

Author's accepted manuscript (postprint)

Effects of increased load of low- versus high-intensity endurance training on performance and physiological adaptations in endurance athletes

Talsnes, R. K., van den Tillaar, R. & Sandbakk, Ø.

Published in: International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance

DOI: 10.1123/ijsp.2021-0190

Available online: 05 Oct 2021

Citation:

Talsnes, R. K., van den Tillaar, R. & Sandbakk, Ø. (2021). Effects of increased load of low- versus high-intensity endurance training on performance and physiological adaptations in endurance athletes. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 17(2), 216-225. doi: 10.1123/ijsp.2021-0190

Accepted author manuscript version reprinted, by permission, from *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 2021, 17(2): 216-225, <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2021-0190>. © Human Kinetics, Inc.

1 **Effects of increased load of low- vs. high-intensity endurance training on**
2 **performance and physiological adaptations in endurance athletes**

3
4 *Original investigation*

5
6 Rune Kjøsén Talsnes^{1,2}, Roland van den Tillaar² and Øyvind Sandbakk³

7
8 ¹Meråker High School, Trøndelag County Council, Steinkjer, Norway.

9 ²Department of Sports Science and Physical Education, Nord University, Bodø, Norway.

10 ³Centre for Elite Sports Research, Department of Neuromedicine and Movement Science,
11 Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.

12
13 Corresponding Author:

14 Rune Kjøsén Talsnes

15 Department of Sports Science and Physical Education

16 Nord University

17 8026 Bodø, Norway

18 E-mail: rune.k.talsnes@nord.no

19 Phone: +47 99430935

20
21 *Running head*

22 Endurance training intensity

23 *Abstract Word Count*

24 250

25 *Text-Only Word Count*

26 3358

27 *Number of Figures and Tables*

28 Figures: 4 Tables: 4

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Abstract

Purpose: To compare the effects of increased load of low- vs. high-intensity endurance training on performance and physiological adaptations in well-trained endurance athletes.

Methods: Following an 8-week pre-intervention period, fifty-one (36 men and 15 women) junior cross-country skiers and biathletes were randomly allocated into a low-intensity (LIG, n=26) or high-intensity training group (HIG, n=25) for an 8-week intervention period, load-balanced using the overall training impulse (TRIMP)-score. Both groups performed an uphill running time-trial and were assessed for laboratory performance and physiological profiling in treadmill running and roller-ski skating pre- and post-intervention.

Results: Pre- to post-intervention changes in running time-trial did not differ between groups ($p=0.44$), with significant improvements in HIG ($-2.3\pm 3.2\%$, $p=0.01$) but not in LIG ($-1.5\pm 2.9\%$, $p=0.20$). There were no differences between groups in peak speed changes when incremental running and roller-ski skating to exhaustion ($p=0.30$ and $p=0.20$, respectively), with both modes being significantly improved in HIG ($2.2\pm 3.1\%$ and $2.5\pm 3.4\%$, both $p<0.01$) and in roller-ski skating for LIG ($1.5\pm 2.4\%$, $p<0.01$). There was a between-group difference in running VO_{2max} changes ($p=0.04$), tending to improve in HIG ($3.0\pm 6.4\%$, $p=0.09$) but not in LIG ($-0.7\pm 4.6\%$, $p=0.25$). Changes in roller-ski skating VO_{2peak} differed between groups ($p=0.02$), with significant improvements in HIG ($3.6\pm 5.4\%$, $p=0.01$) but not in LIG ($-0.1\pm 0.17\%$, $p=0.62$).

Conclusion: There were no significant difference in performance adaptations between increased load of low- vs. high-intensity training in well-trained endurance athletes although both methods improved performance. However, increased load of high-intensity training elicited better VO_{2max} adaptations compared to increased load of low-intensity training.

Keywords: biathlon, endurance performance, maximal oxygen uptake, training intensity distribution, training volume, XC skiing

Introduction

98
99

100 Endurance training involves the manipulation of training intensity, duration, frequency and
101 mode, with the goal of maximizing physiological adaptations and performance.^{1,2} Accordingly,
102 the organization and optimization of endurance training, and in particular training volume and
103 intensity distribution, is widely debated among both sports scientists and practitioners.¹⁻³ Most
104 elite endurance athletes adopt a training model consisting of high volumes of low-intensity
105 training (LIT) combined with low-to-moderate amounts of moderate- (MIT) and high-intensity
106 training (HIT).¹⁻³ However, the exact volume and training intensity distribution depends on the
107 demands of the given endurance sport, individual requirements, as well as the phase of the
108 annual training cycle.^{1,3,4}

109

110 Endurance athletes progress their overall training stimulus throughout the annual cycle, which
111 might be achieved through increased load of LIT or by performing a larger load of MIT and/or
112 HIT.¹ While LIT is seen as an important stimulus for inducing peripheral adaptations such as
113 increased mitochondrial biogenesis and capillary density of the skeletal muscle,^{5,6} central
114 adaptations such as increased stroke volume of the heart, leading to improved maximal oxygen
115 uptake (VO_{2max}), are regarded as more responsive to HIT.⁵⁻⁷ However, LIT and HIT have many
116 similarities (e.g., upregulating PGC-1 α) and both intensities seem to elicit complex and
117 integrated adaptations.^{1,5}

118

119 To better understand how progression in endurance training load by different intensity
120 distributions influence performance and physiological adaptations in endurance athletes, valid
121 methods for the matching of training load is required. The majority of previous intervention
122 studies where training load has been matched for total work or oxygen consumption (iso-
123 energetic method) emphasizes the superiority of HIT for maximizing physiological
124 adaptations.⁷⁻⁹ However, such studies are not realistic from the perspective of how endurance
125 athletes train and perceive stress,³ since endurance athletes can perform far more work, both
126 energetically and in terms of total work at a lower autonomic disturbance, with LIT compared
127 to HIT.¹⁰ Accordingly, progressing the overall training stimulus with increased load of LIT may
128 be advantageous for optimizing adaptive responses at a tolerable level of stress, although most
129 experimental evidence suggests superior adaptations while adopting a more polarized intensity
130 distribution¹¹ with greater training intensification.¹²

131

132 Therefore, the present study compared the effects of increased load of LIT vs. HIT during an
133 8-week intervention period on performance and physiological adaptations in well-trained
134 endurance athletes. This was done by matching the increase of LIT and HIT for overall load by
135 the training impulse method (TRIMP), in which we hypothesized that more HIT would elicit
136 superior VO_{2max} adaptations and thereby greater performance improvements compared to more
137 LIT over 8 weeks.

