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Optimizing Interval Training Through Power-Output Variation Within the Work Intervals

Arthur H. Bossi, Cristian Mesquida, Louis Passfield, Bent R. Rønnestad, and James G. Hopker

Purpose: Maximal oxygen uptake (VO₂max) is a key determinant of endurance performance. Therefore, devising high-intensity interval training (HIIT) that maximizes stress of the oxygen-transport and -utilization systems may be important to stimulate further adaptation in athletes. The authors compared physiological and perceptual responses elicited by work intervals matched for duration and mean power output but differing in power-output distribution. Methods: Fourteen cyclists (VO₂max 69.2 [6.6] mL·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹) completed 3 laboratory visits for a performance assessment and 2 HIIT sessions using either varied-intensity or constant-intensity work intervals. Results: Cyclists spent more time at >90%VO₂max during HIIT with varied-intensity work intervals (410 [207] vs 286 [162] s, P = .02), but there were no differences between sessions in heart-rate- or perceptual-based training-load metrics (all P ≥ .1). When considering individual work intervals, minute ventilation (VE) was higher in the varied-intensity mode (F = 8.42, P = .01), but not respiratory frequency, tidal volume, blood lactate concentration [La], ratings of perceived exertion, or cadence (all F ≤ 3.50, P ≥ .08). Absolute changes (Δ) between HIIT sessions were calculated per work interval, and Δ total oxygen uptake was moderately associated with ΔVE (r = .36, P = .002). Conclusions: In comparison with an HIIT session with constant-intensity work intervals, well-trained cyclists sustain higher fractions of VO₂max when work intervals involved power-output variations. This effect is partially mediated by an increased oxygen cost of hyperpnea and not associated with a higher [La], perceived exertion, or training-load metrics.
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High-intensity interval training (HIIT) involves repeated bouts of high-intensity exercise interspersed with recovery periods. This method is typically employed to increase the training stimulus for the cardiorespiratory system over prolonged continuous exercise. Accordingly, much of the scientific work related to HIIT has focused on maximal oxygen uptake (VO₂max) improvements,1–4 as the upper limit to the aerobic metabolism and a key determinant of endurance performance.5 It has been suggested that exercising at high intensities is beneficial to improve VO₂max,6 particularly in the case of well-trained athletes.1–3 Therefore, accumulating time at or close to VO₂max (eg, >90% or >95%) during a HIIT session may be important for training adaptation.1–4,6–9

Previously, Billat et al10 have demonstrated that the ability to sustain exercise at >95%VO₂max can exceed 15 minutes if power output is adjusted according to expired gas responses. In comparison, constant work rate exercise or HIIT performed to exhaustion produces time at >90% or >95%VO₂max of only a few minutes.1–3,6,7,10 Billat et al10 used a protocol that commenced at the lowest power output eliciting VO₂max, and once attained, power output was decreased progressively. Subsequently, power output was regulated as per individual oxygen uptake (VO₂) responses, enabling >95%VO₂max to be sustained and time to exhaustion prolonged.10 Although this laboratory protocol is appealing as a training session, it is not practical for the majority of athletes. Alternatively, a HIIT session in which the work intervals include power output variations might provide similar means to increase time at >90%VO₂max.

Previous research suggests that power output distribution affects physiological responses during standardized HIIT sessions,8,9 with increased time at >90%VO₂max following decreasing-intensity versus constant-intensity work intervals6 and greater time at >85%VO₂max following all-out versus constant-intensity work intervals being reported.9 Although the previously mentioned studies did not investigate potential mechanisms, authors attributed the results to a difference in VO₂ kinetics between HIIT modes,5,9 as faster VO₂ kinetics have been observed during decreasing-intensity versus constant-intensity single bouts of exercise matched for mean power output.11,12 It is believed that VO₂ kinetics reflect changes in oxidative metabolism within the muscle,13,14 which, in turn, respond to the energy state of the cells, in particular, the concentration of adenosine diphosphate.15 Higher work rates elevate adenosine diphosphate concentrations and activate oxidative phosphorylation more rapidly,16 ultimately producing faster VO₂ kinetics at the onset of decreasing-intensity compared with constant-intensity exercise.11,12 This mechanism leads to the possibility that multiple changes in power output within the first half of a work interval would maximize time at >90%VO₂max.

Despite the attractiveness of the VO₂ kinetics hypothesis, ventilatory variables such as minute ventilation (VE) or respiratory frequency (fR) have been largely ignored as part of the physiological responses to different patterns of power output distribution.6,9,11,12 As the oxygen cost of hyperpnoea at high-intensity exercise is substantial, reaching 15% of VO₂max in some individuals,17,18 exacerbated ventilatory responses caused by varied-intensity work intervals may help to explain an increased time at >90%VO₂max in this type of HIIT. Indeed, evidence suggests work rate magnitude affects ventilatory response dynamics.19 However, the strong association reported between fR and ratings
of perceived exertion (RPE) suggests that the extra respiratory drive may be associated with a higher perceptual strain and premature fatigue, potentially offsetting the benefits of being able to spend a longer time at >90% VO\textsubscript{2}max.

