

A pilot study of exercise training for children and adolescents with inflammatory bowel disease:  
an evaluation of feasibility, safety, satisfaction, and efficacy

Mila Bjelica<sup>1\*</sup>, MSc, Rachel G. Walker<sup>1\*</sup>, MSc BScN RN, Joyce Obeid<sup>1</sup>, PhD, Robert M.  
Issenman<sup>2</sup>, MD, Brian W. Timmons<sup>1</sup>, PhD

1. Department of Pediatrics, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

2. Division of Pediatric Gastroenterology, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

\* These authors contributed equally to this work

Corresponding author: Brian Timmons, [timmonbw@mcmaster.ca](mailto:timmonbw@mcmaster.ca), tel. 905-521-2100 ext. 77615

Sources of funding:

This study was supported by a Discovery Grant (#341353-07) from the Natural Sciences and  
Research Council of Canada awarded to BWT

**Abstract:**

Background: Children with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) experience extra-intestinal side effects including altered body composition, impaired muscle strength and aerobic capacity. Exercise training may remedy these issues.

Purpose: To assess the feasibility, safety, participant satisfaction and efficacy of a training program for youth with IBD.

Methods: Children with IBD completed 16 weeks of training (2 supervised+1 home sessions per week). Feasibility was assessed by tracking recruitment, adherence, and compliance rates. Safety was assessed by tracking symptoms and adverse events. Post-training interviews gauged satisfaction. Circulating inflammatory markers, body composition, muscle strength, aerobic fitness, and habitual physical activity, were measured at baseline, mid-training (8 weeks), and post-training.

Results: Eleven youth were recruited and 10 completed the study. Participants adhered to  $28 \pm 1$  of 32 prescribed supervised sessions and  $8 \pm 4$  of 16 prescribed home sessions. There were no adverse events, and overall feedback on training was positive. Post-training, we observed an increase in lean mass ( $+2.4 \pm 1.1$  kg), bone density ( $+0.0124 \pm 0.015$  g·cm<sup>-2</sup>), aerobic fitness ( $+2.8 \pm 5.7$  mL·kgLM<sup>-1</sup>·min<sup>-1</sup>), and vigorous physical activity levels ( $+13.09 \pm 8.95$  min·hr<sup>-1</sup>) but no change in inflammation or muscle strength.

Conclusion: Supervised exercise training is feasible, safe, and effective for youth with IBD and should be encouraged.

**Introduction:**

The direct economic burden of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) in 2018 was estimated to be \$2.6 billion in Canada alone.<sup>1</sup> Rates of IBD continue to rise globally; however, over the last 20 years there has been shift in affected populations. In fact, there is an increasing incidence in pediatric IBD cases compared to cases in adults and the elderly.<sup>2</sup> In Canada, rates of pediatric IBD are among the

29 highest worldwide, with approximately 600-650 new diagnoses per year among those less than 16  
30 years of age(1).

31 Children with IBD suffer from numerous extra-intestinal side effects including increased systemic  
32 inflammation, altered body composition (i.e., reduced muscle and bone mass, increased fat mass),  
33 reduced muscle strength and impaired aerobic capacity, even when in remission.<sup>3-5</sup> These side effects  
34 can be attributed to complex and interconnected factors including disease pathology, medication usage,  
35 and physical inactivity.<sup>6</sup> Together, the inherent and incidental factors associated with pediatric IBD  
36 may contribute to the development of a vicious cycle of deterioration in overall health and quality of  
37 life.<sup>3-6</sup> As such, it is critical to establish strategies to break this feedforward cycle.

38 Exercise is a simple and accessible intervention with the potential to attenuate some of the extra-  
39 intestinal health deficits associated with IBD. In adults with IBD, exercise training can increase muscle  
40 strength, lean mass, and bone mass, reduce body fat and improve aerobic fitness, without indications of  
41 disease and/or symptom exacerbation.<sup>7-10</sup> Presently, pediatric IBD exercise training studies have been  
42 limited to exergaming interventions and report improvements in exercise capacity, self-reported  
43 physical activity, and circulating inflammatory markers.<sup>11,12</sup> However, no studies to date have assessed  
44 the effects of exercise training on body composition, muscle strength, aerobic fitness, or device-based  
45 measures of physical activity in children with IBD, nor reported the safety and feasibility of an exercise  
46 intervention. Given that children with IBD are less physically active than healthy counterparts,<sup>13</sup> a  
47 disease-appropriate exercise training program using both aerobic and resistance training could be an  
48 effective way to engage these youth in physical activity, while also to managing the side effects of  
49 IBD.

50 In order to effectively design a larger, randomized controlled trial, we first opted to perform a pilot  
51 study. Therefore, the primary aims of this study were to evaluate the: 1) feasibility 2) safety, and 3)  
52 participant satisfaction in an exercise training program for children and adolescents with IBD. The  
53 secondary objectives of this study were to assess the physiological effects of a 16-week exercise

54 training program on: 1) body composition, 2) systemic inflammation, 3) muscle strength, 4) aerobic  
55 fitness, and 5) habitual physical activity levels in children and adolescents with IBD.

56 **Methods:**

57 **Participant recruitment:** Children and adolescents with IBD between 10 to 17 years of age were  
58 recruited from the Centre for Child and Youth Digestive Health at McMaster Children's Hospital,  
59 Hamilton, Canada. Eligible patients were in remission (score of >10) according to the pediatric Crohn's  
60 disease activity index (PCDAI) or the ulcerative colitis activity index (PUCAI) and/or physician  
61 confirmation. Patients were excluded based on physician recommendation or if they regularly engaged  
62 in resistance training  $\geq 3$  times a week. Informed assent and consent were collected from participants  
63 and parents or guardians, as appropriate. This study was approved by the Hamilton Integrated Research  
64 Ethics Board.

65 **Study overview:** The 16-week training program consisted of 3 exercise sessions per week: two  
66 supervised sessions at McMaster University and one home-based session. Heart rate was monitored at  
67 supervised and home sessions. Each session lasted 30-60 min and included both aerobic and resistance  
68 exercises. (full details available in **Supplementary Material 2, Supplementary Table 1**). After each  
69 training session, children were given a high protein beverage (0.2 g protein/kg body weight) to promote  
70 muscle anabolism. Due to dietary allergies, two participants were given an alternative beverage  
71 matched for protein content.<sup>14</sup> Over the course of the study, participants attended 3 assessment visits: 8  
72 days prior to starting the training (PRE), after 8 weeks of training (MID), and 8 days after completing  
73 the last training session (POST) to evaluate study outcomes (**Supplementary Figure 1**). Each  
74 assessment visit included measures of height, weight, body composition, a fasting blood sample for  
75 assessment of inflammatory markers (circulating IL-6 and TNF- $\alpha$ ), muscle strength, aerobic fitness,  
76 and 7-day habitual physical activity. One-repetition maximum (1RM) and maximum repetitions in 45  
77 sec was evaluated after PRE and MID assessment visits to standardize training intensity

78 **(Supplementary Material 1)**. During their POST assessment, participants engaged in a structured  
79 qualitative interview with the investigator to evaluate participant satisfaction with the training study.

