University of Groningen

Effect of a 7-week low intensity synchronous handcycling training programme on physical capacity in abled-bodied women

Abonie, Ulric S.; Monden, Paul; van der Woude, Lucas; Hettinga, Florentina J.

Published in:
Journal of Sports Sciences

DOI:
[10.1080/02640414.2021.1880171](https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2021.1880171)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2021

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Abonie, U. S., Monden, P., van der Woude, L., & Hettinga, F. J. (2021). Effect of a 7-week low intensity synchronous handcycling training programme on physical capacity in abled-bodied women. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2021.1880171>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Effect of a 7-week low intensity synchronous handcycling training programme on physical capacity in abled-bodied women

Ulric S. Abonie , Paul Monden , Lucas van der Woude & Florentina J. Hettinga

To cite this article: Ulric S. Abonie , Paul Monden , Lucas van der Woude & Florentina J. Hettinga (2021): Effect of a 7-week low intensity synchronous handcycling training programme on physical capacity in abled-bodied women, Journal of Sports Sciences, DOI: [10.1080/02640414.2021.1880171](https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2021.1880171)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2021.1880171>

Published online: 02 Feb 2021.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 39

View related articles [↗](#)

View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Effect of a 7-week low intensity synchronous handcycling training programme on physical capacity in abled-bodied women

Ulric S. Abonie ^a, Paul Monden^b, Lucas van der Woude ^{b,c,d} and Florentina J. Hettinga ^e

^aDepartment of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Health and Allied Sciences, Volta Region, Ghana; ^bCenter for Human Movement Sciences, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands; ^cUniversity of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Department of Rehabilitation, Groningen, The Netherlands; ^dSchool of Sport, Exercise & Health Sciences, Peter Harrison Centre for Disability Sport, Loughborough University, Loughborough, UK; ^eDepartment of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the effect of a low-intensity norm duration synchronous handcycle wheelchair training in untrained able-bodied women. The training group ($n = 9$) received 7-weeks of low-intensity upper body training in an instrumented handcycle on a motor-driven treadmill (MDT), 3×30 min/week at 30% heart rate reserve. The control group ($n = 10$) received no training. Incremental handcycle tests on the MDT were used to determine peak values for oxygen uptake (VO_{2peak}), power output (PO_{peak}), heart rate (HR_{peak}), minute ventilation (V_{Epeak}), and respiratory exchange ratio (RER_{peak}), submaximal values for heart rate (HR), oxygen uptake (VO_2) and gross efficiency (GE) before and after training. Local perceived discomfort and rate of perceived exertion (RPE) were also assessed. Training significantly improved PO_{peak} (+20%), HR_{peak} (+3%), RER_{peak} (+5%), submaximal GE (+21%), VO_2 (-20%), V_E (-33%), HR (-12%) and RPE was low (7.1 ± 0.5) ($p < 0.05$). No effects were found in VO_{2peak} and V_{Epeak} ($p > 0.05$). Though VO_{2peak} did not improve, low-intensity norm duration handcycling training improved handcycling PO_{peak} , while RPE was low. Also, GE increased, suggesting a motor control improvement. Handcycle training seems to be an appropriate exercise mode to improve physical capacity, and prevent early fatigue and overuse in untrained individuals.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Accepted 20 January 2021

KEYWORDS

Rehabilitation; recreational adapted sports; handbiking; treadmill training; physical capacity; local perceived discomfort

Introduction

Approximately, 65 million people worldwide are reliant on a wheelchair in their day-to-day lives (Newdisability, 2012; Van der Woude et al., 2006). Deconditioned and vulnerable people (the frail aged people or those with a chronic disease or disability) such as people with stroke, cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, spinal cord dysfunction, brain injury and lower limb amputation rely on their wheelchair for mobility and participation (Van der Woude et al., 2006). Being largely dependent on the upper extremities for daily activities, wheelchair users are susceptible to overuse injuries and pain at the shoulders, elbows, and wrists which compromises their ability to perform necessary daily activities such as making transfers, upper-body lifting and wheelchair propulsion (Spinal cord injury, 2012; Van der Woude et al., 2006).

To cope adequately with the strain of daily activities and to prevent long-term secondary health problems, wheelchair users will require an upper body exercise mode involving wheelchair treadmill exercise, wheelchair ergometry and arm-crank ergometry to improve their physical capacity (Abonie et al., *in press*; Chaikhot et al., 2018; Davis et al., 1981; Esquenazi & DiGiacomo, 2001; Hettinga et al., 2016; Keyser et al., 1999; Myers et al., 2002; O'Brien et al., 2015; Schoenmakers et al., 2016). The goal of upper body training is to increase active muscle mass and strength, maximize overall strength for

functional independence, and improve efficiency of wheelchair propulsion (Hoekstra et al., 2017; O'Brien et al., 2016; Rosa & Westcott, 2010). Research data provide evidence that upper-body endurance and resistance exercise improved physical capacity, quality of life and mood state, reduced risk for secondary health problems such as obesity, diabetes and cardiovascular disease, and reduced risk for mortality (Hoekstra et al., 2017; O'Brien et al., 2016; Rosa & Westcott, 2010).

Despite growing efforts to improve physical capacity through exercise interventions in deconditioned and vulnerable people, studies investigating the effect of exercise interventions report a high number of dropouts, and identified that participants struggle to continue engaging in physical activity post-exercise program (Roehrs & Karst, 2004). Conversely, research shows that overuse complaints of wheelchair users are an important predictor for participation in physical activity and exercise during and after rehabilitation (De Groot et al., 2008). Thus, high straining activities may induce over use complaints in wheelchair users and consequently lead to reduced physical activity participation. Therefore, to maintain a long-term physically active lifestyle and/or rehabilitation aftercare of wheelchair users, it is important to explore ways to prevent overuse complaints.

A low-intensity training could be central to the adoption and maintenance of physical activity behaviour in de-conditioned and vulnerable people, and can provide the platform to engage in graduated activity or higher intensity exercises (Dishman &

Buckworth, 1996; Ekkekakis et al., 2011; Pollock, 1978; Van den Berg et al., 2010). Exercising at a lower intensity is accompanied with greater safety, would be perceived as achievable, reduces the risk of overuse complaints and can improve motivation to remain active (De Groot et al., 2008). However, the potential of low-intensity training to improve physical capacity have not been fully explored.

