

1 **Title:** The impact of physical activity and exercise on aerobic capacity in individuals with spinal cord  
2 injury: A systematic 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**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**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:** 9,299/10,000; **Abstract word count:** 348

36 **Number of tables:** 5; **Number of figures:** 1

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** A low level of cardiorespiratory fitness [CRF; typically defined as peak oxygen uptake  
63 ( $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ ) or peak power output (PPO)] is a widely reported consequence of spinal cord injury (SCI). This  
64 systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression aimed to assess whether certain SCI  
65 characteristics and specific exercise considerations are moderators of changes in CRF.

66 **Methods** Eligible studies included randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and pre-post studies that  
67 conducted an exercise intervention lasting >2 weeks. The outcome measures of interest were absolute  
68 ( $A\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ ) or relative  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $R\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ ), and/or PPO. Four databases were searched up to July 2021.  
69 The Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool and the National Institute of Health Quality Assessment Tool were  
70 used to assess bias/quality. The certainty of the evidence was assessed using the Grading of  
71 Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach. Random effects  
72 meta-analyses and meta-regressions were conducted.

73 **Results** Ninety studies (110 independent exercise interventions) with a total of 1,191 participants were  
74 included in our primary meta-analysis. There were significant improvements in  $A\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  [0.22 (0.17,  
75 0.26) L/min,  $p<0.001$ ],  $R\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  [2.8 (2.2, 3.4) mL/kg/min,  $p<0.001$ ], and PPO [11 (8, 13) W,  
76  $p<0.001$ ]. There were no subgroup differences in  $A\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  or  $R\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ . There were subgroup  
77 differences ( $p\leq 0.008$ ) for changes in PPO based on time since injury, neurological level of injury,  
78 exercise modality, relative exercise intensity, method of exercise intensity prescription, and frequency.  
79 The meta-regression found that increased age was associated with increases in  $A\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  and  $R\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  
80 and exercise intensity prescription and volume were associated with increases in PPO ( $p<0.05$ ). GRADE  
81 assessments indicated a low level of certainty in the estimated effects due to study design, risk of bias,  
82 inconsistency, and imprecision.

83 **Conclusion** The pooled analysis indicates that performing exercise >2 weeks results in significant  
84 improvements in  $A\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ ,  $R\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  and PPO in individuals with SCI. Subgroup comparisons identify  
85 that upper-body aerobic exercise and resistance training appear the most effective at improving PPO.  
86 Furthermore, acutely-injured, individuals with paraplegia, exercising at a moderate-to-vigorous intensity,  
87 prescribed via a percentage of oxygen consumption or heart rate, for more than 3 sessions/week will  
88 likely experience the greatest change in PPO.

89 **Registration** PROSPERO CRD42018104342

90

91 **KEYWORDS:** Cardiorespiratory Fitness, Cardiopulmonary Fitness, Function, Spinal Cord Injuries,  
92 Rehabilitation, Exercise

93

94 **Key Points**

- 95 - Exercise interventions >2 weeks can significantly improve cardiorespiratory fitness in  
96 individuals with a spinal cord injury, by a magnitude greater than one spinal cord injury adjusted  
97 metabolic equivalent (i.e.,  $\geq 2.7$  mL/kg/min). A one metabolic equivalent improvement has been  
98 associated with a reduction in cardiovascular related mortality risk in non-injured individuals.
- 99 - Our findings support the minimum 40 minutes of weekly moderate-to-vigorous intensity  
100 exercise recommended by the spinal cord injury-specific exercise guidelines to significantly  
101 improve fitness. However, a two-fold greater improvement in peak power output may be  
102 achieved with exercising  $\geq 90$  min/week in comparison to  $\geq 40$  min/week.
- 103 - Our secondary meta-analysis comparing cohort studies indicates that prolonged exercise  
104 participation benefits cardiorespiratory fitness in the long term. However, these studies are  
105 prone to confounding and are inherently biased.
- 106 - Future research should consider following the recommendations published in the exercise  
107 intervention reporting guidelines, investigate the dose-response relationship between exercise  
108 and cardiorespiratory fitness in this population, and identify whether differences in supraspinal  
109 sympathetic cardiovascular impacts changes in cardiorespiratory fitness.

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121 **1. INTRODUCTION**

122 Spinal cord injury (SCI) is a complex neurological condition, caused by trauma, disease or degeneration,  
123 which results in sensory-motor deficits (i.e., paralysis or paresis) below the level of lesion and autonomic  
124 dysfunctions. Progressive physical deconditioning following injury results in increased health care  
125 utilisation, reliance on personal assistance services and a greater predisposition towards developing  
126 chronic diseases [1,2]. Individuals with SCI are at an increased risk of stroke, cardiovascular disease  
127 (CVD), and type-2 diabetes mellitus compared to non-injured counterparts [3–5]. The elevated incidence  
128 of these conditions in people with SCI emphasises the need for targeted interventions to address  
129 modifiable risk factors for these chronic diseases, such as cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF). In clinical  
130 populations cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF) is typically defined as an individual’s peak oxygen uptake  
131 ( $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ) or peak power output (PPO).  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO are determined during graded cardiopulmonary  
132 exercise testing (CPET) to the point of volitional exhaustion, and represents the integrated functioning  
133 of different bodily systems (pulmonary, cardiovascular and skeletal) to uptake, transport and utilise  
134 oxygen for metabolic processes [6]. A number of prospective studies have indicated that CRF is at least  
135 as important, if not more so, than other traditional CVD risk factors (e.g., obesity, hypertension and  
136 smoking) and is strongly associated with mortality [7–12].

137

138 Low levels of CRF have been widely reported in the SCI-population [13], with the between-person  
139 variability partially explained by the neurological level and severity of injury (i.e., lower CRF reported  
140 in individuals with tetraplegia) [14]. SCI can damage somatic pathways involved in the voluntary control  
141 of skeletal muscles, but also sympatho-excitatory pathways involved in the autonomic control of the  
142 cardiovascular system. In individuals with cervical and upper-thoracic SCI, the diminished supra-spinal  
143 control to the heart and blood vessels in major capacitance beds can limit exercise capacity [15,16]. This  
144 may explain the minimal returns on investment highlighted in a recent systematic review on the effects  
145 of aerobic exercise interventions in individuals with tetraplegia [17]. A large proportion of the variance  
146 in CRF is also explained by physical activity [18], which is reduced in the SCI-population [19,20]. SCI  
147 is characterised by lower-limb impairments and an ensuing reliance on mobility aids that limits the  
148 engagement in sufficient levels of physical activity to achieve meaningful health benefits.

149

150 Performing regular physical activity and/or structured exercise has long been promoted for improving  
151 CRF in individuals with SCI [21,22]. In 2011, the first evidence-based exercise guidelines, specifically  
152 for individuals with SCI were developed [23], which stated that “*for important fitness benefits, adults*  
153 *with SCI should engage in at least 20 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous-intensity aerobic activity and*  
154 *strength-training exercises 2 times per week*”. This guideline has since been updated, yet remains the  
155 same with regards to CRF benefits [24]. Although this implies adults with SCI can accrue fitness benefits  
156 from volumes of activity well below that promoted in the general population, others have advocated that  
157 adults with a physical disability [25,26] and individuals with SCI [27] should aim to perform at least 150  
158 minutes of aerobic exercise per week. For additional health benefits it has been suggested that adults  
159 should perform closer to 300 minutes per week of moderate-intensity physical activity [28,29]. While  
160 the current SCI-specific guidelines likely represent the “*minimum*” threshold required to achieve CRF  
161 benefits, it has been suggested that this creates an impression that individuals with SCI do not need to be  
162 as physically active as the general population [30]. The dose-response relationship between exercise and  
163 CRF improvements in individuals with SCI remains to be elucidated.

164

165 It is noteworthy that the aforementioned SCI-specific exercise guidelines utilise the terminology of  
166 “*moderate-to-vigorous*” to describe the desired exercise intensity. This is in contrast to accepted  
167 guidelines in the general population whereby moderate and vigorous-intensity exercise are distinguished  
168 from one another with specific thresholds (e.g.,  $\geq 150$  minutes of moderate-intensity or  $\geq 75$  minutes of  
169 vigorous-intensity activity per week) [26]. Exercise intervention intensity has been shown to influence  
170 the magnitude of change in CRF in patients undergoing cardiac rehabilitation [31,32]. The  
171 feasibility/effectiveness of higher intensity exercise is also currently a topical area of research in the SCI-  
172 population [33–35]. There is the potential for vigorous-intensity exercise to be more time efficient or  
173 lead to superior health benefits, although its impact on CRF in individuals with SCI compared to  
174 moderate-intensity exercise is yet to be determined. A recent systematic review identified that exercise  
175 interventions of a specific modality yield distinct changes in certain cardiometabolic health outcomes  
176 and not others in individuals with SCI [36]. This provides rationale for wanting to investigate the efficacy  
177 of different exercise modalities on CRF in this population. Consequently, a number of research questions  
178 requiring further attention include:

179

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

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

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

185

186 To address these questions, we performed a systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression

187 to investigate the impact of different exercise interventions on changes in CRF in individuals with SCI.

188 Moreover, we gathered evidence to determine whether key moderators (e.g., participant/injury  
189 characteristics, intervention/study characteristics and risk of bias) influence these intervention effects.

190

## 191 **2. METHODS**

192 This current review followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

193 (PRISMA) guidelines [37] and was prospectively registered (PROSPERO ID CRD42018104342).

194 Randomised and non-randomised study designs [randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and pre-post  
195 interventions without a comparison control group] were included in the primary meta-analysis of this

196 review. Our secondary meta-analyses included cohort, cross-sectional and observational studies.

197

### 198 **2.1. Eligibility criteria**

199 Studies met the following inclusion criteria: 1) Adult ( $\geq 18$  years) participants; 2) any acquired (traumatic,

200 infection, cancer) SCI (*note, studies were included if >80% of the sample met these two aforementioned*

201 *inclusion criteria*); 3) an exercise or physical activity intervention lasting >2 weeks (RCTs and pre-post

202 trials included in the primary meta-analysis); 4) report a measurable exposure variable (i.e., secondary

203 meta-analysis cohort studies: athletes vs. non-athletes or sedentary vs. active participants; and cross-

204 sectional studies: self-reported or objectively measured habitual physical activity level) and; 5) report

205 CRF-specific outcomes [i.e., absolute or relative  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , evaluated via analysis of expired air during a

206 peak (or symptom-limited) CPET or submaximal prediction, or PPO].

207

208 Studies were excluded if they met the following criteria: 1) non-human; 2) non-original work (i.e.,

209 reviews, guideline documents, editorials, viewpoints, letter-to-editor, protocol paper); 3) case-reports and

210 case series with a number (n) of participants <5 (to increase the robustness of our findings given the  
211 inclusion of smaller sample sizes in previous reviews [21,38,39]); 4) non-peer reviewed (i.e., conference  
212 proceeding/abstracts/posters); 5) children or adolescents (<18 years) ; 6) non-SCI (non-injured  
213 participants or other neurological conditions); 7) does not report a CRF-specific outcome; 8) single  
214 exercise sessions or an intervention <2 weeks; 9) no suitable comparison (i.e., control group or baseline  
215 data pre-intervention) or exposure variable measured; 10) no full text; and 11) not written in English.  
216 Studies with concurrent interventions (i.e., diet, lifestyle or respiratory training) were included only if  
217 the effects of exercise could be isolated.

218

## 219 **2.2. Search strategy**

220 A search of the following electronic databases: MEDLINE (via Pubmed), Excerpta Medica Database  
221 (EMBASE; via Ovid), Web of Science and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials  
222 (CENTRAL) was conducted from their respective inception through to July 18, 2021. Search terms were  
223 developed by the corresponding author (TN) and agreed upon by co-authors (AK, MW). The search  
224 strategy combined key words describing the following: 1) condition (e.g., SCI); 2) ‘intervention or  
225 exposure variable’ (e.g., rehabilitation, exercise and physical activity); and 3) ‘outcome’ (e.g.,  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  or  
226 PPO). Details of the complete search strategy can be found as online supplementary material (S1). Search  
227 results were collated using Endnote software (Thomson Reuters, NY) and duplicates removed.

228

## 229 **2.3. Study selection and data extraction**

230 The citations retrieved from the search strategy were screened by title, abstract, and full text by two  
231 independent reviewers (DH, GB). At each stage of the evaluation, studies were excluded if the inclusion  
232 criteria were not satisfied. A conservative approach was taken, whereby if insufficient information was  
233 available to warrant study exclusion during the title and abstract stages of the screening, studies were  
234 retained in the sample for full text screening. TN resolved any disagreement with regards to study  
235 inclusion.

236

237 Two authors (DH, GB) independently extracted data in duplicate using Microsoft Excel. Any  
238 disagreements were resolved via mutual consensus. Where more than one publication was apparent for  
239 the same participants, data were extracted from the study with the largest sample size to avoid



240 duplication. Author, year, study design, sample size, participant demographics/injury characteristics,  
241 exercise parameters (including the type, frequency, duration, intensity and weekly volume), or physical  
242 activity exposure details (training history, objective wearable device or validated self-report  
243 questionnaire) and adverse events were extracted. For RCTs, pre-post interventions and observational  
244 studies, mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD) for  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO outcomes at baseline and post-  
245 intervention/control or observation period were extracted to assess change in CRF. For cross-sectional  
246 studies, mean  $\pm$  SD outcomes were extracted for the unique cohorts, along with the significance and  
247 magnitude of associations between CRF and habitual physical activity. Where possible,  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  values  
248 were extracted in relative (mL/kg/min) and absolute (L/min) terms or calculated using pre- and post-  
249 intervention body mass values when provided. PPO values were extracted in watts (W) only. If there was  
250 insufficient information, the authors were contacted via email (N=12) and given a two-week window to  
251 provide additional data (responses received, N=8). Detailed notes were recorded outlining the reasons  
252 for study inclusion/exclusion and the number of studies included and excluded at each stage.

253

#### 254 **2.4. Data synthesis and analysis**

255 A variety of methods [i.e., indices of heart rate (HR),  $\dot{V}O_2$  or ratings of perceived exertion (RPE)] have  
256 been utilised in the literature to establish, prescribe and regulate exercise intensity in the SCI-population,  
257 which creates complexity when classifying the intensity of exercise. Each intervention was classified as  
258 having prescribed either light, moderate, vigorous or supramaximal-intensity aerobic exercise, based on  
259 thresholds proposed by the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) [40] (S2). If a study reported  
260 a progression in intensity that spanned the moderate and vigorous-intensity categories (e.g., 60-65%  
261  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ), it was classified as ‘moderate-to-vigorous’. If insufficient data were provided, studies were  
262 classified as ‘mixed-intensity/cannot determine’. Furthermore, where a study reported frequency of  
263 sessions or length of interventions as a range (e.g., 6-8 weeks), the midpoint was extracted and if a study  
264 reported duration as a range (e.g., 40-45 min), the greater value was extracted. Descriptions of adverse  
265 events in the included studies were also collated. These were categorised into the following subgroups:  
266 1) bone, joint or muscular pain, 2) autonomic or cardiovascular function, 3) skin irritation or pressure  
267 sores, and 4) other.

268

269 Means  $\pm$  SD were estimated from median and interquartile range (IQR) [41] or median and range [42],  
270 where required. Where CRF data was only presented in figures, data were extrapolated using Photoshop  
271 (Adobe Inc). To combine within-study subgroups and to estimate SD of the delta ( $\Delta$ ) change in CRF  
272 using correlation factors, we followed guidance from the Cochrane handbook [41]. Correlation factors  
273 were calculated for  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ,  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO using studies that reported pre-post SD and SD of the  
274  $\Delta$  change using the following equation:

275

$$276 \quad Corr = \frac{(SD_{Pre})^2 + (SD_{Post})^2 - (SD_{Change})^2}{2 \times SD_{Pre} \times SD_{Post}}$$

277

278 The specific correlation factors that were calculated for each study were averaged across each study  
279 design (S3) and applied in the following equation to calculate SD of the change for studies where these  
280 values were not reported:

281

$$282 \quad SD_{Change} = \sqrt{(SD_{Pre})^2 + (SD_{Post})^2 - 2 \times corr \times SD_{Pre} \times SD_{Post}}$$

283

284 where *corr* represents the correlation coefficient.