80 **Primary outcomes:**

81 **Feasibility:** Feasibility included measures of recruitment, retention, adherence and compliance rates.  
82 Recruitment and withdrawal rates were tracked over a 9-month period to assess the feasibility of  
83 enrollment and retention at a single site. Based on the rates of absences in an adult IBD exercise  
84 training study with a similar training frequency, we defined our training program to be feasible if  
85 participants on average could adhere to 80% of the prescribed exercise sessions.<sup>15</sup> Participant  
86 adherence to the exercise training program was assessed by the number of exercise sessions completed  
87 relative to total prescribed sessions. For supervised sessions, attendance and reasons for absences were  
88 tracked. Home sessions were marked as completed when there was evidence of HR monitor wear for  
89 exercise. Compliance was defined as the proportion of each training session that was completed as  
90 prescribed. To assess participant compliance to supervised sessions, training logs were maintained for  
91 each participant, tracking the prescribed exercise as well as the completed intensities and repetitions or  
92 duration of each workout. Compliance was reported as the percent of supervised sessions where  
93 participants completed 100% of the prescribed exercise without any modifications to exercise intensity,  
94 duration, or repetitions, as well as how many sessions required an alteration in resistance or aerobic  
95 training volume.

96 **Safety:** Safety was assessed by tracking changes in IBD-related symptoms bi-weekly, using a  
97 participant-completed questionnaire. Adverse events were also tracked over the course of the study.  
98 Adverse events were defined as any event that occurs during the course of exercise training that causes  
99 the participant physical or psychological harm, such as musculoskeletal injuries or hospitalizations. An  
100 exit criterion was defined as any participant who experienced a disease flare-up that required  
101 hospitalization and initiation of steroids.

102 **Participant satisfaction:** Participants engaged in a qualitative interview with an investigator (RW)  
103 post-training to evaluate their level of satisfaction with the exercise training program and identify areas  
104 for improvement. The interview was audio-recorded, transcribed by RW, and participant answers were  
105 extracted and reported as frequencies by MB. Participants were asked the following specific questions:

- 106 1. Which parts of the training program did you enjoy and what did you like about them?
- 107 2. What parts of the training program did you not enjoy and what about them did you not like?
- 108 3. Which parts of the training program would you recommend improving and how should we go  
109 about making these improvements?

110 **Secondary outcomes:**

111 All secondary outcomes were assessed at PRE, MID, and POST. Detailed descriptions of each outcome  
112 are provided in the **Supplementary material 1**. In brief, body composition was assessed by dual  
113 energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA; Hologic, Marlborough, Massachusetts). High-sensitivity enzyme-  
114 linked immunosorbent assays were used to quantify circulating levels of interleukin-6 and tumor  
115 necrosis factor alpha (RND Systems; Minneapolis, Minnesota) from a fasting blood sample (10 hours).  
116 Muscle strength (i.e., isometric and isokinetic at 60,120,180°·s<sup>-1</sup> for elbows and knees) was assessed on  
117 a Biodex Isokinetic Dynamometer (System Pro 4; Biodex Medical Systems Inc, Shirley, New York),  
118 while aerobic fitness was measured using a cardiopulmonary exercise test on a stationary cycle  
119 ergometer (Corival, Lode; The Netherlands). Free-living physical activity was assessed by 7 days of  
120 accelerometry (ActiGraph GT1M; ActiGraph Corp, Pensacola, FL). **Statistical analysis:**

121 Descriptive statistics were used to characterize feasibility, safety, and satisfaction outcomes. All  
122 secondary outcomes (physiological data) were assessed for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk test. PRE,  
123 MID, and POST outcomes were compared using one-way repeated-measures ANOVAs for normally  
124 distributed data and Friedman's ANOVAs for non-normally distributed data. Post hoc analyses were  
125 completed using pairwise comparisons with a Bonferroni correction or Wilcoxon signed-rank test with  
126 a Bonferroni correction for normally and non-normally distributed data, respectively. Statistical

127 significance was set at  $p \leq 0.05$ . Effect sizes were calculated as Cohen's  $d$  for changes in body  
 128 composition, muscle strength and aerobic fitness variables from PRE to POST.<sup>16</sup> A correction factor  
 129 was used to adjust for our small sample size.<sup>17</sup> The correction factor was calculated according to the  
 130 following equation (Eq1.):

$$131 \quad \left( \frac{N - 3}{N - 2.25} \right) \times \sqrt{\frac{N - 2}{N}}$$

132 Eq1. Small sample size correction factor

133 An effect size of 0.2 was defined as small, 0.5 as medium and 0.8 as large.<sup>18</sup> Given that this was a pilot  
 134 study, sample size was not calculated a priori.<sup>19</sup>

## 135 **Results**

136 **Recruitment and retention:** Participant recruitment began in May 2013 and ended February 2014, and  
 137 participant training began July 2013 and ended June 2014. In this time, a total of 217 patients were  
 138 screened for eligibility, 93 (42.9% of total) patients were approached, and 11 (11.8% of approached)  
 139 consented to participate. Ten (90.9% of enrolled) patients completed the 16-week exercise training  
 140 program, and one dropped out for medical reasons unrelated to the study (**Figure 1**).

141 **Figure 1.** Recruitment process flow chart

142 **Adherence:** Of the 48 exercise training sessions prescribed, participants completed an average  $\pm$  SD  
 143 (range) of  $37 \pm 5$  (range: 32-47) sessions, slightly below our 80% attendance threshold for feasibility.  
 144 Participants completed  $28 \pm 1$  (range: 26-31) of the 32 prescribed supervised training sessions and  $8 \pm$   
 145  $4$  (range: 4-16) of the 16 prescribed home training sessions. Reasons given for missing supervised  
 146 training sessions included illness, inclement weather, travel away from home, scheduling conflicts and  
 147 on one instance, a car accident. Reasons given for missing home training included illness, fatigue,  
 148 travel away from home, and time constraints.

149 **Compliance:** Participants completed an average of  $83 \pm 6\%$  (range: 69-92%) of the prescribed exercise  
150 at supervised sessions without any modifications. Resistance exercises were modified at 3 visits or  $12 \pm$   
151  $6\%$  (range: 3-26%) of attended sessions by reducing the intensity or repetitions of at least one set of  
152 exercise. Reasons for modifying resistance exercises included: the resistance was too difficult, and joint  
153 pain (i.e., repetitions and/or intensity of leg curls were reduced due to knee pain). Aerobic exercise was  
154 modified during 1 visit or  $5 \pm 4\%$  (range: 0-13%) of sessions by reducing duration. Reasons for  
155 modifying aerobic exercise sessions included: participants came in too tired from previous activities  
156 (i.e., soccer try-outs, gym class), participants felt the exercise was too difficult to complete, participants  
157 reported joint pain, or participants felt unwell that day due to disease symptoms. In two instances  
158 participants did not complete the final set of resistance training and/or steady state cycling because they  
159 had to leave the session early due to prior commitments. Home compliance was not assessed because  
160 the heart rate monitor only provided overall session averages, and participants did not regularly log  
161 their exercise sessions.