Only two studies were found that investigated the effects of low-intensity training (30% HRR for 30–70 min) using hand-rim wheelchair on physical capacity (De Groot et al., 2008; Van den Berg et al., 2010). These studies showed improvements in peak power output, sprint power, mechanical efficiency, metabolic cost, and submaximal heart rate and oxygen uptake. Conversely, different studies showed that hand-rim wheelchairs have a low mechanical efficiency and are straining for the upper extremities (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2000; Van der Woude, Veeger et al., 2001). Hence, the use of hand-rim wheelchairs may lead to overuse complaints in the upper extremities and subsequent disengagement in physical activity and exercise over time.

Handcycling could be an alternate promising exercise mode, as it is less straining and more mechanically efficient than hand-rim wheelchair propulsion (Dallmeijer, Ottjes et al., 2004; Van der Woude, Dallmeijer et al., 2001; Van der Woude, Veeger et al., 2001) and could optimize rehabilitation and increase long-term adoption of engagement in exercise and physical activity among wheelchair users. The task load during handcycling is spread over time and muscle groups are alternately active (front and back) through the full circular movement of handcycling, and no high peak loads occur (Arnet et al., 2012). Consequently, higher physical capacity can be reached with handcycling compared to hand-rim wheelchair (De Groot et al., 2008). Yet, the effects of low-intensity handcycle training on maximal and submaximal exercise capacity are yet unknown.

The present study aimed to investigate whether a 7-week low intensity (30% heart rate reserve; HRR) handcycle training with a norm duration (30 min/session) can induce favourable effects in physical capacity of able-bodied untrained female subjects, thus simulating to some extent training effects in wheelchair users in early rehabilitation (Flandrois et al., 1986; Maikala & Bhambhani, 2006). Based on the results of previous studies (De Groot et al., 2008; Van den Berg et al., 2010), we hypothesized that a low-intensity (30% HRR) norm duration handcycle training program would improve mobility related parameters such as peak power output and submaximal efficiency. Physical capacity is reflected by the maximal performance [peak values of oxygen uptake ($\text{VO}_{2\text{Peak}}$), power output (PO_{peak}), heart rate (HR_{peak}), minute ventilation (V_{Epeak}) and respiratory exchange ratio (RER_{peak})], submaximal performance [oxygen uptake (VO_2), respiratory exchange ratio (RER), minute ventilation (V_E) and heart rate (HR)] and gross efficiency (GE).

Materials and methods

Participants

Twenty-two able-bodied women initially volunteered to take part in the study. During an initial visit, study details and participation requirements were explained, and after screening

with the Physical Activity Readiness Questionnaire (PAR-Q) (Cardinal et al., 1996) written informed consent was obtained. One participant was no longer willing to participate in the study. The remaining participants ($n = 21$) were randomly assigned to two groups; a training group (TG: $n = 11$) and a control group (CG: $n = 10$). Criteria for inclusion of this study were: female, no experience in handcycling, no recent activity in (upper body) endurance sports, no change in activity level during the study and no medical contraindications. Participants were instructed not to alter other training activities outside those of the study protocol. The study received approval from the local Ethics Committee of the Center for Human Movement Sciences of University Medical Center Groningen and was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

At their first visit to the laboratory, participants familiarized to the experimental set-up with three 6-min familiarization trials in the instrumented synchronous handcycle on a cycle trainer (Sirius T1435, Tacx BV, The Netherlands). Thus, participants could become acquainted to the synchronous hand cycle propulsion technique. Subsequently, a fourth trial was presented on a handcycle on the motor-driven treadmill to get used to the propulsion and steering mechanism.

Design

All training sessions and incremental tests were performed on an instrumented handcycle mounted on a motor-driven treadmill (Enraf Nonius, The Netherlands). The instrumented handcycle consisted of an add-on system (Tracker Challenger, Alois Prassberger, Austria) coupled to a regular standard wheelchair (Double Performance, RGK, RGK Wheelchairs Inc., England) fixed at the lightest gear. To measure power output, it was equipped with an instrumented wheel hub in the front wheel (Powertap SL, CycleOps, USA; 1.5% accuracy, sample frequency 1 Hz). Tire pressure was fixed on 6.0 bar and was measured before all tests and training sessions.

An incremental exercise test was performed to obtain peak cardiovascular and physiological variables and to evaluate handcycling performance before and after a 7-week training or no training program. The test protocols for the pre- and post-test were standardized in terms of handcycle settings (gear, tire pressure, velocity and resistance). The training group (TG) received a 7-week hand cycling training program with a frequency of three times a week with a duration of 30 min conform to the ACSM guidelines (Myers et al., 2002). The average training intensity was 30% heart rate reserve (HRR) using two different training forms, which are described further in training. The control group (CG) did not receive any training and was asked to maintain their activity level similar during the experimental period.

Training

All training sessions were performed on a motor-driven treadmill (Enraf Nonius, Delft, Netherlands) in a climate-controlled work lab. The training sessions were executed 3 times per week for half an hour on a motor-driven treadmill (Enraf-Nonius, Delft, Netherlands) at an average power output corresponding with 30% HRR. Resting heart rate (HR_{rest}) and peak heart rate

(HR_{peak}) were measured before training (Polar Accurex Plus; Polar Electro, OY, Finland) to calculate HRR. To measure HR_{rest} , subjects sat quietly in the handcycle for 10 min in a quiet laboratory, before commencement of the warm-up preceding the incremental test. The final minute was used as HR_{rest} . HR_{peak} was measured during the final stage of the incremental handcycle pre-test as described in "incremental testing".

The training sessions were performed at 30% HRR, determined conform (Karvonen et al., 1957). The required workload, which elicited an intensity of 30% HRR, was determined by the linear relation between HR and PO, measured during the maximal incremental test pre-training. Two different types of training: resistance training and velocity training were used, on alternate days. In the resistance training, the work load was increased when necessary to reach a mean exercise intensity of 30% HRR by adding work load through a pulley system as described in Dallmeijer et al. (Dallmeijer, Zentgraaff et al., 2004), while the velocity was kept constant at $1.11 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ as done in van der Woude et al. (LHV van der Woude et al., 1999). During the velocity training, the resistance was kept constant at a workload corresponding to the workload required to handcycle at 30% HRR only now the velocity was increased when necessary to reach a mean exercise intensity of 30% HRR.

