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## ABSTRACT

# OF THESIS: Aerobic Power and Anaerobic Threshold of Male Rowers 

AUTHOR:<br>Argyrios V. Fotis<br>THESIS ADVISOR: Dr. Thomas M. K. Song<br>Professor<br>Lakehead University

The purpose of this study was to investigate the endurance component of off-season rowing performance in male rowers before and after an 8 -week training period. Specific attention was given to laboratory assessment of aerobic power (AP) and anaerobic threshold (AT) as they were affected by the above training period.

A single subject case study research design was employed, which involved pre- and post-training tests, of seven male rowers of national and provincial calibre. Following the pre-training test, individualized training programs were designed involving continuous and interval endurance training. The training intensity for continuous training (CT) and interval training (IT) was based on a percentage below (AT -10 $\dot{\mathrm{V}}_{2}$ max) and above (AT +10 to $25 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ ) the subject's AT. The training intensity was monitored through heart rate count. The training was carried out on rowing ergometers (Concept II), 3 times per week, each session lasting 50 to 60 minutes. After the training period, $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max $L \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ and $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{MI} \mathrm{kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT increased in all subjects between
$1.8 \%$ and $22.9 \%$ and $-4.2 \%$ to $16.3 \%$, respectively. As well, the maximum rowing ergometer performance, power output, maximum workload, and time before reaching AT increased.

High levels of AT among oarsmen are attributed to the specific nature of training regimens which may have increased the oxidative capacity of muscle fibers and the cardiorespiratory transport system. Measurement of HR at AT could provide the coach and the oarsman with an objective method of monitoring the intensity of training. These results demonstrate that the AT in rowers is profoundly influenced by endurance training.
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## Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

## Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the endurance component of off-season rowing performance in male rowers before and after an 8 week training period. Specific attention was given to laboratory assessment of "aerobic power" and "anaerobic threshold" as they were affected by the above-mentioned training period.

## Significance of the Study

High performance in the sport of rowing is only achieved through systematic training that is structured according to known scientific laws and principles. This high performance is a result of the development and interaction of the following basic components: endurance, strength and power, technique, flexibility, co-ordination and motivational factors.

Rowing has long been considered one of the most demanding continuous endurance activities in competitive sport (Hagerman \& Lee, 1971; Hagerman, Addington \& Gaensler, 1972; Hagerman, Gault, Connors \& Hagerman, 1975a; Hagerman, Whitney, Geensler \& Geensler, 1975b; Hagerman, Connors, Gault, Hagerman \& Polinski, 1978; Hagerman \& Staron, 1983; Jackson \& Secher, 1976; Mickelson \& Hagerman, 1982; Pyke, 1979; Szögy \& Cherebetiu, 1974; Vrijens \& Bouckaert, 1984; Wright, Bompa \& Shephard, 1976), and as a result, most physiological studies have been concerned with measuring the oxygen demands of rowing at submaximal and maximal levels.

Rowing is a continuous performance which utilizes arm, leg and back musculature; therefore, the energy demands placed on oarsmen are great (Jackson \& Secher, 1976). Oarsmen, during a 2,000 meter race, do work at intensities which are near to their maximal cerdio-respiratory capacity (Vrijens \& Bouckaert, 1984). Experiments under laboratory conditions suggest that during a 6 minute, 2,000 meter performance, about $70 \%$ of the total energy cost is produced by aerobic processes, while the anaerobic component accounts for the remaining $30 \%$ (Hagerman \& Lee; 1978). Because of the importance of the aerobic component in rowing performance, the determination of maximal oxygen uptake ( $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max) is undoubtedly a basic criterion when assessing the aerobic power of a rower. In order to increase this aerobic power, an optimal endurance training program is needed.

Maximal oxygen uptake has been used extensively as an objective measurement of physical work capacity, and as an indicator of performance in endurance events for both trained and untrained individuals (Åstrand \& Rodah1, 1977; Bergh, Thorstensson, Sjödin, Holten, Piehl \& Karlsson, 1978; Cunningham, Goode \& Critz, 1975; MacDougal, 1977), however, these values normally serve only to rank athletes or their untrained peers with respect to previously determined norms or expected maximal standards. Although this information is useful in determining the success of various training programs as well as in providing a stimulus for training, it does little to help when designing specific aerobic and anserobic exercise programs to meet individusl or team training needs.

The percentage of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at which an increase in blood lactate occurs is known as the anaerobic threshold (AT) and can be determined
non-invasively during a graded exercise test by analysing expired respiratory gases (Davis, Frank, Whipp \& Wasserman, 1979). Many studies have indicated that the AT can be increased with training (Davis et al., 1979; Denis, Fougnet, Poty, Geyssant \& Lacour, 1982; Dwyer \& Bybee, 1983; MacDougall, 1977; Williams, Wyndham, Kok \& Von Rahden, 1967; Yoshida, Yoshihiro \& Takenchi, 1982).

The non-invasive technique for the measurement of AT (Davis, Vodak, Wilmore, Vodak \& Kurtz, 1976; Naimark, Wasserman \& Mcllroy, 1964; Wasserman \& Mcllroy, 1964; Wasserman, Whipp, Koyal \& Beaver, 1973) was originally designed for use as a diagnostic tool for people suffering from cardiovascular and/or respiratory abnormalities. This technique, however, can also be very useful when applied to asymptomatic subjects and, in particular, to highly conditioned endurance athletes. By measuring the AT of a rower during a step-wise, progressive $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max test, it is possible to determine an individual's power output ( PO ), heart rate $(\mathrm{HR})$, and $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ at AT in addition to maximum values for ventilation (VE), volume of oxygen ( $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max ), volume of carbon dioxide $\left(\mathrm{VCO}_{2} \max \right)$ and HR . The AT information obtained will then allow the outlining of individualized training programs which can limit the deleterious effects of metabolic acidosis. By varying exercise intensity in relation to $\mathrm{AT}, \mathrm{PO}$ and $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$, it will be possible to determine the effectiveness of various training programs in increasing a rower's $\mathrm{AT}, \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max or both concurrently.

Traditionally, training prescriptions based on specific percentages of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max have been used to impose work stress believed to be optimal in terms of the required effort and resulting benefits (American College of Sports Medicine, "Position Statement", 1978; Dwyer \& Bybee, 1983 Pollock,
1973). While the AT is not a constant percentage of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max for all individuals, its influence on fuel use and on lactate accumulation and its supposed reflection of a discrepancy between oxygen supply and demand suggest that precise training prescriptions, with respect to metabolic stress, may be developed with the AT as the major consideration. Some studies have suggested that the AT, reflecting subtle changes in cellular metabolism, may be a more sensitive indicator of circulatory and metabolic adaptations to exercise than some arbitrary fraction of the $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max (Wasserman et al., 1973; Weltman, Katch, Sandy \& Freedson, 1978). Currently, training prescriptions based on percent $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max do not distinguish between work above and below AT (Katch \& Weltman, 1979). Consequently, exercise performed at a specific intensity with the commonly used range of 50 to $85 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, may result in dissimilar work stresses in individuals with different AT values but similar $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max (Weltman et al., 1978). A more uniform training stress may be imposed if work is equated on the basis of AT (Davis et al., 1979; Katch \& Weltman, 1978; Dwyer \& Bybee, 1983; Mickelson \& Hagerman, 1982; and Vrijens \& Bouckaert, 1984).

The AT, expressed as $\mathrm{VO}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \min ^{-1}\right)$ or percent $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, must be translated into a field-measurable term if training intensity is to be regulated at a fixed percent of $A T$. Heart rate can be an effective means of regulating the intensity of exercise above or below the threshold. The effect of training specificity on AT in rowers has not been directly examined. The amount and intensity of training necessary to produce changes in the AT are not yet known. The coach must determine which form of training will best improve AT.

This study will attempt to reveal information in the area of endurance training and AT as found in rowers. Since this investigator is a national
level coach and former rower, there is a personal interest in investigating the effects of off-season training on the serobic power and anaerobic threshold in male rowers. Implications of this study may improve the knowledge and coaching skills of this researcher.

## Delimitations

1. The subjects of this study were seven male rowers, members of the Thunder Bay Rowing Club, who ranged from 15 to 29 years of age.
2. The investigative period was 8 weeks in duration, commencing April 2, 1984, and terminating May 28, 1984.
3. The subjects were required to complete three training sessions, each about 50 to 60 minutes in duration, per week.
4. Training was carried out on rowing ergometers.
5. Diurnal variation was avoided by testing the subject at the same time each day.

## Limitations

1. The subjects in this study participated on a voluntary basis.
2. The subjects completed all testing and training sessions during the investigative period.
3. It was assumed that the subjects would exert maximum effort on $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max tests.
4. It was assumed that the dependent variables $\left(\mathrm{VO}_{2}\right.$ max and AT) would accurately detect any change in the performance of the subjects.
5. Any change in the performance of the subjects was due to the training effect.

## Definitions

Aerobic Power (AP) Also called oxygen uptake, and maximal oxygen consumption $\left(\mathrm{VO}_{2}\right.$ max). The greatest amount of oxygen a person is able to utilize during a maximal effort. It can be reported as absolute $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ (liters . $\min ^{-1}$ ) or relative $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ (milliliters $\cdot$ Kilogram body weight ${ }^{-1} \cdot \min ^{-1}$ ).

Anaerobic threshold (AT) or Ventilatory Threshold (VT) The point of curvilinear increase of ventilation during graded exercise (Wesserman et al., 1973). Anaerobic threshold is identified by a departure from linearity of the $\mathrm{VEO}_{2}, \mathrm{YE}$ and $\mathrm{VCO}_{2}$ relative to $\mathrm{VO}_{2}, \mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$.

Carbon dioxide production $\left(\mathrm{VCO}_{2}\right)$ The volume of carbon dioxide produced per minute by the body.

Continuous endurance training (CET) Exercise performed to completion without rest periods.

The expiratory fraction of carbon dioxide $\left(\mathrm{FECO}_{2}\right)$ Mixed carbon dioxide present in the expired air sample.

The expiratory fraction of oxygen ( $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ ) Mixed oxygen present in the expired air sample.

Heart Rate (HR) The number of heart beats per minute.

Interval training (IT) Exercise performed with alternate periods of rest, as opposed to continuous training.

Oxygen consumption $\left(\mathrm{VO}_{2}\right)$ The volume of oxygen utilized per minute by the body.

Respiratory exchange ratio (RER) The ratio of the volume of carbon dioxide expired per minute $\left(\mathrm{VCO}_{2}\right)$ to the volume of oxygen consumed during the same time interval $\left(\mathrm{Y}_{2}\right)$. Proportionately more fats are being metabolized when the RER is near 0.7 , and more carbohydrates are being metabolized when the RER is near 1.00 .

Ventilation ( $\dot{V} E)$ The volume of air expired per minute.

The ventilatory equivalent of carbon dioxide ( $\dot{V} E \cdot \mathrm{VCO}_{2}{ }^{-1}$ ) The ratio of ventilation to carbon dioxide produced per minute.

The ventilatory equivalent of oxygen ( $\mathrm{VE} \cdot \mathrm{VEO}_{2}{ }^{-1}$ ) The ratio of ventilation to oxygen consumed per minute.

## Chopter 2

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## Maximal Oxygen Uptake in Oarsmen

Maximal oxygen uptake is an excellent indicator of aerobic fitness (\&strand \& Rodahl, 1977). An increase in the total aerobic metabolism during maximal exercise of 4 to 6 minutes duration will be reflected by a similar increase in the $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ (Secher et al., 1982a). Thus, the use of aerobic power for the assessment of aerobic fitness level seems justified in oarsmen.

Maximal aerobic power measured in young untrained men is about 3.4 L $\min ^{-1}$ (Åstrand \& Rodahl,1977), while in oarsmen it ranges from between $2.4 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ (Strydom, Wyndham \& Greyson, 1967) and $6.6 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ (Hagerman et al., 1978). The highly developed aerobic power of oarsmen is essential in maintaining the high steady state energy during the body of the race and permits the oarsmen to work for at least 5 minutes at 97 to $98 \%$ of maximal aerobic power (Hagerman et al., 1975). This supposition is strengthened by the finding of a positive correlation between the average $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ of the crew and their placing in international championships. A direct relationship between placing in an international championship regatta and the average $\stackrel{\mathrm{V}}{2} 2$ max of a crew has been established ( $y=6.15-0.08 x, r=0.87, n=10$ ) (Secher et al., 1982b), giving a value of $6.1 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ for first place and 5.1 $\mathrm{L} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ for 13 th place when 15 to 20 crews are competing, as in FISA championships. These findings indicate that the maximal aerobic power of the best oarsmen may be a limiting factor in rowing performance. The mean
$\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was $6.1 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ for the crew taking first place, $5.7 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ for the crew taking the sixth place, and 5.1 liters $\cdot \min \cdot-1$ for the crew attaining the thirteenth place.

One group reported a $\mathrm{V}_{2}$ max of $7.7 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ (Nowacki, Krause \& Adam, 1969), however, their $\dot{\mathrm{V}}_{2}$ increased curvilinearly as work intensity increased. The large $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max of oarsmen are due mainly to their large body dimensions. When the $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max is expressed per kilogram of body weight (Vaage \& Hermansen, 1977), the smaller oarsmen show similar or slightly larger values.

A correlation between rowing performance and vital capacity (Ishiko, 1967) may reflect the advantage of the larger oarsman. International competitive oarsmen have vital capacities of about 6.8 L (BTPS) with a largest recorded value of 9.1 L , but are characterized by their large aerobic power, and their large body size (Secher, 1983).

Studies on elite rowers have suggested that the $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max values are indeed important. Szögy and Cherebetiu (1974), stated that rowers have been found to exhibit some of the highest absolute $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max values of all athletes. Astrand and Rodahl (1977) also reported that rowers had the highest absolute $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max values ( 5.8 to $6.0 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ ) next to cross country skiers ( $6.3 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ ) of all the athletes they tested.

Hagerman et al. (1979) has published a physiological profile of many ( $n=663$ ) elite heavyweight, lightweight and female rowers. The mean value of $6.1 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ is similar to the value reported by Ástrand and Rodam, 1977; Jackson and Secher, 1976; Secher, 1973; Szögy and Cherebetiu, 1974. It may therefore be postulated that the greater $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max contributes to a superior rowing performance.

## Anaerobic Threshold

During low levels of physical effort, oxygen demand by the working muscle is adequately supplied by adjustments in cardiac output and increased oxygen extraction. With a further increase in work intensity, the increasing contribution of anaerobic metabolism results in production of lactic acid (LA). Anaerobic threshold (AT) has been defined as the rate of work or $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ just below the point at which LA begins to accumulate in the blood. According to Wasserman and Mcllroy (1964), evidence of anaerobic metabolism is provided by biochemical changes in the blood. It may be detected as an increase in blood LA concentration to $2 \mathrm{mMol} \mathrm{L}^{-1}$, and as a decrease in blood bicarbonate $\left(\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}\right)$and hydrogen ion ( pH ).

Indirect evidence of the onset of anaerobic metabolism is provided by non-linear increases in minute ventilation (VE), respiratory exchange ratio (RER), carbon dioxide $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right)$ production and an abrupt increase in the fraction of expired oxygen $\left(\mathrm{FEO}_{2}\right)$, with progressively increased work rate. Several investigators have established the validity and reliability of AT determination while employing non-invasive measures.

In an early investigation, Naimark, Wasserman and Mcllroy (1964) found that increases in blood LA levels were associated with abrupt increases in RER and a decrease in blood $\left(\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}\right)$, and that these changes occured at lower work laads in heart patients than in healthy individuals; however, Wasserman, Whipp, Koyal and Beaver (1973), concluded that the RER was of limited usefulness in determining the AT because the elevation of RER occurred anly when the rate of $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}$change was at its maximum.

Wasserman et al. (1973) defined the AT as the work rate at which the volume of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ produced and the VE deviate from linearity as compared to increases in $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ as wark load is incremented. Davis, Vadak, Wilmore, Vadak and Kurtz (1976) measured gas exchange parameters and blood LA levels during progressive bicycle ergameter exercise on nine male subjects. Of the respiratory parameters measured, $\dot{V} E$, volume of carbon dioxide produced $\left(\mathrm{VCO}_{2}\right)$ and $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ were found to give estimates of the AT within 30 seconds of each other. No significant difference was found between AT by blood LA or gas exchange parameters. Determination of test- retest correlation coefficients were $0.77,0.74$ and 0.72 , respectively.

In a later investigation, Davis et al. (1979) measured exercise responses in nine sedentary middle-aged males and seven control subjects before and after an endurance training program. Each subject was given two work incremented ergometer tests before and after training. The criteris for AT were a systematic increase in the $\mathrm{VEO}_{2}$ without an increase in the $\stackrel{\mathrm{VECO}}{2}$ and a systematic decrease in end-tidal oxygen presure ( $\mathrm{PO}_{2}$ ) without a decrease in end-tidal carbon dioxide pressure $\left(\mathrm{PCO}_{2}\right)$. Test-retest correlation coefficients for the AT expressed as $\dot{V} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ in $L \min ^{-1}$ for all subjects were 0.94 pre-trairing and 0.95 post-training.

Bailey, MacNab and Wenger (1977) measured VE and blood LA of 26 males during a continuous incremental bicycle ergometer work test. No difference was found in estimates of the AT by the two methods. It appears that measurement of the AT from gas exchange parameters is a valid procedure (Davis et al., 1976).

It has been suggested that the AT may provide an indication of functional work capacity or fitness. Several investigators (Naimark, et al., 1964; Wasserman et al., 1973) have reported findings that suggest that the AT of patients with limited cardiovascular function is well below that of healthy individuals. The patients had significantly greater changes in RER and higher LA levels than the healthy subjects at similar work rates, leading to the conclusion that the AT appears to accurately reflect the functional capacity of these groups.

Other evidence suggests that the AT may be useful in assessing physical work capacity in athletes. Weltman and Katch (1979) found that trained athletes reached AT at greater absolute and relative levels of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ than untrained individuals. A number of investigators have examined differences in the AT in trained and untrained subjects using a cross-sectional approach with the "break-away" ventilatory responses during progressive exercise as the indicator that the AT has been reached. McDougal (1977) compared nine elite athletes with ten non-athletes. The AT occurred at $85 \%$ and $70 \%$ of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, respectively. Patton, Heffner, Baun, Gettman and Raven (1979) reported similar findings using the nonlinear inflection point in the ventilatory responses to determine the AT during progressive treadmill exercise. The AT occurred at a significantly higher percentage of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max in varsity cross-country runners ( $\mathrm{N}=5$ ) than physically fit non-runners $(N=6)$, or at $75 \%$ and $53 \%$ percent of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, respectively.

Londeree and Ames (1975) evaluated maximal steady state in 13 adult males during mild to exhaustive discontinuous treadmill exercise. Venous blood LA was measured during minutes 10 and 15 of exercise. Subjects were classified as low-fit, medium-fit and high-fit from an activity recall record for the previous six month. Significant differences between submaximal HR at $2.2 \mathrm{mMol} \mathrm{L}^{-1} \mathrm{LA}$ were found between all three groups. The work rate corresponded to $74 \%, 60 \%$ and $47 \%$ of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max for the high. medium and low-fit groups, respectively. Relative $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ differences were significant for the high and low-fit groups. It is concluded from these results that the rate of work above which there is a significant accumulation of LA in the blood (above $2 \mathrm{mMol} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1}$ ) is reached at a higher percentage of the $\mathrm{V}_{2}$ max in high-fit than in low-fit subjects.

In a related study, Weltman, Katch, Sandy and Freedson (1978) compared submaximal exercise responses in 22 female subjects matched with respect to $\dot{\mathrm{VO}}_{2}$ max. Subjects were subsequently classified with respect to $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ at the onset of metabolic acidosis, determined using gas exchange variables, into high and low $\mathrm{VO}_{2}-\mathrm{AT}$ groups. The high $\mathrm{VO}_{2}-\mathrm{AT}$ group reached a steady state for $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ at a significantly faster rate than the low $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$-AT group. In addition, the AT was reached at a significantly higher percentage of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max in the high-fit group. The percentages were $53 \%$ and $46 \%$ for the high and low-fit groups, respectively.

Comparing 12 trained male cyclists with 12 untrained males during submaximal bicycle ergorneter exercise, Edwards, Jones, Oppenheimer, Hughes and Knill-Jones (1979) found steady state HRs were reached in less
then one minute in trained subjects, whereas steady state HRs were generally not attained until two minutes in the untrained group. Blood LA increased at a higher $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ in the trained than the untrained group, and at a higher percentage of $\dot{\mathrm{V}}_{2}$ max.

In summary, the AT occurs at higher absolute levels of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ at a higher percentage of the $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max in healthy individuals than in patients with cardiovascular disease, and in endurance-trained individuals than in untrained individuals. In addition, trained individuals reach steady state $\stackrel{\mathrm{VO}}{2}$ faster and are able to work with only minimal levels of blood LA at higher $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ levels than untrained individuals. Furthermore, LA production occurs at lower work levels in the untrained. These findings suggest that the AT may be a useful submaximal criterion of physical condition.

Further insight into the relationship between the AT and training has been provided by several longitudinal studies. Davies et al. (1979) compared the physiological responses of nine middle-aged men before and after 9 weeks of endurance training on the bicycle ergometer with those of seven control subjects. The subjects trained at a $\dot{V D}_{2}$ of $50 \%$ between the $A T$ and $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max for the first four weeks. This was increased to $70 \%$ for the last five weeks. Following training, AT increased $44 \%$ when expressed as an absolute rate of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ and $15 \%$ when expressed as a percentage of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max. No changes were observed in the control subjects. Williams, Wyndham, Kok and Von Rahden (1967) reported increases in the AT using a criterion of excess LA, when expressed both as an absolute rate of work and relative to $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, in 13 males following 4 to 16 weeks of training four
hours daily at submaximal and maximal levels of work. The level of work at which excess LA appeared in the blood increased from 468 to 62 of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max.

McLellan and Skinner (1981) reported conflicting findings in 14 male subjects training on the bicycle ergometer 30 to 45 minutes per day, 3 times per week for 8 weeks. They reported increases in the AT on an absolute basis, but no change was observed when AT was expressed relative to $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max. In addition, subjects training $5 \%$ to $15 \%$ above the AT did not differ from those training at or below the AT.

Mickleson and Hagerman (1982) tested 25 members of the 1980 U.S. Olympic Rowing Team during a progressive (to exhaustion) rowing ergometer exercise. Anaerobic threshold, $\dot{\mathrm{VO}}_{2} \mathrm{max}, \mathrm{HR}$ and PO were also measured to gauge the severity of the exercise and were compared with metabolic data. Power increments of 27 watts each minute were achieved by progressively increasing the brake weight resistance on the ergometer while maintaining a stroke rate of 28 to 32 strokes $\cdot \min ^{-1}$ and spinning the ergometer flywheel at 550 revolutions $\cdot \min ^{-1}$. Anaerobic threshold measurements were determined by observing the onset of a non-linear relationship between $\dot{\mathrm{V}}_{2}$, $\dot{\mathrm{VE}}$ and $\mathrm{VCO}_{2}$. A mean AT of $83 \%$ of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, and a mean HR value at AT of 167 beats $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ were found.

Dwyer and Bybee (1983) examined the HR response and percent maximal HR ( $\mathbb{B H R m a x}$ ) at the AT in 20 young women. The $A T, \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and $H R$ were assessed during incremental (25 watts each minute to exhaustion). Ventilation and gas exchange were measured each minute. Anserobic threshold was identified by departure from linearity of the $\dot{V E O}_{2}, \dot{V E}$, and
$\stackrel{V}{ } \mathrm{VCO}_{2}$ relative to $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$. Reliability coefficients for AT and HR at AT were 0.92 and 0.86 , respectively. The mean AT observed in the incremental tests carried out to exhaustion was 70.1 of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, ranging from 54 to $83 \%$. The mean work rate at AT was $151 \pm 28$ Watts or 738 of the average maximal work rate. They concluded that training prescriptions for intensity can be developed and expressed in percent HR max at AT as the major consideration. Indeed, evidence is accumulating which suggests that the training prescriptions lack metabolic specificity if they are not based on AT.

Based on the research reviewed above, it appears that increases in the AT may be observed following training (when the AT is expressed in an absolute rate of work). Increases in the AT expressed relative to $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max may depend on the initial level of condition of the subject and the type of training program engaged in, particularly with respect to the intensity of exercise performed.

## The Relationship Between the Ventilatory and Blood Lactate Responses

As the intensity of exercise increases from low levels to approximately $40 \%$ to $50 \%$ of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, a greater portion of oxygen is extracted by the active tissues, resulting in a decreased fraction of oxygen in the expired air $\left(\mathrm{FEO}_{2}\right)$. In addition, there is a proportional increase in $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ produced oxidatively and in expired $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$. ventilation rises in proportion to the progressively in- creasing $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{VCO}_{2}$ expired $\mathrm{VECO}_{2}$. Although the entry rate of LA into the blood may be increased during these levels of exercise,
the removal rate of LA is also increased (Graham, 1978; Sutton \& Jones, 1979). As a result, little or no change in blood LA is usually observed. Further, the RERs of 0.7 to 0.8 suggest that the predominant source of energy at this intensity of exercise involves FFA oxidation (Skinner \& McLellan, 1980).