285

286 Since  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ,  $\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , and PPO are continuous variables, expressed using the same units across  
287 studies, we utilised weighted mean differences (WMDs) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) as summary  
288 statistics. A primary meta-analysis was carried out in R (Version 3.5.1, R Foundation for Statistical  
289 Computing, Vienna, Austria) describing  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-  
290 characterised exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks (e.g., combining exercise intervention-arms from  
291 RCTs and pre-post studies). Nine separate primary meta-analyses were performed to describe  $\Delta$  in each  
292 CRF outcome with studies categorised into subgroups based on the following: 1) time since injury [(TSI),  
293 e.g., Acute (<1-year), chronic ( $\geq$ 1-year)]; 2) neurological level of injury (e.g., tetraplegia, paraplegia); 3)  
294 injury severity [e.g., grading in accordance with the American Spinal Injury Association Impairment  
295 Scale (AIS): motor-complete (AIS A-B), motor-incomplete (AIS C-D)]; 4) exercise modality [e.g.,  
296 aerobic volitional upper-body, resistance training, FES, gait training, behaviour change]; 5) relative  
297 exercise intensity (e.g., light, moderate, moderate-to-vigorous, vigorous, supramaximal); 6) method used  
298 to prescribe exercise intensity (e.g.,  $\dot{V}O_2$ , HR, RPE, workload); 7) frequency of exercise sessions (<3,  $\geq$ 3

299 to <5, ≥5); 8) exercise volume [e.g., SCI-specific exercise guidelines for fitness (40 - 89 min/wk) [24],  
300 SCI-specific exercise guidelines for cardiometabolic health (90 - 149 min/wk) [24], achieving general  
301 population exercise guidelines (≥150 min/wk) [26], and 9) length of intervention (≤6 weeks, >6 to ≤12  
302 weeks, >12 weeks). Studies were also classified as ‘mixed’ or ‘not reported/cannot determine’ subgroups  
303 based on the aforementioned categories. Four secondary meta-analyses were also conducted for different  
304 trial designs: 1. comparing inactive vs active participants (e.g., cross-sectional cohort studies); 2.  
305 describing  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes with standard of care inpatient rehabilitation or free-living follow up (e.g.,  
306 observational studies); 3. comparing  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes relative to control groups (RCTs only), and 4.  
307 head-to-head comparison of different exercise intensities (RCTs with exercise interventions of differing  
308 intensities). Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using the  $I^2$  and accompanying p-value from the chi-  
309 squared test. A fixed-effect model was used when no significant heterogeneity was detected among  
310 studies ( $P>0.10$ ,  $I^2<50\%$ ), otherwise, a random effect model was used. Evidence for differences in effects  
311 between the subgroups was explored by comparing effects in the subgroups and the corresponding  $p$ -  
312 values for interaction. To assess the effect of potential outlier studies, we conducted a sensitivity analysis  
313 where studies were removed, and pooled WMD recalculated, when their CIs did not overlap with the CIs  
314 of the pooled effect. Sensitivity analyses were also conducted by comparing the WMDs of low and high  
315 risk of bias studies, as well as studies with and without imputed data (i.e., extracted from figures or where  
316 mean  $\pm$  SD were calculated from median, IQR or range), to confirm the robustness of our findings.  
317 Potential publication bias in the dataset was assessed using funnel plots and Egger’s tests in R. Data is  
318 visualised in R (see Github for scripts: <https://github.com/jutzca/Exercise-and-fitness-in-SCI>). A 2.7  
319 mL/kg/min, and thus 1 metabolic equivalent in SCI (1 SCI-MET) [43], change in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  was  
320 considered clinically meaningful.

321

322 To explore potential sources of heterogeneity, a random-effects meta-regression was performed using  
323 preselected moderator variables in Stata (Version 13, StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA),  
324 adjusted for multiple testing. As per Cochrane recommendations [44], for each included covariate in the  
325 model a minimum of 10 studies were required. To achieve this, and to also overcome the issue of  
326 collinearity between moderators, some moderators were not included in the analysis. Moderators were  
327 selected *a priori*, based on their potential to influence CRF responses. Exercise intensity prescription was  
328 later added as a moderator in the meta-regression in light of a recent study challenging strategies for

329 prescribing exercise intensity in individuals with SCI [45]. Moderators fell into two categories: model 1)  
330 participant/injury characteristics [continuous variables: age, TSI and baseline CRF; categorical variables:  
331 sex (n=male), neurological level of injury (n=PARA), severity (n=motor-complete)]; or model 2)  
332 intervention/study characteristics [continuous variables: exercise session duration, frequency, weekly  
333 exercise volume, intervention length; categorical variables: exercise modality, exercise intensity, method  
334 of exercise intensity prescription, and risk of bias classification]. Any potential covariates of the effect  
335 of  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ,  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , and PPO with  $p \leq 0.10$  identified via univariate meta-regression were  
336 subsequently included in multivariate meta-regression modelling. The level of significance for  
337 multivariate meta-regression was set at  $p \leq 0.10$ . Because meta-regression can result in inflated false-  
338 positive rates when heterogeneity is present, or when there are few studies, a permutation test described  
339 by Higgins and Thompson [46] was used to verify the significance of the predictors in the final model,  
340 whereby 10,000 permutations were generated.

341

## 342 **2.5. Risk of bias**

343 Study quality was appraised by at least two independent reviewers in duplicate (DH, GB, SYC), with  
344 any conflicts resolved by a third reviewer (TN). The Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 (RoB 2) was used to assess  
345 the risk of bias of the RCTs [47]. Reviewers determined the level of bias for each domain using the RoB  
346 2 algorithms and is presented visually using robvis [48]. Non-randomised designs were assessed using  
347 assessment tools generated by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Heart, Lung and  
348 Blood Institute (NHLBI, Bethesda, MD). Pre-post studies were rated using the Quality Assessment Tool  
349 for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies with No Control Group (12 items) and observational and cross-  
350 sectional studies were rated using the Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-  
351 Sectional Studies (14 items). Studies were subsequently classified as good, fair or poor quality using the  
352 guidance provided within each tool and is presented visually in online supplementary material.

353

## 354 **2.6. Certainty on the body of the evidence assessment using the GRADE approach**

355 The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach [49]  
356 was used to evaluate the certainty of the evidence for  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ,  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO. Two authors (DH,  
357 SYC) independently assessed the certainty of evidence for each outcome, with any conflicts resolved by  
358 the corresponding author (TN). The certainty of the evidence was graded from 'High' to 'Moderate',

359 'Low' or 'Very Low'. GRADE certainty in the evidence was downgraded if one or more of the following  
360 criteria were present: 1) risk of bias, 2) inconsistency in the results for a given outcome, 3) indirectness,  
361 4) imprecision, and 5) publication bias.

362

### 363 **3. RESULTS**

364 The initial database search identified 12,885 articles after removal of duplicates. Further, 11,029 studies  
365 were removed following the screening of titles and abstracts. The remaining 1,856 articles were selected  
366 for full-text review based on inclusion and exclusion criteria (S1). Of these, a total of 110 eligible studies,  
367 across each specific study design (RCT = 27, pre-post = 63, observational = 5, cross-sectional cohort =  
368 9, cross-sectional association = 6), were included in this review. Ninety studies, comprising the RCTs  
369 and pre-post studies, were included in the primary meta-analysis. Summaries of the pooled cohorts and  
370 descriptions of the individual studies included within each secondary meta-analysis are provided as  
371 supplementary material.

372

373 *[PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]*

374

#### 375 **3.1. Primary meta-analysis: Effects of prescribed, prospective exercise intervention studies**

376 CRF responses were pooled across 90 studies, comprising 110 exercise interventions in total, taken from  
377 76 pre-post exercise interventions and 34 independent exercise intervention arms from RCTs. Some  
378 studies included multiple exercise intervention arms/phases, hence the greater total number of exercise  
379 interventions than studies. A summary of the demographic/injury characteristics and intervention  
380 parameters for the pooled cohort included in the primary analyses for  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ,  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , and PPO are  
381 presented in Tables 1-2.

382

383 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]*

384

##### 385 **3.1.1. Participants**

386 Across the 110 exercise interventions, there were a total of 1,191 participants. Most interventions  
387 included both males and females (64% of studies), where females made up between 6-80% of the mixed  
388 cohorts. There were no female-only cohorts. Mean age ranged between 24 to 58 years and the majority

389 of participants had chronic injuries (69% >1-year), with mean TSI ranging between 56 days to 24 years.  
390 Sixty-three interventions included a mixed cohort of paraplegia and tetraplegia, of which individuals  
391 with paraplegia made up between 10-88% of the mixed cohorts. Four interventions recruited individuals  
392 with tetraplegia-only, 34 paraplegia-only, and nine did not specify. Participants across all AIS groups  
393 were included, of which 39 interventions were motor-complete-only, 19 were motor-incomplete-only,  
394 and 17 did not report. Thirty-five interventions recruited both motor-complete and incomplete  
395 individuals, of which 32% were motor-incomplete. Mean  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  and  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  at baseline was 1.26  
396 (0.51-3.50) L/min and 18.0 (7.3-36.9) mL/kg/min, respectively, and PPO was 49 (0-168) W.

397

398 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]*

399

### 400 **3.1.2. Exercise intervention characteristics**

401 Length of interventions ranged from 4 to 52 weeks, and whilst most studies reported a specific,  
402 predetermined intervention length, some reported a range [50–52], a total or targeted number of sessions  
403 [51,53–57], or provided an average [56,58,59]. Exercise sessions were completed between two to seven  
404 times per week. Eleven studies reported a range (e.g., “two to three sessions”) or maximum frequency  
405 (e.g., “up to three sessions/week”) [51,54,57,60–67], and frequency was either not reported or could not  
406 be determined in five studies [68–72]. The remainder reported an exact frequency (e.g., three sessions  
407 per week). The duration of exercise sessions ranged from 5 to 90 minutes, with four studies reporting a  
408 range (e.g., 20-30 min) [51,73–75] and six studies reporting a progression to a target duration [54,76–  
409 80]. Duration was not reported or could not be determined in 13 studies. Based on current exercise  
410 guidelines, 22 interventions prescribed exercise within the SCI-specific exercise guidelines for fitness  
411 (40-89 min/week), 44 interventions targeted the SCI-specific exercise guidelines for cardiometabolic  
412 health (90-149 min/week), and 26 were greater than general population exercise guidelines ( $\geq 150$   
413 min/week).

414

415 Forty-one interventions utilised aerobic upper-body exercise, 5 upper-body resistance training/circuits,  
416 22 FES, 15 gait training, 4 behaviour change, and 23 mixed/multimodal interventions. Following the  
417 ACSM thresholds, one intervention prescribed light-intensity (<1%), 15 prescribed moderate-intensity  
418 (14%), 33 prescribed moderate-to-vigorous-intensity (30%), 25 prescribed vigorous-intensity (23%), and

419 2 prescribed supramaximal-intensity exercise (2%). Intensity could not be determined from 34  
420 interventions (31%). With regards to exercise intensity prescription methods, 32 interventions used HR,  
421 regulated either via  $HR_{peak}$  ( $\%HR_{peak}$ , i.e., determined via a CPET; N=8),  $HR_{max}$  ( $\%HR_{max}$ , i.e., age-  
422 predicted; N=11), or HR reserve ( $\%HRR$ ; N=13). Fourteen interventions established intensity using  
423  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  ( $\%\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ; N=13) or  $\dot{V}O_2$  reserve ( $\%\dot{V}O_{2reserve}$ ; N=1) calculated from the pre-intervention CPET.  
424 Thirteen interventions utilised RPE, using either the Borg CR10 scale (N=7) or the Borg 6-20 scale  
425 (N=6). Workload was used to prescribe intensity in 10 interventions, via a percentage of PPO ( $\%PPO$ ;  
426 N=5), one repetition maximum ( $\%1RM$ ; N=4), or maximal tolerated power ( $\%MTP$ ; N=1). Forty-one  
427 interventions either used a mixture of prescription methods or intensity could not be classified. Detail for  
428 the specific studies is presented in the forest plots in online supplementary material (S4).

429

### 430 **3.1.3. Adverse events**

431 Adverse events were described in 17 interventions, comprising 49/1,191 (4.1%) participants (S10). These  
432 events were related to: 1) bone, joint or muscular pain (n=10 participants), 2) autonomic or cardiovascular  
433 function (n=8 participants), 3) skin irritation or pressure sores (n=18 participants), and 4) other events  
434 including anxiety, nausea, dizziness and issues with testing equipment (n=3 participants). Adverse events  
435 were reported in three other pre-post studies. Beillot et al. [68] stated that participants experienced  
436 “*spontaneous fractures of lower limbs, occurrence of a syringomyelia and pressure sores at the foot and*  
437 *ankle*” (n=10), but did not define the number of participants who sustained each event. Likewise, Janssen  
438 and Pringle [61] reported “*lightheadedness in some subjects*”, and Gibbons et al. [81] stated that “*a*  
439 *number of participants showed some level of autonomic dysreflexia during the FES response test*”, but  
440 both studies did not quantify further.

441

### 442 **3.1.4. Change in CRF outcomes**

443 The summary statistics for the nine primary meta-analyses are presented in Tables 3-4 and their  
444 corresponding forest plots can be found in supplementary material (S4).

445

446 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLES 3-4 HERE]*

447

448 Sixty-nine exercise interventions assessed the change in  $\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , revealing a significant increase of  
449 0.22 [0.17, 0.26] L/min ( $p < 0.001$ ). There were no significant subgroup differences for any of the nine  
450 meta-analyses. Seventy-four exercise interventions assessed the change in  $\dot{R}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , revealing a  
451 significant increase of 2.8 [2.2, 3.4] mL/kg/min ( $p < 0.001$ ). There were no significant subgroup  
452 differences for any of the nine meta-analyses. Sixty-one exercise interventions assessed the change in  
453 PPO, revealing a significant increase of 11 [8, 13] W ( $p < 0.001$ ). There were significant subgroup  
454 differences for TSI ( $p < 0.001$ ), neurological level of injury ( $p < 0.001$ ), exercise modality ( $p = 0.003$ ),  
455 relative exercise intensity ( $p = 0.003$ ), method of exercise intensity prescription ( $p < 0.001$ ), and frequency  
456 ( $p < 0.001$ ) (Tables 3-4).

457

#### 458 *Sensitivity analyses*

459 The removal of potential outliers resulted in no meaningful changes to the overall pooled effects for any  
460 outcome. A sensitivity analysis for risk of bias revealed no differences in the pooled effects for low and  
461 high risk of bias studies (S11). A sensitivity analysis for imputed data revealed a greater  $\dot{R}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  in  
462 studies with imputed data (3.9 mL/kg/min) compared to studies without (2.5 mL/kg/min). Yet, there were  
463 no differences in the pooled effects for  $\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  or PPO (S11). An additional analysis grouped  
464 interventions into those that matched the CPET modality to the exercise intervention and those that did  
465 not. Following the adjustment for subgroup comparisons, there was a significantly greater  $\dot{R}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  in  
466 studies with matched CPET and intervention modalities ( $p = 0.02$ ). There were no significant differences  
467 in  $\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  or PPO (S12). A sub-analysis on gait training CPETs alone also revealed no subgroup  
468 differences in any outcome (S13).

469

#### 470 **3.1.5. Meta-regression**

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

472 Increased age was associated with increases in  $\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $p = 0.045$ ) and  $\dot{R}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $p = 0.025$ ). There  
473 were no associations between other moderator variables included in this model and CRF outcomes. There  
474 were also no associations between PPO and the other moderator variables (Table 5).

475

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



477 There was no evidence that the exercise intervention and study characteristics included in model 2 were  
478 associated with increases in  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  or  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ . However, there was evidence for an association  
479 between the method of exercise intensity prescription and increases in PPO ( $p < 0.01$ ). Additionally, there  
480 was evidence for an association between exercise volume and increases in PPO ( $p = 0.04$ ) (Table 5).

481

482 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 5 HERE]*

483

### 484 **3.1.6. Publication bias**

485 There was no significant publication bias for  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $Z = -1.23$ ,  $p = 0.22$ ),  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  ( $Z = -0.54$ ,  $p =$   
486  $0.59$ ), or PPO ( $Z = 0.73$ ,  $p = 0.46$ ). Funnel plots are provided in supplementary material (S4).

487

## 488 **3.2. Secondary Meta-Analyses**

### 489 **3.2.1. Cross-sectional studies**

490 Nine studies included cross-sectional data comparing CRF outcomes in active ( $n=129$  participants) vs.  
491 inactive ( $n=115$  participants) individuals with SCI. Inactive participants were mainly classified as  
492 sedentary, whereas active participants varied from recreationally active wheelchair sport players to  
493 paralympic athletes. A meta-analysis of cross-sectional cohort studies revealed significantly ( $p < 0.001$ )  
494 higher  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  [0.54 (0.44, 0.63) L/min],  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , [9.4 (7.0, 11.8) mL/kg/min] and PPO [37 (29, 44)  
495 W] in active compared to inactive individuals with SCI (S5). Given the significant heterogeneity in  
496  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ , a sensitivity analysis was conducted to compare inactive individuals with either ‘active’ or  
497 ‘elite athletes’. There was a significantly higher  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  [5.4 (3.0, 7.7) mL/kg/min,  $p < 0.001$ ] in ‘active’  
498 compared to inactive individuals, but an even higher  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2\text{peak}}$  [11.2 (9.6, 12.9) mL/kg/min,  $p < 0.001$ ] in  
499 ‘elite athletes’ compared to inactive.

500

501 Six studies ( $n=380$  participants) included cross-sectional data and assessed associations between habitual  
502 physical activity level (as a continuous variable) and CRF outcomes. Five studies assessed physical  
503 activity exposure using self-report methods [82–86], whereas one study used a validated wearable device  
504 [87]. The measurement period used to capture physical activity dimensions ranged from 3 to 7 days.

505 There was considerable variability across studies with regards to the physical activity dimensions  
506 captured: hours per week of exercise/sport, minutes per day or week of mild, moderate, heavy-intensity

507 for the subcategories of leisure time physical activity (LTPA), lifestyle or household activity or  
508 cumulative activity (S6). Collectively, data indicates significant positive correlations of a larger  
509 magnitude between CRF/PPO outcomes and the volume of sport, exercise or LTPA rather than  
510 household activity. The only study to use a validated wearable device indicated that participants  
511 performing  $\geq 150$  min/wk of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) had a significantly higher  
512 CRF relative to a low activity group (performing  $< 40$  min/wk). Whereas, there was no significant  
513 difference in CRF between the low activity group and participants achieving the SCI fitness specific  
514 exercise guidelines (40 - 149 min/wk) [87]. Significant, positive correlations were reported for the  
515 amount of moderate-to-vigorous LTPA or cumulative activity with CRF/PPO outcomes, which was not  
516 the case for mild or light-intensity activity.