Training sessions were monitored by heart rate (Polar Electro, Finland) and power output (PowerTap SL, CycleOps, Saris Sydling Group Inc., United States). During the last three minutes of each training session rating of perceived exertion (Borg, 1982) and local perceived discomfort (LPD) of the upper body were obtained (Van der Grinten, 1992). Participant completed 21 (11 resistance, 10 velocity) training sessions.

Incremental testing

Before the training commenced, but after the initial handcycle familiarization sessions and a 10 minute resting period, an incremental handcycling test was performed on the handcycle on the motor-driven treadmill. After 7 weeks of training or no training (CT), the incremental test was repeated at the same time of day on the same day of the week in an identical test protocol and set-up. Participants were asked to refrain from consuming alcohol, caffeine and engaging in strenuous exercise for at least 2-h prior to testing. The test started with a 5-min submaximal steady state warm-up at 30 W.

The protocol of the handcycling stepwise (1 min) incremental maximal test was based on a handcycling protocol designed for males (Dallmeijer, Zentgraaff et al., 2004). This protocol was modified for females based on pilot testing, so that the incremental exercise test would last about 8–12 min (Buchfuhrer et al., 1983). The initial power output (PO) of the maximal test was set at 20 W, and increased with 7 W every minute until voluntary exhaustion. PO was increased by adding or reducing weight to a pulley system attached to the rear end of the handcycle (LHV van der Woude et al., 1999), and was determined by the additional force (F_{add}), the drag force (F_{drag}) and the velocity (v), as described by Eq. (1):

$$\text{Poweroutput(PO)} = (F_{add} + F_{drag}) \times v. \quad (1)$$

The velocity of the treadmill was kept at the same speed at $1.11 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. Drag force was determined by riding with no additional force at $1.11 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$.

Respiratory parameters were measured breath by breath, using open circuit spirometry (Oxycon Delta, Germany). The gas analyser was calibrated prior to each test using room air, a Jaeger 3–1 syringe and a calibration gas (16.0% O_2 , 5.0% CO_2). Peak values for power output (PO_{peak}), oxygen uptake (VO_{2peak}), heart rate (HR_{peak}), minute ventilation (V_{Epeak}) and the respiratory exchange ratio (RER_{peak}) were calculated between the 20th and 50th second of every completed minute.

RPE scores were obtained using a 15-point (Abonie et al., in press; Chaikhot et al., 2018; Davis et al., 1981; Dishman & Buckworth, 1996; Ekkekakis et al., 2011; Esquenazi & DiGiacomo, 2001; De Groot et al., 2008; Hoekstra et al., 2017; Keyser et al., 1999; Myers et al., 2002; O'Brien et al., 2015, 2016; Roehrs & Karst, 2004; Rosa & Westcott, 2010; Van den Berg et al., 2010) Borg scale (Borg, 1982). During the last 10 s of each stage, the experimenter moved his finger along an enlarged, printed RPE list. Participants were informed to nod when the experimenter was pointing to their RPE, so that speech would not interfere with the collected respiratory data. When voluntary exhaustion was reached or when participants could not keep speed constant at $1.11 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ the test was ended. Directly after each test, Local Perceived Discomfort (LPD) scores (Van der Grinten, 1992) were obtained. The participants had to score discomfort in hands, lower arms, upper arms and shoulders, lower back and upper back, and the neck. A scale from 0 (no discomfort) to 10 (maximal discomfort) was used. Total score on the perceived local discomfort was the sum of all parts, which means that the maximal possible score was 50 and minimum score was zero points.

Additionally, HR, VO_2 ($\text{ml}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$), VE ($\text{L}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$), RER and RPE of the 2nd, 4th and 6th stages of the incremental test (PO of 27 W, 41 W and 65 W, respectively) were evaluated for submaximal performance during handcycle. These stages.

Gross-efficiency (GE) was calculated for the submaximal steady state (PO = 30 W) by dividing the measured mechanical PO by the metabolic power input (P_{met}):

$$GE = PO / P_{met} \times 100\%$$

P_{met} was calculated in the last minute (from second 20 to 50) by multiplying oxygen consumption with the oxygen equivalent: $P_{met} = VO_2 \times ((4940 \times RER + 16,040)/60)$ (Garby & Astrup, 1987). For all measured parameters, means and standard deviations were calculated.

Statistics

All data were analysed and calculated using SPSS 17.0 (SPSS Inc., USA) and Matlab 2013 (The Mathworks, USA) and are presented as mean $\pm$ SD. An independent t test was used to determine baseline differences in personal characteristics (age, length, body mass) and the pre-test peak and submaximal values (VO_2 , V_E , HR, RER, PO, RPE and LPD) between the training and control group. The effect of the training on peak and staged submaximal values between the two groups was evaluated with a 2 factor repeated measures ANOVA. The difference

between pre- and post-test was used as within-subject factor and group as between-subjects factor. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$ for all tests.

Results

Participants

In total nine participants of the training group completed the 7 week training program. Two participants were excluded during the training program (week 3 and week 6), because of injuries unrelated to the training program. The flow of participants through the study and reasons for exclusions and withdrawals are displayed in Figure 1. Participant characteristics are presented in Table 1. At baseline, there were no statistical differences between training group and control group with regard to age, height (stature), body mass, body mass index, and performance or cardiorespiratory variables ($p > 0.05$) (see Table 1).

Training sessions

In the training group, training was performed at an average intensity of $30.3 \pm 1.94\%$ HRR. The average heart frequency was 105 ± 4.8 beats per minute for all participants. Participant completed 21 (11 resistance, 10 velocity) training sessions. The average power output (PO) during resistance training session was 25.6 ± 3.4 W and significantly increased ($p = 0.001$) between the first four training sessions (23.0 ± 2.9 W) and the last four training sessions (29.1 ± 4.2 W). The average speed

during the velocity training sessions was 1.47 ± 0.06 m $\cdot$ s⁻¹. No significant differences were found between the first four (1.41 ± 0.13 m $\cdot$ s⁻¹) and last four (1.46 ± 0.12 m $\cdot$ s⁻¹) velocity training sessions ($p = 0.308$). Some participants could not perform the required three training sessions every week and were then allowed to perform extra sessions in other weeks. The training group indicated some discomfort in the hands and the lower back during training, indicated by an average local perceived discomfort (LDP) score of 3.4 ± 1.6 . The total score of LDP decreased significantly ($p = 0.004$) from 5.3 ± 2.4 in the first four training sessions to 2.5 ± 2.0 in the last four training sessions. The training was perceived “very very light”, with an average session rate of perceived exertion (RPE) of 7.1 ± 0.5 .

