

Author's accepted manuscript (postprint)

One long vs. two short sessions? Physiological and perceptual responses to low-intensity training at self-selected speeds in cross-country skiers

Talsnes, R. K., Nordgården, S., Kocbach, J., & Solli, G. S.

Published in: International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance (IJSPP)

DOI: 10.1123/ijspp.2022-0212

Available online: 22 Aug 2022

Citation:

Talsnes, R. K., Nordgården, S., Kocbach, J., & Solli, G. S. (2022). One long vs. two short sessions? Physiological and perceptual responses to low-intensity training at self-selected speeds in cross-country skiers. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 17(11), 1590-1598. doi: 10.1123/ijspp.2022-0212

Accepted author manuscript version reprinted, by permission, from *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* (IJSPP), 2022, 17(11): 1590–1598, <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2022-0212> . © Human Kinetics, Inc.

1 **One long vs. two short sessions? Physiological and perceptual**
2 **responses to low-intensity training at self-selected speeds in cross-**
3 **country skiers**

4
5 *Original investigation*

6
7 Rune Kjösen Talsnes^{1,2}, Sigrid Nordgården², Jan Kocbach³, and Guro Strøm Solli^{2,3}

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

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

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

13
14 Corresponding Author:

15 Rune Kjösen Talsnes

16 Department of Sports Science and Physical Education

17 Nord University

18 8026 Bodø, Norway

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

20 Phone: +47 99430935

21
22 *Running head*

23 Low-intensity training in cross-country skiing

24
25 *Abstract Word Count*

26 250

27
28 *Text-Only Word Count*

29 3522

30
31 *Number of Figures and Tables*

32 Figures: 4 Tables: 3

Abstract

Purpose: To compare self-selected speeds and corresponding physiological responses and perceived training stress between one long session vs. two shorter sessions of low-intensity training (LIT) in one day among cross-country skiers. **Methods:** Thirteen national-level skiers performed two different LIT types during classical roller-skiing matched for the same distance in a counterbalanced order. The training consisted of either one long (~3 hours) session (1LIT) or two shorter (~1.5 hour each) sessions (2LIT) with 7 hours of recovery in between. Speed, heart rate (HR), rating of perceived exertion (RPE), and blood lactate concentrations (Bla) were measured, and perceived training stress (1-10) assessed after sessions. **Results:** 2LIT was performed at mean (SD) 1.9% (2.0%) higher speeds vs. 1LIT ($P \leq 0.01$). Higher speeds were also found in the second vs. first session of 2LIT and the second vs. first part of 1LIT (1.9% [3.2%] and 3.2% [3.6%], respectively, both $P \leq 0.01$). There were no significant differences between LIT types in HR, although RPE increased in the second vs. first part of 1LIT (0.9 [0.8]-point $P \leq 0.01$). Bla was reduced in the second vs. first session/part of both LIT types (~ 0.16 [0.20] $\text{mmol} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$, $P \leq 0.05$). There were no differences in perceived training stress between LIT types 7 and 23 hours after training, although higher perceived muscular exertion (2.0 [1.1]-point $P \leq 0.01$) was found directly after 1LIT. **Conclusion:** Compared to a distance-matched long session, skiers perform two shorter sessions of LIT at slightly higher self-selected speeds with the same physiological responses elicited although minor differences in perceived training stress were observed.

Keywords: duration, endurance training, intensity, physiological drift, LIT, XC skiing.

Introduction

Cross-country (XC) skiing is an endurance sport performed over varied terrain inducing interval-based fluctuations in external and internal intensity, as well as frequent changes between sub-techniques.¹⁻³ To accommodate these demands, skiers perform high annual training volumes (~750-950 hours) consisting of ~90% endurance training.⁴⁻⁷ Although XC skiing competitions are performed at high intensities with an interaction between aerobic and anaerobic energy systems,¹ ~90% of the endurance training (~600-800 hours) is performed as low-intensity training (LIT).⁴⁻⁷ For example, the world's most decorated female skier of all time performed on average 784 LIT hours during her most successful seasons, with 24% of the sessions distributed as "long sessions" (>150 min) and 17% as "short sessions" (<90 min) in the general preparation period. The remaining 59% of LIT sessions were between 90–150 min.⁶

XC skiers perform substantial parts of their LIT volume in varied terrain and competition-specific racecourses, leading to terrain-dependent intensity fluctuations, as evident during competitions.⁸⁻¹⁰ These large volumes of LIT lead to high overall training volumes and are an important stimulus both for physiological and technical development.³ Here, an important feature is to perform LIT at speeds relevant to the higher competition-specific speeds, in which previous studies have found the largest speed differences between LIT and competition-specific speeds (i.e., high intensity [HI]) in uphill terrain.⁸⁻¹⁰ However, these studies are limited by their use of short LIT sessions (~20 min) since both overall and terrain-specific speeds might differ between LIT sessions of different duration.

