

1 **Paper Title:**

2 Objective and Subjective Assessments of Exercise Burden in Masters Athletes Are Poorly  
3 Correlated

4

5 **Author Names and Affiliations:**

6 Jennifer Lewis, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, University of Toronto, Toronto,  
7 Ontario, Canada

8 Robert F. Bentley, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, University of Toronto,  
9 Toronto, Ontario, Canada

10 Kim A. Connelly, Keenan Research Centre for Biomedical Science, Division of Cardiology, St  
11 Michael's Hospital, Unity Health, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; University of Toronto and Heart  
12 and Stroke/Richard Lewar Centres of Excellence in Cardiovascular Research, Toronto, Ontario,  
13 Canada

14 Paul Dorian, Keenan Research Centre for Biomedical Science, Division of Cardiology, St  
15 Michael's Hospital, Unity Health, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; University of Toronto and Heart  
16 and Stroke/Richard Lewar Centres of Excellence in Cardiovascular Research, Toronto, Ontario,  
17 Canada

18 Jack M. Goodman, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, University of Toronto,  
19 Toronto, Ontario, Canada, Division of Cardiology, Mount Sinai Hospital, University of Toronto  
20 and Heart and Stroke/Richard Lewar Centres of Excellence in Cardiovascular Research, Toronto,  
21 Ontario, Canada

22

23 **Institution where work was performed:**

24 University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

25

26 **Mailing Address (for Jack Goodman):**

27 55 Harbord Street  
28 Toronto, Ontario  
29 M5S 2W6  
30 Canada

31

32 **Email Address (for Jack Goodman):**

33 jack.goodman@utoronto.ca

1 KEYWORDS

2 Exercise, Exertion, Perceived Exertion, Cardiovascular, Risk of Exercise, Exercise Physiology

3

4 ABSTRACT

5 Accurate quantification of exercise volume (burden) is crucial for understanding links between  
6 exercise and cardiovascular outcomes in older endurance athletes (EA). Exercise burden, an  
7 integral of intensity and duration (MET·min), is typically determined from subjective self-reports  
8 but has uncertain accuracy. We studied 40 EAs (41 to 69 yrs., 50% female) with >10 yrs.  
9 training history, during a typical outdoor cycling training session (42 km). Subjective self-reports  
10 were related to cardiac (HR·min) and metabolic (MET·min) components of exercise burden,  
11 monitored continuously. Subjective self-reports were highly variable and underestimated  
12 objective metrics of exercise intensity. Discordance was observed between metabolic and cardiac  
13 burden as less fit individuals accrued greater cardiac ( $14039 \pm 2649$  vs.  $11784 \pm 1132$  HR·min,  
14  $P < 0.01$ ) but lower metabolic burden ( $808 \pm 59$  vs.  $858 \pm 61$  MET·min,  $P < 0.05$ ) vs. higher fit EA.  
15 Caution is advised in interpreting MET·min estimates from self-reports, urging objective  
16 measurement of cardiac burden for further insights into the risk-benefit relationship of long-term  
17 exercise.

18

19

20

21

22

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Sustained adherence to physical activity recommendations (1, 2) is associated with a lower risk  
3 of all-cause mortality and various chronic diseases (3-5), including cardiovascular illness (6).

4 There is increasing benefit as exercise volume increases, yet there is some evidence (7, 8), which  
5 is in dispute (6), that suggests prolonged high-intensity exercise may increase the risk of adverse  
6 cardiovascular outcomes. The relationship between exercise volume and in particular, exercise  
7 intensity, and cardiovascular disease or other health outcomes is not completely understood.

8 Studies examining the cumulative effects of exercise dose on cardiovascular outcomes have been  
9 largely based on non-athletic populations, relying on self-reported accounts of exercise  
10 frequency, duration, and intensity, all of which contribute to the overall exercise ‘burden’,  
11 despite uncertain accuracy. However, subjective estimates of exercise intensity have been poorly  
12 correlated to objective measures of intensity due to recall bias and confounding factors including  
13 fitness level, BMI, and sex (9, 10). When considering the exercise dose-cardiovascular response  
14 relationship in endurance athletes, studies have often failed to directly assess exercise intensity  
15 and more importantly, distinguish between the overall *metabolic* (i.e., oxygen consumption) and  
16 *cardiac*-specific (i.e., heart rate) components of the exercise dose-response relationship. This  
17 complex relationship is predicated on accurate quantification of exercise intensity, a key  
18 determining factor determining cardiovascular adaptations to exercise training (11) and the  
19 cumulative exercise ‘volume’ associated with an elevated risk for certain adverse outcomes (12).  
20 These considerations are particularly pertinent for older endurance athletes with long-standing  
21 exercise history who reflect the largest and fastest growing cohort of mass participation events  
22 (13), and who may have increased cardiovascular disease burden, especially an elevated risk for  
23 developing lone atrial fibrillation (14). Without an accurate determination of exercise intensity,

1 reports of exercise histories may be inaccurate and misleading, particularly when attributing high  
2 levels of cumulative exercise ‘burden’ to adverse long-term cardiovascular outcomes.

3 The purpose of this study was to assess subjective reports of exercise intensity during typical  
4 endurance training in the field and relate these to objective measures of intensity. We sought to  
5 determine if estimates of exercise intensity from self-reports would accurately reflect objective  
6 measures of intensity in masters endurance athletes.

## 7 METHODS

### 8 *Participants*

9 Male and female adults aged 40 to 69 years were recruited from local cycling clubs. Inclusion  
10 criteria included experience with standard road cycling including a weekly ride of  $\geq 60$  km and  
11 total weekly mileage of  $\geq 100$  km. Exclusion criteria included ranking as current or former  
12 national or Olympic team cyclists, history of smoking, cardiovascular disease, metabolic  
13 disorders, hypertension with resting pressures exceeding 140/90 despite medication (mmHg),  
14 sleep apnea, recent infection or inflammation, and thyroid disease. Participants completed a  
15 written informed consent approved by the University of Toronto Health Sciences Research  
16 Ethics Board (Protocol #39300) which included directives and restrictions related to the COVID-  
17 19 pandemic at the time (October-November 2020). The study was conducted in full compliance  
18 with the Declaration of Helsinki and its amendments.

### 19 *Field Study Exercise Protocol*

20 This prospective observational cohort field study was designed to mimic a typical mid-distance,  
21 self-paced training session on a 42 km pre-determined route in a rural setting. Participants were

1 instructed to ride at a ‘typical’ training intensity along a pre-determined cycling route on side  
2 roads of varying topography that would elicit different levels of challenge (345 m elevation  
3 change); pre-determined landmarks identified where ratings of perceived exertion (RPE) were  
4 obtained via wireless communication during brief sections (2 to 3 km distance) of ‘self-paced’  
5 efforts at prespecified ‘low’, ‘medium’, ‘high’ and ‘very high’ levels of effort (Figure 1). All  
6 participants abstained from alcohol, caffeine, and endurance training for at least 24 hours prior to  
7 the field study.