As the exercise intensity continues to increase and reaches a level exceeding approximately $50 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, there is an initial continuous rise in LA from values close to 1.5 to $2.0 \mathrm{mMol} \mathrm{L}^{-1}$. This change in acidity $\left(\mathrm{H}^{+}\right)$is buffered principally by the base bound as $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}$(Bouhuys, Pool, Binkhorst \& Van Leeuwen, 1966), resulting in an increased production of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ from the dissociation of carbonic acid $\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\right)$ and a continuous rise in $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ (Skinner \& McLellan, 1980). This increased $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ production which results in a disproportionate rise in $\mathcal{V} E$, however, is related to the change in $\mathrm{VCO}_{2}$, as arterial $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ levels remain normal (Sutton \& Jones, 1979; Wasserman, Whipp \& Davis, 1981). This results in a lower extraction of oxygen relative to the total ventilation and a subsequent rise in $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ (Wasserman et al., 1973). The point at which these changes in gas exchange variables and/or LA occur have been defined as the AT (Wasserman et al., 1973), the lactate threshold (Ivy, Whithers, VanHandel, Elger \& Costill, 1980), and the aerobic threshold (AerT) (Kindermann, Simon \& Keul, 1979; Skinner \& McLellan, 1980).

With increasing intensity of exercise between approximately $50 \%$ to $80 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$. LA continues to increase to values close to $4 \mathrm{mMol} \mathrm{L}^{-1}$ (Sjödin \& Jackobs, 1981; Galdwell \& Pekkarinen, 1983; Davis, Gass, Eager \& Basset, 1981). The proportionate changes in $\mathcal{V} E$ and $\mathrm{VCO}_{2}$ maintain normal
arterial $\mathrm{PCO}_{2}$ during this period of isocapnic buffering, suggesting that respiratory compensation is effective (Skinner \& McLellan, 1980).

After approximately $808 \dot{V O}_{2}$ max and with increasing intensity, LA increases rapidly, resulting in a greater change in arterial pH. This decreased pH increases the afferent discharge from the carotid bodies to the respiratory centre, which increases VE at a rate greater than the continued rise in $\mathrm{VCO}_{2}$ (Davis, Basset, Hughes \& Gass, 1983). As a result, $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ begins to decrease, while $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ continues to rise (Skinner \& McLellan, 1980). This intensity is associated with a point of "break-away" ventilation and/or the onset of a rapid rise in LA and has been associated with the terms respiratory compensation (Wasserman et al., 1973, and 1981), onset of blood lactate accumulation or OBLA (Jacobs, 1983; Sjödin \& Jacobs, 1981) and the AT (Kinderman et al., 1979; Skinner \& McLellan, 1980).

As noted, considerable variability exists in the literature with respect to the terminology used to identify these changes in the ventilatory and blood LA responses during an incremental test. This controversy over terminology appears to be related to two principal issues: the changes in ventilation and gas exchange resulting from and/or relating to the alterations in blood LA values, and the criteria used to define anaerobiosis and its relationship to tissue hypoxia.

The mechanisms involved in the control of ventilation during exercise have provided researchers with a complex topic of investigation for many years. Review articles have summarized the current foci of investigation of the ventilatory response to exercise as relative to the influence of neural and hormonal stimuli originating in the exercising muscle (Mahler, 1979)
and as carotid body chemoreceptor sensitivity (Whipp,1971). Swansson (1979) characterized the control of ventilation in terms of feed-forward and feedback regulating mechanisms. It would appear that neural impulses originating in the exercising muscles, $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ flux to the lungs, increased venous return and/or direct cortical influence, may provide the feed-forward stimuli for regulating ventilation relative to the metabolic state of active tissue (Wasserman et al., 1973 and 1981). Feedback control appears to involve the regulation of arterial $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ (and pH ) by the carotid bodies and the "fine tuning" by higher cortical centers (Whipp, 1971).

Since the buffering of elevated $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the blood by $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}$represents an additional non-metabolic $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ stimulus to increase ventilation, Wasserman et al. (1973) examined the relationships among responses in $\mathrm{LA}, \mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}, \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ and $\dot{V} E$ during an incremental (to exhaustion) work test. It was found that the initial continuous increase in LA and decrease in $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}$occurred at the same PO level as the first disproportionate increase in $\mathrm{VCO}_{2}$ and $\dot{V} E$, i.e., at AT. These findings suggest a "cause and effect" relationship between the increasing blood LA and VE response. Subsequent studies by Davis et al., (1976) and by Yoshida, Yoshihiro and Takeuchi (1981) produced correlation coefficients of 0.95 and 0.86 , respectively, between LA response and the P0 associated with the initial change in $\dot{V} E$.

Sutton and Jones (1979) have stated, however, that increasing LA values will effect the exercise ventilatory response in two ways: as an increased $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ flux to the lungs due to the buffering of LA by $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}$and as a change in pH , the magnitude of which depends on the relative changes in
$\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}$and the partial pressure of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. Therefore, with rapidly increasing blood LA values, one would expect not only an augmented $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ flux but also a substantial increase in $\mathrm{H}^{+}$concentration due to decreasing $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}{ }^{-}$levels.

During low-intensity exercise, increasing amounts of FFA are released into the circulatory system and transported to the working muscle. Since the rate of diffusion of FFA across the cell membrane is proportional to its concentration gradient, high levels of FFA in the blood ensure a constant supply, making FFA the dominant source of fuel for a cantracting muscle at low PO levels (Issekutz, Shaw \& Issekutz, 1976).

As the exercise intensity increases, more ST and possibly some FT fibres will be recruited (Burke, 1980; Éssen, 1978 a $\& b$ ); this produces a greater need for, and utilization of, ATP, with a corresponding increase in the concentration of adenosine diphosphate (ADP), adenosine monophosphate (AMP) and phosphate $\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)$. Since FFA oxidation, however, would still represent a predominant substrate for oxidative phasphorylation, some inhibition of pyruvate oxidation will occur. As a result, there is an imbalance between the rate of pyruvate production, regulated by the energy state of the tissue, and pyruvate oxidation, regulated by the proportion of FFA utilized as a substrate for oxidative metabolism (Issekutz et al., 1976). The intensity of exercise associated with this imbalance between a glycolytic and oxidative substrate flux should also be associated with an initial continuous rise in blood LA values and the initial disproportionate increase in $V \mathrm{~V}$ or Aert (Skinner \& McLellan, 1980).

The previous discussion has defined AT as an intensity of exercise that is associated with the initiation of a hyperventilatory response that is greater than the response observed at POs slightly above AerT. The relationship of $\overline{\mathrm{VE}}$ to $\dot{\mathrm{V}} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ from low-intensity to maximal exercise can be characterized by three different linear equations: below AerT, above AerT but below AT and above AT (Skinmer \& McLellan, 1980).

As noted previously, the term "anaerobic threshold" (AT) has been used to define the change in VE associated with a rise in blood LA (Wasserman et al., 1973) and the point of "break away" VE associated with the onset of a rapid rise in blood LA (Kindermann et al., 1979; McLellan \& Skinner, 1980). This controversy appears to be related to the onset of anaerobiosis. Research by Graham (1978) demonstrated that LA was produced when there was an insufficient supply of $0_{2}$ to the working muscle. Based on these findings, it was then generally assumed that the presence of LA implied hypoxia. This assumption, however, has been questioned by a number of investigators (Holloszy, 1976).

It has been shown that athletes can work at high intensities for prolonged periods with low levels of LA (Costill, 1970). Following the assumption that LA implies hypoxia, the lower LA at a higher relative PD would be due to a removal of hypoxic conditions (Holloszy, 1976). If these hypoxic conditions were reduced, then $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ at a given submaximal PO would have to increase, suggesting an alteration in total body efficiency with training. Since $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ at a given submaximal PO does not change with training, however, local hypoxia cannot be the reason for change in LA (Holloszy, 1976).

It should be realized that blood LA values are also influenced by muscle fibre composition and muscle fibre recruitment (Sjödin, 1976). For example, the production and removal of LA are influenced by the content of lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) in the sarcoplasm of muscle (M) specific subunits (Sjödin, Thorstenson, Firth, \& Karlsson, 1976). Therefore, as pyruvate concentrations increase within the sarcoplasm, less LA will be produced with the heart (H)-LDH isozyme. Consequently, it is generally assumed that M-LDH facilitates the reduction of pyruvate to LA, whereas H-LDH favours the oxidation of LA to pyruvate for subsequent utilization in the Krebs cycle (Sjōdin et al., 1976).

There appears to be a relationship between muscle fibre composition and both the total LDH activity and LDH isozyme distribution. Slow twitch muscle fibres have a relative H -LDH activity (Sjödin et al., 1976), while FT fibres have almost three times as much M-LDH activity (Sjödin et al.,1976). Graham (1978) hypothesized that FT fibres would also be more likely to become hypoxic because they have lower values for capillary-fibre ratio, mitochondrial concentration and a lower rate of oxidative metabolism. This is in agreement with the finding that LA concentration is higher in FT fibres following intense dynamic exercise (Tesch, Sjödin \& Karlson, 1978). Similarly, Bonen, Campbell, Kirby and Belcastro (1978) found a moderate but significant relationship ( $r=0.54$ ) between ST fibres and the rate of LA removal after heavy exercise. They suggested that FT fibres tend to produce LA, while ST fibres continuously extract and oxidize LA from the blood and from FT fibres. In addition, Graham (1978) found an inverse relationship between the percentage of $5 T$ fibres and the $L A$ concentration gradient
between muscle and blood. Although the blood LA concentrations were similar, the muscle LA concentration in FT fibres was three times as high as that found in ST fibres. The explanation for this was that FT fibres have a greater rate of LA production and/or a lower rate of LA release.

During the various phases of progressive exercise, there appears to be a preferential recruitment of specific fibre types (Burke, 1980). Based on studies of glycogen depletion in muscle fibres, (Éssen, 1978a \& b) found a greater loss of glycogen in ST fibres at intensities of 30 to $85 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$. As the duration or intensity of work increased, more FT fibres were recruited. Éssen (1978a) also found that FT oxidative fibres were recruited before FT glycolytic fibres. Athough patterns of glycogen depletion do yield information about muscle fibre recruitment, they are not necessarily indicative of the extent to which the different fibres have been active, since muscle glycogen is not the only substrate used to produce energy (i.e., fat and glucose can also be used).

Summarizing these findings, it would appear that the initial alterations in the ventilatory and blood LA response are associated with tissue hypoxia, and that the term AT is adequate to represent these changes. The onset of the rapid rise in blood LA and the point of break-away $V E$ appear to be related more to anaerobiosis and tissue hypoxia due to the recruitment of the more glycolytic FT fibres, with their predisposition for hypoxia, and a possible reduction of the mitochondrial oxidative potential.

## Factors Influencing the Determination of Anaerobic Threshold

During a progressive work test, AT has usually been determined by using non-invasive measurement techniques, e.g., a non-linear increase in VE and $\mathrm{VCO}_{2}$, an increase in end-tidal $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ tension without a corresponding decrease in end-tidal $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ tension, and an increase in RER (Wasserman et al., 1973). Davis et al. (1976) found a reliability coefficient of 0.95 between the AT determined from these gas exchange variables and AT determined from repeated serial venous LA samples. They also reported a test-retest correlation coefficient of 0.72 for AT determinations from gas exchange alterations. Subsequently, Davis et al. (1979) reported a test-retest reliability coefficient of 0.95 for AT determined from an increase in the ventilatory equivalent for $\mathrm{O}_{2}\left(\mathrm{VE} \cdot \mathrm{VO}_{2}^{-1}\right)$ without an increase in the ventilatory equivalent for $\mathrm{CO}_{2}\left(\mathrm{VE} \cdot \mathrm{VCO}_{2}^{-1}\right)$. Although the use of only one or two criteria measures may provide a more reliable non-invasive estimate of AT , the sensitivity of a ratio measure (such as $\mathrm{VE} \cdot \mathrm{VO}_{2}{ }^{-1}$ ) has been questioned. For example, Davis et al. (1979) suggested that differences occuring in the absolute change of two measures (e.g., $\overline{V E}$ and $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ ) are not necessarily reflected by the same change in the ratio of these variables (e.g., $\mathrm{VE} \cdot \mathrm{VO}_{2}{ }^{-1}$ ). It is possible, therefore, that a greater change in VE is required to detect a change in the $\mathrm{VE} \cdot \mathrm{VO}_{2}{ }^{-1}$ as an estimate of AT , if the ventilatory response alone was examined relative to the changing $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$.

Anaerobic threshold determinations have generally been based on direct LA measures (Kindermann et al.,1979; Stegmann et al.,1981). Although mean LA concentrations at AT approximate $4 \mathrm{mMol} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1}$, Stegmann et al. (1981),
have emphasized the need for the evaluation of AT based on individual blood LA kinetics. Individual differences associated with diet (lvy et al., 1980), alterations in the time course between muscle LA production and release (Graham, 1978), intracellular and extracellular buffering capacity (Stamford et al., 1981), the dissociation of pH and LA ion muscle efflux rates (Jones, 1980), as well as LDH isozyme patterns (Sjödin, 1976) may all influence blood LA values. Therefore, the assignment of absolute or arbitrary levels (as used by Sjödin \& Jacobs, 1981) is of little value as a criterion of equal metabolic stress among all individuals ( $\AA$ istrand, 1984).

Wasserman et al. (1973) and Stamford, Weltman, Moffat and Sandy (1978) suggested that POs of at least 2 to 3 minutes duration were necessary for the accurate determination of AT. Due to the delay in diffusion of LA from muscle to blood, shorter PO durations are likely to result in overestimates, that is, the subject will be exercising at a higher intensity of and will have a higher $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ before the blood LA rises due to conditions produced during the previous PO .

Davis et al. (1976) measured LA and various gas exchange variables during arm cranking, as well as, during leg exercise on a cycle ergometer and treadmill. There were no individual differences between leg cycling and treadmill walking when the respective AT values were expressed relative to the $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max ( $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max) obtained with the same exercise test. SignificatIy lower values for $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and relative AT were found for arm cranking. The authors speculated that these lower values were due to the smaller muscle mass of the arms, to little or no experience with arm cranking so that the arms were less trained, to differences in ST and FT muscle fibre
distribution between arms and legs, or to a lack of uniform motor unit recruitment in arm work. Likewise, Stamford et al. (1978) hypothesized that nonfamiliarity could have produced different patterns of motor fibre recruitment. On the other hand, they did not feel that the size of the total muscle mass involved was important since no difference in relative AT values were found during cycling with one or two legs. Withers, Sherman, Miller and Costill (1981) have reported that there is a specificity for relative AT values depending on the mode of testing.

There is little information in the literature on the influence of the type of exercise on AT. Kindermann et al. (1979) have reported, however, that well-trained cross-country skiers were able to exercise at a given intensity for a longer period of time during roller-ski training than during treadmill running. This difference was attributed to the greater muscle mass involved (arms and legs), to the possibility of training specificity since the skiers trained both arms and legs.

Substrate availability also appears to influence the AT. For example, when high levels of blood glucose were present, lyy et al. (1980) found AT values similar to those found under control conditions. When they elevated blood FFA levels, however, there was a significant rise in relative AT and a reduction in blood LA at AT. Since FFA oxidation inhibits glycolysis (Issekutz et al., 1976), an artificial increase in blood FFA concentrations should produce a greater muscle to blood concentration gradient and a greater inhibition of carbohydrate metabolism at the same PO. As a result, blood LA values should be reduced and AT could occur at a higher PO.

Muscle fibre composition, LDH isozyme patterns and endurance training may effect AT determinations. Ivy et al. (1980) reported that AT was related both to the relative distribution of ST fibres and to oxidative potential of muscle. Therefore, the high relative AT values reported for well-trained endurance athletes (Costill, 1970; Withers et al., 1981) may result both from a high percentage of ST fibres (Bergh, Thorstensson, Sjödin, Holten, Piehl \& Karlsson, 1978; Costill et al. 1976a and b; Golnick et al., 1972; Saltin et al.,1977) and from a greater muscle oxidative potential, as reflected by high succinate dehydrogenase (SDH) activity (Costill, Daniels, Evans, Fink, Krahenbuhl \& Saltin, 1976 and b; Gollnick et al., 1972; Saltin et al., 1977).

Endurance training may also influence the LDH isozyme pattern of the muscle fibres. For example, Sjödin et al. (1976) found a decrease in total LDH activity with training, as well as, a shift towards the H-LDH isozyme, while, the relative activity of the H -LDH isozyme increased in both ST and FT fibres. A preferential H-LDH isozyme pattern may result in a slower LA production (Sjödin et al., 1976), suggesting that AT could occur at higher relative intensity in trained athletes than in untrained persons. A possible explanation for the fact that endurance athletes may have higher values for AT is that these athletes generally have a lower ventilatory response to similar levels of alveolar $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ pressure (Stegmann et al., 1981). Since many determinations of AT are based on alterations in VE and $\mathrm{VCO}_{2}$, this reduced sensitivity of the peripheral and central chemoreceptors to $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ might decrease the magnitude of these changes (Stegmann et al., 1981).

The amount and intensity of training necessary to produce changes in AT are not known. Williams et al. (1976) reported a $16 \%$ increase in AT following 4 to 16 weeks of daily training sessions lasting up to 4 hours. This increase was greater than and independent of the mean rise in $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max of 7\%. Similarly, Davis et al. (1979) reported that relative AT values increased from $49 \%$ to $57 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max following a 9 -week exercise program consisting of four 45-minute sessions per week at an intensity of 75-85\% $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max. In contrast, McLellen and Skinner (1981), found no change in relative AT after 8 weeks of endurance training, 3 times per week with 30 to 45 minutes of each session at about 60 to $658 \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max.

In summary, it is apparent that several factors may influence relative AT values. For example, reliable and sensitive non-invasive estimates should be provided by examining the change in the ventilatory response to the progressively increasing $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ with POs of approximately 2 to 3 minutes duration. The pattern of change in the LA response appears to be more useful than assigning absolute LA values to represent each AT. Further, the mode of testing should be specific to allow for a valid cross-sectional or longitudinal comparison of the effects of training on relative AT values.

## Effects of Selected Training Protocols

## Interval Training

After the development of non-invasive techniques to determine AT, several studies have investigated specific training methods and their effects on the AT. The most commonly investigated training technique is interval training.

Rivera, Metz and Robertson (1980) measured ${\forall 0_{2}}_{2}$ max, maximal LA capacity and performance of athletes during 100 -meter and 400-meter timed swims. Twenty-four swimmers, 12 to 19 years of age, were tested before and after 6 weeks of high intensity interval training. The subjects were randomly assigned to one of two training groups. One group trained at $85 \%$ of its best performance time and a second group at their AT. Both groups had significant gains in $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$, and maximal LA capacity. Both groups improved performance levels, with the AT training group improving at a faster rate. These data support the theory that AT training enhances the efficiency of aerobic and anaerobic metabolic systems and that AT is influenced by swim training. The results of this study indicate that high intensity training has a profound effect on metabolic responses; however, training at AT was equally or more effective with regards to performance.

In another study, Cunningham \& Faulkner (1969) investigated aerobic and anaerobic metabolism during a short exhaustive treadmill run. Eight males served as subjects for the 6 week training program. The training program consisted of interval sprints of 220 yards and distance runs of two miles. The short exhaustive runs were performed on a treadmill at a speed of 8 miles per hour at a grade of 208 . Run times ranged from 36 to 66
seconds. The training program resulted in a 238 increase in run time for the short exhaustive run, a $9 \$$ increase in oxygen debt, and a $17 \%$ increase in blood LA concentration. The authors hypothesized that these parameters indicated an increase in the amount of adenosine triphosphate (ATP) produced by oxidative phosphorylation, by glycolysis and from creatine phosphate (CP) during the short exhaustive run.

## Endurance Training

Still other investigators have examined the effects of endurance training on AT. Kinderman et al. (1979) determined AT as identified by 4 mMol $\cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1}$ of LA ; and measured $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max in seven cross-country skiers of national skill level. All subjects ran on a treadmill for at least 30 minutes at constant running speeds while maintaining constant HRs. During the exercise, performed with a constant speed, LA concentration initially rose to values of nearly $4 \mathrm{mMol} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1}$ and then remained essentially constant during the remainder of the exercise. This research was done to show that workload intensities above the AT can be maintained, with slightly elevated LA levels, for prolonged periods of time. The results of this investigation demonstrated that endurance training done with an intensity leading to LA levels in the range of $4 \mathrm{mMol} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1}$ can be maintained for 45 to 60 minutes or even longer. The study also led to the conclusion that endurance training will maintain a particular level of conditioning when performed in the range of the AT and that it will increase exercise capacity when performed in the range of Aer-AT. Davis et al. (1979) attemped to evaluate the relative
alterations in $A T$ and $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max after 9 weeks of endurance training in healthy middle-aged males. The training program consisted of exercise on a stationary cycle ergometer five days per week for 45 minutes per exercise session. For the first four weeks of training, the subjects exercised at a target HR designed to correspond to a $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ of $50 \%$ of the difference between their $\mathrm{AT}, \vee \mathrm{O}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max. For the last five weeks of training, this value Was increased to $70 \$$ of the difference between their $\mathrm{AT}, \mathrm{VO}_{2}$, and $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max. The major finding of this study was that AT level, expressed as an absolute $\cup \mathrm{O}_{2}$ and as a fraction of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$, increased significantly after endurance training. This study demonstrated that AT is profoundly influenced by endurance training in middle-aged males.

Robinson and Sucec (1980) investigated the effect of training intensity of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, AT , and endurance performance as measured by a 15-minute run. The subjects were 21 healthy active males, with a mean age of 22.3 years, who were divided into three groups and tested prior to and following a twelve-week training program. One group trsined by running continuously for 30 minutes at $85 \%$ of their $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max. Another group trained by running intervals at a work to rest ratio of 1 to 3 for 30 minutes; a third group served as a control group with average activity patterns. The data indicated that both moderate and intensive training programs increased AT as well as endurance performance. The data also demonstrated that AT changes are more closely related to endurance performance changes than $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max changes.

## Summary

Quantities of LA form when muscles are activated by anaerobic metabolism processes. Formation of this LA during exercise permits oxidation to proceed anaerobically and accounts for most of the oxygen debt which accumulates during strenuous exercise. Therefore, measurement of blood LA level has traditionally been used as an indicator of anaerobic metabolism. Because the measurement of LA levels in the past required invasive techniques (specifically, blood sampling), precise research concerning AT has been limited. The development of noninvasive techniques, specifically measurement of respiratory gas exchange ratios, has immensely simplified the reresearch procedures in this area.

Researchers have investigated the effects of various types of exercise on AT. Their findings have indicated that AT will significantly improve using an interval training (IT) exercise mode. Still other researchers have investigated the effects of endurance training on AT. Their conclusions have been that endurance training will either maintain present AT or, in some cases, increase AT.

There is a need for specific research as to the efficiency of various training intensity levels and the effects that these intensity levels have on AT. There is also a need for investigations involving rowers as subjects since most of the studies have involved other athlete groups.

## Chapter 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

## Research Design

An individual case study approach was employed to investigate the effect of an 8 week endurance training period on the aerobic power and the anaerobic threshold of male rowers.

## The Subjects

The subjects in this study were 7 male volunteers ranging in age from 15 to 29 years, all members of the Thunder Bay Rowing Club. The calibre of the subjects is such that they have competed at both provincial and national championships (see Table 1).

## Investigative Period

The investigative period for this study was 8 weeks, commencing on April 2, 1964 and terminating May 28, 1984.

## Training Schedule

The investigative period consisted of three training sessions per week, each session lasting 50 to 60 minutes. The training was carried out on rowing ergometers (Concept II).

Table 1
Chargcteristics of Subjects

| Subject | Calibre | Age <br> $(\mathrm{Yr})$ | Height <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Weight <br> $(\mathrm{Kg})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. B.B. | National | 29 | 177.0 | 75.0 |
| 2. G.F. | Provincial | 15 | 177.0 | 78.0 |
| 3. T.H. | National | Provincial | 27 | 178.0 |

## Training Programs

The training programs were designed for each individual subject. Decisions regarding training intensity were made based on each subject's AT, $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$, workload and $H R$, which have been obtained during the pre-training investigative period. The level of intensity of continuous endurance training (CET) was a percentage below the subject's AT and the level of intensity of interval training (IT) was a percentage above the subject's AT (see Table 2). The intensity of training was monitored through the subject's HR (see APpendix B).

Table 2

The intensity, Frequency and Duration of the Eight-Week Continuous and Interval Rowing Ergometer Trsining Program.

## Training Mode

Continuous Training Interval Training

Intensity $\quad \mathrm{AT}-10 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2} \max \quad$ LOW: AT $+10 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$

High: AT+ 15 to 25 罗 $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ ma\%
Frequency $\quad 3$. week ${ }^{-1}$

Duration
50 to 60 Minutes $^{5}$ session ${ }^{-1}$

## Testing Schedule

Each of the subjects visited the Human Performance Laboratory at Lakehead University, on three separate occasions: Orientation session, pre-training test and post-training test. The subjects were tested at the same time and day of the week to avoid diurnal effects. During the orientation session, the subjects were familiarized with the testing environment, equipment and procedures.

## Pre- and Post-Training Test Procedures

During the pre- and post-training test, the subjects reported to the laboratory in a post-absorptive state for the performance of an incremental rowing ergometer work test, carried out until the subject reached a state of exhaustion. The subjects were instructed to avoid any vigorous activity 36 hours prior to the testing day. Upon arrival at the laboratory, each subject had his age, weight and height recorded. A balance scale (Continental Scale, Bridgeview, lllinois) was used to measure the subject's weight to the nearest one-tenth of a kilogram and height to the nearest .5 centimeter.