The purpose of this study was to compare the physiological and perceptual responses elicited by work intervals matched for duration and mean power output, but differing in power output distribution. Specifically, constant-intensity work intervals were prescribed in 1 HIIT session, whereas power output was repeatedly varied within the work intervals of the other one. We tested the following hypotheses: Higher fractions of VO\textsubscript{2}max would be sustained in the varied-intensity mode, and ventilatory variables would predict changes in VO\textsubscript{2} response.

Methods

Participants

A total of 14 well-trained male cyclists volunteered for this study during their off-season. The Inland Norway University research ethics committee at Lillehammer University College approved the study in compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Study Design

Participants visited the laboratory on 3 occasions, at the same time of the day, separated by at least 48 hours. In the first visit, participants completed a submaximal lactate threshold test and a maximal incremental test to characterize their cycling ability and physiological profile. They were also familiarized with the HIIT sessions used during subsequent visits. In visits 2 and 3, participants performed in randomized order 2 HIIT sessions with either varied-intensity or constant-intensity work intervals, matched for duration and mean power output. Acute physiological and perceptual responses were compared between HIIT sessions at the same time points.

Participants were instructed to refrain from all types of intense exercise 24 hours before each laboratory visit and to prepare as they would for competition. They were instructed to consume identical meals 1 hour before each laboratory visit and to refrain from caffeine during the preceding 3 hours. All tests were performed free from distractions, under similar environmental conditions (16°C–17°C), with participants being cooled with a fan.

Ergometer Setup

All cyclists used the same bike (2017 Roubaix One. 3 size 56; Fuji, Taichung, Taiwan) mounted on a cycle ergometer (KICKR; Wahoo Fitness, Atlanta, GA) considered to be valid and reliable. Saddle position was individually adjusted, and measures were noted for replication. The bike was equipped with a crank-based power meter (SRAM S975; SRM, Jülich, Germany), from which power output and cadence were recorded. An indoor cycling training software (TrainerRoad v1.0.0.49262; TrainerRoad LLC, Reno, NV) was used to customize all testing sessions, which were performed in ergometer mode. The laptop was connected to the KICKR through Bluetooth and to the SRM through an ANT+ dongle. With this setup, the resistance of the KICKR was controlled by the power output and cadence readings of the SRM. Power output, cadence, and heart rate (HR) were recorded by a cycle computer (PowerControl 8; SRM) at a sampling rate of 1 Hz and subsequently analyzed using open-source software (version 3.4; GoldenCheetah, London, UK; http://www.goldencheetah.org). The KICKR and the SRM were calibrated by the manufacturer prior to the study. Before each use, a member of the research team warmed-up the KICKR by riding for 10 minutes at 100 W and then performed the “spindown” through the TrainerRoad software, which is a zero-offset calibration of the strain gauges based on bearing and belt friction. The zero offset procedure of the SRM was performed according to the manufacturer’s recommendations.

To examine the validity of the power outputs generated by the KICKR through this setup, individual targets determined for each HIIT session (see text below) were compared with the SRM readings. A freely available spreadsheet was used to assess data at 77%, 84%, and 100% of maximal aerobic power (MAP) for agreement, with a total of 288, 96 and 288 duplicates, respectively. The comparison KICKR versus SRM revealed a typical error of estimate of 7 W (90% confidence limits [CLs], 6 to 7 W); correlation coefficient ($r$) of .98 (90% CL, 0.97 to 0.98); and mean bias of −3 W (90% CL, −4 to −3 W) at 77% MAP; a TEE of 2 W (90% CL, 2 to 3 W), $r = 1.00$ (90% CL, 1.00 to 1.00) and mean bias of 1 W (90% CL, 0 to 1 W) at 84% MAP; and a TEE of 8 W (90% CL, 7 to 9 W), $r = .97$ (90% CL, 0.97 to 0.98) and mean bias of 11 W (90% CL, 10 to 12 W) at 100% MAP. Our ergometer setup was therefore deemed valid.