138

Methods

139

140

Participants

142 Fifty-one (36 men and 15 women; Table 1) national-level junior cross-country skiers and
143 biathletes volunteered to participate in the study. All athletes were students at a Norwegian high
144 school with a specialized study program for cross-country skiing (n=41) and biathlon (n=10).
145 The Regional Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics waived the requirement for
146 ethical approval for this study. Therefore, the ethics of the study are in accordance with the
147 institutional requirements, and approval for data security and handling obtained from the

148 Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD). All athletes were fully informed of the nature of
149 the study and its experimental risks before providing written consent. Several athletes (n=21)
150 were <18 years, and therefore, the parents were asked to provide parental consent. Some
151 athletes dropped out of the study (low-intensity training group [LIG]=2; high-intensity training
152 group [HIG]=5) due to sickness (n=3), injury (n=2), or other reasons (n=2). In addition, two
153 athletes from LIG were excluded from the final analyses due to lack of 85% compliance with
154 the prescribed training.

155
156 **Table 1 around here**
157

158 **Design**

159 Following an 8-week pre-intervention period, the athletes were randomly allocated into either
160 a group with increased load of LIT (LIG, n=26) or a group with increased load of HIT (HIG,
161 n=25) for an 8-week intervention during their late preparation period (September–November).
162 The training was balanced for overall load using a TRIMP score, and groups were matched for
163 sport, age, sex, physiological indices, and pre-intervention training characteristics. Both groups
164 performed an uphill running time-trial (TT) in the field and were assessed for laboratory
165 performance and physiological profiling in treadmill running and roller-ski skating before (pre)
166 and after (post) the intervention.

167 168 169 **Methodology**

170 *Pre-intervention period*

171 Prior to the intervention, all athletes followed an 8-week baseline period consisting of the same
172 training guidelines. The athletes were instructed to focus on high-volume LIT interspersed with,
173 on average, one weekly MIT and one weekly HIT session. In addition, 2–3 weekly strength or
174 speed sessions were integrated into LIT sessions or performed as a single session. Based on
175 this, individualized training programs were developed together with the athlete's personal
176 coaches to ensure optimal adjustments of load. The athletes were familiarized with the different
177 test protocols before performing all pre-tests during the last week of the pre-intervention period.

178 179 *Intervention period*

180 Training plans during the 8-week intervention period were based on a theoretical framework
181 developed by the researchers and adopted to each athlete in close collaboration with coaches.
182 The groups increased their overall training load in the intervention period by adopting two
183 different training regimes. LIG continued with the same focus as during the pre-intervention
184 period, but with increased volume of LIT, whereas HIG changed towards increased frequency
185 and volume of HIT with reduced volume of LIT. Weekly mesocycle load was designed with
186 three different load structures (high, moderate, and low) for both groups, where the coaches,
187 individually adjusted and optimized load for each athlete. Based on previous research^{13,14} and
188 pilot testing of selected athletes, the use of the training impulse (TRIMP) method was
189 incorporated as the most valid method for the matching of training load between groups.
190 Accordingly, all within-group mesocycle loads were balanced for overall load (TRIMP)
191 between-groups. TRIMP was calculated by multiplying the duration in three intensity zones
192 with a weighting factor (i.e., LIT, MIT, and HIT are given a score of 1, 2, and 3, respectively).
193 Total TRIMP was then obtained by adding the different intensity zone scores. Distribution of
194 MIT and HIT sessions per week together with weekly mesocycle loads for both groups are
195 displayed in Figure 1. All athletes were instructed to maintain the same diet and training plans
196 were designed to maintain similar volume of strength and speed training during the intervention
197 period.

Figure 1 around here

198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213

Training monitoring

All athletes recorded their own training using an online training diary developed by the Norwegian Top Sport Centre (Olympiatoppen) by applying the *modified session-goal approach* (SG/TZ).¹⁵ Training intensity distribution was recorded using a five-zone intensity scale but reported using a three-zone scale (LIT, MIT, and HIT), which better corresponds with relevant literature and underlying physiological mechanisms.¹⁶ For MIT and HIT sessions performed as intervals, time in the intensity zone of the session was registered from the beginning of the first interval to the end of the last interval, including recovery periods. Moreover, strength and speed training were registered from the start to the finish of that separate part (e.g., strength, speed, plyometrics) during the session, including recovery periods. Training mode is reported as specific (classical and skating roller-skiing) and non-specific (running and cycling) endurance training. In addition, intensity control was achieved by regular use of heart rate (HR) monitoring and $[La^-]$ measurements throughout the intervention period.

Test protocols and measurements

Training plans were designed to include standardized training load in the last two days prior to the first day of testing. The athletes were instructed to follow self-selected preparation procedures and not to consume any large meals or caffeinated beverages within the last 2 hours before the test. There were always >24 hours between all tests for each athlete. The TT in combination with laboratory tests were chosen to obtain a comprehensive understanding of performance both in practical and laboratory conditions, as well as the underlying physiological mechanisms.

Uphill running TT (test day 1)

Prior to the TT, athletes performed a ~30-min LIT self-selected warm-up procedure. Performance times were recorded using two synchronized watches and the Racesplitter timekeeping system (Makalu Logistics Inc, Fontana, USA). The TT was performed on asphalt with a total distance of 6.4 km (elevation: 270 m) and 4.5 km (elevation: 160 m) for men and women, respectively. Weather conditions were stable during each test day, being partly cloudy with low and stable wind, but differed in ambient temperature and humidity between pre and post (15 vs. 2 °C and 70 vs. 90%, respectively). Due to different reasons, six athletes in LIG and one athlete in HIG were not able to perform the TT at both pre and post. Hence, 35 athletes were included in the final TT analysis (LIG, 10 men and 5 women; HIG, 14 men and 5 women).

