DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 053	SP 024 998
AUTHOR	Israel, Richard G.; And Others
TITLE	Physiologic Responses of Able-Bodied and Paraplegic Males to Maximal Arm Ergometry.
NOTE	[83] 12p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. Adults; Aerobics; *Cardiovascular System; *Exercise Physiology; *Heart Rate; Males; Motor Reactions; Muscular Strength; *Neurological Impairments; *Physical Fitness

ABSTRACT

A study compared physiologic responses of healthy paraplegic males to those of healthy, able-bodied males during maximal arm ergometry. Fifteen able-bodied, healthy adult males and 13 healthy adult male paraplegics followed an exercise program involving heart rate, increased exercise loads, and oxygen uptake. Results from an analysis of the data reflect the need for using paraplegics as subjects when conducting research designed to elucidate specific exercise prescription regimens for paraplegics. The American College of Sports Medicine guidelines for exercise prescriptions are probably not valid for this population during arm work because the assumption cannot be made that the heart rate and oxygen uptake relationships of paraplegics and able-bodied subjects are similar. Further research comparing physiological responses to submaximal arm ergometry in similar groups is warranted. (JD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

PHYSIOLOGIC RESPONSES OF ABLE-BODIED AND PARAPLEGIC MALES TO MAXIMAL ARM ERGOMETRY

ED246053

50 224 548

Richard G. Israel, Ed.D.

George T. Hardison, Jr., M.A.

Kevin F. O'Brien, Ph.D.

Richard G. Israel is an Associate Professor and Director of the Human Performance Laboratory at East Carolina University, Greenville, N.C. 27834

George T. Hardison, Jr. is a Research Associate in the Human Performance Laboratory at East Carolina University.

Kevin F. O'Brien, is an Associate Professor of Biostatistics at East Carolina University.

> "PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Israel Richard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

originating ... Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction duality

 Points of view or opinións stated in this document du not riecessarily represent official NE position or pulicy. PHYSIOLOGIC RESPONSES OF ABLE-BODIED AND PARAPLEGIC MALES TO MAXIMAL ARM ERGOMETRY

AB\$TRACT

This study compared cardio-respiratory responses of 15 sedentary, able-bodied males and 13 healthy paraplegics during maximal"arm ergometry. The initial exercise load was set at 150 $kgm \cdot min^{-1}$ and sequentially increased by 150 kgm·min⁻¹ every two minutes until volitional fatigue or until the subject could no longer maintain a metronome-paced 70 rpm cranking rate. Heart rate (HR) was recorded during the last ten seconds of each minute from the ECG and $\dot{v}O_2$, \dot{v}_E and RER were obtained using a Beckman Metabolic Measurement Cart. An independent t-test yielded significantly (p < .05) higher values for VO_2 max, O_2 pulse max, VCO_2 max, and V_F max in the able-bodied subjects. There were no significant differences between the groups for RER and $V_{\rm E}/\rm VO_2$. Since there were no significant differences in HR max, but large differences in VO2 max, paraplegics apparently tend to work at a higher percentage of VO, max than normals when working at similar heart rates. These findings reflect, the need for using paraplegic subjects when conducting research designed to elucidate specific exercise prescription standards for paraplegics.

Key Words: Paraplegia, Arm ergometrý, Oxygen uptake.

A study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences reported that World War II veterans who had meither one or both legs amputated had 150 percent higher death rate from cardiovascular disease than other wounded veterans who retained their mobility.¹ Zwiren and Bar-or have shown that adult sedentary paraplegics bound to wheelchairs for years are less fit than the general sedentary population. 2* Laporte and others recently compared high density lipoprotein (HDL) values of able-bodied sedentary males to male marathon runners, joggers, and paraplegics.³ The paraplegics had significantly lower HDL levels than the other groups and the authors proposed that if risk estimates for various HDL concentrations were applied * to the values, the paraplegics would be at 90 percent greater risk for heart attack than the controls and at 350 percent greater risk than the runners. 4 Low fitness levels in addition to an increased risk for cardiovascular disease reflect the need for aerobic training programs for paraplegics. Arm training has been shown to be a satisfactory mode of aerobic activity which can significantly improve cardiovascular function in paraplegics.^{5,6} Previous investigators have made recommendations about arm training regimens for paraplegics based on data obtained while studying cardio-respiratory responses of healthy subjects during arm ergometry, or by simply applying exercise prescription standards published by the American College of Sports Medicine for healthy subjects during running, cycling,_etc...⁷ Exercise prescription guidelines developed using healthy subjects way not be directly applicable to paraplegics during arm ergometry. The purpose of this study was to compare physiologic responses of healthy and paraplegic males during maximal arm ergometry in order to determine whether further research is warranted concerning exercise prescription guidelines for paraplegics.