## Measuring $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$

To determine each subject's $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, a Gjessing rowing ergometer was used, increasing the subject's workload progressively until he reached the point of exhaustion. The subject began to row at a stroke rate of 27 to 32 strokes per minute, while maintaining the ergometer's flywheel at 600 revolutions per minute. The initial workload was 1.5 Kp and it was increased
by 25 Kp every two minutes until a workload of 3.0 Kp was attained. After this point, the workload was increased by .50 Kp to a maximum of 3.75 Kp , whereupon the subject was encouraged to increase maximally the stroke rate and the revolutions per minute until $\mathrm{V}_{2}$ max criterio were observed.

## Gas Analysis

Expired air samples were collected continuously and analyzed every 15 seconds, using a pre-calibrated, computerized Beckman Metabolic Measurement Cart (MMC Horizon II system). Along with the continuous presentation of time, $\mathrm{VO}_{2}, \mathrm{VE}, \mathrm{RER}$ and $H R$ were displayed every 15 seconds on the system's yisual readout screen. As well, the values for $\mathcal{V E}, \forall E O_{2}, \forall E C O_{2}, \forall O_{2}, \forall O_{2} \cdot \mathrm{Kg} \cdot \mathrm{min}{ }^{-1}$, $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}, \mathrm{FECO}_{2}, \mathrm{HR}$, workoad and time were printed every 15 seconds until the test was completed.

## Criteria for Attaining $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max

1. As the workload increases the subject's $V 0_{2}$ reaches a plateau or begins to decrease.
2. The RER value should be greater than 1.10.
3. The observed $H R$ should be close to the subject's personal maximum or to the anticipated age maximum.
4. The subject becomes volitionally exhausted.

## Heart Rate

Heart rate was monitored continuously with a 3 -lead (Campbridge, VS4 model) electrocardiograph, integrated via digital analog to the Beckman MMC system.

## Power Output

A mechanical counter as well as an electronic, computerized counter, connected to the ergometer's flywheel registered and recorded the number of revolutions of the flywheel. A television monitor connected to the electronic counter, provided visual feedback to the subject by displaying the number of revolutions recorded after each 30 -second interval, as well as after each one-minute interval. This was done in order to control the subject's power output. Upon completion of the test each subject's results (number of revolutions after all 30 -second and one-minute intervals, as well as the number of revolutions accumulated during the entire test) was printed out by the computer.

## Stroke Rate

The stroke rate was monitored every 30 seconds via a specialized (Herwins, Swiss) rowing stroke rate stopwatch. Each minute, feedback was given to the subject in order to control his stroke rate during the test.

## Determination of the Anaerobic Threshold

The ventilatory equivalent for $\mathrm{O}_{2}\left(\mathrm{VE} \cdot \mathrm{VO}_{2}{ }^{-1}\right), \mathrm{CO}_{2}\left(\mathrm{VE} \cdot \vee \mathrm{VO}_{2}{ }^{-1}\right)$, as well as $\mathrm{VE}, \mathrm{VO}_{2}, \mathrm{YCO}_{2}, \mathrm{FEO}_{2}, \mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ and workload, were plotted against time (in 30 -second intervals) until $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was reached. Two criteria were used to locate each subject's AT: an incresse in the VE $\cup \mathrm{VO}_{2}^{-1}$ without an increase in $\mathrm{VE} \cdot \mathrm{VCO}_{2}{ }^{-1}$ and an increase in $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ without a decrease in $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$. These are identical criteria to those recommended by Davis et al. (1979) who's findings reported a correlation coefficient of 0.95 . In this study, test-retest reliability of seven AT rowing tests, determined by averaging the analyses of 2 separate investigators using the above criteria (3 analyses per investigator), yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.97 .

## Data Analysis

Each subject's pre-training and post-training test results were presented in tables and graphs. Also, the improvement (or lack thereof) of each subject's $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and AT was recorded. Since this is a descriptive study, no statistical analysis was done.

## Chapter 4

## RESULTS

The general characteristics of each subject are presented in Table 1. The results of pre-training (pre-t) and post-training (post-t) tests for individual subjects are presented in Tables 3 to 9, as well as graphical representations of the pre-t and post-t tests' alterations in gas exchange responses are presented in Figures 1 to 7.

## Subject 1 (S1)

The results of S 1 are shown in Table 3 and Figure 1.
The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by $21.6 \%$, from 4.030 to $4.900 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$. The relative value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by $26.4 \%$, from 52.2 to $66.0 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$.

The total test time, or the time to reach $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was 13 minutes ( min ) and 30 seconds (sec) during the pre-t test and 17 min during the post-t test, the time increase was $25.9 \%$.

The maximum (max) workload was 3.00 Kp during the pre-t while the post-t test max workload increased to 3.50 Kp , the percentage change was $16.7 \%$.

The total power output (P0) was increased by 41.7 from the pre-t test and post-t P0 totals of $18,192 \mathrm{kpm}$ and $25,779 \mathrm{kpm}$, respectively.

The maximum heart rate (HR max) decreased by 1.18, from 187 to 185 beats $\mathrm{min}^{-1}(\mathrm{bpm})$ during the post- t test.

The average stroke rates of the pre-t and post-t tests were 29 and 27 strokes $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ (spm), respectively, the percentage decrease was 6.9 F .

The AT percent of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased from $77.8 \$$ to 85.18 following the training program, the percent incresse was 9.4\%.

The time taken to reach AT was 5 min during the pre-t test and 11 min 30 sec during the post-t test, the improvement rate was $130 \%$.

The workloads at AT in the pre-t and the post-t tests were 2.00 Kp and 2.75 kp , respectively, the percentage increase was $37.5 \%$.

The P0 at AT was $5,212 \mathrm{Kpm}$ during the pre-t test and $14,888 \mathrm{kpm}$ during the post-t, the percentage increase was 186\%.

The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $3.136 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $4.171 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage increase was $33.0 \%$.

The body weight adjusted value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $42.0 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1}$. $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $51.6 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \min ^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage improvement was $34.8 \%$.

The HRs at AT were 161 and 172 bpm for the pre-t and post-t tests, respectively, the HR at AT was increased by $6.8 \%$.

Table 3
Fre- and Fost-Training Test Results of Subject 1

| Variables | Pre-Training Test | Post-Training Test | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Test Time (min:sec) | 13:30 | 17:00 | $25.9 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Workload ( Kp ) | 3.00 | 3.50 | 16.7 † |
| Total Power Output (Kpm) | 18,192 | 25,779 | 41.7 † |
| Average Stroke Rate ( $\mathrm{stks} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 29 | 27 | $6.9 \downarrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 4.030 | 4.900 | 21.6 † |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 52.2 | 66.0 | 26.4 ヶ |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 167 | 185 | 1.1 $\downarrow$ |
| AT 8 of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ | 77.8 | 85.1 | $9.4 \uparrow$ |
| Time at AT | 5:00 | 11:30 | $130 \uparrow$ |
| Workload at AT | 2.00 | 2.75 | 37.5 ¢ |
| Power Output at AT | 5,212 | 14,888 | 186 † |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} L \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ ot $A T$ | 3.136 | 4.171 | $33.0 \uparrow$ |
| V0, $\mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{mi} \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 42.0 | 56.6 | $34.8 \uparrow$ |
| Heart Rate at AT | 161 | 172 | $6.6 \uparrow$ |

$\uparrow$ : Incresse
$\downarrow$ : Decrease
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Figure 1: Representative plots of ventilation and respiratory gas exchange responses during an incremental rowing ergometer Pre-Training and Post-Training tests. The Ar occurs at the time period represented by the two ventical lines.

## Subject $2(52)$

The results of 52 are shown in Table 4 and Figure 2.
The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by $22.9 \%$, from 4.010 to $4.929 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$. The relative value of $\mathrm{yO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$, was increased by 15.48 , from 53.3 to $61.5 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$.

The total test time, or the time to reach $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was 11 min 30 sec during the pre-t test and 14 min during the post-t test, the time increase was 21.78.

The max workload was 2.75 Kp during the pre-t while the post-t test max workload increased to 3.00 Kp , the percentage change was $9.1 \%$.

The total PO was increased by $26.3 \%$ from the pre-t test and the post-t PO totals of $14,284 \mathrm{kpm}$ and $18,037 \mathrm{Kpm}$, respectively.

The HR max decreased by 2.0\%, from 202 to 198 bpm during the post-t test.

The average stroke rates of the pre-t and the post-t tests were 30 and 28 spm , respectively, the percentage decrease was $6.7 \%$.

The AT percent of $\mathrm{V}_{2}$ max was decreased from 84.0 名 to 80.59 following the training program, the percent decrease was 4.28 .

The time taken to reach AT was 4 min during the pre-t test and 9 min and 30 sec during the post-t test, there was a time improvement of $137.5 \%$.

The workloads at AT in the pre-t and the post-t tests were 1.75 kp and 2.50 Kp, respectively, the workload was increased ty 42.98.

The FO at AT was $3,932 \mathrm{Kpm}$ during the pre-t test and $10,535 \mathrm{Kpm}$ during the post-t test, the improvement rate was $168 \%$.

The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $3.395 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $3.969 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post- t test, the percentage increase was $16.9 \%$.

The body weight adjusted value of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max$ at AT was $45.2 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1}$. $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ during the pre- t test and $52.5 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage improvement was $16.2 \%$.

The HRs at AT were 177 and 180 bpm for the pre-t and post-t tests, respectively, the $H R$ at $A T$ was increased by $1.7 \%$.

## Subject 3 ( 53 )

The results of 53 are shown in Table 5 and Figure 3.
The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by 15.4 , from 4.513 to $5.270 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$. The relative value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ was increased by $11.0 \%$, from 60.0 to $66.6 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$.

The total test time, or the time to reach $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was 14 min during the pre-t test and 18 min during the post-t test, the time increase was 28.6\%.

The pre-t test max workload was 3.00 Kp , while the post-t test max workload was increased to 3.75 Kp , the percentage change was $25.0 \%$.

The total PO was increased by $22.6 \%$ from the pre-t test and post-t test totals of $18,962 \mathrm{kpm}$ and $23,247 \mathrm{Kpm}$, respectively.

The HR max decreased by $1.6 \%$, from 189 ta 186 bpm during the post-t test.

The average stroke rate during the pre-t and post-t tests were 28 and 29 spm , respectively, the percentage increase was $3.6 \%$.

The AT percent of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased from 74.3 S to 82.1 P following the training program, the percent increase was $10.5 \%$.

The time taken to reach AT was 6 min and 15 sec during the pre-t test and 10 min and 15 sec during the post-t test, there was an improvement of 64.0\%.

The workload at AT in the pre-t and post-t tests were 2.25 kp and 2.75 $K p$, respectively, the percent increase was $22.2 \%$.

The PO at AT was $6,662 \mathrm{Kpm}$ during the pre-t test and $12,052 \mathrm{Kpm}$ during the post-t, the P0 was increased by $80.9 \%$.

The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $3.355 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $4.327 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t, the percent increase was


The body adjusted value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $44.6 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $54.7 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage improvement was $22.6 \%$.

The HRs at AT were 163 and 164 bpm for the pre-t and post-t tests, respectively, the $H R$ at $A T$ was increased by 0.6 .

## Subject 4 (S4)

The results of 54 are shown in Table 6 and Figure 4.
The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by $7.6 \%$, from 3.797 to $4.066 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$. The relative value of ${\gamma 0_{2}}$ max was increased by $4.2 \%$ from 61.6 to $64.2 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$

The total test time, or the time to reach $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was 11 min during the pre-t test and 13 min during the post-t test, the time increase was $16.2 \%$

The max workload was 2.75 Kp during the pre-t test, while the max worklosd during the post-t test increased to 3.00 Kp , the percent increase was 9.1 .

The total P0 was increased by 22.98 from the pre-t test and post-t test totals of $14,319 \mathrm{kpm}$ and $17,602 \mathrm{kpm}$, respectively.

The HR max decreased by 0.5 思, from 215 to 214 bpm during the post-t test.

The average stroke rate of the pre-t and post-t tests were 30 and 29 spm, respectively, the percentage decrease was $3.3 \notin$

The AT percent of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased from $86.8 \%$ to $88.8 \%$ following the training program, the percent increase was $2.3 \%$.

The time taken to reach AT was 4 min during the pre-t test and 5 min and 15 sec during the post-t test, the time was increased by $58.3 \%$.

The workloads at AT in the pre-t and the post-t test, were 2.00 kp and 2.50 kp , respectively, the workload was increased by $25.0 \%$.

The PO at AT was $3,948 \mathrm{Kpm}$ during the pre-t test and $9,322 \mathrm{Kpm}$ during the post-t test, the PO was increased by 136.1䍐.

The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $3.330 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $3.813 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage increase Was 14.5\%.

The body weight adjusted value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $54.0 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1}$. $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $59.9 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage increase was $10.9 \%$.

The HRs at AT were 202 and 203 bpm for the pre-t and post-t tests, respectively, the HR at. at was increased by $0.5 \%$.

Table 4
Pre- and Fost-Training Test Results of Subject 2

| Variables Pr | Pre-Training Test | Post-Training Test | S Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Test Time (min:sec) | 11:30 | 14:00 | 21.7 † |
| Maximum Workload ( Kp ) | 2.75 | 3.00 | $9.1 \uparrow$ |
| Total Power Output (Kpm) | 14,284 | 18,037 | $26.3 \uparrow$ |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 1) 30 | 28 | $6.7 \downarrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max L \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 4.010 | 4.929 | 22.9 ¢ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 53.3 | 61.5 | 15.4 ¢ |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 202 | 198 | $2.0 \uparrow$ |
| AT \% of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ | 84.0 | 80.5 | $4.2+$ |
| Time at AT | 4.00 | 9.30 | $137.5 \uparrow$ |
| Workload at AT | 1.75 | 2.50 | $42.9 \uparrow$ |
| Power Output ot AT | 3,932 | 10,535 | 168 † |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.395 | 3.969 | $16.9 \uparrow$ |
| $\%_{2} \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 45.2 | 52.5 | 16.2 † |
| Heart Rate at AT | 177 | 180 | $1.7 \downarrow$ |
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Figure 2: Representative plots of ventilation and respiratory gas exchange responses during an incremental rowing ergometer Pre-Training and Post-Training tests. The AT occurs at the time period represented by the two vertical lines.

Table 5
Pre- and Post-Training Test Results of Subject 3

| Variables | Pre-Training Test | Post-Training Test | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Test Time (min:sec) | 14:00 | 18:00 | $28.6 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Workload (K.p) | 3.00 | 3.75 | $25.0 \uparrow$ |
| Total Power Output (Kpm) | 18,962 | 23,247 | 22.6 + |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 28 | 29 | $3.6 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max L \cdot \min ^{-1}$ | 4.513 | 5.207 | $15.4 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 60.0 | 66.6 | $11.0 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts.min ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 189 | 186 | $1.6 \downarrow$ |
| AT 8 of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max | 74.3 | 82.1 | $10.5 \uparrow$ |
| Time at AT | 6:15 | 10:15 | 64.0 † |
| Workload at AT | 2.25 | 2.75 | $22.2 \uparrow$ |
| Power Output at AT | 6,662 | 12,052 | $80.9 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.355 | 4.327 | $29.0 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 44.6 | 54.7 | $22.6 \uparrow$ |
| Heart Rote at AT | 163 | 164 | $0.6+$ |

$t$ : Increase
4 : Decrease
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Figure 3: Representative plots of ventilation and respiratory gas exchange responses during an incremental rowing ergometer Pre-Training and Post-Training tests. The AT occurs at the time period represented by the two vertical lines.

Table 6 Pre- and Post-Training Test Results of Subject 4

| Variables | Pre-Training Test | Post-Training Test | \$ Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Test Time (min:sec) | 11:00 | 13:00 | $18.2 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Workload (Kp) | 2.75 | 3.00 | $9.1 \uparrow$ |
| Total Power Output (kpm) | 14,319 | 17,602 | 22.9 † |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 30 | 29 | $3.3 \downarrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max L \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 3.797 | 4.086 | $7.6 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 61.6 | 64.2 | 4.2 † |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 215 | 214 | $0.5 \downarrow$ |
| AT $\%$ of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max | 86.8 | 88.8 | $2.3 \uparrow$ |
| Time at AT | 5:15 | 8:15 | 57.1 † |
| Workload at AT | 2.00 | 2.50 | $25.0 \uparrow$ |
| Power Output st AT | 3,948 | 9,322 | 136.1 † |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.330 | 3.813 | $14.5 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ st AT | 54.0 | 59.9 | $10.9 \uparrow$ |
| Heart Rate at AT | 202 | 203 | $0.5 \uparrow$ |

$\uparrow$ : Increase, $\downarrow$ : Decreãe.
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Figure 4: Representative plots of ventilation and respiratory gas exchange responses during an incremental rowing ergometer Pre-Training and Post-Training tests. The AT occurs at the time period represented by the two vertical lines

## Subject 5 (S5)

The results of S 5 are shown in Table 7 and Figure 5.
The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by $4.6 \%$, from 4.990 to $5.221 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$. The relative value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by $7.4 \%$, from 64.7 to $69.5 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$.

The total test time, or the time to reach $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, was 10 min during the pre-t test and 14 min during the post-t test, the time increase was $40 \%$.

The max workload was 2.50 Kp during the pre-t, while the post-t test max workload increased to 3.00 Kp , the percentage change was $20.0 \%$.

The total PO increased by $53.8 \%$ from the pre-t test and post-t test totals of $12,486 \mathrm{kpm}$ and $19,210 \mathrm{Kpm}$, respectively.

The HR max increased by 3.6 , from 196 to 203 bpm during the post-t test.

The average strokes rate during the pre-t and post-t tests were 29 and 28 spm , respectively, the percentage decrease was $3.4 \%$.

The AT percent of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased from 64.98 to 69.59 following the training program, the percentage increase was $7.4 \%$.

The time taken to reach AT was 5 min and 30 sec during the pre-t test and 8 min and 30 sec during the post-t test, the time was increase by $56.6 \%$.

The workloads at AT during the pre-t and post-t tests, were 2.00 kp and 2.50 Kp , respectively, the workloadat AT was increase by 25.0 .

The PD at AT was $5,338 \mathrm{kpm}$ during the pre-t test and $9,526 \mathrm{kpm}$ during the post-t test, the percentage increase was $76.5 \%$.

The sbsolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $3.906 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the pre- t test and $4.239 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage improvement was $8.5 \%$.

The body weight adjusted value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $50.6 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1}$. $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $56.4 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage increase was $11.5 \%$.

The HRs at AT were 180 and 188 bpm for the pre- t and post- t tests, respectively, the $H R$ was increased by $4.4 \%$.

## Subject $\epsilon$ (S6)

The results of 56 are shown in Table 8 and Figure 6.
The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by $2.0 \%$, from 4.917 to $5.013 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$. The relative value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by $4.3 \%$, from $53.9 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{kg} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ to $56.2 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$.

The total test time, or the time to reach $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was 14 min during the pre-t test and 16 min during the post-t test, the time was increased by $14.3 \%$.

The max workload was 3.00 Kp during the pre-t-test, while the post-t test max workload increased to 3.50 Kp , the percentage change was $16.7 \%$.

The total PO increased by 20.90 from the pre-t test and post-t test totals of $18,505 \mathrm{kpm}$ and $22,367 \mathrm{kpm}$, respectively.

The HR max decreased by 5.0\%, from 198 to 168 bpm during the post-t test.

The average stroke rates of the pre-t and post-t tests were 29 and 27 spm, respectively, a stroke rate decrease of 6.9 P .

The AT percent of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased from $76.7 \%$ to 89.28 following the training program, the percentage increase was $16.3 \%$.

The time taken to reach AT was 6 min during the pre-t test and 9 min and 15 sec during the post-t test, the time was increased by $54.2 \%$.

The workload at AT was 2.00 Kp during the pre-t test and 2.50 Kp during the post-t test, respectively, the workload was increased by $25.0 \%$.

The PO at AT was $6,340 \mathrm{Kpm}$ during the pre-t test and $10,825 \mathrm{kpm}$ during the post-t test, the increased rate was $70.7 \%$.

The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $3.775 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $4.471 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage increase was 18.48.

The body weight adjusted value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max at AT was $45.2 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1}$. $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $50.1 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage improvement was 21.0 F .

The HRs at AT were 173 and 175 bpm for the pre-t and post-t tests, respectively, the HR at AT was increased by $1.2 \%$.

## Subject 7 (S7)

The results of 57 are shown in Table 9 and Figure 7.
The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased by $5.9 \%$, from 6.287 L . $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ to $6.658 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$. The relative value of $\mathrm{V}_{2}$ max was increased by $7.0 \%$, from $70.4 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{kg} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ to $75.3 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$.

The total test time, or the time to reach $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was 17 min during the pre-t test, and 19 min during the post-t test, the time increase was $11.8 \%$.

The max workload of 3.75 Kp was the same in both pre-t and post-t tests.

The total P0 was increased by 16.38 from the pre-t test and post-t test $\mathrm{P0}$ totals of $25,474 \mathrm{kpm}$ and $29,627 \mathrm{kpm}$, respectively.

The HR max increased by 1.78 , from 180 to 183 bpm during the post-t test.

The average stroke rates of the pre-t and post-t tests were 29 and 28 spm, respectively, the percentage decrease was 3.48 .

The AT percent of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ mox was increased from 81.3\% to 87.3\% following the training program, the percentage increase was $7.4 \%$.

The time taken to reach AT was 12 min and 30 sec min during the pre-t test and 14 min and 45 sec during the post-t test, the time was increased by 18.0\%

The workloads at AT during the pre-t and the post-t tests, were 3.00 kp and 3.50 kp , respectively, the percentage increase was $16.7 \%$.

The PO at AT was $16,362 \mathrm{kpm}$ during the pre-t test and $22,138 \mathrm{Kpm}$ during the post-t test, the improvement rate was 35.38 .

The absolute value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ at AT was $5.110 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $5.812 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test, the percentage change was $13.7 \%$.

The body weight adjusted value of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ at AT was $57.2 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1}$. $\min ^{-1}$ during the pre-t test and $65.8 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ during the post-t test. a percentage increase of $15.0 \%$.

The HRS at AT were 168 and 174 bpm for the pre-t and post-t tests. respectively, the HR at AT was increased by $3.6 \%$.

Table 7
Pre- and Post-Training Test Results of Subject 5

| Variables | Pre-Training Test | Post-Training Test | 8 Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Test Time (minsec) | 10:00 | 14.00 | $40.0 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Workload ( Kp ) | 2.50 | 3.00 | $20.0 \uparrow$ |
| Total Power Output (Kpm) | 12,486 | 19,210 | $53.8 \uparrow$ |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 29 | 28 | $3.4 \downarrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 4.990 | 5.221 | $4.6 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 64.7 | 69.5 | $7.4 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 196 | 203 | $3.6 \uparrow$ |
| AT S of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max | 78.2 | 81.2 | $3.8 \uparrow$ |
| Time at AT | 5:30 | 8:30 | $56.6 \uparrow$ |
| Workload at AT | 2.00 | 2.50 | $25.0 \uparrow$ |
| Power Output at AT | 5,338 | 9,526 | $78.5 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.906 | 4.239 | $8.5 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 50.6 | 56.4 | $11.5 \uparrow$ |
| Heart Rate at AT | 180 | 188 | $4.4 \uparrow$ |

$t$ : Incresse,

+ Decrease.

SUBJECT 5


Figure 5: Representative plots of ventilation and respiratory gas exchange responses during an incremental rowing ergometer Pre-Training and Post-Training tests. The AT occurs at the time period represented by the two verlical lines.

Table 8
Pre- and Post-Training Test Results of Subject 6

| Yariables | Pre-Training Test | Post-Training Test | S Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Test Time (minsec) | 14.00 | 16:00 | $14.3 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Workload (Kp) | 3.00 | 3.50 | $16.7 \uparrow$ |
| Total Power Output (kpm) | 18,505 | 22,367 | 20.91 |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks min ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 29 | 27 | $6.9+$ |
| $\stackrel{\mathrm{V}}{2} \mathrm{maxL} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ | 4.917 | 5.013 | $2.0 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 53.9 | 56.2 | $4.3 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 198 | 188 | $5.0 \downarrow$ |
| AT $\mathcal{E}$ of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ | 76.7 | 89.2 | $16.3 \uparrow$ |
| Time at AT | 6:00 | 9:15 | $54.2 \uparrow$ |
| Workload at AT | 2.00 | 2.50 | $25.0 \uparrow$ |
| Power Output at AT | 6,340 | 10,825 | 70.7 ¢ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} L \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.775 | 4.471 | $18.4 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 41.4 | 50.1 | $21.0 \uparrow$ |
| Heart Rate at AT | 173 | 175 | $1.2+$ |

$\uparrow$ : Increase, 4 : Decrease.

POST-TRAINING TEST


Figure 6: Representalive plots of ventitation and respiratory gas exchange responses during an incremental rowing ergometer Pre-Training and Post-Training tests The AT occurs at the time period represented by the two vertical lines.

