

1 **Title:** The effect of exercise on aerobic capacity in individuals with spinal cord injury: A systematic  
2 review with meta-analysis and meta-regression

3

4 **Authors:** Daniel D. Hodgkiss<sup>1</sup>, Gurjeet S. Bhangu<sup>2,3</sup>, Carole Lunny<sup>4</sup>, Catherine R. Jutzeler<sup>5,6</sup>, Shin-Yi  
5 Chiou<sup>1,7,8,9</sup>, Matthias Walter<sup>2,10</sup>, Samuel J. E. Lucas<sup>1,7</sup>, Andrei V. Krassioukov<sup>2,11,12</sup>, Tom E.  
6 Nightingale<sup>1,2,9\*</sup>

7

8 **Running head:** Exercise and fitness in SCI

9

10 **Author Affiliations:**

11 <sup>1</sup> School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, UK.

12 <sup>2</sup> International Collaboration on Repair Discoveries (ICORD), University of British Columbia,  
13 Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

14 <sup>3</sup> MD Undergraduate Program, Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver,  
15 Canada.

16 <sup>4</sup> Knowledge Translation Program, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto,  
17 and the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

18 <sup>5</sup> Department of Health Sciences and Technology, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

19 <sup>6</sup> Schulthess Clinic, Zurich, Switzerland.

20 <sup>7</sup> Centre for Human Brain Health, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.

21 <sup>8</sup> MRC Versus Arthritis Centre for Musculoskeletal Ageing Research, University of Birmingham,  
22 United Kingdom.

23 <sup>9</sup> Centre for Trauma Science Research, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.

24 <sup>10</sup> Department of Urology, University Hospital Basel, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.

25 <sup>11</sup> Department of Medicine, Division of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of British  
26 Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

27 <sup>12</sup> GF Strong Rehabilitation Centre, Vancouver Coastal Health, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

28

29 **Correspondence and requests should be addressed to:**

30 Corresponding author\*: Tom E. Nightingale PhD,

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

31 Assistant Professor, School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham,

32 Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK,

33 **Email:** T.E.Nightingale@bham.ac.uk **Tel:** +44 (0)121 414 6977

34

35 **Word count:** 11,222 words; **Abstract word count:** 500 words

36 **Number of tables:** 2; **Number of figures:** 4

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61 **ABSTRACT**

62 **Background**

63 A low level of cardiorespiratory fitness [CRF; defined as peak oxygen uptake ( $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ) or peak power  
64 output (PPO)] is a widely reported consequence of spinal cord injury (SCI) and a major risk factor  
65 associated with chronic disease. However, CRF can be modified by exercise. This systematic review  
66 with meta-analysis and meta-regression aimed to assess whether certain SCI characteristics and/or  
67 specific exercise considerations are moderators of changes in CRF.

68

69 **Methods and Findings**

70 Databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL and Web of Science) were searched from inception to  
71 March 2023. A primary meta-analysis was conducted including randomised controlled trials (RCTs;  
72 exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks relative to control groups). A secondary meta-analysis pooled  
73 independent exercise interventions >2 weeks from longitudinal pre-post and RCT studies to explore  
74 whether subgroup differences in injury characteristics and/or exercise intervention parameters explained  
75 CRF changes. Further analyses included cohort, cross-sectional and observational study designs.  
76 Outcome measures of interest were absolute ( $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ) or relative  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  ( $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ), and/or PPO.  
77 Bias/quality was assessed via The Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 and the National Institute of Health Quality  
78 Assessment Tools. Certainty of the evidence was assessed using the Grading of Recommendations  
79 Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach. Random effects models were used in all  
80 meta-analyses and meta-regressions.

81

82 Of 21,020 identified records, 120 studies comprising 29 RCTs, 67 pre-post studies, 11 cohort, 7 cross-  
83 sectional and 6 observational studies were included. The primary meta-analysis revealed significant  
84 improvements in  $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  [0.16 (0.07, 0.25) L/min],  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  [2.9 (1.8, 3.9) mL/kg/min] and PPO [9  
85 (5, 14) W] with exercise, relative to controls ( $p<0.001$ ). Ninety-six studies (117 independent exercise  
86 interventions comprising 1,331 participants) were included in the secondary, pooled meta-analysis which  
87 demonstrated that exercise interventions significantly improve  $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  [0.22 (0.17, 0.26) L/min],  
88  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  [2.8 (2.2, 3.3) mL/kg/min], and PPO [11 (9, 13) W] ( $p<0.001$ ). There were subgroup  
89 differences for  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  based on exercise modality ( $p=0.002$ ) and intervention length ( $p=0.01$ ), but there  
90 were no differences for  $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ . There were subgroup differences ( $p\leq 0.008$ ) for PPO based on time

91 since injury, neurological level of injury, exercise modality, relative exercise intensity, exercise intensity  
92 prescription method, and frequency. The meta-regression found that studies with a higher mean age of  
93 participants were associated with smaller changes in  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  and  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  ( $p < 0.10$ ). GRADE indicated  
94 a moderate level of certainty in the estimated effect for  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ , but low levels for  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  and PPO.  
95 This review may be limited by the small number of RCTs, which prevented a subgroup analysis within  
96 this specific study design.

97

## 98 **Conclusions**

99 Performing exercise >2 weeks results in significant improvements to  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ ,  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  and PPO in  
100 individuals with SCI. Subgroup comparisons identified that exercise interventions lasting up to 12 weeks  
101 yield the greatest change in  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ . Upper-body aerobic exercise and resistance training also appear  
102 the most effective at improving  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  and PPO. Furthermore, acutely-injured, individuals with  
103 paraplegia, exercising at a moderate-to-vigorous intensity, prescribed via a percentage of oxygen  
104 consumption or heart rate, for  $\geq 3$  sessions/week will likely experience the greatest change in PPO.  
105 Ageing seemingly diminishes the adaptive CRF responses to exercise training in individuals with SCI.

106

## 107 **Registration**

108 PROSPERO: CRD42018104342

109

110 **KEYWORDS:** Cardiorespiratory Fitness, Cardiopulmonary Fitness, Function, Spinal Cord Injuries,  
111 Rehabilitation, Exercise

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

## 121 **AUTHOR SUMMARY**

122 Why was this research done?

- 123 - Individuals with spinal cord injury typically exhibit low levels of cardiorespiratory fitness. As  
124 such, these individuals are at a higher risk for the development of chronic diseases in  
125 comparison to the non-injured population.
- 126 - The current spinal cord injury-specific exercise guidelines encourage moderate-to-vigorous  
127 intensity aerobic exercise 40 minutes per week for fitness benefits or 90 minutes per week for  
128 cardiometabolic health benefits. Yet, others have suggested individuals with spinal cord injury  
129 should be achieving 150 minutes per week in line with non-injured population guidelines.
- 130 - This systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression aimed to identify whether  
131 specific injury characteristics (e.g., time, level or severity of injury) or exercise intervention  
132 parameters (e.g., modality, intensity, volume etc.) result in the greatest changes in  
133 cardiorespiratory fitness in individuals with spinal cord injury.

134 What did the researchers do and find?

- 135 - We searched for studies that investigated the effects of exercise interventions lasting longer  
136 than 2 weeks on changes in absolute and relative peak oxygen consumption and/or peak  
137 power output in individuals with spinal cord injury. In total, we included 120 studies of  
138 various study designs: 29 randomised controlled trials, 67 pre-post studies, 11 cohort  
139 comparisons, 7 cross-sectional studies and 6 observational studies.
- 140 - The greatest changes in peak power output may be achieved by individuals with acute spinal  
141 cord injury or paraplegia. Upper-body aerobic and resistance exercise were identified as the  
142 most optimal exercise modalities. Furthermore, prescribing moderate-to-vigorous intensity  
143 aerobic exercise using either a percentage of the individual's peak heart rate or oxygen  
144 consumption, for three or more sessions per week, resulted in the greatest improvements in  
145 peak power output.
- 146 - Our findings support the minimum 40 minutes of weekly moderate-to-vigorous intensity  
147 exercise recommended by the spinal cord injury-specific exercise guidelines to significantly  
148 improve fitness. However, while not statistically significant, a two-fold greater improvement  
149 in peak power output was shown for interventions with exercise performed  $\geq 90$  min/week in  
150 comparison to  $\geq 40$  min/week. Cross-sectional comparisons also revealed that individuals with

151 spinal cord injury performing higher levels of physical activity were associated with higher  
152 cardiorespiratory fitness.

153 What do these findings mean?

- 154 - Exercise interventions >2 weeks can significantly improve cardiorespiratory fitness in  
155 individuals with a spinal cord injury by a clinically meaningful change greater than one spinal  
156 cord injury adjusted metabolic equivalent (i.e.,  $\geq 2.7$  mL/kg/min). A one metabolic equivalent  
157 improvement has been associated with a reduction in cardiovascular related mortality risk in  
158 non-injured individuals.
- 159 - Our findings indicate that certain participant/injury characteristics and exercise intervention  
160 parameters are moderators of the changes observed in cardiorespiratory fitness across studies.  
161 These factors should be considered in the design of future exercise interventions. Future  
162 research should consider: following spinal cord injury-specific reporting guidelines (ensuring  
163 transparency of reporting), investigating the dose-response relationship between exercise and  
164 cardiorespiratory fitness or influence of exercise intensity in this population, and consider how  
165 different injury characteristics impact the benefits of exercise on cardiorespiratory fitness.
- 166 - The main limitation of the study was the lack of randomised controlled trials (RCT) comparing  
167 changes in CRF following an exercise intervention relative to a control group. This prevented  
168 subgroup comparisons in this study design specifically and therefore we pooled pre-post and  
169 RCT exercise interventions to explore these effects.

170

## 171 1. INTRODUCTION

172 Spinal cord injury (SCI) is a complex neurological condition, caused by trauma, disease or degeneration,  
173 which results in sensory-motor deficits (i.e., paralysis or paresis) below the level of lesion and autonomic  
174 dysfunctions. Progressive physical deconditioning following injury results in increased health care  
175 utilisation, reliance on personal assistance services and a greater predisposition towards developing  
176 chronic diseases [1,2]. Individuals with SCI are at an increased risk of stroke, cardiovascular disease  
177 (CVD), and type-2 diabetes mellitus compared to non-injured counterparts [3–5]. The elevated incidence  
178 of these conditions in people with SCI emphasises the need for targeted interventions to address  
179 modifiable risk factors for these chronic diseases, such as cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF). In clinical  
180 populations CRF is typically defined as an individual's peak oxygen uptake ( $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ ) or peak power

181 output (PPO).  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  and PPO are determined during graded cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET)  
182 to the point of volitional exhaustion, and represents the integrated functioning of different bodily systems  
183 (pulmonary, cardiovascular and skeletal) to uptake, transport and utilise oxygen for metabolic processes  
184 [6]. A number of prospective studies have indicated that CRF is at least as important, if not more so, than  
185 other traditional CVD risk factors (e.g., obesity, hypertension and smoking) and is strongly associated  
186 with mortality [7–12].

187

188 Low levels of CRF have been widely reported in the SCI-population [13], with the between-person  
189 variability partially explained by the neurological level and severity of injury (i.e., lower CRF reported  
190 in individuals with tetraplegia) [14]. A large proportion of the variance in CRF is also explained by  
191 physical activity [15], which is reduced in the SCI-population [16,17]. Performing regular physical  
192 activity and/or structured exercise has long been promoted for improving CRF in individuals with SCI  
193 [18,19]. In 2011, the first evidence-based exercise guidelines, specifically for individuals with SCI were  
194 developed [20], which stated that *“for important fitness benefits, adults with SCI should engage in at  
195 least 20 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous-intensity aerobic activity and strength-training exercises 2  
196 times per week”*. This guideline has since been updated, yet remains the same with regards to CRF  
197 benefits [21]. Although this implies adults with SCI can accrue fitness benefits from volumes of activity  
198 well below that promoted in the general population, others have advocated that adults with a physical  
199 disability [22,23] and individuals with SCI [24] should aim to perform at least 150 minutes of aerobic  
200 exercise per week. For additional health benefits it has been suggested that adults should perform closer  
201 to 300 minutes per week of moderate-intensity physical activity [25,26]. While the current SCI-specific  
202 guidelines likely represent the *“minimum”* threshold required to achieve CRF benefits, it has been  
203 suggested that this creates an impression that individuals with SCI do not need to be as physically active  
204 as the general population [27]. The dose-response relationship between exercise volume and CRF  
205 improvements in individuals with SCI remains to be elucidated.

206

207 It is noteworthy that the aforementioned SCI-specific exercise guidelines utilise the terminology of  
208 *“moderate-to-vigorous”* to describe the desired exercise intensity. This is in contrast to accepted  
209 guidelines in the general population whereby moderate and vigorous-intensity exercise are distinguished  
210 from one another with specific thresholds (e.g.,  $\geq 150$  minutes of moderate-intensity or  $\geq 75$  minutes of

211 vigorous-intensity activity per week) [23]. Exercise intervention intensity has been shown to influence  
212 the magnitude of change in CRF in patients undergoing cardiac rehabilitation [28,29]. The  
213 feasibility/effectiveness of higher intensity exercise is also currently a topical area of research in the SCI-  
214 population [30–32]. There is the potential for vigorous-intensity exercise to be more time efficient or  
215 lead to superior health benefits, although the impact of different high-intensity interval training protocols  
216 on CRF in individuals with SCI compared to moderate-intensity exercise is yet to be determined. A recent  
217 systematic review identified that exercise interventions of a specific modality yield distinct changes in  
218 certain cardiometabolic health outcomes, but not other outcomes, in individuals with SCI [33]. This  
219 provides rationale for wanting to investigate the efficacy of different exercise modalities on CRF in this  
220 population. Consequently, a number of research questions requiring further attention include:

221

222 1) Do injury-specific characteristics (e.g., tetraplegia vs. paraplegia, acute vs. chronic injuries, motor-  
223 complete vs. incomplete) mediate CRF responses to exercise?

224 2) What is the best intensity, frequency, and volume of weekly exercise?

225 3) Is there an optimal conditioning modality [e.g., upper-body aerobic exercise, resistance training,  
226 functional electrical stimulation (FES), hybrid or multimodal exercise interventions etc.]?

227

228 To address these questions, we performed a systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression  
229 to investigate the impact of different exercise interventions on changes in CRF in individuals with SCI.  
230 Moreover, we gathered evidence to determine whether key moderators (e.g., participant/injury  
231 characteristics, intervention/study characteristics and risk of bias) influence these intervention effects.

232

## 233 **2. METHODS**

234 This review is reported as per the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses  
235 (PRISMA) guidelines [34] (S1 Checklist) and was prospectively registered (PROSPERO ID  
236 CRD42018104342). The primary meta-analysis of this review included randomised controlled trials  
237 (RCTs; exercise intervention versus a comparison control group). A secondary, pooled meta-analysis  
238 was also conducted that combined the intervention arms of RCTs with non-randomised study designs  
239 (RCTs and pre-post exercise interventions without a comparison control group). Further secondary meta-  
240 analyses were conducted that included cohort comparisons (e.g., physically inactive vs. habitual



241 exercisers) and observational studies (e.g., standard of care rehabilitation), along with RCTs that  
242 specifically compared the impact of different exercise intensities (e.g., low or moderate-intensity vs.  
243 vigorous or supramaximal) on CRF outcomes. Lastly, we qualitatively reviewed cross-sectional studies  
244 that reported associations between physical activity and CRF outcomes.

245

## 246 **2.1. Eligibility criteria**

247 Studies were required to meet the following inclusion criteria: 1) Adult ( $\geq 18$  years) participants; 2) any  
248 acquired (traumatic, infection, cancer) SCI (*note, studies were included if >80% of the sample met these*  
249 *two aforementioned inclusion criteria*); 3) an exercise or physical activity intervention lasting >2 weeks  
250 (RCTs, pre-post and observational trials); 4) report a measurable exposure variable (i.e., cohort studies:  
251 athletes vs. non-athletes or sedentary vs. active participants; and cross-sectional studies: self-reported or  
252 objectively measured habitual physical activity level) and; 5) report CRF-specific outcomes [i.e.,  
253 absolute ( $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ) or expressed as relative to body mass  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  ( $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ), evaluated via analysis of  
254 expired air during a peak (or symptom-limited) CPET or submaximal prediction, or PPO].

255

256 Studies were excluded if they met the following criteria: 1) non-human; 2) non-original work (i.e.,  
257 reviews, guideline documents, editorials, viewpoints, letter-to-editor, protocol paper); 3) case-reports and  
258 case series with a number (n) of participants <5 (to increase the robustness of our findings given the  
259 inclusion of smaller sample sizes in previous reviews [18,35,36]); 4) non-peer reviewed (i.e., conference  
260 proceeding/abstracts/posters); 5) children or adolescents (<18 years); 6) non-SCI (non-injured  
261 participants or other neurological conditions); 7) does not report a CRF-specific outcome; 8) single  
262 exercise sessions or an intervention <2 weeks; 9) no suitable comparison (i.e., control group or baseline  
263 data pre-intervention) or exposure variable measured; and 10) no full text. Studies with concurrent  
264 interventions (i.e., diet, lifestyle or respiratory training) were included only if the effects of exercise could  
265 be isolated.

266

## 267 **2.2. Search strategy**

268 A search of the following electronic databases: MEDLINE (via Pubmed), Excerpta Medica Database  
269 (EMBASE; via Ovid), Web of Science and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials  
270 (CENTRAL) was conducted from their respective inception through to March 25, 2023. Search terms

271 were developed by the corresponding author (TN) and agreed upon by co-authors (AK, MW). The search  
272 strategy combined key words describing the following: 1) condition (e.g., SCI); 2) ‘intervention or  
273 exposure variable’ (e.g., rehabilitation, exercise and physical activity); and 3) ‘outcome’ (e.g.,  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  or  
274 PPO). Details of the complete search strategy can be found in online supplementary material (S2). Search  
275 results were collated using Endnote software (Thomson Reuters, NY) and duplicates removed.

276

### 277 **2.3. Study selection and data extraction**

278 The citations retrieved from the search strategy were screened by title, abstract, and full text by two  
279 independent reviewers (DH, GB). At each stage of the evaluation, studies were excluded if the inclusion  
280 criteria were not satisfied. A conservative approach was taken, whereby if insufficient information was  
281 available to warrant study exclusion during the title and abstract stages of the screening, studies were  
282 retained in the sample for full text screening. TN resolved any disagreement with regards to study  
283 inclusion. There was no restriction on the language of studies. Where necessary, reviewers screened  
284 using Google translate [37] or sought assistance from bilingual co-authors.