517

### 518 **3.2.2. Observational inpatient rehabilitation or community free-living studies**

519 Five studies (n=343 participants) included observational longitudinal data and assessed changes in CRF  
520 outcomes following either standard of care inpatient rehabilitation [88–90] or a period of community  
521 free-living [88,91,92]. The duration between assessments for standard of care varied, ranging from 5 to  
522 28 weeks, whereas the follow-up period for community observations ranged from 1 to 2.9 years.  
523 Reporting on the therapies used within standard of care was poor and only one study included a  
524 measurement of physical activity during the community-based free-living follow-up (self-reported mean  
525 sport activity) [91]. There were significant improvements following standard of care, but not following  
526 community-based free-living, in absolute  $[0.12 (0.07, 0.17) \text{ L/min}, p < 0.001$  vs.  $0.09 (0.00, 0.19) \text{ L/min},$   
527  $p = 0.06]$  and relative  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}} [2.1 (1.0, 3.2) \text{ mL/kg/min}, p < 0.001$  vs.  $-0.1 (-2.9, 2.7) \text{ mL/kg/min}, p = 0.94]$   
528 (S7). Significant improvements in PPO were identified following both standard of care  $[6 (3, 9) \text{ W},$   
529  $p < 0.001]$  and community-based free-living  $[7 (2, 12) \text{ W}, p = 0.006]$  (S7).

530

### 531 **3.2.3. RCTs**

532 Twenty RCTs assessed changes in CRF outcomes between exercise intervention (n=255 participants)  
533 and control (n=229 participants) groups. A meta-analysis of RCTs revealed a significantly higher  
534  $A\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}} [0.15 (0.06, 0.24) \text{ L/min}, p = 0.001]$ ,  $R\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}} [2.9 (1.7, 4.0) \text{ mL/kg/min}, p < 0.001]$ , and PPO  
535  $[10 (5, 14) \text{ W}, p < 0.001]$  following an exercise intervention relative to SCI controls (S8).

536

537 Seven RCTs compared changes in CRF outcomes between moderate (n=52 participants) and vigorous  
538 (n=51 participants) exercise intensity groups. These studies utilised upper-body aerobic exercise and gait  
539 training. A meta-analysis revealed no significant differences between moderate and vigorous-intensity  
540 in  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  ( $p=0.67$ ),  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  ( $p=0.88$ ) or PPO ( $p=0.62$ ) (S9). There were also no significant subgroup  
541 differences between studies that matched exercise volume between intensity groups and those that did  
542 not.

543

### 544 **3.3. Risk of Bias**

545 Full risk of bias assessments for pre-post and RCT interventions can be found in supplementary material  
546 (S4, S8, S9). Twenty-six pre-post studies were rated as having good, 25 as having fair, and 12 as having  
547 poor methodological quality. Six RCTs were rated as having a low risk of bias, 8 as having some  
548 concerns, and 13 as having a high risk of bias. The most common domains in the RCTs with either some  
549 concerns or high risk were ‘bias in the measurement of the outcome’ and ‘bias in selection of the reported  
550 result’. Reporting was inadequate in many of the included studies, which made the assessment of risk of  
551 bias challenging. Notably, reporting of blinding, eligibility or selection criteria, as well as the enrollment  
552 of participants (i.e., a lack of CONSORT flow diagrams) was poor. Individual risk of bias assessments  
553 for each study design are provided in supplementary material (S4-9).

554

### 555 **3.4. Evidence appraisal using GRADE**

556 Overall, the GRADE assessment revealed a ‘Low’ certainty in the body of evidence for improvements  
557 in all CRF outcomes (Table 6). The certainty rating for  $\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  was downgraded due to imprecision  
558 and a lack of high quality study designs, whereas  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  was downgraded as a result of imprecision  
559 and a high risk of bias in the RCTs. The confidence rating for PPO was downgraded due to imprecision  
560 and inconsistency, resulting from considerable heterogeneity in the included exercise interventions.

561

562 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 6 HERE]*

563

## 564 **4. DISCUSSION**

565 This review provides a large evidence-based summary and appraisal on the effects of prescribed and  
566 prospective exercise interventions >2 weeks on CRF in individuals with SCI. The results from the meta-

567 analysis support the role of exercise in improving CRF in this population by 0.22 L/min and 11W in  
568  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  and PPO, respectively. The meta-analysis also indicates a clinically meaningful change in  
569  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  of 2.8 mL/kg/min. However, the GRADE assessment revealed ‘Low’ certainty in the evidence  
570 for significant improvements in  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ ,  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ , and PPO. Subgroup analyses revealed no effects of  
571 injury characteristics or exercise intervention parameters on  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  or  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ . However, there were  
572 significant subgroup differences for PPO based on TSI, neurological level of injury, exercise modality,  
573 exercise intensity, method of exercise intensity prescription, and frequency of sessions.

574

#### 575 **4.1. Impact of injury characteristics**

##### 576 **4.1.1. Time since injury**

577 Following exercise interventions  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  improves in individuals with both acute and chronic SCI.  
578 However, this review highlights the need for more exercise interventions in the acute phase post-SCI.  
579 Indeed, a recent review by Van der Scheer et al. [38] rated the confidence in the evidence base for  
580 exercise in acute SCI as ‘Very Low’, and called for more RCTs to control for the deteriorations in fitness  
581 and health occurring almost immediately following SCI. With regards to PPO in the current review,  
582 subgroup analysis based on TSI reveals that individuals with acute SCI exhibit a greater change than  
583 individuals with chronic SCI. This could be due to spontaneous motor recovery in the first few months  
584 following SCI [93], or speculatively, a familiarisation effect to novel modalities of exercise or additive  
585 upper-limb physiological adaptations in response to concurrent inpatient rehabilitation. To support this  
586 point, the secondary meta-analysis with longitudinal observational studies indicates a 6W improvement  
587 in PPO with standard of care inpatient rehabilitation during the subacute period. Ultimately, more  
588 rigorous RCTs are required in the subacute phase post-SCI that compare standard of care versus standard  
589 of care plus a specific exercise intervention to truly quantify improvements in CRF outcomes.

590

##### 591 **4.1.2. Neurological level of injury**

592 Exercise results in improved  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  regardless of the neurological level of injury. In particular, this  
593 review reveals a pooled improvement of 5.9 mL/kg/min in studies that included only individuals with  
594 tetraplegia (N=3). For comparison, there is a considerably larger evidence-base for studies including only  
595 individuals with paraplegia (N=28). A recent systematic review suggested that aerobic exercise results  
596 in minimal returns on investment in individuals with tetraplegia, with  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  improving on average only

597 9% following 10-37 weeks of training [17]. However, their review excluded studies with a sample size  
598 <10. Consequently, the Dicarolo study [94], which reported a 94% increase in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  was excluded  
599 from their analysis. Whilst the inclusion of this study in the current analysis may have augmented the  
600 overall effect, our findings indicate that exercise improves CRF in individuals with tetraplegia and that  
601 the magnitude of change is not significantly different to individuals with paraplegia. However, this meta-  
602 analysis highlights that individuals with paraplegia (16W) are likely to accrue greater absolute changes  
603 in PPO than those with tetraplegia (9W). Typically, higher neurological levels of injury result in a loss  
604 of trunk control, motor impairments in the upper-limbs and reduced mechanical efficiency, compared to  
605 lower levels of injury [95,96]. Therefore, individuals with tetraplegia may not have the physical or motor  
606 capacity to adapt as effectively as individuals with paraplegia, and thus could experience a ceiling effect  
607 with training. Indeed, a recent study identified lesion level as a significant predictor of PPO in a group  
608 of handcyclists with SCI [97]. To account for baseline motor function differences between individuals  
609 with tetraplegia and paraplegia, we determined relative percentage change for studies that included  
610 upper-body aerobic exercise interventions only. The relative percentage change was similar between  
611 neurological level of injury classifications: 46% tetraplegia (N=1) vs. 53% paraplegia (N=9). While only  
612 one tetraplegia-only intervention was included in this subgroup analysis [98], normalising for baseline  
613 values seems to indicate similar relative magnitudes of change in PPO.

614  
615 Williams et al. [99] demonstrated that individuals with a lower level of injury (<T6) significantly  
616 improved PPO compared to individuals with a higher level of injury ( $\geq$ T6), suggesting a potential role  
617 of disrupted cardiovascular control in mediating changes in PPO. Whilst methods for ameliorating the  
618 reduction in sympathetic cardiovascular control typically associated with injuries  $\geq$ T6 have been  
619 investigated (e.g., abdominal binding [100], lower-body positive pressure [101], and midodrine [102]),  
620 the evidence for an improved CRF is still mixed. A recent case-report has indicated that epidural spinal  
621 cord stimulation (SCS) can safely and effectively restore cardiovascular control and improve CRF [103].  
622 With an explosion in SCS studies over the last few years [104], particularly including transcutaneous  
623 SCS, the pairing of exercise with novel and non-invasive neuromodulatory approaches will likely  
624 continue to receive considerable research attention. Future, adequately powered, research may want to  
625 consider separating participants into paraplegia and tetraplegia groups or dichotomize by injuries above  
626 and below T6 to account for differences in sympathetic cardiovascular control. Currently, there is a

627 paucity of studies analysing data in this fashion, which limits our understanding of how neurological  
628 level of injury and the degree of impaired sympathetic cardiovascular control influences the magnitude  
629 of change in CRF following an exercise intervention. Researchers may want to consider conducting a  
630 battery of autonomic nervous system stress tests at baseline (e.g., Valsalva manoeuvre, head-up tilt,  
631 sympathetic skin responses etc. [105]), to determine the degree of supraspinal sympathetic disruption  
632 rather than relying on a neurological level of injury derived from a motor-sensory examination. This is  
633 important as recent research has indicated that cardiovascular instability cannot be predicted by motor-  
634 sensory level and completeness of SCI [106].

635

### 636 **4.1.3. Injury severity**

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

648

## 649 **4.2. Impact of exercise intervention parameters**

### 650 **4.2.1. Exercise modality**

651 Despite a number of recent reviews summarising the effects of specific exercise modalities on the change  
652 in CRF following SCI, including aerobic ACE [107], FES-cycling [39], and aerobic plus muscle strength  
653 training (mixed multimodal) interventions [108], this meta-analysis is the first to directly compare the  
654 effects of a wide range of exercise modalities on the change in CRF in individuals with SCI.

655

656 This review revealed there were no significant subgroup differences between exercise modalities in  
657  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  or  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ , indicating that improvements can be gained from any form of exercise  
658 intervention. The change in  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$  in the current review (21%) is equivalent to the average 21%  
659 improvement reported in a recent systematic review on the effects of ACE in chronic SCI [107]. Whilst  
660 the current review did not exclusively investigate ACE, it is evident that aerobic, volitional upper-body  
661 exercise training can improve CRF in individuals with SCI. Activating larger amounts of skeletal muscle  
662 mass via FES exercise interventions also appears to improve  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , yet it is noteworthy that more  
663 accessible and less expensive training modalities such as aerobic and resistance training may yield similar  
664 or even greater increases in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , despite utilising less muscle mass. Additionally,  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  improves  
665 following multimodal/hybrid exercise interventions, which challenges a 2015 review reporting  
666 inconclusive findings on the effects of combined upper-body aerobic and muscle strength training on  
667 CRF [108]. Yet, as the current review included a wide range of interventions not restricted to the upper-  
668 body (e.g., aquatic treadmill [54], hybrid cycling [55,60,109], multimodal exercises [110,111], etc.), it is  
669 recommended that more research is conducted to delineate whether the improvements in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  with  
670 multimodal/hybrid exercise interventions are due to the combination of upper- and lower-body exercise  
671 modalities, or due to concurrent training modalities that predominantly use the upper-body (e.g., aerobic  
672 plus muscle strength training). Finally, both gait training and behaviour change interventions appear less  
673 effective at improving  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO.

674

675 Aerobic, upper-body exercise and resistance training modalities demonstrate the greatest improvements  
676 in PPO, by 15W and 20W, respectively. It is perhaps unsurprising that resistance training resulted in the  
677 largest change in PPO given that these interventions included upper-body exercises prescribed to increase  
678 muscular strength, as shown by Jacobs et al. [112]. Ultimately, improvements in PPO have important  
679 ramifications for individuals with SCI that are dependent on performing explosive upper-body  
680 movements during transfers or wheelchair propulsion [88,92], and may lead to increased quality of life  
681 with more functional independence [113].

682

683 Several studies directly compared the effects of specific exercise modalities on the change in CRF  
684 [54,76,114]. Notably, Gorman et al. [54] demonstrated that there were no transfer effects from a robotic  
685 treadmill exercise intervention to ACE performance in a CPET. This review also demonstrates that

686 greater changes in  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  are likely achieved when the CPET modality is matched to the intervention  
687 (S12). Therefore, researchers should endeavour to match the CPET modality to their exercise  
688 intervention, or at the very least be careful when interpreting changes in CRF when using different  
689 modalities.

690

#### 691 **4.2.2. Exercise intensity**

692 The current SCI-specific exercise guidelines recommend that exercise should be performed at a  
693 moderate-to-vigorous intensity [24]. A recent overview of systematic reviews also advocated the use of  
694 moderate-to-vigorous intensity for improving aerobic fitness [115]. The current meta-analysis  
695 demonstrates robust improvements across all CRF outcomes for interventions prescribing exercise at this  
696 particular intensity. Furthermore, the secondary meta-analysis including cross-sectional studies reveals  
697 significant associations of a greater magnitude between MVPA and CRF, as compared to lower-intensity  
698 activity. Despite this, our classification of moderate-to-vigorous exercise intensity spans two of the  
699 ACSM exercise intensity thresholds (S2). There may be considerable variation in the actual intensity  
700 performed by participants given the noticeable range across thresholds (e.g., 46-90%  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ , 64-95%  
701  $HR_{\text{peak}}$ , 12-17 RPE etc.). Therefore, individuals with SCI and exercise practitioners should be cautious  
702 when prescribing such a broad exercise intensity.

703

704 The secondary meta-analysis comparing RCT exercise intensities reveals similar changes in CRF  
705 outcomes between moderate- and vigorous-intensity interventions. This is in agreement with a previous  
706 review [33] and supports the viewpoint from a special communication on high-intensity interval training  
707 (HIIT) [34], which suggested that vigorous-intensity exercise is more time efficient and may result in  
708 similar if not superior CRF and skeletal muscle oxidative capacity improvements in comparison to  
709 moderate-intensity exercise. Interestingly, in a response to a Letter-to-the-Editor [30], the SCI-specific  
710 exercise guideline developers acknowledge the need for shorter, effective protocols to be documented in  
711 the literature [116]. In the current review, a number of HIIT-based studies result in an improved CRF  
712 [60,109,117–121]. Furthermore, recent evidence has suggested that HIIT may be more enjoyable than  
713 moderate-intensity exercise for individuals with SCI [122]. Therefore, this form of training may offer a  
714 more time efficient and readily available alternative to moderate-intensity protocols. However, in



715 echoing the thoughts of Astorino et al. [35], research must first corroborate its safety and feasibility in  
716 the SCI population before it can be recommended as an exercise strategy to improve CRF.

717

#### 718 **4.2.3. Exercise intensity prescription methods**

719 This review reveals that  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  improves regardless of the method used to prescribe exercise intensity.  
720 With regards to PPO, the subgroup difference indicates that the magnitude of change is greater when  
721 prescribing intensity via indices of HR (i.e., %HR<sub>peak</sub>, %HR<sub>max</sub>, %HRR) or  $\dot{V}O_2$  (i.e., % $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ,  
722 % $\dot{V}O_{2reserve}$ ), compared to RPE and workload. Previous research has revealed that RPE results in inter-  
723 individual responses to exercise, with the potential for two individuals to perform the same bout of  
724 exercise above or below lactate threshold despite being prescribed the same intensity, which prevents the  
725 development of SCI-specific RPE recommendations [123]. The difference in PPO may also be due to  
726 individuals with SCI being unaccustomed to subjective measures of exertion. Accordingly, recent  
727 systematic reviews have called for better reporting of the standardisation and familiarisation procedures  
728 used for RPE [124] and have only tentatively recommended its use before the evidence base is expanded  
729 [125]. Therefore, it seems plausible to suggest that the blunted improvements in PPO with intensity  
730 prescribed via RPE, as compared to other prescription methods, may have resulted from insufficient  
731 familiarisation before an exercise intervention.

732

733 Although HR and  $\dot{V}O_2$  have long been used to prescribe exercise intensity, these approaches can result  
734 in large training ranges and ignore individual metabolic responses. Particularly, issues may arise with  
735 using HR for individuals with a neurological level of injury  $\geq T6$ , given that these individuals typically  
736 exhibit a lower HR<sub>peak</sub> [126]. The use of fixed percentages (i.e., %HR<sub>peak</sub>, % $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ) in the non-injured  
737 population has been questioned [127] and has recently been investigated in individuals with SCI,  
738 whereby Hutchinson et al. [45] showed that fixed %HR<sub>peak</sub> and % $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  could not guarantee a  
739 homogenous domain-specific exercise intensity prescription. Notably, individuals were spread across  
740 moderate, heavy and severe domains at the “moderate” and “vigorous” intensity classifications; thereby  
741 questioning whether the “moderate-to-vigorous” terminology used in the SCI-specific exercise  
742 guidelines is suitable for adults with SCI.