Laboratory treadmill running test (test day 2)

Following a 10-min individual running warm-up (60–72% of maximal HR [HR_{max}]), all athletes performed one 5-min submaximal stage running at 10.5% incline and at the same absolute speed (8 km·h⁻¹ for men and 7 km·h⁻¹ for women). After a 2-min recovery period, the athletes performed an incremental test to exhaustion in order to determine VO_{2max} and performance measured as peak treadmill speed ($[V_{peak}]$ calculated according to Sandbakk et al .,¹⁷). The test was performed at 10.5% incline with a 1-km·h⁻¹ increase in speed every minute until voluntary exhaustion. Starting speed was set to 9 km·h⁻¹ and 8 km·h⁻¹ for men and women, respectively.

Laboratory treadmill roller-ski skating test (test day 3)

After a 10-min individual running warm-up (60–72% of HR_{max}) as on test day 2, the athletes completed two 5-min submaximal stages at 5% incline while treadmill roller-ski skating. The two stages were performed at the same absolute speed for men (12 and 14 km·h⁻¹) and women (10 and 12 km·h⁻¹), with 1-min recovery in between. Following a 5-min recovery period, peak

248 oxygen uptake ($\text{VO}_{2\text{peak}}$) and performance measured as V_{peak} were determined.¹⁷ The test was
249 performed at 5% incline with a starting speed of 14 and 12 $\text{km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$ for men and women,
250 respectively. The incline was kept constant, while the speed was subsequently increased by 2
251 $\text{km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$ every minute up to 20 $\text{km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$ for men and 18 $\text{km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$ for women, and thereafter by 1
252 $\text{km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$ until voluntary exhaustion. The athletes were instructed to use the skating G3 sub-
253 technique during the entire test.

254
255 Treadmill running was performed on a 2.5 x 0.7-m motor-driven treadmill and treadmill roller-
256 ski skating on a 3.5 x 2.5-m treadmill (RL 2500 and RL 3500E, Rodby, Vänge, Sweden). For
257 all submaximal testing, respiratory recordings were collected between the third and fourth
258 minute of each 5-min stage and HR defined as the average over the last 30 s. Respiratory
259 variables were measured using open-circuit indirect calorimetry with mixing chamber (Oxycon
260 Pro, Jaeger GmbH, Hoechberg, Germany) and HR by a Garmin Forerunner 935 (Garmin Ltd.,
261 Olathe, KS, USA). Rate of perceived exertion (RPE) using the 6–20-point Borg scale and $[\text{La}^-]$
262 were taken from the fingertip directly after completing each stage. $[\text{La}^-]$ was measured using
263 the stationary Biosen C-Line lactate analyzer (Biosen, EKF Industrial Electronics, Magdeburg,
264 Germany). In addition, gross efficiency was measured for the submaximal roller-ski stages and
265 defined as the ratio of work and metabolic rate.¹⁸ For the incremental test to exhaustion,
266 respiratory variables and HR were measured continuously, and $\text{VO}_{2\text{max/peak}}$ defined as the
267 highest 1-min average. HR_{max} was defined as the highest 5-sec HR measurement, whereas RPE
268 was determined directly after, and $[\text{La}^-]$ approximately 1 min after.

269 270 **Statistical analysis**

271 All data are reported as means \pm standard deviations (SD). Assumption of normality was tested
272 with a Shapiro–Wilk test in combination with visual inspection of histograms. Adopted from
273 previous literature,^{19,20} individual response magnitudes were summarized in three different
274 categories: nonresponse defined as $<0\%$ change, moderate response as 0% to 5% change, and
275 large response as $>5\%$ change. An adaptation index for each athlete was also calculated as the
276 mean of the percentage change in treadmill running $\text{VO}_{2\text{max}}$ and V_{peak} , treadmill roller-ski
277 skating $\text{VO}_{2\text{peak}}$ and V_{peak} from pre- to post.²⁰ To test for differences between groups, a
278 univariate general linear model (GLM) analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used, with the
279 percentage change from pre- to post as the dependent variable, and baseline values as a
280 covariate to adjust for possible between-group differences pre-intervention. Pre- to post
281 changes within groups were assessed using a paired-samples t-test. Between-group differences
282 in baseline and training characteristics were tested using an independent-samples t-test. Effect
283 size (ES) was calculated as Cohen’s d by using the mean pre- to post change between groups,
284 divided by the pooled pre-test SD (interpreted as follows: 0.0–0.24 trivial, 0.25–0.49 small,
285 0.5–1.0 moderate, >1.0 large).²¹ For all comparisons, statistical significance was set at an alpha
286 level of $p<0.05$, and $p=0.05$ – 0.1 indicated trends. All data analyses were conducted using SPSS
287 26.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, United States).

288

289 **Results**

290

291 *Training characteristics*

292 Comparisons of training characteristics between groups are shown in Table 2. Weekly TRIMP
293 during the pre-intervention and intervention periods did not differ between groups ($p=0.60$ and
294 $p=0.93$, respectively), whereas the training intensity distribution shifted from having a similar
295 pattern across groups during the pre-intervention to clearly differing during the intervention.
296 During the intervention period, LIG performed 16% more endurance training hours compared
297 to HIG ($p<0.01$), due to 25% more hours of LIT ($p<0.01$). HIG performed 118% more hours of

298 HIT compared to LIG ($p<0.01$), whereas hours of MIT did not differ between groups ($p=0.35$).
299 The volume of strength and speed training performed during the intervention period did not
300 differ between groups ($p=0.67$ and 0.23 , respectively).

301
302 **Table 2 around here**

303
304
305 *Baseline characteristics and body mass*

306 There were no differences between groups in age, anthropometrics, or any performance or
307 physiological indices before the intervention. There were no between-group differences in body
308 mass changes ($p=0.12$), although an increase was observed in HIG ($1.9\pm 2.2\%$, $p<0.01$) but not
309 in LIG ($0.5\pm 2.1\%$, $p=0.19$).