285

286 Two authors (DH, GB) independently extracted data in duplicate using Microsoft Excel. Any  
287 disagreements were resolved via mutual consensus. Where more than one publication was apparent for  
288 the same participants, data were extracted from the study with the largest sample size to avoid  
289 duplication. Author, year, study design, sample size, participant demographics/injury characteristics,  
290 exercise parameters (including the type, frequency, duration, intensity and weekly volume), or physical  
291 activity exposure details (training history, objective wearable device or validated self-report  
292 questionnaire) and adverse events were extracted. For RCTs, pre-post interventions and observational  
293 studies, mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD) for  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO outcomes at baseline and post-  
294 intervention/control or observation period were extracted to assess change in CRF. For cross-sectional  
295 studies, mean  $\pm$  SD outcomes were extracted for the unique cohorts, along with the significance and  
296 magnitude of associations between CRF and habitual physical activity. Where possible,  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  values  
297 were extracted in relative (mL/kg/min) and absolute (L/min) terms or calculated using pre- and post-  
298 intervention body mass values when provided. As it is widely accepted that  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  should be expressed  
299 in relative terms, to account for changes in body mass, results are presented for both  $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and  
300  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , but the discussion focuses primarily on  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ . PPO values were extracted in watts (W)

301 only. If there was insufficient information, the authors were contacted via email (N=13) and given a two-  
302 week window to provide additional data or clarity (responses received, N=8 [38–45]). Detailed notes  
303 were recorded outlining the reasons for study inclusion/exclusion and the number of studies included and  
304 excluded at each stage.

305

#### 306 **2.4. Risk of bias**

307 Study quality was appraised by at least two independent reviewers in duplicate (DH, GB, SYC), with  
308 any conflicts resolved by a third reviewer (TN). The Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 (RoB 2) was used to assess  
309 the risk of bias of the RCTs [46]. Reviewers determined the level of bias for each domain using the RoB  
310 2 algorithms and is presented visually using Robvis [47]. Non-randomised designs were assessed using  
311 assessment tools generated by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Heart, Lung and  
312 Blood Institute (NHLBI, Bethesda, MD). Pre-post studies were rated using the Quality Assessment Tool  
313 for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies with No Control Group (12 items) and observational and cross-  
314 sectional studies were rated using the Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-  
315 Sectional Studies (14 items). Studies were subsequently classified as good, fair or poor quality using the  
316 guidance provided within each tool and is presented visually in online supplementary material.

317

#### 318 **2.5. Data synthesis and analysis**

319 A variety of methods [i.e., indices of heart rate (HR),  $\dot{V}O_2$  or ratings of perceived exertion (RPE)] have  
320 been utilised in the literature to establish, prescribe and regulate exercise intensity in the SCI-population,  
321 which creates complexity when classifying the intensity of exercise. Each intervention was classified as  
322 having prescribed either light, moderate, vigorous or supramaximal-intensity aerobic exercise, based on  
323 thresholds proposed by the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) [48] (S3). If a study reported  
324 a progression in intensity that spanned the moderate and vigorous-intensity categories (e.g., 60-65%  
325  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ), it was classified as ‘moderate-to-vigorous’. If insufficient data were provided, studies were  
326 classified as ‘mixed-intensity/cannot determine’. Furthermore, where a study reported frequency of  
327 sessions or length of interventions as a range (e.g., 6-8 weeks), the midpoint was extracted and if a study  
328 reported duration as a range (e.g., 40-45 min), the greater value was extracted. Descriptions of adverse  
329 events in the included studies were also collated. These were categorised into the following subgroups:

330 1) bone, joint or muscular pain, 2) autonomic or cardiovascular function, 3) skin irritation or pressure  
331 sores, and 4) other.

332

333 Means  $\pm$  SD were estimated from median and interquartile range (IQR) [49] or median and range [50],  
334 where required. Where CRF data was only presented in figures, data were extrapolated using Photoshop  
335 (Adobe Inc). To combine within-study subgroups and to estimate SD of the delta ( $\Delta$ ) change in CRF  
336 using correlation factors, we followed guidance from the Cochrane handbook [49]. Correlation factors  
337 were calculated for  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  and PPO using studies that reported pre-post SD and SD of the  
338  $\Delta$  change using the following equation:

339

$$340 \quad \text{Corr} = \frac{(SD_{Pre})^2 + (SD_{Post})^2 - (SD_{Change})^2}{2 \times SD_{Pre} \times SD_{Post}}$$

341

342 The specific correlation factors that were calculated for each study were averaged across each study  
343 design (S4) and applied in the following equation to calculate SD of the change for studies where these  
344 values were not reported:

345

$$346 \quad SD_{Change} = \sqrt{(SD_{Pre})^2 + (SD_{Post})^2 - 2 \times corr \times SD_{Pre} \times SD_{Post}}$$

347

348 where *corr* represents the correlation coefficient.

349

350 Since  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ , and PPO are continuous variables, expressed using the same units across  
351 studies, we utilised weighted mean differences (WMDs) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) as summary  
352 statistics. A primary meta-analysis was carried out that included RCTs comparing  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes  
353 following an exercise intervention relative to control groups. A secondary, pooled meta-analysis  
354 describing  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-characterised exercise interventions  
355 lasting >2 weeks (e.g., combining exercise intervention-arms from RCTs and pre-post studies) was also  
356 conducted to facilitate subgroup comparisons. Nine separate subgroup analyses were performed for this  
357 pooled, secondary meta-analysis to describe  $\Delta$  in each CRF outcome with studies categorised into  
358 subgroups based on the following: 1) time since injury [(TSI), e.g., acute (<1-year), chronic ( $\geq$ 1-year)];  
359 2) neurological level of injury (e.g., tetraplegia, paraplegia); 3) injury severity [e.g., grading in

360 accordance with the American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale (AIS): motor-complete (AIS  
361 A-B), motor-incomplete (AIS C-D)]; 4) exercise modality [e.g., aerobic volitional upper-body, resistance  
362 training, FES, gait training, behaviour change]; 5) relative exercise intensity (e.g., light, moderate,  
363 moderate-to-vigorous, vigorous, supramaximal); 6) method used to prescribe exercise intensity (e.g.,  
364  $\dot{V}O_2$ , HR, RPE, workload); 7) frequency of exercise sessions per week (<3,  $\geq 3$  to <5,  $\geq 5$ ); 8) exercise  
365 volume [e.g., SCI-specific exercise guidelines for fitness (40 - 89 min/wk) [21], SCI-specific exercise  
366 guidelines for cardiometabolic health (90 - 149 min/wk) [21], achieving general population exercise  
367 guidelines ( $\geq 150$  min/wk) [23], and 9) length of intervention ( $\leq 6$  weeks, >6 to  $\leq 12$  weeks, >12 weeks).  
368 Studies were also classified as ‘mixed’ or ‘not reported/cannot determine’. Three additional secondary  
369 meta-analyses were conducted for different trial designs: 1) comparing inactive vs active participants  
370 (e.g., cross-sectional cohort studies); 2) describing  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes with standard of care inpatient  
371 rehabilitation or free-living follow up (e.g., observational studies) and 3) head-to-head comparison of  
372 different exercise intensities (RCTs with exercise interventions comparing low or moderate vs. vigorous  
373 or supramaximal-intensity exercise). Meta-analyses were conducted in R (Version 3.5.1, R Foundation  
374 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) using the package metafor [51]. Statistical heterogeneity was  
375 assessed using the  $I^2$  and accompanying  $p$ -value from the chi-squared test. A random effects model was  
376 chosen to account for the variability in the true effect size across studies, given the expected between-  
377 study variability of different exercise intervention components and participant characteristics (by nature  
378 of SCI being a heterogeneous condition depending on the neurological level and severity of injury).  
379 Evidence for differences in effects between the subgroups in the secondary, pooled meta-analysis was  
380 explored by comparing effects in the subgroups and the corresponding  $p$ -values for interaction (metagen  
381 function from the R package meta [52]). Thresholds for statistically significant subgroup differences  
382 were adjusted for the number of subgroup comparisons and individual subgroup  $p$ -values were adjusted  
383 for multiple comparisons via the Bonferroni correction method. To assess the effect of potential outlier  
384 studies, leave-one-out analyses were performed with studies removed and pooled WMD recalculated.  
385 Sensitivity analyses were also conducted by comparing the WMDs of low and high risk of bias studies,  
386 as well as studies with and without imputed data (i.e., extracted from figures or where mean  $\pm$  SD were  
387 calculated from median, IQR or range), to confirm the robustness of our findings. A further subgroup  
388 analysis was performed to compare  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes following exercise interventions that matched  
389 the CPET modality to the intervention modality (i.e., using an incremental arm-crank ergometry CPET

390 to test the effects of an arm-crank exercise intervention). Potential small study effects in the dataset were  
391 assessed using funnel plots. Egger's tests were also conducted in R when there was a minimum of 10  
392 studies included in a meta-analysis [53]. Study design statistical power for both the summary effect size  
393 and a range of hypothetical effect sizes was calculated and visualised in firepower plots using the  
394 metameta R package, recently described by Quintana [54]. Plots were produced for the pre-post exercise  
395 interventions alone and for the RCT exercise interventions alone relative to controls (i.e., the primary  
396 meta-analysis studies) to facilitate comparisons between study designs. Data is visualised in R (see  
397 Github for scripts: <https://github.com/jutzca/Exercise-and-fitness-in-SCI>). A 2.7 mL/kg/min, and thus 1  
398 metabolic equivalent in SCI (1 SCI-MET) [55], change in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  was considered clinically  
399 meaningful.

400

401 To explore potential sources of heterogeneity, a random-effects meta-regression was performed using  
402 preselected moderator variables in Stata (Version 13, StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA),  
403 adjusted for multiple testing. As per Cochrane recommendations [53], for each included covariate in the  
404 model a minimum of 10 studies were required. To achieve this, and to also overcome the issue of  
405 collinearity between moderators, some moderators were not included in the analysis. Moderators were  
406 selected *a priori*, based on their potential to influence CRF responses. Exercise intensity prescription was  
407 later added as a moderator in the meta-regression in light of a recent study challenging strategies for  
408 prescribing exercise intensity in individuals with SCI [56]. Moderators fell into two categories: model 1)  
409 participant/injury characteristics [continuous variables: age, TSI and baseline CRF; categorical variables:  
410 sex (n=male), neurological level of injury (n=PARA), severity (n=motor-complete)]; or model 2)  
411 intervention/study characteristics [continuous variables: exercise session duration, frequency, weekly  
412 exercise volume, intervention length; categorical variables: exercise modality, exercise intensity, method  
413 of exercise intensity prescription, and risk of bias classification]. Any potential covariates of the effect  
414 of  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ,  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , and PPO with  $p \leq 0.10$  identified via univariate meta-regression were  
415 subsequently included in multivariate meta-regression modelling. The level of significance for  
416 multivariate meta-regression was set at  $p \leq 0.10$ . Because meta-regression can result in inflated false-  
417 positive rates when heterogeneity is present, or when there are few studies, a permutation test described  
418 by Higgins and Thompson [57] was used to verify the significance of the predictors in the final model,  
419 whereby 10,000 permutations were generated.

420

## 421 **2.6. Certainty on the body of the evidence assessment using the GRADE approach**

422 The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach [58]  
423 was used to evaluate the certainty of the evidence for  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  and PPO for the pooled, pre-  
424 post and RCT exercise interventions secondary meta-analysis. It was decided that the greater number of  
425 studies included in the pooled meta-analysis, in comparison to the primary meta-analysis consisting of  
426 RCTs only, would provide a more accurate assessment of the current body of evidence. Two authors  
427 (DH, SYC) independently assessed the certainty of evidence for each outcome, with any conflicts  
428 resolved by the corresponding author (TN). The certainty of the evidence was graded from ‘High’ to  
429 ‘Moderate’, ‘Low’ or ‘Very Low’. GRADE certainty in the evidence was downgraded if one or more of  
430 the following criteria were present: 1) risk of bias, 2) inconsistency in the results for a given outcome, 3)  
431 indirectness, 4) imprecision, and 5) small study effects.

432

## 433 **3. RESULTS**

434 The initial database search identified 14,248 articles after removal of duplicates. A further 12,322 studies  
435 were removed following the screening of titles and abstracts. The remaining 1,926 articles were selected  
436 for full-text review based on inclusion and exclusion criteria (S2). Of these, a total of 120 eligible studies,  
437 across each specific study design (RCT = 29, pre-post = 67, observational = 6, cross-sectional cohort =  
438 11, cross-sectional association = 7), were included in this review. Twenty-nine RCTs were included in  
439 the primary meta-analysis. Ninety-six studies, comprising the RCTs and pre-post studies (total = 117  
440 independent interventions), were included in the secondary, pooled meta-analysis. Summaries of the  
441 pooled cohorts and descriptions of the individual studies included within each additional secondary meta-  
442 analysis are provided as supplementary material.

443

444 *[PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]*

445

### 446 **3.1. Primary meta-analysis: RCT exercise intervention vs control groups**

447 Twenty-two RCTs assessed changes in CRF outcomes between exercise intervention (n=283  
448 participants) and control (n=252 participants) groups. Participant demographics, injury characteristics,  
449 exercise intervention parameters and changes in CRF outcomes for each RCT can be found in Figure 2.



450 A summary of the pooled cohort characteristics, summary statistics for the meta-analysis and forest plots  
451 for each CRF outcome are presented in supplementary material (S5). The meta-analysis of RCTs revealed  
452 a significantly higher  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  [0.16 (0.07, 0.25) L/min,  $p<0.001$ ],  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  [2.9 (1.8, 3.9) mL/kg/min,  
453  $p<0.001$ ], and PPO [9 (5, 14) W,  $p<0.001$ ] following exercise interventions relative to controls. There  
454 was significant heterogeneity present across all CRF outcomes ( $p<0.001$ ), with  $I^2$  values of 87%, 93%  
455 and 88% for  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , and PPO, respectively.

456

457 *[PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]*

458

459 **3.2. Secondary, pooled meta-analysis: Effects of prescribed, prospective exercise interventions**  
460 **from pre-post and RCT studies**

461 CRF responses were pooled across 96 studies, comprising 117 exercise interventions in total, taken  
462 from 81 pre-post exercise interventions and 36 independent exercise intervention arms from RCTs.

463 Some studies included multiple exercise intervention arms/phases, hence the greater total number of  
464 exercise interventions than studies. A summary of the demographic/injury characteristics and  
465 intervention parameters for the pooled cohort (i.e., all 117 interventions) included in the analyses for  
466  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , and PPO are presented in supplementary material (S6). Participant demographics  
467 and exercise intervention parameters across the total 117 exercise interventions are summarised below.  
468 Summaries of the interventions for each CRF outcome, along with details of the specific studies is  
469 presented in online supplementary material (S6).

470

471 **3.2.1. Participants**

472 Across the 117 exercise interventions, there were a total of 1,331 participants. Most interventions  
473 included both males and females (63% of studies), where females made up between 6-80% of the mixed  
474 cohorts. There were no female-only cohorts. Mean age ranged between 23 to 58 years and the majority  
475 of participants had chronic injuries (64% >1-year), with mean TSI ranging between 56 days to 24 years.  
476 Sixty-three interventions included a mixed cohort of paraplegia and tetraplegia, of which individuals  
477 with paraplegia made up between 10-88% of the mixed cohorts. Four interventions recruited individuals  
478 with tetraplegia-only, 39 paraplegia-only, and 11 did not specify. Participants across all AIS groups were  
479 included, of which 41 interventions were motor-complete-only, 19 were motor-incomplete-only, and 20



480 did not report. Thirty-seven interventions recruited both motor-complete and incomplete individuals, of  
481 which 33% were motor-incomplete. Weighted mean  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  at baseline was 1.28 (0.51-  
482 3.50) L/min and 17.8 (7.3-36.9) mL/kg/min, respectively, and PPO was 49 (0-168) W.

483

### 484 **3.2.2. Exercise intervention characteristics**

485 Length of interventions ranged from 4 to 52 weeks, and whilst most studies reported a specific,  
486 predetermined intervention length, some reported a range [59–61], a total or targeted number of sessions  
487 [60,62–66], or provided an average [65,67,68]. Exercise sessions were completed between two to seven  
488 times per week. Eleven studies reported a range (e.g., “two to three sessions”) or maximum frequency  
489 (e.g., “up to three sessions/week”) [60,63,66,69–76], and frequency was either not reported or could not  
490 be determined in seven studies [39,77–82]. The remainder reported an exact frequency (e.g., three  
491 sessions per week). The duration of exercise sessions ranged from 5 to 90 minutes, with five studies  
492 reporting a range (e.g., 20-30 min) [60,76,83–85] and six studies reporting a progression to a target  
493 duration [63,86–90]. Duration was not reported or could not be determined in 15 studies. Based on  
494 current exercise guidelines, 23 interventions prescribed exercise within the SCI-specific exercise  
495 guidelines for fitness (40-89 min/week), 45 interventions targeted the SCI-specific exercise guidelines  
496 for cardiometabolic health (90-149 min/week), and 30 were greater than general population exercise  
497 guidelines ( $\geq 150$  min/week).

498

499 Forty-two interventions utilised aerobic upper-body exercise, 7 upper-body resistance training, 22 FES,  
500 15 gait training, 5 behaviour change, and 26 mixed/multimodal interventions. Following the ACSM  
501 thresholds, one intervention prescribed light-intensity (1%), 17 prescribed moderate-intensity (14%), 35  
502 prescribed moderate-to-vigorous-intensity (30%), 26 prescribed vigorous-intensity (22%), and 2  
503 prescribed supramaximal-intensity exercise (2%). Intensity could not be determined from 36  
504 interventions (31%). With regards to exercise intensity prescription methods, 35 interventions used HR,  
505 regulated either via  $HR_{peak}$  ( $\%HR_{peak}$ , i.e., determined via a CPET; N=10),  $HR_{max}$  ( $\%HR_{max}$ , i.e., age-  
506 predicted; N=10), or HR reserve ( $\%HRR$ ; N=15). Fourteen interventions established intensity using  
507  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  ( $\%\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ; N=13) or  $\dot{V}O_2$  reserve ( $\%\dot{V}O_{2reserve}$ ; N=1) calculated from the pre-intervention CPET.  
508 Fourteen interventions utilised RPE, using either the Borg CR10 scale (N=7) or the Borg 6-20 scale  
509 (N=7). Workload was used to prescribe intensity in 11 interventions, via a percentage of PPO ( $\%PPO$ ;

510 N=6), one repetition maximum (%1RM; N=4), or maximal tolerated power (%MTP; N=1). Forty-three  
511 interventions either used a mixture of prescription methods or intensity could not be classified.

512

### 513 **3.2.3. Adverse events**

514 Adverse events were described in 18 interventions, comprising at least 49/1,331 (3.7%) participants (S7).  
515 These events were related to: 1) bone, joint or muscular pain (n=10 participants), 2) autonomic or  
516 cardiovascular function (n=8 participants), 3) skin irritation or pressure sores (n=18 participants), and 4)  
517 other events including anxiety, nausea, dizziness and issues with testing equipment (n=3 participants).  
518 The following adverse events were reported in four other pre-post studies but could not be categorised  
519 as above. Beillot et al. [77] stated that participants experienced “*spontaneous fractures of lower limbs,*  
520 *occurrence of a syringomyelia and pressure sores at the foot and ankle*” (n=10), but did not define the  
521 number of participants who sustained each event. Likewise, Janssen and Pringle [70] reported  
522 “*lightheadedness in some subjects*” and Gibbons et al. [91] stated that “*a number of participants showed*  
523 *some level of autonomic dysreflexia during the FES response test*”, but both studies did not quantify  
524 further. Vestergaard et al. [92] reported adverse events relating to “*slight non-persisting pain in neck*  
525 *(n=1), arms and shoulders (n=4) during and between training sessions, dizziness that disappeared after*  
526 *5-min (n=1), feeling tired in the head/dizziness that disappeared after training with no other signs of*  
527 *autonomic hyperreflexia (n=2), increased spasms (n=2), and vomiting just after training (n=2)*”.  
528 However, as only seven participants completed the intervention, it cannot be determined whether these  
529 events were reported for one or multiple participants.