743

744 Given that prescribing exercise intensity via HR and  $\dot{V}O_2$  can typically be resource and cost-intensive,  
745 there is some scope for using RPE as a cheaper and more practical method for community-based exercise  
746 prescription. However, this may not be as effective as other objective methods. Future research should  
747 aim to identify the optimal methods of exercise intensity prescription, as well as consider revisiting the  
748 current “moderate-to-vigorous intensity” recommendations.

749

#### 750 **4.2.4. Frequency and exercise volume**

751 Subgroup analyses based on frequency of sessions and exercise volume reveal no differences in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ,  
752 thereby supporting the minimal volume of exercise required to attain CRF benefits in individuals with  
753 SCI. Furthermore, although there are no subgroup differences in PPO, the meta-regression identifies that  
754 a greater volume of exercise is associated with greater changes in PPO. Indeed, there is a greater  
755 magnitude of change observed for individuals exercising 90-149 min/wk in comparison to 40-89 min/wk  
756 (12W vs 6W change, respectively). A greater weekly exercise volume may therefore accrue greater  
757 changes in PPO and, as already described, may be important in improving the capacity to perform daily  
758 tasks such as bed or wheelchair transfers [88,92].

759

760 Although changes in CRF are similar between each exercise volume subgroup, and thus exercise  
761 guideline, the secondary meta-analysis on cross-sectional cohorts indicates a significant cumulative  
762 impact of prolonged participation in physical activity and exercise. To support this point, a sensitivity  
763 analysis revealed a larger difference in  $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  between inactive individuals and elite athletes,  
764 compared to between inactive and active individuals, suggesting that those who exercise more exhibit a  
765 greater CRF. Indeed, a cross-sectional association study [87], using a wearable device to objectively  
766 monitor habitual physical activity, reported a significantly higher CRF in those performing the general  
767 population exercise guidelines ( $\geq 150$  min/wk) compared to the SCI-specific fitness guidelines (40-89  
768 min/wk). In fact, a recent study by Hoevenaars et al. [128] explored whether meeting the guidelines  
769 proposed by Tweedy et al. [27] (“ $\geq 150$  min/wk of moderate or  $\geq 60$  min/wk of vigorous exercise”), which  
770 are nearly consistent with the general population exercise guidelines, is associated with greater health  
771 and fitness benefits than the current SCI-specific guidelines by Martin-Ginis et al. [24]. Individuals  
772 meeting the Tweedy guidelines had a significantly greater  $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO than those meeting the  
773 guidelines developed by Martin-Ginis et al. [24]. Looking forward, longitudinal RCTs with multiple

774 intervention arms would be the best way to explore dose-response changes with regards to differing  
775 volumes of exercise, as has been done in the non-injured population [129–132].

776

### 777 **4.3. Adverse events**

778 Adverse events were reported for 4.1% of the total included participants, with the majority of events  
779 related to skin sores, pressure sores or ulcers. Qualitatively, there was no particular exercise modality  
780 that suggested an increased risk for an adverse event, but higher-intensity exercise appeared to reveal  
781 more adverse events, albeit being swayed by one study in particular [111]. Reporting was poor in a  
782 number of studies with reviewers at times unable to determine the exact number of events per participant.  
783 Furthermore, there is generally a lack of follow-up assessments following exercise interventions, so it is  
784 currently unknown whether there are any detrimental long-term effects of exercise in SCI.

785

### 786 **4.4. Strengths and limitations of the review and future directions**

#### 787 **4.4.1. Limitations of the included studies**

788 Poor reporting of injury characteristics and exercise parameters prevented a perfect comparison of  
789 exercise interventions. Overall, studies could have provided more precise descriptions of training  
790 parameters to aid with any future refinements to the SCI-specific exercise guidelines. Reporting of  
791 adherence to interventions was also poor and should be encouraged to provide an indication of the  
792 feasibility or applicability of specific exercise interventions for individuals with SCI. Moreover, adverse  
793 events should be transparently reported, even if none occur so that practitioners are able to identify forms  
794 of exercise that are most likely to be safe for this population. Additionally, studies typically failed to  
795 utilise the training principle of progression, which during prolonged exercise interventions is essential  
796 for preventing a plateau in training adaptations and perhaps particularly important in this population for  
797 supporting the transition from an inactive lifestyle to higher levels of activity, and ultimately achieving  
798 greater CRF benefits [27]. On the whole, the reporting of  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  attainment criteria was poor, with only  
799 16% of the included exercise interventions using at least three criterion methods for identifying when an  
800 individual had reached peak capacity. Thus, the magnitude of change in these studies could be inflated  
801 or underestimated. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, only 30% of interventions had a  
802 prospectively registered clinical trial entry and only 6.4% had a protocol manuscript published. To

803 sustain the integrity and transparency of reporting in this field, researchers are encouraged to  
804 prospectively register any planned clinical trials using publicly available repositories.

805

806 The risk of bias assessments on pre-post studies revealed that no study conducted multiple baseline or  
807 follow-up assessments. Whilst often time-consuming and impractical with larger sample sizes, multiple  
808 assessments ensure reproducibility by accounting for any technical or biological variation, as shown  
809 previously in non-injured individuals at risk for type-2 diabetes [133]. In the SCI population, individuals  
810 are typically deconditioned and often exhibit variable responses to a CPET. This variance may be  
811 explained by profound blood pressure instability [134], including unintentional ‘boosting’ via episodes  
812 of autonomic dysreflexia [135]. Researchers should therefore consider performing multiple CPETs at  
813 baseline and follow-up to attain reliable assessments of CRF.

814

815 There are also several limitations with regards to the studies included in the secondary meta-analyses for  
816 this review. First, there is only one cross-sectional study using a wearable device to investigate the  
817 association between physical activity and CRF [87]. Whilst self-report questionnaires are valid tools for  
818 estimating levels of physical activity [86,136–138], there are important drawbacks including the  
819 difficulty of accurately capturing intensity, lack of questionnaires measuring activities of daily living,  
820 and recall bias. Secondly, there is a lack of RCTs comparing near-maximal, maximal or supramaximal  
821 exercise intensities to moderate-intensity exercise. The only supramaximal intervention included in this  
822 review demonstrated a 17W improvement in PPO [120]. The inclusion of more RCTs comparing  
823 vigorous-intensity to lower intensity exercise could identify whether there are, in fact, benefits to  
824 performing shorter but more vigorous-intensity exercise bouts, in comparison to longer continuous forms  
825 of exercise.

826

#### 827 **4.4.2. Strengths and limitations of the review**

828 A major strength of the current study is that we pre-planned and prospectively registered (PROSPERO  
829 ID CRD42018104342) our systematic review. We used GRADE to assess the certainty in the body of  
830 evidence and used quality appraisal tools for the specific study designs included in this review. Our  
831 GRADE assessment demonstrates generalisability within the SCI population, through the inclusion of  
832 participants across the lifespan and with a wide range of injury characteristics. Yet, the ‘Low’ confidence

833 in the evidence across all CRF outcomes emphasises the need for more rigorous exercise interventions  
834 to address current gaps in the literature [38].

835

836 As there were not enough RCTs to perform a meta-regression on this study design specifically, we pooled  
837 pre-post and RCT exercise interventions. The changes in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and PPO in the primary meta-analysis  
838 (2.8 mL/kg/min and 11W, respectively) are somewhat similar to those reported with RCT interventions  
839 relative to controls (2.9 mL/kg/min and 10W, respectively), and thus confirms the robustness of our  
840 overall findings. Furthermore, our rigorous approach of adjusting for multiple comparisons minimises  
841 any erroneous interpretations of subgroup differences and therefore strengthens our conclusions on the  
842 available evidence.

843

844 Despite this, the categorisation of interventions within each subgroup could be considered a limitation of  
845 the current review. Whilst this was done to directly compare the effects of different subgroups (i.e., acute  
846 vs chronic, tetraplegia vs paraplegia, aerobic vs resistance vs FES etc.), it resulted in an unequal number  
847 of interventions within each classification and likely underpowered the subgroup comparisons. For  
848 example, the subgroup analysis based on exercise intensity reveals an effect of exercise intensity on PPO,  
849 yet this may be influenced by the small number of interventions for light- and supramaximal-intensity.  
850 Despite reporting some significant subgroup differences across dichotomised studies, these variables  
851 were not identified as significant moderator variables in the random-effects meta-regression, meaning  
852 these findings should be viewed with caution. It is perhaps more of a limitation of the evidence-base *per*  
853 *se*, rather than our meta-analysis, in that more studies should be conducted to increase the power of these  
854 subgroups and to ascertain whether there would be any significant improvements with a greater study  
855 sample size.

856

857 Another limitation is that despite our comprehensive search strategy we may have missed relevant studies  
858 as we did not search the grey literature and abstracts were not included. Finally, this review excluded  
859 studies that were not published in English, introducing a source of language bias. However, of the full  
860 texts screened for eligibility only 0.6% were excluded for being unavailable in English and is therefore  
861 highly unlikely to have influenced the overall findings.

862

#### 863 **4.4.3. Implications and future directions**

864 Our results support the current guidelines regarding the minimal weekly volume of exercise necessary to  
865 improve CRF in the SCI population. However, our pooled analysis indicates subgroup differences for  
866 PPO based on certain exercise intervention parameters. To the best of our knowledge, there are no large  
867 scale epidemiological studies investigating the dose-response relationship between physical activity and  
868 CRF in this population using sensitive and validated methods to quantify the exposure variable (e.g. free-  
869 living physical activity). Such studies have been performed in non-injured individuals [139,140]. To  
870 identify the optimal stimulus for beneficial CRF responses in this population, dose-ranging studies, akin  
871 to those that are used in the pharmaceutical industry, should be conducted. A recent overview of  
872 systematic reviews [141] highlighted the poor reporting in exercise interventions in health and disease  
873 and called upon the inclusion of checklists [e.g., the Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template (CERT)  
874 [142] or the Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) [143]] to improve study  
875 quality. This would ultimately lead to a better understanding of the ‘dose’ of exercise as medicine  
876 required to optimise CRF outcomes in this population.

877

878 Exercise interventions >2 weeks result in an overall pooled increase in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  of 2.8 mL/kg/min, which  
879 is roughly equivalent to 1 MET-SCI [metabolic equivalent in SCI (2.7 mL/kg/min)] [43]. An increase in  
880 maximal aerobic capacity (an estimate of CRF) by 1 MET (3.5 mL/kg/min) in non-injured individuals is  
881 associated with a 13% and 15% reduction in all-cause and cardiovascular mortality, respectively [144].  
882 The current review shows that individuals meeting the SCI-specific guidelines for cardiometabolic health  
883 [24] can improve  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  to a similar magnitude to the overall pooled effect (~1 MET-SCI),  
884 highlighting that these guidelines may offer a reduction in CVD risk, and therefore mortality.  
885 Nonetheless, an association between an improvement in CRF and a reduction in mortality is yet to be  
886 established specifically in the SCI population, and remains an important avenue of research for the future.

887

#### 888 **5. CONCLUSION**

889 This systematic review with meta-analysis provides an updated, evidence-based summary of the effects  
890 of exercise interventions on CRF in individuals with SCI. It reveals that exercise interventions >2 weeks  
891 are associated with significant improvements to CRF, and in particular, a clinically meaningful change  
892 in  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ . Subgroup comparisons identified that upper-body aerobic exercise and resistance training

893 appear the most effective at improving PPO. Furthermore, acutely-injured, paraplegic individuals,  
894 exercising at a moderate-to-vigorous intensity, prescribed via  $\dot{V}O_2$  or HR, for more than 3 sessions/week  
895 will likely experience the greatest change in PPO. Importantly, there is an ever-growing need for studies  
896 to establish a dose-response relationship between exercise and CRF in the SCI population to determine  
897 the most optimal form of exercise prescription to reduce the wide-ranging consequences typically  
898 associated with SCI.

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

## 919 **6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

920 We would like to thank Mr. Sajjad Tavassoly (Faculty of Medicine, UBC, Vancouver, Canada) for his  
921 assistance with piloting the initial database search. We would also like to thank Dr. Matthew Querée  
922 (Department of Physical Therapy, UBC, Spinal Cord Injury Research Evidence Team, GF Strong  
923 Rehabilitation Centre, Vancouver, Canada) for his assistance with the risk of bias assessments. We  
924 appreciate the assistance of Mr Adrian Cheng (ICORD) and Dr. Alex Williams (ICORD), who helped  
925 pilot the inclusion/exclusion of articles and supported the use of Photoshop to extract data from figures,  
926 respectively. We thank Dr. Sam Weaver (University of Birmingham) for support with the meta-analysis  
927 using R.

928

## 929 **7. DECLARATIONS**

### 930 **7.1. Author Contributions**

931 Conceptualisation and study design were conducted by MW, AK and TN. Literature searches were  
932 completed by DH, GB and TN. Risk of bias and GRADE assessments were completed by DH, GB, SYC  
933 and TN. Statistical analysis and data interpretation were performed by DH, CL, CJ and TN. All authors  
934 contributed to the drafting and critical revision of the work.

935

### 936 **7.2. Funding**

937 Daniel Hodgkiss is supported by a Nathalie Rose Barr PhD studentship (#NRB123) from the  
938 International Spinal Research Trust (ISRT), a registered charity in the UK. Gurjeet Bhangu was  
939 supported by the Faculty of Medicine within the University of British Columbia (UBC) via the Flexible  
940 and Enhanced Learning Program. Carole Lunny's postdoctoral work is supported by a CIHR project  
941 grant (2021-2023). Catherine Jutzeler was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation  
942 (Ambizione Grant [PZ00P3\_186101]) and Wings for Life (Wings for Life Research Foundation [#ID  
943 2020\_118]). Tom Nightingale (grant number 17767) and Matthias Walter (grant number 17110) were  
944 recipients of Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research Trainee Awards in conjunction with the  
945 International Collaboration on Repair Discoveries and Rick Hansen Foundation, respectively.

946

### 947 **7.3. Availability of data and materials**

948 All data included in this systematic review can be provided upon request to the corresponding author.



949

950 **7.4. Ethics approval and consent to participate**

951 Not applicable.

952

953 **7.5. Consent for publication**

954 Not applicable.

955

956 **7.6. Code availability**

957 R scripts can be found on the Github repository: <https://github.com/jutzca/Exercise-and-fitness-in-SCI>

958

959 **7.7. Competing interests**

960 Daniel Hodgkiss, Gurjeet Bhangu, Carole Lunny, Catherine Jutzeler, Shin-Yi Chiou, Matthias Walter,

961 Samuel Lucas, Andrei Krassioukov and Tom Nightingale declare that they have no competing interests

962 relevant to the content of this article.

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979 **8. 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{A}V\dot{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><math>\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math></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}O_2</math></b>	Oxygen uptake
<b><math>\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math></b>	Peak oxygen uptake
<b><math>\dot{V}O_{2reserve}</math></b>	Reserve oxygen uptake
<b>W</b>	Watts
<b>WMD</b>	Weighted mean difference

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997 **9. REFERENCES**

- 998 1 Miller LE, Herbert WG. Health and economic benefits of physical activity for patients with spinal  
999 cord injury. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res* 2016;**8**:551–8.
- 1000 2 Rimmer JH, Schiller W, Chen M-D. Effects of disability-associated low energy expenditure  
1001 deconditioning syndrome. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev* 2012;**40**:22–9.
- 1002 3 Cragg JJ, Noonan VK, Dvorak M, *et al.* Spinal cord injury and type 2 diabetes: results from a  
1003 population health survey. *Neurology* 2013;**81**:1864–8.
- 1004 4 Cragg JJ, Noonan VK, Krassioukov A, *et al.* Cardiovascular disease and spinal cord injury:  
1005 results from a national population health survey. *Neurology* 2013;**81**:723–8.
- 1006 5 Wu J-C, Chen Y-C, Liu L, *et al.* Increased risk of stroke after spinal cord injury: a nationwide 4-  
1007 year follow-up cohort study. *Neurology* 2012;**78**:1051–7.
- 1008 6 Ross R, Blair SN, Arena R, *et al.* Importance of Assessing Cardiorespiratory Fitness in Clinical  
1009 Practice: A Case for Fitness as a Clinical Vital Sign: A Scientific Statement From the American  
1010 Heart Association. *Circulation* 2016;**134**:e653–99.
- 1011 7 Clausen Johan S.R., Marott Jacob L., Holtermann Andreas, *et al.* Midlife Cardiorespiratory  
1012 Fitness and the Long-Term Risk of Mortality. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;**72**:987–95.
- 1013 8 Lee D-C, Sui X, Artero EG, *et al.* Long-term effects of changes in cardiorespiratory fitness and  
1014 body mass index on all-cause and cardiovascular disease mortality in men: the Aerobics Center  
1015 Longitudinal Study. *Circulation* 2011;**124**:2483–90.
- 1016 9 Myers J, Prakash M, Froelicher V, *et al.* Exercise capacity and mortality among men referred for  
1017 exercise testing. *N Engl J Med* 2002;**346**:793–801.
- 1018 10 Laukkanen JA, Kurl S, Salonen R, *et al.* The predictive value of cardiorespiratory fitness for  
1019 cardiovascular events in men with various risk profiles: a prospective population-based cohort  
1020 study. *Eur Heart J* 2004;**25**:1428–37.
- 1021 11 Erikssen G, Liestøl K, Bjørnholt J, *et al.* Changes in physical fitness and changes in mortality.