### 8 *Baseline Measures and Preparation for Exercise*

9 Upon arrival at the staging area before the ride, participants were provided with a detailed  
10 familiarization session and completed a questionnaire (15) assessing the quality of their previous  
11 night’s sleep, current state of fatigue, stress, and muscle soreness. Body mass (kg) was assessed  
12 using a digital scale (Starfrit Balance, Atlantic Promotions Inc., Canada), and resting blood  
13 pressure (BP) and resting heart rate (HR) were obtained from three consecutive measures from a  
14 BP monitor (Omron 10 Series, Model BP7450CAN, Canada). Height (cm) was self-reported.  
15 Participants were then refamiliarized with RPE scales, including the Borg 6-20 ( $RPE_{\text{Borg}}$ ) (16)  
16 and the Word scale ( $RPE_{\text{Word}}$ ) (17), where: 1=very light, 2=light, 3=moderate, 4=vigorous,  
17 5=extremely vigorous. Participants were then fitted with equipment that provided continual  
18 measurements of heart rate and work rate which began at rest for 5 minutes in a seated position.  
19 They were also fitted with a portable earphone. Bike and communication set-up were tested by  
20 the participants in the staging area before ride departure.

### 21 *Exercise Protocol and Monitoring*

1 Participants performed the ride at their preferred cadence and training effort until called upon to  
2 complete the prespecified paced session (Figure 1) and then verbally reported their subjective  
3 effort using both RPE scales, in random order, without feedback provided. Following the  
4 completion of the exercise, a measure of the global perception of effort for the entire ride (post-  
5 ride RPE) was obtained 30 minutes after recovery using the Borg 6-20 and Word scales.

6 The warm-up (first 6 km) and cool-down (last 3.5 km) during the route were performed as per  
7 their usual routine, and non-caffeinated fluid and fuel ingestion were permitted, ad libitum.

8 Due to COVID-19-related face-to-face research restrictions, direct laboratory assessment or in-  
9 field measures of  $VO_{2max}$  were not possible, therefore  $VO_{2peak}$  was estimated from peak power  
10 and heart rate data. The maximal heart rate observed was derived from the average of two  
11 consecutive 60-sec recordings, compared against age-predicted  $HR_{max}$  (18), and  $VO_{2peak}$  was then  
12 estimated based on the peak power aligned to these values (19).

13 Communication (for monitoring and soliciting RPE scores) between the investigator and  
14 participants utilized hands-free, automatic call-answering communication through a mobile  
15 device (s10 or s20 Plus, Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd., South Korea) mounted on the bike with a  
16 portable earphone (AirPods Pro, Apple Inc., USA) secured before starting the ride. Remote  
17 tracking of participants was provided by asset tracking software (Fluid Mobility Inc., Ontario,  
18 Canada), and geo-fencing ensured all participants were at the same location when reporting RPE.

### 19 *Physiological Monitoring and Data Processing*

20 Heart rate (HR) was continuously monitored using a Viiiiva chest strap (4iiii Innovations Inc.,  
21 Alberta, Canada) and a Frontier X chest strap (Frontier X, Fourth Frontier Technologies Private

1 Limited, Bangalore, India). Participants' road bikes were fitted with calibrated power meter  
2 pedals (Garmin Vector 3, Garmin International Inc., Olathe, KS, USA) and Vector cleats (Arc  
3 R2, Garmin, USA). The Viiiiva heart rate monitor and Vector 3 pedals were synced with a  
4 portable computer (Edge 530, Garmin International Inc., Olathe, KS, USA), allowing for  
5 continuous monitoring of power (watts), with only speed, time and direction measures visible to  
6 the participants. All measures were recorded continuously throughout the ride for each device at  
7 sampling frequencies of 125 Hz (HR) or 1 Hz (power). Heart rate and power data were averaged  
8 over one-minute intervals. Age-predicted maximal heart rate was calculated using Tanaka's  
9 formula (18), and percentage of effort for HR and METs was relative to the peak levels achieved  
10 during the ride. RPE was recorded at six distinct landmarks (LM1 to LM6). The first 120s and  
11 last 60s of each ride were excluded from the analysis to account for variations in departure and  
12 arrival routines.

13 The total exercise cardiac burden of the field ride was determined by an area under the curve  
14 (AUC) analysis for individual participants' heart rate data, obtained from the continuous  
15 recordings averaged over 1-minute intervals data for (AUC HR, expressed as HR·min). This  
16 measure is an estimate of the total number of heartbeats during the ride. Similarly, the estimated  
17 total metabolic burden (MET·min) of the entire ride was derived from AUC analysis calculated  
18 from the average power (watts) and body mass (kg) over time, using the ACSM equation for  
19 oxygen cost of cycling/leg ergometry (19). Total MET·min is an estimate of (body mass  
20 corrected) total energy produced during the ride.

21 *Statistical Analysis*

1 Normality of data was assessed with a Shapiro-Wilk test. All normally distributed data are  
2 reported as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation while non-normally distributed data are median  
3 (interquartile range). To explore the effect of each landmark on heart rate, power, and calculated  
4 METs, one-way repeated measures ANOVAs were completed. When the assumption of  
5 sphericity was violated, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied. Following a significant  
6 landmark effect, Bonferroni corrected *post hoc* tests were completed. To explore the effect of  
7 biological sex on objective and subjective measures over the entire ride and participant  
8 characteristics, independent samples t-tests and Mann-Whitney U tests were completed as  
9 appropriate. The effect of fitness on ride endpoints was assessed with independent samples t-tests  
10 and Mann-Whitney U tests as appropriate. The associations between cardiac and metabolic  
11 burden and ride parameters were assessed with Pearson correlations and Spearman Rho as  
12 appropriate. Statistical significance was set at a two-tailed alpha level of 0.05. All statistical  
13 analyses were carried out using SPSS Statistics software 26 (IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY,  
14 USA), and AUC calculations used SigmaPlot 11 graphing software (Systat Software Inc.,  
15 California, USA).

## 16 RESULTS

17 Forty masters athletes (50% female) between 41 and 69 years of age completed the study.  
18 Baseline characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Participants had an average history of  
19 recreational and or competitive training for cycling equal to  $15\pm 9$  years or mixed endurance  
20 training equal to  $19\pm 2$  years. All reported normal sleep patterns and duration (*median*=7.6 hours)  
21 the night before testing and did not report unusual muscle soreness, fatigue, or stress.

### 22 *Field Conditions*



1 Participants completed the 42 km ride without consequence during the morning (n=37) or early  
2 afternoon (n=3). Environmental conditions (Environment and Climate Change Canada) varied by  
3 ambient temperature (5 to 21°C), wind (2 to 25 km/h; gusts 0 to 44 km/h), and relative humidity  
4 (31 to 99%). Light rain occurred on one day (impacting two female riders).

### 5 *Exercise Intensity*

6 Continuous measures of exercise intensity from the entire ride are presented in Table 2. The  
7 mean time to complete the ride was 90.0±8.6 min, at a mean cadence of 82±6 rpm, and a mean  
8 speed of 28.9±2.5 km/h, with an average power output of 173±42 W. The mean HR<sub>peak</sub> achieved  
9 during the ride was 167±10 bpm, equivalent to 98% of the age-predicted HR<sub>max</sub> (170±5 bpm)  
10 using Tanaka's formula (18).

11 The mean relative percentage of effort (relative to peak levels achieved) during the entire ride for  
12 heart rate and METs was 87±4% (range 80-98%) and 79±6% (range 64-101%), respectively.