Once-a-day vs. twice-a-day training ("doubles") are frequently discussed in endurance training optimization.¹¹ For example, performing the same LIT work or distance as either one long session or two shorter sessions in one day might elicit differences in self-selected speeds, physiological responses and thereby influence adaptive signaling, as well as recovery times differently.¹¹ However, the majority of studies today have only investigated twice-a-day training as a strategy to perform the second session in a more glycogen depleted state (i.e., "train-low").¹² In this context, it is also likely that longer sessions elicit duration-dependent "drifts" in rating of perceived exertion (RPE) and heart rate (HR). This has recently been referred to as "durability", and defined as deterioration in physiological characteristics over time during prolonged exercise.¹³ These changes in physiological responses associated with longer sessions may induce a different physiological stimulus compared to performing two shorter sessions, but may also increase training stress and recovery demands. Consequently, a better understanding of the influence of performing one long vs. two shorter sessions of LIT in one day on physiological and perceptual responses, as well as the associated training stress and recovery in endurance athletes is needed.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to compare self-selected speeds and corresponding physiological responses and perceived training stress between performing one long vs. two shorter sessions of LIT in one day among XC skiers. It was hypothesized that the skiers would perform two shorter sessions at higher speeds due to the reduced duration of each session, whereas the long session would be associated with a duration-dependent drift in physiological and perceptual responses and thus influence subjective markers of training stress more negatively.

Methods

Participants

Thirteen male skiers volunteered to participate in the study (participant characteristics are shown in Table 1). The participants were classified as highly trained/national level athletes according to the classification framework developed by McKay et al.¹⁴ The study is done in accordance to the institutional ethical requirements, and approval for data security and handling was obtained from the Norwegian Centre for Research Data. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and all participants signed an informed consent prior to the experimental trials.

[Table 1]

Design

The two experimental trials were performed in a counterbalanced order, consisting of either one long (~3 hours) LIT session (1LIT) or two shorter (~1.5 hour each) LIT sessions (2LIT) with 7 hours of recovery in between. The 1LIT and 2LIT was matched for the same distance and performed over two consecutive days. The experimental trials were performed in a roller-skiing racecourse using the classical technique during the skier's late preparation period (October). Speed and HR were continuously monitored for all sessions, whereas subjective markers of training stress and recovery were determined at two different time points after sessions. The participant's diet was monitored, and fluid and carbohydrate (CHO) intake standardized during all sessions (see nutritional protocol). After the experimental trials on day three, a simulated competition (~34 min HI session) was performed in the same racecourse to compare terrain-specific external and internal intensities during LIT with competition-specific values.

Protocols and measurements

Experimental trials

The participants training loads were standardized over the last two days before the experimental trials consisting of one moderate-intensity training (MIT) session (~45-min total work duration) in roller-ski skating the penultimate day and one LIT session (~1.5-hour duration) in running the last day before the trials. Both the experimental trials and the simulated competition were performed in a 4.5-km roller-skiing racecourse. Course and elevation profiles of the racecourse (Figure 1) were measured with an integrated global positioning system (GPS) and barometer (Garmin Forerunner 920 XT [Garmin Ltd., Olathe, KS, USA]) using a methodology previously described.¹⁵ The racecourse was further divided into four different terrain sections: S1 (uphill: distance, 1140 m; climb, +65 m; gradient, 6%), S2 (flat: distance, 400 m; climb, +7 m; gradient, 0%), S3 (downhill: distance, 1770 m; climb, -71 m; gradient, -3%), and S4 (flat: distance, 970 m; climb, +2 m; gradient, 0%). A small part (flat: distance, 220 m; climb, 0 m; gradient; 0%) at the start and finish of the racecourse was excluded from the analyses because the participants reduced their speed and stopped during this part in connection to measurements and fluid intake. The exact distance of the racecourse analyzed was therefore 4280 m. The participants were blinded for all measures of external and internal intensity during the experimental trials. The participants started with a 1-min starting interval in a randomized order. The participants were further instructed not to draft behind each other to establish valid comparisons. Weather conditions were similar and stable during all three days being partly cloudy, with ambient air

195 temperatures of 12-15 °C, a low and stable wind (3-4 m·s⁻¹), and relative humidity varying
196 between 60% and 65%.

197
198
199

[Figure 1]

200 **Low-intensity training types.** Seven and six of the participants started with 2LIT and 1LIT on
201 day 1, respectively. The two LIT types were distance-matched, consisting of two sessions of 6
202 laps for 2LIT (25.7 km) and one session of 12 laps for 1LIT (51.4 km), respectively. Every
203 second lap was interspersed with a ~2-min recovery period to determine blood lactate
204 concentrations (Bla), RPE using the 6–20-point Borg scale,¹⁶ and to provide fluid and CHO
205 intake. The participants were instructed to perform all LIT sessions according to their own self-
206 selected LIT speeds but to target an intensity corresponding to RPE = 8-12.¹⁶ The two sessions
207 constituting 2LIT were separated by 7 hours of recovery, in which the participants rested at
208 home according to their self-selected recovery procedures (including fluid and dietary intake)
209 used in connection with twice-a-day training sessions.

210

211 **Simulated competition.** The simulated competition was an individual time-trial consisting of
212 3 laps in the same racecourse (12.8 km). The distance was chosen based on its relevance for the
213 group of skiers. The participants were instructed to perform ~30 min of self-selected warm-up
214 prior to the start of the competition. The participants started with a 1-min starting interval in a
215 randomized order. Performance times were recorded as previously described by Talsnes et al.¹⁷