- 1022 *Lancet* 1998;**352**:759–62.
- 1023 12 Lee DC, Sui X, Ortega FB, *et al.* Comparisons of leisure-time physical activity and  
1024 cardiorespiratory fitness as predictors of all-cause mortality in men and women. *Br J Sports Med*  
1025 2011;**45**:504–10.
- 1026 13 Haisma JA, van der Woude LHV, Stam HJ, *et al.* Physical capacity in wheelchair-dependent  
1027 persons with a spinal cord injury: a critical review of the literature. *Spinal Cord* 2006;**44**:642–52.
- 1028 14 Simmons OL, Kressler J, Nash MS. Reference fitness values in the untrained spinal cord injury  
1029 population. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2014;**95**:2272–8.
- 1030 15 Cruz S, Blauwet CA. Implications of altered autonomic control on sports performance in athletes  
1031 with spinal cord injury. *Auton Neurosci* 2018;**209**:100–4.
- 1032 16 West CR, Gee CM, Voss C, *et al.* Cardiovascular control, autonomic function, and elite  
1033 endurance performance in spinal cord injury. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2015;**25**:476–85.
- 1034 17 Figoni SF, Dolbow DR, Crawford EC, *et al.* Does aerobic exercise benefit persons with  
1035 tetraplegia from spinal cord injury? A systematic review. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2021;**44**:690–703.
- 1036 18 Stofan JR, DiPietro L, Davis D, *et al.* Physical activity patterns associated with cardiorespiratory  
1037 fitness and reduced mortality: the Aerobics Center Longitudinal Study. *Am J Public Health*  
1038 1998;**88**:1807–13.
- 1039 19 Nightingale TE, Williams S, Thompson D, *et al.* Energy balance components in persons with  
1040 paraplegia: daily variation and appropriate measurement duration. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*  
1041 2017;**14**:132.
- 1042 20 van den Berg-Emons RJ, Bussmann JB, Stam HJ. Accelerometry-based activity spectrum in  
1043 persons with chronic physical conditions. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2010;**91**:1856–61.
- 1044 21 Hicks AL, Martin Ginis KA, Pelletier CA, *et al.* The effects of exercise training on physical  
1045 capacity, strength, body composition and functional performance among adults with spinal cord  
1046 injury: a systematic review. *Spinal Cord* 2011;**49**:1103–27.

- 1047 22 Valent L, Dallmeijer A, Houdijk H, *et al.* The effects of upper body exercise on the physical  
1048 capacity of people with a spinal cord injury: a systematic review. *Clin Rehabil* 2007;**21**:315–30.
- 1049 23 Ginis KAM, Hicks AL, Latimer AE, *et al.* The development of evidence-informed physical  
1050 activity guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2011;**49**:1088–96.
- 1051 24 Martin Ginis KA, van der Scheer JW, Latimer-Cheung AE, *et al.* Evidence-based scientific  
1052 exercise guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury: an update and a new guideline. *Spinal Cord*  
1053 2018;**56**:308–21.
- 1054 25 Smith B, Kirby N, Skinner B, *et al.* Infographic. Physical activity for disabled adults. *Br J Sports*  
1055 *Med* 2019;**53**:335–6.
- 1056 26 Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, *et al.* World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical  
1057 activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J Sports Med* 2020;**54**:1451–62.
- 1058 27 Tweedy SM, Beckman EM, Geraghty TJ, *et al.* Exercise and sports science Australia (ESSA)  
1059 position statement on exercise and spinal cord injury. *J Sci Med Sport* 2017;**20**:108–15.
- 1060 28 Piercy KL, Troiano RP, Ballard RM, *et al.* The Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans.  
1061 *JAMA* 2018;**320**:2020–8.
- 1062 29 Powell KE, Paluch AE, Blair SN. Physical activity for health: What kind? How much? How  
1063 intense? On top of what? *Annu Rev Public Health* 2011;**32**:349–65.
- 1064 30 Tweedy SM, Beckman EM, Connick MJ, *et al.* Correspondence re ‘Evidence-based scientific  
1065 exercise guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury: an update and new guideline’. *Spinal Cord*.  
1066 2018;**56**:406–8.
- 1067 31 Yue T, Wang Y, Liu H, *et al.* Effects of High-Intensity Interval vs. Moderate-Intensity  
1068 Continuous Training on Cardiac Rehabilitation in Patients With Cardiovascular Disease: A  
1069 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Cardiovasc Med* 2022;**9**:845225.
- 1070 32 Hannan AL, Hing W, Simas V, *et al.* High-intensity interval training versus moderate-intensity  
1071 continuous training within cardiac rehabilitation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Open*  
1072 *Access J Sports Med* 2018;**9**:1–17.

- 1073 33 Peters J, Abou L, Rice LA, *et al.* The effectiveness of vigorous training on cardiorespiratory  
1074 fitness in persons with spinal cord injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Spinal Cord*  
1075 2021;**59**:1035–44.
- 1076 34 Nightingale TE, Metcalfe RS, Vollaard NB, *et al.* Exercise Guidelines to Promote  
1077 Cardiometabolic Health in Spinal Cord Injured Humans: Time to Raise the Intensity? *Arch Phys*  
1078 *Med Rehabil* 2017;**98**:1693–704.
- 1079 35 Astorino TA, Hicks AL, Bilzon JLJ. Viability of high intensity interval training in persons with  
1080 spinal cord injury—a perspective review. *Spinal Cord* 2021;**59**:3–8.
- 1081 36 Farrow M, Nightingale TE, Maher J, *et al.* Effect of Exercise on Cardiometabolic Risk Factors in  
1082 Adults With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*  
1083 2020;**101**:2177–205.
- 1084 37 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-  
1085 analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009;**339**:b2535.
- 1086 38 van der Scheer JW, Martin Ginis KA, Ditor DS, *et al.* Effects of exercise on fitness and health of  
1087 adults with spinal cord injury: A systematic review. *Neurology* 2017;**89**:736–45.
- 1088 39 van der Scheer JW, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, Valentino SE, *et al.* Functional electrical stimulation  
1089 cycling exercise after spinal cord injury: a systematic review of health and fitness-related  
1090 outcomes. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2021;**18**:99.
- 1091 40 American College Medicine. *ACSM’s guidelines for exercise testing and prescription*. 9th ed.  
1092 Lippincott Williams & Wilkins 2013. <https://shop.lww.com/ACSM-s-Guidelines-for-Exercise-Testing-and-Prescription/p/9781975150181> (accessed 3 Dec 2021).  
1093
- 1094 41 Higgins JPT, Li T, Deeks JJ. Choosing effect measures and computing estimates of effect.  
1095 *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. 2019;:143–76.  
1096 doi:10.1002/9781119536604.ch6
- 1097 42 Hozo SP, Djulbegovic B, Hozo I. Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and  
1098 the size of a sample. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2005;**5**:13.

- 1099 43 Collins EG, Gater D, Kiratli J, *et al.* Energy cost of physical activities in persons with spinal cord  
1100 injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2010;**42**:691–700.
- 1101 44 Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al.* *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*  
1102 *Interventions*. John Wiley & Sons 2019.
- 1103 45 Hutchinson MJ, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Rethinking aerobic exercise intensity prescription in adults  
1104 with spinal cord injury: time to end the use of ‘moderate to vigorous’ intensity? *Spinal Cord*  
1105 2021;:1–7.
- 1106 46 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Controlling the risk of spurious findings from meta-regression. *Stat*  
1107 *Med* 2004;**23**:1663–82.
- 1108 47 Higgins JPT, Sterne JAC, Savovic J, *et al.* A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomized  
1109 trials. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;**10**:29–31.
- 1110 48 McGuinness LA, Higgins JPT. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and Shiny web  
1111 app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. *Res Synth Methods* 2021;**12**:55–61.
- 1112 49 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, *et al.* GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of  
1113 evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;**336**:924–6.
- 1114 50 Han D-S, Hsiao M-Y, Wang T-G, *et al.* Association of serum myokines and aerobic exercise  
1115 training in patients with spinal cord injury: an observational study. *BMC Neurol* 2016;**16**:142.
- 1116 51 Hoekstra F, van Nunen MPM, Gerrits KHL, *et al.* Effect of robotic gait training on  
1117 cardiorespiratory system in incomplete spinal cord injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2013;**50**:1411–22.
- 1118 52 Pollack SF, Axen K, Spielholz N, *et al.* Aerobic training effects of electrically induced lower  
1119 extremity exercises in spinal cord injured people. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1989;**70**:214–9.
- 1120 53 Barstow TJ, Scremin AM, Mutton DL, *et al.* Changes in gas exchange kinetics with training in  
1121 patients with spinal cord injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1996;**28**:1221–8.
- 1122 54 Gorman PH, Scott W, VanHiel L, *et al.* Comparison of peak oxygen consumption response to  
1123 aquatic and robotic therapy in individuals with chronic motor incomplete spinal cord injury: a



- 1124 randomized controlled trial. *Spinal Cord* 2019;**57**:471–81.
- 1125 55 Heesterbeek PJC, Berkelmans HWA, Thijssen DHJ, *et al.* Increased physical fitness after 4-week  
1126 training on a new hybrid FES-cycle in persons with spinal cord injury. *Technol Disabil*  
1127 2005;**17**:103–10.
- 1128 56 Mutton DL, Scremin AM, Barstow TJ, *et al.* Physiologic responses during functional electrical  
1129 stimulation leg cycling and hybrid exercise in spinal cord injured subjects. *Arch Phys Med*  
1130 *Rehabil* 1997;**78**:712–8.
- 1131 57 Ozturk ED, Lapointe MS, Kim D-I, *et al.* Effect of 6-Month Exercise Training on Neurovascular  
1132 Function in Spinal Cord Injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2021;**53**:38–46.
- 1133 58 Hooker SP, Scremin AM, Mutton DL, *et al.* Peak and submaximal physiologic responses  
1134 following electrical stimulation leg cycle ergometer training. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 1995;**32**:361–6.
- 1135 59 Hooker SP, Figoni SF, Rodgers MM, *et al.* Physiologic effects of electrical stimulation leg cycle  
1136 exercise training in spinal cord injured persons. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1992;**73**:470–6.
- 1137 60 Hasnan N, Engkasan JP, Husain R, *et al.* High-Intensity Virtual-reality Arm plus FES-leg Interval  
1138 Training in Individuals with Spinal Cord Injury. *Biomed Tech* 2013;**58** Suppl 1.  
1139 doi:10.1515/bmt-2013-4028
- 1140 61 Janssen TWJ, Pringle DD. Effects of modified electrical stimulation-induced leg cycle ergometer  
1141 training for individuals with spinal cord injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2008;**45**:819–30.
- 1142 62 Jeon JY, Hettinga D, Steadward RD, *et al.* Reduced plasma glucose and leptin after 12 weeks of  
1143 functional electrical stimulation-rowing exercise training in spinal cord injury patients. *Arch Phys*  
1144 *Med Rehabil* 2010;**91**:1957–9.
- 1145 63 Midha M, Schmitt JK, Sclater M. Exercise effect with the wheelchair aerobic fitness trainer on  
1146 conditioning and metabolic function in disabled persons: a pilot study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*  
1147 1999;**80**:258–61.
- 1148 64 Milia R, Roberto S, Marongiu E, *et al.* Improvement in hemodynamic responses to metaboreflex  
1149 activation after one year of training in spinal cord injured humans. *Biomed Res Int*

- 1150 2014;**2014**:893468.
- 1151 65 Solinsky R, Mercier H, Picard G, *et al.* Cardiometabolic Effects of High-Intensity Hybrid  
1152 Functional Electrical Stimulation Exercise after Spinal Cord Injury. *PM R* 2021;**13**:937–44.
- 1153 66 Lavado EL, Cardoso JR, Silva LGA, *et al.* Effectiveness of aerobic physical training for treatment  
1154 of chronic asymptomatic bacteriuria in subjects with spinal cord injury: a randomized controlled  
1155 trial. *Clin Rehabil* 2013;**27**:142–9.
- 1156 67 Brazg G, Fahey M, Holleran CL, *et al.* Effects of Training Intensity on Locomotor Performance  
1157 in Individuals With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Randomized Crossover Study. *Neurorehabil*  
1158 *Neural Repair* 2017;**31**:944–54.
- 1159 68 Beillot J, Carré F, Le Claire G, *et al.* Energy consumption of paraplegic locomotion using  
1160 reciprocating gait orthosis. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 1996;**73**:376–81.
- 1161 69 Bombardier CH, Dyer JR, Burns P, *et al.* A tele-health intervention to increase physical fitness in  
1162 people with spinal cord injury and cardiometabolic disease or risk factors: a pilot randomized  
1163 controlled trial. *Spinal Cord* 2021;**59**:63–73.
- 1164 70 Kooijmans H, Post MWM, Stam HJ, *et al.* Effectiveness of a Self-Management Intervention to  
1165 Promote an Active Lifestyle in Persons With Long-Term Spinal Cord Injury: The HABITS  
1166 Randomized Clinical Trial. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2017;**31**:991–1004.
- 1167 71 Ma JK, West CR, Martin Ginis KA. The Effects of a Patient and Provider Co-Developed,  
1168 Behavioral Physical Activity Intervention on Physical Activity, Psychosocial Predictors, and  
1169 Fitness in Individuals with Spinal Cord Injury: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Sports Med*  
1170 2019;**49**:1117–31.
- 1171 72 Nooijen CF, Stam HJ, Sluis T, *et al.* A behavioral intervention promoting physical activity in  
1172 people with subacute spinal cord injury: secondary effects on health, social participation and  
1173 quality of life. *Clin Rehabil* 2017;**31**:772–80.
- 1174 73 Bakkum AJT, de Groot S, Stolwijk-Swüste JM, *et al.* Effects of hybrid cycling versus  
1175 handcycling on wheelchair-specific fitness and physical activity in people with long-term spinal

- 1176 cord injury: a 16-week randomized controlled trial. *Spinal Cord* 2015;**53**:395–401.
- 1177 74 Capodaglio P, Grilli C, Bazzini G. Tolerable exercise intensity in the early rehabilitation of  
1178 paraplegic patients. A preliminary study. *Spinal Cord* 1996;**34**:684–90.
- 1179 75 Gorgey AS, Lai RE, Khalil RE, *et al.* Neuromuscular electrical stimulation resistance training  
1180 enhances oxygen uptake and ventilatory efficiency independent of mitochondrial complexes after  
1181 spinal cord injury: a randomized clinical trial. *J Appl Physiol* 2021;**131**:265–76.
- 1182 76 Alrashidi AA, Nightingale TE, Currie KD, *et al.* Exercise Improves Cardiorespiratory Fitness, but  
1183 Not Arterial Health, after Spinal Cord Injury: The CHOICES Trial. *J Neurotrauma*  
1184 2021;**38**:3020–9.
- 1185 77 Berry HR, Perret C, Saunders BA, *et al.* Cardiorespiratory and power adaptations to stimulated  
1186 cycle training in paraplegia. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2008;**40**:1573–80.
- 1187 78 Duffell LD, Paddison S, Alahmary AF, *et al.* The effects of FES cycling combined with virtual  
1188 reality racing biofeedback on voluntary function after incomplete SCI: a pilot study. *J Neuroeng*  
1189 *Rehabil* 2019;**16**:149.
- 1190 79 Durán FS, Lugo L, Ramírez L, *et al.* Effects of an exercise program on the rehabilitation of  
1191 patients with spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2001;**82**:1349–54.
- 1192 80 Gorman PH, Scott W, York H, *et al.* Robotically assisted treadmill exercise training for  
1193 improving peak fitness in chronic motor incomplete spinal cord injury: A randomized controlled  
1194 trial. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2016;**39**:32–44.
- 1195 81 Gibbons RS, Stock CG, Andrews BJ, *et al.* The effect of FES-rowing training on cardiac structure  
1196 and function: pilot studies in people with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2016;**54**:822–9.
- 1197 82 Janssen TWJ, Dallmeijer AJ, Veeger DJHEJ, *et al.* Normative values and determinants of  
1198 physical capacity in individuals with spinal cord injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2002;**39**:29–39.
- 1199 83 Lannem AM, Sørensen M, Lidal IB, *et al.* Perceptions of exercise mastery in persons with  
1200 complete and incomplete spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2010;**48**:388–92.

- 1201 84 Latimer AE, Ginis KAM, Craven BC, *et al.* The physical activity recall assessment for people  
1202 with spinal cord injury: validity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2006;**38**:208–16.
- 1203 85 Manns PJ, McCubbin JA, Williams DP. Fitness, inflammation, and the metabolic syndrome in  
1204 men with paraplegia. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2005;**86**:1176–81.
- 1205 86 Martin Ginis KA, Úbeda-Colomer J, Alrashidi AA, *et al.* Construct validation of the leisure time  
1206 physical activity questionnaire for people with SCI (LTPAQ-SCI). *Spinal Cord* 2021;**59**:311–8.
- 1207 87 Nightingale TE, Walhin J-P, Thompson D, *et al.* Biomarkers of cardiometabolic health are  
1208 associated with body composition characteristics but not physical activity in persons with spinal  
1209 cord injury. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2019;**42**:328–37.
- 1210 88 Haisma JA, Post MW, van der Woude LH, *et al.* Functional independence and health-related  
1211 functional status following spinal cord injury: a prospective study of the association with physical  
1212 capacity. *J Rehabil Med* 2008;**40**:812–8.
- 1213 89 Leving MT, de Groot S, Woldring FAB, *et al.* Motor learning outcomes of handrim wheelchair  
1214 propulsion during active spinal cord injury rehabilitation in comparison with experienced  
1215 wheelchair users. *Disabil Rehabil* 2021;**43**:1429–42.
- 1216 90 Stewart MW, Melton-Rogers SL, Morrison S, *et al.* The measurement properties of fitness  
1217 measures and health status for persons with spinal cord injuries. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*  
1218 2000;**81**:394–400.
- 1219 91 Dallmeijer AJ, van der Woude LH, Hollander PA, *et al.* Physical performance in persons with  
1220 spinal cord injuries after discharge from rehabilitation. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1999;**31**:1111–7.
- 1221 92 Janssen TW, van Oers CA, Rozendaal EP, *et al.* Changes in physical strain and physical capacity  
1222 in men with spinal cord injuries. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1996;**28**:551–9.
- 1223 93 Steeves JD, Kramer JK, Fawcett JW, *et al.* Extent of spontaneous motor recovery after traumatic  
1224 cervical sensorimotor complete spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2011;**49**:257–65.
- 1225 94 DiCarlo SE. Effect of arm ergometry training on wheelchair propulsion endurance of individuals  
1226 with quadriplegia. *Phys Ther* 1988;**68**:40–4.

