that this supports their elite performances. The top athletes in the HIIT group in this study validate this supposition. Notably, the top male in the CONT group, who would have
ranked number 1 at the 2015 IRC, did not improve on any of the anaerobic measures. This illustrates the positive effects of this HIIT protocol on preserving anaerobic power and capacity while improving the aerobic measures of these elite athletes.

In conclusion, six sessions of a novel HIIT training protocol was superior in promoting adaptations in power output metrics compared to predominantly moderate intensity training in elite, well-trained athletes. Rowing coaches should be advised to intersperse this novel training protocol within their predominantly aerobic training program to maintain anaerobic fitness and peak performances.

2.5 SUMMARY: LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTION

Due to the nature of the breathing behavior of these athletes during maximal rowing, breath-by-breath gas-exchange measurement data were difficult to assess and as such these data were not included in this study. Power output data were collected and analyzed. Interestingly, the athlete’s familiarity with power output measures facilitated the interpretation of their own results.

Anecdotally, the participants in the HIIT group reported feeling more power on the “pulling” stroke on the rowing ergometer from this type of intensity. Initially, their prescribed watts were difficult to attain, however, with successive trials, they were able to reach their target. This reinforcement provided motivation since they were able to quantify their progress. The participants also reported enjoying the variety from traditional continuous rowing, which according to Bartlett et al. (2011), HIIT may increase enjoyment and thus contribute to adherence to an exercise training program. Survey research by Kilpatrick, Greeley, and Collins (2015) agreed that intermittent training is more enjoyable than continuous training in the heavy intensity domain.
The participants that did not demonstrate an improvement with Peak Aerobic Power during post-tests reported heightened fatigue from this intense training stimulus. The onset of fatigue in these athletes may have precipitated a decline in power output. Rodas, Ventura, Cadefau, Cusso, and Parra (2000) reported that despite improvements in physiological measures such as higher [PCr] and lower lactate concentrations, the inability to improve performance outcomes may be due to neuromuscular fatigue. Their study demonstrated that one day of rest following a HIIT intervention demonstrated no improvements in post-tests, however, improvements were noted when the post-tests were completed five days post intervention. This present study had two days of recovery, albeit continuous steady state training. The ideal recovery time may not have transpired which would have enabled them to perform at their peak. For example, HIIT participant #1 did not demonstrate an improvement in PAP (Table 1), however a 2 km ergometer race time improved by 3.45% (Table 4). This may have implications for the timing of training and/or tapering prior to competition and needs to be investigated further in order to determine the optimal rest period in order to prevent the detrimental effects of overtraining.

Performance enhancement studies at the elite level must be done on the same population since subtle improvements may represent meaningful gains in competition (Londeree, 1997). Within this present study, although some improvements were not statistically significant, they may be considered substantial at this caliber of competition, specifically with those participants that demonstrated higher adaptations to the training stimulus. A larger sample size with a more homogenized group of the athletes may be advantageous.
The long term effects of this stimulus has yet to be elucidated. The dynamic nature of the preparation and competition phases limits consecutive studies on the same population. However, our study gained meaningful insight into the benefits of supra-maximal intensity interval training for coaches and for future rowing training studies.
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