13 Mean power output was significantly higher in males than in females, but similar relative  
14 intensities were observed as there were no differences observed between biological sex for  
15 %HR<sub>peak</sub> or %VO<sub>2peak</sub>.

16 Predicted %HR<sub>max</sub> achieved and total duration for the ride were positively correlated ( $r_s=0.36$ ,  
17 95% CI 0.23 to 0.71,  $P=0.02$ ), whereas a negative correlation was observed between ride  
18 duration and mean METs ( $r_s=-0.82$ , 95% CI -0.90 to -0.69,  $P<0.001$ ) and estimated VO<sub>2peak</sub> ( $r_s=-$   
19 0.79, 95% CI -0.88 to -0.64,  $P<0.001$ ). Absolute and relative heart rate and power data at each  
20 landmark are presented in Supplementary Data Table 1. The correlation between mean power  
21 output (watts) and mean heart rate from the landmarks was  $r_s=0.34$  ( $P=0.001$ ). Each measure was  
22 obtained within 0.35±0.06 km of each pre-determined landmark location. The mean MET level

1 (gross, including resting energy) corresponding to each landmark ranged considerably from 7.7  
2 to 12.1 METs (Suppl Table 1).

### 3 *Metabolic and Cardiac Burden: Area Under the Curve (AUC) Analyses*

4 The calculated AUC power throughout the exercise was higher for males versus females  
5 (17,185±2253 versus 13,155±1580 W·min,  $P=0.001$ ), but differences were not apparent in AUC  
6 power when controlling for body mass between groups (Males: 214±22 W·kg<sup>-1</sup>·min; Females:  
7 210±24 W·kg<sup>-1</sup>·min,  $P=0.57$ ). Males had a lower AUC HR [12,109 (2099) bpm·min] compared  
8 with females [13,320 (2960) bpm·min] ( $U=127.00$ ,  $z=-1.975$ ,  $P=0.048$ ).

9 When participants were grouped by faster (median ≤ 89.0 min) versus slower (median >89.0  
10 min) finishing times, the faster group had a lower AUC HR [11,711.5 (1556.8) bpm·min versus  
11 those with slower finishing times (AUC HR [13,856.5 (2043.4) bpm·min] ( $U=42.00$ ,  $z=-4.272$ ,  
12  $P=0.001$ ). However, there was no difference between the two groups for AUC METs [Faster  
13 group: 846 (84) MET·min; Slower group: 808 (96) MET·min] ( $U=149.00$ ,  $z=-1.380$ ,  $P=0.10$ ).

14 Profiles of contrasting cardiac work but similar AUC METS from two riders are depicted in  
15 Figure 2. There was no correlation between total metabolic work (measured as AUC METs) and  
16 total cardiac work (measured as AUC HR). A negative correlation was observed between AUC  
17 HR and estimated  $VO_{2peak}$  ( $r=-0.51$ , 95% CI 0.24 to 0.71,  $P=0.001$ ) (Figure 3).

18 To evaluate the impact of fitness on exercise burden, AUC analysis was performed by grouping  
19 those above and below the field-based median estimated  $VO_{2peak}$  (41.0 mL/kg/min) (Table 3);  
20 there was a statistically significant difference between groups for AUC HR and AUC METs even  
21 after adjusting for biological sex ( $P=0.001$ ). The more fit subjects produced 16% more energy,  
22 but the less fit subjects required 19% more heartbeats during the ride (Table 3).

## 1 *Perceived Exertion and Recall Analyses*

2 RPE obtained during exercise (at each landmark; “instantaneous” RPE<sub>Borg</sub>, RPE<sub>Word</sub>) and 30  
3 minutes following the ride (post-ride RPE) varied significantly between participants. Reports of  
4 effort were significantly higher if obtained during the ride compared to reports obtained 30  
5 minutes after the ride’s completion, where median RPE<sub>Borg</sub> during (14.5) was higher than post-  
6 ride RPE<sub>Borg</sub> (14.0,  $P=0.009$ ), similar to that observed for the median RPE<sub>Word</sub> (3.5) during the  
7 ride versus that reported post ride (post-ride RPE<sub>Word</sub>) (3.0;  $P=0.024$ ).

8 Subjective reports of effort (RPE<sub>Borg</sub> vs. RPE<sub>Word</sub>) obtained during the ride were well-aligned  
9 ( $r_s=0.86$ , 95% CI 0.75 to 0.92,  $P=0.001$ ; Figure 4A) but had less agreement post ride ( $r_s=0.54$ ,  
10 95% CI 0.28 to 0.73,  $P=0.001$ ; Figure 4B). In addition, the word descriptor ‘moderate’ exercise  
11 intensity was associated with a wide variation of Borg ratings, ranging from 9 to 17 during  
12 exercise, and 12 to 16 after exercise. Similarly, ‘vigorous’ exercise was also equated with large  
13 ranges of Borg ratings both during the ride [11 to 19] and post ride [13 to 17] (Figure 4). When  
14 comparing participant’s word descriptor RPEs during and after exercise, a weak positive  
15 correlation was observed (RPE<sub>Word</sub> vs. post-ride RPE<sub>Word</sub>,  $r_s=0.38$ , 95% CI 0.08 to 0.62,  
16  $P=0.015$ ). However, the RPE<sub>Borg</sub> and post-ride RPE<sub>Borg</sub> showed no significant correlation  
17 ( $r_s=0.31$ , 95% CI -0.002 to 0.57,  $P=0.051$ ).

18 There were no biological sex differences for post-ride RPE using either perceived exertion scale.  
19 The relationship between subjective reports of effort and physiologic data was highly variable,  
20 with no association observed between post-ride RPE<sub>Word</sub> and total AUC HR and AUC MET.  
21 No differences were found between the means of heart rate (Figure 5A, 5C, 5D) and estimated  
22 METs (Figure 5B) when riders’ post-ride subjective ratings were grouped based on those who

1 reported ‘moderate’ versus ‘vigorous. However, post-ride RPE<sub>Word</sub> was negatively correlated  
2 with estimated fitness measured as VO<sub>2peak</sub> ( $r_s=-0.32$ , 95% CI -0.57 to -0.01,  $P=0.04$ ) where  
3 higher fitness individuals reported lower post-ride RPE<sub>Word</sub>. Fitness was not significantly  
4 correlated with post-ride measures of RPE<sub>Borg</sub>, or “instantaneous” RPE<sub>Word</sub>, or RPE<sub>Borg</sub>.

## 5 DISCUSSION

6 We report novel data describing the relationship between subjective and objective physiological  
7 measures of exercise intensity obtained during a typical, field-based, training session in masters  
8 endurance athletes. Key findings were: a) subjective reports of effort/intensity using commonly-  
9 used verbal descriptors were highly variable between participants and were poorly correlated to  
10 objective measures of intensity, especially when reported after exercise; b) measures of exercise  
11 ‘burden’ quantified by metabolic energy expenditure, even when performed at the same relative  
12 intensity, can be accompanied by significantly different cardiac-specific measures of intensity  
13 and are influenced by fitness level. This discordance suggests that a conflation of metabolic and  
14 cardiac-specific measures of exercise burden may be inaccurate and misleading.