Table 9
Pre- and Post-Training Test Results of Subject 7

| Variables | Pre-Training Test | Post-Training Test | \$ Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Test Time (minssec) | 17:00 | 19.00 | $11.8 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Workload ( Kp ) | 3.75 | 3.75 | $=$ |
| Total Power Output (Kpm) | 25,474 | 29,627 | 16.3 † |
| Aversge Stroke Rate (stks $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | ) 29 | 28 | $3.4 \downarrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 6.287 | 6.658 | $5.9 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 70.4 | 75.3 | $7.0 \uparrow$ |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 180 | 183 | $1.7 \uparrow$ |
| AT \% of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ | 81.3 | 87.3 | 7.4 ¢ |
| Time ot AT | 12:30 | 14.45 | $16.0 \uparrow$ |
| Workload at AT | 3.00 | 3.50 | 16.7 † |
| Power Output at AT | 16,362 | 22,138 | 35.3 † |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 5.110 | 5.812 | 13.7 † |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 57.2 | 65.8 | $15.0 \uparrow$ |
| Heart Rate at AT | 168 | 174 | $3.6 \uparrow$ |
| $\uparrow$ : /ncrease, $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ Decrease, | $=$ : | o change |

PRE-TRAINING TEST POST-TRAINING TEST


Figure 7: Representative plots of ventilation and respiratory gas exchange responses during an incremental rowing ergometer Pre-Training and Post-Training tesis. The AT occurs at the time period represented by the two vertical lines.

## Summary

After the 8 -week training program, improvements were found in the results of the post-t test as compared with the pre-t test results. The following statements apply to all subjects and summarize the data which illustrate this improvement:

The absolute and relative values of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ were increased within the range of 1.88 to 22.98 and $-4.2 \%$ to $16.3 \%$, respectively.

The AT percent of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was increased within the range of -4.28 to16.38. The total test time was increased during the post-t tests within the range of $11.8 \%$ to 40.0 F .

The total PO, as well as, the max workload, were increased during the post-t tests within the range of 16.38 to $53.8 \%$ and 9.18 to $25.0 \%$, respectively. The time, workload and PO at AT were increased during the post-t tests within the ronge of $18.0 \%$ to $137.5 \%, 16.7 \%$ to $42.9 \%$, and $35.3 \%$ to $186 \%$, respectively.

All of the subjects reached AT at higher absolute and relative values of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ during the post-t test, and the improvements were within the range of $8.5 \%$ to $33.0 \%$ and $11.5 \%$ to $34.6 \%$, respectively.

The maximum HRs were increased within the ranges of 1.08 to $3.6 \%$ in 52,55 and 57 , during the post- $t$ test, and were decreased within the range of $1.0 \%$ to 5.0 . in $51,53,54$ and 56.

The HRs at AT were increased during the post-t test within the range of $1.10 \%$ to 6.88 in $51,53,54,55,56$, and 57 , however, in 52 was decreased by $1.7 \%$.

The average stroke rates were decreased during the post-t test within the range of $3.3 \$$ to 6.98 , respectively.

The rowing performance was improved in all subjects following the 8-week training program.

## Chapter 5

## DISCUSSION

Results from cross-sectional and longitudinal studies suggest that endurance training produces changes in $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and AT values, i.e., the AT occurs at a higher percentage of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max following training. For example, Costill (1970) and Costill et al. (1973) reported that well-trained endurance athletes could exercise at 70.8 of $\mathrm{V}_{2}$ max with little or no change in blood LA values. These athletes also were able to maintain, for $30 \mathrm{~min}-$ utes, s running pace which required an energy cost close to $90 \%$ of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max. From this information, AT values for these athletes would appear to approximate $85 . \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max. This value is higher than the normally reported values of 50 to $55 \%$ and 70 to $80 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max for untrained and trained individuals, respectively (Davis et al.,1976; MacDougall,1977). Data from endurance training programs have also indicated improvements in relative AT values. Davis et al. (1979) and Sady et al. (1980) reported that relative AT values increased from $49 \%$ to $57 \% \quad \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max following 6 tolo weeks of training. The findings of this study are in agreement with the previous investigations.

The effects of high-intensity IT on relative AT values are not well documented. Since it has been propased by Skinner and McLellan (1980) that the ventilatory and LA responses during an incremental work test reflect changes in metabolic substrate flux within the muscle fibres that are being recruited, high-intensity IT, which demands fast energy turnaver, should be associated with on enhanced carbohydrate utilization
within specific muscle fibres. For example, Costill et al. (19769) reported that the highest muscle phosphorylase (MP) activity was found among sprint and middle-distance runners who were utilizing high-intensity IT. These enzyme levels were not related to fibre composition and were more than two times greater than the MP activity of endurance athletes. Therefore, high-intensity IT appears to increase an individual's ability to utilize carbohydrate as a fuel substrate. It may also produce a greater glycolytic than oxidative substrate flux. From the results of this study, as well as, from these previous investigations, it is apparent that endurance training increases AT values, whereas the effects of high-intensity IT are essentially unknown.

In this study, the non-invasive technique was used to detect the AT. The test-retest reliability coefficient value of 0.97 for the determination of AT is higher than the value of 0.95 established by Davis et al. (1976) but is comparable to the coefficient volue of 0.96 obtained by Davis et al. (1979). Absolute ( $L \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ ) and relative ( $\% \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max) AT values for the two tests were not different. This suggests that the non-invasive estimates of $A T$ are also reproducable.

The relative values of $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ (see Tables $3,5,7$ and 9 ) of the subjects $51,53,55$ and 57 in this study are comparable to previous data on well-trained endurance athletes (Costill et al., 1976a). The $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max values appraaching $60 \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ for $S_{2}$ and 56 are similar to values reported for trained individuals (Gollnick et al. 1972), and to club
level rowers (Hagerman and Mikelson, 1979; Vrijens and Bouckaert, 1984).
The higher relative values of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max observed for $51,53,54,55$, and 57 (see Tables $3,5,6,7$ and 9) are comparable to the interpreted data presented by Costill (1970), but are lower than the mean value of $72 \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max $m \mathrm{~kg}{ }^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ determined by Hagerman et al. (1979). This later study, however, used higher calibre rowers.

The values of $A T$ obtained in this study ( 80.5 ta 89.29 of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max ) are comparable to the mean values of $83 \% \quad \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max obtained by Mickelson and Hagerman (1982). Thus, individuals involved in endurance training appear to have higher AT values than individuals participating in other types and intensities of exercise (Costill et al., 1970; Withers et al., 1981; Stegman, 1981; Weltmen \& Katch, 1979). Since national calibre subjects in this study had higher values of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and AT than the provincial calibre subjects, the magnitude of the training influence may depend on other factors: for example, it cannot be disregarded that these differences resulted because national calibre subjects had been training for more years, or had trained at higher intensities. All the subjects, however, were involved in endurance training prior to the study.

The difference in AT among the subjects might olso be relited to the influence of training on a given muscle fibre composition. It has been reported that well-trained endurance athletes tend to have a higher portion of ST fibres with specifically trained muscle groups (Costill et al. 19760; Gollnick et al., 1972; Bergh, Thorstensson, Sjodin, Hulten, Fiehl and

Karlsson, 1978; Larsson and Forsberg,1980). Bergh et al. (1978) have shown shown a positive relationship between high $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max values and a large percentage of ST muscle fibres in the gastrognemius and vastus lateralis of elite othletes. The high oxidative characteristics present in the vastus lateralis, one of the primary muscles used in rowing (Larsson and Forsberg, 1980), may be representative of an overall increase in the oxidative capacity of the muscles utilized in rowing. It, therefore, appears that highly trained oarsmen, along with other endurance-trained athletes, have a greater mitochondrial density along with an increase in the oxidative enzymes, which may allow them to oxidize large quentities of $L A$ during exercise. Although training appears to have no influence on the percentage of ST fibre distribution (Saltin et al., 1977), it may enhance the oxidative potential of all fibre types (Saltin et al., 1977). Ivy et al. (1980) reported that AT is related both to the oxidative potential of the muscle and to the percentage of ST fibre distribution; therefore, it may be that relative AT values are the result of a training effect (i.e., oxidative potential) on a given muscle fibre distribution. If so, the endurance athletes should have higher AT values due to the influence of training or the high proportion of ST fibres which are more likely to be recruited during the initial workloads of the rowing ergometer test.

Type of training appears to influence $V 0_{2} m a x$ and $A T$ values. The fact that national calibre subjects had higher values than provincial calibre subjects, suggests that high intensity IT, although enhancing the oxidative potential of all fibre types (Saltin et al. 1977), may lead to a greater dependence on carbohydrate metabolism at a given relative workload.

Endurance training appears, from the results of this study, to augment AT values in the range of 2.38 to $16.3 \%$ of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max as observed in subjects $1,3,4,5,6$ and 7 , with an exception of subject 2 which showed $4.2 \%$ decrease. The mechanism whereby the type of training affects AT values cannot be established from this data. It is possible, however, that endurance training, which is known to augment the relative proportion of FFA oxidation at a given P0 (Holloszy, 1977), produces increased inhibition of carbohydrate flux through glycolysis and the Kreb's cycle due to elevated sarcoplasmic citrate concentrations and mitochondrial acetyl CoA levels (Newsholme, 1977). Conversely, high-intensity IT could lead to an augmented carbohydrate flux due to the fast energy turnover required. As a result, AT may occur at lower relative values (Skinner and McLellan, 1980) due to an earlier dependence on an anaerobic, rather than an oxidative, carbohydrate flux within the muscle fibres being recruited.

The degree of improvement in $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and AT following the 8 weeks of training is in agreement with other reports for both CT (McLellan and Skinner, 1981; Pollock, 1973) and IT (Rivera et al., 1980) with subjects of similar fitness levels. Further, since this improvement was found during both CT and IT, one type of training does not appear to enhance $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and AT more then the other. The pattern of responses following the training program is similar to the one reported by Davis et al. (1979), and Williams et al. (1976), but the magnitude of change is less than the changes documented by these earlier investigations. This difference could the explained by the greater intensity (approximately $95 \%$ V0z max), frequency ( 4 to 7 days per week) and/or duration of training ( 60 minutes
per session for 9 weeks) used by these investigators. As mentioned before, it appears that the intensity of exercise may be a more important determinant for producing changes in $V 0_{2}$ max and AT with only 8 weeks of CT and IT 3 times per week. Since there was a change in $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and AT with CT and IT, this may suggest that the intensity of exercise (CT: AT $10 \$ \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and IT: AT +10 to $25 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max) was sufficient to enhance the oxidative potential and rate of FFA oxidation within the more glycolytic fibres which would be recruited during the above intensities of training. Since muscle adaptation appears to be localized in those fibres recruited during a given exercise intensity (Saltin et al., 1977), it is suggested that future research focus on the effects of a CT program with the PO maintained closer to individual AT levels.

The maximum performance time increased among all subjects (see Tables 3 to 9 ) after the 8 weeks of training. The results are in contrast to the findings of Eddy et al. (1977), who stated that performence time at $90 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max was not affected by CTor IT programs. Since these researchers reported an increase in $400_{2} \max$ ( 42 to $48 \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ ) lower than the results of the present investigation, it appears that fitness level can account for the different findings. Further, the CT program used by Eddy et al (1977) consisted of 4 sessions per week at 70 多 $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ max for 7 weeks, a program which was similar to the one used in this study. Although the average PO for the IT group was 50 多 $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max (IT low was 1 minute of rest), the high phase consisted of 1 minute of exercise at 100 s $\forall 0_{2}$ mas, which was similar to the IT high used in this study.

The major discrepancy between the CT and IT programs used by Eddy et al. (1977) and those of the present study, concerns the total P0 and, as a result, the total duration of each training session. Eddy et al (1977) controlled the total PO for the CT and IT programs. The differences between the training program of the present study and those reported by Eddy et al. (1977) suggest that the duration and total PO of each exercise session were important for producing the changes observed between the two tests of maximum performance time following the 8-week program. Also, this change may reflect the improvement in the fitness level of the subjects.

Following the 8 -week training program, AT occurred at greater values of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}, \mathrm{PO}$ and time (see Tables 3 to 9 and Figures 1 to 7 ). These values are in agreement with Davis et al. (1979). These findings indicate that the subjects were able to perform greater amounts of work without an accumulation of LA during the incremental test. This can most likely be explained by the delayed onset of LA acidosis consequent to exercise training (Holloszy, 1976), and to the fact that exercise training reduces the level of blood LA at submaximal work rates (0avis et al., 1979). Possible mechanisms which might account for an increased AT after endurance training include an improved distribution of blood flow in the trained muscles, increased oxidative capacity at the cellular level, and an alteration in the muscle fibre reoruitment pittern resulting in an increased activation of the ST muscle fibres. As it has been discussed previously, there appears to be a great deal of support in the literature for
esch of these possible mechanisms. It is tempting to suggest that the post-training differences in the rate of change in $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max during the rowing test reflected the changes in relative $A T$ values which were ubserved.

It is believed that the mode of exercise used in this study was specific to the rowing movement (Specificity of Training Concept, $\&$ strand and Rodahl,1977, p. 434-435), may have contributed to the enhancement of $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and AT . Rowing ergometer training replicates the movement patterns of the actual rowing performance; therefore, the muscular adaptations are specific to rowing performance.

Tables 3 to 9, present the changes in HR at AT during the pre- and post-training tests, there were notable different ranges for HR at AT among the subjects. The AT occurred at slightly higher $H R$ responses following the endurance training program; however, the subjects reached AT during the post-training test at greater workloads than during the pre-t test. These specific observations have been made by other investigators (Davis et al., 1979; Katch et al.,1978). Although HR cannot be used to identify the AT, it may be used to regulate training intensity above or below AT, and this requires individual assessment of HR at AT.

Another observation worth mentioning is that the subjects, during the post-training test, were able to maintain the $P 0$ required during the test by rowing at a lower stroke rate. This indicates that the mechanical efficiency of the subjects had improwed during the training period.

The high AT and $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max outputs of oarsmen can be attributed, at least in part, to the specific nature of their training programs. Because rowing is primarily an aerobic event, a substantial percentage ( $75-80 \%$ ) of training time is devoted to aerobic work. The effect of this type of training on both ST and FT muscle fibres has been well documented. The result is an increased of aerobic adaptations at the cellular level, most likely a result of the rigorous training regimen. The increase in oxygen utilization could, therefore, delay the deleterious effects of LA accumulation during high intensity exercise. The high AT of trained athletes may also be indicative of their increased ability to utilize LA as a fuel during exercise (Larsson and Forsberg, 1980). The increased oxidation of LA could therefore result in a diminished influence of LA at AT (Larsson and Forsberg, 1980).

The morphological, histochemical and biochemical nature of major muscles contributing to the rowing movement may also affect the AT. Oarsmen routinely train daily all year round, and their in-season regimen includes long-duration exercise at varying intensities and shorter IT sessions at very high intensity. This training program is aimed at delaying the onset of metabolic acidosis during the early part of a 2,000 meter race, developing a high aerobic power output, and increasing tolerance of high LA levels.

The main findings of the present study indicate increases in $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and $A T$, and increases in performance times, $P O$ and $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ mac before reaching AT following the 8 weeks of endurance training. These findings are in agreement with the results obtained from other investigations
(Bueno, 1982; Davis et al., 1976), however, because of differences in the training regimen, mode of exercise, age, fitness level of the subjects and type of exercise test, the results obtained could not always be compared with each other.

Training programs using prescriptions based on percent $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max or HR max without considerations of individual AT create, among the participants, multiple training stimuli which in turn result in a wide range of improvements in cardiovascular and metabolic functions. A better approach would be to make individual assessments of the AT and HR at the AT before prescribing a target $H R$ for training intensity.

The idea that exercise should be maintained at a level sbove or below AT to determine training intensity more effectively according to objectives, rests on the premise that real differences exist in the exercise stress at, for example, $90 \%$ of AT compared to $110 \%$ of AT. In this regard, clear differences in $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ kinetics and ventilatory responses have been observed above and below the AT. There is a preliminary evidence supporting this presumption (Vrijens and Bouckaert,1983). In this regard, compliance with a voluntary training program may be influenced by indiscriminately prescribed exercise which requires an individual to exercise at that level. This reveals a need for greater precision, with respect to metabolic stress, in developing training prescriptions. Prescriptions for training intensity can be developed and expressed in percent HR max with $A T$ as the major consideration. Indeed, evidence is accumulisting which suggests that training prescriptions lack metabolic specificity if they are
not based on AT to some degree. Standard values for the percentage of HR max at AT, grouped by age, for example, should not be applied to individusls due to the wide range, among homogeneous subjects, of relative HR at the AT (Yrijens and Bouckaert, 1983).

For the purpose of obtaining information which can be spplied to training, measurement of $H R$ at AT may provide very useful information. Use of the $H R$ at AT in determining intensities of training sessions could prove to be a valuable aid to both coaches and oarsmen(Mickelson \& Hagerman, 1982; Vrijens and Bouckaert, 1983). More specifically, the increased use of long, steady-state training sessions below an oarsman's AT are becoming more common, not only to develop aerobic power but also to train neuromuscular pathways and increase local muscular endurance. Along with this, the progressive test used to measure AT allows one to determine what percentage of an oarsman's $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ is elicited by a particular PO. Previously, training sessions at or near AT were determined by the calculated estimate of the coach or by the intuition of the oarsman during the training exercise. Some of this trial-and-error technique can now be eliminated and training time can be utilized more efficiently. Angerobic threshold measurements not only point out deficiencies in aerobic conditioning, but they can also provide insight into the PO at AT, i.e., the maximum power which can be generated while avoiding on accumulation of LA and a resultant drop in blood pH . This information along with the $H R$ at $A T$, can be very important to a coach when planning or assessing land and water training sessions.

The results of this study demonstrated that $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and $A T$ can be altered with CT and IT training programs. Future research within this ares of investigation should include control groups, and training at different intensities in order to determine the optimal training intensity.

There has been a great deal of controversy and discussion as to the means of measuring AT and the exact definition of AT. Although the AT reported in this study is indeed an estimate, it does give the coach and athlete a useful tool with which to evaluate relative fitness levels. At the same time, AT serves as a beneficial guide in determining the intensity of training programs for oarsmen.

The findings of this study appear to be more applicable to an individual involved in continuous, long duration athletic competitions. It may seem difficult to apply these results to the majority of endurance events or team sports which involve interval exercise. A coach should be aware, however, that specific training programs may influence AT values and endurance performance differently.

## Chapter 6

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Summary

This study was conducted to evaluate the influence of an 8 -week endurance training program (continuous and interval), carried out 3 times per week, for 50 to 60 minutes each session, on the aerobic power and the sngerobic threshold of male rowers.

The research design selected for this investigation was a single subject case study. The aerobic power and AT were measured in 7 subjects, all members of the Thunder Bay Rowing Club, before (Pre-Training Test) and after (Post-Training Test) the investigative period. Following the pre-training test, training programs were designed for each subject, based on a percentage above and below the subject's AT (AT +10 to 258 $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, for interval training, and $A T-10 \% \mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max, for continuous training, respectively). The training intensity was monitored through the subject's heart rate.

The results obtained following the training program, indicated that $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max values were increased in all subjects within the ranges of $1.8 \%$ to $22.9 \%$. AT values were also increased within the ranges of 0.38 to $16.3 \%$ in subjects $1,3,4,5,6$, and 7 , and in subject 2 there was a decrease of $4.2 \%$. The total test time, $P 0$ and maximum workload were also increased. Similarly, time and PD at AT were increased in all of the subjects. These findings indicated that $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ and AT values can be altered with rowing ergometer CT and IT training, and that AT is an important factor to consider when devising training programs.

## Conclusions

Based upon the results obtained and within the limitations of the experiment in this study, the following conclusions appear justified regarding the influence of an 8 -week rowing ergometer training program on the $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and AT in male rowers:

1. Continuous and interval endurance training program(s) based on an individual's AT increase both $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max and AT.
2. Anaerobic threshold values can be used to prescribe training intensities, while $H R$ at AT can be used to monitor these training intensities.

## Recommendations

1. Perhaps the most important recommendation would be to emphasize the effect of IT with different intensities and durations in several training groups, on $A T$ and subsequent endurance performance. These investigations may elucidate an optimal training program for enhancing an individual's capacity to perform maximal or submaximal exercise.
2. Throughout this study, it was stated that several other mechanisms of response remain unclear: for example, it would be useful to investigate the influence of FFA oxidation to account for the different
changes in AT values following a continuous or interval training program. Further, it would be interesting to isolate the intramuscular mechanism(s) responsible for determining AT values. Athough this suggestion may seem impractical, scientific techniques are now available which use single muscle fibre dissections for micro-enzymatic studies. The application of such procedures to the observed responses during incremental exercise may help to clarify the controversy in terminology which exists in the literature with respect to the AT.
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APPENDIX A

## RAW DATA TABLES

Table al
Pre-Training Test Raw Data of Subjet 1

| Time Revs | St. Rt. $/ \dot{Y}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ | $\dot{Y}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{YCO}_{2}$ | RER | Heart | $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| min:sec No/min | min | BTPS |  | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | STPD | STPD |  | Rate | $\mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{Kg}$ |
|  |  | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ |  | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ |  | $\mathrm{Bts} / \mathrm{min}$ | $/ \mathrm{min}$ |



| 2:15 |  |  | 63.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 145 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2:30 | 310 | 28 | 63.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 147 |  |
| 2:45 |  |  | 61.4 | 0.1542 | 0.0502 | 21.924 .8 | 2.803 | 2.480 | 0.88 | 150 | 36.3 |
| 3:00 | 610 | 28 | 63.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |
| 3:15 |  |  | 64.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 153 |  |
| 3:30 | 310 | 28 | 65.0 | 0.1521 | 0.0525 | 21.123 .7 | 3.077 | 2.747 | 0.89 | 155 | 39.9 |
| 3:45 |  |  | 66.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 154 |  |
| 4:00 | 615 | 28 | 66.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 154 |  |
|  |  | W0R | OAD | 3, | 2.00 Kp , | changed at | 4:00 m | nutes |  |  |  |
| 4:15 |  |  | 71.5 | 0.1563 | 0.0488 | 22.825 .5 | 3.196 | 2.807 | 0.90 | 156 | 40.6 |
| 4:30 | 310 | 28 | 71.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 |  |
| 4:45 |  |  | 74.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 160 |  |
| 5:00 | 615 | 28 | 75.2 | 0.1569 | 0.0492 | 23.225 .3 | 3.242 | 2.975 | 0.92 | 161 | 42.0 |
| $5: 15$ |  |  | 77.2 | 0.1564 | 0.0502 | 23.024 .8 | 3.350 | 3.112 | 0.93 | 164 | 43.4 |
| 5:30 | 305 | 28 | 79.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 166 |  |
| 5:45 |  |  | 75.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 167 |  |
| 6:00 | 610 | 28 | 75.3 | 0.1557 | 0.0512 | 22.824 .3 | 3.229 | 3.028 | 0.94 | 167 | 43.0 |
|  |  | WOR | OAD | 4, | 2.25 Kp, | changed at | 6:00 mi | nutes |  |  |  |
| 6:15 |  |  | 77.8 | 0.1571 | 0.0501 | 23.424 .8 | 3.328 | 3.133 | 0.94 | 167 | 43.1 |
| 6:30 | 310 | 30 | 78.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 167 |  |
| 6:45 |  |  | 79.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 167 |  |
| 7:00 | 610 | 30 | 80.0 | 0.1552 | 0.0526 | 23.223 .6 | 3.340 | 3.134 | 0.94 | 167 | 43.3 |
| $7: 15$ |  |  | 81.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 169 |  |
| 7:30 | 305 | 29 | 81.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 168 |  |
| 7:45 |  |  | 79.9 | 0.1585 | 0.0522 | 24.523 .8 | 3.264 | 3.353 | 1.03 | 168 | 43.3 |
| 8:00 | 605 | 30 | 80.1 | 0.1568 | 0.0517 | 23.424 .1 | 3.069 | 2.988 | 1.03 | 167 | 43.1 |