- 1227 95 de Groot S, Dallmeijer AJ, Kilkens OJ, *et al.* Course of gross mechanical efficiency in handrim  
1228 wheelchair propulsion during rehabilitation of people with spinal cord injury: a prospective cohort  
1229 study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2005;**86**:1452–60.
- 1230 96 Sprigle S, Maurer C, Holowka M. Development of valid and reliable measures of postural  
1231 stability. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2007;**30**:40–9.
- 1232 97 Kouwijzer I, Valent L, Osterthun R, *et al.* Peak power output in handcycling of individuals with a  
1233 chronic spinal cord injury: predictive modeling, validation and reference values. *Disabil Rehabil*  
1234 2020;**42**:400–9.
- 1235 98 Hjeltnes N, Wallberg-Henriksson H. Improved work capacity but unchanged peak oxygen uptake  
1236 during primary rehabilitation in tetraplegic patients. *Spinal Cord* 1998;**36**:691–8.
- 1237 99 Williams AM, Ma JK, Martin Ginis KA, *et al.* Effects of a Tailored Physical Activity  
1238 Intervention on Cardiovascular Structure and Function in Individuals With Spinal Cord Injury.  
1239 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2021;**35**:692–703.
- 1240 100 West CR, Campbell IG, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, *et al.* Effects of abdominal binding on field-based  
1241 exercise responses in Paralympic athletes with cervical spinal cord injury. *J Sci Med Sport*  
1242 2014;**17**:351–5.
- 1243 101 Pitetti KH, Barrett PJ, Campbell KD, *et al.* The effect of lower body positive pressure on the  
1244 exercise capacity of individuals with spinal cord injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1994;**26**:463–8.
- 1245 102 Nieshoff EC, Birk TJ, Birk CA, *et al.* Double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial of midodrine for  
1246 exercise performance enhancement in tetraplegia: a pilot study. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2004;**27**:219–  
1247 25.
- 1248 103 Nightingale TE, Walter M, Williams AMM, *et al.* Ergogenic effects of an epidural  
1249 neuroprosthesis in one individual with spinal cord injury. *Neurology* 2019;**92**:338–40.
- 1250 104 Laskin JJ, Waheed Z, Thorogood NP, *et al.* Spinal Cord Stimulation Research in the Restoration  
1251 of Motor, Sensory, and Autonomic Function for Individuals Living With Spinal Cord Injuries: A  
1252 Scoping Review. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* Published Online First: 23 February 2022.

- 1253           doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.01.161
- 1254   105   Berger MJ, Kimpinski K, Currie KD, *et al.* Multi-Domain Assessment of Autonomic Function in  
1255           Spinal Cord Injury Using a Modified Autonomic Reflex Screen. *J Neurotrauma* 2017;**34**:2624–  
1256           33.
- 1257   106   Wang S, Wecht JM, Legg Ditterline B, *et al.* Heart rate and blood pressure response improve the  
1258           prediction of orthostatic cardiovascular dysregulation in persons with chronic spinal cord injury.  
1259           *Physiol Rep* 2020;**8**:e14617.
- 1260   107   Chiou SY, Clarke E, Lam C, *et al.* Effects of Arm-Crank Exercise on Fitness and Health in  
1261           Adults With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review. *Front Physiol* 2022;**13**:831372.
- 1262   108   Bochkezanian V, Raymond J, de Oliveira CQ, *et al.* Can combined aerobic and muscle strength  
1263           training improve aerobic fitness, muscle strength, function and quality of life in people with  
1264           spinal cord injury? A systematic review. *Spinal Cord* 2015;**53**:418–31.
- 1265   109   Brurok B, Helgerud J, Karlsen T, *et al.* Effect of aerobic high-intensity hybrid training on stroke  
1266           volume and peak oxygen consumption in men with spinal cord injury. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*  
1267           2011;**90**:407–14.
- 1268   110   Gant KL, Nagle KG, Cowan RE, *et al.* Body System Effects of a Multi-Modal Training Program  
1269           Targeting Chronic, Motor Complete Thoracic Spinal Cord Injury. *J Neurotrauma* 2018;**35**:411–  
1270           23.
- 1271   111   Lotter JK, Henderson CE, Plawewcki A, *et al.* Task-Specific Versus Impairment-Based Training on  
1272           Locomotor Performance in Individuals With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Randomized  
1273           Crossover Study. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2020;**34**:627–39.
- 1274   112   Jacobs PL, Nash MS, Rusinowski JW. Circuit training provides cardiorespiratory and strength  
1275           benefits in persons with paraplegia. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001;**33**:711–7.
- 1276   113   Sweet SN, Martin Ginis KA, Tomasone JR. Investigating intermediary variables in the physical  
1277           activity and quality of life relationship in persons with spinal cord injury. *Health Psychol*  
1278           2013;**32**:877–85.

- 1279 114 Farkas GJ, Gorgey AS, Dolbow DR, *et al.* Energy Expenditure, Cardiorespiratory Fitness, and  
1280 Body Composition Following Arm Cycling or Functional Electrical Stimulation Exercises in  
1281 Spinal Cord Injury: A 16-Week Randomized Controlled Trial. *Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil*  
1282 2021;**27**:121–34.
- 1283 115 Eitivipart AC, de Oliveira CQ, Arora M, *et al.* Overview of Systematic Reviews of Aerobic  
1284 Fitness and Muscle Strength Training after Spinal Cord Injury. *J Neurotrauma* 2019;**36**:2943–63.
- 1285 116 Martin Ginis KA, van der Scheer JW, Latimer-Cheung AE, *et al.* Response to correspondence  
1286 from the ESSA Statement authors. *Spinal Cord*. 2018;**56**:409–11.
- 1287 117 Tordi N, Dugue B, Klupzinski D, *et al.* Interval training program on a wheelchair ergometer for  
1288 paraplegic subjects. *Spinal Cord* 2001;**39**:532–7.
- 1289 118 de Groot PCE, Hjeltnes N, Heijboer AC, *et al.* Effect of training intensity on physical capacity,  
1290 lipid profile and insulin sensitivity in early rehabilitation of spinal cord injured individuals. *Spinal*  
1291 *Cord* 2003;**41**:673–9.
- 1292 119 Gauthier C, Brosseau R, Hicks AL, *et al.* Feasibility, Safety, and Preliminary Effectiveness of a  
1293 Home-Based Self-Managed High-Intensity Interval Training Program Offered to Long-Term  
1294 Manual Wheelchair Users. *Rehabil Res Pract* 2018;**2018**:8209360.
- 1295 120 Mcleod JC, Diana H, Hicks AL. Sprint interval training versus moderate-intensity continuous  
1296 training during inpatient rehabilitation after spinal cord injury: a randomized trial. *Spinal Cord*  
1297 2020;**58**:106–15.
- 1298 121 Graham K, Yarar-Fisher C, Li J, *et al.* Effects of High-Intensity Interval Training Versus  
1299 Moderate-Intensity Training on Cardiometabolic Health Markers in Individuals With Spinal Cord  
1300 Injury: A Pilot Study. *Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil* 2019;**25**:248–59.
- 1301 122 Astorino TA, Thum JS. Within-session responses to high-intensity interval training in spinal cord  
1302 injury. *Disabil Rehabil* 2018;**40**:444–9.
- 1303 123 Hutchinson MJ, Kouwijzer I, de Groot S, *et al.* Comparison of two Borg exertion scales for  
1304 monitoring exercise intensity in able-bodied participants, and those with paraplegia and

- 1305 tetraplegia. *Spinal Cord* 2021;**59**:1162–9.
- 1306 124 Valentino SE, Hutchinson MJ, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, *et al.* Effects of Perceptually Regulated  
1307 Exercise Training on Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Peak Power Output in Adults With Spinal  
1308 Cord Injury: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* Published Online  
1309 First: 6 April 2022. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.008
- 1310 125 van der Scheer JW, Hutchinson MJ, Paulson T, *et al.* Reliability and Validity of Subjective  
1311 Measures of Aerobic Intensity in Adults With Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review. *PM R*  
1312 2018;**10**:194–207.
- 1313 126 Cowley KC. A new conceptual framework for the integrated neural control of locomotor and  
1314 sympathetic function: implications for exercise after spinal cord injury. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab*  
1315 2018;**43**:1140–50.
- 1316 127 Jamnick NA, Pettitt RW, Granata C, *et al.* An Examination and Critique of Current Methods to  
1317 Determine Exercise Intensity. *Sports Med* 2020;**50**:1729–56.
- 1318 128 Hoevenaars D, Holla JFM, Postma K, *et al.* Associations between meeting exercise guidelines,  
1319 physical fitness, and health in people with spinal cord injury. *Disabil Rehabil* 2022;:1–8.
- 1320 129 Tjønnå AE, Leinan IM, Bartnes AT, *et al.* Low- and high-volume of intensive endurance training  
1321 significantly improves maximal oxygen uptake after 10-weeks of training in healthy men. *PLoS*  
1322 *One* 2013;**8**:e65382.
- 1323 130 Stensvold D, Viken H, Steinshamn SL, *et al.* Effect of exercise training for five years on all cause  
1324 mortality in older adults-the Generation 100 study: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*  
1325 2020;**371**:m3485.
- 1326 131 Church TS, Earnest CP, Skinner JS, *et al.* Effects of different doses of physical activity on  
1327 cardiorespiratory fitness among sedentary, overweight or obese postmenopausal women with  
1328 elevated blood pressure: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2007;**297**:2081–91.
- 1329 132 Foulds HJA, Bredin SSD, Charlesworth SA, *et al.* Exercise volume and intensity: a dose-response  
1330 relationship with health benefits. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2014;**114**:1563–71.



- 1331 133 Phillips BE, Kelly BM, Lilja M, *et al.* A Practical and Time-Efficient High-Intensity Interval  
1332 Training Program Modifies Cardio-Metabolic Risk Factors in Adults with Risk Factors for Type  
1333 II Diabetes. *Front Endocrinol* 2017;**8**:229.
- 1334 134 Katzelnick CG, Weir JP, Jones A, *et al.* Blood Pressure Instability in Persons With SCI: Evidence  
1335 From a 30-Day Home Monitoring Observation. *Am J Hypertens* 2019;**32**:938–44.
- 1336 135 Nightingale TE, Eginyan G, Balthazaar SJT, *et al.* Accidental boosting in an individual with  
1337 tetraplegia - considerations for the interpretation of cardiopulmonary exercise testing. *J Spinal*  
1338 *Cord Med* 2021;:1–6.
- 1339 136 Martin Ginis KA, Phang SH, Latimer AE, *et al.* Reliability and validity tests of the leisure time  
1340 physical activity questionnaire for people with spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*  
1341 2012;**93**:677–82.
- 1342 137 Ginis KAM, Latimer AE, Hicks AL, *et al.* Development and evaluation of an activity measure for  
1343 people with spinal cord injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2005;**37**:1099–111.
- 1344 138 de Groot S, van der Woude LHV, Niezen A, *et al.* Evaluation of the physical activity scale for  
1345 individuals with physical disabilities in people with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2010;**48**:542–  
1346 7.
- 1347 139 Healy GN, Wijndaele K, Dunstan DW, *et al.* Objectively measured sedentary time, physical  
1348 activity, and metabolic risk: the Australian Diabetes, Obesity and Lifestyle Study (AusDiab).  
1349 *Diabetes Care* 2008;**31**:369–71.
- 1350 140 O’Donovan G, Hillsdon M, Ukoumunne OC, *et al.* Objectively measured physical activity,  
1351 cardiorespiratory fitness and cardiometabolic risk factors in the Health Survey for England. *Prev*  
1352 *Med* 2013;**57**:201–5.
- 1353 141 Hansford HJ, Wewege MA, Cashin AG, *et al.* If exercise is medicine, why don’t we know the  
1354 dose? An overview of systematic reviews assessing reporting quality of exercise interventions in  
1355 health and disease. *Br J Sports Med* 2022;**56**:692–700.
- 1356 142 Slade SC, Dionne CE, Underwood M, *et al.* Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template (CERT):

- 1357 Explanation and Elaboration Statement. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;**50**:1428–37.
- 1358 143 Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, *et al*. Better reporting of interventions: template for  
1359 intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ* 2014;**348**:g1687.
- 1360 144 Kodama S, Saito K, Tanaka S, *et al*. Cardiorespiratory fitness as a quantitative predictor of all-  
1361 cause mortality and cardiovascular events in healthy men and women: a meta-analysis. *JAMA*  
1362 2009;**301**:2024–35.
- 1363
- 1364
- 1365
- 1366
- 1367
- 1368
- 1369
- 1370
- 1371
- 1372
- 1373
- 1374
- 1375
- 1376
- 1377
- 1378

1379 **FIGURE/TABLE LEGEND**

1380 **Figure 1.** PRISMA flow diagram. Abbreviation: PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic  
1381 Reviews and Meta-Analyses

1382 **Table 1.** Participant demographics and injury characteristics reported within the included studies of the  
1383 primary meta-analysis.

1384 **Table 2.** Exercise intervention parameters reported within the included studies of the primary meta-  
1385 analysis.

1386 **Table 3.** Summary statistics of the three subgroup analyses on injury characteristics describing  $\Delta$  in CRF  
1387 outcomes.

1388 **Table 4.** Summary statistics of the three subgroup analyses on exercise parameters describing  $\Delta$  in CRF  
1389 outcomes.

1390 **Table 5.** Meta-regression models with adjusted values for each cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

1391 **Table 6.** Grading of recommendations assessment, development and evaluation analysis for each  
1392 cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

1393

1394 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

1395 **Supplementary file 1 (S1): Systematic Review Search Strategy**

1396 **Supplementary file 2 (S2): Description of Exercise Intensity Classifications as per the American**  
1397 **College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) guidelines**

1398 **Supplementary file 3 (S3): Calculated Correlation Factors**

1399 **Supplementary file 4 (S4): Change in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-**  
1400 **characterised exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks (Primary meta-analysis)**

1401 1. Summary of the individual studies included in the review

1402 2. Forest and funnel plots for change in each CRF outcome for each subgroup comparison (time since  
1403 injury, neurological level of injury, injury severity, exercise modality, length of intervention,  
1404 relative exercise intensity, method of exercise intensity prescription, frequency of exercise sessions,  
1405 and exercise volume)

1406 3. Quality assessment ratings for each pre-post study included in the primary meta-analysis

1407 4. Risk of bias for each RCT intervention arm included in the primary meta-analysis

1408 5. References

1409 **Supplementary file 5 (S5): Cross-sectional cohort comparisons summary (secondary meta-**  
1410 **analysis 1)**

1411 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled cohort  
1412 comparisons

1413 2. Summary of the individual studies included in the review

1414 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the NIH tool for observational cohort and cross-  
1415 sectional studies

1416 4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome

1417 5. Sensitivity analysis on  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$

1418 6. References

1419 **Supplementary file 6 (S6): Cross-sectional associations between physical activity and CRF**  
1420 **outcomes**

1421 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled association  
1422 comparisons

1423 2. Summary of the individual studies included in the review

1424 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the NIH tool for observational cohort and cross-  
1425 sectional studies

1426 4. Visualisation of correlation coefficients between physical activity dimensions and CRF outcomes  
1427 across included studies

1428 5. References

1429 **Supplementary file 7 (S7): Observational studies (secondary meta-analysis 2)**

1430 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled observational  
1431 studies

1432 2. Summary of the individual studies included in the review

- 1433 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the NIH tool for observational cohort and cross-  
1434 sectional studies
- 1435 4. Forest plots for absolute and relative  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and peak power output
- 1436 5. Funnel plots for absolute and relative  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$  and peak power output
- 1437 6. References

1438 **Supplementary file 8 (S8): RCTs (secondary meta-analysis 3)**

- 1439 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled RCTs (exercise  
1440 intervention vs. true-world control or standard of care)
- 1441 2. Summary of the individual RCTs included in the review
- 1442 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool
- 1443 4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome
- 1444 5. References

1445 **Supplementary file 9 (S9): RCTs intensity comparisons (secondary meta-analysis 4)**

- 1446 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled RCTs comparing  
1447 the effects of different exercise intensities
- 1448 2. Summary of the individual RCTs comparing exercise intensity included in the review
- 1449 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool
- 1450 4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome
- 1451 5. References

1452 **Supplementary file 10 (S10): Adverse events**

1453 **Supplementary file 11 (S11): Sensitivity analyses**

1454 **Supplementary file 11 (S12): CPET vs. exercise intervention modality**

- 1455 1. Forest plots for each CRF outcome

1456 **Supplementary file 10 (S13): Gait-training sub-analysis**

- 1457 1. Forest plots for each CRF outcome

**Table 1.** Participant demographics and injury characteristics reported within the included studies of the primary meta-analysis.