310
311 *Performance adaptations*

312 There were no between-group differences in running TT performance changes ($p=0.44$), but
313 HIG improved by $-2.3\pm 3.2\%$ ($p=0.01$), with no change in LIG ($-1.5\pm 2.9\%$, $p=0.20$). The
314 individual response magnitudes for TT performance changes are shown in Figure 2. The
315 changes in treadmill running V_{peak} did not differ between groups ($p=0.30$) but were improved
316 in HIG ($2.2\pm 3.1\%$, $p<0.01$), with a corresponding non-change in LIG ($1.4\pm 4.2\%$, $p=0.18$, Table
317 3). Treadmill roller-ski skating V_{peak} changes did not differ between groups ($p=0.20$) but were
318 improved within both LIG and HIG ($1.5\pm 2.4\%$ and $2.5\pm 3.4\%$, respectively, both $p<0.01$).

319
320 **Figure 2 around here**

321
322 **Table 3 around here**

323
324 *Physiological adaptations*

325 There was a between-group difference in treadmill running VO_{2max} changes ($p=0.04$, Table 3),
326 tending to improve in HIG ($3.0\pm 6.4\%$, $p=0.09$), with a corresponding non-change in LIG ($-$
327 $0.7\pm 4.6\%$, $p=0.25$). There were no between-group differences in submaximal adaptations
328 running at absolute speeds, although trivial to small effects of reduced RER, HR, $\%HR_{max}$, and
329 RPE in HIG vs. LIG were found (see Table 3 for all details).

330
331
332 The change in treadmill roller-ski skating VO_{2peak} was different between groups ($p=0.02$), with
333 improvements in HIG ($3.6\pm 5.4\%$, $p=0.01$) and a corresponding non-change in LIG ($-0.1\pm 4.0\%$,
334 $p=0.62$). Overall, positive submaximal adaptations (i.e., $\%VO_{2max}$, RER, $\%HR_{max}$, and RPE) in
335 roller-ski skating at absolute speeds were found in HIG and not in LIG, although gross
336 efficiency was improved in both groups (see Table 4 for all details). Individual response
337 magnitudes for V_{peak} and $VO_{2max/peak}$ in treadmill running and roller-ski skating are presented in
338 Figure 3, while Figure 4 shows the adaptation index for each athlete in LIG and HIG.

339
340 **Table 4 around here**

341
342 **Figure 3 around here**

343
344 **Figure 4 around here**

Discussion

348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397

The present study compared the effects of increased load of LIT vs. HIT on performance and physiological adaptations in well-trained endurance athletes. The main findings were that performance adaptations, including uphill running TT performance and peak speed when incremental running and roller-ski skating to exhaustion in the laboratory, did not differ significantly between the two groups progressing their training with different endurance training intensities. However, while both groups improved their performance, increased load of HIT elicited 3–4% greater changes in running VO_{2max} and roller-ski skating VO_{2peak} compared to increased load of LIT.

In contrast to most previous intervention studies where endurance training load is matched for total work or oxygen consumption,⁷⁻⁹ the present approach induced a similar increase in TRIMP load when progressing the overall training stimulus for both groups.^{22,23} Accordingly, a significant between-group difference in LIT and HIT load was achieved while obtaining similar training loads. Although the intervention *per se* was regarded as successful because most athletes improved their performance, there are potential limitations with this approach caused by, e.g., between-athlete variations in adaptive signaling and stress tolerance to LIT and HIT training. In addition, this approach does not consider variations in metabolic vs. neuromuscular load between different training modalities (e.g., running vs. XC skiing). Although there was a change towards more specific training in the intervention period compared to baseline training, these changes were non-significant and similar between-groups. Accordingly, the design could be regarded valid for the purpose of the study.

With such matching of training load progression, the present study found little or no effects on performance adaptations in running or roller-ski skating when increasing the load of LIT vs. HIT in well-trained endurance athletes. Although the individual response magnitudes indicated more positive performance adaptations in HIT, the present statistical findings are in contrast to those of Stöggl and Sperlich¹¹ and Vesterinen et al.,²⁴ who demonstrated superior performance adaptations of a more polarized intensity distribution with greater HIT load compared to high-volume LIT regimes. However, Ingham et al.²⁵ and Nuutila et al.²⁶ found similar performance adaptations of high-volume LIT and HIT regimes, which is in line with the present findings and implies that similar performance progression can be achieved both by increased load of LIT and HIT during the preparation period in endurance athletes.

In accordance with the hypothesis, increased load of HIT led to 3–4% better VO_{2max} adaptations in running and roller-ski skating compared to increased load of LIT. These findings were strengthened by the greater individual response magnitudes and adaptation index as well as better submaximal adaptations (e.g., reduced HR) at absolute speeds in HIT. Better VO_{2max} adaptations in HIT are likely explained by increased O_2 delivery capacity,^{5,6,12} supported by other short-term training intensification studies.⁷⁻⁹ This argues that even when matching training load with a more ecologically valid method as employed here, a high HIT stimulus seems needed to stress the cardiovascular system sufficiently and will thereby increase VO_{2max} more than when compensating with increased load of LIT.^{5,12} Still, only trivial to small effects in the differences in physiological adaptations were found, which is likely explained by the relatively high training status and the short intervention period.²⁷⁻²⁹ Altogether, progressing the overall training stimulus by intensification seems favorable if the goal is to elicit VO_{2max} adaptations over a relatively short training period in well-trained endurance athletes. To what extent these adaptations can be transferred also to performance benefits over a longer timescale requires further examination.