### 15 *Limitations to Self-Reports of Perceived Exertion*

16 While we observed a positive correlation between the two subjective scales of perceived effort at  
17 each landmark during exercise, the verbal descriptors of their effort (e.g., “moderate” or  
18 “vigorous” effort), were associated with a broad numerical range of the Borg scale (Figure 4),  
19 often exceeding the common verbal descriptors described by the ACSM (17). These findings  
20 imply that subjective ratings of effort as “moderate” or “vigorous” are not only poorly correlated  
21 with actual effort expended but also fail to assess accurately the actual intensity of effort. Our  
22 data also demonstrate that individuals with higher fitness levels tend to under-report subjective

1 efforts relative to their true physiological effort, particularly when using traditional categorical  
2 classifications. Similar disparate findings were observed for self-reports of effort obtained 30  
3 minutes after ride completion: moderate levels of agreement existed between scales, but there  
4 was no agreement between objective measures and subjective descriptors. This was likely due to  
5 the wide range of both metabolic and cardiac demands between participants at both ‘moderate’  
6 and ‘vigorous’ intensities. In other words, our data indicate that the reliance on commonly used  
7 terms describing effort (e.g., ‘light’, ‘moderate’ or ‘vigorous’) to ascertain exercise intensity, in  
8 well-trained athletes, may lead to a substantial error, especially when calculating metabolic  
9 exercise intensity (i.e., MET/mins) from compendium data when direct measures of power or  
10 velocity are not available. In addition, the mean subjective rating of effort obtained after the ride  
11 was associated with a wide range of objective measures; for example, a ‘rating of moderate’  
12 exercise was associated with heart rates ranging from 118 bpm to 165 bpm, with similar disparity  
13 observed for METs (7.4 METs to 12.2 METs) and power outputs (112 W to 264 W). Post-  
14 exercise subjective recalls of overall effort tended to systematically underestimate the ‘real-time’  
15 effort (i.e., during the ride), and greater intra-individual variability was observed as exercise  
16 intensity increased. A high intra-individual variance in ratings of perceived exertion relative to  
17 oxygen cost during exercise (12%) has been reported previously (20); collectively, these findings  
18 underscore the potential confounding impact of phenotypic variability, including fitness level, on  
19 subjective reports of exercise intensity (21, 22).

## 20 *Isolating Components of Exercise Burden*

21 A key finding of our study was a discordance of cardiac-specific and global metabolic metrics of  
22 exercise intensity amongst athletes of differing fitness levels. As expected, ‘fitter’ athletes had  
23 faster ride-completion times but did so performing exercise at a similar relative intensity

1 (%  $VO_{2Peak}$  and %  $HR_{Peak}$ ), while at a significantly lower AUC HR (total heartbeats/ride) and  
2 higher absolute AUC METs. The higher AUC MET achieved over the same distance covered  
3 may reflect greater power outputs achieved during horizontal sections of the ride (vs. gliding),  
4 and other phenotypic factors contributing to variability of power output and mechanical  
5 efficiency during cycling (23).

6 Taken together, our data suggest that cardiac burden and perception of effort during vigorous  
7 exercise are inversely related to fitness level. These findings may explain prior reports of acute,  
8 reversible cardiac dysfunction occurring during prolonged exercise to a greater extent in less  
9 experienced participants with lower levels of fitness (24). Observations of increased cardiac risk  
10 associated with high intensity exercise may therefore be biased from cohorts of relatively lower  
11 fitness levels, who demonstrate a relatively higher cardiac burden of exercise, compared to  
12 athletes with superior fitness.

13 Physical activity recommendations (1, 2) include 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous exercise  
14 per week, equivalent to 500 to 1000 MET·min of exercise per week (25). As expected, our  
15 participants far exceeded recommended exercise time and MET·min per week by 3 and 6 times,  
16 matching previous studies of similar athletes (26, 27). While an estimate of MET·min may infer  
17 exercise intensity, in isolation, it can be misleading. Accurate quantification of duration and  
18 intensity is required, preferably the integral of each, but reports that include objective measures  
19 of intensity remain elusive given technical requirements. We used direct, in-field measures of  
20 power and duration to estimate metabolic burden and observed that these measures fail to  
21 correlate with self-reports of subjective effort. Even in studies that report MET·min, it is rarely  
22 disclosed how such values were obtained but are presumably estimated from self-reports (28-35).  
23 MET values may also be estimated from a compendium of physical activity (36, 37), some of

1 which are based on data derived over 60 years ago (38). In one report, exercise intensity was  
2 calculated based on data from a questionnaire validated in a clinical, non-athlete population (39).  
3 A strength of our study was its ecological validity, ensuring a self-paced training session which  
4 was performed on a common route and training distance, matching the participant's a priori  
5 description of their typical training intensity (range between 69-83% HR<sub>max</sub> or 56-75% FTP) (40).  
6 This approach avoided conditions that would mimic a time trial or race condition that typically  
7 elicits exercise intensities beyond 90% VO<sub>2max</sub> (41). Our data demonstrated that most athletes  
8 exercised largely within the 'vigorous' zone (17) based on objective measures of heart rate,  
9 power output, and METs (17). This is not surprising given the classification of vigorous exercise  
10 intensity (>6 METs) was developed for the general population (17) and is far exceeded by well-  
11 trained athletes.

## 12 *Implications*

13 Acute cardiac events during exercise are associated with vigorous levels of intensity (42), and  
14 high exercise heart rates alone have been linked to acute cardiac dysfunction after prolonged  
15 exercise (43-46), exercise-related myocardial fibrosis (47-50) and sudden cardiac death (51).  
16 However, the paradoxical findings of adverse cardiovascular outcomes linked to long-term  
17 cumulative vigorous exercise training remain unresolved. We suggest that efforts to distinguish  
18 between the cardiac and metabolic components of exercise will help to provide mechanistic  
19 insights into these findings. Ideally, specific metrics of exercise burden should be obtained using  
20 direct, objective measures including metabolic and cardiac endpoints. While cardiac minute  
21 work (the product of cardiac output and mean arterial pressure) would be a more precise metric  
22 than heart rate alone, assessing its constituents would be impractical outside of a laboratory

1 setting. Heart rate can be reliably measured during exercise using wearable technology,  
2 providing absolute or relative measures of exercise intensity. While not a complete indicator of  
3 cardiac work, it is the most significant factor determining myocardial oxygen cost (52),  
4 increasing 3-4 fold during vigorous exercise, whereas systolic blood pressure, a key determinant  
5 of left ventricular afterload, may only increase by 1.5- to 2.0-fold.

6 A more robust measure of cardiac burden would be the integral of heart rate and duration, similar  
7 to Banister's TRIMP method (53) to monitor training intensity (54), especially for determining if  
8 there is a threshold effect where cumulative exercise increases the risk for adverse cardiac  
9 outcomes. Notwithstanding, simplistic metrics of exercise burden, such as an excess of 1500  
10 cumulative hours of vigorous sport practice, are commonly reported risk factors for atrial  
11 fibrillation (AF) (52), yet adults adhering to widely accepted exercise guidelines would surpass  
12 numerous thresholds within 12-15 years and are reported to have a *lowered* risk for AF (29).  
13 Moreover, there is wide discrepancy in the cumulative hours associated with AF risk [1500 hours  
14 to 4500 hours of exercise (52-54, 55)] or metabolic burden [1900 MET·min per week (35) to  
15 5000 MET·min per week (34)], which may reflect an overly simplistic approach when  
16 quantifying total exercise burden, especially when based on self-reports (55). Our data suggest  
17 that subjective self-reports obtained soon after exercise fail to accurately reflect objective  
18 endpoints obtained during exercise, are less precise than a rating of perceived exertion (Borg)  
19 and show diminishing accuracy over time. Therefore, the reliance on subjective self-reports to  
20 estimate exercise 'burden' simply based on 'hours of exercise' or its metabolic cost (MET·min),  
21 may be inaccurate and misleading indicators of exercise burden.