162 **Safety:** During the intervention, two participants experienced minor disease flares that resolved  
163 without the need for medical intervention. No adverse events associated with the exercise training were  
164 reported. Based on results from the bi-weekly symptom questionnaire, self-reported general well-being  
165 4 of 10 participants reported themselves as “well” from beginning to end (the highest rating on this  
166 scale). Three participants fluctuated between “well” and “slightly below par” throughout the study, but  
167 ended the study feeling “well”. Two children finished with “well” despite starting with “poor” and  
168 “slightly below par”, while one child started with “well” and finished with “slightly below par”.

169 Complete results for all items in the questionnaire can be found in **Supplementary Tables 3-15**.

170 **Participant satisfaction:** Nine of 10 participants completed the satisfaction interview. Participants  
171 likes (10 unique responses from 9 participants) and dislikes (5 unique responses from 8 participants)  
172 are reported by frequency in **Supplementary table 2**. Resistance training activities performed on  
173 machines received the most frequent positive feedback. One child said they felt uncomfortable with



174 their body and self-conscious exercising in public places, but they enjoyed the opportunity to exercise  
175 one-on-one with a trainer. Another child indicated they felt more motivated to exercise in the presence  
176 of a trainer, unlike at home. Conversely, one participant said they enjoyed the structured home sessions  
177 because it was more convenient and helped them realize they can be active on their own, at home. The  
178 most frequently reported dislike was cycling activities: two participants reported disliking interval  
179 cycling, two participants disliked continuous cycling, one participant disliked the aerobic fitness test,  
180 and two participants stated that cycling did not feel satisfying because it was done on a stationary bike.  
181 In addition, two participants disliked leg extensions because of the pressure they felt on their knees and  
182 thighs, one participant disliked home sessions because they were difficult to remember to complete.  
183 Finally, participants also provided recommendations on how they would improve the training program.  
184 The most notable suggestions were to:

- 185 • Create a personalized training goal for each participant (e.g., to be able to perform a chin up by  
186 the end of the program).
- 187 • More options for aerobic exercises (e.g., ellipticals, treadmills).
- 188 • Host group training sessions with multiple children of a similar age.
- 189 • Include more parental involvement in the program, so that they can motivate participants to  
190 complete home-based sessions.
- 191 • Include a follow-up period post-study completion to ensure participants are still training and/or  
192 to have a longer training period until the participant is comfortable enough to train on their own.

### 193 **Secondary outcomes**

194  
195 **Participant characteristics:** Participant characteristics are displayed in **Table 1**.

196 **Table 1.** Participant characteristics Data are presented as frequencies, mean  $\pm$  standard deviation, and  
197 range. CD= Crohn's disease, UC= Ulcerative colitis, YPHV= Years to peak height velocity

198 As expected in children with IBD, the majority of our participants presented with below average height,  
199 weight and BMI percentiles.<sup>20</sup>

200 **Body composition:** There were significant increases in lean body mass (LBM) in kg from PRE to  
201 MID, MID to POST, and PRE to POST. There was a main effect for training suggesting an increase in  
202 LBM% (post-hoc comparisons not significant, NS). Additionally, there was an increase in bone mineral  
203 content (BMC) in kg from PRE to MID and PRE to POST. While an effect for training suggests BMD  
204 (post-hoc NS) increased over the course of 16 weeks. While we did not observe any change in FBM  
205 (kg), FBM% decreased (post-hoc NS). There was also a significant decrease in trunk fat% from PRE to  
206 MID (**Table 2**).

207 **Table 2.** Participant body composition at PRE, MID and POST training. PRE, MID, and POST  
208 outcomes reported as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation. BMC= bone mineral content, FBM= fat body mass,  
209 LBM= lean body mass. \*P<0.05 compared to PRE, §P<0.05 compared to MID, +Post-hoc test not  
210 sensitive enough to detect differences, ¶For non-parametric Freidman test the Bonferroni correction  
211 used for post-hoc testing resulted in significance level of  $p \leq 0.017$

212 **Cytokine levels:** There were no observed trends for circulating levels of IL-6 ( $\chi^2(2) = 0.200$ ,  $p = 0.905$ )  
213 or TNF- $\alpha$  ( $\chi^2(2) = 2.400$ ,  $p = 0.301$ ; see **Supplementary Figure 2** for individual data).

214 **Muscle strength:** There was a significant increase in isokinetic muscle strength for leg extension at  
215 120 degrees per second ( $^{\circ} \cdot s^{-1}$ ), flexion at  $120^{\circ} \cdot s^{-1}$  and  $180^{\circ} \cdot s^{-1}$  from PRE to POST training. Arm flexion  
216 increased at  $60^{\circ} \cdot s^{-1}$  and  $180^{\circ} \cdot s^{-1}$  from PRE to POST training. When normalized to lean muscle mass,  
217 only leg flexion at  $120^{\circ} \cdot s^{-1}$  and arm flexion at  $180^{\circ} \cdot s^{-1}$  remained significant (**Table 3**).

218 **Table 3.** Absolute and normalized muscle strength values at PRE, MID and POST training. PRE, MID,  
219 and POST outcomes reported as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation. Arm and grip strength are normalized to  
220 the lean mass (kg) of the arm performing the exercise. Leg strength is normalized to the lean mass (kg)  
221 of the leg performing the exercise. \*P<0.05 compared to PRE, §P<0.05 compared to MID, +Post-hoc

222 test not sensitive enough to detect differences, <sup>€</sup>For non-parametric Freidman test the Bonferroni  
223 correction used for post-hoc testing resulted in significance level of  $p \leq 0.017$

224 **Aerobic fitness:** There was a significant increase in peak oxygen consumption (VO<sub>2</sub> peak) and %  
225 predicted VO<sub>2</sub> peak PRE to POST. We observed a trend towards an increase in VO<sub>2</sub> peak normalized to  
226 lean mass. Maximum workload increased significantly from PRE to POST, even when normalized to  
227 lean mass. The submaximal data used to calculate work efficiency were only available for 8  
228 participants, but showed a significant increase in work efficiency throughout the study (post-hoc NS,  
229 **Table 4**).