	$\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (L/min)	$\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (mL/kg/min)	PPO (W)
<b>Baseline CRF</b>			
Total number of interventions [sum of participants] Mean (range)	69 [766] 1.26 (0.51 – 3.50)	74 [768] 18.0 (7.3 – 36.9)	61 [662] 49 (0 – 168)
<b>Participant demographics</b>			
Age (years)	38 (24 - 54)	39 (24 - 58)	39 (25 - 57)
<i>Sex</i>			
Male	22 [181]	21 [150]	20 [157]
Female	-	-	-
Mixed (% F)	43 [559] (22%)	44 [535] (24%)	39 [492] (28%)
Not reported/cannot determine	4 [26]	9 [83]	2 [13]
<b>Injury characteristics</b>			
Time since injury (years)	8 (0 - 21)	6 (0 - 24)	7 (0 - 21)
Acute (<1-year)	7 [111]	8 [95]	9 [117]
Chronic (>1-year)	47 [472]	48 [443]	38 [367]
Mixed (% acute)	7 [89] (13.5%)	6 [64] (17%)	7 [84] (24%)
Not reported/cannot determine	8 [94]	12 [166]	7 [94]
<i>Neurological level of injury (TETRA/PARA)</i>			
TETRA	2 [18]	3 [23]	3 [23]
PARA	19 [176]	27 [264]	22 [220]
Mixed (% PARA)	41 [488] (59%)	36 [398] (51%)	32 [382] (62%)
Not reported/cannot determine	7 [84]	8 [83]	4 [37]
<i>Severity</i>			
Motor-complete (AIS A-B)	27 [248]	29 [253]	24 [219]
Motor-incomplete (AIS C-D)	8 [102]	13 [142]	2 [14]
Mixed (% motor-incomplete)	22 [303] (32%)	21 [270] (34%)	25 [344] (35%)
Not reported/cannot determine	12 [113]	11 [103]	10 [85]

Total number of studies (N) and participants ( $\Sigma$ ), along with descriptive characteristics for the primary meta-analysis included in this systematic review that describes  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-characterised exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks (e.g., combining exercise intervention-arms from RCTs and pre-post studies). Continuous variables are displayed as weighted means (range: lowest – highest mean values reported from studies). Categorical variables are displayed as n (%). Weighted means were calculated to account for differences in sample size between studies using the following formula:  $\Sigma n \cdot \bar{x} / \Sigma n$ , where  $\Sigma$  = the sum of, n = number of participants in each study, and  $\bar{x}$  = mean CRF outcome of each study. AIS, American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale; F, females; M, males; NR, not reported; PARA, paraplegia; PPO, peak power output; TETRA, tetraplegia;  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , peak oxygen consumption; W, watts.

1458  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467

**Table 2.** Exercise intervention parameters reported within the included studies of the primary meta-analysis.

	<b><math>\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}</math></b> <b>(L/min)</b>	<b><math>\dot{R}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}</math></b> <b>(mL/kg/min)</b>	<b>PPO</b> <b>(W)</b>
<b>Baseline CRF</b>			
Total number of interventions [sum of participants]	69 [766]	74 [768]	61 [662]
Mean (range)	1.26 (0.51 – 3.50)	18.0 (7.3 – 36.9)	49 (0 – 168)
<b>Exercise intervention parameters</b>			
<i>Modality</i>			
Upper-body aerobic exercise	25 [272]	33 [299]	26 [259]
Upper-body resistance training/circuits	4 [33]	3 [29]	3 [25]
Functional electrical stimulation	17 [170]	8 [66]	14 [140]
Gait/locomotor training	10 [130]	10 [126]	2 [28]
Mixed/multimodal	10 [94]	18 [227]	12 [136]
Behaviour change	3 [67]	2 [21]	4 [74]
<i>Relative intensity</i>			
Light	1 [14]	-	1 [14]
Moderate	8 [58]	12 [94]	10 [73]
Moderate-to-vigorous	21 [270]	24 [305]	16 [183]
Vigorous	14 [119]	20 [194]	11 [104]
Supramaximal	-	1 [4]	1 [10]
Mixed/cannot determine	25 [305]	17 [171]	22 [278]
<i>Relative intensity prescription method</i>			
$\text{VO}_2$ (%peak, %reserve)	8 [61]	12 [112]	9 [93]
Heart rate (%HRR, %HR <sub>peak</sub> , %HR <sub>max</sub> )	16 [156]	26 [285]	14 [113]
RPE	9 [144]	8 [111]	6 [90]
Workload (%PPO, %MTP, %1RM)	9 [71]	6 [49]	7 [53]
Mixed/cannot determine	27 [334]	22 [211]	25 [313]
<i>Session duration (min)</i>			
	41 (20 - 90)	41 (15 - 90)	39 (5 - 90)
<i>Frequency (sessions/week)</i>			
	3 (2 - 7)	3 (2 - 7)	3 (2 - 7)
< 3	19 [230]	13 [168]	13 [156]
≥ 3 and < 5	35 [339]	49 [500]	38 [387]
≥ 5	11 [116]	9 [65]	5 [31]
Not reported	4 [81]	3 [35]	5 [88]
<i>Volume (min/week)</i>			
	113 (40 - 450)	116 (40 - 330)	107 (15 - 330)
SCI-specific exercise guidelines [fitness (40 – 89 min/wk)]	13 [140]	14 [156]	15 [146]
	45 (40 - 84)	47 (40 - 88)	48 (15 - 88)
SCI-specific exercise guidelines [cardiomatabolic (90 – 149 min/wk)]	30 [309]	31 [336]	26 [290]
	99 (90 - 135)	102 (90 - 135)	113 (90 - 135)
Achieving general population exercise guidelines (≥150 min/wk)	13 [135]	21 [197]	13 [117]
	229 (150 - 450)	206 (150 - 330)	212 (171 - 330)
Cannot classify	13 [182]	8 [79]	7 [109]
<i>Length (weeks)</i>			
	17 (6 - 52)	12 (4 - 52)	16 (4 - 52)
≤ 6 weeks	10 [85]	23 [215]	18 [175]
> 6 and ≤ 12 weeks	33 [368]	36 [371]	21 [223]
> 12 weeks	26 [313]	15 [182]	22 [264]
<b>Adverse events reported</b>			
Bone, joint or muscular pain	5 [5] <sup>a</sup>	6 [9] <sup>a</sup>	4 [4] <sup>a</sup>

Autonomic or cardiovascular function	3 [5]	2 [1]	4 [3]
Skin irritation or pressure sores	2 [2] <sup>a</sup>	5 [18] <sup>a</sup>	2 [2] <sup>a</sup>
Other <sup>d</sup>	2 [NR] <sup>a,c</sup>	4 [3] <sup>a</sup>	3 [1] <sup>a,c</sup>

Total number of studies (N) and participants, (Σ) along with descriptive characteristics for the primary meta-analysis included in this systematic review that describes Δ in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-characterised exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks (e.g., combining exercise intervention-arms from RCTs and pre-post studies). Continuous variables are displayed as weighted means (range: lowest – highest mean values reported from studies). Categorical variables are displayed as n (%). Weighted means were calculated to account for differences in sample size between studies using the following formula:  $\Sigma n \cdot \bar{x} / \Sigma n$ , where Σ = the sum of, n = number of participants in each study, and  $\bar{x}$  = mean CRF outcome of each study. F, females; HR<sub>max</sub>, maximal heart rate; HR<sub>peak</sub>, peak heart rate; HRR, heart rate reserve; 1RM, one repetition maximum; M, males; MTP, maximal tolerated power; NR, not reported; PPO, peak power output;  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{ peak}}$ , peak oxygen consumption; W, watts. <sup>a</sup> Beillot et al. [68] (pre-post intervention study) reported n=10 suffered major complications including spontaneous fractures of lower limbs, occurrence of syringomyelia and pressure sores but did not specify the sum of participants for each adverse event. <sup>b</sup> Gibbons et al. [81] reported that some individuals experienced autonomic dysreflexia during the FES response test but did not quantify further. <sup>c</sup> Sum of participants experiencing adverse events were not reported by Janssen and Pringle [61]. <sup>d</sup> Other adverse events included: anxiety, nausea, dizziness and issues with testing equipment.

1468  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497



**Table 3.** Summary statistics of the three subgroup analyses on injury characteristics describing  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes.

	$\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ (L/min)		$\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ (mL/kg/min)		PPO (W)	
	N [ $\Sigma$ ] (%)	WMD (95% CIs) <i>p</i> -values	N [ $\Sigma$ ] (%)	WMD (95% CIs) <i>p</i> -values	N [ $\Sigma$ ] (%)	WMD (95% CIs) <i>p</i> -values
<b>Main effect</b>	69 [696]	0.22 [0.17, 0.26] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	74 [716]	2.8 [2.2, 3.4] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	61 [602]	11 [8, 13] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>
<b>Heterogeneity (<math>I^2</math>)</b>	74% ( <i>p</i> < 0.001)		52% ( <i>p</i> < 0.001)		78% ( <i>p</i> < 0.001)	
<b>Time since injury</b>						
Acute (<1-year)	7 [86] (10.4%)	0.23 [0.11, 0.35] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	8 [70] (10.9%)	3.4 [1.5, 6.1] <b><i>p</i> = 0.002</b>	9 [95] (13.6%)	16 [11, 22] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>
Chronic ( $\geq$ 1-year)	47 [461] (62.6%)	0.20 [0.14, 0.27] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	48 [431] (61.8%)	2.7 [1.9, 3.5] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>	38 [343] (61.8%)	9 [6, 12] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>
Mixed	7 [79] (14%)	0.25 [0.10, 0.39] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	6 [54] (5.9%)	1.9 [0.1, 3.7] <b><i>p</i> = 0.03</b>	7 [75] (12.8%)	6 [5, 7] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>
Not reported/cannot determine	8 [70] (13%)	0.25 [0.11, 0.38] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	12 [161] (21.4%)	2.6 [2.0, 3.3] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>	7 [89] (11.8%)	16 [9, 23] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>
Subgroup differences	-	<i>p</i> = 0.87	-	<i>p</i> = 0.64	-	<b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>
<b>Neurological level of injury</b>						
Tetraplegia	2 [18] (5.1%)	0.45 [-0.28, 1.19] <i>p</i> = 0.23	3 [23] (8.5%)	5.9 [0.2, 11.7] <b><i>p</i> = 0.04</b>	3 [23] (6.8%)	9 [6, 13] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>
Paraplegia	20 [174] (28.4%)	0.24 [0.17, 0.32] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	28 [262] (45.2%)	2.8 [2.2, 3.4] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>	22 [216] (42.2%)	16 [12, 19] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>
Mixed	44 [470] (58.9%)	0.20 [0.15, 0.25] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	41 [418] (42.5%)	2.2 [1.5, 2.8] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>	34 [350] (48.6%)	6 [4, 8] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>
Not reported/cannot determine	3 [34] (7.6%)	0.19 [0.11, 0.27] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	2 [13] (3.8%)	2.8 [0.7, 4.8] <b><i>p</i> = 0.02</b>	2 [13] (2.4%)	17 [7, 27] <b><i>p</i> = 0.001</b>
Subgroup differences	-	<i>p</i> = 0.65	-	<i>p</i> = 0.34	-	<b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>
<b>Injury severity</b>						
Motor-complete (AIS A-B)	27 [235] (40%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.27] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	29 [241] (47.4%)	2.7 [2.0, 3.4] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	24 [210] (49.2%)	11 [8, 15] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>
Motor-incomplete (AIS C-D)	8 [103] (9%)	0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] <i>p</i> = 0.08	13 [139] (12.5%)	1.6 [0.2, 2.9] <b><i>p</i> = 0.02</b>	2 [14] (3.1%)	4 [-3, 12] <i>p</i> = 0.25
Mixed (AIS A-D)	22 [247] (26.2%)	0.18 [0.13, 0.24] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	21 [244] (23.3%)	2.7 [1.7, 3.6] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	25 [296] (31.1%)	10 [6, 14] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>
Not reported/cannot determine	12 [111] (24.8%)	0.32 [0.20, 0.44] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	11 [92] (16.8%)	3.9 [1.7, 6.1] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	10 [82] (16.6%)	11 [5, 17] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>
Subgroup differences	-	<i>p</i> = 0.06	-	<i>p</i> = 0.28	-	<i>p</i> = 0.43

Total number of interventions (N), sum of participants analysed at post-intervention ( $\Sigma$ ), weighting of subgroups (%). Thresholds for statistically significant subgroup differences were adjusted for the number of subgroup comparisons and are highlighted in bold: time since injury (*p*<0.0125), neurological level of injury (*p*<0.0125) and injury severity (*p*<0.0125). Individual subgroup *p*-values were adjusted for multiple comparisons via the Bonferroni correction method. AIS, American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale;  $\dot{A}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ , absolute peak oxygen consumption; CIs, confidence intervals; PPO, peak power output;  $\dot{R}V\dot{O}_{2peak}$ , relative peak oxygen consumption; WMD, weighted mean difference.

1498

**Table 4.** Summary statistics of the six subgroup analyses on exercise parameters describing  $\Delta$  in CRF outcomes.

	<b>AVO<sub>2peak</sub></b> <b>(L/min)</b>		<b>RVO<sub>2peak</sub></b> <b>(mL/kg/min)</b>		<b>PPO</b> <b>(W)</b>	
	<b>N [Σ]</b> <b>(%)</b>	<b>WMD (95% CIs)</b> <b>p-values</b>	<b>N [Σ]</b> <b>(%)</b>	<b>WMD (95% CIs)</b> <b>p-values</b>	<b>N [Σ]</b> <b>(%)</b>	<b>WMD (95% CIs)</b> <b>p-values</b>
<b>Main effect</b>	69 [696]	0.22 [0.17, 0.26] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>	74 [716]	2.8 [2.2, 3.4] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>	61 [602]	11 [8, 13] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>
<b>Heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup>)</b>	74% (p < 0.001)		52% (p < 0.001)		78% (p < 0.001)	
<b>Exercise modality</b>						
Aerobic, volitional upper-body	25 [235] (33.5%)	0.25 [0.16, 0.34] <b>p &lt; 0.004</b>	33 [264] (43.1%)	3.4 [2.4, 4.4] <b>p &lt; 0.004</b>	26 [223] (32.5%)	15 [11, 19] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>
Resistance training	4 [31] (3.5%)	0.33 [0.13, 0.52] <b>p = 0.003</b>	3 [27] (3.9%)	5.0 [2.9, 7.0] <b>p &lt; 0.004</b>	3 [25] (4.6%)	20 [12, 28] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>
Functional electrical stimulation	17 [168] (33.9%)	0.22 [0.15, 0.29] <b>p &lt; 0.004</b>	8 [66] (14.4%)	2.4 [0.9, 3.9] <b>p = 0.006</b>	14 [138] (37.1%)	6 [3, 10] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>
Gait training	10 [127] (12%)	0.07 [-0.02, 0.17] <b>p = 0.14</b>	10 [120] (9.7%)	1.0 [-0.5, 2.6] <b>p = 0.40</b>	2 [24] (2.2%)	4 [-9, 18] <b>p = 0.54</b>
Behaviour change	3 [49] (2.5%)	0.22 [0.00, 0.44] <b>p = 0.10</b>	2 [21] (3.3%)	1.1 [-1.2, 3.5] <b>p = 0.35</b>	4 [56] (4.6%)	12 [-1, 24] <b>p = 0.12</b>
Mixed	10 [86] (14.6%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.27] <b>p &lt; 0.004</b>	18 [218] (25.6%)	2.4 [1.7, 3.2] <b>p &lt; 0.004</b>	12 [136] (19%)	10 [5, 16] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>
Subgroup differences	-	<b>p = 0.07</b>	-	<b>p = 0.02</b>	-	<b>p = 0.003</b>
<b>Length of intervention</b>						
≤6 weeks	10 [79] (14.5%)	0.26 [0.19, 0.39] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>	23 [206] (23.1%)	2.9 [1.9, 3.9] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>	17 [159] (26.7%)	10 [6, 14] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>
>6 – ≤12 weeks	32 [327] (46.6%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.29] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>	36 [337] (54.6%)	3.2 [2.3, 4.1] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>	22 [202] (34.5%)	13 [8, 17] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>
>12 weeks	27 [290] (38.9%)	0.22 [0.15, 0.28] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>	15 [173] (22.3%)	1.8 [1.0, 2.6] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>	22 [241] (38.8%)	9 [5, 13] <b>p &lt; 0.001</b>
Subgroup differences	-	<b>p = 0.59</b>	-	<b>p = 0.05</b>	-	<b>p = 0.49</b>
<b>Relative exercise intensity</b>						
Light	1 [10] (0.6%)	-0.05 [-0.57, 0.47] <b>p = 0.85</b>	-	-	1 [10] (1%)	-1 [-22, 20] <b>p = 0.92</b>
Moderate	8 [58] (9.5%)	0.32 [0.09, 0.54] <b>p = 0.01</b>	12 [92] (18.1%)	3.2 [1.1, 5.3] <b>p = 0.006</b>	10 [71] (15.9%)	13 [4, 21] <b>p = 0.009</b>
Moderate-to-vigorous	21 [247] (33.7%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.27] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>	24 [279] (32.5%)	2.7 [2.0, 3.5] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>	16 [161] (24.1%)	17 [13, 21] <b>p &lt; 0.004</b>
Vigorous	14 [109] (15.2%)	0.19 [0.14, 0.25] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>	20 [183] (21.6%)	2.2 [1.4, 3.0] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>	11 [96] (12%)	10 [7, 16] <b>p &lt; 0.004</b>
Supramaximal	-	-	1 [4] (0.4%)	1.1 [-8.2, 10.4] <b>p = 0.82</b>	1 [10] (0.6%)	17 [-12, 46] <b>p = 0.50</b>
Mixed/cannot determine	25 [272] (41%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.29] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>	17 [158] (27.4%)	2.6 [1.5, 3.8] <b>p &lt; 0.003</b>	22 [254] (46.4%)	8 [5, 10] <b>p &lt; 0.004</b>
Subgroup differences	-	<b>p = 0.71</b>	-	<b>p = 0.67</b>	-	<b>p = 0.003</b>