216

217 **Nutritional protocol.** In an attempt to standardize nutritional status, breakfast before sessions
218 and lunch between/after sessions were provided to the participants. The participants were
219 instructed to replicate their dietary intake across the experimental trials and the simulated
220 competition. The content of all meals was self-reported under supervision of the researchers
221 conducting the study. Between lunch and the start of the 2. session during 2LIT, the participant
222 recorded their fluid and nutritional intake. No differences in dietary intake between the
223 experimental trials were found (see supplementary Table 1 for detailed description). During the
224 experimental trials, the participants consumed 0.3 dl of sports drink (High 5 Sports Nutrition.,
225 Brighton, United Kingdom) every second lap. The total intake during 6 laps was 0.9 L (0.6
226 L/h). Fluid and CHO intake were matched between 2LIT and 1LIT. The amount of sports drink
227 and CHO intake (40 g/h) were in accordance with the ACSM guidelines on CHO intake during
228 endurance exercise.¹⁸

229

230 **Measurements and equipment**

231 The participants used the same type (category two wheels) and pair of roller skis (IDT Sports,
232 Lena, Norway) during the experimental trials and the simulated competition. HR was monitored
233 continuously during all sessions using a wrist-worn Garmin Forerunner 920 XT/935 watch.
234 Due to measurement error, HR data was missing on four of the participants and are therefore
235 presented as n=9. Bla of 5-μL samples were taken from the fingertip and analyzed using a
236 Lactate Scout 4 kit (EKF diagnostics., Cardiff, United Kingdom). Speed was continuously
237 monitored using an integrated global navigation satellite system (10 Optimeye S5 [Catapult
238 Sports, Melbourne, Australia] and 3 Admos [Advanced Sport Instruments, Lausanne,
239 Switzerland]). The Catapult sensors has previously been validated against a geodetic, multi-
240 frequency receiver by Gløersen et al.,¹⁹ and the Admos sensors included the same
241 specifications.

242

243 **Training stress and recovery.** The participants were asked to rate and report their sleep quality
244 the previous night, general mental and physical wellbeing, readiness to train, muscle soreness,

245 fatigue, and attractiveness to the training day, using a visual analogue scale (VAS) from 1 to
246 10. These subjective markers were reported 7 hours (POST-1) and 23 hours (POST-2) after the
247 start of the first session for both 2LIT and 1LIT. Moreover, the participants answered a
248 questionnaire on their acute perceived muscular and ventilatory exertion directly after each
249 session. For comparison of these variables, the average of the two sessions constituting 2LIT
250 was compared to the corresponding values for 1LIT.

251

252 **Statistical analyses**

253 All statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS 26.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, United States).
254 Data are reported as mean (standard deviation [SD]) for continuous variables and assumptions
255 of normality verified using a Shapiro–Wilk test. Ordinal data are reported as median
256 (interquartile range [IQR]). Analyses of variances (ANOVA) for repeated measures was
257 applied to compare speed and physiological responses between the experimental trials. Initially,
258 main effects of LIT type (2LIT vs. 1LIT) and session/part within LIT type (first vs. second
259 session [2LIT] and first vs. second part [1LIT], respectively) were examined. Further, possible
260 interaction effects between LIT type and LIT session/part were evaluated. In cases of significant
261 interaction effects, pairwise comparisons were applied using the paired-sample t-test procedure.
262 The strength of the main analyses was quantified by effect size (ES) calculated as partial eta
263 square (partial η^2) with 0.01, 0.06, and 0.14 interpreted as small, medium, and large effects,
264 respectively.²⁰ The non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test was applied to compare
265 subjective markers of training stress and recovery between LIT types. For all comparisons,
266 alpha levels of $P \leq 0.05$ were considered statistically significant.

267

268

269

Results

270

271 **Speed characteristics.** Descriptive data for time and speed between and within LIT types, as
272 well as the HI session (simulated competition) are shown in Table 2 and supplementary Table
273 2. There was a main effect of both LIT type ($F=10.5$, $P=0.008$, partial $\eta^2=0.488$) and LIT
274 session/part ($F=11.5$, $P=0.006$, partial $\eta^2=0.511$) on speed. Analyses revealed 1.9% (2.0%)
275 higher speeds in 2LIT vs. 1LIT (Figure 2), as well as higher speeds in the second vs. first LIT
276 session/part (1.9% [3.2%] and 3.2% [3.6%] for 2LIT and 1LIT, respectively, Figure 2). Similar
277 main effects of LIT type and LIT session/part were found comparing speed in %HI. Time
278 differences between and within LIT types for each lap are displayed in Figure 3.

279

280

[Table 2]

281

282

[Figure 2]

283

284

[Figure 3]

285

286

287 There was a significant main effect of LIT type in S2 ($F=7.06$, $P=0.021$, partial $\eta^2=0.370$) and
288 S4 ($F=6.7$, $P=0.024$, partial $\eta^2=0.359$), as well as a tendency towards main effect in S3
289 ($F=4.04$, $P=0.058$, partial $\eta^2=0.268$). There was a significant main effect of LIT session/part
290 in S1 ($F=10.1$, $P=0.008$, partial $\eta^2=0.456$), S2 ($F=14.3$, $P=0.003$, partial $\eta^2=0.544$), S3
291 ($F=15.9$, $P=0.002$, partial $\eta^2=0.570$), and S4 ($F=4.8$, $P=0.049$, partial $\eta^2=0.286$). All main
292 effects revealed higher speeds in 2LIT vs. 1LIT, and higher speeds in the second vs. first LIT
293 session/part within LIT types.