Training evaluation

Table 2 shows the peak physiological and performance capacity of both training group and the non-training control group before (pre) and after (post) the experimental period. Due to mechanical problems with the heart rate monitor in the post-test, heart rate could not be measured in three control subjects.

Training resulted in a 20% increase in peak power output (PO_{peak}), 5% increase in peak respiratory exchange rate (RER_{peak}) and 3% increase in peak heart rate (HR_{peak}). Comparisons of peak values obtained during maximal incremental tests before and after training are presented in Table 2. Significant group $\times$ time interactions were found for PO_{peak} (W), PO_{peak} (W $\cdot$ kg⁻¹), RER_{peak} and HR_{peak} with greater increases occurring in the training group for each variable. Significant main effects of time (increases) were found in PO_{peak} (W),

Figure 1. Flowchart of the study.

Table 1. Participant characteristics for training and control group.

	Training (N = 9) Mean $\pm$ SD	Control (N = 10) Mean $\pm$ SD	p-value
Age (years)	20.8 $\pm$ 1.69	20.9 $\pm$ 1.83	0.91
Height (metres)	1.69 $\pm$ 5.4	1.69 $\pm$ 8.1	0.95
Body mass (kg)	62.8 $\pm$ 6.8	61.9 $\pm$ 9.3	0.80
Body mass index (kg·m ⁻²)	22.0 $\pm$ 1.6	21.7 $\pm$ 3.1	0.80
HR _{peak} (beats · min ⁻¹)	182 $\pm$ 11	182 $\pm$ 9	0.97
PO _{peak} (W)	81.1 $\pm$ 11.2	88.2 $\pm$ 18.9	0.34
PO _{peak} (W·kg ⁻¹)	1.33 $\pm$ 0.19	1.41 $\pm$ 0.28	0.47
VE (L·min ⁻¹)	69.2 $\pm$ 14.4	73.0 $\pm$ 20.1	0.65
VO _{2peak} (L·min ⁻¹)	1.60 $\pm$ 0.20	1.78 $\pm$ 0.42	0.27
VO _{2peak} (ml·min ⁻¹ ·kg ⁻¹)	26.4 $\pm$ 4.6	28.5 $\pm$ 7.1	0.46
RER	1.21 $\pm$ 0.08	1.21 $\pm$ 0.04	0.93
RPE	19.4 $\pm$ 1.3	19.2 $\pm$ 1.0	0.66
LPD	16 $\pm$ 5	15 $\pm$ 3	0.49

PO_{peak} (W·kg⁻¹), RER_{peak} and HR_{peak}. No significant interactions or main effects of time were detected in VO_{2peak} (L·min⁻¹), VO_{2peak} (ml·min⁻¹·kg⁻¹), V_E (L·min⁻¹), LPD and RPE.

To examine submaximal performance during handbiking, the 2nd, 4th and 6th stages of the incremental test were evaluated. In Table 3 the mean values and differences for the submaximal stages 2nd, 4th and 6th are presented for the variables HR, VO₂ (ml·min⁻¹), V_E (L·min⁻¹), RER and RPE for both groups. These stages correspond with a power output of 27 W, 41 W and 65 W.

Significant group $\times$ time interactions were found for V_E (L·min⁻¹) and RPE, and stage 2 VO₂ (ml·min⁻¹) with greater increases occurring in TG for each variable. Significant main effects of time (decreases) were found in HR, VO₂ (ml·min⁻¹), V_E (L·min⁻¹) and RPE in the training group. The greatest differences were found for ventilation (V_E), where participants inhaled on average 31% (38 $\pm$ 6 l·min⁻¹ to 28 $\pm$ 5 l·min⁻¹) less air per minute. VO₂ decreased by 20% (1148 $\pm$ 117 ml·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹ to 955 $\pm$ 133 ml·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹) and HR by 12% (152 $\pm$ 17 beats·min⁻¹ to 136 $\pm$ 12 beats·min⁻¹). A significant main effect of time (-7%) was found for stage 6 VO₂ (ml·min⁻¹) in the control group. No significant interactions or main effects of time were detected in RER.

Comparisons of GE during the steady submaximal warm-up (PO = 30 W) and the 4th stage of the maximal incremental test (PO = 41 W), before and after intervention is presented in Figure 2. For the 4th stage, GE was determined for only 10

participants (5 training, 5 control), as RER-values in the other participants were greater than 1.0. Significant main time effects were found showing increases in GE at submaximal warm-up phase (11.2 to 13.6%, $p = 0.001$) and 4th stage of incremental test (12.7 to 16.6%, $p = 0.019$) in the training groups, compared to no improvement (11.2 to 10.7%; warm up, and 13.7 to 13.6%; 4th stage) in the control group.

Discussion

This study is the first to evaluate the effect of a 7-week low intensity (30% HRR) handcycle training program on the physical capacity of able-bodied women, and revealed the design effectively increased gross efficiency; GE (+2.4–3.9%), peak heart rate; HR_{peak} (+3.0%), peak power output; PO_{peak} (+20.1%), and peak respiratory exchange ratio; RER_{peak} (+5.0%) without any signals of muscle soreness and physical strain. This study provides insight into the potential use of handcycling for rehabilitation of wheelchair users, who might struggle with higher intensities, particularly in the early stages of rehabilitation. Training resulted in lower values on ventilation, oxygen uptake and rate of perceived exertion at different submaximal stages (27 W, 41 W & 65 W). Furthermore, the training was perceived as low straining and was easily achieved as shown by the low values of LPD (3.4 $\pm$ 1.6) and RPE (7.1 $\pm$ 0.5) scores.