WORKLOAD $5, \quad 2.50 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $8: 00$ minutes

| 8:15 |  |  | 80.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 169 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:30 | 305 | 30 | 81.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 171 |  |
| 8:45 |  |  | 81.9 | 0.1545 | 0.0528 | 22.3 | 23.6 | 3.671 | 3.473 | 0.99 | 170 | 47.6 |
| 9:00 | 605 | 30 | 80.8 | 0.1539 | 0.0535 | 22.1 | 23.2 | 3.614 | 3.439 | 0.99 | 171 | 47.8 |
| $9: 15$ |  |  | 82.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 171 |  |
| 9.30 | 300 | 31 | 84.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 175 |  |
| 9:45 |  |  | 91.4 | 0.1567 | 0.0530 | 23.5 | 23.4 | 3.891 | 3.901 | 1.00 | 175 | 50.4 |
| 10:00 | 600 | 31 | 92.4 | 0.1562 | 0.0542 | 23.6 | 22.8 | 3.813 | 3.793 | 1.00 | 175 | 50.5 |
|  |  | WOR | KLOAD | 6. | 2.75 Kp , | chan | ed at | 10:00 | inutes |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  |  | 95.2 | 0.1575 | 0.0526 | 23.9 | 23.7 | 3.975 | 4.023 | 1.01 | 176 | 51.5 |
| 10:30 | 300 | 30 | 96.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 178 |  |
| 10:45 |  |  | 97.4 | 0.1595 | 0.0514 | 25.0 | 24.2 | 3.893 | 4.028 | 1.03 | 181 | 51.5 |
| 11:00 | 600 | 30 | 97.7 | 0.1583 | 0.0531 | 24.5 | 23.4 | 3.991 | 4.171 | 1.05 | 181 | 51.7 |
| 11:15 |  |  | 97.9 | 0.1598 | 0.0513 | 25.2 | 24.2 | 3.882 | 4.040 | 1.06 | 182 | 51.6 |
| 11:30 | 300 | 32 | 99.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 185 |  |
| 11:45 |  |  | 98.8 | 0.1585 | 0.0543 | 24.9 | 22.9 | 3.972 | 4.293 | 1.08 | 184 | 51.5 |
| 12:00 | 605 | 32 | 101.2 | 0.1592 | 0.0535 | 25.1 | 23.3 | 3.976 | 4.288 | 1.08 | 184 | 51.5 |
|  |  | WOR | LOAD | 7. | 3.00 Kp | , cha | nged at | 12:00 | minutes |  |  |  |
| 12:15 |  |  | 101.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 186 |  |
| 12:30 | 300 | 32 | 104.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 186 |  |
| 12:45 |  |  | 104.0 | 0.1607 | 0.0525 | 26.0 | 23.7 | 3.960 | 4.339 | 1.10 | 186 | 51.3 |
| 13:00 | 600 | 32 | 104.0 | 0.1612 | 0.0527 | 26.3 | 23.6 | 3.952 | 4.412 | 1.12 | 186 | 51.5 |
| 13:15 |  |  | 108.4 | 0.1620 | 0.0528 | 26.9 | 23.5 | 4.029 | 4.606 | 1.14 | 186 | 52.2 |
| 13:30 | 300 | 31 | 112.1 | 0.1609 | 0.0555 | 26.5 | 22.4 | 3.967 | 4.698 | 1.18 | 186 | 51.4 |


| Total Test time (min:sec) | $13: 30$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 8,230 |
| Maximum Workload (Kp) | 3.00 |
| Total Power Dutput ( Kpm ) | 18,192 |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 29 |
| $\mathrm{HO}_{2}$ max ( $\mathrm{L} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 4.030 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ max $\mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 52.2 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts-min ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 187 |
| AT \% of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 77.8 \% |
| Time at AT | 5:00 |
| Workload at AT | 2.00 |
| Revolutions at AT | 3,065 |
| Power Output at AT | 5,212 |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.136 |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{mifi}^{-1}$ at AT | 42.0 |
| Heart Rate at AT | 161 |

Table AZ

## Post-Training Test Raw Data of Subject 1




| 4:15 |  |  | 63.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 145 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4:30 | 305 | 27 | 65.8 | 0.1488 | 0.0582 | 20.4 | 21.6 | 3.217 | 3.039 | 0.94 | 146 | 43.7 |
| $4: 45$ |  |  | 68.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 147 |  |
| 5:00 | 615 | 27 | 68.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 148 |  |
| 5:15 |  |  | 68.8 | 0.1491 | 0.0575 | 20.5 | 21.9 | 3.352 | 3.140 | 0.94 | 149 | 45.5 |
| 5:30 | 310 | 27 | 67.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 149 |  |
| 5:45 |  |  | 73.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |
| 6:00 | 620 | 27 | 72.0 | 0.1498 | 0.0574 | 20.8 | 21.9 | 3.452 | 3.281 | 0.95 | 153 | 46.9 |
|  |  | WOR | OAD | 4. | 2.25 Kp, | chan | ged at | 6:00 m | nutes |  |  |  |
| 6:15 |  |  | 78.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 157 |  |
| 6:30 | 305 | 27 | 77.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 157 |  |
| 6:45 |  |  | 79.7 | 0.1515 | 0.0567 | 21.5 | 22.2 | 3.703 | 3.586 | 0.97 | 157 | 50.3 |
| 7:00 | 610 | 27 | 77.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 157 |  |
| 7:15 |  |  | 79.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 159 |  |
| 7:30 | 310 | 27 | 79.3 | 0.1513 | 0.0581 | 21.6 | 21.7 | 3.678 | 3.659 | 0.99 | 158 | 49.9 |
| 7:45 |  |  | 78.8 | 0.1511 | 0.0585 | 21.6 | 21.5 | 3.466 | 3.301 | 0.98 | 158 | 49.9 |
| 8:00 | 615 | 27 | 78.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 157 |  |

WORKLOAD $5, \quad 2.50 \mathrm{Kp}$, Ehanged at 0.00 minutes

| 8:15 | 300 | 27 | 86.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 160 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:30 |  |  | 86.9 | 0.1530 | 0.0564 | 22.222 .3 | 3.914 | 3.891 | 0.99 | 166 | 53.1 |
| $8: 45$ |  |  | 84.1 | 0.1521 | 0.0574 | 21.921 .9 | 3.841 | 3.836 | 1.00 | 163 | 53.0 |
| 9:00 | 605 | 27 | 89.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 165 |  |
| $9: 15$ |  |  | 95.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 166 |  |
| 9:30 | 315 | 27 | 94.0 | 0.1519 | 0.0575 | 21.821 .9 | 3.806 | 3.792 | 1.00 | 166 | 52.7 |
| 9:45 |  |  | 92.3 | 0.1553 | 0.0544 | 23.223 .2 | 3.977 | 3.987 | 1.00 | 167 | 54.0 |
| 10:00 | 615 | 27 | 89.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 167 |  |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 6. | 2.75 Kp , changed at $10: 00$ minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  |  | 88.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 167 |  |
| 10:30 | 310 | 27 | 93.7 | 0.1536 | 0.0566 | 22.522 .2 | 4.159 | 4.213 | 1.01 | 170 | 56.5 |
| 10:45 |  |  | 92.5 | 0.1533 | 0.0575 | 22.521 .9 | 4.111 | 4.223 | 1.03 | 170 | 55.8 |
| 11:00 | 620 | 27 | 93.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 170 |  |
| 11:15 |  |  | 98.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 171 |  |
| 11:30 | 310 | 27 | 97.1 | 0.1550 | 0.0564 | 23.322 .3 | 4.171 | 4.345 | 1.04 | 172 | 56.6 |
| 11:45 |  |  | 98.6 | 0.1551 | 0.0566 | 23.422 .2 | 4.219 | 4.434 | 1.05 | 172 | 57.3 |
| 12:00 | 615 | 27 | 103.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 174 |  |

WORKLOAD $\quad 7, \quad 3.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $12: 00$ minutes

| $12: 15$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12: 30$ | 310 |
| $12: 45$ |  |
| $13: 00$ | 620 |
| $13: 15$ |  |
| $13: 30$ | 305 |
| $13: 45$ |  |
| $14: 00$ | 625 |

108.9

174
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}27 & 106.2 & 0.1573 & 0.0549 & 24.4 & 22.9 & 4.350 & 4.629 & 1.06 & 175\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}109.3 & 0.1575 & 0.0551 & 24.6 & 22.9 & 4.446 & 4.779 & 1.07 & 177\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}27 & 105.2 & 0.1575 & 0.0588 & 24.6 & 22.6 & 4.267 & 4.658 & 1.09 & 177\end{array}$ 115.6
27114.1
0.1578
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.0564 & 24.9 & 22.3 & 4.584 & 5.107\end{array}$
$1.11 \quad 178$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}109.8 & 0.1563 & 0.0587 & 24.3 & 21.4 & 4.526 & 5.122 & 1.13 & 177\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}28 & 119.2 & 0.1572 & 0.0575 & 24.7 & 21.9 & 4.832 & 5.445 & 1.13 & 177\end{array}$
WORKLOAD $\quad 8, \quad 3.50 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $14: 00$ minutes
14:15
14:30
14:45
15:00
15:15
15:30 300
15:45 16:00 600
119.0

180
300
28
0.1593
$0.0551 \quad 25.7 \quad 22.84 .731 \quad 5.326$
1.13

183
$28 \quad 117.0$
123.2
$28 \quad 123.0 \quad 0.1580$ $123.0 \quad 0.1580$
$28 \quad 123.7$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}0.0575 & 25.2 & 21.9 & 4.630 & 5.327 & 1.15 & 184\end{array}$ 184 184
123.0

WORKLOAD 9, $\quad 3.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $16: 00$ minutes
16:15
16:30
16:45
$17: 00 \quad 560$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}124.7 & 0.1597 & 0.0561 & 26.1 & 22.5 & 4.762 & 5.540\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}28 & 127.6 & 0.1599 & 0.0560 & 26.2 & 22.5 & 4.863 & 5.675 & 1.17 & 185\end{array}$ 185 185
62.2
65.2
59.1
60.4
57.9
61.5
65.6 64.6
64.0
62.8
64.9
66.0

| Total Test time (min:sec) | 17:00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 10,420 |
| Maximum Workload (Kp) | 3.50 |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks-min ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 27 |
| Total Power Output ( Kpm ) | 25,779 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 4.900 |
| Y0 $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ max ml $\cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 66.0 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 185 |
| AT \% of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max}\left(\mathrm{L} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}\right)$ | 85.1\% |
| Time at AT | 11:30 |
| Workload at AT | 2.75 |
| Revolutions at AT | 7,105 |
| Power Output of AT | 14,888 |
| $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 4.171 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 56.6 |
| Heart Rate at AT | 172 |

Table A3
Pre-Training Test Raw Data of Subject 2

| Time Revs | St. Rt/ $\gamma_{\mathrm{E}} \quad$ FEO2 | FECO2 | $\stackrel{Y}{e}$ | $\dot{Y}_{E}$ | $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{YCO}_{2}$ | RER | Heart | ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| min:sec No/min | min BTPS |  | 02 | $\mathrm{CO2}$ | STPD | STPD |  | Rate | $\mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{Kg}$ |
|  | L/min |  | L/L | L/L | L/min | L/min |  | Bts/min | $/ \mathrm{min}$ |


|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 1, 1.50 Kp |  | 29.0 | 29.0 | 1.374 | 1.372 | 1.00 | 131 | 18.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0: 15$ |  |  | 39.8 | 0.1665 | 0.0431 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0:30 | 310 | 28 | 35.9 | 0.1613 | 0.0451 | 25.4 | 27.7 | 1.412 | 1.295 | 0.92 | 132 | 18.8 |
| 0:45 |  |  | 54.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 145 |  |
| 1:00 | 610 | 28 | 55.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 148 |  |
| 1:15 |  |  | 62.5 | 0.1571 | 0.0489 | 23.4 | 25.5 | 2.671 | 2.446 | 0.92 | 152 | 35.5 |
| 1:30 | 305 | 28 | 68.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 |  |
| 1:45 |  |  | 68.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 158 |  |
| 2:00 | 605 | 28 | 70.6 | 0.1589 | 0.0500 | 24.6 | 25.0 | 2.875 | 2.825 | 0.98 | 159 | 38.3 |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 2, | 1.75 Kp , | chang | ged at | $2: 00 \mathrm{mi}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2:15 |  |  | 77.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 172 |  |
| 2:30 | 305 | 28 | 79.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 174 |  |
| 2:45 |  |  | 83.0 | 0.1619 | 0.0501 | 26.6 | 24.9 | 3.124 | 3.329 | 1.07 | 179 | 41.6 |
| 3:00 | 605 | 28 | 85.7 | 0.1620 | 0.0507 | 26.7 | 24.6 | 3.214 | 3.480 | 1.08 | 187 | 42.8 |
| $3: 15$ |  |  | 85.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 189 |  |
| 3:30 | 300 | 28 | 85.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 187 |  |
| 3:45 |  |  | 88.0 | 0.1628 | 0.0506 | 27.3 | 24.7 | 3.227 | 3.565 | 1.10 | 189 | 42.9 |
| 4:00 | 600 | 28 | 91.9 | 0.1624 | 0.0509 | 27.1 | 24.5 | 3.395 | 3.743 | 1.10 | 191 | 45.2 |

WORKLOAD $\quad 3, \quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $4: 00$ minutes

| 4:15 |  |  | 95.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 192 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4:30 | 300 | 28 | 100.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 192 |  |
| 4:45 |  |  | 100.0 | 0.1634 | 0.0505 | 27.724 .7 | 3.608 | 4.040 | 1.12 | 190 | 48.0 |
| 5:00 | 600 | 30 | 102.1 | 0.1645 | 0.0498 | 28.525 .1 | 3.482 | 4.071 | 1.14 | 190 | 48.0 |
| 5:15 |  |  | 107.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 198 |  |
| 5:30 | 300 | 30 | 106.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 202 |  |
| 5:45 |  |  | 108.7 | 0.1667 | 0.0479 | 30.126 .1 | 3.617 | 4.170 | 1.15 | 198 | 48.1 |
| 6:00 | 600 | 30 | 105.9 | 0.1649 | 0.0495 | 28.825 .2 | 3.646 | 4.165 | 1.15 | 198 | 48.5 |
|  |  | W0R | LOAD | 4, | 2.25 kp , | changed at | 6:00 m | nutes |  |  |  |
| 6:15 |  |  | 105.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 197 |  |
| 6:30 | 305 | 30 | 109.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 198 |  |
| 6:45 |  |  | 116.0 | 0.1675 | 0.0463 | 30.527 .0 | 3.798 | 4.301 | 1.13 | 196 | 50.5 |
| 7:00 | 605 | 30 | 115.5 | 0.1670 | 0.0470 | 30.226 .6 | 3.694 | 4.186 | 1.13 | 195 | 51.0 |
| 7:15 |  |  | 114.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 195 |  |
| 7:50 | 300 | 30 | 114.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 194 |  |
| 7:45 |  |  | 115.5 | 0.1670 | 0.0468 | 30.126 .7 | 3.838 | 4.325 | 1.13 | 194 | 51.1 |
| 8:00 | 600 | 32 | 114.5 | 0.1670 | 0.0467 | 30.126 .7 | 3.703 | 4.167 | 1.13 | 192 | 51.1 |

WORKLOAD $5, \quad 2.50 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $8: 00$ minutes


Total Test time (min:sec)
Total Number of Revolutions
Maximum Workload ( $\mathrm{K} p$ )
Average Stroke Rate ( $\mathrm{stks} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ )
Total Power Output (Kpm)
$\mathrm{HO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L}-\mathrm{min}^{-1}\right)$
$\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ max $\mathrm{ml}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$
Maximum Heart Rate (bts:min ${ }^{-1}$ )
AT $\%$ of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$
Time at AT
Workload at AT
Revolutions at AT
Power Output at AT
$\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT
$\mathrm{HO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT
Heart Rate at AT

11:30
6,840
2.75

30
14,284
4.010
53.3

202
84\%
4:00
1.75

2,420
3,932
3.395
45.2

177

Table A4

## Post-Training Test Row Data of Subject 2


$0: 15$
$0: 30$
$0: 45$
$1: 00$
$1: 15$
$1: 30$
$1: 45$
$2: 00$

310
$610 \quad 26$
35.50 .1601

WORKLIAD 1, 1.50 Kp
$0: 15$

| 305 | 26 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 605 | 26 |

$\begin{array}{lllllllll}64.1 & 0.1545 & 0.0514 & 22.3 & 24.3 & 2.879 & 2.640 & 0.92 & 144\end{array}$
64.3 144 62.7 144 $\begin{array}{lllllllll}69.5 & 0.1562 & 0.0527 & 23.3 & 23.7 & 2.987 & 2.932 & 0.98 & 145\end{array}$ 39.5

WORKLOAD 2, $\quad 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at 2:00 minutes
43.4

2:15 $310 \quad 26 \quad 71$.
$73.4 \quad 0.1577$
0.052924 .223 .63 .037
3.11

150
2:30
2:45
3:00
3:15
3:30
3:45 4:00
$2: 15$
$2: 30$
$2: 45$
$3: 00$
$3: 15$
$3: 30$
$3: 45$
$4: 00$
$610 \quad 26$ 79.0 78.0 $300 \quad 27$ 83.0 $77.7 \quad 0.1579$
0.0528
3.512 $600 \quad 27 \quad 85.0$

WORKLOAD $\quad 3, \quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $4: 00$ minutes

4:15
4:30
4:45
5:00
5:15
5:30
5:45 6:00 595
86.9

164
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}300 & 27 & 90.6 & 0.1602 & 0.0529 & 25.8 & 23.6 & 3.512 & 3.841 & 1.09 & 164\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}92.9 & 0.1604 & 0.0532 & 26.0 & 23.5 & 3.576 & 3.956 & 1.11 & 164\end{array}$

167
168 97.3 $\begin{array}{llllllll}92.6 & 0.1605 & 0.0526 & 25.0 & 23.7 & 3.567 & 3.902\end{array}$ 1.09 94.20 .1606 92.5

|  |  | 92.9 | 0.1604 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 600 | 27 | 83.4 |  |
|  |  | 97.3 |  |
| 295 | 27 | 92.6 | 0.1605 |
|  |  | 94.2 | 0.1606 |
| 595 | 27 | 92.5 |  |

151 153

157
161

WORKLOAD $4, \quad 2.25 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at 6:00 minutes
6:15
6:30
6:45
7:00
7:15
7:30
7:45 $8: 00 \quad 600$

|  | 99.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 300 | 27 | 103.0 | 0.1633 | 0.0504 | 27.5 | 24.8 | 3.727 | 4.155 | 1.12 | 176 | 49.3 |
|  |  | 93.5 | 0.1608 | 0.0527 | 26.1 | 23.7 | 3.578 | 3.944 | 1.10 | 176 | 47.3 |
| 595 | 27 | 104.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 177 |  |
|  |  | 95.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 178 |  |  |
| 300 | 27 | 100.7 | 0.1614 | 0.0521 | 26.5 | 24.0 | 3.802 | 4.201 | 1.10 | 178 | 50.3 |
|  |  | 102.2 | 0.1622 | 0.0516 | 27.0 | 24.2 | 3.787 | 4.220 | 1.11 | 178 | 50.1 |

MORKLOAD 5, 2.50 Kp , changed at $8: 00$ minutes


| Total Test time (minsec) | 14:00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 8,370 |
| Maximum Workload ( Kp ) | 3.00 |
| Total Power Output (Kpm) | 18,037 |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 28 |
| $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right.$ ) | 4.929 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max} \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 61.5 |
| Maximum Heart Rate ( $\mathrm{bts} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 198 |
| AT \% of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max}\left(\mathrm{L} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}\right)$ | 80.5\% |
| Time at AT | 9:30 |
| Workload at AT | 2.50 |
| Revolutions at AT | 6,005 |
| Power Output at AT | 10,535 |
| $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.969 |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 52.5 |
| Heart Rate at AT | 180 |

## Pre-Training Test Row Data of Subject 3

| Time | Revs | $\mathrm{St} . \mathrm{Rt} / \gamma_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ | $\gamma_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\gamma_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{YCO}_{2}$ | RER | Heart | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| min:sec $\mathrm{No} / \mathrm{min}$ | min | BTPS |  |  | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | STPD | STPD |  | Rate | $\mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{Kg}$ |
|  |  | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ |  | $\mathrm{Bts} / \mathrm{min}$ | $/ \mathrm{min}$ |

$0: 15$
WORKLOAD 1, 1.50 Kp
$0: 30$ 0:45 1:00 1:15
1:30 $310 \quad 27$
30.1

120
31526
40.2
0.1679
0.041
48.2
$041129.930 .41 .346 \quad 1.321$
$625 \quad 26$
48.0
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}53.0 & 0.1562 & 0.0449 & 22.4 & 27.8 & 2.362 & 1.904 & 0.81 & 130\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}53.0 & 0.1562 & 0.0449 & 22.4 & 27.8 & 2.362 & 1.904 & 0.81 & 130\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}53.0 & 0.1562 & 0.0449 & 22.4 & 27.8 & 2.362 & 1.904 & 0.81 & 130\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}53.0 & 0.1562 & 0.0449 & 22.4 & 27.8 & 2.362 & 1.904 & 0.81 & 130\end{array}$
1:45 2:00
$620 \quad 27$
59.0

27 65.6
0.1578
$0.0466 \quad 23.526 .8 \quad 2.793 \quad 2.448$
WORKLOAD $2, \quad 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $2: 00$ minutes
2:15
2:30
2:45
3:00
3:15
3:30
3:45 4:00
$305 \quad 27$
64.6
66.1
70.2
0.1584
0.047924 .026 .12 .9252 .692
$\begin{array}{llll}610 & 27 & 71.4 & 147\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllllll}305 & 27 & 75.8 & 0.1615 & 0.0474 & 25.9 & 26.4 & 2.929 & 2.872 & 0.98 & 149\end{array}$
$27 \quad 74.2$
WORKLOAD $3, \quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at 4:00 minutes
4:15
4:30
4:45
5:00
5:15
5:30
5:45 6:00

30527
$81.7 \quad 0.1632$
0.045526 .827 .53 .0472 .973 $\begin{array}{lllllllll}82.1 & 0.1646 & 0.0450 & 27.7 & 27.8 & 2.958 & 2.953 & 1.00 & 158\end{array}$ 84.9 87.3 $\begin{array}{llllllll}86.4 & 0.1627 & 0.0478 & 26.8 & 26.1 & 3.220 & 3.306 & 1.03 \\ 161\end{array}$
30028 90.2

60028

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 89.9 \\
& 949
\end{aligned}
$$

94.90 .1669
0.0441
29.5
28.
$3.215 \quad 3.348$
WORKLOAD $4, \quad 2.25 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $6: 00$ minutes
$6: 15$
$6: 30$
30528
$101.3 \quad 0.1676 \quad 0.044430 .2 \quad 28.23355 \quad 3.594$
6:45
7:00
7:15
$7: 30$
7:45 8:00

| 605 | 28 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 300 | 28 |
| 600 | 28 |

101.1 $\begin{array}{llllllllll}104.3 & 0.1673 & 0.0447 & 30.0 & 28.0 & 3.475 & 3.729 & 1.07 & 166\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllll}114.3 & 0.1673 & 0.0447 & 30.0 & 28.0 & 3.475 & 3.729 & 1.07 \\ 114.3 & & & & & 166 \\ 103\end{array}$ 108.0 168
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}600 & 28 & 103.1 & 0.1691 & 0.0424 & 31.3 & 29.5 & 3.300 & 3.500 & 1.06 & 169\end{array} \quad 43.9$
0.98

121
124
127
0.88

132
0.92

141
144

154
0.98

156
40.5

160

162
31.4
37.2

134
137
17.9  38.9
39.0
39.4
42.8
42.8
1.04162
44.6
44.3
46.2

|  | WORKLOAD |  |  | 5, | 2.50 Kp , changed at $8: 00$ minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $8: 15$ |  |  | 112.0 | 0.1693 | 0.0430 | 31.6 | 29.1 | 3.548 | 3.580 | 1.08 | 170 | 47.2 |
| 8:30 | 305 | 28 | 111.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 170 |  |
| 8:45 |  |  | 115.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 171 |  |
| 9:00 | 605 | 28 | 121.0 | 0.1702 | 0.0423 | 32.3 | 29.6 | 3.742 | 4.090 | 1.09 | 172 | 49.8 |
| $9: 15$ |  |  | 119.2 | 0.1706 | 0.0420 | 32.8 | 29.8 | 3.636 | 4.003 | 1.10 | 172 | 48.4 |
| $9: 30$ | 310 | 28 | 115.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 174 |  |
| 9:45 |  |  | 119.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 174 |  |
| 10:00 | 610 | 28 | 124.9 | 0.1709 | 0.0421 | 33.1 | 29.7 | 3.776 | 4.198 | 1.11 | 175 | 50.2 |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 6, | 2.75 Kp , | changed at 10:00 minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  |  | 134.1 | 0.1722 | 0.0411 | 34.3 | 30.4 | 3.905 | 4.407 | 1.13 | 175 | 52.0 |
| 10:30 | 300 | 29 | 130.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 177 |  |
| 10:45 |  |  | 138.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 178 |  |
| 11:00 | 600 | 29 | 131.5 | 0.1725 | 0.0410 | 34.7 | 30.5 | 3.790 | 4.310 | 1.14 | 179 | 50.4 |
| 11:15 |  |  | 130.3 | 0.1730 | 0.0400 | 35.1 | 31.2 | 3.715 | 4.170 | 1.12 | 180 | 49.4 |
| 11:30 | 300 | 29 | 138.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 182 |  |
| 11:45 |  |  | 153.7 | 0.1747 | 0.0389 | 37.0 | 32.2 | 4.158 | 4.775 | 1.15 | 182 | 55.3 |
| 12:00 | 600 | 29 | 160.1 | 0.1759 | 0.0385 | 38.6 | 32.5 | 4.143 | 4.923 | 1.19 | 184 | 55.1 |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 7. | 3:00 Kp, | changed at 12:00 minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:15 |  |  | 166.3 | 0.1762 | 0.0383 | 39.0 | 32.7 | 4.265 | 5.092 | 1.19 | 185 | 56.7 |
| 12:30 | 300 | 31 | 165.6 | 0.1757 | 0.0395 | 38.6 | 31.7 | 4.285 | 5.227 | 1.22 | 185 | 57.0 |
| 12:45 |  |  | 173.9 | 0.1755 | 0.0399 | 38.5 | 31.4 | 4.513 | 5.544 | 1.23 | 186 | 60.0 |
| 13:00 | 600 | 31 | 179.6 | 0.1771 | 0.0384 | 40.6 | 32.6 | 4.429 | 5.515 | 1.25 | 186 | 58.9 |
| $13: 15$ |  |  | 171.9 | 0.1766 | 0.0384 | 39.7 | 32.6 | 4.328 | 5.282 | 1.22 | 187 | 57.6 |
| 13:30 | 305 | 32 | 178.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 188 |  |
| 13:45 |  |  | 183.3 | 0.1779 | 0.0365 | 41.3 | 34.3 | 4.441 | 5.346 | 1.20 | 189 | 59.1 |
| 14:00 | 600 | 32 | 182.5 | 0.1773 | 0.0373 | 40.5 | 33.6 | 4.508 | 5.432 | 1.20 | 189 | 60.0 |


| Total Test time (min:sec) | 14:00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 8,490 |
| Maximum Workload ( Kp ) | 3.00 |
| Total Power Output ( Kpm ) | 18,962 |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 28 |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 4.513 |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 60.0 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 189 |
| AT $\$_{6}$ of $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \mathrm{max}\left(\mathrm{L} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}\right)$ | 74.3\% |
| Time at AT | 6:15 |
| Workload at AT | 2.25 |
| Revolutions at AT | 3.670 |
| Power Output at AT | 6,662 |
| $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.355 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 44.6 |
| Heart Rate at AT | 163 |