230 **Table 4.** Aerobic fitness variables and average daily physical activity/ sedentary time at PRE, MID and  
231 POST training. PRE, MID, and POST outcomes reported as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation. LM= lean  
232 mass, % Predicted W<sub>peak</sub> based on height. \*P<0.05 compared to PRE, P<0.05 compared to MID, <sup>+</sup>Post-  
233 hoc test not sensitive enough to detect differences, <sup>€</sup>For non-parametric Freidman test the Bonferroni  
234 correction used for post-hoc testing resulted in significance level of  $p \leq 0.017$

235 **Physical activity and sedentary time:** Valid accelerometer data were available for 7 participants; 2  
236 participants did not meet the wear time criteria at all measurement timepoints, while 1 participant did  
237 not wear the accelerometer at POST. There was a trend towards a decrease in sedentary time and an  
238 increase in total physical activity time from PRE to MID. We observed a significant increase in time  
239 spent in vigorous physical activity from PRE to MID intervention. From MID to POST, we observed a  
240 significant increase in sedentary time and a decrease in light and total physical activity (**Table 4**).

#### 241 **Discussion:**

242 Overall, our 16-week aerobic and resistance exercise training program was safe, well-tolerated,  
243 and enjoyable for children and adolescents with IBD. We observed good compliance levels and  
244 adherence to supervised exercise sessions, but low adherence to home-based sessions. While there were  
245 no changes in inflammation, we did observe some improvements in body composition, muscle strength,  
246 aerobic fitness, habitual physical activity with training.

247 **Feasibility:** In this study, 11 youth were recruited over 9 months and of these, 90.9% completed the  
248 study. A primary barrier to recruitment was the distance families had to travel to our institution for  
249 training sessions. The IBD clinic at McMaster Children’s Hospital has a large catchment area, some  
250 patients are required to travel up to 2 hours to attend the clinic. Naturally, such a far commute is not  
251 feasible 2 times a week for 16 weeks. Hence, increasing the amount of training locations or recruiting  
252 from a clinic with more local patients may increase recruitment rates.

253 On average, participants adhered to 77% of the prescribed exercise sessions, which did not meet  
254 our feasibility goal of at least 80% attendance. While having on-site training sessions did limit our  
255 recruitment, it is important to note that children who were enrolled had a high adherence rate to  
256 supervised sessions (87.5%), while home sessions were loosely followed with a much lower completion  
257 rate (50%). This is in accordance with previous pediatric exercise training studies that have compared  
258 adherence to supervised and unsupervised training programs.<sup>21</sup> Altogether, this speaks to the need for  
259 approaches to increase motivation and the implementation of behavioural change strategies in studies  
260 designed with unsupervised training sessions.<sup>21</sup> Interestingly, pediatric IBD exergame-based training  
261 studies, which also took place at home, had higher adherence rates (84.5%).<sup>11</sup> Therefore, a more effective  
262 approach to increase overall program adherence may be to combine our supervised training sessions with  
263 exergame-based home sessions.

264 Although we were unable to report compliance for home sessions, participants were able to  
265 complete 83% of supervised sessions with no modifications to the exercise. Even in sessions requiring  
266 modification to the prescribed exercise, the modifications were minimal – often just a decrease in  
267 intensity with the participant persevering to finish the required repetitions. Overall, this suggests the  
268 training program was feasible to a certain extent, but still requires the trainer to consider the participant’s  
269 status daily. While participants wore a HR monitor for home-based sessions, the unit averaged HR over  
270 the wear period making it impossible to gauge true exercise response (i.e., resting heart rates included in  
271 the average). To improve methods of tracking home session compliance, we would suggest implementing

272 a participant-managed training log and/or wearable device with higher resolution of data capture. Using  
273 an online platform with the log and wearable would allow real-time updates and prompts for incomplete  
274 sessions, which may be beneficial for monitoring and increasing adherence throughout the program.

275 **Safety:** Our safety findings suggests that an increase in regular exercise does not have any significant  
276 detrimental impact on IBD-related symptoms. Such findings are in line with previous pediatric IBD  
277 and chronic inflammatory disease patients that report no significant disease exacerbation with  
278 exercise.<sup>10,21-23</sup> Although two participants experienced minor flares during the study, this is not  
279 necessarily a contraindication to exercise. Given that IBD is a chronic inflammatory condition, it is  
280 expected that participants will experience sporadic exacerbation of disease symptoms regardless of  
281 what activities they engage in. Importantly, no participants withdrew from the exercise training  
282 program because of health-related concerns, and all participants remained in remission post-training.

283 **Participant satisfaction:** Participants provided valuable feedback that can serve to inform the design  
284 of future exercise programs. For instance, the idea of individualized and goal-oriented training may  
285 help to improve motivation and adherence. There were some contradictory perspectives: one  
286 participant reported they would have been more engaged if supervised exercise sessions included their  
287 peers, while another emphasized that children with little experience being physically active may feel  
288 self-conscious and prefer the option to have one-on-one training sessions until they are comfortable  
289 training in a group. Therefore, future programs may wish to consider these options on a case-by-case  
290 basis. Furthermore, a single participant enjoyed the home-based sessions because they were more  
291 convenient and helped them recognize that they can be physically active on their own with minimal  
292 equipment. This aligns with our initial rationale for implementing home-based training sessions, and  
293 gives us hope that participants would continue to be physically active autonomously using the workouts  
294 they learned throughout the program. This is a key message that future programs may wish to  
295 emphasize to participants to increase post-training program benefits.

296 **Inflammatory cytokines:** There were no significant changes in inflammatory cytokine levels from pre  
297 to post training. It is important to note that all of our participants were treated with drugs that modulate  
298 inflammation (e.g., corticosteroids, anti-TNF $\alpha$ , anti-inflammatories) throughout the study, and 7 of 10  
299 participants changed medication dosage or type during the study.<sup>24</sup> Therefore, it is likely that any  
300 training effects on inflammation were masked by pharmacologic effects. Stratifying by medication use  
301 may be a more effective approach in future trials where the goal is to investigate the effects of regular  
302 physical activity on inflammation. Nonetheless, our results provide evidence that exercise training did  
303 not significantly increase systemic inflammation in children and adolescents treated for IBD.

304 **Body composition:** We observed a significant increase in LBM of  $2.4 \pm 1.1$  kg over 16 weeks of  
305 training. In healthy children of the same chronological age, we would expect to see a  $1.3 \pm 0.4$  kg  
306 increase in LBM over a four month-period due to growth and development.<sup>26</sup> This cautiously suggests  
307 that exercise training was capable of increasing lean mass in children with IBD, which is consistent  
308 with findings in children with other chronic inflammatory diseases.<sup>25,26</sup> Nevertheless, without a direct  
309 control group, it is difficult to definitively conclude that this finding can be attributed to training effects  
310 or to normal growth and development.

311 Similarly, healthy children of the same chronological age as our participants are expected to gain  
312  $\sim 0.010$ - $0.015$  g $\cdot$ cm<sup>-2</sup> of BMD per year. Our participants gained  $0.012$  g $\cdot$ cm<sup>-2</sup> BMD in 16 weeks or about  
313 one third of the year.<sup>27</sup> This implies that exercise may help increase BMD in children with IBD, a  
314 meaningful finding given that these youth tend to have impaired bone mass and retention.<sup>28</sup> Naturally,  
315 including a non-exercising control group with IBD would provide a more definitive answer.