294

295 **Physiological and perceptual responses.** Descriptive data on physiological responses between
296 and within LIT types are shown in Table 2 and Figure 4. There were no significant main effects
297 of LIT type or LIT session/part on HR, %HR_{max}, and HR in %HI. There was a main effect of
298 LIT session/part on Bla (F=4.9, P=0.047, partial eta²=0.290), revealing lower Bla during the
299 second session/part within both LIT types (~0.16 [0.20] mmol·L⁻¹, both P≤0.05). There was an
300 interaction effect found between LIT type and LIT session/part on RPE (F=12.7, P=0.004,
301 partial eta²=0.514). Analyses revealed higher RPE during the second vs. first part of 1LIT (2.0
302 [1.1]-point P=0.011). Although not significant, large interaction effects (ES=0.230-0.240)
303 between LIT type and LIT session/part on HR were found. However, pairwise comparisons
304 demonstrated no significant differences (P=0.112 and P=0.321) for the second vs. first session
305 of 2LIT and the second vs. first part of 1LIT, respectively. There was a significant interaction
306 between LIT type and LIT session/part on HR in S1 (F=4.6, P=0.046, partial eta²=0.410).
307 Analysis revealed reduced HR in the second vs. first session of 2LIT (P=0.013). However, no
308 significant main effects of LIT type or LIT session/part on HR in the different terrain sections
309 were found. Similar findings were found for %HR_{max} and HR in %HI.

310
311 [Figure 4]

312
313 **Perceived training stress and recovery.** There were no significant differences in any of the
314 VAS markers of training stress and recovery between LIT types at POST-1 and POST-2 (Table
315 3). However, higher acute perceived muscular (2.0 [1.1]-point, P=0.012) and ventilatory (1.0
316 [1.0]-point, P=0.023) exertion were found for 1LIT vs. 2LIT.

317
318 [Table 3]

319 320 321 **Discussion**

322
323 The purpose of this study was to compare self-selected speeds and corresponding physiological
324 responses and perceived training stress between performing one long vs. two shorter sessions
325 of LIT in one day among XC skiers. The main finding was that skiers perform two shorter
326 sessions at higher self-selected speeds compared to one long session. Higher speeds were also
327 observed in the second session of 2LIT and the second part of 1LIT. However, no significant
328 differences in average physiological and perceptual responses were found between LIT types,
329 although RPE increased in the second part of 1LIT. Lastly, higher acute perceived muscular
330 and ventilatory exertion were found in connection to 1LIT, although perceived training stress
331 and recovery were not significantly different between LIT types 7 and 23 hours after training.

332
333 This is the first study to investigate differences in external and internal intensity between
334 different LIT manipulations in XC skiing and to compare these intensities to competition-
335 specific values. In accordance with the hypotheses, skiers perform two shorter sessions in one
336 day at higher self-selected speeds compared to one long LIT session. However, significant main
337 effects of LIT type were only found during the two flat terrain sections, with a tendency toward
338 significant main effect in the downhill section. This implies that the observed speed differences
339 between 1LIT and 2LIT were mostly due to differences in flat and downhill terrain at relatively
340 high speeds, whereas no differences were found in uphill terrain at lower speeds. Although the
341 observed speed differences were statistically significant, their practical relevance (only ~2%
342 speed or ~3 min time difference) may be questioned. However, it cannot be ignored that these
343 findings may have implications for skiers' technical training by allowing more competition-
344 relevant speeds in flat and downhill terrain sections. It could also be speculated that such speed

345 differences would be more evident in racecourses involving larger terrain variations (i.e., speed
346 fluctuations and sub-technique changes) than the racecourse used in the present study, with
347 only 4 terrain sections and a ~4-min downhill section. Therefore, future studies including data
348 on sub-technique selection and associated kinematical patterns are needed to further understand
349 technical responses to different LIT manipulations in XC skiing.

350

351 The overall LIT speeds were ~82-83% of competition speeds, and were somewhat higher than
352 those previously reported among male skiers.^{8,10} However, contrary to the present study, these
353 studies were performed on snow using the skating technique with similar distances for LIT and
354 HI. This may indicate that LIT are performed closer to competition speeds while roller-skiing
355 compared to actual on-snow skiing. However, independent of LIT type, skiers performed both
356 short and long LIT sessions relatively close to their competition speeds (~83% and ~90% in flat
357 and downhill terrain sections, respectively). Relative to competition-specific values, the largest
358 speed differences were found in the uphill terrain section (~73-74% of competition speed), in
359 accordance with previous findings.^{8,10} Altogether, the present findings indicate a large potential
360 for performing high volumes of LIT at competition-relevant speeds in XC skiing.

361

362 Interestingly, there was a significant main effect of LIT session/part on speed, revealing higher
363 speeds in the second session of 2LIT and the second part of 1LIT, which was consistent across
364 the different terrain sections investigated. The reason for these findings is not known but may
365 imply better “performance” in the afternoon during 2LIT, possibly explained by circadian
366 variations (i.e., time-of-day effects)²¹ and/or positive precondition-effects from the first
367 session.²² However, more surprising were the higher speeds found during the second part of
368 1LIT, indicating a “pacing strategy” with increasing speeds throughout the long LIT session.
369 In particular, the first 3 laps of 1LIT were slower and the first 2 laps of the second session of
370 2LIT were faster than the average time for all laps. Whether this observation is only a
371 consequence of the distance-matched design or a deliberate “pacing practice” employed during
372 different LIT sessions among skiers remains unknown and requires attention in future studies.