530

### 531 **3.2.4. Change in CRF outcomes**

532 Seventy-four exercise interventions assessed the change in  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , revealing a significant increase of  
533 0.22 [0.17, 0.26] L/min ( $p<0.001$ ). There were no significant subgroup differences for any of the nine  
534 subgroup analyses. Seventy-nine exercise interventions assessed the change in  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , revealing a  
535 significant increase of 2.8 [2.3, 3.3] mL/kg/min ( $p<0.001$ ). There were significant subgroup differences  
536 for exercise modality ( $p=0.002$ ) and length of intervention ( $p=0.01$ ), but there were no other differences  
537 (Figure 3). Sixty-five exercise interventions assessed the change in PPO, revealing a significant increase  
538 of 11 [9, 13] W ( $p<0.001$ ). There were significant subgroup differences for TSI ( $p<0.001$ ), neurological  
539 level of injury ( $p<0.001$ ), exercise modality ( $p=0.002$ ), relative exercise intensity ( $p=0.001$ ), method of

540 exercise intensity prescription ( $p < 0.001$ ), and frequency ( $p < 0.001$ ) (Figure 3). There was significant  
541 heterogeneity present across all CRF outcomes ( $p < 0.001$ ), with  $I^2$  values of 72%, 53% and 78% for  
542  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , and PPO, respectively. Forest plots for each subgroup analysis are presented in  
543 supplementary material (S6).

544

545 An additional subgroup analysis grouped interventions into those that matched the CPET modality to the  
546 exercise intervention and those that did not. Following the adjustment for subgroup comparisons, there  
547 were no significant differences in  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  or PPO (S9). However, there were trends for a  
548 greater  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $p = 0.05$ ) and  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $p = 0.06$ ) in studies with matched CPET and intervention  
549 modalities in comparison to interventions without matched modalities. A sub-analysis for gait training  
550 interventions alone also revealed no subgroup differences between studies that used upper-body or  
551 treadmill CPETs to determine CRF outcomes (S10).

552

553 *[PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]*

554

### 555 **3.2.5. Sensitivity analyses**

556 Leave-one-out analyses identified outliers for  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  [42][61,93]. A sensitivity analysis for risk of bias  
557 revealed no differences in the pooled effects for low and high risk of bias studies (S8). A sensitivity  
558 analysis comparing studies with imputed data via conversion of medians (IQR), extrapolated data from  
559 figures, and studies without imputed data revealed no differences in the pooled effects for any outcome.  
560 (S8).

561

### 562 **3.2.6. Study-design statistical power considerations**

563 Median statistical power and observed effect sizes for each CRF outcome and study design (i.e., pre-post  
564 studies compared to RCT interventions relative to controls) are reported in Figure 4. Across each CRF  
565 outcome, median statistical power was higher for the RCTs included in the primary meta-analysis in  
566 comparison to the pre-post studies. In general, this indicates that the RCT studies were designed to  
567 reliably detect a wider range of effect sizes in comparison to the pre-post studies.

568

569 *[PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE]*

570

### 571 **3.2.7. Meta-regression**

#### 572 *Model 1 - Participant and injury characteristics*

573 Exercise interventions with a greater mean age of participants were associated with smaller changes in  
574 the effect estimates for  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $p=0.08$ ) and  $\dot{R}\dot{V}\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $p=0.01$ ). The coefficients indicate that for every  
575 one-year increase in mean age of participants in an exercise intervention, the effect on  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  and  
576  $\dot{R}\dot{V}\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  decreases on average by 0.003 L/min and 0.041 mL/kg/min, respectively, holding all other  
577 covariates constant (Table 1). There were no associations between the other moderator variables included  
578 in this model and  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  or  $\dot{R}\dot{V}\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ . Whilst there were no significant associations between PPO and  
579 the other moderator variables (Table 1), there was a trend for an association between PPO and TSI  
580 ( $p=0.18$ ). The coefficient for TSI indicates that for every additional year since injury, the effect on PPO  
581 following an exercise intervention decreases by 1.5W on average (Table 1).

582

#### 583 *Model 2 - Exercise intervention and study characteristics*

584 There were no significant associations between the exercise intervention and study characteristics  
585 included in model 2 for  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  $\dot{R}\dot{V}\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , or PPO (Table 1).

586

587 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]*

588

### 589 **3.2.8. Small study effects**

590 Egger's tests for funnel plot asymmetry were not statistically significant for  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $Z = -1.20$ ,  $p =$   
591  $0.23$ ),  $\dot{R}\dot{V}\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $Z = -0.44$ ,  $p = 0.66$ ), or PPO ( $Z = 0.76$ ,  $p = 0.45$ ). Funnel plots are provided in  
592 supplementary material (S6).

593

## 594 **3.3. Secondary Meta-Analyses**

### 595 **3.3.1. Cross-sectional studies**

596 Eleven studies included cross-sectional data comparing CRF outcomes in active ( $n=182$  participants) vs.  
597 inactive ( $n=134$  participants) individuals with SCI. Inactive participants were mainly classified as  
598 sedentary, whereas active participants varied from recreationally active wheelchair sport players to  
599 paralympic athletes. A meta-analysis of cross-sectional cohort studies revealed significantly ( $p<0.001$ )

600 higher  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  [0.55 (0.43, 0.67) L/min],  $\dot{R}\dot{V}\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , [9.1 (7.0, 11.2) mL/kg/min] and PPO [38 (32, 45)  
601 W] in active compared to inactive individuals with SCI (S11). Given the significant heterogeneity in  
602  $\dot{R}\dot{V}\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , a sensitivity analysis was conducted to compare inactive individuals with either ‘active’ or  
603 ‘elite athletes’. There was a significantly higher  $\dot{R}\dot{V}\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  [6.4 (4.7, 8.1) mL/kg/min,  $p<0.001$ ] in ‘active’  
604 compared to inactive individuals, but an even higher  $\dot{R}\dot{V}\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  [11.2 (9.6, 12.9) mL/kg/min,  $p<0.001$ ] in  
605 ‘elite athletes’ compared to inactive.

606

607 Seven studies (n=581 participants) included cross-sectional data and assessed associations between  
608 habitual physical activity level (as a continuous variable) and CRF outcomes (S12). Six studies assessed  
609 physical activity exposure using self-report methods [38,40,94–97], whereas one study used a validated  
610 research-grade wearable device [98]. The measurement period used to capture physical activity  
611 dimensions ranged from 3 to 7 days. There was considerable variability across studies with regards to  
612 the physical activity dimensions captured: hours per week of exercise/sport, minutes per day or week of  
613 mild, moderate, heavy-intensity for the subcategories of leisure time physical activity (LTPA), lifestyle  
614 or household activity or cumulative activity. Collectively, data indicates significant positive correlations  
615 of a larger magnitude between CRF/PPO outcomes and the volume of sport, exercise or LTPA rather  
616 than household activity. The only study to use a validated wearable device indicated that participants  
617 performing  $\geq 150$  min/week of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) had a significantly higher  
618 CRF relative to a low activity group (performing  $<40$  min/wk). Whereas, there was no significant  
619 difference in CRF between the low activity group and participants achieving the SCI-specific exercise  
620 guidelines (40 - 149 min/week) [98]. These data have been replicated in a recent study, which compared  
621 CRF outcomes for participants achieving either the SCI-specific exercise guidelines for fitness (40 - 89  
622 min/week) and cardiometabolic health (90 - 149 min/week) [21] with the Exercise and Sport Science  
623 Australia (ESSA) position statement recommending that individuals with SCI achieve  $\geq 150$  min/week  
624 [24]. There were no differences in CRF outcomes between individuals classified as inactive and those  
625 meeting the current SCI-specific exercise guidelines, yet there were significant differences across all  
626 CRF outcomes between inactive individuals and those achieving the ESSA guidelines. Furthermore,  
627  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  and PPO were greater for individuals meeting the ESSA guidelines, relative to the current SCI-  
628 specific exercise guidelines. Across studies, significant, positive correlations were reported for the

629 amount of moderate-to-vigorous LTPA or cumulative activity with CRF/PPO outcomes, which was not  
630 the case for mild or light-intensity activity.

631

### 632 **3.3.2. Observational inpatient rehabilitation or community free-living studies**

633 Six studies (n=354 participants) included observational longitudinal data and assessed changes in CRF  
634 outcomes following either standard of care inpatient rehabilitation [99–101] or a period of community  
635 free-living [99,102,103]. Whilst one study described a training programme for elite-level wheelchair  
636 rugby players, it could not be determined whether players adhered to the pre-specified training  
637 programme throughout the season and therefore the study was categorised as a community free-living  
638 observational study in this review [104]. The duration between assessments for standard of care varied,  
639 ranging from 5 to 28 weeks, whereas the follow-up period for community observations ranged from 30  
640 weeks to 2.9 years. Reporting on the therapies used within standard of care was poor and only one study  
641 included a measurement of physical activity during the community-based free-living follow-up (self-  
642 reported mean sport activity) [102]. There were significant improvements following standard of care, but  
643 not following community-based free-living, in  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  [0.12 (0.07, 0.17) L/min,  $p<0.001$  vs. 0.09 (0.00,  
644 0.19) L/min,  $p=0.06$ ] and  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  [2.1 (1.0, 3.2) mL/kg/min,  $p<0.001$  vs -0.5 (-2.5, 1.5) mL/kg/min,  
645  $p=0.64$ ] (S13). Significant improvements in PPO were identified following both standard of care [6 (3,  
646 9) W,  $p<0.001$ ] and community-based free-living [7 (2, 12) W,  $p=0.006$ ] (S13).

647

### 648 **3.3.3. RCT exercise intensity comparisons**

649 Seven RCTs compared changes in CRF outcomes between low or moderate (n=52 participants) and  
650 vigorous or supramaximal (n=51 participants) exercise intensity groups. These studies utilised upper-  
651 body aerobic exercise and gait training. A meta-analysis revealed no significant differences between low  
652 or moderate and vigorous or supramaximal intensity in  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  ( $p=0.67$ ),  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  ( $p=0.88$ ) or PPO  
653 ( $p=0.62$ ) (S14). There were also no significant subgroup differences between studies that matched  
654 exercise volume between intensity groups and those that did not.

655

### 656 **3.4. Risk of Bias**

657 Full risk of bias assessments for pre-post and RCT interventions can be found in supplementary material  
658 (S5, S6, S14). Twenty-six pre-post studies were rated as having good, 27 as having fair, and 14 as having

659 poor methodological quality. Six RCTs were rated as having a low risk of bias, 8 as having some  
660 concerns, and 15 as having a high risk of bias. The most common domains in the RCTs with either some  
661 concerns or high risk were ‘bias in the measurement of the outcome’ and ‘bias in selection of the reported  
662 result’. Reporting was inadequate in many of the included studies, which made the assessment of risk of  
663 bias challenging. Notably, reporting of blinding, eligibility or selection criteria, as well as the enrolment  
664 of participants (i.e., a lack of CONSORT flow diagrams) was poor. Individual risk of bias assessments  
665 for each study design are provided in supplementary material (S5, S6, S11-14).

666

### 667 **3.5. Evidence appraisal using GRADE**

668 Overall, the GRADE assessment revealed a Moderate certainty in the body of evidence for improvements  
669 in  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , but a ‘Low’ certainty in the body of evidence for improvements in  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO (Table  
670 2). The certainty rating for  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  was downgraded due to imprecision and a lack of high-quality study  
671 designs, whereas  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  was downgraded as a result of imprecision. The certainty rating for PPO was  
672 downgraded due to imprecision and inconsistency, resulting from considerable heterogeneity in the  
673 included exercise interventions.

674

675 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]*

676

## 677 **4. DISCUSSION**

678 This review provides a large evidence-based summary and appraisal on the effects of prescribed and  
679 prospective exercise interventions >2 weeks on CRF in individuals with SCI. The results from the  
680 primary meta-analysis of RCTs support the role of exercise in improving CRF in this population by 0.16  
681 L/min and 9W in  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO, respectively. The primary meta-analysis also indicates a clinically  
682 meaningful change in  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  of 2.9 mL/kg/min. Subgroup analyses in the secondary, pooled meta-  
683 analysis revealed no effects of injury characteristics or exercise intervention parameters on  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , but  
684 an effect of exercise modality and length of intervention on  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ . There were also significant  
685 subgroup differences for PPO based on TSI, neurological level of injury, exercise modality, exercise  
686 intensity, method of exercise intensity prescription, and frequency of sessions per week. The GRADE  
687 assessment including RCTs and pre-post intervention studies revealed ‘Moderate’ certainty in the



688 evidence for improvements in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , yet ‘Low’ certainty in the evidence for significant improvements  
689 in  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO.

690

691 Following exercise interventions,  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  improves in individuals with both acute and chronic SCI.  
692 However, this review highlights the need for more exercise interventions in the acute phase post-SCI.  
693 Indeed, a recent review by Van der Scheer et al. [35] rated the confidence in the evidence base for  
694 exercise in acute SCI as ‘Very Low’, and called for more RCTs to control for the deteriorations in fitness  
695 and health occurring almost immediately following SCI. With regards to PPO in the current review, the  
696 meta-regression revealed a trend for an association between TSI and changes in PPO, with individuals  
697 with long-term injuries exhibiting smaller changes in PPO in comparison to those with relatively newer  
698 injuries. The subgroup analysis based on TSI also revealed that individuals with acute SCI exhibit a  
699 greater change than individuals with chronic SCI. This may be due to exercise being delivered in  
700 combination with standard of care inpatient rehabilitation for individuals with acute injuries, representing  
701 an additive effect. Indeed, the secondary meta-analysis with longitudinal observational studies indicates  
702 a 6W improvement in PPO with standard of care inpatient rehabilitation alone during the subacute period.  
703 This could be influenced by spontaneous motor recovery in the first few months following SCI [105]. Or  
704 alternatively, this subacute period may provide a familiarisation effect to novel modalities of exercise  
705 that patients were previously unaccustomed to and/or provides a notable stimulus to naive upper-body  
706 musculature following a period of bed rest and deconditioning, possibly representing a regression to the  
707 mean artefact. Ultimately, more rigorous RCTs are required in the subacute phase post-SCI that compare  
708 standard of care versus standard of care plus a specific exercise intervention to truly quantify the  
709 independent effects of a prescribed exercise intervention in the inpatient setting.

710

711 Exercise results in improved  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  regardless of the neurological level of injury. In particular, this  
712 review reveals a pooled improvement of 5.9 mL/kg/min in studies that included only individuals with  
713 tetraplegia (N=3 interventions). For comparison, there is a considerably larger evidence-base for studies  
714 including only individuals with paraplegia (N=31 interventions). A recent systematic review suggested  
715 that aerobic exercise results in minimal returns on investment in individuals with tetraplegia, with  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$   
716 improving on average only 9% following 10-37 weeks of training [106]. However, their review excluded  
717 studies with a sample size <10. Consequently, the Dicarlo study [93], which reported a 94% increase in



718  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  was excluded from their analysis. Whilst the inclusion of this study in the current analysis may  
719 have augmented the overall effect, as identified by our leave-one-out analysis, there was nothing  
720 untoward in this study to suggest a reason for this exaggerated response. Therefore, our findings indicate  
721 that exercise improves CRF in individuals with tetraplegia and that the magnitude of change is not  
722 significantly different to individuals with paraplegia.

723

724 However, the pooled meta-analysis highlights that individuals with paraplegia (16W) are likely to accrue  
725 greater absolute changes in PPO than those with tetraplegia (9W). Typically, higher neurological levels  
726 of injury result in a loss of trunk control, motor impairments in the upper-limbs and reduced mechanical  
727 efficiency, compared to lower levels of injury [107,108]. Therefore, individuals with tetraplegia may not  
728 have the physical or motor capacity to adapt as effectively as individuals with paraplegia, and thus could  
729 experience a ceiling effect with training. Indeed, a recent study identified lesion level as a significant  
730 predictor of PPO in a group of handcyclists with SCI [109]. To account for baseline motor function  
731 differences between individuals with tetraplegia and paraplegia, we determined relative percentage  
732 change for studies that included upper-body aerobic exercise interventions only. The relative percentage  
733 change was similar between neurological level of injury classifications: 46% tetraplegia (N=1  
734 interventions) vs. 53% paraplegia (N=9 interventions). While only one tetraplegia-only intervention was  
735 included in this subgroup analysis [110], normalising for baseline values seems to indicate similar  
736 relative magnitudes of change in PPO.

737

738 Williams et al. [111] recently demonstrated that individuals with a lower level of injury (<T6)  
739 significantly improved PPO compared to individuals with a higher level of injury ( $\geq$ T6), suggesting a  
740 potential role of disrupted cardiovascular control in mediating changes in PPO [112,113]. Whilst  
741 methods for ameliorating the reduction in sympathetic cardiovascular control typically associated with  
742 injuries  $\geq$ T6 have been investigated (e.g., abdominal binding [114], lower-body positive pressure [115],  
743 and midodrine [116]), the evidence for an improved CRF is still mixed. A recent case-report has indicated  
744 that epidural spinal cord stimulation (SCS) can safely and effectively restore cardiovascular control and  
745 improve CRF [117]. With an explosion in SCS studies over the last few years [118], particularly  
746 including transcutaneous SCS, the pairing of exercise with novel and non-invasive neuromodulatory  
747 approaches will likely continue to receive considerable research attention. Future, adequately powered,

748 research may want to consider separating participants into paraplegic and tetraplegic groups or  
749 dichotomize by injuries above and below T6 to account for differences in sympathetic cardiovascular  
750 control. Currently, there is a paucity of studies analysing data in this fashion, which limits our  
751 understanding of how neurological level of injury and the degree of impaired sympathetic cardiovascular  
752 control influences the magnitude of change in CRF following an exercise intervention. Researchers may  
753 want to consider conducting a battery of autonomic nervous system stress tests at baseline (e.g., Valsalva  
754 manoeuvre, head-up tilt, sympathetic skin responses etc. [119]), to determine the degree of supraspinal  
755 sympathetic disruption rather than relying on a neurological level of injury derived from a motor-sensory  
756 examination. This is important as recent research has indicated that cardiovascular instability cannot be  
757 predicted by motor-sensory level and completeness of SCI [120].

758

759 There were no significant subgroup differences in CRF based on injury severity. However, the subgroup  
760 analysis suggests that individuals with a motor-incomplete SCI may not yield PPO improvements of the  
761 same magnitude as individuals with a motor-complete SCI. This is most likely due to the majority of  
762 motor-incomplete studies implementing gait training as its exercise modality, which we reveal is the least  
763 effective modality for improving CRF. The gait training interventions that measured PPO (N=2  
764 interventions) used arm-crank ergometry (ACE) as the CPET modality, demonstrating no transfer effect  
765 from lower-body to upper-body exercise. During data extraction, reviewers noted poor reporting of injury  
766 severity in a number of studies. Whilst this may be due to older studies having used alternative severity  
767 scales (e.g., International Stoke Mandeville Games Federation or Frankel), researchers should endeavour  
768 to perform an International Standards for Neurological Classification of SCI (ISNCSCI) exam during  
769 screening, and subsequently report an AIS grade, to enable better comparisons to be made between injury  
770 severities in the future.