The improvements in physical capacity found in this study were similar to those found after wheelchair ergometry training in persons with lower limb amputation, stroke and spinal cord injuries (Hicks et al., 2003; Midha et al., 1999). Specifically, the improvement in GE, HR_{peak}, PO_{peak} and RER_{peak} are in accordance with handcycle studies in able-bodied individuals, persons with spinal cord injury and wheelchair users (Abonie et al., in press; Chaikhot et al., 2018; Hettinga et al., 2016; Hoekstra et al., 2017; Schoenmakers et al., 2016), and comparable to low-intensity training studies using hand-rim wheelchair (De Groot et al., 2008; Van den Berg et al., 2010). The improvement in PO_{peak} (+20.1%) found in this study was comparable to that reported by Van de Berg [18] in their study to simulate the effect of low-intensity exercise in early rehabilitation using hand-rim wheelchair (+34%) (Van den Berg et al., 2010). The improvement in GE (+2.4–3.9%) found in this study was higher than that reported by De Groot et al., [17] in their study

Table 2. Changes in physiological capacity and handcycling performance using handcycling incremental maximal test from pre- to post-training period for two groups.

	Training group (N = 9)		Control group (N = 10)		Interaction (group $\times$ time)			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	p-value	F	Partial Eta square (η^2)	Observed Power
HR _{peak} (beats·min ⁻¹)	182 $\pm$ 11	188 $\pm$ 11 ^{a*}	182 $\pm$ 9	183 $\pm$ 5	0.02 ^S	6.83	0.33	0.83
PO _{peak} (W)	81.1 $\pm$ 11.2	97.4 $\pm$ 11.3*	88.2 $\pm$ 18.9	91.3 $\pm$ 20.7	0.00 ^{SS}	28.88	0.59	1.00
PO _{peak} (W·kg ⁻¹)	1.33 $\pm$ 0.19	1.59 $\pm$ 0.22*	1.41 $\pm$ 0.28	1.47 $\pm$ 0.30	0.00 ^{SS}	24.03	0.74	1.00
RER _{peak}	1.21 $\pm$ 0.08	1.27 $\pm$ 0.07*	1.21 $\pm$ 0.04	1.21 $\pm$ 0.04	0.04 ^S	4.81	0.22	0.54
V _{Epeak} (L·min ⁻¹)	69.2 $\pm$ 14.4	79.1 $\pm$ 17.5	73.0 $\pm$ 20.1	75.7 $\pm$ 25.5	0.40	0.75	0.04	0.13
VO _{2peak} (L·min ⁻¹)	1.60 $\pm$ 0.20	1.68 $\pm$ 0.24	1.78 $\pm$ 0.42	1.81 $\pm$ 0.47	0.73	0.11	0.01	0.06
VO _{2peak} (ml·min ⁻¹ ·kg ⁻¹)	26.4 $\pm$ 4.6	27.5 $\pm$ 3.8	28.5 $\pm$ 7.1	29.0 $\pm$ 7.4	0.74	0.10	0.01	0.06
LPD	16 $\pm$ 5	16 $\pm$ 8	15 $\pm$ 3	12 $\pm$ 4	0.26	1.01	0.06	0.16
RPE	19.4 $\pm$ 1.3	19.8 $\pm$ 0.4	19.2 $\pm$ 1.0	19.6 $\pm$ 0.5	0.92	0.01	0.00	0.05

Data are reported as mean $\pm$ SD.

^aN = 7.

No significant differences were found in baseline values between the training group and the non-training control group.

*Significant different from pre-test ($p < 0.05$).

^SSignificant interaction of group*time ($p < 0.05$).

^{SS}Significant interaction of group*time ($p < 0.001$).

Table 3. Changes in physiological capacity and handcycling performance using submaximal stages 2, 4 & 6 from pre- to post-training period for the two groups.

Table 4: Changes in physiological capacity and managing performance using performance stages 2, 4, 6 from pre to post training periods for the two groups																
		Training Group				Control Group				Difference (%)		P-value	F	Interaction (group x time)		Observed Power
		Pre-test (Mean ± SD)		Post-test (Mean ± SD)		Pre-test (Mean ± SD)		Post-test (Mean ± SD)		Training Pre-Post	Control Pre-Post			Partial Eta square (η^2)		
		Pre-test (Mean ± SD)	Post-test (Mean ± SD)	Pre-test (Mean ± SD)	Post-test (Mean ± SD)	Pre-test (Mean ± SD)	Post-test (Mean ± SD)									
HR (bpm)	Stage 2	135 ± 18	121 ± 10	131 ± 23	128 ± 15 ^a	-11.6*	-2.3	0.07	2.52	0.14	0.32					
	Stage 4	152 ± 17	136 ± 12	146 ± 22	141 ± 19 ^a	-11.8*	-3.4	0.26	2.27	0.14	0.29					
	Stage 6	163 ± 15	154 ± 12	160 ± 18	155 ± 15 ^a	-5.8*	-3.1	0.24	2.04	0.13	0.27					
VO ₂ (ml·kg ⁻¹ ·min ⁻¹)	Stage 2	690 ± 76	589 ± 101	744 ± 94	703 ± 111	-17.1*	-5.51	0.02 ^s	1.38	0.08	0.20					
	Stage 4	958 ± 110	803 ± 92	921 ± 98	894 ± 158	-19.3*	-2.93	0.07	3.81	0.18	0.45					
	Stage 6	1148 ± 117	955 ± 133	1151 ± 137	1067 ± 159	-20.2*	-7.30*	0.15	2.30	0.12	0.30					
V _E (l·min ⁻¹)	Stage 2	21.4 ± 3.6	16.3 ± 3.1	21.8 ± 2.2	20.8 ± 2.4	-31.3*	-4.59	0.03 ^s	5.65	0.25	0.61					
	Stage 4	28.4 ± 4.1	21.7 ± 3.5	27.7 ± 4.6	26.9 ± 4.0	-30.9*	-2.89	0.03 ^s	5.86	0.27	0.63					
	Stage 6	37.6 ± 6.1	28.3 ± 4.5	36.1 ± 5.5	34.1 ± 5.0	-32.9*	-5.54	0.02 ^s	6.18	0.27	0.65					
RER	Stage 2	0.97 ± 0.11	0.92 ± 0.08	0.92 ± 0.06	0.92 ± 0.07	-5.4	0.00	0.35	0.92	0.05	0.15					
	Stage 4	0.97 ± 0.08	0.95 ± 0.06	0.98 ± 0.07	0.98 ± 0.06	-2.1	0.00	0.27	0.34	0.02	0.09					
	Stage 6	1.06 ± 0.07	1.06 ± 0.05	1.04 ± 0.05	1.06 ± 0.06	0	1.92	0.28	1.25	0.07	0.18					
RPE	Stage 2	8.6 ± 1.2	6.3 ± 0.5	7.4 ± 1.6	7.6 ± 1.2	-36.5*	2.70	0.00 ^{ss}	7.27	0.30	1.00					
	Stage 4	11.7 ± 1.7	8.3 ± 1.3	10.5 ± 2.9	11.0 ± 2.9	-41.0*	4.76	0.00 ^{ss}	7.00	0.29	1.00					
	Stage 6	14.8 ± 2.4	11.0 ± 3.2	13.8 ± 3.5	14.3 ± 3.2	-34.5*	3.62	0.00 ^{ss}	12.77	0.43	1.00					