398 The individual response magnitudes revealed that some athletes in LIG also improved their
399 VO_{2max} to the same extent as HIG, indicating individual variations in how athletes respond to
400 different endurance training in eliciting VO_{2max} .^{24,30} The present sample of athletes, including
401 both sexes and different initial levels, could in part have contributed to the subsequent variations
402 in training response. However, the groups were matched for sex and physiological indices pre-
403 intervention, and baseline values were adjusted for as a covariate in the statistical analysis. In
404 this context, no significant sex-differences in any performance or physiological adaptations
405 were found. Accordingly, the present group comparisons are likely valid, although future
406 studies should further investigate individual responses to changes in training volume and
407 intensity distribution, as well as overall load adjustments in endurance athletes.
408

409 It seems obvious that improved VO_{2max} had a positive effect on performance adaptations in
410 HIG. However, the reasons for improved performance in LIG without improving VO_{2max} could
411 be explained by increased fractional utilization of VO_{2max} (i.e., anaerobic threshold). In this
412 context, an interesting feature is that the number of LIT sessions above 2.5 hours in LIG might
413 have provided a different stimulus for adaptive signaling than shorter LIT sessions.
414 Accordingly, the hypothesis was that LIT and HIT induce complementary adaptations, which
415 is partly induced through different molecular pathways.^{1,5} However, this remains speculative
416 as muscle biopsies or other measures to examine underlying mechanisms were not included in
417 the present design.
418

419 **Practical applications**

420
421 The data presented in this study provide novel information with relevance for optimizing the
422 training volume and intensity distribution in periods when the overall training stimulus is
423 progressed in endurance athletes. The present data indicate that performance progression can
424 be achieved both by increased load of LIT and HIT, although a sufficient HIT stimulus seems
425 to be beneficial for eliciting maximal energy delivery capacities in 8 weeks. However, the more
426 long-term effects and the effect of different periodization models of LIT and HIT focus prior to
427 the competition period require further attention in future studies.
428

429 **Conclusions**

430
431 The present study found no significant difference in performance adaptations in running or
432 roller-ski skating during 8 weeks of increased load of LIT vs. HIT in well-trained endurance
433 athletes, although both methods improved performance. However, increased load of HIT
434 elicited better VO_{2max} adaptations compared to increased load of LIT.
435
436

437 **Acknowledgements**

438 The authors would like to thank the athletes and their coaches for their enthusiastic cooperation
439 and participation in the study. Particular gratitude is directed to Lars Jonatan Engdahl, Johan
440 Persson, and Henek Tomson for their help with collecting laboratory data. Moreover, the
441 authors would like to thank Knut Skovereng and Guro Strøm Solli for valuable comments on
442 the manuscript. The study is funded by Meråker High School and the Research Council of
443 Norway (RCN) (project no. 298645).
444

445 **References**

446

- 447 1. Seiler S. What is best practice for training intensity and duration distribution in
448 endurance athletes? *International journal of sports physiology and performance*.
449 2010;5(3):276-291.
- 450 2. Stöggl TL, Sperlich B. The training intensity distribution among well-trained and elite
451 endurance athletes. *Frontiers in Physiology*. 2015;6(295).
- 452 3. Seiler S, Tønnessen E. Intervals, Thresholds, and Long Slow Distance: the Role of
453 Intensity and Duration in Endurance Training. *Sportsmedicine*. 2009;13:32-53.
- 454 4. Sandbakk O, Haugen T, Ettema G. The influence of exercise modality on training load
455 management. *International journal of sports physiology and performance*.
456 2021;16(4):605-608.
- 457 5. Laursen PB. Training for intense exercise performance: high-intensity or high-volume
458 training? *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*. 2010;20 Suppl 2:1-10.
- 459 6. Hughes DC, Ellefsen S, Baar K. Adaptations to Endurance and Strength Training. *Cold
460 Spring Harbor perspectives in medicine*. 2018;8(6).
- 461 7. Helgerud J, Høydal K, Wang E, et al. Aerobic high-intensity intervals improve VO₂max
462 more than moderate training. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*.
463 2007;39(4):665-671.
- 464 8. Daussin FN, Ponsot E, Dufour SP, et al. Improvement of VO₂max by cardiac output
465 and oxygen extraction adaptation during intermittent versus continuous endurance
466 training. *European journal of applied physiology*. 2007;101(3):377-383.
- 467 9. Wisløff U, Støylen A, Loennechen JP, et al. Superior cardiovascular effect of aerobic
468 interval training versus moderate continuous training in heart failure patients: a
469 randomized study. *Circulation*. 2007;115(24):3086-3094.
- 470 10. Seiler S, Haugen O, Kuffel E. Autonomic recovery after exercise in trained athletes:
471 intensity and duration effects. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*.
472 2007;39(8):1366-1373.
- 473 11. Stöggl T, Sperlich B. Polarized training has greater impact on key endurance variables
474 than threshold, high intensity, or high volume training. *Frontiers in Physiology*.
475 2014;5(33).
- 476 12. Laursen PB, Jenkins DG. The scientific basis for high-intensity interval training:
477 optimising training programmes and maximising performance in highly trained
478 endurance athletes. *Sports medicine (Auckland, NZ)*. 2002;32(1):53-73.
- 479 13. Foster C, Florhaug JA, Franklin J, et al. A new approach to monitoring exercise training.
480 *Journal of strength and conditioning research*. 2001;15(1):109-115.
- 481 14. Solli GS, Tønnessen E, Sandbakk O. Block vs. Traditional Periodization of HIT: Two
482 Different Paths to Success for the World's Best Cross-Country Skier. *Frontiers in
483 physiology*. 2019;10:375.
- 484 15. Sylta O, Tønnessen E, Seiler S. From heart-rate data to training quantification: a
485 comparison of 3 methods of training-intensity analysis. *International journal of sports
486 physiology and performance*. 2014;9(1):100-107.
- 487 16. Seiler KS, Kjerland GO. Quantifying training intensity distribution in elite endurance
488 athletes: is there evidence for an "optimal" distribution? *Scandinavian journal of
489 medicine & science in sports*. 2006;16(1):49-56.
- 490 17. Sandbakk O, Holmberg HC, Leirdal S, Ettema G. The physiology of world-class sprint
491 skiers. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*. 2011;21(6):e9-16.
- 492 18. Sandbakk O, Holmberg HC, Leirdal S, Ettema G. Metabolic rate and gross efficiency
493 at high work rates in world class and national level sprint skiers. *European journal of
494 applied physiology*. 2010;109(3):473-481.