771

772 Van der Scheer et al. [35] concluded that there was high certainty in the evidence that exercise  
773 interventions  $\geq 2$  weeks can improve CRF in young and middle-aged adults. However, they revealed that  
774 there was a lack of studies exploring the effects of exercise in older adults with SCI (>65 years). The  
775 oldest mean age included in our review is 57.9 years [121], and thus supports their call for more research  
776 to be conducted in the older SCI population. Interestingly, our meta-regression identified that exercise  
777 interventions with a higher mean age were associated with smaller changes in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , suggesting that

778 older adults do not achieve the same CRF benefits as younger or middle-aged adults. This is not  
779 surprising given the progressive physical deconditioning that occurs naturally with age, as previously  
780 shown in the non-injured population [122]. Research indicates that SCI represents a model of advanced  
781 ageing [123], with the ageing process being exacerbated in individuals with SCI possibly due to  
782 diminished mobility independence resulting in physical deconditioning. Older adults with SCI find it  
783 harder to change body position, transfer, and move around independently in comparison to younger  
784 adults with SCI [124]. Moreover, it has been suggested that older adults with SCI do not perform volumes  
785 or intensities of leisure time physical activity required to achieve fitness benefits [125]. These changes  
786 will likely result in reduced incidental physical activity outside of a prescribed exercise intervention.  
787 Ageing skeletal muscle is also susceptible to mitochondrial dysfunction, which may be related to chronic  
788 inflammation (e.g., “inflammaging”), possibly explaining the diminished responses in CRF for older  
789 adults with SCI. Future research may want to investigate optimal strategies for improving CRF in older  
790 adults. Moreover, there is a need for more longitudinal studies that explore the age-related decline in  
791 CRF in the SCI population, and whether this is accelerated relative to the non-injured population.

792

793 Despite a number of recent reviews summarising the effects of specific exercise modalities on the change  
794 in CRF following SCI, including aerobic ACE [126], FES-cycling [36], and aerobic plus muscle strength  
795 training (mixed multimodal) interventions [127], to the best of our knowledge our secondary, pooled  
796 meta-analysis is the first to directly compare the effects of a wide range of exercise modalities on the  
797 change in CRF in individuals with SCI. This review revealed there was a significant subgroup difference  
798 in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , with the greatest changes gained via upper-body aerobic exercise or resistance training. The  
799 change in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  for upper-body aerobic exercise in the current review (21%) is equivalent to the  
800 average 21% improvement reported in a recent systematic review on the effects of ACE in chronic SCI  
801 [126]. Whilst the current review did not exclusively investigate ACE, it is evident that aerobic, volitional  
802 upper-body exercise training can improve CRF in individuals with SCI. Activating larger amounts of  
803 skeletal muscle mass via FES exercise interventions also appears to improve  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , yet it is  
804 noteworthy that more accessible and less expensive training modalities such as aerobic and resistance  
805 training may yield similar or even greater increases in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , despite utilising less muscle mass.  
806 Additionally,  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  improves following multimodal/hybrid exercise interventions, which challenges  
807 a 2015 review reporting inconclusive findings on the effects of combined upper-body aerobic and muscle

808 strength training on CRF [127]. Yet, as the current review included a wide range of interventions not  
809 restricted to the upper-body (e.g., aquatic treadmill [63], hybrid cycling [64,69,128], multimodal  
810 exercises [129,130], etc.), it is recommended that more research is conducted to delineate whether the  
811 improvements in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  with multimodal/hybrid exercise interventions are due to the combination of  
812 upper- and lower-body exercise modalities, or due to concurrent training modalities that predominantly  
813 use the upper-body (e.g., aerobic plus muscle strength training). Finally, both gait training and behaviour  
814 change interventions appear less effective at improving  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO.

815

816 Aerobic, upper-body exercise and resistance training modalities demonstrate the greatest improvements  
817 in PPO, by 15W and 20W, respectively. It is perhaps unsurprising that resistance training resulted in the  
818 largest change in PPO given that these interventions included upper-body exercises prescribed to increase  
819 muscular strength, as shown by Jacobs et al. [131]. Volitional exercise, as opposed to activity-based  
820 therapy modalities (i.e., interventions that provide activation of the neuromuscular system below the  
821 level of lesion with the goal of retraining the nervous system, such as FES and gait training), may  
822 therefore be more beneficial at improving PPO. Ultimately, these improvements have important  
823 ramifications for individuals with SCI that are dependent on performing functional upper-body  
824 movements such as transfers or wheelchair propulsion [99,103], and may lead to increased quality of life  
825 with more functional independence [132].

826

827 Several studies directly compared the effects of specific exercise modalities on the change in CRF  
828 [42,63,86]. Notably, Gorman et al. [63] demonstrated that there were no transfer effects from a robotic  
829 treadmill exercise intervention to ACE performance in a CPET. This review also demonstrates a trend  
830 for greater changes in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  are likely achieved when the CPET modality is matched to the  
831 intervention (S9). Therefore, researchers should endeavour to match the CPET modality to their exercise  
832 intervention, or at the very least be careful when interpreting changes in CRF when using different  
833 modalities.

834

835 The current SCI-specific exercise guidelines recommend that exercise should be performed at a  
836 moderate-to-vigorous intensity [21]. A recent overview of systematic reviews also advocated the use of  
837 moderate-to-vigorous intensity for improving aerobic fitness [133]. The current secondary, pooled meta-

838 analysis demonstrates robust improvements across all CRF outcomes for interventions prescribing  
839 exercise at this particular intensity. Furthermore, the secondary meta-analysis including cross-sectional  
840 studies reveals significant associations of a greater magnitude between MVPA and CRF, as compared to  
841 lower-intensity activity. Despite this, our classification of moderate-to-vigorous exercise intensity spans  
842 two of the ACSM exercise intensity thresholds (S3). There may be considerable variation in the actual  
843 intensity performed by participants given the noticeable range across the two thresholds (e.g., 46-90%  
844  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ , 64-95%  $HR_{\text{peak}}$ , 12-17 RPE etc.). Therefore, individuals with SCI and exercise practitioners  
845 should be cautious when prescribing such a broad exercise intensity.

846

847 The secondary meta-analysis comparing RCT exercise intensities reveals similar changes in CRF  
848 outcomes between moderate- and vigorous-intensity interventions. This is in agreement with a previous  
849 review [30] and supports the viewpoint from a special communication on high-intensity interval training  
850 (HIIT) [31], which suggested that vigorous-intensity exercise is more time efficient and may result in  
851 similar if not superior CRF and skeletal muscle oxidative capacity improvements in comparison to  
852 moderate-intensity exercise. Interestingly, in a response to a Letter-to-the-Editor [27], the SCI-specific  
853 exercise guideline developers acknowledge the need for shorter, effective protocols to be documented in  
854 the literature [134]. Furthermore, recent evidence has suggested that HIIT may be more enjoyable than  
855 moderate-intensity exercise for individuals with SCI [135], and so this form of training may offer a more  
856 time efficient and readily available alternative to moderate-intensity protocols. In the current review, a  
857 number of HIIT-based arm-crank ergometry, wheelchair propulsion, and FES hybrid cycling and skiing  
858 interventions demonstrated improvements in CRF [69,92,128,136–140]. The potential of “real-world”  
859 strategies such as virtual HIIT have also been discussed in a recent review by McMillan et al. [141].  
860 Future exercise interventions should look to compare the effects of different HIIT modalities/protocols  
861 (i.e., virtual home-based HIIT versus supervised arm-crank HIIT, the most appropriate number and/or  
862 length of intervals and recovery periods, vigorous or supramaximal exercise intensities) before concrete  
863 recommendations can be made on the most optimal HIIT prescription for improving CRF. Whilst efforts  
864 are ongoing to corroborate the safety and feasibility of HIIT [32,92,142] both researchers and individuals  
865 with SCI should be vigilant in identifying risks associated with HIIT such as shoulder discomfort or pain,  
866 skin irritation or pressure sores caused by abrasive movements, or increased spasticity, along with  
867 monitoring for post-exercise hypotension [143]. As higher-intensity exercise generates a greater

868 metabolic heat load than lower-intensity exercise, which increases core body temperature, considerations  
869 should be made for individuals with higher neurological levels of injury exercising at a high-intensity  
870 and/or in warm to hot ambient temperatures given their greater likelihood of experiencing  
871 thermoregulatory issues [144]. General contraindications for performing HIIT have been discussed in  
872 the non-injured population [145] yet they also apply for individuals with SCI.

873

874 This review reveals that  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  improves regardless of the method used to prescribe exercise intensity.  
875 With regards to PPO, subgroup difference indicates that the magnitude of change is greater when  
876 prescribing intensity via indices of HR (i.e., %HR<sub>peak</sub>, %HR<sub>max</sub>, %HRR) or  $\dot{V}O_2$  (i.e., % $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ,  
877 % $\dot{V}O_{2reserve}$ ), compared to RPE and workload. A recent systematic review concluded that exercise  
878 interventions using RPE to prescribe relative exercise intensities improved PPO in individuals with SCI  
879 [146]. Previous research has revealed that RPE results in inter-individual responses to exercise, with the  
880 potential for two individuals to perform the same bout of exercise either above or below lactate threshold  
881 despite being prescribed the same perceptually regulated intensity, which prevents the development of  
882 SCI-specific RPE recommendations [147]. These differences identified in our meta-analysis may also be  
883 due to individuals with SCI being unaccustomed to subjective measures of exertion. Accordingly, there  
884 have been calls for better reporting of the standardisation and familiarisation procedures used for RPE  
885 [146] and have only tentatively recommended its use before the evidence base is expanded [148].  
886 Therefore, it seems plausible to suggest that the blunted improvements in PPO with intensity prescribed  
887 via RPE, as compared to other prescription methods, may have resulted from insufficient familiarisation  
888 before an exercise intervention.

889

890 Although HR and  $\dot{V}O_2$  have long been used to prescribe exercise intensity, these approaches can result  
891 in large training ranges and ignore individual metabolic responses. Particularly, issues may arise with  
892 using HR for individuals with a neurological level of injury  $\geq T6$ , given that these individuals typically  
893 exhibit a lower HR<sub>peak</sub> [149]. The use of fixed percentages (i.e., %HR<sub>peak</sub>, % $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ) in the non-injured  
894 population has been questioned [150] and has recently been investigated in individuals with SCI,  
895 whereby Hutchinson et al. [56] showed that fixed %HR<sub>peak</sub> and % $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  could not guarantee a  
896 homogenous domain-specific exercise intensity prescription. Notably, individuals were spread across  
897 moderate, heavy and severe domains at the “moderate” and “vigorous” intensity classifications; thereby

908 questioning whether the “moderate-to-vigorous” terminology used in the SCI-specific exercise  
909 guidelines is suitable for adults with SCI.

900

901 Given that prescribing exercise intensity via HR and  $\dot{V}O_2$  can typically be resource and cost-intensive,  
902 there is some scope for using RPE as a cheaper and more practical method for community-based exercise  
903 prescription. However, this may not be as effective as other objective methods. Future research should  
904 aim to identify the optimal methods of exercise intensity prescription, as well as consider revisiting the  
905 current “moderate-to-vigorous intensity” recommendations. Moreover, further research may want to  
906 consider using traditional intensity anchors (e.g., the gas exchange threshold, critical power or lactate  
907 threshold) rather than prescribing exercise relative to physiological thresholds to see whether this results  
908 in more homogeneous CRF responses to exercise, given research in non-injured individuals suggests this  
909 may increase the precision of exercise intensity prescription [151,152]. However, it is worth  
910 acknowledging that it is not always possible to identify such traditional intensity anchors in individuals  
911 with higher levels of SCI [153,154].

912

913 Subgroup analyses based on frequency of sessions and exercise volume reveal no differences in  
914  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , thereby supporting the minimal volume of exercise required to attain CRF benefits in  
915 individuals with SCI. Furthermore, although there are no statistically significant subgroup differences  
916 for PPO based on exercise volume, there is a greater magnitude of change observed for individuals  
917 exercising 90-149 min/wk in comparison to 40-89 min/wk (12W vs 7W change, respectively). A greater  
918 weekly exercise volume may therefore accrue greater changes in PPO and, as already described, may be  
919 important in improving the capacity to perform daily tasks such as bed or wheelchair transfers [99,103].  
920 Although changes in CRF are similar between each exercise volume subgroup, and thus corresponding  
921 exercise guidelines, the secondary meta-analysis on cross-sectional cohorts indicates a significant  
922 cumulative impact of prolonged participation in physical activity and exercise. To support this point, a  
923 sensitivity analysis revealed a larger difference in  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  between inactive individuals and elite  
924 athletes, compared to between inactive and active individuals, suggesting that those who exercise more  
925 exhibit a greater CRF. Indeed, two cross-sectional association studies [40,98], reported significantly  
926 higher CRF in individuals with SCI that were habitually performing greater volumes of physical activity.  
927 Looking forward, longitudinal RCTs with multiple intervention arms would be the best way to explore



928 dose-response changes with regards to differing volumes of exercise, as has been done in the non-injured  
929 population [155–158].

930

931 Subgroup analysis based on length of intervention indicated that exercise interventions of 12 weeks or  
932 less yield greater changes in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  than those lasting >12 weeks. This may be explained by  
933 compliance and adherence issues during prolonged interventions (i.e., >12 weeks). Indeed, the two  
934 behaviour change studies included in this subgroup analysis observed minimal changes in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$   
935 following 16 [82] and 24 weeks [39]. This perhaps emphasises the benefit of short and intensive exercise  
936 interventions  $\leq 12$  weeks as well as the need for supervised exercise sessions in prolonged interventions  
937 to ensure compliance and meaningful changes in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ .

938

939 Adverse events were reported for at least 3.7% of the total included participants, with the majority of  
940 events related to skin irritation, pressure sores or ulcers. Qualitatively, there was no particular exercise  
941 modality that suggested an increased risk for an adverse event, but higher-intensity exercise appeared to  
942 reveal more adverse events, albeit being swayed by one study in particular [130]. Reporting was poor in  
943 a number of studies with reviewers at times unable to determine the exact number of events per  
944 participant. Furthermore, there is generally a lack of follow-up assessments following exercise  
945 interventions, so it is currently unknown whether there are any detrimental long-term effects of exercise  
946 in the SCI population. Going forward, researchers are encouraged to follow a standardised adverse event  
947 reporting procedure (including serious and non-serious adverse events) and ensure that they are  
948 transparent with reporting of both the nature and the total numbers of each event, either related or  
949 unrelated to the exercise intervention.

950

#### 951 **4.1. Strengths and limitations of the review and future directions**

##### 952 **4.1.1. Limitations of the included studies**

953 Poor reporting of injury characteristics and exercise parameters prevented a perfect comparison of  
954 exercise interventions. Overall, studies could have provided more precise descriptions of training  
955 parameters to aid with any future refinements to the SCI-specific exercise guidelines. Reporting of  
956 adherence to interventions was also poor and should be encouraged to provide an indication of the  
957 feasibility or applicability of specific exercise interventions for individuals with SCI. Moreover, adverse



958 events should be transparently reported, even if none occur so that practitioners are able to identify forms  
959 of exercise that are most likely to be safe for this population. Additionally, studies typically failed to  
960 utilise the training principle of progression, which during prolonged exercise interventions is essential  
961 for preventing a plateau in training adaptations and perhaps particularly important in this population for  
962 supporting the transition from an inactive lifestyle to higher levels of activity, and ultimately achieving  
963 greater CRF benefits [24]. On the whole, the reporting of  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  attainment criteria was poor, with only  
964 24% of the included exercise interventions using at least two criterion methods for identifying when an  
965 individual had reached peak capacity, as recently recommended by Alrashidi et al. [159]. At least two  
966 methods [e.g., RPE  $\geq 17$ , respiratory exchange ratio (RER)  $\geq 1.1$ , plateau in oxygen uptake] should be  
967 adopted for confirming the attainment of a true  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  to prevent magnitudes of change in CRF from  
968 being inflated or underestimated. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, only 30% of interventions  
969 had a prospectively registered clinical trial entry and only 7.7% had a protocol manuscript published. To  
970 sustain the integrity and transparency of reporting in this field, researchers are encouraged to  
971 prospectively register any planned clinical trials using publicly available repositories.

972

973 The risk of bias assessments on pre-post studies revealed that no study conducted multiple baseline or  
974 follow-up assessments. Whilst often time-consuming and impractical with larger sample sizes, multiple  
975 assessments ensure reproducibility by accounting for any technical or biological variation, as shown  
976 previously in non-injured individuals at risk for type-2 diabetes [160]. In the SCI population, individuals  
977 are typically deconditioned and often exhibit variable responses to a CPET. This variance may be  
978 explained by profound blood pressure instability [161], including unintentional ‘boosting’ via episodes  
979 of autonomic dysreflexia [162]. Researchers should therefore consider performing multiple CPETs at  
980 baseline and follow-up to attain reliable assessments of CRF.

981

982 There are also several limitations with regards to the studies included in the secondary meta-analyses for  
983 this review. First, there is only one cross-sectional study using a research-grade wearable device to  
984 investigate the association between physical activity and CRF [98]. Whilst self-report questionnaires are  
985 valid tools for estimating levels of physical activity [97,163–165], there are important drawbacks  
986 including the difficulty of accurately capturing intensity, lack of questionnaires measuring activities of  
987 daily living, and recall bias. Secondly, there is a lack of RCTs comparing near-maximal, maximal or

988 supramaximal exercise intensities to moderate-intensity exercise. The only supramaximal intervention  
989 included in this review demonstrated a 17W improvement in PPO [139]. The inclusion of more RCTs  
990 comparing vigorous-intensity to lower intensity exercise could identify whether there are, in fact, benefits  
991 to performing shorter but more vigorous-intensity exercise bouts, in comparison to longer continuous  
992 forms of exercise.

993

#### 994 **4.1.2. Strengths and limitations of the review**

995 A major strength of the current study is that we pre-planned and prospectively registered (PROSPERO  
996 ID CRD42018104342) our systematic review. We used GRADE to assess the certainty in the body of  
997 evidence and used quality appraisal tools for the specific study designs included in this review. Our  
998 GRADE assessment demonstrates generalisability within the SCI population, through the inclusion of  
999 participants across the lifespan and with a wide range of injury characteristics. Yet, the ‘Low’ confidence  
1000 in the evidence for  $\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  and PPO emphasises the need for more rigorous exercise interventions to  
1001 address current gaps in the literature [35]. The disparity in GRADE confidence ratings across the specific  
1002 CRF outcomes likely is a factor of the variability of the total number of included interventions across  
1003 outcomes  $\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  (N=74),  $\dot{R}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  (N=79) and PPO (N=65).