373

374 There were no significant main effects of LIT type on average HR responses, indicating that
375 the two LIT types elicited somewhat similar physiological loads. However, interaction effects
376 (large ES) between LIT type and LIT session/part on HR were found, which did not reach
377 significance due to the reduced statistical power on HR data. These interaction effects indicated
378 reduced HR in the second vs. first session of 2LIT (particularly the first 4 laps) and *vice-versa*
379 in the second vs. first part of 1LIT (particularly the last 4 laps), although the pairwise
380 comparisons did not reach statistical significance. These indications were further strengthened
381 by the significant interaction effects on HR found in S1 (uphill terrain), revealing significantly
382 lower HR in the second vs. first session of 2LIT. These findings coincided with an interaction
383 effect between LIT type and LIT session/part on RPE, revealing higher RPE in the second vs.
384 first part of 1LIT. Altogether, the observed physiological and perceptual responses were partly
385 in accordance with the hypotheses, implying a small duration-dependent HR and RPE “drift”
386 in connection to the long LIT session.¹³ However, considering the experimental design using
387 self-selected speeds, and the higher speeds found during the second part of 1LIT, the reasons
388 for these physiological and perceptual changes cannot be established. Lastly, there was a
389 significant main effect of LIT session/part on Bla, revealing reduced Bla in the second vs. first
390 session/part of both LIT types. These findings are likely explained by glycogen depletion, and
391 reduced CHO availability,¹² which were somewhat surprising, particularly during 2LIT,
392 considering the amount of exogenous CHO provided. Altogether, future studies using
393 laboratory designs under more standardized conditions should further investigate physiological

394 responses and potential “drifts” in HR and RPE (i.e., internal-to-external workload ratio)
395 between long vs. short LIT sessions.

396

397 There were no significant differences between LIT types in the subjective markers of training
398 stress and recovery (VAS) measured at two different time points after sessions. This implies
399 somewhat similar training-induced stress and recovery demands from performing one long
400 session vs. two shorter sessions of LIT in one day. However, higher perceived muscular and
401 ventilatory exertion, assessed directly after each session was found in connection to 1LIT,
402 revealing some inconsistency in the training stress data. Therefore, training stress and
403 associated recovery times for different LIT manipulations should be further investigated using
404 objective markers of hormonal and/or autonomic disturbance. When considering the optimal
405 ratio between signaling and stress of performing one long vs. two shorter LIT sessions, the
406 question is probably not whether one or the other are needed, and most likely, both are relevant
407 for maximizing responses from endurance training. For example, one long session might elicit
408 a greater magnitude of molecular signaling, but induce a higher stress response, whereas two
409 shorter sessions might elicit higher external intensities, different signaling and a lower stress
410 response.¹¹ However, these topics are only speculative, and intervention studies on the actual
411 training effects of different LIT manipulations are warranted to elucidate these questions.

412

413

Practical applications

414

415 Two shorter LIT sessions are performed at slightly higher self-selected speeds than one long
416 LIT session, particularly on flat and downhill terrain during skiers LIT training. However, the
417 practical significance of these findings can be questioned as the average speed difference was
418 only ~2%. Still, this may have implications for the technical training of skiers by allowing sub-
419 technique selections and kinematical patterns closer to competition-specific values. Therefore,
420 such features should be considered when programming LIT sessions, constituting ~90% of the
421 endurance training volume among skiers. However, performing a longer LIT session may elicit
422 higher acute training stress, thereby inducing a different physiological stimulus, although
423 perceived training stress and recovery one day after were the same as after performing two
424 shorter sessions.

425

426

Conclusions

427

428 Compared to a distance-matched long session, skiers perform two shorter sessions of LIT in
429 one day at slightly higher self-selected speeds, particularly on flat and downhill terrain. These
430 findings coincided with average similar physiological responses, although minor differences in
431 perceived training stress were observed between the two LIT types.

432

433

Acknowledgements

435 The authors would like to thank the athletes and their coaches for their enthusiastic cooperation
436 and participation in the study. The study is funded by Meråker High School and the Research
437 Council of Norway (RCN) (project no. 298645). The authors would like to thank Daniel Büchel
438 for help with the statistical analyses and Professor Thomas Losnegard and Professor Øyvind
439 Sandbakk for valuable comments on the manuscript.