METHODS

Subjects

Fifteen healthy, able-bodied males (\bar{x} age 22.6) and 13 healthy male paraplejics (\bar{x} age 28.2.years) with lesion levels ranging from T4 to T12, were recruited to serve as subjects (Tab. 1). All subjects received medical clearance for participation in the study and signed informed consent was obtained. The healthy, able-bodied subjects were untrained, and relatively sedentary, whereas the majority of the paraplegics were actively engaged in wheel-chair sports and as a group were relatively active. Procedures

Each subject was weighed prior to the test. The paraplegics were weighed with a Hoyer lifter, and a Digitron 200 load cell. The healthy subjects were weighed with standard scales.

Previous research by Israel and others indicated that the sitting position was the most desirable as well as the most practical body position to assume during maximal and submaximal arm ergometry.⁸ Each subject was seated such that the axis of movement of the gleno-humeral joint was horizontal to the axis of the arm ergometer rotary mechanism. Plywood sheets were used under the chairs to achieve this position if necessary. The arm ergometer was adjusted to allow full extension of the arms during rotation. A specialized set of "wheel chocks", in conjunction with brakes were used to stabilize the wheelchairs for the paraplegics. Healthy subjects were seated with legs crossed and bound at the ankles. Elastic safety belts were employed in an attempt to secure the subject's body to the chair and reduce the use of trunk muscles during exercise.

Each subject performed a maximal arm ergometry exercise test on a Schwinn Ergometric EX 2-0 bicycle ergometer that was modified for arm work.

The initial exercise load was set at 150 kgm \cdot min⁻¹ and was sequentially increased every two minutes by 150 kgm \cdot min⁻¹ until volitional fatigue, until the subject could no longer maintain a metronome-paced 70 rpm cranking rate, or until contraindications were observed. Provious research by Dotson and others showed 70 rpm to be the most efficient cranking rate for maximum arm ergometry testing.⁹ All, subjects reached volitional fatigue between 6 and 8 minutes.

Heart rate was determined from a CM5 lead arrangement during the final ten seconds of each minute from the EKG using a Burdick single channel electrocardiograph. Oxygen uptake ($\dot{V}O_2$), pulmonary ventilation (\dot{V}_E), carbon dioxide output ($\dot{V}CO_2$), and respiratory exchange fatio (RER) were obtained each minute using a Beckman metabolic measurement cart (MMC). The MMC was calibrated by a 2-point system of using ambient air, and a Scholander verified gas mixture of 16% oxygen and 4% carbon dioxide.¹⁰ Other MMC calibrations were performed according to manu-Facturer specifications.¹¹ Ventilatory equivalent (\dot{V}_E/VO_2) and oxygen pulse (\dot{O}_2 pulse) were derived from the data collected.

Data Analysis .

Independent t-tests were used to analyze maximal physiological data F-tests were conducted to examine the equality of variances assumption for the t-tests. All comparisons were tested for significance at the $\mathbf{A} = .05$ level.

RESULTS

Table 1 contains a summary of descriptive data for the paraplegic subjects. Mean body weight for the paraplegic and able-bodied groups was 70.9 \pm 13 kg and 72.4 \pm 9.1 kg, respectively. Table 2 contains means \pm SD, t-ratios and probability values for the dependent variables.

Although the paraplegics were approximately six years older than the able-bodied subjects this difference probably had no significant effect on the physiological responses obtained in this study. Maximum oxygen uptake ($\dot{V}O_2$), relative $\dot{V}O_2$ (expressed in ml·kg·min⁻¹), pulmonary ventilation (\ddot{V}_E), oxygen pulse (O_2 pulse) and carbon dioxide output ($\dot{V}CO_2$) were significantly higher for the able-bodied subjects. There were no significant differences between the two groups for maximum heart rate ventilatory equivalent ($\dot{V}_E/\dot{V}O_2$) or RER.