22 *Limitations*



1 Our study has limitations. Effort was made to ensure our participants were typical recreational,  
2 sub-elite cyclists based on their training history. While recall bias was possible, their training  
3 histories were determined by questionnaire and verified by digital records of training history  
4 through mobile applications. All field data were subject to varying environmental conditions  
5 (e.g., wind, temperature) that may have influenced physiological and perceptual efforts. We were  
6 limited to estimations of METs based on power outputs given institutional COVID-19  
7 restrictions that precluded direct gas-exchange measures in the field or laboratory; estimates of  
8  $VO_{2peak}$ , derived from relationships between peak power and in-field peak heart rate, may have  
9 led to error. Quantifying metabolic and cardiac burden plus subjective effort during a non-  
10 weight-bearing activity such as cycling may introduce error because external work at times can  
11 be zero or nominal given the ability to glide, reflected by the modest correlation between mean  
12 heart rate and mean power ( $r_s=0.34$ ). Consequently, our findings may not be generalizable to  
13 other weight-bearing endurance activities such as running, where exercise intensity is less  
14 variable. Lastly, we recognize the limitations of using AUC HR as a measure of “cardiac  
15 burden”, but additional hemodynamic measures (cardiac output, ambulatory systolic blood  
16 pressure) were not feasible.

## 17 *Conclusion*

18 This study demonstrated a discordance between the overall metabolic and cardiac burden of  
19 exercise. Less fit endurance athletes completed a fixed training distance with a lower metabolic  
20 burden but at a higher cardiac burden, despite performing exercise at a similar relative intensity.  
21 Post-exercise subjective reports of exercise intensity were variable at high levels of exercise  
22 intensity and did not align with objective, physiological measures of effort. These findings  
23 demonstrate the complexities of assessing exercise burden and suggest that caution is warranted

- 1 when interpreting studies that report simplistic, subjective reports of effort used to estimate
- 2 exercise intensity, and in particular, relate exercise history to cardiovascular outcomes. The use
- 3 of physiological endpoints is advised when designing studies that consider the impact of long-
- 4 term exercise training and its relationship to the risks of adverse cardiac outcomes.

1 FUNDING

2

3 Funding for this study was provided by the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR;  
4 Operating Grant 130477) and from the Heart & Stroke/Richard Lewar Centres of Excellence.

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Piercy KL, Troiano RP, Ballard RM, Carlson SA, Fulton JE, Galuska DA, et al. The  
3 physical activity guidelines for Americans. *JAMA*. 2018;320(19):2020-8.
- 4 2. Macridis S, Cameron C, Chaput J-P, Chulak-Bozzer T, Clark P, Davenport MH, et al.  
5 Results from the 2019 ParticipACTION report card on physical activity for adults. *J Phys*  
6 *Act Health*. 2020;17(10):995-1002.
- 7 3. Paffenbarger RS, Jr., Hyde RT, Wing AL, Hsieh CC. Physical activity, all-cause mortality,  
8 and longevity of college alumni. *N Engl J Med*. 1986;314(10):605-13.
- 9 4. Arem H, Moore SC, Patel A, Hartge P, Berrington De Gonzalez A, Visvanathan K, et al.  
10 Leisure time physical activity and mortality: A detailed pooled analysis of the dose-response  
11 relationship. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2015;175(6):959-67.
- 12 5. Zhao M, Veeranki SP, Li S, Steffen LM, Xi B. Beneficial associations of low and large  
13 doses of leisure time physical activity with all-cause, cardiovascular disease and cancer  
14 mortality: a national cohort study of 88,140 US adults. *Br J Sports Med*. 2019;53(22):1405-  
15 11.
- 16 6. Lee DH, Rezende LFM, Joh HK, Keum N, Ferrari G, Rey-Lopez JP, et al. Long-term  
17 leisure-time physical activity intensity and all-cause and cause-specific mortality: a  
18 prospective cohort of US adults. *Circulation*. 2022;146(7):523-34.
- 19 7. O'Keefe EL, Torres-Acosta N, O'Keefe JH, Lavie CJ. Training for longevity: the reverse J-  
20 curve for exercise. *Mo Med*. 2020;117(4):355-61.
- 21 8. Schnohr P, O'Keefe JH, Marott JL, Lange P, Jensen GB. Dose of jogging and long-term  
22 mortality: the Copenhagen City Heart Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2015;65(5):411-9.
- 23 9. Ekelund U, Dalene KE, Tarp J, Lee I-M. Physical activity and mortality: what is the dose  
24 response and how big is the effect? *Br J Sports Med*. 2020;54(19):1125-6.
- 25 10. Quinlan C, Rattray B, Pryor D, Northey JM, Anstey KJ, Butterworth P, et al. The accuracy  
26 of self-reported physical activity questionnaires varies with sex and body mass index. *PLoS*  
27 *One*. 2021;16(8):e0256008.
- 28 11. Tucker WJ, Fegers-Wustrow I, Halle M, Haykowsky MJ, Chung EH, Kovacic JC. Exercise  
29 for primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular disease: JACC focus seminar 1/4. *J*  
30 *Am Coll Cardiol*. 2022;80(11):1091-106.
- 31 12. Hindricks G, Potpara T, Dagres N, Arbelo E, Bax JJ, Blomström-Lundqvist C, et al. 2020  
32 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of atrial fibrillation developed in  
33 collaboration with the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS): the  
34 Task Force for the diagnosis and management of atrial fibrillation of the European Society  
35 of Cardiology (ESC) developed with the special contribution of the European Heart Rhythm  
36 Association (EHRA) of the ESC. *Eur Heart J*. 2021;42(5):373-498.