Data are reported as mean $\pm$ SD.^aN = 7

No significant differences were found in baseline values between the training group and the non-training control group.

*Significant different from pre-test ($p < 0.05$).^sSignificant interaction of group*time ($p < 0.05$).^{ss}Significant interaction of group*time ($p < 0.001$).

Figure 2. The gross efficiency (GE) (in percentage) at warm up (PO = 30 W) and the 4th stage (PO = 41 W).

evaluating the effect of low-intensity training using hand-rim wheelchair (+1.3–1.9%). This conforms expectations that a higher physical capacity can be reached with handcycling compared to using a hand-rim wheelchair. It is worth mentioning that in this current study, GE was determined for only 10 participants (5 out of 9 participants in the training group, and 5 out of 10 participants from the control group, respectively), as RER-values in the other participants were greater than 1. The difference with previous literature may be due to the different sample population. Participants in previous studies (Dallmeijer, Zentgraaff et al., 2004; De Groot et al., 2008; Van den Berg et al., 2010) had clinical conditions and experience using a manual wheelchair, compared with novice able-bodied participants who were recruited in the present study.

The improvement in PO_{peak} and GE is an important finding, as performance of many daily activities, particularly mobility lean on strength and efficiency, and thus improvement in PO_{peak} and GE leads to more mobility and participation in daily activities at lower physical strain (Janssen et al., 1994). However, VO_{2peak} did not increase significantly over the training program. This is in accordance with previous work [18] (30% HRR training) using hand-rim wheelchair which did not show significant improvements on VO_{2peak} either, but contrary to those of handcycling studies exploring higher exercise intensities (De Groot et al., 2007; Powers & Howley, 2007) and wheelchair ergometer training studies in people with spinal cord injury, stroke and lower limb amputation (Hicks et al., 2003) that found improvements in VO_{2peak} .

The improvement in PO_{peak} and non-significant improvement in VO_{2peak} found in this study may indicate an improvement in handcycling GE, the ratio between external power output and metabolic power input, after the training program (Buchfuhrer et al., 1983). Studies indicate that the PO_{peak} is positively associated with improvements in GE (De Groot et al., 2007; Hooker & Wells, 1989), which increased significantly over the training period in this study. Conversely, the improvement in GE suggests a motor control improvement or motor learning optimization and may explain the lower submaximal physiological values found, as V_E decreased by 30%, VO_2 by 18% and HR by 10%. Our findings of lower physiological values

and a higher efficiency in submaximal stages are in accordance with previous works (De Groot et al., 2008; Van den Berg et al., 2010) and support the notion that low-intensity training program could have greater beneficial effects on performance compared with control as wheelchair users perform most activities of daily life at submaximal levels (Janssen et al., 1994).

The current study findings indicate that training at low intensities improves physical capacity, leads to motor skills optimization, and consequently improves participation and mobility. The limited data available on low intensity upper body training makes it difficult to conclude whether exercising at a low intensity is always beneficial. It remains uncertain whether the improvement in GE is due to physiological advantages, such as oxygen utilization in the working muscles, or from mechanical/propulsion advantages such as user-interface optimization. That notwithstanding, the improvements in mobility parameters; PO_{peak} and GE found in this study indicates that handcycling at lower intensities is an appropriate approach to stimulate an active lifestyle and subsequently prevent or reduce disability and sedentary lifestyle and thereby reduce the risk for cardiovascular problems in persons with disabilities and or chronic conditions such as wheelchair-dependent people (Van der Woude, Dallmeijer et al., 2001).

The training was perceived as “very very light”, with low physical strain as evident in the average RPE and LPD scores. The scores on local perceived discomfort indicate that the physical strain was low at the beginning of the training and further decreased after training. This finding supports the notion that handcycling is an appropriate alternative for training wheelchair users and reduces the risk of overuse injuries in the shoulder joint (Arnet et al., 2012; LHV van der Woude et al., 1999). Incorporating this study design in rehabilitation program will improve motivation to stay active and to participate in different leisure time activities after rehabilitation. Thus the low straining nature of the current training makes it applicable for the early phase of rehabilitation of novice wheelchair users, and makes adoption and maintenance of physical activity behaviour more likely (Hoekstra et al., 2017; O'Brien et al., 2016), and can provide the platform to engage in graduated activity or higher intensity exercises.

Previous studies have explored the effect of upper body handcycle on physical capacity and wheelchair performance using resistance training, moderate-intensity continuous training and/or high-intensity interval training (Abonie et al., *in press*; Chaikhot et al., 2018; Hettinga et al., 2016; Schoenmakers et al., 2016). The uniqueness of this study, is that deliberately low intensity (30% HRR) was chosen to induce favourable effects in physical capacity, as low-intensity exercise is accompanied by greater safety, reduces the risk of overuse complaints and can stimulate participation and long-term adoption and adherence to physically active lifestyle among novice wheelchair users. Variables related to mobility and adherence were positively influenced in the current study, which indicates that low-intensity handcycle training may be appropriate in novice wheelchair users at the start of their rehabilitation, to prevent early fatigue and overuse and enhance participation, motivation and adherence.