316 The reduction in FBM% we reported was likely due to an increase in overall LBM. Nonetheless,  
317 decreased FBM% and torso fat% along with an increase LBM% are encouraging, because skeletal muscle  
318 is a metabolically active tissue, which oxidizes fatty acids, even at rest.<sup>29</sup> In theory, increased LBM

319 should contribute to metabolism and energy homeostasis, and in turn, regulate fat stores and deposition  
320 as well.<sup>28</sup>

321 **Muscle strength:** When normalized to extremity lean mass, only leg extension at  $120^{\circ}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  and arm  
322 flexion at  $180^{\circ}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  remained significant, suggesting that the increase in LBM was primarily responsible  
323 for the increase in muscle strength. Since the prescribed workouts did not expressly target isokinetic  
324 movements equivalent to  $120^{\circ}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  leg extension and  $180^{\circ}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  arm flexion, it is unusual that a true increase  
325 in strength would only occur for those specific angular velocities without also seeing an increase in  
326 strength tested at other angular velocities. Most of the supervised resistance training activities activated  
327 the biceps (i.e., lat pull, pec fly, seated row). However, exercises that targeted elbow extensors, like push-  
328 ups and triceps extensions, were included in the home training protocol, which was underperformed. A  
329 more balanced and targeted protocol may induce more uniform increases in strength.

330 **Aerobic fitness:** We speculate the observed increase in absolute  $\text{VO}_2$  peak from pre to post was likely  
331 due to the increase in LBM, since there were no changes when  $\text{VO}_2$  peak was normalized to LBM. This  
332 is in contrast to previous studies in healthy children and adolescents that reported an increase in LBM-  
333 normalized  $\text{VO}_2$  peak following moderate intensity bi-weekly training.<sup>30</sup> Significant increases in  $W_{\text{peak}}$ ,  
334 even when normalized to total body mass and lean mass, were likely due to an increase in mechanical  
335 efficiency, as demonstrated by improved work efficiency at same metabolic costs. Previous studies  
336 have shown that children with IBD have lower recent hemoglobin levels, which were correlated with  
337 lower aerobic fitness.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, further study may be required as to the trainability of these patients.

338 **Physical activity levels:** We demonstrated a significant increase in vigorous physical activity from PRE  
339 to MID, and a trend towards a decrease in sedentary time and increase in total physical activity from mid  
340 to post intervention. Since data from 3 (of 10) participants were omitted from this analysis, it is possible  
341 that increasing the number of participants analyzed would strengthen the trends we observed.  
342 Furthermore, despite the strengths of device-measured physical activity, accelerometry cannot capture  
343 resistance training or stationary cycling, which were both major components of our training intervention.

344 Exploring a combination of waist- and arm-worn activity tracking devices, or those that incorporate heart  
345 rate measurements may provide more insight into this type of structured exercise training. Importantly,  
346 our results suggest that participants were increasing their activity levels outside of the exercise  
347 intervention.

348 **Limitations:** As previously discussed, a limitation of this pilot study is a lack of non-exercising IBD  
349 control group when evaluating the efficacy of exercise training. However, a non-exercising IBD control  
350 group was not required to achieve the primary goals of the study related to feasibility, safety, and  
351 participant feedback.

352 **Conclusion:**

353 The findings of this pilot study demonstrate that our 16-week exercise intervention was feasible  
354 for supervised visits and safe for youth with IBD (**Supplementary material 4**). Participants were  
355 satisfied with the training intervention, and also provided valuable feedback that can be easily  
356 implemented to improve our future training studies. From an efficacy perspective, we observed an  
357 improvement in body composition, no change in systemic inflammation, improvements in absolute  
358 aerobic fitness and work efficiency, as well as some indicators of muscle strength. Participants also  
359 demonstrated some increases in physical activity. Taken together, the findings of this pilot study are  
360 promising and should encourage further research to support the implementation of safe and effective  
361 exercise prescription as an adjunct therapy for children and adolescents with IBD.

362 **Acknowledgements:**

363 The authors wish to thank the participants and their families for their time and effort. We are grateful to  
364 Ms. Chris Radoja for her tremendous support with identifying and recruiting participants. We also like  
365 to thank Mr. Peter Breithaupt for designing the exercise training intervention, as well as Ms. Jovana  
366 Milenkovic, Ms. Camilla Thorne-Tjomslund and Mr. Ian Cooper for their support with assessment and  
367 exercise training sessions. BWT was supported by a CIHR New Investigator Award.



**References:**

1. Benchimol EI, Bernstein CN, Bitton A, et al. The Impact of Inflammatory Bowel Disease in Canada 2018: A Scientific Report from the Canadian Gastro-Intestinal Epidemiology Consortium to Crohn's and Colitis Canada. *Journal of the Canadian Association of Gastroenterology*. Published online 2019. doi:10.1093/jcag/gwy052
2. Benchimol EI, MacK DR, Nguyen GC, et al. Incidence, outcomes, and health services burden of very early onset inflammatory bowel disease. *Gastroenterology*. 2014;147(4):803-813.e7. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2014.06.023
3. Thangarajah D, Hyde MJ, Konteti VKS, Santhakumaran S, Frost G, Fell JME. Systematic review: Body composition in children with inflammatory bowel disease. *Alimentary Pharmacology and Therapeutics*. Published online 2015. doi:10.1111/apt.13218
4. Ploeger HE, Takken T, Wilk B, et al. Exercise capacity in pediatric patients with inflammatory bowel disease. *Journal of Pediatrics*. 2011;158(5):814-819. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2010.10.020
5. Rosen MJ, Dhawan A, Saeed SA. Inflammatory bowel disease in children and adolescents. *JAMA Pediatrics*. Published online 2015. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.1982
6. Eckert KG, Abbasi-Neureither I, Köppel M, Huber G. Structured physical activity interventions as a complementary therapy for patients with inflammatory bowel disease - A scoping review and practical implications. *BMC Gastroenterology*. Published online 2019. doi:10.1186/s12876-019-1034-9
7. Cronin O, Barton W, Moran C, et al. Moderate-intensity aerobic and resistance exercise is safe and favorably influences body composition in patients with quiescent Inflammatory Bowel Disease: A randomized controlled cross-over trial. *BMC Gastroenterology*. Published online 2019. doi:10.1186/s12876-019-0952-x

