

MECHANICAL POWER OUTPUT DURING CYCLING

The efficacy of mobile power meters for monitoring exercise intensity
during cycling

February 8, 2011

Submitted by Alfred Nimmerichter, to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Sports and Health Sciences

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature

Abstract

One of the most meaningful technical innovations in cycling over the past two decades was the development of mobile power meters. With the ability to measure the physical strain under “real world” outdoor conditions, the knowledge of the demand during cycling has improved enormously. Power output has been described as the most direct measure of intensity during cycling and consequently power meters becomes a popular tool to monitor the training and racing of cyclists. However, only limited research data are available on the utilisation of power meters for performance assessment in the field or the analysis of training data. Therefore, the aims of the thesis were to evaluate the ecological validity of a field test, to provide an extensive insight into the longitudinal training strategies of world-class cyclists and to investigate the effects of interval training in the field at different cadences.

The first study aimed to assess the reproducibility of power output during a 4-min (TT4) and a 20-min (TT20) time-trial and the relationship with performance markers obtained during a laboratory graded exercise test (*GXT*). Ventilatory and lactate thresholds during a *GXT* were measured in competitive male cyclists ($n = 15$; $\dot{V}O_{2max} 67 \pm 5 \text{ mL} \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$; $P_{max} 440 \pm 38 \text{ W}$). Two 4-min and 20-min time-trials were performed on flat roads. Strong intraclass-correlations for TT4 ($r = 0.98$; 95 % *CL*: 0.92-0.99) and TT20 ($r = 0.98$; 95 % *CL*: 0.95-0.99) were observed. TT4 showed a bias \pm random error of $-0.8 \pm 23 \text{ W}$ or $-0.2 \pm 5.5 \%$. During TT20 the bias \pm random error was $-1.8 \pm 14 \text{ W}$ or $0.6 \pm 4.4 \%$. Both time-trials were strongly correlated with performance measures from the *GXT* ($p < 0.001$). Significant differences were observed between power output during TT4 and *GXT* measures ($p < 0.001$). No significant differences were found between TT20 and power output at the second lactate-turn-point (*LTP 2*) ($p = 0.98$) and respiratory compensation point (*RCP*) ($p = 0.97$). In conclusion, TT4 and TT20 mean power outputs are reliable predictors of endurance performance. TT20 was in agreement with power output at *RCP* and *LTP 2*.

Study two aimed to quantify power output (PO) and heart rate (HR) distributions across a whole season in elite cyclists. Power output and heart rate were monitored for 11 months in ten male (age: $29.1 \pm 6.7 \text{ y}$; $\dot{V}O_{2max}$: $66.5 \pm 7.1 \text{ mL} \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$) and one female (age: 23.1y; $\dot{V}O_{2max}$: $71.5 \text{ mL} \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$) cyclist. In total, 1802 data sets were sampled and divided into workout categories according to training goals. The PO at the *RCP* was used to determine seven intensity zones (Z1-Z7). PO and HR distributions into Z1-Z7 were calculated for all data and workout categories. The ratio of mean PO to *RCP* (intensity factor, *IF*) was assessed for each training session and for each interval during the training sessions (IF_{INT}). Variability of PO was calculated as coefficient of variation (*CV*). There was no significant difference in the distribution of PO and HR for the total season ($p = 0.15$), although significant differences between workout categories were observed ($p < 0.001$). Compared with PO, HR distributions showed a shift from low to high intensities. *IF* was

significantly different between categories ($p < 0.001$). The IF_{INT} was related to performance ($p < 0.01$), although the overall IF for the session was not. Also, total training time was related to performance ($p < 0.05$). The variability in PO was inversely associated with performance ($p < 0.01$). In conclusion, HR accurately reflects exercise intensity over a total season or low intensity workouts but is limited when applied to high intensity workouts. Better performance by cyclists was characterised by lower variability in PO, greater training volume and the production of higher exercise intensities during intervals.

The third study tested the effects of low-cadence ($60 \text{ rev} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$) uphill (Int_{60}) or high-cadence ($100 \text{ rev} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$) flat (Int_{100}) interval training on PO during 20 min uphill (TT_{up}) and flat (TT_{flat}) time-trials. Eighteen male cyclists ($\dot{V}O_{2max}$: $58.6 \pm 5.4 \text{ mL} \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$) were randomly assigned to Int_{60} , Int_{100} or a control group (Con). The interval training comprised of two training sessions per week over four weeks, which consisted of 6 bouts of 5 min at the PO at RCP . For the control group, no interval training was conducted. A two-factor ANOVA revealed significant increases on performance measures obtained from GXT ($Pmax$: $2.8 \pm 3.0 \%$; $p < 0.01$; PO and $\dot{V}O_2$ at RCP : $3.6 \pm 6.3 \%$ and $4.7 \pm 8.2 \%$, respectively; $p < 0.05$; and $\dot{V}O_2$ at ventilatory threshold: $4.9 \pm 5.6 \%$; $p < 0.01$), with no significant group effects. Significant interactions between group and the uphill and flat time-trials, pre vs. post-training on time-trial PO were observed ($p < 0.05$). Int_{60} increased PO during both, TT_{up} ($4.4 \pm 5.3 \%$) and TT_{flat} ($1.5 \pm 4.5 \%$), whereas the changes were $-1.3 \pm 3.6 \%$; $2.6 \pm 6.0 \%$ for Int_{100} and $4.0 \pm 4.6 \%$; $-3.5 \pm 5.4 \%$ for Con, during TT_{up} and TT_{flat} , respectively. PO was significantly higher during TT_{up} than TT_{flat} ($4.4 \pm 6.0 \%$; $6.3 \pm 5.6 \%$; pre and post-training, respectively; $p < 0.001$). These findings suggest that higher forces during the low-cadence intervals are potentially beneficial to improve performance. In contrast to the GXT , the time-trials are ecologically valid to detect specific performance adaptations.