There is a strong rationale for generalization of the study findings to wheelchair-dependent people with spinal cord injury, stroke, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and lower limb amputation. First, the study sample: able-bodied women, respond relatively homogenous to handcycle exercise (LHV van der Woude et al., 1999). Second, able-bodied women have a comparable physical capacity with paraplegic SCI patients (Flandrois et al., 1986; Maikala & Bhambhani, 2006). Third, participants in this study had no prior experience in upper body exercise, which is comparable to inexperienced wheelchair-dependent persons early in rehabilitation (Van der Woude et al., 1986). Lastly, studies have shown that similar trends are seen in physiological outcomes in both able-bodied subjects and wheelchair users (Dallmeijer, Ottjes et al., 2004). Thus, this study gives valuable insight on effects of low-intensity handcycling training in people with a SCI who are novice wheelchair users in early rehabilitation. However, future low intensities training programmes should include people with a SCI to allow firm conclusion to be drawn. Future studies should evaluate the effect of low-intensity handcycling training on wheelchair capacity, as was done in Chaikhot et al [6] for concurrent training. In their study, they found a decrease in push frequency at speed typical of everyday functional propulsion (comfortable speed and at 125% of comfortable) following a combined resistance and high-intensity training.

Conclusion

Low-intensity handcycling training was perceived as achievable and accomplished without any discomfort, and improves gross efficiency and peak power output. This indicates that improvements in performance can be found for low training intensity. The study training design provides an alternate for people who cannot or are not motivated to train at high intensity such as novice wheelchair-dependent persons. Training at low intensities, individuals can improve their physical capacity, which subsequently can improve their social participation and mobility. This study also supports the idea that handcycling is an appropriate exercise training during rehabilitation to maintain physical capacity and lower risk of developing overuse complaints. The study findings suggest motor adaptation in the form of improved task skill in combination with physiological adaptations at submaximal activity levels. Further studies

employing this study design in a sample of wheelchair-dependent people in rehabilitation setting is warranted.

Disclosure of interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Ulric S. Abonie <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2509-4413>
 Lucas van der Woude <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8472-334X>
 Florentina J. Hettinga <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7027-8126>

References

- Abonie, U. S., Albada, T., Morrien, F., van der Woude, L. H. V., & Hettinga, F. J. (*in press*). Effect of a 7-week resistance training program on handcycle work capacity in able-bodied males. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*.
- Arnet, U., van Drongelen, S., Scheel-Sailer, A., van der Woude, L. H., & Veeger, D. H. (2012). Shoulder load during synchronous handcycling and handrim wheelchair propulsion in persons with paraplegia. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 44(3), 222–228. <https://doi.org/10.2340/16501977-0929>
- Borg, G. A. V. (1982). Psychophysical bases of perceived exertion. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 14(5), 377–381. <https://doi.org/10.1249/00005768-198205000-00012>
- Buchfuhrer, M. J., Hansen, J. E., Robinson, T. E., Sue, D. Y., Wasserman, K., & Whipp, B. J. (1983). Optimizing the exercise protocol for cardiopulmonary assessment. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 55(5), 1558–1564. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jap.1983.55.5.1558>
- Cardinal, B. J., Esters, J., & Cardinal, M. K. (1996). Evaluation of the revised physical activity readiness questionnaire in older adults. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 28(4), 468–472. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005768-199604000-00011>
- Chaikhot, D., Reed, K., Petroongrad, W., Athanasiou, F., van Kooten, D., & Hettinga, F. J. (2018). Effects of an upper-body training program involving resistance exercise and high-intensity arm cranking on peak handcycling performance and wheelchair propulsion efficiency in able-bodied men. *Journal Of Strength And Conditioning Research / National Strength & Conditioning Association* 34(8), 2267–2275. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002738>
- Dallmeijer, A. J., Ottjes, L., de Waardt, E., & van der Woude, L. H. V. (2004). A physiological comparison of synchronous and asynchronous hand cycling. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 25(8), 622–626. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2004-817879>
- Dallmeijer, A. J., Zentgraaff, I. D., Zijp, N. I., & van der Woude, L. H. V. (2004). Submaximal physical strain and peak performance in handcycling versus handrim wheelchair propulsion. *Spinal Cord*, 42(2), 91–98. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.sc.3101566>
- Davis, G. M., Kofsky, P. R., Kelsey, J. C., & Shephard, R. J. (1981). Cardiorespiratory fitness and muscular strength of wheelchair users. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 125(12), 1317–1323. pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/6459841/
- De Groot, S., Dallmeijer, A. J., Van Asbeck, F. W., Post, M. W., Bussmann, J. B., & van der Woude, L. (2007). Mechanical efficiency and wheelchair performance during and after spinal cord injury rehabilitation. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 28(10), 880–886. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2007-964900>
- de Groot, S., de Bruin, M., Noomen, S. P., & van der Woude, L. H. V. (2008). Mechanical efficiency and propulsion technique after 7 weeks of low-intensity wheelchair training. *Clinical Biomechanics*, 23(4), 434–441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2007.11.001>