440

References

- 441
442
443 1. Losnegard T. Energy system contribution during competitive cross-country skiing.
444 *European journal of applied physiology*. 2019;119(8):1675-1690.
445 2. Sandbakk Ø, Holmberg HC. A reappraisal of success factors for Olympic cross-country
446 skiing. *International journal of sports physiology and performance*. 2014;9(1):117-121.
447 3. Sandbakk Ø, Holmberg HC. Physiological Capacity and Training Routines of Elite
448 Cross-Country Skiers: Approaching the Upper Limits of Human Endurance.
449 *International journal of sports physiology and performance*. 2017;12(8):1003-1011.
450 4. Sandbakk Ø, Hegge AM, Losnegard T, Skattebo O, Tonnessen E, Holmberg HC. The
451 Physiological Capacity of the World's Highest Ranked Female Cross-country Skiers.
452 *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*. 2016;48(6):1091-1100.
453 5. Sandbakk Ø, Holmberg HC, Leirdal S, Ettema G. The physiology of world-class sprint
454 skiers. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*. 2011;21(6):e9-16.
455 6. Solli GS, Tønnessen E, Sandbakk Ø. The Training Characteristics of the World's Most
456 Successful Female Cross-Country Skier. *Frontiers in physiology*. 2017;8:1069.
457 7. Tønnessen E, Sylta Ø, Haugen TA, Hem E, Svendsen IS, Seiler S. The road to gold:
458 training and peaking characteristics in the year prior to a gold medal endurance
459 performance. *PloS one*. 2014;9(7):e101796.
460 8. Haugnes P, Kocbach J, Luchsinger H, Ettema G, Sandbakk Ø. The Interval-Based
461 Physiological and Mechanical Demands of Cross-Country Ski Training. *International
462 journal of sports physiology and performance*. 2019:1-7.
463 9. Seeberg TM, Kocbach J, Danielsen J, et al. Physiological and Biomechanical Responses
464 to Cross-Country Skiing in Varying Terrain: Low- vs. High-Intensity. *Frontiers in
465 physiology*. 2021;12:741573.
466 10. Solli GS, Kocbach J, Seeberg TM, et al. Sex-based differences in speed, sub-technique
467 selection, and kinematic patterns during low- and high-intensity training for classical
468 cross-country skiing. *PloS one*. 2018;13(11):e0207195.
469 11. Seiler S. What is best practice for training intensity and duration distribution in
470 endurance athletes? *International journal of sports physiology and performance*.
471 2010;5(3):276-291.
472 12. Bartlett JD, Hawley JA, Morton JP. Carbohydrate availability and exercise training
473 adaptation: too much of a good thing? *European journal of sport science*. 2015;15(1):3-
474 12.
475 13. Maunder E, Seiler S, Mildenhall MJ, Kilding AE, Plews DJ. The Importance of
476 'Durability' in the Physiological Profiling of Endurance Athletes. *Sports medicine
477 (Auckland, NZ)*. 2021;51(8):1619-1628.
478 14. McKay AKA, Stellingwerff T, Smith ES, et al. Defining Training and Performance
479 Caliber: A Participant Classification Framework %J *International Journal of Sports
480 Physiology and Performance*. 2021:1-15.
481 15. Bolger CM, Kocbach J, Hegge AM, Sandbakk Ø. Speed and heart-rate profiles in
482 skating and classical cross-country skiing competitions. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*.
483 2015;10(7):873-880.
484 16. Borg G. Perceived exertion as an indicator of somatic stress. *Scandinavian journal of
485 rehabilitation medicine*. 1970;2(2):92-98.
486 17. Talsnes RK, Solli GS, Kocbach J, Torvik P, Sandbakk Ø. Laboratory- and field-based
487 performance-predictions in cross-country skiing and roller-skiing. *PloS one*.
488 2021;16(8):e0256662.

- 489 18. Rodriguez NR, Di Marco NM, Langley S. American College of Sports Medicine
490 position stand. Nutrition and athletic performance. *Medicine and science in sports and*
491 *exercise*. 2009;41(3):709-731.
- 492 19. Gløersen Ø, Kocbach J, Gilgien M. Tracking Performance in Endurance Racing Sports:
493 Evaluation of the Accuracy Offered by Three Commercial GNSS Receivers Aimed at
494 the Sports Market. *Frontiers in physiology*. 2018;9:1425.
- 495 20. Lakens D. Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a
496 practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. 2013;4.
- 497 21. Chtourou H, Souissi N. The effect of training at a specific time of day: a review. *Journal*
498 *of strength and conditioning research*. 2012;26(7):1984-2005.
- 499 22. Kilduff LP, Finn CV, Baker JS, Cook CJ, West DJ. Preconditioning strategies to
500 enhance physical performance on the day of competition. *International journal of sports*
501 *physiology and performance*. 2013;8(6):677-681.
502

503
504
505

Table 1. Participant characteristics of the thirteen national-level male cross-country skiers participating in the study.

Variables	
Age (y)	19 (1)
Body height (cm)	180.2 (5.2)
Body mass (kg)	73.2 (6.8)
Body mass index (kg·m ⁻²)	22.3 (1.5)
VO _{2max} (L·min ⁻¹)	4.99 (0.36)
VO _{2max} (mL·min ⁻¹ ·kg ⁻¹)	68.4 (3.5)
HR _{max} (beats·min ⁻¹)	201 (8)
Annual training volume (h y ⁻¹)	566 (52)
Distance FIS points	223 (43)

VO_{2max}, maximal oxygen uptake obtained during incremental running in the laboratory; HR_{max}, maximal heart rate obtained during incremental running in the laboratory; FIS, International Ski Federation. Data are presented as mean (standard deviation).

506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530

Table 2. Descriptive data on speed, physiological, and perceptual responses to one long vs. two short sessions of low-intensity training, as well as a simulated competition (high intensity) in national-level male cross-country skiers.