1004

1005 As there were not enough RCTs to perform subgroup comparisons and a meta-regression on this study  
1006 design specifically, we pooled pre-post (N=81) and RCT (N=36) exercise interventions. This is in  
1007 accordance with Cochrane guidance stating that the inclusion of non-randomised study designs is  
1008 justified when there are only a small number of RCTs available to provide evidence of the effects of  
1009 interventions [53]. To consider this limitation, we generated firepower plots to explore the statistical  
1010 power of the included RCTs and pre-post studies. These plots demonstrate that the RCTs had greater  
1011 median statistical power across CRF outcomes and were designed to reliably detect a wider range of  
1012 effect sizes than the pre-post studies. However, the changes in  $\dot{R}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  and PPO in the primary meta-  
1013 analysis of RCT interventions relative to controls (2.9 mL/kg/min and 9W, respectively) are similar to  
1014 those reported in the secondary, pooled meta-analysis (2.8 mL/kg/min and 11W, respectively), and thus  
1015 confirms the robustness of our overall findings. Furthermore, our rigorous approach of adjusting for  
1016 multiple comparisons minimises any erroneous interpretations of subgroup differences and therefore  
1017 strengthens our conclusions on the available evidence.

1018

1019 Despite this, the categorisation of interventions within each subgroup could be considered a limitation of  
1020 the current review. Whilst this was done to directly compare the effects of different subgroups (i.e., acute  
1021 vs chronic, tetraplegia vs paraplegia, aerobic vs resistance vs FES etc.), it resulted in an unequal number  
1022 of interventions within each classification and likely underpowered the subgroup comparisons. For  
1023 example, the subgroup analysis based on exercise intensity reveals an effect of exercise intensity on PPO,  
1024 yet this may be influenced by the small number of interventions for light- and supramaximal-intensity.  
1025 Despite reporting some significant subgroup differences across dichotomised studies, these variables  
1026 were not identified as significant moderator variables in the random-effects meta-regression, meaning  
1027 these findings should be viewed with caution. It is perhaps more of a limitation of the evidence-base *per*  
1028 *se*, rather than our meta-analysis, in that more RCTs should be conducted to increase the power of these  
1029 subgroups. Another limitation is that despite our comprehensive search strategy we may have missed  
1030 relevant studies as abstracts, theses, and other unpublished work were not included.

1031

#### 1032 **4.2. Clinical implications and future directions**

1033 Our results support the current guidelines regarding the minimal weekly volume of exercise necessary to  
1034 improve CRF in the SCI population. However, our pooled analysis indicates subgroup differences for  
1035 PPO based on certain exercise intervention parameters. To the best of our knowledge, there are no large-  
1036 scale epidemiological studies investigating the dose-response relationship between physical activity and  
1037 CRF in this population using sensitive and validated methods to quantify the exposure variable (e.g. free-  
1038 living physical activity). Such studies have been performed in non-injured individuals [166,167]. To  
1039 identify the optimal stimulus for beneficial CRF responses in this population, dose-ranging studies, akin  
1040 to those that are used in the pharmaceutical industry, should be conducted. A recent overview of  
1041 systematic reviews [168] highlighted the poor reporting in exercise interventions in health and disease  
1042 and called upon the inclusion of checklists [e.g., the Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template (CERT)  
1043 [169] or the Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) [170]] to improve study  
1044 quality. This would ultimately lead to a better understanding of the ‘dose’ of exercise as medicine  
1045 required to optimise CRF outcomes in this population.

1046

1047 Both the primary meta-analysis of RCTs ( $\Delta 2.9$  mL/kg/min) and the secondary, pooled meta-analysis  
1048 ( $\Delta 2.8$  mL/kg/min) reveal that exercise interventions >2 weeks result in an overall increase in  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$   
1049 which is roughly equivalent to 1 MET-SCI [metabolic equivalent in SCI (2.7 mL/kg/min)] [55]. An  
1050 increase in maximal aerobic capacity (an estimate of CRF) by 1 MET (3.5 mL/kg/min) in non-injured  
1051 individuals is associated with a 13% and 15% reduction in all-cause and cardiovascular mortality,  
1052 respectively [171]. The current review shows that individuals meeting the SCI-specific guidelines for  
1053 cardiometabolic health [21] can improve  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  to a similar magnitude to the overall pooled effect (~1  
1054 MET-SCI), highlighting that these guidelines may offer a reduction in CVD risk, and therefore mortality.  
1055 Nonetheless, an association between an improvement in CRF and a reduction in mortality is yet to be  
1056 established specifically in the SCI population and remains an important avenue of research for the future.

1057

## 1058 5. CONCLUSION

1059 This systematic review with meta-analysis provides an updated, evidence-based summary of the effects  
1060 of exercise interventions on CRF in individuals with SCI. Based on evidence of moderate-to-low  
1061 certainty, exercise interventions >2 weeks are associated with significant improvements in CRF, and in  
1062 particular, a clinically meaningful change in  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ . Subgroup comparisons identified that upper-body,  
1063 aerobic exercise and resistance training appear the most effective at improving  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO.  
1064 Furthermore, acutely-injured, paraplegic individuals, exercising at a moderate-to-vigorous intensity,  
1065 prescribed via  $\dot{V}O_2$  or HR (at a minimum of either 46%  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , 64%  $HR_{peak}$ , or 40%  $HRR/\dot{V}O_{2reserve}$ , in  
1066 accordance with ACSM classifications), for more than 3 sessions/week will likely experience the greatest  
1067 change in PPO. Exercise interventions up to 12-weeks are also most likely to lead to improvements in  
1068  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ . The meta-regression revealed that older adults may experience smaller changes in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$   
1069 following an exercise intervention. Importantly, there is an ever-growing need for studies to establish a  
1070 dose-response relationship between exercise and CRF in the SCI population to determine the most  
1071 optimal form of exercise prescription to reduce the wide-ranging consequences typically associated with  
1072 SCI. To improve the certainty of evidence in the field moving forward, we call for the development of  
1073 an SCI-specific reporting template for exercise interventions, as well as encourage researchers to pre-  
1074 register and/or publish protocol papers for prospective clinical exercise trials. Researchers should also  
1075 consider whether injury characteristics or participant demographics (e.g., impact of neurological level of

1076 injury/severity on motor-sensory or autonomic cardiovascular control, age, sex) influence changes in  
1077 CRF outcomes with a period of exercise training.

1078

## 1079 **6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

1080 We would like to thank Mr. Sajjad Tavassoly (Faculty of Medicine, UBC, Vancouver, Canada) for his  
1081 assistance with piloting the initial database search. We would also like to thank Dr. Matthew Querée  
1082 (Department of Physical Therapy, UBC, Spinal Cord Injury Research Evidence Team, GF Strong  
1083 Rehabilitation Centre, Vancouver, Canada) for his assistance with the risk of bias assessments. We  
1084 appreciate the assistance of Mr Adrian Cheng (ICORD) and Dr. Alex Williams (ICORD), who helped  
1085 pilot the inclusion/exclusion of articles and supported the use of Photoshop to extract data from figures,  
1086 respectively. We thank Dr. Sam Weaver (University of Birmingham) for support with the meta-analysis  
1087 using R. Figure 3 was created using Biorender.com.

1088

## 1089 **7. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>IRM</b>	One repetition maximum
	Arm-crank ergometry
<b>ACSM</b>	American College of Sports Medicine
<b>AIS</b>	American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale
<b><math>\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math></b>	Absolute peak oxygen uptake
<b>CENTRAL</b>	Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
<b>CERT</b>	Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template
<b>CI</b>	Confidence interval
<b>CPET</b>	Cardiopulmonary exercise test
<b>CRF</b>	Cardiorespiratory fitness
<b>CVD</b>	Cardiovascular disease
<b>EMBASE</b>	Excerpta Medica Database
<b>FES</b>	Functional electrical stimulation
<b>GRADE</b>	Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation

<b>HIIT</b>	High-intensity interval training
<b>HR</b>	Heart rate
<b>HR<sub>max</sub></b>	Maximum heart rate (age-predicted)
<b>HR<sub>peak</sub></b>	Peak heart rate
<b>HRR</b>	Heart rate reserve
<b>IQR</b>	Interquartile range
<b>ISNCSCI</b>	International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury
<b>LTPA</b>	Leisure time physical activity
<b>MET</b>	Metabolic equivalent
<b>MTP</b>	Maximal tolerated power
<b>MVPA</b>	Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity
<b>PPO</b>	Peak power output
<b>PRISMA</b>	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews
<b>RCT</b>	Randomised-controlled trial
<b>RoB 2</b>	The Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool
<b>RPE</b>	Rating of perceived exertion
<b>R<math>\dot{V}</math>O<sub>2peak</sub></b>	Relative peak oxygen uptake
<b>SCI</b>	Spinal cord injury
<b>SCS</b>	Spinal cord stimulation
<b>SD</b>	Standard deviation
<b>TIDieR</b>	Template for Intervention Description and Replication
<b>TSI</b>	Time since injury
<b><math>\dot{V}</math>O<sub>2</sub></b>	Oxygen uptake
<b><math>\dot{V}</math>O<sub>2peak</sub></b>	Peak oxygen uptake
<b><math>\dot{V}</math>O<sub>2reserve</sub></b>	Reserve oxygen uptake
<b>W</b>	Watts
<b>WMD</b>	Weighted mean difference

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094 **8. REFERENCES**

- 1095 1. Miller LE, Herbert WG. Health and economic benefits of physical activity for patients with spinal  
1096 cord injury. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res.* 2016;8: 551–558.
- 1097 2. Rimmer JH, Schiller W, Chen M-D. Effects of disability-associated low energy expenditure  
1098 deconditioning syndrome. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev.* 2012;40: 22–29.
- 1099 3. Cragg JJ, Noonan VK, Dvorak M, Krassioukov A, Mancini GBJ, Borisoff JF. Spinal cord injury  
1100 and type 2 diabetes: results from a population health survey. *Neurology.* 2013;81: 1864–1868.
- 1101 4. Cragg JJ, Noonan VK, Krassioukov A, Borisoff J. Cardiovascular disease and spinal cord injury:  
1102 results from a national population health survey. *Neurology.* 2013;81: 723–728.
- 1103 5. Wu J-C, Chen Y-C, Liu L, Chen T-J, Huang W-C, Cheng H, et al. Increased risk of stroke after  
1104 spinal cord injury: a nationwide 4-year follow-up cohort study. *Neurology.* 2012;78: 1051–1057.
- 1105 6. Ross R, Blair SN, Arena R, Church TS, Després J-P, Franklin BA, et al. Importance of Assessing  
1106 Cardiorespiratory Fitness in Clinical Practice: A Case for Fitness as a Clinical Vital Sign: A  
1107 Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation.* 2016;134: e653–e699.
- 1108 7. Clausen Johan S.R., Marott Jacob L., Holtermann Andreas, Gyntelberg Finn, Jensen Magnus T.  
1109 Midlife Cardiorespiratory Fitness and the Long-Term Risk of Mortality. *J Am Coll Cardiol.*  
1110 2018;72: 987–995.
- 1111 8. Lee D-C, Sui X, Artero EG, Lee I-M, Church TS, McAuley PA, et al. Long-term effects of  
1112 changes in cardiorespiratory fitness and body mass index on all-cause and cardiovascular disease  
1113 mortality in men: the Aerobics Center Longitudinal Study. *Circulation.* 2011;124: 2483–2490.
- 1114 9. Myers J, Prakash M, Froelicher V, Do D, Partington S, Atwood JE. Exercise capacity and  
1115 mortality among men referred for exercise testing. *N Engl J Med.* 2002;346: 793–801.
- 1116 10. Laukkanen JA, Kurl S, Salonen R, Rauramaa R, Salonen JT. The predictive value of  
1117 cardiorespiratory fitness for cardiovascular events in men with various risk profiles: a prospective  
1118 population-based cohort study. *Eur Heart J.* 2004;25: 1428–1437.
- 1119 11. Erikssen G, Liestøl K, Bjørnholt J, Thaulow E, Sandvik L, Erikssen J. Changes in physical fitness  
1120 and changes in mortality. *Lancet.* 1998;352: 759–762.
- 1121 12. Lee DC, Sui X, Ortega FB, Kim Y-S, Church TS, Winnett RA, et al. Comparisons of leisure-time  
1122 physical activity and cardiorespiratory fitness as predictors of all-cause mortality in men and  
1123 women. *Br J Sports Med.* 2011;45: 504–510.
- 1124 13. Haisma JA, van der Woude LHV, Stam HJ, Bergen MP, Sluis TAR, Bussmann JBJ. Physical  
1125 capacity in wheelchair-dependent persons with a spinal cord injury: a critical review of the  
1126 literature. *Spinal Cord.* 2006;44: 642–652.
- 1127 14. Simmons OL, Kressler J, Nash MS. Reference fitness values in the untrained spinal cord injury  
1128 population. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2014;95: 2272–2278.
- 1129 15. Stofan JR, DiPietro L, Davis D, Kohl HW 3rd, Blair SN. Physical activity patterns associated with  
1130 cardiorespiratory fitness and reduced mortality: the Aerobics Center Longitudinal Study. *Am J*  
1131 *Public Health.* 1998;88: 1807–1813.
- 1132 16. Nightingale TE, Williams S, Thompson D, Bilzon JJJ. Energy balance components in persons  
1133 with paraplegia: daily variation and appropriate measurement duration. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.*  
1134 2017;14: 132.
- 1135 17. van den Berg-Emons RJ, Bussmann JB, Stam HJ. Accelerometry-based activity spectrum in  
1136 persons with chronic physical conditions. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2010;91: 1856–1861.
- 1137 18. Hicks AL, Martin Ginis KA, Pelletier CA, Ditor DS, Foulon B, Wolfe DL. The effects of exercise



- 1138 training on physical capacity, strength, body composition and functional performance among  
1139 adults with spinal cord injury: a systematic review. *Spinal Cord*. 2011;49: 1103–1127.
- 1140 19. Valent L, Dallmeijer A, Houdijk H, Talsma E, van der Woude L. The effects of upper body  
1141 exercise on the physical capacity of people with a spinal cord injury: a systematic review. *Clin*  
1142 *Rehabil*. 2007;21: 315–330.
- 1143 20. Ginis KAM, Hicks AL, Latimer AE, Warburton DER, Bourne C, Ditor DS, et al. The  
1144 development of evidence-informed physical activity guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury.  
1145 *Spinal Cord*. 2011;49: 1088–1096.
- 1146 21. Martin Ginis KA, van der Scheer JW, Latimer-Cheung AE, Barrow A, Bourne C, Carruthers P, et  
1147 al. Evidence-based scientific exercise guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury: an update and a  
1148 new guideline. *Spinal Cord*. 2018;56: 308–321.
- 1149 22. Smith B, Kirby N, Skinner B, Wightman L, Lucas R, Foster C. Infographic. Physical activity for  
1150 disabled adults. *Br J Sports Med*. 2019;53: 335–336.
- 1151 23. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, Borodulin K, Buman MP, Cardon G, et al. World Health  
1152 Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J Sports Med*.  
1153 2020;54: 1451–1462.
- 1154 24. Tweedy SM, Beckman EM, Geraghty TJ, Theisen D, Perret C, Harvey LA, et al. Exercise and  
1155 sports science Australia (ESSA) position statement on exercise and spinal cord injury. *J Sci Med*  
1156 *Sport*. 2017;20: 108–115.
- 1157 25. Piercy KL, Troiano RP, Ballard RM, Carlson SA, Fulton JE, Galuska DA, et al. The Physical  
1158 Activity Guidelines for Americans. *JAMA*. 2018;320: 2020–2028.
- 1159 26. Powell KE, Paluch AE, Blair SN. Physical activity for health: What kind? How much? How  
1160 intense? On top of what? *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2011;32: 349–365.
- 1161 27. Tweedy SM, Beckman EM, Connick MJ, Geraghty TJ, Theisen D, Perret C, et al. Correspondence  
1162 re “Evidence-based scientific exercise guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury: an update and  
1163 new guideline.” *Spinal cord*. 2018. pp. 406–408.
- 1164 28. Yue T, Wang Y, Liu H, Kong Z, Qi F. Effects of High-Intensity Interval vs. Moderate-Intensity  
1165 Continuous Training on Cardiac Rehabilitation in Patients With Cardiovascular Disease: A  
1166 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2022;9: 845225.
- 1167 29. Hannan AL, Hing W, Simas V, Climstein M, Coombes JS, Jayasinghe R, et al. High-intensity  
1168 interval training versus moderate-intensity continuous training within cardiac rehabilitation: a  
1169 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Open Access J Sports Med*. 2018;9: 1–17.
- 1170 30. Peters J, Abou L, Rice LA, Dandeneau K, Alluri A, Salvador AF, et al. The effectiveness of  
1171 vigorous training on cardiorespiratory fitness in persons with spinal cord injury: a systematic  
1172 review and meta-analysis. *Spinal Cord*. 2021;59: 1035–1044.
- 1173 31. Nightingale TE, Metcalfe RS, Vollaard NB, Bilzon JL. Exercise Guidelines to Promote  
1174 Cardiometabolic Health in Spinal Cord Injured Humans: Time to Raise the Intensity? *Arch Phys*  
1175 *Med Rehabil*. 2017;98: 1693–1704.
- 1176 32. Astorino TA, Hicks AL, Bilzon JL. Viability of high intensity interval training in persons with  
1177 spinal cord injury—a perspective review. *Spinal Cord*. 2021;59: 3–8.
- 1178 33. Farrow M, Nightingale TE, Maher J, McKay CD, Thompson D, Bilzon JL. Effect of Exercise on  
1179 Cardiometabolic Risk Factors in Adults With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review.  
1180 *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2020;101: 2177–2205.
- 1181 34. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for  
1182 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*. 2009;339: b2535.