8. de Souza Tajiri GJ, de Castro CLN, Zaltman C. Progressive resistance training improves muscle strength in women with inflammatory bowel disease and quadriceps weakness. *Journal of Crohn's and Colitis*. Published online 2014. doi:10.1016/j.crohns.2014.09.001
9. D'Inca R, Varnier M, Mestriner C, Martines D, D'Odorico A, Sturniolo GC. Effect of moderate exercise on Crohn's disease patients in remission. *Italian Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology*. Published online 1999.
10. Robinson RJ, Krzywicki T, Almond L, et al. Effect of a low-impact exercise program on bone mineral density in Crohn's disease: A randomized controlled trial. *Gastroenterology*. Published online 1998. doi:10.1016/S0016-5085(98)70362-2
11. Mählmann L, Gerber M, Furlano RI, et al. Aerobic exercise training in children and adolescents with inflammatory bowel disease: Influence on psychological functioning, sleep and physical performance – An exploratory trial. *Mental Health and Physical Activity*. Published online 2017. doi:10.1016/j.mhpa.2017.09.002
12. Legeret C, Mählmann L, Gerber M, et al. Favorable impact of long-term exercise on disease symptoms in pediatric patients with inflammatory bowel disease. *BMC Pediatrics*. Published online 2019. doi:10.1186/s12887-019-1680-7
13. Mählmann L, Gerber M, Furlano RI, et al. Psychological wellbeing and physical activity in children and adolescents with inflammatory bowel disease compared to healthy controls. *BMC Gastroenterology*. Published online 2017. doi:10.1186/s12876-017-0721-7
14. Moore DR, Volterman KA, Obeid J, Offord EA, Timmons BW. Postexercise protein ingestion increases whole body net protein balance in healthy children. *Journal of Applied Physiology*. Published online 2014. doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.00224.2014

15. Klare P, Nigg J, Nold J, et al. The impact of a ten-week physical exercise program on health-related quality of life in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: A prospective randomized controlled trial. *Digestion*. Published online 2015. doi:10.1159/000371795
16. Daly JC, Cohen J. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, Revised Edition. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. Published online 1978. doi:10.2307/2286629
17. Durlak JA. How to select, calculate, and interpret effect sizes. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*. Published online 2009. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsp004
18. Cohen J. A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*. Published online 1992. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155
19. Thabane L, Ma J, Chu R, et al. A tutorial on pilot studies: The what, why and how. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. Published online 2010. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-10-1
20. Wiskin AE, Wootton SA, Hunt TM, et al. Body composition in childhood inflammatory bowel disease. *Clinical Nutrition*. Published online 2011. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2010.07.014
21. van Brussel M, van der Net J, Hulzebos E, Helders PJM, Takken T. The Utrecht approach to exercise in chronic childhood conditions: The decade in review. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*. Published online 2011. doi:10.1097/PEP.0b013e318208cb22
22. Ng V, Millard W, Lebrun C, Howard J. Low-intensity exercise improves quality of life in patients with Crohn's disease. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine*. Published online 2007. doi:10.1097/JSM.0b013e31802b4fda
23. van Doorn N. Exercise programs for children with cystic fibrosis: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. Published online 2010. doi:10.3109/09638280902991842

24. Adegbola SO, Sahnun K, Warusavitarne J, Hart A, Tozer P. Anti-TNF therapy in Crohn's disease. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*. Published online 2018.  
doi:10.3390/ijms19082244
25. Selvadurai HC, Blimkie CJ, Meyers N, Mellis CM, Cooper PJ, van Asperen PP. Randomized controlled study of in-hospital exercise training programs in children with cystic fibrosis. *Pediatric Pulmonology*. Published online 2002. doi:10.1002/ppul.10015
26. van Oort C, Tupper SM, Rosenberg AM, Farthing JP, Baxter-Jones AD. Safety and feasibility of a home-based six week resistance training program in juvenile idiopathic arthritis. *Pediatric Rheumatology*. Published online 2013. doi:10.1186/1546-0096-11-46
27. Elhakeem A, Frysz M, Tilling K, Tobias JH, Lawlor DA. Association between Age at Puberty and Bone Accrual from 10 to 25 Years of Age. *JAMA Network Open*. Published online 2019. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.8918
28. Sgambato D, Gimigliano F, Musis C de, et al. Bone alterations in inflammatory bowel diseases. *World Journal of Clinical Cases*. 2019;7(15):1908-1925.  
doi:10.12998/wjcc.v7.i15.1908
29. Slentz CA, Houmard JA, Kraus WE. Exercise, abdominal obesity, skeletal muscle, and metabolic risk: Evidence for a dose response. *Obesity*. Published online 2009.  
doi:10.1038/oby.2009.385
30. Carazo, P. Moncada-Jimenez J. A meta-analysis on the effects of exercise training on the VO<sub>2</sub>max in children and adolescents. *RETOS Nuevas Tendencias en Educación Física, Deporte y Recreación*. Published online 2015.
31. Weber DR, Leonard MB, Zemel BS. Body composition analysis in the pediatric population. *Pediatric Endocrinology Reviews*. Published online 2012.

<b>Mean ± SD (min-max)</b>	<b>PRE</b>	<b>MID</b>	<b>POST</b>
N (M/F)	10 (9/1)	10 (9/1)	10 (9/1)
CD/UC	6/4	6/4	6/4
Age (years)	15.4 ± 1.2 (14.1 – 17.3)	15.59 ± 1.2 (14.2 – 17.5)	15.8 ± 1.2 (14.4 – 17.7)
YPHV	-1.3 ± 1.3 (-3.2 – +1.6)	-1.2 ± 1.2 (-3.0 – +1.4)	-1.1 ± 1.2 (-2.9 – +1.5)
Tanner (# per stage)			
II	1	1	1
III	3	2	1
IV	4	5	5
V	2	2	3
Height (m)	1.67 ± 0.72 (1.58 – 1.80)	1.68 ± 0.70 (1.58 – 1.81)	1.69 ± 0.70 (1.58 – 1.81)
Weight (kg)	54.3 ± 8.3 (42.1 – 68.9)	55.9 ± 9.1 (43.1 – 70.9)	57.1 ± 9.0 (43.1 – 69.9)
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	19.4 ± 2.7 (15.3 – 24.0)	19.7 ± 3.0 (15.6 – 24.8)	20 ± 2.9 (16.2 – 25.3)

**Table 1.** Participant characteristics

Data are presented as frequencies, mean ± standard deviation, and range. CD= Crohn's disease, UC= Ulcerative colitis, YPHV= Years to peak height velocity