<b>Exercise intensity prescription</b>						
Oxygen consumption	8 [57] (13.1%)	0.19 [0.07, 0.32] <b><i>p</i> = 0.003</b>	12 [107] (17.9%)	2.3 [1.5, 3.2] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>	9 [89] (12.6%)	20 [15, 25] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>
Heart rate	16 [156] (20.2%)	0.28 [0.15, 0.40] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	26 [284] (37.7%)	3.1 [2.0, 4.3] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>	14 [113] (21.8%)	14 [8, 19] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>
Rating of perceived exertion	9 [121] (12.1%)	0.18 [0.09, 0.26] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	8 [84] (8.3%)	3.5 [1.2, 5.07] <b><i>p</i> = 0.002</b>	6 [66] (5.7%)	9 [1, 17] <b><i>p</i> = 0.03</b>
Workload	9 [65] (9.9%)	0.23 [0.13, 0.33] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	6 [43] (6.5%)	3.0 [1.2, 4.8] <b><i>p</i> = 0.002</b>	7 [49] (11.9%)	11 [4, 19] <b><i>p</i> = 0.01</b>
Mixed/cannot determine	27 [297] (44.7%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.27] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	22 [198] (29.6%)	2.4 [1.4, 3.3] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>	25 [285] (48%)	7 [5, 10] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.003</b>
Subgroup differences	-	<i>p</i> = 0.72	-	<i>p</i> = 0.71	-	<b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>
<b>Frequency of exercise sessions</b>						
<3 sessions/wk	19 [213] (24%)	0.18 [0.12, 0.25] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	13 [155] (15.2%)	2.8 [1.5, 4.0] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	13 [148] (21.4%)	4 [1, 6] <b><i>p</i> = 0.003</b>
≥3 – <5 sessions/wk	35 [306] (57.6%)	0.26 [0.19, 0.33] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	49 [465] (65.9%)	2.8 [2.1, 3.6] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	38 [357] (61.8%)	13 [10, 15] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.004</b>
≥5 sessions/wk	11 [118] (14.4%)	0.15 [0.07, 0.23] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	9 [65] (14.2%)	3.6 [1.7, 5.4] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	5 [31] (10.9%)	10 [-2, 23] <i>p</i> = 0.10
Not reported/cannot determine	4 [59] (4%)	0.13 [-0.05, 0.31] <i>p</i> = 0.15	3 [31] (4.7%)	0.8 [-1.2, 2.8] <i>p</i> = 0.42	5 [66] (5.9%)	9 [0, 18] <i>p</i> = 0.10
Subgroup differences	-	<i>p</i> = 0.14	-	<i>p</i> = 0.24	-	<b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>
<b>Exercise volume</b>						
SCI-specific exercise guidelines for fitness (40 - 89 min/wk)	13 [132] (13.1%)	0.23 [0.13, 0.33] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	14 [151] (13.9%)	3.2 [2.0, 4.5] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	15 [138] (19.1%)	6 [2, 10] <b><i>p</i> = 0.002</b>
SCI-specific exercise guidelines for cardiometabolic health (90 - 149 min/wk)	30 [269] (52.3%)	0.23 [0.16, 0.30] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	31 [295] (48.3%)	2.8 [1.9, 3.8] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	26 [260] (48.7%)	12 [9, 16] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>
Achieving general population exercise guidelines (≥150 min/wk)	13 [133] (18%)	0.18 [0.11, 0.25] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	21 [195] (28.1%)	2.8 [1.8, 3.9] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>	13 [117] (23.9%)	11 [5, 17] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.002</b>
Not reported/cannot determine	13 [162] (16.6%)	0.24 [0.12, 0.36] <b><i>p</i> &lt; 0.001</b>	8 [75] (9.7%)	2.1 [0.7, 3.5] <b><i>p</i> = 0.003</b>	7 [87] (8.3%)	10 [4, 17] <b><i>p</i> = 0.002</b>
Subgroup differences	-	<i>p</i> = 0.67	-	<i>p</i> = 0.70	-	<i>p</i> = 0.17

Total number of interventions (N), sum of participants analysed at post-intervention ( $\Sigma$ ), weighting of subgroups (%). Thresholds for statistically significant subgroup differences were adjusted for the number of subgroup comparisons and are highlighted in bold: exercise modality ( $p < 0.008$ ), length of intervention ( $p < 0.017$ ), relative exercise intensity [ $\dot{A}V_{O_{2peak}}$  and  $\dot{R}V_{O_{2peak}}$  ( $p < 0.01$ ), PPO ( $p < 0.008$ )], exercise intensity prescription ( $p < 0.01$ ), frequency of exercise sessions ( $p < 0.025$ ), and exercise volume ( $p < 0.025$ ). Individual subgroup  $p$ -values were adjusted for multiple comparisons via the Bonferroni correction method.  $\dot{A}V_{O_{2peak}}$ , absolute peak oxygen consumption; CIs, confidence intervals; PPO, peak power output;  $\dot{R}V_{O_{2peak}}$ , relative peak oxygen consumption; WMD, weighted mean difference.

1499

1500

**Table 5:** 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{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math> Model 1 (N = 69)<sup>1</sup> (# covariates = 5)</b>						
Male	0.006	0.004	1.610	0.084	-0.001 to 0.013	0.322
Mean age	-0.003	0.001	-2.580	0.010	-0.006 to -0.001	0.045
TSI	0.000	0.001	0.260	0.714	-0.002 to 0.003	0.999
Neurological level of injury	-0.002	0.004	-0.470	0.584	-0.010 to 0.006	0.984
Severity	-0.005	0.003	-1.340	0.153	-0.012 to 0.002	0.534
<b><math>\dot{A}\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math> Model 2 (N = 69)<sup>2</sup> (# covariates = 6)</b>						
Exercise modality	-0.015	0.016	-0.940	0.281	-0.048 to 0.017	0.865
Exercise intensity	-0.006	0.016	-0.390	0.666	-0.038 to 0.026	0.999
Length of intervention	0.000	0.002	0.050	0.828	-0.004 to 0.004	1.000
Duration (mins)	-0.005	0.006	-0.790	0.327	-0.018 to 0.008	0.917
Frequency	0.002	0.011	0.180	0.902	-0.019 to 0.023	1.000
Volume	-0.000	0.003	-0.040	0.929	-0.006 to 0.006	1.000
<b><math>\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math> Model 1 (N = 74)<sup>3</sup> (# covariates = 5)</b>						
Male	0.084	0.047	1.790	0.84	-0.010 to 0.177	0.395
Mean age	-0.041	0.013	-3.010	0.004	-0.068 to -0.014	0.025
TSI	-0.012	0.013	-0.940	0.386	-0.039 to 0.014	0.932
Neurological level of injury	-0.043	0.042	-1.020	0.356	-0.128 to 0.042	0.907
Severity	-0.030	0.047	-0.650	0.521	-0.124 to 0.063	0.983
<b><math>\dot{R}\dot{V}O_{2peak}</math> Model 2 (N = 74)<sup>4</sup> (# covariates = 6)</b>						
Exercise modality	-0.276	0.164	-1.680	0.110	-0.603 to 0.051	0.511
Exercise intensity	-0.076	0.200	-0.380	0.718	-0.474 to 0.323	1.00
Length of intervention	-0.024	0.033	-0.740	0.437	-0.089 to 0.041	0.982
Risk of bias	-0.057	0.350	-0.160	0.866	-0.756 to 0.642	1.000
Duration (mins)	-0.043	0.063	-0.690	0.494	-0.169 to 0.082	0.986
Frequency	0.143	0.139	1.030	0.308	-0.133 to 0.420	0.908
<b>PPO Model 1 (N = 61)<sup>5</sup> (# covariates = 6)</b>						
Male	-0.090	0.236	-0.380	0.712	-0.562 to 0.383	0.997
Mean age	-0.035	0.082	-0.420	0.694	-0.199 to 0.130	0.995
TSI	-0.149	0.077	-1.940	0.075	-0.303 to 0.005	0.296
Neurological level of injury	-0.122	0.193	-0.630	0.556	-0.509 to 0.265	0.972
Severity	-0.051	0.182	-0.280	0.796	-0.416 to 0.314	1.000
<b>PPO Model 2 (N = 61)<sup>6</sup> (# covariates = 5)</b>						
Exercise modality	-0.685	0.733	-0.930	0.068	-2.156 to 0.786	0.266
Exercise intensity prescription	-1.465	0.749	-1.960	0.001	-2.967 to 0.036	0.002
Duration (mins)	-0.170	0.361	-0.470	0.476	-0.893 to 0.554	0.945
Frequency	0.254	0.643	0.390	0.997	-1.036 to 1.543	1.00
Volume	-0.217	0.178	-1.220	0.009	-0.574 to 0.140	0.041

\* Permutations = 10,000

<sup>1</sup>  $\tau^2 = 0.02339$ ;  $I^2 \text{ res} = 98.61\%$ ;  $\text{Adj } R^2 = 13.00\%$ ;  $\text{Model } F(5,63) = 2.77$ ;  $\text{Prob} > F = 0.0252$

<sup>2</sup>  $\tau^2 = 0.2932$ ;  $I^2 \text{ res} = 98.52\%$ ;  $\text{Adj } R^2 = -9.04\%$ ;  $\text{Model } F(7,61) = 0.31$ ;  $\text{Prob} > F = 0.9446$

<sup>3</sup>  $\tau^2 = 3.639$ ;  $I^2 \text{ res} = 97.98\%$ ;  $\text{Adj } R^2 = 11.98\%$ ;  $\text{Model } F(5,68) = 2.89$ ;  $\text{Prob} > F = 0.0201$

---

<sup>4</sup>  $\tau^2 = 4.108$ ;  $I^2 \text{ res} = 98.13\%$ ;  $\text{Adj } R^2 = 0.63\%$ ;  $\text{Model F } (7,66) = 1.04$ ;  $\text{Prob} > F = 0.4124$

<sup>5</sup>  $\tau^2 = 65.65$ ;  $I^2 \text{ res} = 99.56\%$ ;  $\text{Adj } R^2 = 1.07\%$ ;  $\text{Model F } (5,55) = 1.16$ ;  $\text{Prob} > F = 0.3399$

<sup>6</sup>  $\tau^2 = 64.86$ ;  $I^2 \text{ res} = 99.34\%$ ;  $\text{Adj } R^2 = 2.26\%$ ;  $\text{Model F } (7,53) = 1.17$ ;  $\text{Prob} > F = 0.3333$

$\text{Adj } R^2$ , proportion of between-study variance explained;  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ , absolute peak oxygen consumption; Coef, coefficient of variation;  $I^2 \text{ res}$ ,  $I^2$  residual variation due to heterogeneity; Model F, joint test for all covariates; PP Prob > F, with Knapp-Hartung modification;  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$ , relative peak oxygen consumption; Std.Err, standard error; TSI, time since injury.

1501

**Table 6.** Grading of recommendations assessment, development and evaluation analysis for each cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

	$\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ (L/min)	$\dot{R}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ (mL/kg/min)	PPO (W)
<i>Summary of findings according to GRADE analysis</i>			
GRADE	LOW	LOW	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, imprecision, an unclear dose response and residual confounding reduced the Grade to Low.</p> <p>The evidence supporting improvements in <math>\dot{A}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}</math> is predominantly in young and middle-aged males that had been injured for &gt;1-year (chronic TSI). Participants were mostly paraplegic (70%) but there were a mixture of injury severities (AIS A-D).</p> <p>There were no subgroup differences in exercise intervention characteristics to suggest the 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>High risk of bias, imprecision, an unclear dose response and residual confounding reduced the Grade to Low.</p> <p>The evidence supporting improvements in <math>\dot{R}V\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}</math> is predominantly in young and middle-aged males that had been injured for &gt;1-year (chronic TSI). Participants were mostly paraplegic (70.5%) but there were a mixture of injury severities (AIS A-D).</p> <p>There were no subgroup differences in exercise intervention characteristics to suggest the 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>Inconsistency, imprecision, an unclear dose response and residual confounding reduced the Grade to Moderate.</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 (76%) but there were a mixture of injury severities (AIS A-D).</p> <p>Subgroup differences suggest that upper-body aerobic exercise and resistance training appear the most effective at improving PPO. Furthermore, acutely-injured, individuals with paraplegia, exercising for &gt;3 sessions/week at a moderate-to-vigorous-intensity, prescribed via <math>\dot{V}\text{O}_2</math> or heart rate, will likely experience the greatest change in PPO.</p>
<i>Lower quality criteria</i>			
Study design	Mixture of RCTs and pre-post studies with no control groups.	Mixture of RCTs and pre-post studies with no control groups.	Mixture of RCTs and pre-post studies with no control groups.

	Overall WMDs for RCT interventions relative to controls and pre-post interventions only: RCTs (0.15 L/min) and pre-post studies (0.23 L/min). <b>DOWNGRADE</b>	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). <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>	Overall WMDs for RCT interventions relative to controls and pre-post interventions only: RCTs (10 W) and pre-post studies (11 W). <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>
Risk of bias (RoB)	28% of pre-post studies were rated as good, 56% as fair, and 16% as poor. 31% of RCTs had low RoB, 23% had some concerns, and 46% had high RoB. <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>	38% of pre-post studies were rated as good, 48% as fair, and 14% as poor. 15% of RCTs had low RoB, 25% had some concerns, and <u>60% had high RoB.</u> <b>DOWNGRADE</b>	26% of pre-post studies were rated as good, 59% as fair, and 15% as poor. 23% of RCTs had low RoB, 38.5% had some concerns, and 38.5% had high RoB. <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>
Inconsistency of results	Effect estimates were consistent, with 91% of the included exercise interventions favouring an increase in $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , but most had a low effect estimate. $I^2 = 74\%$ <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>	Effect estimates were consistent, with 91% of the included exercise interventions favouring an increase in $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , and most had a large effect estimate. $I^2 = 52\%$ <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>	Effect estimates were consistent, with 93% of the included exercise interventions favouring an increase in PPO, and most had a large effect estimate. $I^2 = 78\%$ <b>DOWNGRADE</b>
Indirectness	Most studies (83%) included $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ in their main outcome measures, across a range of participant characteristics. <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>	Most studies (72%) included $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ in their main outcome measures, across a range of participant characteristics. <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>	Most studies (82%) included PPO in their main outcome measures, across a range of participant characteristics. <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>
Imprecision	Large sample size (N=696), however, 62% of the included exercise interventions had 95% CI overlap 0. <b>DOWNGRADE</b>	Large sample size (N=716), however, 76% of the included exercise interventions had 95% CI overlap 0. <b>DOWNGRADE</b>	Large sample size (N=601), however, 67% of the included exercise interventions had 95% CI overlap 0. <b>DOWNGRADE</b>
Publication bias	An exhaustive approach was used during the search strategy (i.e., scientific databases and grey literature search). Egger's test: $Z = -1.23$ ( $p = 0.22$ ). Visual inspection of the funnel plots, data extraction sheets and Tables 3-4 revealed no noticeable publication bias. <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>	An exhaustive approach was used during the search strategy (i.e., scientific databases and grey literature search). Egger's test: $Z = -0.54$ ( $p = 0.59$ ). Visual inspection of the funnel plots, data extraction sheets and Tables 3-4 revealed no noticeable publication bias. <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>	An exhaustive approach was used during the search strategy (i.e., scientific databases and grey literature search). Egger's test: $Z = 0.73$ ( $p = 0.46$ ). Visual inspection of the funnel plots, data extraction sheets and Tables 3-4 revealed no noticeable publication bias. <b>NO DOWNGRADE</b>
<b>Higher quality criteria</b>			
Large effect	Yes $Z = 9.5$ ( $p < 0.001$ ) <b>NO UPGRADE</b>	Yes $Z = 9.4$ ( $p < 0.001$ ) <b>NO UPGRADE</b>	Yes $Z = 8.7$ ( $p < 0.001$ ) <b>NO UPGRADE</b>

Dose response	No clear dose response. <b>NO UPGRADE</b>	No clear dose response. <b>NO UPGRADE</b>	No clear dose response. <b>NO UPGRADE</b>
Residual confounding	Mixture of exercise modalities, levels of injury, etc. <b>NO UPGRADE</b>	Mixture of exercise modalities, levels of injury, etc. <b>NO UPGRADE</b>	Mixture of exercise modalities, levels of injury, etc. <b>NO UPGRADE</b>

GRADE certainty in the evidence can be ‘High’, ‘Moderate’, ‘Low’ or ‘Very Low’ according to published guidelines [34]. Risk of bias was downgraded where >50% of RCTs had a high risk of bias. Heterogeneity was also included as a measure of inconsistency, whereby 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;  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , absolute peak oxygen consumption; CI, confidence intervals; CRF, cardiorespiratory fitness; PPO, peak power output; RCTs, randomised-controlled trials; RoB, risk of bias;  $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ , relative peak oxygen consumption;  $\dot{V}O_2$ , peak oxygen consumption.