- 1183 35. van der Scheer JW, Martin Ginis KA, Ditor DS, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, Hicks AL, West CR, et al.  
1184 Effects of exercise on fitness and health of adults with spinal cord injury: A systematic review.  
1185 *Neurology*. 2017;89: 736–745.
- 1186 36. van der Scheer JW, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, Valentino SE, Davis GM, Ho CH. Functional electrical  
1187 stimulation cycling exercise after spinal cord injury: a systematic review of health and fitness-  
1188 related outcomes. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*. 2021;18: 99.
- 1189 37. Jackson JL, Kuriyama A, Anton A, Choi A, Fournier J-P, Geier A-K, et al. The Accuracy of  
1190 Google Translate for Abstracting Data From Non-English-Language Trials for Systematic  
1191 Reviews. *Ann Intern Med*. 2019;171: 677–679.
- 1192 38. Lannem AM, Sørensen M, Lidal IB, Hjeltnes N. Perceptions of exercise mastery in persons with  
1193 complete and incomplete spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord*. 2010;48: 388–392.
- 1194 39. Bombardier CH, Dyer JR, Burns P, Crane DA, Takahashi MM, Barber J, et al. A tele-health  
1195 intervention to increase physical fitness in people with spinal cord injury and cardiometabolic  
1196 disease or risk factors: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Spinal Cord*. 2021;59: 63–73.
- 1197 40. Hoevenaars D, Holla JFM, Postma K, van der Woude LHV, Janssen TWJ, de Groot S.  
1198 Associations between meeting exercise guidelines, physical fitness, and health in people with  
1199 spinal cord injury. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2022; 1–8.
- 1200 41. Piira A, Lannem AM, Sørensen M, Glott T, Knutsen R, Jørgensen L, et al. Manually assisted  
1201 body-weight supported locomotor training does not re-establish walking in non-walking subjects  
1202 with chronic incomplete spinal cord injury: A randomized clinical trial. *J Rehabil Med*. 2019;51:  
1203 113–119.
- 1204 42. Farkas GJ, Gorgey AS, Dolbow DR, Berg AS, Gater DR Jr. Energy Expenditure,  
1205 Cardiorespiratory Fitness, and Body Composition Following Arm Cycling or Functional Electrical  
1206 Stimulation Exercises in Spinal Cord Injury: A 16-Week Randomized Controlled Trial. *Top*  
1207 *Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil*. 2021;27: 121–134.
- 1208 43. Dallmeijer AJ, Hopman MT, van der Woude LH. Lipid, lipoprotein, and apolipoprotein profiles in  
1209 active and sedentary men with tetraplegia. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1997;78: 1173–1176.
- 1210 44. Davis GM, Shephard RJ, Leenen FH. Cardiac effects of short term arm crank training in  
1211 paraplegics: echocardiographic evidence. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol*. 1987;56: 90–96.
- 1212 45. Hansen RK, Samani A, Laessoe U, Handberg A, Mellergaard M, Figlewski K, et al. Rowing  
1213 exercise increases cardiorespiratory fitness and brachial artery diameter but not traditional  
1214 cardiometabolic risk factors in spinal cord-injured humans. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2023; 1–15.
- 1215 46. Higgins JPT, Sterne JAC, Savovic J, Page MJ, Hróbjartsson A, Boutron I, et al. A revised tool for  
1216 assessing risk of bias in randomized trials. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;10: 29–31.
- 1217 47. McGuinness LA, Higgins JPT. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and Shiny web  
1218 app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. *Res Synth Methods*. 2021;12: 55–61.
- 1219 48. American College Medicine. ACSM’s guidelines for exercise testing and prescription. 9th ed.  
1220 Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2013. Available: <https://shop.lww.com/ACSM-s-Guidelines-for-Exercise-Testing-and-Prescription/p/9781975150181>  
1221
- 1222 49. Higgins JPT, Li T, Deeks JJ. Choosing effect measures and computing estimates of effect.  
1223 *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. Wiley; 2019. pp. 143–176.  
1224 doi:10.1002/9781119536604.ch6
- 1225 50. Hozo SP, Djulbegovic B, Hozo I. Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and  
1226 the size of a sample. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2005;5: 13.
- 1227 51. Viechtbauer W. Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *J Stat Softw*. 2010;36:  
1228 1–48.

- 1229 52. Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial.  
1230 Evid Based Ment Health. 2019;22: 153–160.
- 1231 53. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. Cochrane Handbook for  
1232 Systematic Reviews of Interventions. John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
- 1233 54. Quintana DS. A Guide for Calculating Study-Level Statistical Power for Meta-Analyses.  
1234 Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science. 2023;6: 25152459221147260.
- 1235 55. Collins EG, Gater D, Kiratli J, Butler J, Hanson K, Langbein WE. Energy cost of physical  
1236 activities in persons with spinal cord injury. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2010;42: 691–700.
- 1237 56. Hutchinson MJ, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Rethinking aerobic exercise intensity prescription in adults  
1238 with spinal cord injury: time to end the use of “moderate to vigorous” intensity? Spinal Cord.  
1239 2021; 1–7.
- 1240 57. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Controlling the risk of spurious findings from meta-regression. Stat  
1241 Med. 2004;23: 1663–1682.
- 1242 58. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an  
1243 emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ.  
1244 2008;336: 924–926.
- 1245 59. Han D-S, Hsiao M-Y, Wang T-G, Chen S-Y, Yang W-S. Association of serum myokines and  
1246 aerobic exercise training in patients with spinal cord injury: an observational study. BMC Neurol.  
1247 2016;16: 142.
- 1248 60. Hoekstra F, van Nunen MPM, Gerrits KHL, Stolwijk-Swüste JM, Crins MHP, Janssen TWJ.  
1249 Effect of robotic gait training on cardiorespiratory system in incomplete spinal cord injury. J  
1250 Rehabil Res Dev. 2013;50: 1411–1422.
- 1251 61. Pollack SF, Axen K, Spielholz N, Levin N, Haas F, Ragnarsson KT. Aerobic training effects of  
1252 electrically induced lower extremity exercises in spinal cord injured people. Arch Phys Med  
1253 Rehabil. 1989;70: 214–219.
- 1254 62. Barstow TJ, Scremin AM, Mutton DL, Kunkel CF, Cagle TG, Whipp BJ. Changes in gas  
1255 exchange kinetics with training in patients with spinal cord injury. Med Sci Sports Exerc.  
1256 1996;28: 1221–1228.
- 1257 63. Gorman PH, Scott W, VanHiel L, Tansey KE, Sweatman WM, Geigle PR. Comparison of peak  
1258 oxygen consumption response to aquatic and robotic therapy in individuals with chronic motor  
1259 incomplete spinal cord injury: a randomized controlled trial. Spinal Cord. 2019;57: 471–481.
- 1260 64. Heesterbeek PJC, Berkelmans HWA, Thijssen DHJ, van Kuppevelt HJM, Hopman MTE,  
1261 Duysens J. Increased physical fitness after 4-week training on a new hybrid FES-cycle in persons  
1262 with spinal cord injury. Technol Disabil. 2005;17: 103–110.
- 1263 65. Mutton DL, Scremin AM, Barstow TJ, Scott MD, Kunkel CF, Cagle TG. Physiologic responses  
1264 during functional electrical stimulation leg cycling and hybrid exercise in spinal cord injured  
1265 subjects. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 1997;78: 712–718.
- 1266 66. Ozturk ED, Lapointe MS, Kim D-I, Hamner JW, Tan CO. Effect of 6-Month Exercise Training on  
1267 Neurovascular Function in Spinal Cord Injury. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2021;53: 38–46.
- 1268 67. Hooker SP, Scremin AM, Mutton DL, Kunkel CF, Cagle G. Peak and submaximal physiologic  
1269 responses following electrical stimulation leg cycle ergometer training. J Rehabil Res Dev.  
1270 1995;32: 361–366.
- 1271 68. Hooker SP, Figoni SF, Rodgers MM, Glaser RM, Mathews T, Suryaprasad AG, et al. Physiologic  
1272 effects of electrical stimulation leg cycle exercise training in spinal cord injured persons. Arch  
1273 Phys Med Rehabil. 1992;73: 470–476.

- 1274 69. Hasnan N, Engkasan JP, Husain R, Davis GM. High-Intensity Virtual-reality Arm plus FES-leg  
1275 Interval Training in Individuals with Spinal Cord Injury. *Biomed Tech* . 2013;58 Suppl 1.  
1276 doi:10.1515/bmt-2013-4028
- 1277 70. Janssen TWJ, Pringle DD. Effects of modified electrical stimulation-induced leg cycle ergometer  
1278 training for individuals with spinal cord injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2008;45: 819–830.
- 1279 71. Jeon JY, Hettinga D, Steadward RD, Wheeler GD, Bell G, Harber V. Reduced plasma glucose and  
1280 leptin after 12 weeks of functional electrical stimulation-rowing exercise training in spinal cord  
1281 injury patients. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2010;91: 1957–1959.
- 1282 72. Midha M, Schmitt JK, Sclater M. Exercise effect with the wheelchair aerobic fitness trainer on  
1283 conditioning and metabolic function in disabled persons: a pilot study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*.  
1284 1999;80: 258–261.
- 1285 73. Milia R, Roberto S, Marongiu E, Olla S, Sanna I, Angius L, et al. Improvement in hemodynamic  
1286 responses to metaboreflex activation after one year of training in spinal cord injured humans.  
1287 *Biomed Res Int*. 2014;2014: 893468.
- 1288 74. Lavado EL, Cardoso JR, Silva LGA, Dela Bela LF, Atallah AN. Effectiveness of aerobic physical  
1289 training for treatment of chronic asymptomatic bacteriuria in subjects with spinal cord injury: a  
1290 randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil*. 2013;27: 142–149.
- 1291 75. Brazg G, Fahey M, Holleran CL, Connolly M, Woodward J, Hennessy PW, et al. Effects of  
1292 Training Intensity on Locomotor Performance in Individuals With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A  
1293 Randomized Crossover Study. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2017;31: 944–954.
- 1294 76. Schleifer G, Solinsky R, Hamner JW, Picard G, Taylor JA. Hybrid Functional Electrical  
1295 Stimulation Improves Anaerobic Threshold in First Three Years after Spinal Cord Injury. *J*  
1296 *Neurotrauma*. 2022;39: 1050–1056.
- 1297 77. Beillot J, Carré F, Le Claire G, Thoumie P, Perruoin-Verbe B, Cormerais A, et al. Energy  
1298 consumption of paraplegic locomotion using reciprocating gait orthosis. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup*  
1299 *Physiol*. 1996;73: 376–381.
- 1300 78. Koch I, Schlegel M, Pirrwitz A, Jaschke B, Schlegel K. [Objectification of the training effect of  
1301 sports therapy for wheelchair users]. *Int J Rehabil Res*. 1983;6: 439–448.
- 1302 79. Kooijmans H, Post MWM, Stam HJ, van der Woude LHV, Spijkerman DCM, Snoek GJ, et al.  
1303 Effectiveness of a Self-Management Intervention to Promote an Active Lifestyle in Persons With  
1304 Long-Term Spinal Cord Injury: The HABITS Randomized Clinical Trial. *Neurorehabil Neural*  
1305 *Repair*. 2017;31: 991–1004.
- 1306 80. Ma JK, West CR, Martin Ginis KA. The Effects of a Patient and Provider Co-Developed,  
1307 Behavioral Physical Activity Intervention on Physical Activity, Psychosocial Predictors, and  
1308 Fitness in Individuals with Spinal Cord Injury: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Sports Med*.  
1309 2019;49: 1117–1131.
- 1310 81. Nooijen CF, Stam HJ, Sluis T, Valent L, Twisk J, van den Berg-Emons RJ. A behavioral  
1311 intervention promoting physical activity in people with subacute spinal cord injury: secondary  
1312 effects on health, social participation and quality of life. *Clin Rehabil*. 2017;31: 772–780.
- 1313 82. Froehlich-Grobe K, Lee J, Ochoa C, Lopez A, Sarker E, Driver S, et al. Effectiveness and  
1314 feasibility of the workout on wheels internet intervention (WOWii) for individuals with spinal  
1315 cord injury: a randomized controlled trial. *Spinal Cord*. 2022;60: 862–874.
- 1316 83. Bakkum AJT, de Groot S, Stolwijk-Swüste JM, van Kuppevelt DJ, ALLRISC, van der Woude  
1317 LHV, et al. Effects of hybrid cycling versus handcycling on wheelchair-specific fitness and  
1318 physical activity in people with long-term spinal cord injury: a 16-week randomized controlled  
1319 trial. *Spinal Cord*. 2015;53: 395–401.
- 1320 84. Capodaglio P, Grilli C, Bazzini G. Tolerable exercise intensity in the early rehabilitation of

- 1321 paraplegic patients. A preliminary study. *Spinal Cord*. 1996;34: 684–690.
- 1322 85. Gorgey AS, Lai RE, Khalil RE, Rivers J, Cardozo C, Chen Q, et al. Neuromuscular electrical  
1323 stimulation resistance training enhances oxygen uptake and ventilatory efficiency independent of  
1324 mitochondrial complexes after spinal cord injury: a randomized clinical trial. *J Appl Physiol*.  
1325 2021;131: 265–276.
- 1326 86. Alrashidi AA, Nightingale TE, Currie KD, Hubli M, MacDonald MJ, Hicks AL, et al. Exercise  
1327 Improves Cardiorespiratory Fitness, but Not Arterial Health, after Spinal Cord Injury: The  
1328 CHOICES Trial. *J Neurotrauma*. 2021;38: 3020–3029.
- 1329 87. Berry HR, Perret C, Saunders BA, Kakebeeke TH, Donaldson NDN, Allan DB, et al.  
1330 Cardiorespiratory and power adaptations to stimulated cycle training in paraplegia. *Med Sci*  
1331 *Sports Exerc*. 2008;40: 1573–1580.
- 1332 88. Duffell LD, Paddison S, Alahmary AF, Donaldson N, Burrige J. The effects of FES cycling  
1333 combined with virtual reality racing biofeedback on voluntary function after incomplete SCI: a  
1334 pilot study. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*. 2019;16: 149.
- 1335 89. Durán FS, Lugo L, Ramírez L, Eusse E. Effects of an exercise program on the rehabilitation of  
1336 patients with spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2001;82: 1349–1354.
- 1337 90. Gorman PH, Scott W, York H, Theyagaraj M, Price-Miller N, McQuaid J, et al. Robotically  
1338 assisted treadmill exercise training for improving peak fitness in chronic motor incomplete spinal  
1339 cord injury: A randomized controlled trial. *J Spinal Cord Med*. 2016;39: 32–44.
- 1340 91. Gibbons RS, Stock CG, Andrews BJ, Gall A, Shave RE. The effect of FES-rowing training on  
1341 cardiac structure and function: pilot studies in people with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord*.  
1342 2016;54: 822–829.
- 1343 92. Vestergaard M, Jensen K, Juul-Kristensen B. Hybrid high-intensity interval training using  
1344 functional electrical stimulation leg cycling and arm ski ergometer for people with spinal cord  
1345 injuries: a feasibility study. *Pilot Feasibility Stud*. 2022;8: 43.
- 1346 93. DiCarlo SE. Effect of arm ergometry training on wheelchair propulsion endurance of individuals  
1347 with quadriplegia. *Phys Ther*. 1988;68: 40–44.
- 1348 94. Janssen TWJ, Dallmeijer AJ, Veeger DJHEJ, van der Woude LHV. Normative values and  
1349 determinants of physical capacity in individuals with spinal cord injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev*.  
1350 2002;39: 29–39.
- 1351 95. Latimer AE, Ginis KAM, Craven BC, Hicks AL. The physical activity recall assessment for  
1352 people with spinal cord injury: validity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2006;38: 208–216.
- 1353 96. Manns PJ, McCubbin JA, Williams DP. Fitness, inflammation, and the metabolic syndrome in  
1354 men with paraplegia. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2005;86: 1176–1181.
- 1355 97. Martin Ginis KA, Úbeda-Colomer J, Alrashidi AA, Nightingale TE, Au JS, Currie KD, et al.  
1356 Construct validation of the leisure time physical activity questionnaire for people with SCI  
1357 (LTPAQ-SCI). *Spinal Cord*. 2021;59: 311–318.
- 1358 98. Nightingale TE, Walhin J-P, Thompson D, Bilzon JL. Biomarkers of cardiometabolic health are  
1359 associated with body composition characteristics but not physical activity in persons with spinal  
1360 cord injury. *J Spinal Cord Med*. 2019;42: 328–337.
- 1361 99. Haisma JA, Post MW, van der Woude LH, Stam HJ, Bergen MP, Sluis TA, et al. Functional  
1362 independence and health-related functional status following spinal cord injury: a prospective study  
1363 of the association with physical capacity. *J Rehabil Med*. 2008;40: 812–818.
- 1364 100. Leving MT, de Groot S, Woldring FAB, Tepper M, Vegter RJK, van der Woude LHV. Motor  
1365 learning outcomes of handrim wheelchair propulsion during active spinal cord injury  
1366 rehabilitation in comparison with experienced wheelchair users. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2021;43: 1429–

- 1367 1442.
- 1368 101. Stewart MW, Melton-Rogers SL, Morrison S, Figoni SF. The measurement properties of  
1369 fitness measures and health status for persons with spinal cord injuries. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*  
1370 2000;81: 394–400.
- 1371 102. Dallmeijer AJ, van der Woude LH, Hollander PA, Angenot EL. Physical performance in  
1372 persons with spinal cord injuries after discharge from rehabilitation. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*  
1373 1999;31: 1111–1117.
- 1374 103. Janssen TW, van Oers CA, Rozendaal EP, Willemsen EM, Hollander AP, van der Woude LH.  
1375 Changes in physical strain and physical capacity in men with spinal cord injuries. *Med Sci Sports*  
1376 *Exerc.* 1996;28: 551–559.
- 1377 104. Szymczak Ł, Podgórski T, Lewandowski J, Janiak A, Michalak E, Domaszewska K. Physical  
1378 Fitness and Inflammatory Response to the Training Load of Wheelchair Rugby Players. *Int J*  
1379 *Environ Res Public Health.* 2022;19. doi:10.3390/ijerph19042228
- 1380 105. Steeves JD, Kramer JK, Fawcett JW, Cragg J, Lammertse DP, Blight AR, et al. Extent of  
1381 spontaneous motor recovery after traumatic cervical sensorimotor complete spinal cord injury.  
1382 *Spinal Cord.* 2011;49: 257–265.
- 1383 106. Figoni SF, Dolbow DR, Crawford EC, White ML, Pattanaik S. Does aerobic exercise benefit  
1384 persons with tetraplegia from spinal cord injury? A systematic review. *J Spinal Cord Med.*  
1385 2021;44: 690–703.
- 1386 107. de Groot S, Dallmeijer AJ, Kilkens OJ, van Asbeck FW, Nene AV, Angenot EL, et al. Course  
1387 of gross mechanical efficiency in handrim wheelchair propulsion during rehabilitation of people  
1388 with spinal cord injury: a prospective cohort study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2005;86: 1452–1460.
- 1389 108. Sprigle S, Maurer C, Holowka M. Development of valid and reliable measures of postural  
1390 stability. *J Spinal Cord Med.* 2007;30: 40–49.
- 1391 109. Kouwijzer I, Valent L, Osterthun R, van der Woude L, de Groot S, HandbikeBattle group.  
1392 Peak power output in handcycling of individuals with a chronic spinal cord injury: predictive  
1393 modeling, validation and reference values. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2020;42: 400–409.
- 1394 110. Hjeltnes N, Wallberg-Henriksson H. Improved work capacity but unchanged peak oxygen  
1395 uptake during primary rehabilitation in tetraplegic patients. *Spinal Cord.* 1998;36: 691–698.
- 1396 111. Williams AM, Ma JK, Martin Ginis KA, West CR. Effects of a Tailored Physical Activity  
1397 Intervention on Cardiovascular Structure and Function in Individuals With Spinal Cord Injury.  
1398 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2021;35: 692–703.
- 1399 112. Cruz S, Blauwet CA. Implications of altered autonomic control on sports performance in  
1400 athletes with spinal cord injury. *Auton Neurosci.* 2018;209: 100–104.
- 1401 113. West CR, Gee CM, Voss C, Hubli M, Currie KD, Schmid J, et al. Cardiovascular control,  
1402 autonomic function, and elite endurance performance in spinal cord injury. *Scand J Med Sci*  
1403 *Sports.* 2015;25: 476–485.
- 1404 114. West CR, Campbell IG, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, Mason BS, Romer LM. Effects of abdominal  
1405 binding on field-based exercise responses in Paralympic athletes with cervical spinal cord injury. *J*  
1406 *Sci Med Sport.* 2014;17: 351–355.
- 1407 115. Pitetti KH, Barrett PJ, Campbell KD, Malzahn DE. The effect of lower body positive pressure  
1408 on the exercise capacity of individuals with spinal cord injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1994;26:  
1409 463–468.
- 1410 116. Nieshoff EC, Birk TJ, Birk CA, Hinderer SR, Yavuzer G. Double-blinded, placebo-controlled  
1411 trial of midodrine for exercise performance enhancement in tetraplegia: a pilot study. *J Spinal*  
1412 *Cord Med.* 2004;27: 219–225.