**Table 2.** Participant body composition at PRE, MID and POST training

	PRE	MID	POST	Effect size	ANOVA or Freidman Statistics
<b>BMC (kg)</b>	1.74 ± 0.24	1.78 ± 0.25*	1.83 ± 0.26* <sup>§</sup>	0.29	Greenhouse Geisser correction used, ε=0.626; F(1.252,11.266)=16.825 p<0.05
<b>FBM (kg)</b>	12.7 ± 5.04	12.95 ± 5.46	12.8 ± 5.63	0.02	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=0.800$ , p>0.05
<b>LBM (kg)</b>	40.8 ± 5.2	42.3 ± 5.3*	43.2 ± 5.2*	0.37	F(2,18)=2.113, p>0.05
<b>BMC %</b>	3.2 ± 0.4	3.2 ± 0.4	3.2 ± 0.4	0.03	F(2,18)=0.988, p>0.05
<b>FBM %</b>	22.5 ± 6.5 <sup>+</sup>	22.1 ± 6.6 <sup>+</sup>	21.5 ± 6.8 <sup>+</sup>	-0.12	Greenhouse Geisser correction used, ε= 0.626; F(1.251,11.260)=5.637 p<0.05
<b>LBM %</b>	74.3 ± 6.3 <sup>+€</sup>	74.8 ± 6.3 <sup>+€</sup>	75.3 ± 6.5 <sup>+€</sup>	0.13	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=7.200$ p<0.05
<b>BMD (g·cm<sup>-2</sup>)</b>	0.967 ± 0.071 <sup>+</sup>	0.971 ± 0.074 <sup>+</sup>	0.979 ± 0.072 <sup>+</sup>	0.14	F(2,18)=3.714 p<0.05
<b>Trunk fat (kg)</b>	4.46 ± 1.86	4.42 ± 1.97	4.43 ± 2.09	-0.01	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=0.200$ , p>0.05
<b>Trunk fat %</b>	18.0 ± 5.2	17.2 ± 4.6*	17.0 ± 5.6	-0.15	F(2,18)=3.958 p<0.05

PRE, MID, and POST outcomes reported as mean ± standard deviation. BMC= bone mineral content, FBM= fat body mass, LBM= lean body mass. \*P<0.05 compared to PRE, <sup>§</sup>P<0.05 compared to MID, <sup>+</sup>Post-hoc test not sensitive enough to detect differences, <sup>€</sup>For non-parametric Freidman test the Bonferroni correction used for post-hoc testing resulted in significance level of p≤0.017

**Table 3.** Absolute and normalized muscle strength values at PRE, MID and POST training

	<b>PRE</b>	<b>MID</b>	<b>POST</b>	<b>Effect size</b>	<b>ANOVA/ Freidman Statistics</b>
<b>Grip strength (Nm)</b>	20.4 ± 7.1	20.0 ± 7.0	21.5 ± 7.8	0.12	Greenhouse Geisser correction used, $\epsilon=0.635$ , $F(1.250,11.248)=0.312$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Normalized grip strength (Nm·kgLM<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	8.3 ± 2.4	7.9 ± 2.0	8.1 ± 2.7	-0.07	Greenhouse Geisser correction used, $\epsilon=0.615$ $F(1.230, 11.071)=0.095$ , $p>0.05$
<i>Elbow absolute values (Nm)</i>					
<b>Isometric extension</b>	42.1 ± 10.3	42.8 ± 9.7	45.3 ± 12.0	0.23	$F(2,16)=1.186$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Extension 60 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	31.7 ± 5.62	34.6 ± 7.9	32.3 ± 11.0	0.06	Greenhouse Geisser correction used, $\epsilon=0.630$ , $F(1.259, 11.334)= 0.894$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Extension 120 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	28.8 ± 6.5	29.6 ± 8.5	28.9 ± 7.90	0.02	$F(2,16)=0.126$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Extension 180 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	25.0 ± 3.7	24.7 ± 6.7	27.4 ± 8.7	0.29	$F(2,16)=1.333$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Flexion 60 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	27.2 ± 8.7	26.5 ± 11.0 <sup>+</sup>	32.1 ± 11.2 <sup>+</sup>	0.39	$F(2,16)=4.998$ , $p<0.05$
<b>Flexion 120 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	24.0 ± 9.4 <sup>€</sup>	25.2 ± 11.1 <sup>€</sup>	28.2 ± 9.2 <sup>€</sup>	0.36	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=5.000$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Flexion 180 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	19.0 ± 6.8 <sup>€</sup>	22.1 ± 8.2 <sup>€</sup>	25.4 ± 9.0 <sup>€</sup>	0.66	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=6.200$ , $p<0.05$
<i>Elbow normalized values (Nm kgLM<sup>-1</sup>)</i>					
<b>Isometric extension</b>	17.4 ± 3.0	17.2 ± 3.9	17.1 ± 4.2	-0.06	$(2,18)=0.055$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Extension 60 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	13.2 ± 1.8	13.7 ± 1.8	12.3 ± 4.2	-0.22	Greenhouse Geisser correction used, $\epsilon=0.637$ $F(1.274, 11.468)=1.113$
<b>Extension 120 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	11.9 ± 1.7	11.7 ± 2.6	10.9 ± 2.8	-0.34	$F(2,18)=1.431$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Extension 180 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	10.5 ± 1.9	9.9 ± 2.8	10.3 ± 2.8	-0.08	$F(2,18)=0.416$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Flexion 60 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	11.2 ± 3	10.3 ± 3.3	12.2 ± 4.3	0.21	$F(2,18)=2.939$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Flexion 120 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	9.8 ± 2.8	9.9 ± 3.8	10.7 ± 3.6	0.24	$F(2,18)=0.694$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Flexion 180 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	7.8 ± 2.4 <sup>€</sup>	8.8 ± 3.2* <sup>€</sup>	9.6 ± 3.3 <sup>+€</sup>	0.49	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=6.200$ , $p<0.05$
<i>Knee absolute values (Nm)</i>					
<b>Extension 60 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	109.1 ± 29.9	111.7 ± 27.8	120.4 ± 20.6	0.36	$F(2,16)=1.835$ , $p>0.05$

<b>Extension 120 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	87.9 ± 14.3	92.6 ± 19.3	103.5 ± 15.0*	0.86	Greenhouse Geisser correction used, $\epsilon=0.615$ , $F(1.230, 11.071)=5.023$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Extension 180 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	74.2 ± 23.1 <sup>+</sup>	81.9 ± 17.7 <sup>+</sup>	85.3 ± 16.2 <sup>+</sup>	0.45	$F(2,16)=4.817$ , $p<0.05$
<b>Flexion 60 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	65.3 ± 19.5 <sup>€</sup>	79.34 ± 12.2 <sup>€</sup>	74.6 ± 16.1 <sup>€</sup>	0.39	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=4.629$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Flexion 120 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	57.2 ± 14.5	65.89 ± 16.4	72.22 ± 14.8*	0.76	$F(2,16)=6.357$ , $p<0.05$
<b>Flexion 180 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	45.5 ± 12.3	56.7 ± 15.9	65.9 ± 13.5* <sup>§</sup>	1.18	$F(2,16)=10.334$ , $p<0.05$
<b><i>Knee normalized values (Nm kgLM<sup>-1</sup>)</i></b>					
<b>Isometric extension</b>	21.4 ± 3.5	22 ± 4.3	21.8 ± 3.5	0.09	$F(2, 16)=2.643$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Extension 60 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	15.9 ± 4.5 <sup>€</sup>	15.6 ± 3.6 <sup>€</sup>	16.5 ± 2.7 <sup>€</sup>	0.13	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=0.6000$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Extension 120 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	12.8 ± 2.2 <sup>€</sup>	12.9 ± 2.5 <sup>€</sup>	14.2 ± 1.9* <sup>€</sup>	0.53	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=6.200$ , $p<0.05$
<b>Extension 180 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	10.9 ± 3.7	11.4 ± 2.4	11.7 ± 2.2	0.21	$F(2,18)=0.991$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Flexion 60 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	9.4 ± 2.9 <sup>€</sup>	11.2 ± 2 <sup>€</sup>	9.2 ± 3.7 <sup>€</sup>	-0.06	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=3.800$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Flexion 120 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	8.3 ± 2.0	9.3 ± 2.0	9.0 ± 3.8	0.15	Greenhouse Geisser correction used, $\epsilon=0.643$ $F(1.286, 11.578)= 0.405$ , $p>0.05$
<b>Flexion 180 °·s<sup>-1</sup></b>	7.0 ± 2.2	8.1 ± 2.1	8.2 ± 3.3	0.31	$F(2.18)=0.782$ , $p>0.05$