DISCUSS ION

Mean, relative arm VO_2 max for the healthy able-bodied subjects was 26.4 ml·kg·min⁻¹, while mean relative VO_2 max for the paraplegics was only 19.8 ml·kg·min⁻¹. This study compared a relatively active group of paraplegics to a sedentary sample of healthy able-bodied subjects. Astrand, as well as Israel and Hardison, have demonstrated that VO_2 max during arm exercise is roughly 70% of VO_2 max obtained by leg work. ^{12,13} By increasing the able-bodied VO_2 max by 30%, a value of approximately 37 ml·kg·min⁻¹ would be predicted for leg work. A VO_2 max of 37 ml·kg·min⁻¹ would be classified in a low fitness category for this age group.

In contrast, the highest VO_2 max obtained by a paraplegic in this study was only 24 ml·kg·min⁻¹, and this subject was extremely active for a paraplegic. He wheels <u>3</u> miles per day, at least <u>6</u> days per week, in addition to participating in wheelchair sports. Even the best conditioned paraplegic's VO_2 max wasn't comparable to the average sedentary able-bodied

subject's arm VO2 max in this study.

These data suggest that cardio-respiratory responses of normals and paraplegics are very much different during maximal arm ergometry. Because there was no significant difference in maximum heart rate, but large differences in VO_2 max (both absolute and relative), paraplegics apparently have a different heart rate - VO_2 relationship during arm work than the able-bodied. Difficulty in isolating leg and trunk muscles in normals, during arm ergometry may explain some of the large difference in VO_2 max, since VO_2 is dependent upon the amount of active muscle mass involved during exercise.¹²

CONCLUS ION

Results from this study reflect the need for using paraplegics as subjects when conducting research designed to elucidate specific exercise prescription regimens for paraplegics. The American College of Sports Medicine guidelines for exercise prescription are probably not valid for this population during arm work because the assumption cannot be made that the heart rate and VO₂ relationships of paraplegics and able-bodied subjects (used to develop the guidelines) are similar.⁷ Further research comparing physiological-responses to submaximal arm ergometry in similar groups is warranted.

REFERENCES

- Hrubec Z, Ryder RA: Report to the Veterans Administraion Department of Medicine and Surgery on Service Connected Traumatic Limb Amputation and Subsequent Mortality from Cardiovascular Diseases and other Causes of Death. Medical Follow-up Agency, National Academy of Sciences -National Research Council, Washington, D.C., December, 1978
- Zwiren LD, Bar-or O: Responses to exercise of paraplegics who differ in conditioning level. Med Sci Sports 7:94-98, 1975
- 3. LaPorte RE, Brenes G, Dearwater S, et al: HDL cholesterol across a spectrum of physical activity from quadriplegia to marathon running. Lancet 1:1212-1213, 1983
- 4. Kannel WB, Gordon T, Castelli WP: Role of lipids and lipoprotein fractions in atherogenesis: The Framingham Study. Prog Lipid Res 720:339-48, 1981
- 5. Pollock ML, Miller HS, Linnerud AC, et al: Arm pedaling as an endurance training regimen for the disabled. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 55:418-424, 1974
- 6. DiCarlo SE, Supp MD, Taylor HC: Effect of arm ergometry training on physical work capacity of individuals with spinal cord injuries. Phys Ther _63:1104-1107, 1983
- 7. Position Statement on the Recommended Quantity and Quality of Exercise for Developing and Maintaining Fitness in Healthy Adults. Med Sci Sports 10:vii-x, 1978
- Israel RG, Leppo ML, Bond V, et al: Cardio-respiratory and perceived exertion responses to different body positions during submaximal arm ergometry. Int J Sports Med 2:274, 1981

.

- 9. Dotson CO, Israel RG, Leppo ML, et al: Cardio-respiratory and perceived exertion responses to different crankin; rates during maximal arm er,ometry. Med Sci Sports Exerc 14:158, 1982
- Scholander PF: Analyzer for accurate estimation of respiratory gases in one-half cubic centimeter samples. J Biol Chem 167:235-250, 1947
- 11. Beckman Operating Instructions: The Exercise Program, Program Instructions. No. 675501, October 1978
- Astrand PO, Rodahl K: Textbook of Work Physiology, ed 2. New York, NY, McGraw-Hill Inc, 1970, pp 305-309
- 13. Israel RG, Hardison GT Jr: Cardio-respiratory responses to maximal work during arm and bicycle ergometry. Educational Resources Information Center. Washington, D.C., Doc # SP-022-09, 1-12, December, 1983