- 495 19. Sylta Ø, Tønnessen E, Sandbakk Ø, et al. Effects of High-Intensity Training on
496 Physiological and Hormonal Adaptions in Well-Trained Cyclists. *Medicine and science*
497 *in sports and exercise*. 2017;49(6):1137-1146.
- 498 20. Zinner C, Schäfer Olstad D, Sperlich B. Mesocycles with Different Training Intensity
499 Distribution in Recreational Runners. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*.
500 2018;50(8):1641-1648.
- 501 21. Morris SB. Estimating Effect Sizes From Pretest-Posttest-Control Group Designs. *Sage*
502 *Journals*. 2008;11(2):364-386.
- 503 22. Muñoz I, Seiler S, Bautista J, España J, Larumbe E, Esteve-Lanao J. Does polarized
504 training improve performance in recreational runners? *International journal of sports*
505 *physiology and performance*. 2014;9(2):265-272.
- 506 23. Esteve-Lanao J, Foster C, Seiler S, Lucia A. Impact of training intensity distribution on
507 performance in endurance athletes. *Journal of strength and conditioning research*.
508 2007;21(3):943-949.
- 509 24. Vesterinen V, Häkkinen K, Laine T, Hynynen E, Mikkola J, Nummela A. Predictors of
510 individual adaptation to high-volume or high-intensity endurance training in
511 recreational endurance runners. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*.
512 2016;26(8):885-893.
- 513 25. Ingham SA, Carter H, Whyte GP, Doust JH. Physiological and performance effects of
514 low- versus mixed-intensity rowing training. *Medicine and science in sports and*
515 *exercise*. 2008;40(3):579-584.
- 516 26. Nuutila O-P, Nummela A, Häkkinen K, Seipäjärvi S, Kyröläinen H. Monitoring
517 Training and Recovery during a Period of Increased Intensity or Volume in Recreational
518 Endurance Athletes. *International Journal of Enviromental Research and Public*
519 *Health*. 2021;18(5):2401.
- 520 27. Sylta Ø, Tønnessen E, Hammarström D, et al. The Effect of Different High-Intensity
521 Periodization Models on Endurance Adaptations. *Medicine and science in sports and*
522 *exercise*. 2016;48(11):2165-2174.
- 523 28. Rønnestad BR, Hansen J, Thyli V, Bakken TA, Sandbakk Ø. 5-week block
524 periodization increases aerobic power in elite cross-country skiers. *Scandinavian*
525 *journal of medicine & science in sports*. 2016;26(2):140-146.
- 526 29. Rønnestad BR, Hansen J, Ellefsen S. Block periodization of high-intensity aerobic
527 intervals provides superior training effects in trained cyclists. *Scandinavian journal of*
528 *medicine & science in sports*. 2014;24(1):34-42.
- 529 30. Mann TN, Lamberts RP, Lambert MI. High responders and low responders: factors
530 associated with individual variation in response to standardized training. *Sports*
531 *medicine (Auckland, NZ)*. 2014;44(8):1113-1124.
532

533 **Figure legends**

534

535 **Figure 1** – Training program for 8 weeks of **(A)** low-intensity training group and **(B)** high-
536 intensity training group, including weekly distribution of moderate- (MIT) and high-intensity
537 training (HIT) sessions and overall training load (TRIMP) within three different mesocycle
538 loads (low, moderate, and high)

539

540 **Figure 2** – Individual response magnitude for pre- to post changes in uphill running time trial
541 performance summarized in three different categories: nonresponse (white), <0% change;
542 moderate response (grey), 0–5% change; and large response (black) >5% change

543

544 **Figure 3** – Individual response magnitude for pre- to post changes summarized in three
545 different categories: nonresponse (white), <0% change; moderate response (grey), 0–5%
546 change; and large response (black) >5% change. **(A)** Maximal oxygen uptake in treadmill
547 running, **(B)** peak speed in treadmill running, **(C)** peak oxygen uptake in treadmill roller-ski
548 skating, **(D)** peak speed in treadmill roller-ski skating

549

550 **Figure 4** – Adaptation index for each individual athlete in **(A)** low-intensity training group and
551 **(B)** high-intensity training group, calculated as the mean of the percentage change in maximal
552 oxygen uptake and peak speed in treadmill running and peak oxygen uptake and peak speed in
553 treadmill roller-ski skating from pre- to post

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the 51 well-trained endurance athletes participating in the study (mean \pm SD)

Variables	Men (n = 36)	Women (n = 15)	Total (n = 51)
Age (y)	17 \pm 1	17 \pm 0	18 \pm 1
Body height (cm)	181.3 \pm 0.7	167.2 \pm 3.6	177.1 \pm 8.2
Body mass (kg)	72.7 \pm 7.1	62.0 \pm 5.4	69.6 \pm 8.2
Body mass index (kg·m ⁻²)	22.1 \pm 1.6	22.2 \pm 2.2	22.1 \pm 1.8
RUN-VO _{2max} (L·min ⁻¹)	5.08 \pm 0.56	3.48 \pm 0.35	4.59 \pm 0.90
RUN-VO _{2max} (mL·min ⁻¹ ·kg ⁻¹)	70.3 \pm 4.5	56.0 \pm 3.4	65.9 \pm 7.8
SKATE-VO _{2peak} (L·min ⁻¹)	4.86 \pm 0.55	3.32 \pm 0.36	4.41 \pm 0.86
SKATE-VO _{2peak} (mL·min ⁻¹ ·kg ⁻¹)	66.8 \pm 4.9	53.7 \pm 3.9	62.9 \pm 7.6
Annual training volume (h y ⁻¹)	529 \pm 95	493 \pm 103	511 \pm 99
RUN-VO _{2max} , maximal oxygen uptake in running; SKATE-VO _{2peak} , peak oxygen uptake in roller-ski skating.			