PRE, MID, and POST outcomes reported as mean ± standard deviation. Arm and grip strength are normalized to the lean mass (kg) of the arm performing the exercise. Leg strength is normalized to the lean mass (kg) of the leg performing the exercise. \* $P<0.05$  compared to PRE, <sup>§</sup> $P<0.05$  compared to MID, <sup>+</sup>Post-hoc test not sensitive enough to detect differences, <sup>€</sup>For non-parametric Freidman test the Bonferroni correction used for post-hoc testing resulted in significance level of  $p\leq 0.017$



**Table 4.** Aerobic fitness variables and average daily physical activity/ sedentary time at PRE, MID and POST training

	PRE	MID	POST	Effect size	ANOVA/ Freidman Statistics
<b>VO<sub>2</sub> peak (L·min<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	2.0 ± 0.3	2.2 ± 0.3	2.3 ± 0.2*	0.68	F(2, 18)=5.476, p<0.05
<b>VO<sub>2</sub> peak (mL·kg<sup>-1</sup>·min<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	36.7 ± 3.4	37.9 ± 4.3	39.5 ± 5.2	0.52	F(2, 18)=1.934
<b>VO<sub>2</sub> peak (mL·kgLM<sup>-1</sup>·min<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	49.6 ± 5.7 <sup>€</sup>	50.8 ± 4.5 <sup>€</sup>	52.4 ± 4.8 <sup>€</sup>	0.42	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=0.200$
<b>% Predicted VO<sub>2</sub> peak</b>	73.5 ± 13.9 <sup>€</sup>	76.1 ± 11.0* <sup>€</sup>	79.3 ± 14.9* <sup>€</sup>	0.32	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=16.200$ , p<0.05
<b>W<sub>peak</sub> (Watts)</b>	134.8 ± 19.1	149.0 ± 24.3*	160.7 ± 15.6* <sup>§</sup>	1.2	F(2, 18)=38.589, p<0.05
<b>W<sub>peak</sub> (Watts·kg<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	2.5 ± 0.2	2.6 ± 0.3*	2.8 ± 0.4*	0.91	F(2, 18)=12.323, p<0.05
<b>W<sub>peak</sub> (W·kgLM<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	3.3 ± 0.2	3.5 ± 0.3	3.8 ± 0.3*	1.19	F(2, 18)=11.606, p<0.05
<b>% Predicted W<sub>peak</sub></b>	61.5 ± 8.1 <sup>€</sup>	66.2 ± 7.4* <sup>€</sup>	71.6 ± 8.5* <sup>€</sup>	0.98	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=16.200$ , p<0.05
<b>HR<sub>peak</sub> (beats·min<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	188 ± 9	188 ± 9	188 ± 10	-0.07	F(2, 18)=0.038, p>0.05
<b>Work efficiency % (at PRE VO<sub>2</sub> peak)</b>	18.7 ± 1.9 <sup>+€</sup>	19.4 ± 1.4 <sup>+€</sup>	19.9 ± 1.3 <sup>+€</sup>	0.49	Nonparametric Friedman test, $\chi^2(2)=6.25$ , p<0.05
<b><i>Daily physical activity and sedentary time (Min·day<sup>-1</sup>)</i></b>					
<b>Sedentary</b>	701.0 ± 52.6	666.8 ± 57.9	687.4 ± 53.8 <sup>§</sup>	<b>Effect size</b>	<b>ANOVA Statistics</b>
<b>Total physical activity</b>	129 ± 52.6	163.2 ± 57.9	142.1 ± 54.2 <sup>§</sup>	-0.18	Greenhouse Geisser correction used, $\epsilon=0.585$ , F(1.170, 7.022)=5.827, p<0.05
<b>Light intensity</b>	91.5 ± 32.8	107.1 ± 33.5	96.3 ± 33.5 <sup>§</sup>	0.10	F(2,12)=5.865, p<0.05
<b>Moderate intensity</b>	22.9 ± 12.1	28.4 ± 11.6	26.5 ± 11.2	0.22	F(2,12)=4.487, p<0.05
<b>Vigorous intensity</b>	14.6 ± 9.1	27.7 ± 15*	19.3 ± 13.1	0.30	F(2,12)=1.329, p>0.05
<b>Moderate-to-vigorous</b>	37.5 ± 20.6 <sup>+</sup>	56.1 ± 26 <sup>+</sup>	45.7 ± 23.1 <sup>+</sup>	0.27	F(2,12)=6.476, p<0.05

<b>intensity</b>					
------------------	--	--	--	--	--

PRE, MID, and POST outcomes reported as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation. LM= lean mass, % Predicted  $W_{peak}$  based on height. \* $P < 0.05$  compared to PRE,  $P < 0.05$  compared to MID, <sup>+</sup>Post-hoc test not sensitive enough to detect differences, <sup>€</sup>For non-parametric Friedman test the Bonferroni correction used for post-hoc testing resulted in significance level of  $p \leq 0.017$

IBD patients assessed for eligibility (217)

Not eligible (36):

- Not in remission (17)
- Age <10 or >17 years (30)
- MD or RN recommended (5)
- IBD diagnosis not confirmed (4)

Not approached (57):

- No show (12)
- RA absent (55)
- >45 min away (8)
- No time to talk (2)

Approached (91)

Approached but not eligible (5):

- Trains >3 times a week (5)

Approached but not interested (73):

- Distance (40)
- Big time commitment (4)
- Reasons not given (18)
- Too busy (3)
- Cannot get to McMaster (5)
- Moving away or away on extended travel (3)

Interested, but did not enroll (15):

- Unable to contact (4)
- Distance (1)
- Family did not follow up (8)
- Away (1)
- Other medical issues (1)

Enrolled (11)

Received intervention (11)

Withdraw (1):

- Medical issues unrelated to study

Completed study (10)