Subject	A;e (yr)	Weight) (kg)	Lesion Level	Cause	Duration of Disability (yr)
1	30 ·	81.18	T8-9	Tumor	12
2	42	54.42	T12	Car Accident	- 9
3	: 22	86.62	T8-9	Fall .	2
4	32	57.59	Τ5	Gun Shot	. 8
5	27	84.35	· T7	Car Accident	6
6	25	76.96	T12	Car Accident	10
. 7	29	56.46	T7-9	Car Accident	8
8	31	80.18	T 5	Tree Fell On	15
9	22	52.43	т4 ,	Gun Shot	9
19 `	28	68.71	T6	Car Accident	3
11	29	76.83	.T12	Car Accident	10
12	30	68.84	Т6	Car, Accident	. 7
13	26	72.94	Т7	Car Accident	6

Table 1					
Summary	of	Descriptive	Data	for Paraples,	cs

R

	1	0

Means <u>+</u> SD							
Units	Paraplegics (N=13)	Able-Bodied : (N=15)	t-Ratio	Р			
	*						
(bpm)	181.2 <u>+</u> 15.7	171.3 <u>+</u> 1 2 .5	1.85	.074			
(L/min)	61.6 <u>+</u> 20.1	79.7 <u>+</u> 19.7	2.39	.024			
(L/min)	1.41 <u>+</u> 0.4	2.04 <u>+</u> 0.2	7.69	•.001			
(ml/kg/min)	19.8 ±,3.2	26.4 <u>+</u> 3.4	5.34	.001			
(L/min)	1.8 <u>+</u> 0.5	2.4 ± 0.3	3.34	.002			
(L/L)	43.9 <u>+</u> 8.2	41.3 <u>+</u> 8.4	0.81	.423			
(ml/beat)	7.7 <u>+</u> 1.8	11.3 <u>+</u> 1.9	4.95	.001			
	1.29 <u>+</u> 0.1	1.23 <u>+</u> 0.1	1.58	.120			
	Units (bpm) (L/min) (L/min) (m1/kg/min) (L/min) (L/L) (m1/beat)	Means \pm Si Paraplegics (N=13)(bpm)181.2 \pm 15.7(L/min)61.6 \pm 20.1(L/min)1.41 \pm 0.4(m1/kg/min)19.8 \pm 3.2(L/min)1.8 \pm 0.5(L/L)43.9 \pm 8.2(m1/beat)7.7 \pm 1.81.29 \pm 0.1	Means \pm SDParaplegics (N=13)Able-Bodied : (N=15)(bpm) 181.2 ± 15.7 171.3 ± 12.5 (L/min) 61.6 ± 20.1 79.7 ± 19.7 (L/min) 1.41 ± 0.4 2.04 ± 0.2 (ml/kg/min) 19.8 ± 3.2 26.4 ± 3.4 (L/min) 1.8 ± 0.5 2.4 ± 0.3 (L/L) 43.9 ± 8.2 41.3 ± 8.4 (ml/beat) 7.7 ± 1.8 11.3 ± 1.9 1.29 ± 0.1 1.23 ± 0.1	Means \pm SDParaplegics (N=13)Able-Bodied : (N=15)UnitsN181.2 \pm 15.7171.3 \pm 12.51.85(L/min)61.6 \pm 20.179.7 \pm 19.72.39(L/min)1.41 \pm 0.42.04 \pm 0.27.69(m1/kg/min)19.8 \pm 3.226.4 \pm 3.45.34(L/min)1.8 \pm 0.52.4 \pm 0.33.34(L/L)43.9 \pm 8.241.3 \pm 8.40.81(m1/beat)7.7 \pm 1.811.3 \pm 1.94.951.29 \pm 0.11.23 \pm 0.11.58	Means \pm SDParaplegics (N=13)Able-Bodied: (N=15)UnitsParaplegics (N=13)Able-Bodied: (N=15)t-RatioP(bpm)181.2 \pm 15.7171.3 \pm 12.51.85.074(L/min) 61.6 ± 20.1 79.7 ± 19.7 2.39.024(L/min) 1.41 ± 0.4 2.04 ± 0.2 7.69 .001(m1/kg/min) 19.8 ± 3.2 26.4 ± 3.4 5.34 .001(L/min) 1.8 ± 0.5 2.4 ± 0.3 3.34 .002(L/L) 43.9 ± 8.2 41.3 ± 8.4 0.81 .423(m1/beat) 7.7 ± 1.8 11.3 ± 1.9 4.95 .001 1.29 ± 0.1 1.23 ± 0.1 1.58 .120		

, Table 2 Means, Standard Deviations, t-Ratios and P Values ' For Maximal Arm Ergometry Data