Table 2. Training characteristics during an 8-week baseline and 8-week intervention period among 42 well-trained endurance athletes, randomized into either LIG or HIG (mean \pm SD)

	8-week baseline period		8-week intervention period	
	LIG (n=22)	HIG (n=20)	LIG (n=22)	HIG (n=20)
Training forms				
Training volume (h)	97.0 \pm 14.2	96.3 \pm 18.1	108.7 \pm 10.7*	94.8 \pm 11.6#
Sessions (n)	60.7 \pm 8.1	61.2 \pm 9.9	67.0 \pm 5.6*	67.0 \pm 7.1*
Sickness/injury (d)	1.3 \pm 2.6	0.6 \pm 1.6	1.8 \pm 2.8	1.7 \pm 2.7
Training forms				
Endurance (h)	87.0 \pm 12.9	84.7 \pm 19.1	95.6 \pm 9.3*	82.5 \pm 10.4#
Strength (h)	7.7 \pm 3.3	8.4 \pm 1.8	9.0 \pm 2.2	8.8 \pm 2.0
Speed (h)	2.3 \pm 1.1	3.2 \pm 0.9#	4.1 \pm 2.1	3.5 \pm 1.0
Training mode				
Specific (h) ^a	40.5 \pm 13.4	41.3 \pm 9.6	52.6 \pm 8.6*	43.7 \pm 9.4
Non-specific (h) ^b	45.1 \pm 9.2	43.2 \pm 9.5	43.0 \pm 7.9	38.8 \pm 9.0
Specific/non-specific (%)	47/53	49/51	55/45	53/47
Endurance training volume				
Compliance (%TRIMP)	NaN	NaN	98 \pm 9	100 \pm 7
Load (TRIMP/wk)	729 \pm 98	725 \pm 157	781 \pm 80*	779 \pm 87
Load (TRIMP)	5831 \pm 781	5804 \pm 1257	6249 \pm 640*	6230 \pm 696
LIT load (TRIMP)	4649 \pm 630	4586 \pm 1121	5092 \pm 587*	4303 \pm 665#
MIT load (TRIMP)	489 \pm 214	258 \pm 237	434 \pm 69	403 \pm 122
HIT load (TRIMP)	703 \pm 269	760 \pm 204	723 \pm 133	1523 \pm 193*#
LIT (h)	78.8 \pm 11.7	76.3 \pm 18.8	88.0 \pm 9.1*	70.4 \pm 10.0#
MIT (h)	4.2 \pm 1.8	3.8 \pm 2.0	3.6 \pm 0.6	3.4 \pm 1.0
HIT (h)	4.0 \pm 1.5	3.8 \pm 1.3	4.0 \pm 0.7	8.7 \pm 1.0*#
LIT/MIT/HIT (%)	90/5/5	90/5/5	92/4/4	85/4/11
Endurance training sessions				
LIT (n)	39.9 \pm 4.8	37.9 \pm 7.0	44.9 \pm 4.1*	37.1 \pm 5.6#
LIT sessions \geq 150 min (n)	7.1 \pm 2.2	6.7 \pm 2.3	10.3 \pm 2.2*	2.3 \pm 1.4*#
MIT (n)	5.6 \pm 2.2	6.1 \pm 2.4	4.9 \pm 0.8	4.1 \pm 1.1*#
HIT (n)	7.1 \pm 2.2	8.6 \pm 1.7	6.8 \pm 1.0	15.6 \pm 1.7*#
LIT/MIT/HIT (%)	76/11/13	72/11/16	80/9/11	65/7/28

LIG, low-intensity training group; HIG, high-intensity training group; LIT, low-intensity training; MIT, moderate-intensity training; HIT, high-intensity training. Compliance is calculated as percent of total TRIMP in relation to total TRIMP prescribed. ^a classical and skating roller skiing; ^b running and cycling.

*Significantly different from baseline period (*p<0.05) #Significantly different from LIG (#p<0.05).

600

601

602

Table 3. Anthropometrics and TT performance as well as performance and physiological indices during treadmill running at pre- and post-intervention in 42 well-trained endurance athletes, randomized into either LIG or HIG (mean \pm SD)

	LIG (n=22)		HIG (n=20)		LIG vs. HIG ES
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	
Anthropometrics					
Body mass (kg)	70.8 \pm 7.5	71.2 \pm 8.0	67.5 \pm 7.9	68.8 \pm 7.7*	0.10
Body mass index (kg·m ⁻²)	22.5 \pm 1.6	22.6 \pm 1.6	21.4 \pm 1.6	21.8 \pm 1.6*	0.19
TT performance (4.5/6.4-km)					
Mean finishing time (s)	27:14	26:49	28:06	27:31	0.06
RUN submaximal (7/8-km·h⁻¹)					
VO ₂ (L·min ⁻¹)	3.28 \pm 0.46	3.20 \pm 0.45	3.13 \pm 0.43	3.16 \pm 0.44*#	0.22
VO ₂ in % VO _{2max}	70.9 \pm 6.2	69.9 \pm 6.2	69.7 \pm 5.5	68.3 \pm 4.6	0.07
RER	0.91 \pm 0.04	0.91 \pm 0.03	0.92 \pm 0.05	0.90 \pm 0.03*	0.75
HR (beats·min ⁻¹)	167 \pm 12	165 \pm 11	164 \pm 10	160 \pm 8	0.27
HR in %HR _{max}	83.2 \pm 4.8	82.2 \pm 4.7	82.9 \pm 4.2	80.5 \pm 4.1	0.29
Borg (6-20)	12.7 \pm 1.3	12.4 \pm 1.6	12.8 \pm 1.4	12.2 \pm 1.1	0.21
[La ⁻] (mmol·L ⁻¹)	2.12 \pm 0.84	1.90 \pm 0.58	2.27 \pm 0.90	2.02 \pm 0.74*	0.03
RUN TTE					
VO _{2max} (L·min ⁻¹)	4.68 \pm 0.92	4.63 \pm 0.83	4.54 \pm 0.80	4.64 \pm 0.81#	0.18
VO _{2max} (mL·min ⁻¹ ·kg ⁻¹)	65.7 \pm 7.6	64.7 \pm 6.3	66.7 \pm 7.1	67.4 \pm 6.2#	0.22
RER	1.13 \pm 0.04	1.15 \pm 0.04	1.14 \pm 0.05	1.14 \pm 0.04	0.30
HR _{max} (beats·min ⁻¹)	199 \pm 6	199 \pm 7	197 \pm 9	197 \pm 8	0.02
[La ⁻] (mmol·L ⁻¹)	11.02 \pm 1.49	11.57 \pm 1.91	11.48 \pm 1.78	11.92 \pm 1.88	0.06
TTE (s)	350 \pm 63	360 \pm 57	359 \pm 55	381 \pm 45*	0.36
V _{peak} (km·h ⁻¹)	14.5 \pm 1.4	14.7 \pm 1.3	14.8 \pm 1.2	15.1 \pm 1.1*	0.10