- 1413 117. Nightingale TE, Walter M, Williams AMM, Lam T, Krassioukov AV. Ergogenic effects of an  
1414 epidural neuroprosthesis in one individual with spinal cord injury. *Neurology*. 2019;92: 338–340.
- 1415 118. Laskin JJ, Waheed Z, Thorogood NP, Nightingale TE, Noonan VK. Spinal Cord Stimulation  
1416 Research in the Restoration of Motor, Sensory, and Autonomic Function for Individuals Living  
1417 With Spinal Cord Injuries: A Scoping Review. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2022.  
1418 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.01.161
- 1419 119. Berger MJ, Kimpinski K, Currie KD, Nouraei H, Sadeghi M, Krassioukov AV. Multi-Domain  
1420 Assessment of Autonomic Function in Spinal Cord Injury Using a Modified Autonomic Reflex  
1421 Screen. *J Neurotrauma*. 2017;34: 2624–2633.
- 1422 120. Wang S, Wecht JM, Legg Ditterline B, Ugiliweneza B, Maher MT, Lombard AT, et al. Heart  
1423 rate and blood pressure response improve the prediction of orthostatic cardiovascular  
1424 dysregulation in persons with chronic spinal cord injury. *Physiol Rep*. 2020;8: e14617.
- 1425 121. DiPiro ND, Embry AE, Fritz SL, Middleton A, Krause JS, Gregory CM. Effects of aerobic  
1426 exercise training on fitness and walking-related outcomes in ambulatory individuals with chronic  
1427 incomplete spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord*. 2016;54: 675–681.
- 1428 122. Fleg JL, Morrell CH, Bos AG, Brant LJ, Talbot LA, Wright JG, et al. Accelerated longitudinal  
1429 decline of aerobic capacity in healthy older adults. *Circulation*. 2005;112: 674–682.
- 1430 123. Groah SL, Charlifue S, Tate D, Jensen MP, Molton IR, Forchheimer M, et al. Spinal cord  
1431 injury and aging: challenges and recommendations for future research. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*.  
1432 2012;91: 80–93.
- 1433 124. Hinrichs T, Lay V, Arnet U, Eriks-Hoogland I, Koch HG, Rantanen T, et al. Age-related  
1434 variation in mobility independence among wheelchair users with spinal cord injury: A cross-  
1435 sectional study. *J Spinal Cord Med*. 2016;39: 180–189.
- 1436 125. Jørgensen S, Martin Ginis KA, Lexell J. Leisure time physical activity among older adults  
1437 with long-term spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord*. 2017;55: 848–856.
- 1438 126. Chiou SY, Clarke E, Lam C, Harvey T, Nightingale TE. Effects of Arm-Crank Exercise on  
1439 Fitness and Health in Adults With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review. *Front*  
1440 *Physiol*. 2022;13: 831372.
- 1441 127. Bochekezanian V, Raymond J, de Oliveira CQ, Davis GM. Can combined aerobic and muscle  
1442 strength training improve aerobic fitness, muscle strength, function and quality of life in people  
1443 with spinal cord injury? A systematic review. *Spinal Cord*. 2015;53: 418–431.
- 1444 128. Brurok B, Helgerud J, Karlsen T, Leivseth G, Hoff J. Effect of aerobic high-intensity hybrid  
1445 training on stroke volume and peak oxygen consumption in men with spinal cord injury. *Am J*  
1446 *Phys Med Rehabil*. 2011;90: 407–414.
- 1447 129. Gant KL, Nagle KG, Cowan RE, Field-Fote EC, Nash MS, Kressler J, et al. Body System  
1448 Effects of a Multi-Modal Training Program Targeting Chronic, Motor Complete Thoracic Spinal  
1449 Cord Injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2018;35: 411–423.
- 1450 130. Lotter JK, Henderson CE, Plawewski A, Holthus ME, Lucas EH, Ardestani MM, et al. Task-  
1451 Specific Versus Impairment-Based Training on Locomotor Performance in Individuals With  
1452 Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Randomized Crossover Study. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*.  
1453 2020;34: 627–639.
- 1454 131. Jacobs PL, Nash MS, Rusinowski JW. Circuit training provides cardiorespiratory and strength  
1455 benefits in persons with paraplegia. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2001;33: 711–717.
- 1456 132. Sweet SN, Martin Ginis KA, Tomasone JR. Investigating intermediary variables in the  
1457 physical activity and quality of life relationship in persons with spinal cord injury. *Health Psychol*.  
1458 2013;32: 877–885.

- 1459 133. Eitvikipart AC, de Oliveira CQ, Arora M, Middleton J, Davis GM. Overview of Systematic  
1460 Reviews of Aerobic Fitness and Muscle Strength Training after Spinal Cord Injury. *J*  
1461 *Neurotrauma*. 2019;36: 2943–2963.
- 1462 134. Martin Ginis KA, van der Scheer JW, Latimer-Cheung AE, Barrow A, Bourne C, Carruthers  
1463 P, et al. Response to correspondence from the ESSA Statement authors. *Spinal cord*. 2018. pp.  
1464 409–411.
- 1465 135. Astorino TA, Thum JS. Within-session responses to high-intensity interval training in spinal  
1466 cord injury. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2018;40: 444–449.
- 1467 136. Tordi N, Dugue B, Klupzinski D, Rasseneur L, Rouillon JD, Lonsdorfer J. Interval training  
1468 program on a wheelchair ergometer for paraplegic subjects. *Spinal Cord*. 2001;39: 532–537.
- 1469 137. de Groot PCE, Hjeltnes N, Heijboer AC, Stal W, Birkeland K. Effect of training intensity on  
1470 physical capacity, lipid profile and insulin sensitivity in early rehabilitation of spinal cord injured  
1471 individuals. *Spinal Cord*. 2003;41: 673–679.
- 1472 138. Gauthier C, Brosseau R, Hicks AL, Gagnon DH. Feasibility, Safety, and Preliminary  
1473 Effectiveness of a Home-Based Self-Managed High-Intensity Interval Training Program Offered  
1474 to Long-Term Manual Wheelchair Users. *Rehabil Res Pract*. 2018;2018: 8209360.
- 1475 139. Mcleod JC, Diana H, Hicks AL. Sprint interval training versus moderate-intensity continuous  
1476 training during inpatient rehabilitation after spinal cord injury: a randomized trial. *Spinal Cord*.  
1477 2020;58: 106–115.
- 1478 140. Graham K, Yarar-Fisher C, Li J, McCully KM, Rimmer JH, Powell D, et al. Effects of High-  
1479 Intensity Interval Training Versus Moderate-Intensity Training on Cardiometabolic Health  
1480 Markers in Individuals With Spinal Cord Injury: A Pilot Study. *Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil*.  
1481 2019;25: 248–259.
- 1482 141. McMillan DW, Astorino TA, Correa MA, Nash MS, Gater DR. Virtual Strategies for the  
1483 Broad Delivery of High Intensity Exercise in Persons With Spinal Cord Injury: Ongoing Studies  
1484 and Considerations for Implementation. *Front Sports Act Living*. 2021;3: 703816.
- 1485 142. Maher JL, Whitmarsh C, Smith P, Taylor H, Fard A, Bilzon J. Feasibility study of high-  
1486 intensity interval training to reduce cardiometabolic disease risks in individuals with acute spinal  
1487 cord injury. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13: e068507.
- 1488 143. Claydon VE, Hol AT, Eng JJ, Krassioukov AV. Cardiovascular responses and postexercise  
1489 hypotension after arm cycling exercise in subjects with spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med*  
1490 *Rehabil*. 2006;87: 1106–1114.
- 1491 144. Griggs KE, Leicht CA, Price MJ, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Thermoregulation during intermittent  
1492 exercise in athletes with a spinal-cord injury. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*. 2015;10: 469–475.
- 1493 145. Weston KS, Wisløff U, Coombes JS. High-intensity interval training in patients with lifestyle-  
1494 induced cardiometabolic disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*.  
1495 2014;48: 1227–1234.
- 1496 146. Valentino SE, Hutchinson MJ, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, MacDonald MJ. Effects of Perceptually  
1497 Regulated Exercise Training on Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Peak Power Output in Adults With  
1498 Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2022.  
1499 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.008
- 1500 147. Hutchinson MJ, Kouwijzer I, de Groot S, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Comparison of two Borg  
1501 exertion scales for monitoring exercise intensity in able-bodied participants, and those with  
1502 paraplegia and tetraplegia. *Spinal Cord*. 2021;59: 1162–1169.
- 1503 148. van der Scheer JW, Hutchinson MJ, Paulson T, Martin Ginis KA, Goosey-Tolfrey VL.  
1504 Reliability and Validity of Subjective Measures of Aerobic Intensity in Adults With Spinal Cord  
1505 Injury: A Systematic Review. *PM R*. 2018;10: 194–207.

- 1506 149. Cowley KC. A new conceptual framework for the integrated neural control of locomotor and  
1507 sympathetic function: implications for exercise after spinal cord injury. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab.*  
1508 2018;43: 1140–1150.
- 1509 150. Jammick NA, Pettitt RW, Granata C, Pyne DB, Bishop DJ. An Examination and Critique of  
1510 Current Methods to Determine Exercise Intensity. *Sports Med.* 2020;50: 1729–1756.
- 1511 151. Meyler S, Bottoms L, Wellsted D, Muniz-Pumares D. Variability in exercise tolerance and  
1512 physiological responses to exercise prescribed relative to physiological thresholds and to  
1513 maximum oxygen uptake. *Exp Physiol.* 2023;108: 581–594.
- 1514 152. Anselmi F, Cavigli L, Pagliaro A, Valente S, Valentini F, Cameli M, et al. The importance of  
1515 ventilatory thresholds to define aerobic exercise intensity in cardiac patients and healthy subjects.  
1516 *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2021;31: 1796–1808.
- 1517 153. Au JS, Sithamparapillai A, Currie KD, Krassioukov AV, MacDonald MJ, Hicks AL.  
1518 Assessing Ventilatory Threshold in Individuals With Motor-Complete Spinal Cord Injury. *Arch*  
1519 *Phys Med Rehabil.* 2018;99: 1991–1997.
- 1520 154. Kouwijzer I, Cowan RE, Maher JL, Groot FP, Riedstra F, Valent LJM, et al. Interrater and  
1521 intrarater reliability of ventilatory thresholds determined in individuals with spinal cord injury.  
1522 *Spinal Cord.* 2019;57: 669–678.
- 1523 155. Tjønnå AE, Leinan IM, Bartnes AT, Jenssen BM, Gibala MJ, Winett RA, et al. Low- and  
1524 high-volume of intensive endurance training significantly improves maximal oxygen uptake after  
1525 10-weeks of training in healthy men. *PLoS One.* 2013;8: e65382.
- 1526 156. Stensvold D, Viken H, Steinshamn SL, Dalen H, Støylen A, Loennechen JP, et al. Effect of  
1527 exercise training for five years on all cause mortality in older adults-the Generation 100 study:  
1528 randomised controlled trial. *BMJ.* 2020;371: m3485.
- 1529 157. Church TS, Earnest CP, Skinner JS, Blair SN. Effects of different doses of physical activity on  
1530 cardiorespiratory fitness among sedentary, overweight or obese postmenopausal women with  
1531 elevated blood pressure: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA.* 2007;297: 2081–2091.
- 1532 158. Foulds HJA, Bredin SSD, Charlesworth SA, Ivey AC, Warburton DER. Exercise volume and  
1533 intensity: a dose-response relationship with health benefits. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2014;114: 1563–  
1534 1571.
- 1535 159. Alrashidi AA, Nightingale TE, Bhangu GS, Bissonnette-Blais V, Krassioukov AV. Post-  
1536 processing of peak oxygen uptake data obtained during cardiopulmonary exercise testing in  
1537 individuals with spinal cord injury: A scoping review and analysis of different post- processing  
1538 strategies. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2022. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.11.015
- 1539 160. Phillips BE, Kelly BM, Lilja M, Ponce-González JG, Brogan RJ, Morris DL, et al. A Practical  
1540 and Time-Efficient High-Intensity Interval Training Program Modifies Cardio-Metabolic Risk  
1541 Factors in Adults with Risk Factors for Type II Diabetes. *Front Endocrinol.* 2017;8: 229.
- 1542 161. Katzelnick CG, Weir JP, Jones A, Galea M, Dyson-Hudson TA, Kirshblum SC, et al. Blood  
1543 Pressure Instability in Persons With SCI: Evidence From a 30-Day Home Monitoring  
1544 Observation. *Am J Hypertens.* 2019;32: 938–944.
- 1545 162. Nightingale TE, Eginyan G, Balthazaar SJT, Williams AMM, Lam T, Krassioukov AV.  
1546 Accidental boosting in an individual with tetraplegia - considerations for the interpretation of  
1547 cardiopulmonary exercise testing. *J Spinal Cord Med.* 2021; 1–6.
- 1548 163. Martin Ginis KA, Phang SH, Latimer AE, Arbour-Nicitopoulos KP. Reliability and validity  
1549 tests of the leisure time physical activity questionnaire for people with spinal cord injury. *Arch*  
1550 *Phys Med Rehabil.* 2012;93: 677–682.
- 1551 164. Ginis KAM, Latimer AE, Hicks AL, Craven BC. Development and evaluation of an activity  
1552 measure for people with spinal cord injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2005;37: 1099–1111.



- 1553 165. de Groot S, van der Woude LHV, Niezen A, Smit CAJ, Post MWM. Evaluation of the  
1554 physical activity scale for individuals with physical disabilities in people with spinal cord injury.  
1555 *Spinal Cord*. 2010;48: 542–547.
- 1556 166. Healy GN, Wijndaele K, Dunstan DW, Shaw JE, Salmon J, Zimmet PZ, et al. Objectively  
1557 measured sedentary time, physical activity, and metabolic risk: the Australian Diabetes, Obesity  
1558 and Lifestyle Study (AusDiab). *Diabetes Care*. 2008;31: 369–371.
- 1559 167. O’Donovan G, Hillsdon M, Ukoumunne OC, Stamatakis E, Hamer M. Objectively measured  
1560 physical activity, cardiorespiratory fitness and cardiometabolic risk factors in the Health Survey  
1561 for England. *Prev Med*. 2013;57: 201–205.
- 1562 168. Hansford HJ, Wewege MA, Cashin AG, Hagstrom AD, Clifford BK, McAuley JH, et al. If  
1563 exercise is medicine, why don’t we know the dose? An overview of systematic reviews assessing  
1564 reporting quality of exercise interventions in health and disease. *Br J Sports Med*. 2022;56: 692–  
1565 700.
- 1566 169. Slade SC, Dionne CE, Underwood M, Buchbinder R. Consensus on Exercise Reporting  
1567 Template (CERT): Explanation and Elaboration Statement. *Br J Sports Med*. 2016;50: 1428–  
1568 1437.
- 1569 170. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better reporting of  
1570 interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide.  
1571 *BMJ*. 2014;348: g1687.
- 1572 171. Kodama S, Saito K, Tanaka S, Maki M, Yachi Y, Asumi M, et al. Cardiorespiratory fitness as  
1573 a quantitative predictor of all-cause mortality and cardiovascular events in healthy men and  
1574 women: a meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2009;301: 2024–2035.

1575

## 1576 **FIGURE/TABLE LEGEND**

1577 **Figure 1.** PRISMA flow diagram. Abbreviation: PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic  
1578 Reviews and Meta-Analyses.

1579 **Figure 2.** Summary of the study design, exercise intervention parameters, participant  
1580 demographics/injury characteristics and changes in cardiorespiratory fitness outcomes for each  
1581 randomised controlled trial study included in the primary meta-analysis. Studies were assessed for risk  
1582 of bias (ROB) and rated as either low (L), some concerns (SC) or high (H) risk.  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , absolute peak  
1583 oxygen uptake; BC, behaviour change; FES, functional electrical stimulation; L, light-intensity; M,  
1584 moderate-intensity; M/CD, mixed/cannot determine; M-V, moderate-to-vigorous-intensity; NR, not  
1585 reported; PPO, peak power output; RT, resistance training;  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ , relative peak oxygen uptake; SCI,  
1586 spinal cord injury; V, vigorous-intensity.

1587 **Figure 3.** Overview of the subgroup effects for relative peak oxygen uptake (A;  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ ) and peak  
1588 power output (B; PPO) for pooled pre-post and randomised-controlled trial exercise interventions based  
1589 on injury-specific characteristics (purple) and exercise intervention parameters (blue). Individual  
1590 subgroup effects are highlighted in bold. Differences within each subgroup category are represented by

1591 green ticks whereas subgroup categories without significant differences are represented by red question  
1592 marks. AIS, American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale; FES, functional electrical  
1593 stimulation; Mod-to-Vig, moderate-to-vigorous; NR/CD, not reported/cannot determine; RPE, rating of  
1594 perceived exertion;  $\dot{V}O_2$ , volume of oxygen consumption W, watts.

1595 **Figure 4.** Firepower plots visualising study-level statistical power for a range of effect sizes between  
1596 meta-analyses for pre-post studies alone in comparison to RCT studies included in the primary meta-  
1597 analysis (i.e., exercise interventions relative to control groups) for each cardiorespiratory fitness  
1598 outcome. Hedges' g effect sizes were calculated for each meta-analysis and used as the observed effect  
1599 size, as described by Quintana [54]. (A) Meta-analysis of pre-post studies describing changes in absolute  
1600 peak oxygen uptake ( $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ) had a median power of 62% for detecting an effect size of 0.90, whereas  
1601 the RCTs had a median power of 86% for detecting an effect size of 1.25. (B) Meta-analysis of pre-post  
1602 studies describing changes in relative peak oxygen uptake ( $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ) had a median power of 41% for  
1603 detecting an effect size of 0.67, whereas the RCTs had a median power of 91% for detecting an effect  
1604 size of 1.57. (C) Meta-analysis of pre-post studies describing changes in peak power output (PPO) had a  
1605 median power of 58% for detecting an effect size of 0.91, whereas the RCTs had a median power of 86%  
1606 for detecting an effect size of 1.13.