Table A6

## Post-Training Test Raw Data of Subject 3

| Time Revs | St. Rt/ ${ }^{\text {Y }}$ E | $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ | ${ }^{\text {V }}$ | $Y_{E}$ | $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{YCO}_{2}$ | RER | Heart | $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| min:sec ${ }^{\text {No/min }}$ | min BTPS |  |  | 02 | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | STPD | STPD |  | Rate | $\mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{Kg}$ |
|  | L/min |  |  | L/L | L/L | L/min | L/min |  | Bts/min | $/ \mathrm{min}$ |

WORKLOAD 1, 1.50 Kp

| $0: 15$ |  |  | 40.2 | 0.1736 | 0.0375 | 35.1 | 33.2 | 1.145 | 1.210 | 1.06 | 123 | 14.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $0: 30$ | 305 | 26 | 46.5 | 0.1649 | 0.0391 | 26.9 | 31.9 | 1.725 | 1.458 | 0.85 | 123 | 21.8 |
| $0: 45$ |  |  | 45.0 | 0.1591 | 0.0401 | 23.4 | 31.1 | 1.926 | 1.450 | 0.75 | 108 | 24.3 |
| $1: 00$ | 605 | 26 | 52.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 119 |  |
| $1: 15$ |  |  | 61.9 | 0.1566 | 0.0446 | 22.5 | 27.9 | 2.748 | 2.219 | 0.81 | 128 | 34.7 |
| $1: 30$ | 310 | 26 | 68.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 129 |  |
| $1: 45$ |  |  | 66.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 130 |  |
| $2: 00$ | 610 | 26 | 63.4 | 0.1587 | 0.0454 | 23.8 | 27.4 | 2.665 | 2.310 | 0.87 | 130 | 33.7 |

WORKLOAD 2, $\quad 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at 2:00 minutes
$2: 15$
2:30
2:45 3:00
3:15
3:30
3:45 4:00
$-70.7$
63.8
69.6
69.4
72.0
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}77.1 & 0.1611 & 0.0450 & 25.2 & 27.7 & 3.062 & 2.787 & 0.91 & 138\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}80.2 & 0.1619 & 0.0446 & 25.7 & 27.9 & 3.123 & 2.873 & 0.92 & 140\end{array}$
2682.0

WORKLOAD $3, \quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $4: 00$ minutes

| $4: 15$ |  |  | 73.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4: 30$ | 300 | 27 | 80.6 | 0.1625 | 0.0442 | 26.0 | 28.2 | 3.101 | 2.861 | 0.92 | 140 | 39.2 |
| 4:45 |  |  | 82.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 141 |  |
| $5: 00$ | 600 | 27 | 85.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 143 |  |
| 5:15 |  |  | 87.5 | 0.1637 | 0.0425 | 26.6 | 29.3 | 3.289 | 2.987 | 0.91 | 145 |  |
| 5:30 | 295 | 27 | 88.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 146 |  |
| 5:45 |  |  | 86.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 146 |  |
| 6:00 | 595 | 27 | 81.1 | 0.1649 | 0.0413 | 27.3 | 30.2 | 2.974 | 2.688 | 0.90 | 147 | 37.6 |
|  |  | wo | LOAD | 4. | 2.25 Kp , | chan | ged at | 6:00 m | nutes |  |  |  |
| 6:15 |  |  | 88.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 149 |  |
| 6:30 | 300 | 27 | 93.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 151 |  |
| 6:45 |  |  | 93.1 | 0.1643 | 0.0419 | 26.9 | 29.7 | 3.457 | 3.131 | 0.91 | 153 | 43.7 |
| 7:00 | 600 | 27 | 100.7 | 0.1657 | 0.0414 | 27.9 | 30.1 | 3.611 | 3.345 | 0.93 | 153 | 45.6 |
| 7:15 |  |  | 102.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 154 |  |
| 7:30 | 295 | 27 | 101.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 154 |  |
| 7:45 |  |  | 105.5 | 0.1657 | 0.0418 | 28.0 | 29.6 | 3.766 | 3.542 | 0.94 | 154 | 47.6 |
| 8:00 | 600 | 27 | 103.3 | 0.1667 | 0.0407 | 28.6 | 30.6 | 3.613 | 3.378 | 0.93 | 156 | 45.6 |

WORKLOAD 5, $\quad 2.50 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $8: 00$ minutes


Total Test time (min:sec) 18:00
Total Number of Revolutions 10,880
Maximum Workload (Kp) 3.75
Total Power Output (Kpm)23,247
Average Strake Rate (stks $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) 29
$\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right) \quad 5.270$
$\mathrm{VO}_{2} \operatorname{max~ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1} 66.6$
Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ )
186
AT \% of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right) \quad 82.1 \%$
Time at AT $\quad 10: 15$
Workload at AT 2.75
Revolutions at at 6,030
Power Output at AT 12,052
$\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT 4.327
$\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT54.7
Heart Rate at AT 163

Table A7
Pre-Training Test Raw Data of Subject 4

| Time | Revs | St Rt/ | $\gamma_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ | $\dot{Y}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\dot{Y}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{YCO}_{2}$ | RER | Heart | $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| min:sec | $\mathrm{No} / \mathrm{min}$ | min | BTPS |  |  | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | CO | STPD | STPD |  | Rate | $/ \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{Kg}$ |
|  |  | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{L}$ | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ |  | $\mathrm{Bts} / \mathrm{min}$ | $/ \mathrm{min}$ |  |



WORKLOAD 3, $\quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at 4:00 minutes

| $4: 15$ |  |  | 80.4 | 0.1608 | 0.0469 | 25.6 | 27.0 | 3.140 | 2.983 | 0.95 | 207 | 51.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4: 30$ | 300 | 29 | 77.3 | 0.1598 | 0.0476 | 25.1 | 26.6 | 3.079 | 2.906 | 0.94 | 206 | 50.0 |
| 4:45 |  |  | 85.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 204 |  |
| 5:00 | 600 | 29 | 88.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 204 |  |
| 5:15 |  |  | 88.7 | 0.1624 | 0.0461 | 26.6 | 27.4 | 3.330 | 3.233 | 0.97 | 205 | 54.0 |
| 5:30 | 300 | 30 | 90.3 | 0.1624 | 0.0461 | 26.6 | 27.4 | 3.393 | 3.293 | 0.97 | 210 | 55.1 |
| 5:45 |  |  | 89.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 210 |  |
| 6:00 | 600 | 30 | 91.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 204 |  |
|  |  | WOR | OAD | 4, | 2.25 Kp, | chan | ged at | :00 mi | nutes |  |  |  |
| 6:15 |  |  | 88.1 | 0.1617 | 0.0465 | 26.2 | 27.2 | 3.359 | 3.328 | 0.96 | 204 | 54.5 |
| 6:30 | 300 | 31 | 85.6 | 0.1610 | 0.0475 | 25.9 | 26.6 | 3.306 | 3.214 | 0.97 | 204 | 53.6 |
| 6:45 |  |  | 95.6 | 0.1601 | 0.0484 | 25.4 | 26.1 | 3.770 | 3.658 | 0.97 | 205 | 61.2 |
| 7:00 | 600 | 30 | 91.6 | 0.1615 | 0.0479 | 26.3 | 26.4 | 3.547 | 3.529 | 0.99 | 209 | 57.6 |
| 7:15 |  |  | 93.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 209 |  |
| 7:30 | 300 | 31 | 97.8 | 0.1629 | 0.0470 | 27.1 | 26.9 | 3.603 | 3.634 | 1.01 | 211 | 58.5 |
| 7:45 |  |  | 97.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 211 |  |
| 8:00 | 600 | 31 | 90.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 210 |  |


|  |  | WORKLIOAD |  | 5, | 2.50 Kp , changed at $8: 00$ minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:15 |  |  | 104.0 | 0.1640 | 0.0464 | 27.9 | 27.2 | 3.730 | 3.817 | 1.02 | 210 | 60.5 |
| 8:30 | 300 | 31 | 104.4 | 0.1648 | 0.0459 | 28.4 | 27.6 | 3.682 | 3.789 | 1.03 | 210 | 59.7 |
| 8:45 |  |  | 101.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 210 |  |
| 9:00 | 600 | 32 | 107.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 210 |  |
| 9:15 |  |  | 104.0 | 0.1643 | 0.0464 | 28.1 | 27.2 | 3.701 | 3.819 | 1.03 | 210 | 610 |
| 9:30 | 300 | 32 | 99.2 | 0.1632 | 0.0467 | 27.3 | 27.1 | 3.631 | 3.663 | 1.01 | 210 | 58.9 |
| 9:45 |  |  | 106.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 212 |  |
| 10:00 | 595 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 212 |  |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 6, | 2.75 Kp, changed at 10:00 minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  |  | 104.5 | 0.1640 | 0.0458 | 27.8 | 27.6 | 3.761 | 3.789 | 1.01 | 215 | 61.0 |
| 10:30 | 305 | 32 | 108.0 | 0.1651 | 0.0449 | 28.5 | 28.2 | 3.797 | 3.832 | 1.01 | 215 | 61.6 |
| 10:45 |  |  | 108.5 | 0.1661 | 0.0441 | 29.1 | 28.7 | 3.723 | 3.784 | 1.02 | 214 | 60.4 |
| 11:00 | 525 | 32 | 109.0 | 0.1665 | 0.0438 | 29.5 | 28.9 | 3.696 | 3.773 | 1.02 | 213 | 60.0 |


| Total Test time (min:sec) | 11:00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 6,550 |
| Maximum Workload (Kp) | 2.75 |
| Total Power Output ( Kpm ) | 14,319 |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 30 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 3.797 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 61.6 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 215 |
| AT $\%$ of $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 86.8\% |
| Time at AT | 5:15 |
| Workload at AT | 2.00 |
| Revolutions at aT | 3,030 |
| Power Output at AT | 3,948 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.330 |
| $Y_{0} \mathrm{ml}^{\text {mi }} \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 54.0 |
| Heart Rate at AT | 202 |

Post-Training Test Raw Data of Subject 4

| Time Revs min:sec No/min | St. Rt/ min | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{E}} \quad \mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ |  | E | $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ | 9 CO | RER | Heart | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | BTPS |  | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | STPD | STPD |  | Rate | $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{Kg}$ |
|  |  | L/min |  | L/L | L/L | L/min | L/min |  | Bts/min | $/ \mathrm{min}$ |

WORKLOAD 1, 1.50 Kp

| $0: 15$ |  |  | 34.9 | 0.1667 | 0.0428 | 29.1 | 29.2 | 1.199 | 1.193 | 1.00 | 166 | 18.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.30 | 300 | 26 | 42.0 | 0.1576 | 0.0440 | 23.1 | 28.4 | 1.820 | 1.477 | 0.81 | 171 | 28.6 |
| $0: 45$ |  |  | 47.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 168 |  |
| $1: 00$ | 600 | 26 | 52.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 175 |  |  |
| $1: 15$ |  |  | 59.5 | 0.1547 | 0.0468 | 21.9 | 26.7 | 2.717 | 2.225 | 0.82 | 174 | 42.7 |
| $1: 30$ | 300 | 26 | 51.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 172 |  |
| $1: 45$ |  |  | 63.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 180 |  |
| $2: 00$ | 600 | 26 | 59.9 | 0.1548 | 0.0491 | 22.1 | 25.5 | 2.705 | 2.354 | 0.87 | 181 | 42.5 |

HORKLOAD $2, \quad 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $2: 00$ minutes

| $2: 15$ |  |  | 65.7 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2:30 | 300 | 26 | 67.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2:45 |  |  | 65.1 | 0.1563 | 0.0494 | 23.025 .32 .833 | 2.575 |
| 3:00 | 600 | 26 | 68.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 3:15 |  |  | 71.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 3:30 | 295 | 26 | 77.6 | 0.1580 | 0.0493 | $23.925 .3 \quad 3.245$ | 3.064 |
| 3:45 |  |  | 76.2 | 0.1584 | 0.0493 | $24.225 .3 \quad 3.155$ | 3.008 |
| 4:00 | 595 | 26 | 75.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | W0 | OAD | 3, | 2.00 Kp | changed at $4: 00 \mathrm{~m}$ | nutes |

$4: 15$
4.30

300
1.4192
$4: 45$
5:00
5:15
5:30
5:45 6:00 600
80.1 194
$0.0508 \quad 23.6 \quad 24.6 \quad 3.212 \quad 3.083$
0.96194
$600 \quad 27 \quad 82.6$
194
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}78.9 & 0.1517 & 0.0517 & 23.5 & 24.2 & 3.359 & 3.264 & 0.97 & 195\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}27 & 86.1 & 0.1594 & 0.0502 & 24.9 & 24.9 & 3.458 & 3.461 & 1.00 & 196\end{array}$ $89.6 \quad 196$
2788.0

198
50.5
52.8
54.3

WORKLOAD $4, \quad 2.25 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $6: 00$ minutes
$6: 15$
$6: 30 \quad 300 \quad 27$
$6: 45$
7:00 600 27
$7: 15$
$7: 30 \quad 295 \quad 27$
$7: 45$
$8: 00 \quad 580$

$$
\begin{array}{lllllllll}
94.2 & 0.1622 & 0.0484 & 26.5 & 25.8 & 3.556 & 3.648 & 1.03 & 200
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{llllllll}
89.4 & 0.1609 & 0.0495 & 25.8 & 25.2 & 3.467 & 3.542 & 1.02
\end{array} 200
$$

$$
95.7
$$

$$
97.2
$$

$\begin{array}{llllllll}96.4 & 0.1626 & 0.0478 & 26.7 & 26.1 & 3.606 & 3.687 & 1.02 \\ 98.1 & 0.1629 & 0.0479 & 27.0 & 26.1 & 3.637 & 3.763 & 1.03\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllll}96.4 & 0.1626 & 0.0478 & 26.7 & 26.1 & 3.606 & 3.687 & 1.02 \\ 98.1 & 0.1629 & 0.0479 & 27.0 & 26.1 & 3.637 & 3.763 & 1.03\end{array}$
200 95.8

201
201
202
202

|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 5, | 2.50 Kp , changed at 8.00 minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:15 |  |  | 104.7 | 0.1636 | 0.0477 | 27.5 | 26.2 | 3.813 | 3.995 | 1.05 | 203 | 59.9 |
| 8:30 | 300 | 27 | 104.3 | 0.1626 | 0.0492 | 26.9 | 25.4 | 3.869 | 4.104 | 1.06 | 204 | 60.8 |
| 8:45 |  |  | 99.4 | 0.1600 | 0.0522 | 25.6 | 23.9 | 3.889 | 4.153 | 1.07 | 205 | 61.1 |
| 9:00 | 600 | 27 | 110.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 205 |  |
| 9:15 |  |  | 109.8 | 0.1646 | 0.0476 | 28.2 | 26.3 | 3.893 | 4.181 | 1.07 | 205 | 61.2 |
| 9:30 | 300 | 27 | 108.6 | 0.1649 | 0.0472 | 28.4 | 26.4 | 3.828 | 4.106 | 1.07 | 205 | 60.2 |
| 9:45 |  |  | 107.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 206 |  |
| 10:00 | 600 | 27 | 114.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 206 |  |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 6, | 2.75 Kp , changed at $10: 00$ minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  |  | 111.0 | 0.1659 | 0.0458 | 29.0 | 27.3 | 3.825 | 4.070 | 1.06 | 208 | 60.1 |
| 10:30 | 300 | 27 | 105.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 209 |  |
| 10:45 |  |  | 110.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 209 |  |
| 11:00 | 600 | 27 | 112.7 | 0.1638 | 0.0476 | 27.6 | 26.2 | 4.086 | 4.297 | 1.05 | 208 | 64.2 |
| 11:15 |  |  | 113.6 | 0.1662 | 0.0455 | 29.2 | 27.5 | 3.891 | 4.139 | 1.06 | 209 | 61.9 |
| 11:30 | 300 | 27 | 113.3 | 0.1662 | 0.0459 | 29.3 | 27.5 | 3.871 | 4.156 | 1.07 | 198 | 60.8 |
| 11:45 |  |  | 115.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 210 |  |
| 12:00 | 600 | 27 | 112.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 210 |  |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 7. | 3.00 Kp, | changed at 12:00 minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:15 |  |  | 119.9 | 0.1674 | 0.0445 | 30.1 | 28.1 | 3.986 | 4.265 | 1.07 | 212 | 62.6 |
| 12:30 | 280 | 31 | 118.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 212 |  |
| 12:45 |  |  | 118.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 212 |  |
| 13:00 | 505 | 31 | 116.6 | 0.1685 | 0.0437 | 30.9 | 28.6 | 3.774 | 4.072 | 1.08 | 214 | 59.6 |

Total Test time (min:sec)
Total Number of Revolutions
Maximum Workload (Kp)
Total Power Output (Kpm)
Average Stroke Rate (stks $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ )
$\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ max ( $\mathrm{L} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ )
$\mathrm{HO}_{2} \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$
Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ )
AT $\mathbb{\&}$ of $\mathrm{Y}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$
Time at AT
Worklogd at AT
Revolutions at AT
Power Output at AT
$\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT
$\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml}^{-\mathrm{Kg}^{-1}} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT
Heart Rate at AT

13:00
7,670
3.00

17,602
29
4.086
64.2

214
88.8\%

8:15
2.50

4,775
9,322
3.813
59.9

203

Table A9
Pre-Training Test Raw Data of Subject 5


WORKLOAD $1,1.50 \mathrm{Kp}$

| $0: 15$ |  |  | 26.1 | 0.1607 | 0.0458 | 25.0 | 27.2 | 1.044 | 0.961 | 0.92 | 122 | 13.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $0: 30$ | 335 | 27 | 27.3 | 0.1557 | 0.0481 | 22.4 | 25.8 | 1.217 | 1.055 | 0.87 | 118 | 15.8 |
| $0: 45$ |  |  | 25.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 136 |  |
| $1: 00$ | 665 | 27 | 38.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 138 |  |
| $1: 15$ |  |  | 42.5 | 0.1620 | 0.0451 | 25.8 | 27.6 | 1.651 | 1.542 | 0.93 | 149 |  |
| $1: 30$ | 310 | 28 | 54.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 159 |  |
| $1: 45$ |  |  | 57.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 164 |  |
| 2.00 | 620 | 28 | 69.8 | 0.1576 | 0.0487 | 23.5 | 25.5 | 2.969 | 2.734 | 0.92 | 166 | 38.5 |

WORKLOAD $2, \quad 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $2: 00$ minutes
$2: 15$
$2: 30$
$2: 45$
$3.00 \quad 620$
3:15
3:30

### 3.45

$4: 00 \quad 620$
305
$310 \quad 30$
30
71.3

167
167
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}78.0 & 0.1564 & 0.0542 & 23.5 & 22.9 & 3.323 & 3.401 & 1.02 & 169\end{array}$
29
77.5
87.3
84.50 .1592
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.0543 & 25.2 & 22.9 & 3.357 & 3.689\end{array}$
1.10

170 $\begin{array}{llllllll}89.0 & 0.1594 & 0.0546 & 25.4 & 22.8 & 3.506 & 3.912 & 1.12\end{array}$

171
43.5

174 176

WORKLOAD $3, \quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $4: 00$ minutes

| $4: 15$ |  |  | 84.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 176 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4: 30$ | 310 | 30 | 89.9 | 0.1589 | 0.0553 | 25.1 | 22.5 | 3.577 | 4.003 | 1.12 | 176 | 46.4 |
| 4.45 |  |  | 96.5 | 0.1617 | 0.0526 | 26.7 | 23.6 | 3.620 | 4.083 | 1.13 | 178 | 46.9 |
| 5:00 | 620 | 30 | 104.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 179 |  |
| $5: 15$ |  |  | 95.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 179 |  |
| 5:30 | 310 | 30 | 107.5 | 0.1630 | 0.0517 | 27.5 | 24.1 | 3.906 | 4.467 | 1.14 | 180 | 50.6 |
| 5.45 |  |  | 108.9 | 0.1645 | 0.0488 | 28.2 | 25.5 | 3.862 | 4.274 | 1.11 | 182 | 52.2 |
| 6:00 | 615 | 30 | 111.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 184 |  |
|  |  | WO | LOAD | 4, | 2.25 Kp, | chen | ged at | 6:00 m | nutes |  |  |  |
| 6.15 |  |  | 118.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 184 |  |
| 6.30 | 305 | 30 | 114.8 | 0.1651 | 0.0477 | 28.5 | 26.1 | 4.028 | 4.397 | 1.09 | 186 | 52.2 |
| $6: 45$ |  |  | 119.7 | 0.1665 | 0.0467 | 29.6 | 26.6 | 4.048 | 4.492 | 1.11 | 186 | 52.5 |
| 7:00 | 625 | 30 | 114.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 188 |  |
| $7: 15$ |  |  | 120.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 186 |  |
| $7: 30$ | 305 | 29 | 127.6 | 0.1670 | 0.0462 | 29.9 | 27.0 | 4.272 | 4.731 | 1.11 | 158 | 55.4 |
| $7: 45$ |  |  | 120.8 | 0.1666 | 0.0458 | 29.5 | 27.2 | 4.101 | 4.449 | 1.08 | 190 | 53.2 |
| $8: 00$ | 615 | 30 | 125.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 191 |  |

WORKLOAD 5, 2.50 Kp , changed at $8: 00$ minutes

| $8: 15$ |  |  | 126.2 | 0.1688 | 0.0432 | 31.0 | 28.9 | 4.071 | 4.375 | 1.07 | 192 | 52.8 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $8: 30$ | 310 | 30 | 136.5 | 0.1694 | 0.0429 | 31.5 | 29.0 | 4.328 | 4.700 | 1.09 | 193 | 56.1 |
| $8: 45$ |  |  | 125.4 | 0.1669 | 0.0446 | 29.6 | 27.9 | 4.243 | 4.495 | 1.06 | 195 | 55.0 |
| $9: 00$ | 620 | 30 | 131.4 | 0.1681 | 0.0436 | 30.4 | 28.5 | 4.323 | 4.605 | 1.07 | 195 | 56.0 |
| $9: 15$ |  |  | 140.7 | 0.1691 | 0.0424 | 31.1 | 29.4 | 4.516 | 4.789 | 1.06 | 195 | 58.5 |
| 9.30 | 330 | 28 | 156.1 | 0.1691 | 0.0429 | 31.3 | 29.0 | 4.990 | 5.377 | 1.08 | 195 | 64.7 |
| $9: 45$ |  |  | 156.3 | 0.1700 | 0.0439 | 32.3 | 28.4 | 4.833 | 5.508 | 1.14 | 196 | 62.6 |
| $10: 00$ | 640 | 28 | 159.4 | 0.1698 | 0.0442 | 32.2 | 28.2 | 4.948 | 5.664 | 1.14 | 196 | 64.1 |


| Total Test time ( minsec) | $10: 00$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 6,260 |
| Maximum Workload (Kp) | 2.50 |
| Total Power Output (Kpm) | 12,486 |
| Average Stroke Rate (stksmin ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 29 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right.$ ) | 4.990 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 64.7 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts.min ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 196 |
| AT $\%_{6}$ of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(L \cdot m i n^{-1}\right\}$ | 78.2\% |
| Time at AT | 5:30 |
| Workload at AT | 2.00 |
| Revolutions at AT | 3,145 |
| Power Output st AT | 5,338 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 3.906 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 50.6 |
| Heart Rate at AT | 180 |