- Dishman, R. K., & Buckworth, J. (1996). Increasing physical activity: A quantitative synthesis. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 28(6), 706–719. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005768-199606000-00010>
- Ekkekakis, P., Parfitt, G., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2011). The pleasure and displeasure people feel when they exercise at different intensities: decennial update and progress towards a tripartite rationale for exercise intensity prescription. *Sports Medicine*, 41(8), 641–671. <https://doi.org/10.2165/11590680-000000000-00000>
- Esquenazi, A., & DiGiacomo, R. (2001). Rehabilitation after amputation. *Journal of the American Podiatric Medical Association*, 91(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.7547/87507315-91-1-13>
- Flandrois, R., Grandmontagne, M., Gerin, H., Mayet, M. H., Jehl, J. L., & Eyssette, M. (1986). Aerobic performance capacity in paraplegic subjects. *European Journal of Applied Physiology and Occupational Physiology*, 55(6), 604–609. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00423204>
- Garby, L., & Astrup, A. (1987). The relationship between the respiratory quotient and the energy equivalent of oxygen during simultaneous glucose and lipid oxidation and lipogenesis. *Acta Physiologica Scandinavica*, 129(3), 443–444. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-201X.1987.tb10613.x>
- Hettinga, F. J., Hoogwerf, M., & van der Woude, L. H. V. (2016). Handcycling: Training effects of a specific dose of upper body endurance training in females. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 116(7), 1387–1394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-016-3395-x>
- Hicks, A. L., Martin, K. A., Ditor, D. S., Latimer, A. E., Craven, C., Bugaresti, J., & McCartney, N. (2003). Long-term exercise training in persons with spinal cord injury: Effects on strength, arm ergometry performance and psychological well-being. *Spinal Cord*, 41(1), 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.sc.3101389>
- Hoekstra, S., Valent, L., Gobets, D., van der Woude, L., & de Groot, S. (2017). Effects of four-month handbike training under free-living conditions on physical fitness and health in wheelchair users. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 39(16), 1581–1588. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2016.1200677>
- Hooker, S. P., & Wells, C. L. (1989). Effects of low- and moderate-intensity training in spinal cord-injured persons. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 21(1), 18–22. <https://doi.org/10.1249/00005768-198902000-00004>
- Janssen, T. W., van Oers, C. A., van der Woude, L. H., & Hollander, A. P. (1994). Physical strain in daily life of wheelchair users with spinal cord injuries. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 26(6), 661–670. <https://doi.org/10.1249/00005768-199406000-00002>
- Karvonen, M. J., Kentala, E., & Mustala, O. (1957). The effects of training on heart rate: a longitudinal study. *Annales Medicinae Experimentalis Et Biologiae Fenniae*, 35(3), 307–315. pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/13470504/
- Keyser, R. E., Rodgers, M. M., Gardner, E. R., & Russell, P. J. (1999). Oxygen uptake during peak graded exercise and single-stage fatigue tests of wheelchair propulsion in manual wheelchair users and the able-bodied. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 80(10), 1288–1292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-9993\(99\)90031-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-9993(99)90031-X)
- Maikala, R. V., & Bhambhani, Y. N. (2006). Comparisons of physiological and perceptual responses in healthy men and women during standardized arm cranking and task-specific pushing-pulling. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 79(6), 509–520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-005-0076-1>
- Midha, M., Schmitt, J. K., & Sclater, M. (1999). Exercise effect with the wheelchair aerobic fitness trainer on conditioning and metabolic function in disabled persons: A pilot study. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 80(3), 258–261. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-9993\(99\)90135-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-9993(99)90135-1)
- Myers, J., Herbert, W. G., & Humphrey, R. H. (2002). *ACSM's resources for clinical exercise physiology: Musculoskeletal, neuromuscular, neoplastic, immunologic, and hematologic conditions*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Newdisability. (2012). *Wheelchair statistics: How many wheelchair users are there?* [Retrieved June 12 2012, from]. Med Services Europe. <http://www.newdisability.com/wheelchairstatistics.htm>
- O'Brien, T. D., Noyes, J., Spencer, L. H., Kubis, H. P., Edwards, R. T., Bray, N., & Whitaker, R. (2015). Well-being, health and fitness of children who use wheelchairs: Feasibility study protocol to develop child-centred 'keep-fit' exercise interventions. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 71(2), 430–440. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12482>
- O'Brien, T. D., Noyes, J., Spencer, L. H., Kubis, H. P., Hastings, R. P., & Whitaker, R. (2016). Systematic review of physical activity and exercise interventions to improve health, fitness and well-being of children and young people who use wheelchairs. *BMJ Open Sport & Exercise Medicine*, 2(1), e000109. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjsem-2016-000109>
- Pollock, M. L. (1978). How much exercise is enough? *Physiotherapists in Sports Medicine*, 6, 50–64. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED289876.pdf#page=63>
- Powers, S. K., & Howley, E. T. (2007). *Exercise physiology: Theory and application to fitness and performance*. McGraw-Hill.
- Roehrs, T. G., & Karst, G. M. (2004). Effects of an aquatic exercise program on quality of life measures for individuals with progressive multiple sclerosis. *Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy*, 28(2), 63–71. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NPT.0000281186.94382.90>
- Rosa, S. A., & Westcott, W. L. (2010). Physical fitness programming for individuals with spinal cord injury: paraplegia and tetraplegia. *Strength and Conditioning Journal*, 32(6), 19–21. <https://doi.org/10.1519/SSC.0b013e3181f3d5ae>
- Schoenmakers, P., Reed, K., Van Der Woude, L., & Hettinga, F. J. (2016). High intensity interval training in handcycling: The effects of a 7 week training intervention in able-bodied men. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 23:7:638. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2016.00638>
- Spinal cord injury. (2012). Organization of the Netherlands; [Retrieved June 12 2012, from]. Netherlands: Paraplegia Organization. <http://www.dwarslaesie.nl/een-dwarslaesie/wat-is-het>
- United States Department of Health and Human Services. (2000). *Healthy People 2010* (Vol. 2, 2nd ed.). U.S. Government Printing Office.
- van den Berg, R., de Groot, S., Swart, K. M., & van der Woude, L. H. V. (2010). Physical capacity after 7 weeks of low-intensity wheelchair training. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 32(26), 2244–2252. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2010.535688>
- van der Grinten, S. (1992). *Development of a practical method for measuring body part discomfort* (pp. 311). London: Taylor and Francis.
- van der Woude, L. H., Dallmeijer, A. J., Janssen, T. W., & Veeger, D. (2001). Alternative modes of manual wheelchair ambulation: An overview. *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, 80(10), 765–777. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00002060-200110000-00012>
- van der Woude, L. H., de Groot, G., Hollander, A. P., van Ingen Schenau, G. J., & Rozendal, R. H. (1986). Wheelchair ergonomics and physiological testing of prototypes. *Ergonomics*, 29(12), 1561–1573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140138608967269>
- van der Woude, L. H., de Groot, S., & Janssen, T. W. (2006). Manual wheelchairs: Research and innovation in rehabilitation, sports, daily life and health. *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 28(9), 905–915. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medengphy.2005.12.001>
- van der Woude, L. H., Veeger, H. E., Dallmeijer, A. J., Janssen, T. W., & Rozendaal, L. A. (2001). Biomechanics and physiology in active manual wheelchair propulsion. *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 23(10), 713–733. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1350-4533\(01\)00083-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1350-4533(01)00083-2)
- van der Woude, L. H. V., van Croonenborg, J. J., Wolff, I., Dallmeijer, A. J., & Hollander, A. P. (1999). Physical work capacity after 7 week of wheelchair training: Effect of intensity in able-bodied subjects. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 31(2), 331–341. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005768-199902000-00018>