- 1 13. Andersen JJ. Marathon Statistics 2019 Worldwide (Research). Available from:  
2 <https://runrepeat.com/research-marathon-performance-across-nations> (accessed 2020 March  
3 4, 2020).
- 4 14. Sanchis-Gomar F, Perez-Quilis C, Lippi G, Cervellin G, Leischik R, Löllgen H, et al. Atrial  
5 fibrillation in highly trained endurance athletes — description of a syndrome. *Int J Cardiol.*  
6 2017;226:11-20.
- 7 15. Haddad M, Chaouachi A, Wong DP, Castagna C, Hambli M, Hue O, et al. Influence of  
8 fatigue, stress, muscle soreness and sleep on perceived exertion during submaximal effort.  
9 *Physiol Behav.* 2013;119:185-9.
- 10 16. Borg G. *Borg's perceived exertion and pain scales*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics; 1998.
- 11 17. American College of Sports Medicine. *ACSM's Guidelines for Exercise Testing and*  
12 *Prescription*. 10th ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer; 2018. p146.
- 13 18. Tanaka H, Monahan KD, Seals DR. Age-predicted maximal heart rate revisited. *J Am Coll*  
14 *Cardiol.* 2001;37(1):153-6.
- 15 19. Ehrman JK. *ACSM's resource manual for guidelines for exercise testing and prescription*.  
16 6th ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2010. p458.
- 17 20. Shephard RJ. A critique of RPE as a basis of exercise prescription. *Eur J Appl Physiol.*  
18 2013;113(5):1369-70.
- 19 21. Howley ET. Type of activity: resistance, aerobic and leisure versus occupational physical  
20 activity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2001;33(6):S364–S9.
- 21 22. Norton K, Norton L, Sadgrove D. Position statement on physical activity and exercise  
22 intensity terminology. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2010;13(5):496-502.
- 23 23. Faria EW, Parker DL, Faria IE. The science of cycling: physiology and training - part 1.  
24 *Sports Med.* 2005;35(4):285-312.
- 25 24. Neilan TG, Januzzi JL, Lee-Lewandrowski E, Ton-Nu TT, Yoerger DM, Jassal DS, et al.  
26 Myocardial injury and ventricular dysfunction related to training levels among nonelite  
27 participants in the Boston marathon. *Circulation.* 2006;114(22):2325-33.
- 28 25. Garber CE, Blissmer B, Deschenes MR, Franklin BA, Lamonte MJ, Lee IM, et al. American  
29 College of Sports Medicine position stand. Quantity and quality of exercise for developing  
30 and maintaining cardiorespiratory, musculoskeletal, and neuromotor fitness in apparently  
31 healthy adults: guidance for prescribing exercise. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2011;43(7):1334-  
32 59.
- 33 26. Peiffer JJ, Abbiss CR, Chapman D, Laursen PB, Parker DL. Physiological characteristics of  
34 masters-level cyclists. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2008;22(5).

- 1 27. Priego Quesada JI, Kerr ZY, Bertucci WM, Carpes FP. The categorization of amateur  
2 cyclists as research participants: findings from an observational study. *J Sports Sci.*  
3 2018;36(17):2018-24.
- 4 28. Aaron CP, Tandri H, Barr RG, Johnson WC, Bagiella E, Chahal H, et al. Physical activity  
5 and right ventricular structure and function. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2011;183(3):396-  
6 404.
- 7 29. Aengevaeren VL, Mosterd A, Braber TL, Prakken NHJ, Doevendans PA, Grobbee DE, et al.  
8 Relationship between lifelong exercise volume and coronary atherosclerosis in athletes.  
9 *Circulation.* 2017;136(2):138-48.
- 10 30. Lear SA, Hu W, Rangarajan S, Gasevic D, Leong D, Iqbal R, et al. The effect of physical  
11 activity on mortality and cardiovascular disease in 130 000 people from 17 high-income,  
12 middle-income, and low-income countries: the PURE study. *Lancet.* 2017;390(10113):2643-  
13 54.
- 14 31. Ricci C, Gervasi F, Gaeta M, Smuts CM, Schutte AE, Leitzmann MF. Physical activity  
15 volume in relation to risk of atrial fibrillation. A non-linear meta-regression analysis. *Eur J*  
16 *Prev Cardiol.* 2018;25(8):857-66.
- 17 32. Defina LF, Radford NB, Barlow CE, Willis BL, Leonard D, Haskell WL, et al. Association  
18 of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality with high levels of physical activity and concurrent  
19 coronary artery calcification. *JAMA Cardiology.* 2019;4(2):174.
- 20 33. Jin MN, Yang PS, Song C, Yu HT, Kim TH, Uhm JS, et al. Physical activity and risk of  
21 atrial fibrillation: a nationwide cohort study in general population. *Sci Rep.*  
22 2019;9(1):13270.
- 23 34. Elliott AD, Linz D, Mishima R, Kadhim K, Gallagher C, Middeldorp ME, et al.  
24 Associations between physical activity and risk of incident arrhythmias in 402 406  
25 individuals: evidence from the UK Biobank cohort. *Eur Heart J.* 2020;41:1479–86.
- 26 35. Mishima RS, Verdicchio CV, Noubiap JJ, Ariyaratnam JP, Gallagher C, Jones D, et al. Self-  
27 reported physical activity and atrial fibrillation risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
28 *Heart Rhythm.* 2021;18(4):520-8.
- 29 36. Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Herrmann SD, Meckes N, Bassett Jr DR, Tudor-Locke C, et al.  
30 The Compendium of Physical Activities Tracking Guide. Available from:  
31 <https://sites.google.com/site/compendiumofphysicalactivities/home> (accessed 2023 May 11).
- 32 37. Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Herrmann SD, Meckes N, Bassett Jr DR, Tudor-Locke C, et al.  
33 2011 compendium of physical activities: a second update of codes and MET values. *Med*  
34 *Sci Sports Exerc.* 2011;43(8):1575-81.
- 35 38. Passmore R, Durnin JVGA. Human energy expenditure. *Physiol Rev.* 1955;35:801-40.


- 1 39. Aengevaeren VL, Mosterd A, Bakker EA, Braber TL, Nathoe HM, Sharma S, et al. Exercise  
2 volume versus intensity and the progression of coronary atherosclerosis in middle-aged and  
3 older athletes: findings from the MARC-2 study. *Circulation*. 2023;147(13):993-1003.
- 4 40. Coggan AR. Power Training Zones for Cycling. Available from:  
5 <https://www.trainingpeaks.com/blog/power-training-levels/> (accessed 2021 July 21).
- 6 41. Lucia A, Earnest CP, Arribas C. The Tour de France: a physiological review. *Scand J Med  
7 Sci Sports*. 2003;13:275-83.
- 8 42. Thompson PD, Franklin BA, Balady GJ, Blair SN, Corrado D, Estes NA, 3rd, et al. Exercise  
9 and acute cardiovascular events placing the risks into perspective: a scientific statement  
10 from the American Heart Association Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity, and  
11 Metabolism and the Council on Clinical Cardiology. *Circulation*. 2007;115(17):2358-68.
- 12 43. La Gerche A, Inder WJ, Roberts TJ, Brosnan MJ, Heidebuchel H, Prior DL. Relationship  
13 between inflammatory cytokines and indices of cardiac dysfunction following intense  
14 endurance exercise. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(6):e0130031.
- 15 44. Aschar-Sobbi R, Izaddoustdar F, Korogyi AS, Wang Q, Farman GP, Yang F, et al. Increased  
16 atrial arrhythmia susceptibility induced by intense endurance exercise in mice requires  
17 TNF $\alpha$ . *Nat Commun*. 2015;6(1):6018.
- 18 45. Stewart GM, Yamada A, Haseler LJ, Kavanagh JJ, Chan J, Koerbin G, et al. Influence of  
19 exercise intensity and duration on functional and biochemical perturbations in the human  
20 heart. *J Physiol*. 2016;594(11):3031-44.
- 21 46. Franklin BA, Thompson PD, Al-Zaiti SS, Albert CM, Hivert M-F, Levine BD, et al.  
22 Exercise-related acute cardiovascular events and potential deleterious adaptations following  
23 long-term exercise training: placing the risks into perspective – an update: a scientific  
24 statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2020;141(13).
- 25 47. Breuckmann F, Mohlenkamp S, Nassenstein K, Lehmann N, Ladd S, Schmermund A, et al.  
26 Myocardial late gadolinium enhancement: prevalence, pattern, prognostic relevance in  
27 marathon runners. *Radiology*. 2009;251(1):50-7.
- 28 48. Wilson M, O'Hanlon R, Prasad S, Deighan A, Macmillan P, Oxborough D, et al. Diverse  
29 patterns of myocardial fibrosis in lifelong, veteran endurance athletes. *J Appl Physiol*.  
30 2011;110(6):1622-6.
- 31 49. Erz G, Mangold S, Franzen E, Claussen CD, Niess AM, Burgstahler C, et al. Correlation  
32 between ECG abnormalities and cardiac parameters in highly trained asymptomatic male  
33 endurance athletes: evaluation using cardiac magnetic resonance imaging. *Int J Cardiovasc  
34 Imaging*. 2013;29(2):325-34.
- 35 50. Schnell F, Claessen G, La Gerche A, Bogaert J, Lentz PA, Claus P, et al. Subepicardial  
36 delayed gadolinium enhancement in asymptomatic athletes: let sleeping dogs lie? *Br J  
37 Sports Med*. 2016;50(2):111-7.