Table A 10
Post-Training Test Raw Data of Subject 5



| 2:15 |  |  | 73.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 159 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2:30 | 310 | 27 | 68.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 160 |  |
| 2:45 |  |  | 69.2 | 0.1490 | 0.0595 | 20.521 .0 | 3.376 | 3.300 | 0.98 | 162 | 44.9 |
| 3:00 | 610 | 27 | 76.6 | 0.1517 | 0.0579 | 21.621 .5 | 3.554 | 3.555 | 1.00 | 162 | 47.3 |
| 3:15 |  |  | 75.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 164 |  |
| 3:30 | 305 | 27 | 61.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 165 |  |
| 3:45 |  |  | 82.6 | 0.1532 | 0.0575 | 22.321 .7 | 3.710 | 3.806 | 1.03 | 166 | 49.4 |
| 4:00 | 610 | 27 | 80.1 | 0.1528 | 0.0583 | 22.121 .4 | 3.617 | 3.743 | 1.03 | 167 | 48.1 |
|  |  |  | OAD | 3, | 2.00 Kp , | changed at | 4:00 m | nutes |  |  |  |


| 4:15 |  |  | 81.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 169 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4: 30$ | 305 | 27 | 77.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 169 |  |
| 4:45 |  |  | 86.5 | 0.1539 | 0.0574 | 22.6 | 21.8 | 3.832 | 3.974 | 1.04 | 170 | 51.0 |
| 5:00 | 605 | 27 | 71.0 | 0.1497 | 0.0614 | 21.0 | 20.3 | 3.382 | 3.492 | 1.03 | 171 | 45.0 |
| $5: 15$ |  |  | 77.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 172 |  |
| 5:30 | 310 | 27 | 86.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 173 |  |
| 5:45 |  |  | 76.2 | 0.1518 | 0.0586 | 21.7 | 21.3 | 3.516 | 3.582 | 1.02 | 174 | 46.8 |
| 6:00 | 610 | 27 | 87.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 174 |  |
|  |  | W0 | LOAD | 4. | 2.25 Kp , | chan | ged at | 6:00 m | nutes |  |  |  |
| 6:15 |  |  | 85.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 180 |  |
| 6.30 | 300 | 27 | 88.1 | 0.1536 | 0.0574 | 22.4 | 21.8 | 3.924 | 4.048 | 1.03 | 183 | 52.2 |
| 6:45 |  |  | 96.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 183 |  |
| $7: 00$ | 605 | 27 | 88.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 183 |  |
| $7: 15$ |  |  | 101.1 | 0.1556 | 0.0570 | 23.5 | 21.9 | 4.505 | 4.611 | 1.07 | 184 | 57.3 |
| 7:30 | 300 | 27 | 94.6 | 0.1558 | 0.0564 | 23.5 | 22.1 | 4.017 | 4.273 | 1.06 | 185 | 53.4 |
| 7:45 |  |  | 92.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 186 |  |
| 8:00 | 600 | 27 | 99.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 187 |  |


|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 5. | $2.50 \mathrm{~K} p$, changed at $8: 00$ minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $8: 15$ |  |  | 99.6 | 0.1572 | 0.0555 | 24.2 | 22.5 | 4.111 | 4.429 | 1.08 | 188 | 54.7 |
| 8:30 | 310 | 28 | 100.7 | 0.1561 | 0.0572 | 23.8 | 21.8 | 4.239 | 4.611 | 1.09 | 188 | 56.4 |
| 8:45 |  |  | 106.0 | 0.1534 | 0.0592 | 22.5 | 21.1 | 4.702 | 5.031 | 1.07 | 189 | 62.6 |
| 9:00 | 615 | 28 | 101.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 190 |  |
| $9: 15$ |  |  | 110.3 | 0.1585 | 0.0545 | 24.9 | 22.9 | 4.433 | 4.817 | 1.09 | 190 | 59.0 |
| $9: 30$ | 305 | 29 | 97.8 | 0.1571 | 0.0564 | 24.3 | 22.1 | 4.034 | 4.423 | 1.10 | 189 | 53.7 |
| 9:45 |  |  | 109.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 190 |  |
| $10: 00$ | 610 | 29 | 110.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 190 |  |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 6. | 2.75 Kp, | changed at 10:00 minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  |  | 110.1 | 0.1586 | 0.0551 | 25.0 | 22.7 | 4.400 | 4.856 | 1.10 | 192 | 58.5 |
| 10:30 | 300 | 29 | 109.4 | 0.1596 | 0.0542 | 25.6 | 23.0 | 4.280 | 4.751 | 1.11 | 195 | 57.0 |
| 10:45 |  |  | 115.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 194 |  |
| 11:00 | 600 | 29 | 119.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 195 |  |
| 11:15 |  |  | 127.5 | 0.1615 | 0.0527 | 26.6 | 23.7 | 4.790 | 5.378 | 1.12 | 196 | 63.7 |
| 11:30 | 305 | 30 | 121.2 | 0.1611 | 0.0531 | 26.4 | 23.5 | 4.589 | 5.158 | 1.12 | 197 | 61.1 |
| 11:45 |  |  | 124.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 197 |  |
| 12:00 | 605 | 29 | 127.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 198 |  |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 7. | 3:00 Kp, | changed at 12:00 mi nutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:15 |  |  | 137.6 | 0.1633 | 0.0507 | 27.7 | 24.7 | 4.972 | 5.583 | 1.12 | 199 | 66.2 |
| 12:30 | 315 | 30 | 131.2 | 0.1633 | 0.0511 | 27.8 | 24.4 | 4.729 | 5.371 | 1.14 | 202 | 62.9 |
| 12:45 |  |  | 143.9 | 0.1633 | 0.0496 | 27.6 | 25.2 | 5.221 | 5.717 | 1.09 | 203 | 69.5 |
| 13:00 | 625 | 30 | 147.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13:15 |  |  | 130.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13:30 | 310 | 30 | 148.8 | 0.1654 | 0.0503 | 29.4 | 24.8 | 5.065 | 5.997 | 1.18 | 203 | 67.4 |
| 13:45 |  |  | 156.9 | 0.1668 | 0.0491 | 30.4 | 25.4 | 5.157 | 6.170 | 1.20 | 203 | 68.6 |
| $14: 00$ | 615 | 30 | 147.7 | 0.1650 | 0.0546 | 29.8 | 22.9 | 4.948 | 6.461 | 1.31 | 203 | 65.8 |


| Total Test time (min:sec) | 14:00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 8,550 |
| Maximum Workload ( Kp ) | 3.00 |
| Total Power Output (Kpm) | 19,219 |
| Average Stroke Rate ( 3 kss $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 28 |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 5.221 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \mathrm{ml}^{-\mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}}$ | 69.5 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 203 |
| AT $\mathrm{S}^{\text {of }} \mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max}\left(\mathrm{L} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}\right)$ | 81.2\% |
| Time at AT | $8: 30$ |
| Workload at AT | 2.50 |
| Revolutions st AT | 5,190 |
| Power Output at AT | 9,526 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 4.239 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{mil}^{-\mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1} \text { at AT }}$ | 56.4 |
| Hesrt Rate at AT | 188 |

Table A11
Pre-Training Test Raw Data of Subject 6


| 0.15 |  |  | 34.8 | 0.1719 | 0.0400 | 34.1 | 31.6 | 1.019 | 1.100 | 1.08 | 147 | 11.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $0: 30$ | 305 | 27 | 50.7 | 0.1610 | 0.0439 | 25.4 | 28.8 | 1.998 | 1.757 | 0.88 | 144 | 21.9 |
| $0: 45$ |  |  | 54.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 146 |  |
| $1: 00$ | 605 | 27 | 66.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 146 |  |  |
| $1: 15$ |  |  | 70.4 | 0.1556 | 0.0510 | 23.1 | 24.8 | 3.052 | 2.845 | 0.93 | 148 | 33.5 |
| $1: 30$ | 305 | 27 | 78.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 149 |  |
| $1: 45$ |  |  | 74.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2: 00$ | 610 | 27 | 82.5 | 0.1588 | 0.0514 | 25.0 | 24.6 | 3.308 | 3.356 | 1.01 | 150 | 36.3 |

WORKLOAD 1, 1.50 Kp

WORKLOAD 2, $\quad 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at 2:00 minutes

2:15
2:30
2:45
3:00
3:15
3:30
3:45 4:00
31028
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}76.4 & 0.1573 & 0.0538 & 24.3 & 23.5 & 3.140 & 3.258 & 1.04 & 154\end{array}$
$610 \quad 28$
75.9

154

61028
86.6
0.1579
$\begin{array}{lllllll}0.0532 & 24.6 & 23.8 & 3.515 & 3.643 & 1.04 & 157\end{array}$
38.5
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}82.9 & 0.1579 & 0.0528 & 25.1 & 23.9 & 3.303 & 3.463 & 1.05 & 158\end{array}$
$300 \quad 28$
86.6
84.1

29
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}86.8 & 0.1594 & 0.0527 & 25.5 & 24.0 & 3.403 & 3.625 & 1.07 & 162\end{array}$
34.4
36.2
37.3

WORKLOAD 3, $\quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $4: 00$ minutes
$4: 15$
4:30
4:45
5:00
$5: 15$
5:30
5:45 6:00

300
$605 \quad 29$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}90.0 & 0.1601 & 0.0505 & 25.7 & 25.0 & 3.503 & 3.597 & 1.03 & 169\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}90.0 & 0.1601 & 0.0505 & 25.7 & 25.0 & 3.503 & 3.597 & 1.03 & 169\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}77.3 & 0.1575 & 0.0537 & 24.4 & 23.5 & 3,162 & 3.283 & 1.04 & 164 \\ 96.7 & & & & & & & 165 \\ 92.3 & & & & & & & 168\end{array}$

295
595
30
30
100.40 .1624 99.8 96.6
0.1628
$\begin{array}{lllllll}0.0485 & 27.3 & 26.0 & 3.775 & 3.953 & 1.05 & 173\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}77.3 & 0.1575 & 0.0537 & 24.4 & 23.5 & 3,162 & 3.283 & 1.04 & 164 \\ 96.7 & & & & & & & 165 \\ 92.3 & & & & & & & 168\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}77.3 & 0.1575 & 0.0537 & 24.4 & 23.5 & 3,162 & 3.283 & 1.04 & 164 \\ 96.7 & & & & & & & 165 \\ 92.3 & & & & & & & 168\end{array}$
34.7
38.4
40.5

170
172

WORKLOAD 4, 2.25 Kp , changed at 6:00 minutes
$6: 15$
6:30
6:45
7:00
7:15
7:30
7:45 $8: 00$
$300 \quad 30$

60030
$300 \quad 30$
60030
103.40 .1627
$\begin{array}{llll}0.0491 & 27.3 & 25.73 .787 & 4.019\end{array}$
1.06
1.06

174
41.5 $\begin{array}{llllllllll}103.6 & 0.1586 & 0.0531 & 25.0 & 23.6 & 4.137 & 4.359 & 1.05 & 175 & 45.5\end{array}$ 106.8
$+\quad 176$ 101.80 109.2 94.8 113.6
$30 \quad 110.9$
0.1635
0.049
1.05

176
41.2
44.0

179
180
43.9

|  | WORKLOAD |  |  | 5, | 2.50 KP , chariged st 8.00 minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:15 |  |  | 118.6 | 0.1648 | 0.0471 | 28.6 | 26.8 | 4.144 | 4.423 | 1.07 | 181 | 45.4 |
| 8:30 | 300 | 30 | 112.8 | 0.1610 | 0.0514 | 26.4 | 24.6 | 4.272 | 4.594 | 1.08 | 182 | 46.6 |
| 8:45 |  |  | 11.0 .2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 183 |  |
| 9:00 | 600 | 30 | 112.6 | 0.1638 | 0.0471 | 27.8 | 26.9 | 4.045 | 4.191 | 1.04 | 183 | 44.4 |
| 9.15 |  |  | 123.3 | 0.1656 | 0.0460 | 29.1 | 27.5 | 4.240 | 4.486 | 1.06 | 184 | 46.5 |
| 9.30 | 295 | 31 | 117.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 184 |  |
| 9:45 |  |  | 117.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 185 |  |
| 10:00 | 600 | 31 | 125.0 | 0.1657 | 0.0448 | 29.0 | 28.2 | 4.311 | 4.425 | 1.03 | 186 | 47.3 |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | E, | 2.75 Kp , changed at $10: 00$ minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  |  | 122.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 186 |  |
| 10:30 | 300 | 31 | 119.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 187 |  |
| 10:45 |  |  | 118.0 | 0.1642 | 0.0459 | 27.9 | 27.6 | 4.226 | 4.280 | 1.01 | 187 | 46.3 |
| 11:00 | 600 | 31 | 128.9 | 0.1659 | 0.0450 | 29.2 | 28.1 | 4.416 | 4.588 | 1.04 | 188 | 48.4 |
| 11:15 |  |  | 118.8 | 0.1633 | 0.0474 | 27.5 | 26.7 | 4.326 | 4.458 | 1.03 | 189 | 47.4 |
| 11:30 | 300 | 31 | 113.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 189 |  |
| 11:45 |  |  | 128.2 | 0.1654 | 0.0451 | 28.8 | 28.1 | 4.452 | 4.569 | 1.03 | 190 | 48.8 |
| 12:00 | 600 | 31 | 118.8 | 0.1653 | 0.0450 | 29.6 | 28.1 | 4.146 | 4.230 | 1.02 | 190 | 45.5 |
|  |  | WORKLOAD |  | 7, | 3.00 Kp , changed at 12:00 minutes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:15 |  |  | 132.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 192 |  |
| 12:30 | 295 | 32 | 122.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 192 |  |
| 12:45 |  |  | 110.0 | 0.1613 | 0.0496 | 26.4 | 25.5 | 4.171 | 4.316 | 1.03 | 193 | 45.7 |
| 13:00 | 595 | 32 | 122.7 | 0.1652 | 0.0443 | 28.5 | 28.5 | 4.304 | 4.300 | 1.00 | 195 | 47.2 |
| 13:15 |  |  | 141.3 | 0.1661 | 0.0438 | 29.1 | 28.9 | 4.917 | 4.959 | 1.01 | 195 | 53.9 |
| 13:30 | 285 | 32 | 140.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 196 |  |
| 13:45 |  |  | 130.5 | 0.1658 | 0.0455 | 29.2 | 27.8 | 4.472 | 4.700 | 1.05 | 197 | 49.0 |
| 14:00 | 460 | 32 | 139.3 | 0.1669 | 0.0445 | 30.0 | 28.4 | 4.650 | 4.901 | 1.05 | 198 | 51.0 |


| Total Test time ( min:sec) | 14:00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number-af Revolutions | 8,280 |
| Maximum Worklaad ( Kp ) | 3.00 |
| Total Power Output ( Kpm ) | 18,505 |
| Avergge Stroke Rate (stks $\cdot \mathrm{mir}^{-1}$ ) | 29 |
| $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 4.917 |
| $\mathrm{FO}_{2} \mathrm{mox} \mathrm{ml}^{\mathrm{Kg}}{ }^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 53.9 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (ute min ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 198 |
| AT \% of $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right.$ ) | 76.78 |
| Time st AT | 6:00 |
| Workload at AT | 2.00 |
| Fevolutions at AT | 3,615 |
| Power Output at at | 6,340 |
| $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at $\mathrm{hT}^{\text {a }}$ | 3.775 |
| \%O2 ml $\mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 41.4 |
| Heart Rate at AT | 173 |

Table A 12
Post-Training Test Raw Data of Subject 6

| Time Revs | St. Rt/ | ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ | ${ }^{\dagger} \mathrm{E}$ | ${ }^{\text {Y }}$ E | $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ | $8 \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | RER | Heart | $\mathrm{YO}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| min:sec $\mathrm{No} / \mathrm{min}$ | min | BTPS |  |  | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | STPD | STPD |  | Rate | $\mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{Kg}$ |
|  |  | L/min |  |  | L/L | L/L | L/min | L/min |  | Bts/min | $/ \mathrm{min}$ |

$0: 15$
0:30
0:45
1:00 1:15 1:30 1:45 2:00

305
605
300
600
26
WORKLOAD $2, \quad 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $2: 00$ minutes
2:15
2:30 2:45 3:00 3:15 3:30 3:45 4:00

Workload $2, \ldots, 75 \mathrm{Kp}$, ehanged at 2.00 minutes
$300 \quad 26$
61.5
65.0
61.5
0.1501
$0.0532 \quad 20.4 \quad 23.5 \quad 3.0192 .618$
68.6
67.7
65.8
0.1494
$0.0558 \quad 20.3 \quad 22.43 .235 \quad 2.940$ 68.6
$26 \quad 73.7$

WORKLOAD 1. 1.50 Kp
0.87
0.91

WORKLOAD $3, \quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $4: 00$ minutes
$4: 15$
4:30 4:45 5:00 $600 \quad 26$ 5:15 5:30 $295 \quad 26$ 5:45 6:00 595

26
70.3
0.1524
$0.0541 \quad 21.523 .13 .269 \quad 3.043$
$\begin{array}{ll}0.93 & 152\end{array}$
84.3
0.1533
$0.053921 .9 \quad 23.23 .8443 .693$
0.95
84.9
82.3
$83.6 \quad 0.1545$
89.8 90.9 86.8
0.1553
0.0
0.053 2 22.

9
23.5
.53
3.72

63
559
3.559
0.9
3.831
0.97

WORKLOAD $4, \quad 2.25 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at 6:00 minutes

| $6: 30$ | 290 | 26 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6: 45$ |  |  |

59026
30026
93.5
$\begin{array}{llllll}0.1556 & 0.0536 & 31.1 & 23.3 & 4.054 & 4.010\end{array}$ 87.4
$\begin{array}{lllllll}0.1548 & 0.0542 & 22.7 & 23.0 & 3.845 & 3.790\end{array}$
0.99 99.4 92.9 0.1561 $\begin{array}{llllllll}98.9 & 0.1566 & 0.0530 & 23.3 & 23.6 & 4.083 & 4.031 & 0.98 \\ & 23.6 & 23.6 & 4.194 & 4.187 & 1.00\end{array}$ 98.1
$26 \quad 104.7$

140
140

15
158
163
164 165

165
16.1
22.7

131
131
132
132
136
139

WORKLOAD $\quad 5, \quad 2.50 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $8: 00$ minutes

| $8: 15$ |  |  | 100.7 | 0.1567 | 0.0537 | 23.7 | 23.3 | 4.254 | 4.328 | 1.02 | 173 | 47.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:30 | 295 | 27 | 98.5 | 0.1572 | 0.0532 | 23.9 | 23.5 | 4.118 | 4.194 | 1.02 | 174 | 46.2 |
| 8:45 |  |  | 106.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 175 |  |
| 9:00 | 595 | 27 | 100.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 175 |  |
| 9:15 |  |  | 108.4 | 0.1580 | 0.0521 | 24.3 | 24.0 | 4.471 | 4.524 | 1.01 | 175 | 50.1 |
| 9:30 | 295 | 27 | 106.8 | 0.1582 | 0.0526 | 24.5 | 23.7 | 4.368 | 4.503 | 1.03 | 177 | 49.0 |
| 9:45 |  |  | 104.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 179 |  |
| 10:00 | 600 | 27 | 11.9 .8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 178 |  |
|  |  | WOR | LOAD | 6, | 2.75 Kp , | chang | ged at | 0:00 | minutes |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  |  | 110.3 | 0.1590 | 0.0515 | 24.8 | 24.2 | 4.450 | 4.549 | 1.02 | 178 | 49.9 |
| $10: 30$ | 300 | 27 | 115.6 | 0.1608 | 0.0505 | 25.8 | 24.7 | 4.476 | 4.673 | 1.04 | 178 | 50.2 |
| 10:45 |  |  | 109.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 179 |  |
| 11:00 | 600 | 27 | 102.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 179 |  |
| 11:15 |  |  | 115.6 | 0.1600 | 0.0516 | 25.5 | 24.2 | 4.535 | 4.776 | 1.05 | 180 | 50.8 |
| 11:30 | 295 | 27 | 117.0 | 0.1597 | 0.0519 | 25.3 | 24.1 | 4.623 | 4.860 | 1.05 | 181 | 51.8 |
| 11:45 |  |  | 106.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 181 |  |
| 12:00 | 595 | 27 | 117.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 181 |  |

WORKLOAD 7, 3.00 Kp , changed at 12:00 minutes
12:15
12:30 300
12:45
13:00 600
13:15
13:30 300
13:45
14:00 600
$14: 15$
$14: 30300$
14:45
15:00 600
15:15
15:30 295
15:45
16:00 405
51.7
52.9
54.6
53.8
54.5
55.5
56.2
56.1
55.0

| Total Test time (min:sec) | 16:00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 9,380 |
| Maximum Workload (Kp) | 3.50 |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 27 |
| Total Power Output ( Kpm ) | 22,367 |
| $\mathrm{HO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 5.013 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 56.2 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 188 |
| AT \& of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max}\left(\mathrm{L} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}\right)$ | 89.2 \% |
| Time ot AT | 9:15 |
| Workload at AT | 2.50 |
| Revolutions at AT | 5,385 |
| Power Output at AT | 10,825 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 4.471 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 50.1 |
| Heart Rate at AT | 175 |

## Table AIS

$$
\text { Pre-Traiming Test Raw Data of Subject } 7
$$

| Time Revs min:sec No/min | St. Rt min |  | $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ | $\psi_{E}$ | $Y_{E}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{YCO}_{2}$ | RER | Heart | $\mathrm{HO}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | BTPS |  |  | $0_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | STPD | STPD |  | Rate | $\mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{Kg}$ |
|  |  | L/min |  |  | L/L | L/L | $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min}$ | L/min |  | Etsimin | /min |



WORKLOAD 2, $\quad 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at 2:00 minutes

| $2: 15$ |  |  | 70.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2: 30$ | 305 | 27 | 72.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2: 45$ |  |  | 71.4 | 0.1521 | 0.0532 | 21.1 | 23.2 | 3.372 | 3.061 | 0.91 | 136 | 37.8 |  |
| $3: 00$ | 610 | 27 | 71.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 139 |  |  |
| $3: 15$ |  |  | 70.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $3: 30$ | 310 | 27 | 70.7 | 0.1492 | 0.0549 | 20.0 | 22.5 | 3.438 | 3.051 | 0.89 | 138 | 38.5 |  |
| $3: 45$ |  |  | 75.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 139 |  |  |
| $4: 00$ | 610 | 27 | 75.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 138 |  |  |  |  |

WORKLOAD $3, \quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $4: 00$ minutes

| $4: 15$ |  |  | 79.4 | 0.1513 | 0.0549 | 20.9 | 22.5 | 3.801 | 3.526 | 0.93 | 143 | 42.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $4: 30$ | 300 | 28 | 75.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 143 |  |
| $4: 45$ |  |  | 80.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $5: 00$ | 600 | 28 | 80.1 | 0.1530 | 0.0543 | 21.6 | 22.8 | 3.713 | 3.519 | 0.95 | 144 | 41.6 |
| 5.15 |  |  | 80.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 146 |  |
| $5: 30$ | 300 | 28 | 81.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $5: 45$ |  |  | 86.1 | 0.1544 | 0.0532 | 2.22 | 23.2 | 3.683 | 3.707 | 0.95 | 146 | 43.5 |
| $6: 00$ | 600 | 28 | 86.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 149 |  |

WORKLOAD 4, 2.25 KF , changed at $6: 00$ minutes

| 6.15 |  |  | 85.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 149 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6: 30$ | 305 | 28 | 84.9 | 0.1527 | 0.0549 | 21.522 .5 | 3.911 | 3.738 | 0.96 | 150 | 43.8 |
| 6:45 |  |  | 82.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 149 |  |
| 7:00 | 605 | 28 | 84.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 149 |  |
| $7: 15$ |  |  | 87.3 | 0.1527 | 0.0543 | 21.422 .6 | 4.071 | 3.836 | 0.94 | 150 | 45.6 |
| 7:30 | 300 | 29 | 90.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 152 |  |
| 7:45 |  |  | 89.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.4 |  |
| 800 | 600 | 29 | 90.7 | 0.1530 | 0.0547 | 21.7226 | 4.189 | 4.011 | 0.96 | 154 | 46.9 |

WORKLOAD 5, 2.50 KH , changed st 3.00 minutes
$8: 15$
$8: 30$
$8: 45$
$9: 00$
$9: 15$
$9: 30$
$9: 45$
$10: 00$
$10: 15$
$10: 30$
$10: 45$
$11: 00$
$11: 15$
$11: 30$
$11: 45$
$12: 00$

11:45 12:00

12:15 $12: 30$ 12:45 13:00 13:15 $13: 30$ $13: 34$ 14:00
$14: 15$ $14: 30$
$14: 45$ $15: 00$ $15: 15$ 15:30 15:45 16:00

```
16:15
```

16.30
$16: 45$
17:00

$305 \quad 29$
$605 \quad 29$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}300 & 29 & 91.2 & 0.1506 & 0.0584 & 20.9 & 21.2 & 4.367 & 4.309 \\ & & 95.7 & 0.1517 & 0.0572 & 21.3 & 21.6 & 4.495 & 4.424 \\ 600 & 29 & 96.1 & & & & & & \\ & \\ & \text { WORKLOAD } & 6, & & 2.75 \mathrm{~K} p, \text { changed st } 10: 00 \text { minutes }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}300 & 29 & 91.2 & 0.1506 & 0.0584 & 20.9 & 21.2 & 4.367 & 4.309 \\ & & 95.7 & 0.1517 & 0.0572 & 21.3 & 21.6 & 4.495 & 4.424 \\ 600 & 29 & 96.1 & & & & & & \\ & \\ & \text { WORKLOAD } & 6, & & 2.75 \mathrm{~K} p, \text { changed st } 10: 00 \text { minutes }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}300 & 29 & 91.2 & 0.1506 & 0.0584 & 20.9 & 21.2 & 4.367 & 4.309 \\ & & 95.7 & 0.1517 & 0.0572 & 21.3 & 21.6 & 4.495 & 4.424 \\ 600 & 29 & 96.1 & & & & & & \\ & \\ & \text { WORKLOAD } & 6, & & 2.75 \mathrm{~K} p, \text { changed st } 10: 00 \text { minutes }\end{array}$
158
$\begin{array}{llllllllllll}300 & 30 & 90.9 & 0.1493 & 0.0596 & 20.4 & 20.7 & 4.453 & 4.380 & 0.98 & 15\end{array}$
$60030 \quad 98.1$ 16.1
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}305 & 30 & 106.8 & 0.1537 & 0.0563 & 22.3 & 21.9 & 4.820 & 4.870 & 1.01\end{array}$
155

|  | 96.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 600 | 30 | 98.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 103.7 | 0.1536 | 0.0565 | 21.1 | 21.9 | 4.681 | 4.741 | 1.01 | 164 |  |
| 305 | 30 | 106.8 | 0.1537 | 0.0563 | 22.3 | 21.9 | 4.820 | 4.370 | 1.01 | 163 |  |
|  |  | 104.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 165 |  |
| 610 | 30 | 112.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 166 |  |