1607 **Table 1.** Meta-regression models with adjusted values for each cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

1608 **Table 2.** Grading of recommendations assessment, development and evaluation analysis for each  
1609 cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

1610

## 1611 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

1612 **Supplementary material 1 (S1): PRISMA Checklist**

1613 **Supplementary file 2 (S2): Systematic Review Search Strategy**

1614 **Supplementary file 3 (S3): Description of Exercise Intensity Classifications as per the American**  
1615 **College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) guidelines**

1616 **Supplementary file 4 (S4): Calculated Correlation Factors**

1617 **Supplementary file 5 (S5): Primary meta-analysis (RCT interventions relative to controls)**

- 1618 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled RCTs (exercise  
1619 intervention vs. true-world control or standard of care)
- 1620 2. Summary of the individual RCTs included in the review
- 1621 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool
- 1622 4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome
- 1623 5. References
- 1624 **Supplementary file 6 (S4): Change in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-**  
1625 **characterised exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks from pre-post and RCT studies (Secondary,**  
1626 **pooled meta-analysis)**
- 1627 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled exercise  
1628 interventions from pre-post and RCT studies
- 1629 2. Summary statistics of the subgroup analyses
- 1630 3. Figure visualising the worldwide coverage of exercise interventions included in the secondary,  
1631 pooled meta-analysis
- 1632 4. Summary of the individual studies included in the review
- 1633 5. Forest and funnel plots for change in each CRF outcome for each subgroup comparison (time since  
1634 injury, neurological level of injury, injury severity, exercise modality, length of intervention,  
1635 relative exercise intensity, method of exercise intensity prescription, frequency of exercise sessions,  
1636 and exercise volume)
- 1637 6. Quality assessment ratings for each pre-post study included in the primary meta-analysis
- 1638 7. Risk of bias for each RCT intervention arm included in the primary meta-analysis
- 1639 8. References
- 1640 **Supplementary file 7 (S7): Adverse events**
- 1641 **Supplementary file 8 (S8): Sensitivity analyses**
- 1642 **Supplementary file 9 (S9): CPET vs. exercise intervention modality**
- 1643 1. Forest plots for each CRF outcome
- 1644 **Supplementary file 10 (S10): Gait-training sub-analysis**

1645 1. Forest plots for each CRF outcome

1646 **Supplementary file 11 (S11): Cross-sectional cohort comparisons summary (secondary meta-**  
1647 **analysis)**

1648 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled cohort  
1649 comparisons

1650 2. Summary of the individual studies included in the review

1651 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the NIH tool for observational cohort and cross-  
1652 sectional studies

1653 4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome

1654 5. Sensitivity analysis on  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$

1655 6. References

1656 **Supplementary file 12 (S12): Cross-sectional associations between physical activity and CRF**  
1657 **outcomes**

1658 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled association  
1659 comparisons

1660 2. Summary of the individual studies included in the review

1661 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the NIH tool for observational cohort and cross-  
1662 sectional studies

1663 4. Visualisation of correlation coefficients between physical activity dimensions and CRF outcomes  
1664 across included studies

1665 5. References

1666 **Supplementary file 13 (S13): Observational studies (secondary meta-analysis)**

1667 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled observational  
1668 studies

1669 2. Summary of the individual studies included in the review

1670 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the NIH tool for observational cohort and cross-  
1671 sectional studies

1672 4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome

1673 5. References

1674 **Supplementary file 14 (S14): RCTs intensity comparisons (secondary meta-analysis)**

1675 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled RCTs comparing  
1676 the effects of different exercise intensities

1677 2. Summary of the individual RCTs comparing exercise intensity included in the review

1678 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool

1679 4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome

1680 5. References

1681

1682

1683

1684

1685

1686

1687

1688

1689

1690

1691

1692

1693

1694

1695

1696

1697

1698

1699

1700

1701

1702

1703

1704

1705

1706

1707

1708

1709

1710

1711

1712

1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728

**Table 1.** Meta-regression models with adjusted values for each cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

Covariate	Coef.	Std.Err.	t	Unadjusted P>t	95% CI	Adjusted P>t
<b><math>\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math> Model 1 (N = 74)<sup>1</sup> (#covariates = 5)</b>						
Male	0.005	0.003	1.530	0.131	-0.002, 0.012	0.448
Mean Age	-0.003	0.001	-2.430	0.018	-0.005, -0.001	<b>0.083</b>
TSI	-0.000	0.001	-0.440	0.665	-0.003, 0.002	0.995
Injury Class	0.003	0.003	0.850	0.398	-0.004, 0.009	0.899
Severity	-0.007	0.004	-1.910	0.061	-0.015, 0.000	0.219
<b><math>\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math> Model 2 (N = 74)<sup>2</sup> (#covariates = 6)</b>						
Exercise Type	-0.009	0.014	-0.700	0.489	-0.037, 0.018	0.967
Exercise Intensity	-0.010	0.015	-0.710	0.481	-0.039, 0.019	0.972
Intervention length	-0.000	0.002	-0.130	0.894	-0.004, 0.003	1.000
Minutes	0.004	0.008	0.490	0.626	-0.012, 0.020	0.994
Frequency	-0.012	0.011	-1.110	0.269	-0.035, 0.010	0.831
Volume	0.002	0.003	0.790	0.434	-0.003, 0.007	0.937
<b><math>\dot{R}VO_{2peak}</math> Model 1 (N = 79)<sup>3</sup> (#covariates = 5)</b>						
Male	0.060	0.044	1.370	0.174	-0.027, 0.146	0.651
Mean Age	-0.041	0.013	-3.200	0.002	-0.066, -0.015	<b>0.013</b>
TSI	-0.005	0.012	-0.430	0.666	-0.030, 0.019	0.996
Injury Class	-0.031	0.047	-0.650	0.518	-0.125, 0.064	0.976
Severity	-0.044	0.040	-1.110	0.272	-0.124, 0.035	0.819
<b><math>\dot{R}VO_{2peak}</math> Model 2 (N = 79)<sup>4</sup> (#covariates = 6)</b>						
Exercise Type	-0.229	0.145	-1.580	0.120	-0.518, 0.061	0.497
Exercise Intensity	-0.093	0.189	-0.490	0.622	-0.470, 0.283	0.996
Intervention length	-0.028	0.033	-0.870	0.385	-0.093, 0.036	0.930
Risk of bias	-0.034	0.329	-0.100	0.919	-0.690, 0.623	1.000
Minutes	-0.023	0.057	-0.400	0.687	-0.137, 0.091	0.998
Frequency	0.183	0.141	1.290	0.200	-0.099, 0.464	0.705
<b>PPO Model 1 (N = 65)<sup>5</sup> (#covariates = 5)</b>						
Male	-0.137	0.210	-0.650	0.518	-0.557, 0.284	0.972
Mean Age	-0.057	0.073	-0.780	0.439	-0.204, 0.090	0.940

TSI	-0.153	0.069	-2.220	0.031	-0.291, -0.015	0.177
Injury Class	0.005	0.173	0.030	0.978	-0.342, 0.351	1.000
Severity	-0.065	0.173	-0.380	0.707	-0.410, 0.280	0.997
<b>PPO Model 2 (N = 65) <sup>6</sup> (#covariates = 5)</b>						
Exercise Type	-0.172	0.687	-0.250	0.803	-1.547, 1.203	0.999
Exercise Intensity	-1.310	0.724	-1.810	0.076	-2.759, 0.140	0.202
Minutes	-0.064	0.314	-0.200	0.840	-0.693, 0.566	0.999
Frequency	0.288	0.687	0.420	0.676	-1.087, 1.664	0.989
Volume	-0.176	0.159	-1.110	0.272	-0.495, 0.142	0.669

\*1730 Simulations = 10,000

<sup>1</sup>1731 **Adj R-squared = 14.49%; Model F(5,68) = 3.10 ; Prob > F = 0.01**

<sup>2</sup>1732 **Adj R-squared = -6.11%; Model F(6,67) = 0.50; Prob > F = 0.80**

<sup>3</sup>1733 **Adj R-squared = 10.57%; Model F(5,73) = 2.76; Prob > F = 0.02**

<sup>4</sup>1734 **Adj R-squared = 5.0%; Model F(6,72) = 1.60; Prob > F = 0.16**

<sup>5</sup>1735 **Adj R-squared = 2.98%; Model F(5,59) = 1.41; Prob > F = 0.23**

<sup>6</sup>1736 **Adj R-squared = 0.23%; Model F(7,59) = 1.02 ; Prob > F = 0.41**

1737 Significance is highlighted in bold. Adj R<sup>2</sup>, proportion of between-study variance explained; AVO<sub>2peak</sub>, absolute peak oxygen consumption; Coef, coefficient of variation; Model F, joint test for all covariates; Prob > F, with Knapp-Hartung modification;

1738 R<sub>peak</sub>, relative peak oxygen consumption; Std.Err, standard error; TSI, time since injury.

1739  
1740

**Table 2.** Grading of recommendations assessment, development and evaluation analysis for each cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.


	$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (L/min)	$\dot{R}VO_{2peak}$ (mL/kg/min)	PPO (W)
Summary of findings according to GRADE analysis			
GRADE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW
Comments	<p>Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.</p> <p>Study design and imprecision reduced the GRADE to Low.</p> <p>The evidence supporting improvements in <math>\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math> is predominantly in young and middle-aged males that had been injured for &gt;1-year (chronic TSI). Participants were mostly paraplegic (67%) but there were a mixture of injury severities (AIS A-D).</p> <p>There were no subgroup differences to suggest optimal training parameters.</p>	<p>Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.</p> <p>Imprecision reduced the GRADE to Moderate.</p> <p>The evidence supporting improvements in <math>\dot{R}VO_{2peak}</math> is predominantly in young and middle-aged males that had been injured for &gt;1-year (chronic TSI). Participants were mostly paraplegic (69%) but there were a mixture of injury severities (AIS A-D).</p> <p>Please see Figure 3 for subgroup effects.</p>	<p>Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.</p> <p>Inconsistency and imprecision reduced the Grade to Low.</p> <p>The evidence supporting improvements in PPO is predominantly in young and middle-aged males that had been injured for &gt;1-year (chronic TSI). Participants were mostly paraplegic (73.5%) but there were a mixture of injury severities (AIS A-D).</p> <p>Please see Figure 3 for subgroup effects.</p>
Lower quality criteria			
Study design	<p>Mixture of RCTs and pre-post studies with no control groups.</p> <p>Overall WMDs for RCT interventions relative to controls and pre-post interventions only: RCTs (0.16 L/min) and pre-post studies (0.23 L/min). DOWNGRADE</p>	<p>Mixture of RCTs and pre-post studies with no control groups.</p> <p>Overall WMDs for RCT interventions relative to controls and pre-post interventions only: RCTs (2.9 mL/kg/min) and pre-post studies (2.9 mL/kg/min). NO DOWNGRADE</p>	<p>Mixture of RCTs and pre-post studies with no control groups.</p> <p>Overall WMDs for RCT interventions relative to controls and pre-post interventions only: RCTs (9 W) and pre-post studies (11 W). NO DOWNGRADE</p>
Risk of bias (RoB)	<p>Sensitivity analysis revealed no significant difference between studies with low and high risk of bias. NO DOWNGRADE</p>	<p>Sensitivity analysis revealed no significant difference between studies with low and high risk of bias. NO DOWNGRADE</p>	<p>Sensitivity analysis revealed no significant difference between studies with low and high risk of bias. NO DOWNGRADE</p>
Inconsistency of results	<p>Effect estimates were consistent, with 89% of the included exercise interventions favouring an increase in <math>\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math>, but most had a low effect estimate. Large overlap in confidence intervals. <math>I^2 = 72\%</math> NO DOWNGRADE</p>	<p>Effect estimates were consistent, with 92% of the included exercise interventions favouring an increase in <math>\dot{R}VO_{2peak}</math>, and most had a large effect estimate. Large overlap in confidence intervals. <math>I^2 = 53\%</math> NO DOWNGRADE</p>	<p>Effect estimates were consistent, with 94% of the included exercise interventions favouring an increase in PPO, and most had a large effect estimate. Large overlap in confidence intervals. <math>I^2 = 78\%</math> DOWNGRADE</p>



Indirectness	Most studies (81%) included $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ in their main outcome measures, across a range of participant characteristics. NO DOWNGRADE	Most studies (68%) included $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ in their main outcome measures, across a range of participant characteristics. NO DOWNGRADE	Most studies (80%) included PPO in their main outcome measures, across a range of participant characteristics. NO DOWNGRADE
Imprecision	Large sample size (N=779), however, 66% of the included exercise interventions had 95% CI overlap 0. DOWNGRADE	Large sample size (N=778), however, 75% of the included exercise interventions had 95% CI overlap 0. DOWNGRADE	Large sample size (N=647), however, 65% of the included exercise interventions had 95% CI overlap 0. DOWNGRADE
Small study effects	An exhaustive approach was used during the search strategy (i.e., scientific databases and grey literature search). Egger's test: $Z = -1.20$ ( $p = 0.23$ ). Visual inspection of the funnel plots, data extraction sheets and Tables 3-4 of S6 revealed no noticeable small study effects. NO DOWNGRADE	An exhaustive approach was used during the search strategy (i.e., scientific databases and grey literature search). Egger's test: $Z = -0.44$ ( $p = 0.66$ ). Visual inspection of the funnel plots, data extraction sheets and Tables 3-4 of S6 revealed no noticeable small study effects. NO DOWNGRADE	An exhaustive approach was used during the search strategy (i.e., scientific databases and grey literature search). Egger's test: $Z = 0.76$ ( $p = 0.45$ ). Visual inspection of the funnel plots, data extraction sheets and Tables 3-4 of S6 revealed no noticeable small study effects. NO DOWNGRADE
Higher quality criteria			
Large effect	Yes $Z = 9.90$ ( $p < 0.001$ ) NO UPGRADE	Yes $Z = 9.80$ ( $p < 0.001$ ) NO UPGRADE	Yes $Z = 9.07$ ( $p < 0.001$ ) NO UPGRADE
Dose response	No clear dose response. NO UPGRADE	No clear dose response. NO UPGRADE	No clear dose response. NO UPGRADE
Residual confounding	Mixture of exercise modalities, levels of injury, etc. NO UPGRADE	Mixture of exercise modalities, levels of injury, etc. NO UPGRADE	Mixture of exercise modalities, levels of injury, etc. NO UPGRADE

GRADE certainty in the evidence can be 'High', 'Moderate', 'Low' or 'Very Low' according to published guidelines [34]. Judgement on risk of bias followed Cochrane guidance whereby certainty would be downgraded if the reviewers judged that the high risk of bias studies had influenced the pooled effects. Wide variance of point estimates, minimal or no overlap of confidence intervals, and heterogeneity were included as criteria of inconsistency. For heterogeneity, an outcome with  $I^2 > 75\%$  was classed as considerable and resulted in a downgrade. Imprecision was downgraded where  $>50\%$  of studies had confidence intervals overlap the no effect line. Indirectness would have been downgraded where  $<50\%$  of studies did not include the appropriate main outcome measure or assess a range of participant characteristics. Overall effect sizes are presented as Z-scores. Statistical significance accepted as  $p < 0.05$ . AIS, American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale;  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , absolute peak oxygen consumption; CI, confidence intervals; CRF, cardiorespiratory fitness; PPO, peak power output; RCTs, randomised-controlled trials; RoB, risk of bias;  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , relative peak oxygen consumption;  $\dot{V}O_2$ , peak oxygen consumption.

**PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases and registers only**







STUDY DESIGN			INTERVENTION DETAILS						PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS				RESULTS						ROB			
Study (Year)	Participants	Randomization	Intervention length [week]	Exercise Modality	Exercise Intensity	Exercise Duration [min]	Exercise Frequency	Exercise Volume [min/week]	Mean Age [yrs]	Ratio Men	Ratio Complete SCI	Ratio Paraplegic SCI	Time since injury [yrs]	$\dot{A}VO_{2\text{peak}}$ (L/min)		$\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ (mL/kg/min)				PPO (Watts)		
														Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	
Taylor (1986)	10	5 Control 5 Intervention	8	Aerobic	V	30min	5	150min	33	1.0	NR	1.0	16	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Capodaglio (1996)	8	4 Control 4 Intervention	6	Aerobic	M/CD	30min	5	150min	30	1.0	1.0	1.0	7	NR	NR	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Lavado (2013)	42	21 Control 21 Intervention	16	Aerobic	M-V	60min	2.5	150min	39	0.8	NR	NR	4	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	L
Kim (2015)	15	7 Control 8 Intervention	6	Aerobic	M-V	60min	3	180min	35	0.4	1	0	8	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	SC
Pelletier (2015)	23	11 Control 12 Intervention	16	Mixed	M-V	20min	2	40min	46	0.8	0.5	NR	9	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Rosety-Rodriguez (2015)	17	8 Control 9 Intervention	12	Aerobic	M-V	30min	3	90min	30	1	1	1	5	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Gorman (2016)	18	6 Control 12 Intervention	12	Gait Training	V	39min	3	116min	52	NR	0	0	NR	15	15	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Torhaug (2016)	16	7 Control 9 Intervention	6	RT	V	60min	3	180min	47	1	0.7	1	15	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Van der Scheer (2016)	29	15 Control 14 Intervention	16	Aerobic	L	30min	2	60min	55	0.7	0.7	0.7	22	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	SC
Akkurt (2017)	33	16 Control 17 Intervention	12	Aerobic	M-V	30min	3	90min	39	0.8	0.6	0.8	3	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	L
Kooijmans (2017)	64	31 Control 33 Intervention	42	BC	NR	NR	NR	NR	49	0.8	0.8	0.7	23	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	L
Nooijen (2017)	39	19 Control 20 Intervention	52	BC	NR	NR	NR	NR	44	0.8	0.6	0.7	<1	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	SC
Nightingale (2018)	23	8 Control 15 Intervention	6	Aerobic	M-V	45min	4	180min	48	0.3	NR	1	NR	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Yarar-Fisher (2018)	11	5 Control 6 Intervention	8	Mixed	V	15min	3	45min	43	0.8	1	0.6	19	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Cheung (2019)	16	8 Control 8 Intervention	8	Gait Training	M/CD	30min	3	90min	53	0.5	0	NR	<1	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	L
Kim (2019)	17	6 Control 11 Intervention	6	Mixed	M-V	60min	3	180min	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	15	15	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Piira (2019)	20	10 Control 10 Intervention	12	Gait Training	M/CD	90min	5	450min	54	0.9	0	0.5	8	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Ma (2019)	28	14 Control 14 Intervention	8	BC	NR	NR	NR	NR	46	0.6	0.5	0.4	18	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	SC
Gorgey (2021)	33	13 Control 20 Intervention	12	FES	M/CD	60min	2	120min	42	0.8	0.8	0.7	13	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	L
Bombardier (2021)	15	8 Control 7 Intervention	24	BC	NR	NR	NR	NR	49	0.8	NR	0.9	18	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	SC
Froehlich-Grobe (2022)	168	81 Control 87 Intervention	16	BC	NR	NR	NR	NR	51	0.6	NR	NR	16	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	H
Hansen (2023)	33	7 Control 8 Intervention	12	Mixed	M-V	30min	3	90min	50	0.4	0.6	NR	NR	2	2	15	25	5	15	0	0	H



A



B



SPINAL CORD INJURY CHARACTERISTICS




EXERCISE INTERVENTION PARAMETERS



SIGNIFICANT SUBGROUP DIFFERENCE



NO SUBGROUP DIFFERENCE



**Figure 3.** Firepower plots visualising study-level statistical power for a range of effect sizes between meta-analyses for pre-post studies alone in comparison to RCT studies included in the primary meta-analysis (i.e., exercise interventions relative to control groups) for each cardiorespiratory fitness outcome. Hedges'  $g$  effect sizes were calculated for each meta-analysis and used as the observed effect size, as described by Quintana [54]. (A) Meta-analysis of pre-post studies describing changes in absolute peak oxygen uptake ( $\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ ) had a median power of 62% for detecting an effect size of 0.90, whereas the RCTs had a median power of 86% for detecting an effect size of 1.25. (B) Meta-analysis of pre-post studies describing changes in relative peak oxygen uptake ( $R\dot{V}\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ ) had a median power of 41% for detecting an effect size of 0.67, whereas the RCTs had a median power of 91% for detecting an effect size of 1.57. (C) Meta-analysis of pre-post studies describing changes in peak power output (PPO) had a median power of 58% for detecting an effect size of 0.91, whereas the RCTs had a median power of 86% for detecting an effect size of 1.13.