- 1 51. Goodman JM, Burr JF, Banks L, Thomas SG. The acute risks of exercise in apparently  
2 healthy adults and relevance for prevention of cardiovascular events. *Can J Cardiol.*  
3 2016;32(4):523-32.
- 4 52. Duncker DJ, Bache RJ. Regulation of coronary blood flow during exercise. *Physiol Rev.*  
5 2008;88(3):1009-86.
- 6 53. Banister EW. Modeling elite athletic performance. In: Green H, McDougal J, Wenger HA,  
7 editors. *Physiological Testing of Elite Athletes*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics; 1991.  
8 p403-24.
- 9 54. Arbab-Zadeh A, Perhonen M, Howden E, Peshock RM, Zhang R, Adams-Huet B, et al.  
10 Cardiac remodeling in response to 1 year of intensive endurance training. *Circulation.*  
11 2014;130(24):2152-61.
- 12 55. Ainsworth B, Haskell W, Leon AS, Jacobs DR, Jr., Montoye HJ, Sallis JF, et al.  
13 Compendium of physical activities: classification of energy costs of human physical  
14 activities. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1993;25(1):71-80.

15



## 1 STRUCTURED GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT



**Left Figure:** Area under the curve graphs of two male riders (Rider 1, Rider 2; aged between 60-69 years) with equal metabolic burdens (*top figure*) but different cardiac burdens (*bottom figure*) for equal distances cycled (42 km). **Right Figure:** Relationship between area under the curve (AUC) measure of cardiac burden and estimated fitness (VO<sub>2peak</sub>) with 95% confidence limits.

## 2 STRUCTURED GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT TEXT

### 3 Key Questions:

4 Are subjective ratings of exercise intensity from endurance athletes congruent with objective  
5 measures obtained in the field, and is it important to distinguish between the cardiac and  
6 metabolic burden of exercise?

### 7 Key Findings:

8 Post-exercise subjective reports of exercise intensity were variable at high levels of exercise  
9 intensity and did not align with objective, physiological measures of exertion. In addition, there  
10 is a discordance between metabolic and cardiac burden during intensive exercise, with cardiac  
11 burden being inversely related to fitness level.

### 12 Take Home Message:

13 Estimates of exercise intensity from self-reports are highly variable and a conflation of metabolic  
14 and cardiac-specific measures of exercise burden may be misleading when considering the

- 1 impact of long-term exercise training and its relationship to the risks of long-term adverse
- 2 cardiac outcomes.
- 3

1 FIGURE LEGENDS

2 Figure 1.

3 Course profile and rating-of-perceived-exertion (RPE) landmarks. Prescribed efforts: L=low  
4 effort, M=medium effort, H=high effort, VH=very high effort.

5 Figure 2.

6 Area under the curve graphs of two male riders (Rider 1, Rider 2; aged between 60-69 years)  
7 with equal metabolic burdens (Fig. 2A) but different cardiac burdens (Fig. 2B) for equal  
8 distances cycled (42 km).

9 Figure 3.

10 Relationship between area under the curve (AUC) measure of cardiac burden and estimated  
11 fitness ( $VO_{2peak}$  median = 41.0 mL/kg/min). 95% confidence limits are identified by the dashed  
12 line above and below the line of best fit.

13 Figure 4.

14 Relationship between Word and Borg 6-20 scale ratings of perceived exertion at landmarks (Fig.  
15 4A) and 30 minutes post ride (Fig. 4B). Dot size represents the frequency of participant  
16 responses. Word Scale Ratings: 1=very light, 2=light, 3=moderate, 4=vigorous, 5=extremely  
17 vigorous; Borg Scale Ratings: 6=no exertion at all, 9=very light, 11=light, 13=somewhat hard,  
18 15=hard, 17=very hard, 19=extremely hard, 20=maximal exertion.

19 Figure 5.

20 Mean objective measures for post-ride ratings of perceived exertion (RPE) using the Word scale  
21 (n=39). Error bars represent standard deviation.

22

23 Table 1. Participant characteristics.

24 Table 2. Mean objective and median subjective measures for the entire ride (42 km).

25 Table 3. Impact of fitness on key mean and median endpoints of entire ride (42 km).


26 Suppl Table 1. Key endpoints at each landmark (n=40).

27

28

1 Figure 1


- 2 Course profile and rating-of-perceived-exertion (RPE) landmarks. Prescribed efforts: L=low  
3 effort, M=medium effort, H=high effort, VH=very high effort.



4

1 Figure 2

2 Area under the curve graphs of two male riders (Rider 1, Rider 2; aged between 60-69 years)  
3 with equal metabolic burdens (Fig. 2A) but different cardiac burdens (Fig. 2B) for equal  
4 distances cycled (42 km).




1

2

1 Figure 3

2 *Relationship between area under the curve (AUC) measure of cardiac burden and estimated*  
3 *fitness ( $VO_{2peak}$  Mdn = 41.0 mL/kg/min). 95% confidence limits are identified by the dashed line*  
4 *above and below the line of best fit.*

5




6

7

1 Figure 4

2 Relationship between Word and Borg 6-20 scale ratings of perceived exertion at landmarks (Fig.  
3 4A) and 30 minutes post ride (Fig. 4B). Dot size represents the frequency of participant  
4 responses. Word Scale Ratings: 1=very light, 2=light, 3=moderate, 4=vigorous, 5=extremely  
5 vigorous; Borg Scale Ratings: 6=no exertion at all, 9=very light, 11=light, 13=somewhat hard,  
6 15=hard, 17=very hard, 19=extremely hard, 20=maximal exertion.