Variables	1LIT		2LIT		1LIT	2LIT	HI
	1.Part	2.Part	1. Session	2.Session	Total	Total	Total
Total							
Time (min:sec)	86:28 (03:28)	83:38 (02:55)	84:34 (02:33)	82:51 (03:24)	170:05 (06:01)	167:24 (05:13)	33:47 (00:32)
Speed (m·s ⁻¹)	5.17 (0.21)	5.34 (0.17)	5.29 (0.14)	5.40 (0.18)	5.26 (0.18)	5.34 (0.14)	6.43 (0.13)
HR (beats·min ⁻¹)	139 (7)	140 (8)	142 (5)	139 (8)	140 (6)	140 (7)	178 (5)
HR in %HR _{max}	69.4 (3.4)	70.0 (4.3)	70.6 (3.0)	69.1 (4.4)	69.8 (3.6)	69.7 (3.8)	88.9 (1.9)
Bla (mmol·L ⁻¹)	0.8 (0.1)	0.7 (0.0)	0.9 (0.3)	0.7 (0.1)	0.8 (0.2)	0.8 (0.2)	7.8 (2.7)
RPE (6-20)	11.2 (0.4)	12.0 (0.3)	11.3 (0.8)	11.3 (1.0)	11.3 (0.9)	11.3 (0.8)	18.0 (2.5)
Speed in %HI	80.5 (3.6)	83.1 (2.7)	82.3 (2.8)	83.9 (3.2)	81.8 (3.0)	83.1 (2.7)	NA
HR in %HI	78.1 (2.9)	78.7 (4.0)	79.4 (2.1)	77.7 (4.0)	78.5 (2.9)	78.4 (3.4)	NA
Segment 1							
Time (min:sec)	06:06 (00:18)	05:53 (00:17)	05:58 (00:13)	05:50 (00:22)	06:00 (00:17)	05:54 (00:16)	04:23 (00:05)
HR (beats·min ⁻¹)	143 (6)	144 (7)	146 (5)	143 (6)	144 (7)	144 (6)	181 (5)
HR in %HR _{max}	71.5 (3.0)	72.0 (3.8)	72.9 (2.9)	71.1 (4.2)	71.8 (3.4)	72.0 (3.5)	90.2 (2.2)
Speed in %HI	72.0 (3.4)	74.6 (3.3)	73.5 (2.6)	75.3 (4.3)	73.3 (3.2)	74.4 (3.1)	NA
HR in %HI	79.3 (2.0)	79.7 (3.0)	80.8 (1.9)	78.8 (3.7)	79.5 (3.4)	79.8 (2.7)	NA
Segment 2							
Time (min:sec)	01:34 (00:05)	01:30 (00:04)	01:31 (00:03)	01:29 (00:04)	01:32 (00:04)	01:30 (00:03)	01:10 (00:02)
HR (beats·min ⁻¹)	144 (7)	145 (9)	146 (6)	143 (8)	144 (7)	145 (7)	184 (6)
HR in %HR _{max}	71.6 (3.5)	72.4 (4.6)	73.0 (3.4)	71.5 (4.6)	72.0 (4.0)	72.3 (3.9)	91.7 (1.8)
Speed in %HI	75.3 (3.9)	78.6 (3.7)	77.8 (3.2)	79.4 (3.9)	77.0 (3.6)	78.6 (3.2)	NA
HR in %HI	78.0 (3.1)	78.9 (4.2)	79.5 (2.7)	78.0 (4.3)	78.4 (3.6)	78.8 (3.4)	NA
Segment 3							
Time (min:sec)	03:54 (00:10)	03:47 (00:07)	03:49 (00:05)	03:45 (00:07)	03:51 (00:09)	03:47 (00:05)	03:24 (00:04)
HR (beats·min ⁻¹)	132 (8)	133 (9)	134 (6)	132 (9)	133 (8)	133 (7)	174 (7)
HR in %HR _{max}	65.8 (4.1)	66.5 (4.7)	66.9 (3.0)	66.0 (4.7)	66.2 (4.3)	66.4 (3.6)	86.7 (2.2)
Speed in %HI	87.0 (3.6)	89.6 (2.3)	90.0 (2.4)	90.8 (2.4)	88.3 (2.9)	90.0 (2.0)	NA
HR in %HI	75.9 (4.5)	76.7 (5.2)	77.1 (2.5)	76.1 (4.7)	76.3 (4.7)	76.6 (3.2)	NA
Segment 4							
Time (min:sec)	02:50 (00:07)	02:46 (00:05)	02:47 (00:05)	02:45 (00:07)	02:48 (00:05)	02:46 (00:06)	02:19 (00:04)
HR (beats·min ⁻¹)	138 (7)	139 (9)	139 (6)	136 (9)	138 (8)	138 (7)	177 (7)
HR in %HR _{max}	68.6 (3.8)	69.4 (4.9)	69.5 (3.3)	67.7 (5.1)	69.0 (4.2)	68.6 (4.1)	88.3 (2.0)
Speed in %HI	81.8 (4.5)	83.9 (3.2)	83.2 (4.0)	84.5 (4.2)	82.8 (3.7)	83.9 (3.7)	NA
HR in %HI	77.7 (4.3)	78.5 (4.7)	78.7 (2.7)	76.6 (4.7)	78.1 (4.0)	77.6 (3.4)	NA

1LIT, one long low-intensity training session; 2LIT, two short low-intensity training sessions; HI, high-intensity obtained from a simulated-competition; HR, heart rate; HR_{max}, maximal heart rate; Bla, blood lactate; RPE, rating of perceived exertion; NA, not available. Data are presented as mean (standard deviation).

531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539

Table 3. Descriptive data on subjective markers of training stress and recovery between one long vs. two short sessions of low-intensity training in national-level male cross-country skiers.