WORKLOAD $\quad 7, \quad 3.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $12: 00$ minutes

| 300 | 30 | 116.9 | 0.1554 | 0.0550 | 22.9 | 22.5 | 5.110 | 5.196 | 1.02 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | 113.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 600 | 30 | 117.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 117.3 | 0.1560 | 0.0553 | 23.3 | 22.3 | 5.040 | 5.252 | 1.04 | 1 |  |
| 300 | 30 | 122.0 | 0.1562 | 0.0548 | 23.3 | 22.5 | 5.232 | 5.413 | 1.04 | 1 |  |
|  |  | 121.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 600 | 30 | 122.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

WORKLOAD $8, \quad 3.50 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed st $14: 00$ minutes
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll} & & 134.8 & 0.1579 & 0.0541 & 24.2 & 22.8 & 5.566 & 5.899 & 1.06 & 173 & 62.3 \\ 300 & 30 & 128.5 & 0.1569 & 0.0550 & 23.8 & 22.5 & 5.408 & 5.721 & 1.06 & 173 & 60.6 \\ & & 135.6 & & & & & & & & & 174 & \\ 600 & 30 & 140.8 & 0.1590 & 0.0531 & 24.8 & 23.3 & 5.678 & 6.043 & 1.06 & 175 & 63.6 \\ & & 143.8 & 0.1598 & 0.0525 & 25.2 & 23.6 & 5.709 & 6.103 & 1.07 & 175 & 63.9 \\ 300 & 30 & 147.0 & & & & & & & & & 176 & \\ & & 139.3 & 0.1568 & 0.0535 & 24.7 & 23.1 & 5.633 & 6.029 & 1.07 & 177 & 63.1 \\ 600 & 30 & 147.7 & 0.1593 & 0.0535 & 25.0 & 23.1 & 5.908 & 6.397 & 1.08 & 178 & 66.2\end{array}$ WORKLGAD 9, 3.75KF, chariped at $16: 00$ minutes

|  |  | 149.2 | 0.1568 | 0.0557 | 23.7 | 22.2 | 6.297 | 6.718 | 1.07 | 178 | 70.4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 300 | 30 | 156.0 | 0.1626 | 0.0495 | 26.7 | 25.0 | 5.916 | 6.520 | 1.07 | 178 | 66.3 |
|  |  | 163.2 | 0.1631 | 0.0492 | 27.1 | 25.2 | 6.052 | 6.487 | 1.08 | 179 | 67.6 |
| 590 | 30 | 167.9 | 0.1640 | 0.0475 | 27.5 | 26.0 | 6.118 | 6.449 | 1.05 | 180 | 68.5 |


| Total Test time ( min:sec) | 17:00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 10,280 |
| Maximum Workload ( Kp ) | 3.75 |
| Average Stroke Rate (stks $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 29 |
| Total Power Output ( Kpm ) | 25,474 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 6.287 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 70.4 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 180 |
| AT \% of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 81.3\% |
| Time at AT | 12:30 |
| Workload at AT | 3.00 |
| Revolutions at AT | 7,590 |
| Power Output at AT | 16,362 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 5.110 |
| $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 57.2 |
| Heart Rate at AT | 168 |

Table Ail 4
Fost-Training Test Ray Data of Subject 7

| Time Revs minsec Noimin | St. Rt min | $\psi_{E}$ | $\mathrm{FEO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{FECO}_{2}$ | $\dot{Y}_{E}$ | $\dot{\gamma}_{E}$ | $\mathrm{HO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{YCO}_{2}$ | RER | Heart | $\mathrm{HO}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | BTPG |  |  | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | STPD | STPO |  | Rate | $\mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{Kg}$ |
|  |  | L/min |  |  | L/L | L/ $/$ | L/min | L/min |  | Bts/min | / min |

$0: 15$
0:30 0:45 1:00 1:15 1:30 1:45 2:00
$315 \quad 26$
$615 \quad 26$
27
$305 \quad 27$
$605 \quad 27$

WORKLOAD 1, 1.50 Kp

WORKLOAD $2, \quad 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $2: 00$ minutes
$2: 15$

2:30
2:45 3:00 $3: 15$ 3:30 3:45 $4: 00 \quad 605$

300
600
305
605
25.6
57.8 $\begin{array}{ll}54.6 & 0.1397\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.0547 & 17.1 & 23.1 & 3.197 & 2.364\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll} & 135 \\ 0.74 & 136\end{array}$
$27 \quad 63.5$ 58.9
$\begin{array}{lll}27 & 67.3 & 0.1452\end{array}$ 66.5 $27 \quad 65.7$

WORKLOAD $3, \quad 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $4: 00$ minutes
$4: 15$
$4: 30$

27
27
27
27
WORKLOAD 4. 2.25 Kp , changed at 6:00 minutes

| $6: 15$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6: 30$ | 300 |
| $6: 45$ |  |
| 700 | 600 |
| $7: 15$ |  |
| 7.30 | 295 |
| $7: 45$ |  |
| 6.00 | 595 |

- 

76.3
$28 \quad 75.6$
74.8 0.1462 $0.0546 \quad 19.2 \quad 23.1 \quad 3.940 \quad 3.267$教

145
$28 \quad 81.2$
75.9 75.3 78.9

29
$66.0 \quad 0.1457$ 69.1 69.7
39.4

144
143
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}67.5 & 0.1454 & 0.0533 & 18.8 & 23.7 & 3.591 & 2.846 & 0.79 & 143\end{array}$ 66.1 70.6 70.20 .1444
0.0554
18.6

622
.83
3.775
3.08
3.084
0.82

145
145 144
28.70 .1623
33.40 .1509
55.1
58.8
$67.0 \quad 0.1478$
65.7
63.7
63.9
$0.0355 \quad 25.0 \quad 35.7 \quad 1.147$
0.90
0.7

11
13.0
19.0
39.6

130
131
132
38.6
36.2
40.7

140
141

WORKLOAD $5, \quad 2.50 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $8: 00$ minutes

| 8:15 |  |  | 80.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 152 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:30 | 300 | 28 | 81.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 153 |  |
| 8:45 |  |  | 87.7 | 0.1468 | 0.0560 | 19.5 | 22.64 .487 | 3.888 | 0.87 | 154 | 50.8 |
| 9:00 | 600 | 28 | 87.4 | 0.1464 | 0.0564 | 19.4 | 22.44 .499 | 3.905 | 0.87 | 156 | 50.9 |
| $9: 15$ |  |  | 85.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 157 |  |
| 9:30 | 300 | 28 | 93.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 158 |  |
| 9:45 |  |  | 96.6 | 0.1494 | 0.0541 | 20.4 | 23.44 .732 | 4.137 | 0.87 | 159 | 53.5 |
| 10:00 | 605 | 28 | 98.9 | 0.1504 | 0.0532 | 20.8 | 23.84 .759 | 4.162 | 0.87 | 159 | 53.8 |
|  |  | WOR | LOAD | 6, | 2.75 Kp, | chang | ged at 10:00 m | minutes |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  |  | 98.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 160 |  |
| $10: 30$ | 300 | 28 | 97.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 160 |  |
| 10:45 |  |  | 100.2 | 0.1505 | 0.0531 | 20.8 | 23.84 .816 | 4.216 | 0.88 | 161 | 54.5 |
| 11:00 | 595 | 28 | 96.9 | 0.1488 | 0.0545 | 20.2 | 23.24 .796 | 4.185 | 0.87 | 161 | 54.3 |
| 11:15 |  |  | 97.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 163 |  |
| 11:30 | 305 | 28 | 101.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 165 |  |
| 11:45 |  |  | 104.1 | 0.1501 | 0.0548 | 20.8 | 23.15 .011 | 4.513 | 0.90 | 166 | 56.7 |
| 12:00 | 610 | 28 | 103.3 | 0.1501 | 0.0545 | 20.7 | 23.24 .980 | 4.454 | 0.89 | 167 | 56.3 |
|  |  | wo | LOAD | 7. | 3.00 Kp | chan | nged at 12:00 | minutes |  |  |  |


| $12: 15$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12: 30$ | 300 |
| $12: 45$ |  |
| $13: 00$ | 600 |
| $13: 15$ |  |
| $13: 30$ | 305 |
| $13: 45$ |  |
| $14: 00$ | 605 |

        60.4
        62.4
    | $14: 15$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $14: 30$ | 305 |
| $14: 45$ |  |
| $15: 00$ | 595 |
| $15: 15$ |  |
| $15: 30$ | 305 |
| $15: 45$ |  |
| $16: 00$ | 615 |

$\begin{array}{lllll}14: 15 & & & 121.0 \\ 14: 30 & 305 & 28 & 128.1\end{array}$
121.0
171
$29 \quad 131.0 \quad 0.1539 \quad 0.0526 \quad 22.3 \quad 24.0 \quad 5.861$
135.1 173
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}29 & 130.9 & 0.1537 & 0.0535 & 22.3 & 23.6 & 5.864 & 5.542 & 0.95 & 176\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}136.5 & 0.1548 & 0.0529 & 22.8 & 23.9 & 5.982 & 5.720 & 0.96 & 175\end{array}$
$29 \quad 136.8$
$106.0 \quad 167$
$\begin{array}{lllll}28 & 105.2 & 167\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}107.6 & 0.1507 & 0.0541 & 21.0 & 23.3 & 5.130 & 4.609 & 0.90 & 168\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}28 & 112.4 & 0.1512 & 0.0532 & 21.1 & 23.7 & 5.326 & 4.737 & 0.89 & 168\end{array}$
108.6
170
$\begin{array}{lllll}28 & 110.2 & 169\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}112.3 & 0.1507 & 0.0547 & 21.0 & 23.1 & 5.338 & 4.869 & 0.91 & 169\end{array}$
WORKLOAD $8, \quad 3.50 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at $14: 00$ minutes

167

| 28 | 105.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 107.6 | 0.1507 | 0.0541 | 21.0 | 23.3 | 5.130 | 4.609 |  |  |
| 28 | 112.4 | 0.1512 | 0.0532 | 21.1 | 23.7 | 5.326 | 4.737 |  |  |
|  | 108.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | 110.2 |  |  | 0.0547 | 21.0 | 23.1 | 5.338 | 4.869 |  |
|  | 112.3 | 0.1507 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | 118.6 | 0.1519 | 0.0537 | 21.5 | 23.5 | 5.518 | 5.041 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKLOAD | 8, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

YORKLOAD 9, $\quad 3.75 \mathrm{Kp}$, changed at 16:00 minutes

| $16: 15$ |  |  | 145.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $16: 30$ | 310 | 30 | 140.8 | 0.1560 | 0.0515 | 23.3 | 24.5 | 6.039 | 5.741 | 0.95 | 177 | 68.3 |  |
| $16: 45$ |  |  | 139.5 | 0.1548 | 0.0529 | 22.9 | 23.9 | 6.107 | 5.845 | 0.96 | 177 | 69.1 |  |
| $17: 00$ | 610 | 30 | 146.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 179 |  |
| $17: 15$ |  |  | 146.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 178 |  |  |  |
| $17: 30$ | 305 | 31 | 146.7 | 0.1565 | 0.0509 | 23.6 | 24.8 | 6.226 | 5.910 | 0.95 | 180 | 70.4 |  |
| $17: 45$ |  |  | 156.7 | 0.1573 | 0.0506 | 23.9 | 25.0 | 6.546 | 6.279 | 0.96 | 180 | 74.11 |  |
| $18: 00$ | 610 | 31 | 160.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 180 |  |
| $18: 15$ |  |  | 170.2 | 0.1605 | 0.0476 | 25.6 | 26.5 | 6.658 | 6.413 | 0.96 | 181 | 75.3 |  |
| $18: 30$ | 310 | 31 | 171.7 | 0.1610 | 0.0477 | 25.9 | 26.5 | 6.637 | 6.485 | 0.98 | 182 | 75.1 |  |
| $18: 45$ |  |  | 166.7 | 0.1611 | 0.0478 | 25.9 | 26.4 | 6.425 | 6.305 | 0.98 | 183 | 72.7 |  |
| $19: 00$ | 615 | 32 | 169.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.03 | 183 |  |  |


| Total Test time (min:sec) | 19:00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Revolutions | 11,480 |
| Maximum Workload ( Kp ) | 3.75 |
| Average Stroke Rate ( $\mathrm{stks} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ ) | 28 |
| Total Power Output ( Kpm ) | 29,627 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 6.658 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ | 75.3 |
| Maximum Heart Rate (bts $\cdot \mathrm{min}{ }^{-1}$ ) | 183 |
| AT $\mathrm{B}_{8}$ of $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \max \left(\mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | 87.3\% |
| Time at AT | 14:45 |
| Workload at AT | 3.50 |
| Revolutions at at | 8,740 |
| Power Output at AT | 22,138 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~min}{ }^{-1}$ at AT | 5.812 |
| $\mathrm{YO}_{2} \mathrm{ml} \cdot \mathrm{Kg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ at AT | 65.8 |
| Heart Rate st AT | 174 |

## APPENDIX B

TRAINING PROGRAMS

## TRAINING PROGRAM OF SUB IECT I

PERIDD: week ! to 2.

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) 40 min Steody State Rowing (St. St.R.)
$i$ Workload (WL.) 2.00 Kp
ii Target Heart Rate (T.H.R.):
$145-150 \mathrm{bts} \mathrm{min}^{-1}$
iii Stroke Rate (St. Rt.): $25-26 \mathrm{Stks} \cdot \mathrm{min}^{-1}$
c) Werm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $3 \times(5 \times 405 t k s 0 N / 205 t k s ~ O F F)$
i WL.: 2.25 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 175-180
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $20 \mathrm{~min} 5 \mathrm{t} . \mathrm{St} \cdot \mathrm{R}$
i $W L .: 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 150
iii 5t. Rt.: 26-27
c) $3 \times 5 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 4 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WLL.: 2.25 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii St. Rt.: 27-29
d) Warm-down \& stretch

PERIOD Week 3 to 4.

DAY 1:
a) 15 min Worm-up
b) $2 \times(5 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 2 \mathrm{~min}$ OFF $)$

8-10 min Light between sets
i $\quad W \mathrm{~L} .: 2.50 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 177-185
iii St. Rt.: 28-32
c) Warm down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
g) 15 min warm-up
b) 30 minst st. R.
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ij T.H.R.: 145-150
c) Warm down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min Warm-up
b) $3 \times 50 \mathrm{~N} / 8 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i WL: 2.25 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 177-182
c) Werm down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 5 to 6

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $3 \times 50 \mathrm{~N} / 10 \mathrm{~min}$ Light now
i WL.: 2.25 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 178-182
iii St. Rt.: 28-30
c) Warm down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min worm-up
b) PYRAMID
$2 x(3 \mathrm{~min}, 2 \mathrm{~min}, 1 \mathrm{~min}, 2 \mathrm{~min}, 3 \mathrm{~min}) 0 \mathrm{~N} / 15 \mathrm{~min}$ OFF
i WL.: 2.25 Kp
ii T.H.R. 180-185
iii St. Rt. 29-31
c) Warm down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min Worm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t .5 t . R$.
$i \quad W \mathrm{~L} .: 2.00 \mathrm{~K} p$
i) T.H.R.: 145-150
iii St. Rt.: 25-26
c) Warm down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 7 to 8

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $7 \times 3 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{ON} / 5 \mathrm{~min}$ aFF
i WL.: 2.25
ii T.H.R.: 175-180
iii St. Rt.: 29-30
c) Warm down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t .5 t . R$.
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 145-150
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min Warm-up
b) $8 \times(3 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 4 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF})$
$i$ WL.: 2.25 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 178-182
iii St. Rt.: 28-30
c) Warm down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 1 to 2

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) 25 min St. St. R.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min Warm-up
b) $4 \times 40 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i WL.: 2.00 kp
ii T.H.R.: 185-190
ii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 \mathrm{t} . \mathrm{St} . \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii St.Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PEPIOD: Week 3 to 4

DAY 1: a) 15 min worm-up
b) $3 \times 6 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
$i \quad W L: 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 168-175
iii St.Rt.: 27-29
c) Warm-Down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min Warm-up
b) $4 \times 6 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{ON} / 6 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 175 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 178-165
iii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3: a) 15 min Worm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t . \mathrm{st}$. R.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 168-172
ii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD Week 5 to 6

DAY 1: g) 15 min warm-up
b) $5 \times 2 \mathrm{~min}$ ON/ 3 min OFF
$i \quad W L .: 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 180-190
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2: $\quad$ a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t .5 t . R$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 160-165
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Werm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3: a) 15 min warm-up
b) $5 \times 4 \mathrm{~min} 0 N / 4 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i $W \mathrm{~L} .: 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 180-190
ii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: 7 to 8

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $6 \times 30 \mathrm{~N} / 4 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 185-190
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t .5 t . R$.
i $\quad$ WL: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $9 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 3 \mathrm{~min}$ GFF
$1 \quad W L: 2.25 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 186-190
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 1 to 2

DAY 1:
-) 15 min worm-up
b) $8 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} O N / 2 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 2.50 kp
ii T.H.R.: 168-175
iist.Rt.: 27-29
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) 30 min St. St. R.
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 152-156
ii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $4 \times 5 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 5 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i WL.: 2.75
ii T.H.R.: 175-178
iii St. Rt.: 28-30

PERIOO: Week 3 to 4

DAY 1:
-) $15 \mathrm{~min} w a r m-u p$
b) $7 \times 3$ ON/ 3 min OFF
i WL: 2.50 Kp
ii T.H.R.:175-180
iii St.Rt.: 28-30
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2: a) 15 min worm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{St}. \mathrm{St}. \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 152-156
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
จ) 15 min warm-up
b) PYRAMID
$2 \mathrm{x}(2 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{ON}, 2 \mathrm{~min}$ OFF, $3 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{ON}, 3 \mathrm{~min}$ OFF, 4 min
$\mathrm{ON}, 4 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}, 3 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N}, 3 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}, 2 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{ON}, 2 \mathrm{~min}$
OFF $10-12 \mathrm{~min}$ Light Rowing
i LD: 2.50 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 175-180
iii St. Rt.: 3032
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 5 to 6

DAY 1:
g) 15 min worm-up
b) $7 \times 3 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 5 \mathrm{~min}$ Light Rowing
$1 \mathrm{WL} .: 2.50 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 175-185
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t .5 t . R$.

1 WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 152-156
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $10 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 3.5 \mathrm{~min}$ OFF
i $W L .: 2.75 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 178-185
iii St. Rt.: 31-33
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 7 ta 8

DAY 1:
8) 15 min warm-up
b) $4 \times 50 \mathrm{~N} / 5 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 2.50
ii T.H.R.: 174-180
iii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) 30 minst St. R.
i $W L .: 2.25 \mathrm{Kp}$
iiT.H.R.: 152-156
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Worm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $3 \times 8 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i WL.: 2.50 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 178-186
iii St. Rt.: 29-30
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

## TRAINING PROGRAM OF GUEJECT 4

PERIOD: Week 1 to 2

DAY 1:
s) 15 min worm-up
b) $25 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{St}. \mathrm{St}. \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii 5t. Rt. $26-27$
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min Warm-up
b) $4 \times 40 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i WL: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 185-190
ii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
6) 15 min Warm-up
b) 30 min st. St. R.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
ii) St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 3 to 4

DAY 1:

- $) 15 \mathrm{~min}$ worm-up
b) $3 \times 8 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{DFF}$
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 168-175
iii St. Rt.: 27-29
c) Warm-Down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $4 \times 6 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{ON} / 6 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 175 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 178-185
iii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm -up
b) 30 minst st. R.
$i$ WL: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 168 -172
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 5 to 6

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $5 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 3 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i $\$ \mathrm{~L}: 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 180-190
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 \mathrm{t} . \mathrm{St} . \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 160-165
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Werm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $5 \times 4 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 4 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 180-190
iii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: 7 to 6

DAY 1:
5) 15 min warm-up
b) $6 \times 3 \mathrm{ON} / 4 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 185-190
iii St. Rt.: 3032
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) $15 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{worm}-\mathrm{up}$
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t .5 t . R$.
$i \quad W L: 1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: $165-170$
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Worm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $9 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 3 \mathrm{~min}$ DFF
i WL.: 2.25 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 186-190
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

## TRAINING PROGRAM OF SUEJECT 5

PERIDD: Week 1 to 2

DAY 1:
g) 15 min warm-up
b) 25 min St. St. R.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) $15 \mathrm{~min} w a r m-u p$
b) $4 \times 40 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 185-190
ii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{St}. \mathrm{St}. \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii 5t. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $3 \times 8 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{ON} / 6 \mathrm{~min}$ OFF
i $\quad W L:=1.75 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: $168-175$
iii St. Rt.: 27-29
c) Worm-Down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $4 \times 6 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 175 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 178-185
iii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 \mathrm{t} . \mathrm{st}$. R.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 168-172
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIDD: Week 5 to 6

DAY 1: a) 15 min warm-up
b) $5 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{ON} / 3 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{DFF}$
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 180-190
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) 30 min St. St. R.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 160-165
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Worm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3: $\quad$ a) 15 min worm-up
b) $5 \times 4 \mathrm{~min} 0 N / 4 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i $W \mathrm{~L} .: 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: $180-190$
iii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: 7 to 8

DAY 1:
0) 15 min worm-up
b) $6 \times 30 \mathrm{~N} / 4 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
$1 \quad W \mathrm{~L} .2 .00 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 185-190
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t .5 t . R$.
i WL: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min worm-up
b) $9 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 3 \mathrm{~min}$ OFF
i $W \mathrm{~L} .: 2.25 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 186-190
ii) St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIDD: Week 1 to 2

DAY 1:
o) 15 min Worm-up
b) 25 min 5 t . $5 \mathrm{t} . \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min Worm-up
b) $4 \times 40 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 185-190
ii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min Worm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 \mathrm{t} .5 \mathrm{t} . \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIDO: Week 3 to 4

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $3 \times 6 \mathrm{~min}$ ON/ 6 min OFF
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 168-175
iii St. Rt.: 27-29
c) Warm-Down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
8) 15 min Worm-up
b) $4 \times 6 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 175 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 178-185
iii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
-) 15 min Warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t . \mathrm{st} . \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 168-172
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Worm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 5 to 6

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $5 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 3 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i $W \mathrm{~L} .: 2.00 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 180-190
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t .5 t . R$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 160-165
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $5 \times 4 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 4 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$

1 WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 180-190
iii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 7 to 6

DAY 1:
g) 15 min warm-up
b) $6 \times 30 \mathrm{~N} / 4 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 2.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 185-190
iii St. Rt.: 3032
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
o) 15 min worm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 \mathrm{t} . \mathrm{St} . \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 1.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 165-170
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $9 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 3 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i wL.: 2.25 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 186-190
iii St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

## TRAINING PROGRAM OF SUBIECT 7

PERIOD: Week 1 to 2

DAY 1:
a) 15 min worm-up
b) $8 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{ON} / 2 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 3.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 168-175
iiSt.Rt.: 27-29
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{minst} .5 t . R$.
i WL.: 2.50 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 152-156
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $4 \times 5 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 5 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
i WL.: 2.75
ii T.H.R.: 175-178
iii 5t. Rt.: 28-30
c) Warm-down\& Stretch

PERIDD: week 3 to 4

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $7 \times 3$ ON/ 3 min OFF
i WL.: 2.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 175-180
iii St. Rt.: 28-30
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
ง) 15 min warm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 t .5 t . R$.
i WL.: 2.50 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 152-156
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY $3:$
8) 15 min warm-up
b) PYRAMID

2 K ( 2 min ON, 2 min DFF, 3 min ON, 3 min OFF, 4 min
ON, 4 min OFF, 3 min ON, 3 min OFF, 2 min ON, 2 min
OFF $10-12$ min Light Rowing
$i$ LD.: 2.75 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 175-180
iii St. Rt. $30-32$
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

## PERIOD: Week 5 to 6

DAY 1:
5) 15 min worm-up
b) $7 \times 3 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 5 \mathrm{~min}$ Light Rowing
i WL.: 3.25
ii T.H.R.: 175-185
ii 5 St. Rt.: 30-32
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) 30 min St. St. R.
i WL.: 2.50 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 152-156
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $10 \times 2 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 3.5 \mathrm{~min}$ OFF
$1 \mathrm{WL} .: 3.50 \mathrm{Kp}$
ii T.H.R.: 178-185
iii St. Rt.: 31-33
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

PERIOD: Week 7 to 8

DAY 1:
a) 15 min warm -up
b) $4 \times 5 \mathrm{ON} / 5 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{OFF}$
$\dagger$ WL.: 3.00 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 174-180
iii St. Rt.: 29-31
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 2:
a) 15 min worm-up
b) $30 \mathrm{~min} 5 \mathrm{t} .5 \mathrm{t} . \mathrm{R}$.
i WL.: 2.50 Kp
iiT.H.R.: 152-156
iii St. Rt.: 26-27
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

DAY 3:
a) 15 min warm-up
b) $3 \times 8 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{~N} / 6 \mathrm{~min} 0 \mathrm{FF}$
i WL.: 3.25 Kp
ii T.H.R.: 178-186
iii St. Rt.: 29-30
c) Warm-down \& Stretch