Contents

I	Introduction	20
1	Basic Principles of Mechanical Power Output	22
1.1	Power Measurement with Mobile Devices	28
2	Exercise Metabolism	29
II	Literature Review	31
3	Physiology of Cycling	31
3.1	Anthropometry	31
3.2	Endurance Performance	32
3.2.1	Aerobic Power	33
	Central Factors	33
	Peripheral Factors	34
3.2.2	Aerobic Capacity	38
	Lactate and Ventilatory Thresholds	38
	Maximal Lactate Steady State	41
	Critical Power	42
	Interchangeability of Thresholds	46
3.3	Efficiency	47
	Influence of the Test Protocol	48
	Influence of Power Output and Cadence	48
	Influence of Training	49
3.4	Anaerobic Performance	51
4	Performance Assessment	53
4.1	General Considerations of Performance Tests	53
	Validity	54
	Reliability	54
	Accuracy	55
4.2	Laboratory Tests	55
4.2.1	Measures of Aerobic Power	55
4.2.2	Measures of Aerobic Capacity	57

Pre-test Preparation	57
Test Protocol	58
Blood Collection and Analysis	58
Data Analysis	60
4.2.3 Exercise Intensity Zones	60
4.3 Field Tests	61
5 Endurance Training in Cyclists	63
6 Summary and Purpose	70
III Experimental Procedures	72
7 General Methods	72
7.1 Laboratory Incremental Graded Exercise Tests	72
7.2 Mobile Power Meters	73
7.3 Data Analyses	74
8 Evaluation of a Field Test to Assess Performance in Elite Cyclists	75
8.1 Introduction	75
8.2 Materials and Methods	76
8.2.1 Participants	76
8.2.2 Study Design	77
8.2.3 Laboratory Incremental Graded Exercise Tests	77
8.2.4 Field Tests	77
8.2.5 Data Analyses	77
8.3 Results	78
8.4 Discussion	80
8.5 Conclusion	84
9 Longitudinal Monitoring of Power Output and Heart Rate Profiles in Elite Cyclists	85
9.1 Introduction	85
9.2 Materials and Methods	86
9.2.1 Participants	86
9.2.2 Periodization	86
9.2.3 Quantification of Exercise Intensity	87

9.2.4	Exercise Intensity Zones	87
9.2.5	Mean Power, Normalized Power, Intensity Factor	88
9.2.6	Workout Categories	90
9.2.7	Laboratory Incremental Graded Exercise Tests	90
9.2.8	Performance Tests	91
9.2.9	Data Analyses	91
9.3	Results	91
9.3.1	Performance Measures	91
9.3.2	Quantification of Total Training	92
9.3.3	Exercise Intensity Zones	94
9.3.4	Mean Power, Normalized Power, Intensity Factor	94
9.4	Discussion	99
9.5	Conclusion	102
10	The Effects of Low and High Cadence Interval Training in the Field on Power Output in Flat and Uphill Cycling Time-Trials	103
10.1	Introduction	103
10.2	Materials and Methods	104
10.2.1	Participants	104
10.2.2	Study Design	105
10.2.3	Laboratory Incremental Graded Exercise Tests	105
10.2.4	Time-Trials	106
10.2.5	Interval Training	106
10.2.6	Data Analyses	108
10.3	Results	108
10.3.1	Training Records	108
10.3.2	Laboratory Incremental Graded Exercise Test	108
10.3.3	Time-Trials	110
10.3.4	Interval Training	112
10.4	Discussion	116
10.5	Conclusion	118

11	General Discussion	119
11.1	Maximum Power Field Tests	119
	Reliability of the Field Tests	119
	Relation Between Laboratory and Field Tests	120
	Power Output during 20-min Uphill and Flat Time-Trials	121
11.2	Training Strategies in Cyclists	126
	Workout Categories and Intensity Factors	126
	Distribution of Power Output and Heart Rate Exercise Intensity Zones	129
	Variability in Power Output	131
11.3	Appraisal of Hypotheses	133
11.4	Conclusions and Directions for Future Research	135
V	Appendices	135
12	Appendix 1	136
12.1	Publication Resulted from Study One	136
12.2	Conference Communication European College of Sports Sciences, Oslo 2009	143
12.3	Field Test Instructions	146
12.4	Example of the Results from the 4-min and 20-min Maximal Power Time-Trial	147
12.5	Example of the Results from a Laboratory Graded Exercise Test	149
13	Appendix 2	152
13.1	Publication Resulted from Study Two	152
13.2	Conference Communication World Congress on Cycling Science, Edinburgh 2010	161
13.3	Conference Communication European College of Sports Sciences, Antalya 2010	166
13.4	Example of the Diary	168
13.5	Example of the CVs during Basic Aerobic Endurance Training Sessions in World Class and National Class Cyclists	169
13.6	Example of a Training Session at the Anaerobic Threshold	170
13.7	Example of an Interval Training Session to Improve Maximum Oxygen Uptake	170
13.8	Examples of Low-cadence/High-force Interval Training Sessions of a World Class MTB Cyclist	171
13.9	Example of a Maximum Power Interval Training Session	172
13.10	Example of a mountain-bike Cross Country Race	172
13.11	Example of a Road Race	173

13.12	Example of a Road Time-Trial	173
13.13	Example of a Short-Circuit Criterium Race	174
14	Appendix 3	175
14.1	Publication Resulted from Study Three	175
14.2	Example of the Results from the 20-min Maximum Power Uphill and Flat Time-Trials .	185
14.3	Example of an Uphill and Flat Interval Training Session	186