TT, time trial; LIG, low-intensity training group; HIG, high-intensity training group; ES, effect size; RUN, laboratory test running; VO₂, oxygen uptake; VO_{2max}, maximal oxygen uptake; HR, heart rate; HR_{max}, maximal heart rate; [La⁻], blood lactate; RER, respiratory exchange ratio; TTE, time to exhaustion; V_{peak}, peak velocity. *Significantly different from pre (*p< 0.05). #Significantly different from pre- to post change in LIG (#p<0.05).

603

604


605

Table 4. Performance and physiological indices obtained during treadmill roller-ski skating at pre and post-intervention in 42 well-trained endurance athletes, randomized into either LIG or HIG (mean \pm SD)

	LIG (n=22)		HIG (n=20)		LIG vs. HIG ES
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	
SKATE submaximal (10/12-km·h⁻¹)					
VO ₂ (L·min ⁻¹)	3.19 \pm 0.51	3.12 \pm 0.49*	3.05 \pm 0.42	3.03 \pm 0.39	0.10
VO ₂ in % VO _{2peak}	71.8 \pm 5.3	70.3 \pm 4.4*	71.6 \pm 5.9	68.8 \pm 4.7*	0.29
RER	0.93 \pm 0.03	0.91 \pm 0.03	0.95 \pm 0.05	0.94 \pm 0.03*	0.13
HR (beats·min ⁻¹)	173 \pm 10	173 \pm 9	170 \pm 10	167 \pm 9*#	0.32
HR in %HR _{max}	86.4 \pm 4.2	86.5 \pm 3.3	86.2 \pm 3.8	84.5 \pm 3.4*#	0.40
Borg (6-20)	11.2 \pm 1.9	11.6 \pm 1.8	11.9 \pm 1.2	11.8 \pm 1.7	0.44
[La ⁻] (mmol·L ⁻¹)	2.72 \pm 0.91	2.79 \pm 0.77	3.06 \pm 1.21	2.82 \pm 0.77	0.27
GE (%)	13.8 \pm 0.6	14.2 \pm 0.6*	13.9 \pm 0.8	14.3 \pm 0.6*	0.08
SKATE submaximal (12/14-km·h⁻¹)					
VO ₂ (L·min ⁻¹)	3.57 \pm 0.55	3.52 \pm 0.52	3.44 \pm 0.47	3.42 \pm 0.43	0.08
VO ₂ in % VO _{2peak}	80.6 \pm 5.6	79.5 \pm 4.5	80.7 \pm 4.8	77.6 \pm 4.9*#	0.41
RER	0.96 \pm 0.04	0.95 \pm 0.03	0.97 \pm 0.03	0.96 \pm 0.04*	0.15
HR (beats·min ⁻¹)	184 \pm 9	183 \pm 7	180 \pm 11	178 \pm 9*	0.12
HR in %HR _{max}	92.0 \pm 3.2	91.5 \pm 2.2	91.4 \pm 3.7	90.3 \pm 3.0*	0.17
Borg (6-20)	14.4 \pm 1.3	14.1 \pm 1.4	14.6 \pm 1.2	13.9 \pm 1.2*	0.31
[La ⁻] (mmol·L ⁻¹)	4.11 \pm 1.37	4.09 \pm 1.11	4.28 \pm 2.01	4.17 \pm 1.27	0.05
GE (%)	14.3 \pm 0.6	14.6 \pm 0.3*	14.4 \pm 0.7	14.7 \pm 0.6*	0.01
SKATE TTE					
VO _{2peak} (L·min ⁻¹)	4.48 \pm 0.89	4.46 \pm 0.84	4.30 \pm 0.72	4.43 \pm 0.67*#	0.18
VO _{2peak} (mL·min ⁻¹ ·kg ⁻¹)	62.8 \pm 7.0	62.5 \pm 6.5	63.4 \pm 6.7	64.4 \pm 5.8#	0.18
RER	1.11 \pm 0.05	1.11 \pm 0.04	1.11 \pm 0.05	1.11 \pm 0.05	0.01
HR _{peak} (beats·min ⁻¹)	198 \pm 7	199 \pm 7	196 \pm 8	196 \pm 7	0.10
[La ⁻] (mmol·L ⁻¹)	10.84 \pm 1.66	11.16 \pm 2.17	10.78 \pm 1.60	10.92 \pm 1.83	0.12
TTE (s)	281 \pm 56	299 \pm 56*	292 \pm 71	322 \pm 58*	0.18
V _{peak} (km·h ⁻¹)	21.0 \pm 1.6	21.3 \pm 1.6*	21.4 \pm 1.8	21.9 \pm 1.6*	0.11


LIG, low-intensity training group; HIG, high-intensity training group; ES, effect size; SKATE, laboratory test roller-ski skating; VO₂, oxygen uptake; VO_{2peak}, peak oxygen uptake; HR, heart rate; HR_{peak}, peak heart rate; [La⁻], blood lactate; GE, gross efficiency; RER, respiratory exchange ratio; TTE, time to exhaustion; V_{peak}, peak velocity; *Significantly different from pre (*p< 0.05). #Significantly different from pre- to post change in LIG (#p<0.05).

Figure 1.




606

607 **Figure 2.**




608

609
610 **Figure 3.**



611
612 **Figure 4.**



613
614
615

616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627