Variables	1LIT		2LIT	
	Session	1. Session	2.Session	Total
Perceived muscular exertion (1-10)	6.0 (3.0)	4.0 (1.5)	4.0 (1.5)	4.0 (1.0)
Perceived ventilatory exertion (1-10)	4.0 (1.5)	3.0 (1.5)	3.0 (1.5)	3.0 (1.5)
Perceived technical quality (1-5)	4.0 (0.5)	4.0 (1.0)	4.0 (1.0)	4.0 (1.3)

Variables	1LIT		2LIT	
	POST-1	POST-2	POST-1	POST-2
Sleep quality (1-10)	7.0 (1.0)	7.0 (2.0)	7.5 (2.0)	6.0 (2.5)
General mental wellbeing (1-10)	7.0 (2.0)	8.0 (3.0)	8.0 (2.0)	8.0 (2.5)
General physical wellbeing (1-10)	7.0 (2.0)	7.0 (2.0)	7.0 (2.0)	7.0 (2.0)
Readiness to train (1-10)	7.0 (2.0)	6.0 (2.0)	7.0 (2.0)	7.0 (3.0)
Muscle soreness (1-10)	6.0 (2.0)	7.0 (1.5)	7.0 (2.5)	7.0 (0.5)
Fatigue (1-10)	6.0 (2.0)	6.5 (1.0)	7.0 (2.5)	7.0 (2.5)
Attractiveness to the training day (1-10)	7.0 (2.0)	8.0 (2.0)	8.0 (2.5)	8.0 (1.5)

1LIT, one long low-intensity training session; 2LIT, two short low-intensity training sessions; POST-1, seven hours after the start of low-intensity training session; POST-2, twenty-three hours after start of low-intensity training session. Data are presented as median (interquartile range).

Figure captions

Figure 1 - (A) two-dimensional and (B) three-dimensional map of the 4.3-km racecourse divided into 4 different terrain sections.

Figure 2 - Speed difference between (upper panel) and within (lower panel) 1LIT and 2LIT among thirteen national-level male cross-country skiers. 2LIT-1, first session of two short low-intensity training sessions; 2LIT-2, second session of two short low-intensity training sessions; 1LIT-1, first part of one long low-intensity training session; 1LIT-2, second part of one long low-intensity training session.

Figure 3 - Time differences per lap compared to average lap time for 1LIT and 2LIT among thirteen national-level male cross-country skiers. 2LIT-1, first session of two short low-intensity training sessions; 2LIT-2, second session of two short low-intensity training sessions. 1LIT-1, first part of one long low-intensity training session; 1LIT-2, second part of one long low-intensity training session.

Figure 4 - Heart rate differences (percent-point of maximal heart rate) between (upper panel) and within (lower panel) 1LIT and 2LIT among nine national-level male cross-country skiers. 2LIT-1, first session of two short low-intensity training sessions; 2LIT-2, second session of two short low-intensity training sessions; 1LIT-1, first part of one long low-intensity training session; 1LIT-2, second part of one long low-intensity training session.

Supplementary Table 1. Fluid and nutritional intake across the experimental trials and the simulated competition in national-level male cross-country skiers.

Variables	1LIT		2LIT			HI
	Breakfast	Lunch	Breakfast	Lunch	Snack	Breakfast
Fluid, ml/kg body mass	4.9 (1.4)	10.4 (3.7)	4.7 (1.1)	9.7 (3.2)	6.5 (0.8)	4.8 (1.8)
Energy, kcal/kg body mass	7.7 (1.5)	13.8 (3.4)	8.0 (1.5)	12.8 (1.7)	6.4 (2.6)	7.4 (1.8)
Carbohydrate, g/kg mass	1.1 (0.2)	1.5 (0.4)	1.2 (0.2)	1.4 (0.2)	1.2 (0.2)	1.1 (0.2)
Fat, g/kg body mass	0.2 (0.0)	0.6 (0.2)	0.2 (0.1)	0.6 (0.1)	0.1 (0.1)	0.2 (0.0)
Protein, g/kg body mass	0.3 (0.1)	0.5 (0.2)	0.3 (0.1)	0.5 (0.1)	0.2 (0.1)	0.2 (0.1)

1LIT, one long low-intensity training session; 2LIT, two short low-intensity training sessions. Snack represents fluid and nutritional intake between the lunch and the start of the second session of 2LIT. Data are presented as mean (standard deviation).


Supplementary Table 2. Individual data on speed and speed differences between one long vs. two short sessions of low-intensity training in national-level male cross-country skiers.

	1LIT		2LIT		1LIT	2LIT	Speed difference
	1.Part	2.Part	1. Session	2.Session	Total	Total	1LIT vs. 2LIT
Participant 1	5.35	5.51	5.26	5.44	5.43	5.35	-1.58
Participant 2	4.73	4.91	4.97	5.03	4.82	5.00	3.69
Participant 3	5.26	5.30	5.26	5.33	5.28	5.30	0.82
Participant 4	4.75	4.86	4.96	5.18	4.80	5.07	5.56
Participant 5	5.03	5.03	5.24	5.11	5.03	5.18	2.95
Participant 6	4.86	5.01	5.02	4.98	4.94	5.00	1.50
Participant 7	4.97	5.18	5.05	5.42	5.08	5.23	3.50
Participant 8	5.05	5.10	5.23	5.26	5.08	5.24	3.23
Participant 9	4.95	5.12	5.16	5.26	5.04	5.21	3.45
Participant 10	4.79	5.09	4.89	4.72	4.94	4.80	-2.74
Participant 11	5.20	5.27	5.13	5.36	5.24	5.25	0.90
Participant 12	4.73	4.91	4.90	4.90	4.82	4.90	1.74
Participant 13	4.79	5.31	4.80	5.27	5.05	5.03	-0.40
Mean (SD)	5.17 (0.21)	5.34 (0.17)	5.29 (0.14)	5.40 (0.18)	5.26 (0.18)	5.34 (0.14)	1.90 (2.6)

1LIT, one long low-intensity training session; 2LIT, two short low-intensity training sessions; SD, standard deviation.

Figure 1

A



B




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4