7



8


9

10




1 Figure 5

2 *Mean objective measures for post-ride ratings of perceived exertion (RPE) using the Word scale*  
3 *(n=39). Error bars represent standard deviation.*



10

11



12

13

14

15

1 Table 1

	Males (n=20)	Females (n=20)	Group (n=40)
Age (years)	55 ± 8	53 ± 7	54 ± 8
Body Mass (kg)	80.3 ± 7.9**	63.2 ± 9.5	71.7 ± 12.2
Height (cm)	178 ± 7**	166 ± 8	172 ± 10
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	25.3 ± 2.8**	22.8 ± 2.9	24.1 ± 3.1
BSA (m <sup>2</sup> )	1.99 ± 0.11**	1.71 ± 0.16	1.85 ± 0.20
Resting HR (bpm)	60 ± 13	63 ± 9	62 ± 11
Resting SBP (mmHg)	140 ± 17*	128 ± 17	134 ± 18
Resting DBP (mmHg)	84 ± 11	81 ± 12	82 ± 11
Estimated VO <sub>2peak</sub> (mL/kg/min)	44.2 ± 6.6	40.2 ± 5.6	42.3 ± 6.3
Prior Smoker	20% (4)	15% (3)	18% (7)
Alcohol (drinks/week)	5 ± 5	5 ± 4	5 ± 4
Yearly Cycling Mileage (km)	8196 ± 3837*	5530 ± 2831	6863 ± 3592
Weekly Cycling Duration (hours)	9.4 ± 3.7*	7.1 ± 3.4	8.2 ± 3.7

*Note.* Data are means ± standard deviations or percentages (number of participants). BMI, body mass index; BSA, body surface area; HR, heart rate (beats per minute); SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; estimated VO<sub>2peak</sub>, estimated peak oxygen consumption.

\*Statistically significant biological sex difference at  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

2 *Participant characteristics.*

3

4

5

6

1 Table 2

2 *Mean objective and median subjective measures for the entire ride (42 km).*

	Males (n=20)	Females (n=20)	Group (n=40)
HR (bpm)	143 ± 13	146 ± 11	144 ± 12
WR (watts)	202 ± 37**	145 ± 24	173 ± 42
WR/body mass (watts/kg)	2.5 ± 0.4	2.3 ± 0.4	2.4 ± 0.4
METs	9.8 ± 1.2	9.1 ± 1.2	9.5 ± 1.3
MET·min	842.7 ± 64.3	840.9 ± 67.7	841.8 ± 65.2
Duration (min)	87.1 ± 7.6*	93.0 ± 8.8	90.0 ± 8.6
Combined Landmark RPE <sub>Borg</sub> (6-20)	14.5 (1.1)	14.3 (0.9)	14.5 (1.0)
Combined Landmark RPE <sub>Word</sub> (1-5)	3.6 (0.3)	3.5 (0.2)	3.5 (0.2)

*Note.* Data are means ± stand deviations or medians (interquartile ranges). HR, heart rate; WR, power; METs, estimated metabolic equivalents; RPE, rate of perceived exertion; Borg, Borg Scale; Word, Word Scale.

\* Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ , two-tailed; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , two-tailed.

3

4

5

6

7

1 Table 3

2 *Impact of fitness on key mean and median endpoints of entire ride (42 km).*

	More Fit <sup>a</sup> (n=20)	Less Fit <sup>a</sup> (n=20)	Group (n=40)
AUC HR (bpm·min)	11784 ± 1132**	14039 ± 2649	12911 ± 1857
AUC WR (watts·min)	16283 ± 2776*	14056 ± 2409	15170 ± 2802
AUC WKG (watts·kg <sup>-1</sup> ·min)	224 ± 20**	200 ± 18	212 ± 23
AUC METs (MET·min)	858 ± 61*	808 ± 59	833 ± 64
%HR <sub>peak</sub>	85.7 ± 3.8	87.4 ± 4.4	86.5 ± 4.1
%HR <sub>max</sub>	83.0 ± 6.2	86.6 ± 7.0	84.8 ± 6.8
Estimated VO <sub>2peak</sub> (mL/kg/min)	47.4 ± 4.5**	37.3 ± 2.6	42.3 ± 6.3
TRT (min)	83.9 ± 5.1**	96.1 ± 7.0	90.0 ± 8.6
Resting SBP (mmHg)	136 ± 19	132 ± 18	134 ± 18
Resting HR (bpm)	59 (10)	63 (17)	61 (14)
Post-Ride RPE <sub>Word</sub>	3 (1)	4 (1)	3 (1)
Post-Ride RPE <sub>Borg</sub>	14 (2)	13.5 (2)	14 (2)

*Note.* Data are means ± standard deviations or medians (interquartile ranges). AUC, area under the curve; HR, heart rate; WR, power; WKG, work rate normalized for body mass; METs, estimated metabolic equivalents; %HR<sub>peak</sub>, percentage of maximal heart rate achieved during the ride; %HR<sub>max</sub>, percentage of calculated maximal heart rate; VO<sub>2peak</sub>, estimated peak oxygen consumption; TRT, total ride time; SBP, systolic blood pressure; RPE, rate of perceived exertion; Borg, Borg Scale 6-20; Word, Word Scale 1-5.

<sup>a</sup> More Fit: ≥ Median; Less fit: < Median (VO<sub>2peak</sub> *Mdn* = 41.0 mL/kg/min)

\* Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ , two-tailed; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , two-tailed.

3

4

1 Supplemental Table 1

2 Key endpoints at each landmark (n=40).

LM Gradient (%)	LM1-M	LM2-H	LM3-L <sup>a</sup>	LM4-H	LM5-M	LM6-VH
	0.9	6.7	0.2	1.5	1.2	-0.4
Absolute Objective Measures						
HR (bpm)	143 ± 13*	160 ± 12	131 ± 17*	157 ± 11	145 ± 13*	159 ± 12
WR (watts)	185 ± 48*	236 ± 65*	131 ± 46*	204 ± 55	158 ± 50*	206 ± 59
WR/body mass (W/kg)	2.6 ± 0.5*	3.3 ± 0.7*	1.8 ± 0.6*	2.8 ± 0.5	2.2 ± 0.6*	2.9 ± 0.6
METs	10.0 ± 1.5*	12.1 ± 2.0*	7.7 ± 1.7*	10.8 ± 1.7	8.8 ± 1.7*	10.8 ± 1.9
Relative Objective Measures						
%HR <sub>max</sub>	84 ± 8*	94 ± 7	77 ± 10*	92 ± 6	85 ± 7*	93 ± 7
%HR <sub>peak</sub>	86 (7)*	98 (3)	80 (11)*	95 (4)	88 (7)*	96 (5)
%MET <sub>peak</sub>	84 ± 11*	101 ± 6*	64 ± 4*	90 ± 9	73 ± 8*	90 ± 7
Relative Subjective Measures						
RPE <sub>Borg</sub> (6-20)	13 (2)*	17 (1)*	10 (2)*	16.5 (2)*	13 (2)*	18 (2)
RPE <sub>Word</sub> (1-5)	3 (2)*	4 (1)	2 (0)*	4 (1)*	3 (0)*	5 (1)

*Note.* Data are means ± standard deviations or medians (interquartile ranges). Prescribed efforts: M, medium; H, high; L, low; VH, very high. LM, landmark; HR, heart rate; WR, power; W, watts; METs, estimated metabolic equivalents; %HR<sub>max</sub>, percentage of calculated maximal heart rate; %HR<sub>peak</sub>, percentage of peak heart rate; %MET<sub>peak</sub>, percentage of estimated peak metabolic equivalents; RPE, rating of perceived exertion; Borg, Borg Scale; Word, Word Scale.

<sup>a</sup> All variables at LM3 were statistically significant from all other LMs at  $p < 0.05$ . For simplicity, significant symbols were not shown.

\* Statistically significant landmark from LM6 at  $p < 0.05$ .

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8