Preliminary Testing

In the first visit, participant’s height and body mass were measured, and they completed a cycling experience index questionnaire, as well as standalone questions about their training habits. In brief, by adding up the scores from each question, individuals are assigned a total score from 0 (representing a complete noncyclist) to 37 (representing a highly experienced and well-trained cyclist). Participants subsequently completed a lactate threshold test, which started at 125 W, increasing by 50 W every fifth minute (25 W if blood lactate concentration [La] was ≥3 mmol·L$^{-1}$), and terminated when [La] reached ≥4 mmol·L$^{-1}$. Blood samples were taken from a fingertip at the last 30 seconds of each 5-minute bout and were immediately analyzed (Biosen C-Line; EKF Diagnostics, Penarth, United Kingdom). At the start of the test, cyclists chose their cadence, which they subsequently held constant throughout the remainder of the test. Power output at 4 mmol·L$^{-1}$ [La] was calculated for each cyclist from the relationship between [La] and power output in the last 2 stages, by using linear regression. VO\textsubscript{2} was measured during the last 3 minutes of each stage (15-s sampling time) using a computerized metabolic system with mixing chamber (Oxycon Pro; Erich Jaeger, Hoechberg, Germany). Prior to every test, the gas analyzer was calibrated with certified calibration gases of known concentrations, and the flow turbine (Triple V; Erich Jaeger) was calibrated with a 3-L syringe (5530 series; Hans Rudolph Inc, Shawnee Mission, KS).

After the lactate threshold test, cyclists rode for 10 minutes at a power output between 50 and 100 W before performing the maximal incremental test to determine VO\textsubscript{2max}, MAP and maximal work rate ($W_{\text{max}}$). The test started at 200 W with work rate being increased by 25 W every minute until voluntary exhaustion or an inability to maintain cadence above 70 rev·min$^{-1}$ despite verbal encouragement. Pedaling cadence was freely chosen, but participants were instructed to avoid abrupt changes. VO\textsubscript{2} was continually measured, and VO\textsubscript{2max} was calculated as the highest 60-second mean. MAP was calculated according to Daniels et al. This method extrapolates the relationship between submaximal power outputs and respective measures of VO\textsubscript{2} to VO\textsubscript{2max}, by means of linear regression. Power output data were recorded continuously throughout the test, with $W_{\text{max}}$ calculated as the mean of the last 60 seconds of the
incremental test. Straight after the maximal incremental test, a blood sample was taken from a fingertip and immediately analyzed to establish [La]. Cyclists reported their peak RPE using the Borg 6 to 20 scale immediately after terminating the test.

**HIIT Sessions**

Initially, participants performed a 15-minute warm-up based on Borg 6 to 20 RPE scale. The warm-up consisted of 5 minutes at an RPE of 11 (light), followed by three 1-minute intervals at 16 (between hard and very hard), interspersed with two 2-minute blocks and a final 3 minutes, all at 9 (very light). Cyclists were allowed to manipulate the work rate imposed by the cycle ergometer to match the required RPE.

Both HIIT sessions started with 5 minutes at 50%MAP, followed by six 5-minute work intervals at a mean intensity of 84%MAP, interspersed with 2.5-minute recovery at 30%MAP. Varied-intensity work intervals consisted of three 30-second surges at 100%MAP, interspersed with two 1-minute blocks, and a final 1.5 minutes at 77%MAP. Constant-intensity work intervals consisted of 5 minutes at 84%MAP. A detailed outline of the warm-up and both work intervals can be seen in Figure 1. The number of work intervals, their duration, and the duration of recovery intervals were chosen based on athletes’ perception of what constitutes a valuable training session for aerobic capacity development. The mean intensity for the work intervals was chosen based on pilot testing to warrant both HIIT sessions would be completed with physiological responses typical of exercise performed within the severe intensity domain. As for the varied-intensity work intervals, the 30-second surges at 100% MAP were chosen based on previous work of our lab with cyclists and cross-country skiers. Given the superior time at >90%VO₂max elicited by 30 seconds compared with longer work intervals in the cycling study, we reasoned that the 1.5 minutes at 100%MAP employed in the cross-country skiing study could be split into 3 surges to characterize the varied-intensity work interval.

Heart rate was continuously measured during the entire HIIT sessions. VO₂ was measured during the 5-minute work intervals (5-s sampling time) using the same equipment and following the calibration procedures adopted in the preliminary testing. Time at >90%VO₂max was calculated by summing all raw VO₂ measures over the established cutoff. At the end of each work interval, fingertip blood samples were taken to assess [La], and RPE was recorded. Participants self-selected their cadence, and water consumption was not restricted. Twenty minutes after finishing the HIIT sessions, participants performed an incremental test, followed by blood sample collection and RPE recording.

**Figure 1** — (A) Warm-up procedure based on RPE that was performed prior to both sessions of high-intensity interval training, (B) varied-intensity work intervals, and (C) constant-intensity work intervals. The intensity of both sessions was prescribed as a percentage of the individual’s MAP, and 6 work intervals were completed. Both high-intensity interval-training sessions started with 5 minutes at 50%MAP, which is omitted from the figure for clarity. %MAP indicates percentage of maximal aerobic power; RPE, rating of perceived exertion.

(Ahead of Print)
sessions, session RPE (sRPE) was recorded. An individualized training impulse (iTRIMP), which is a training-load metric based on HR, was also calculated to compare the training load between HIIT sessions. Within the iTRIMP calculation, exercise intensity is weighted according to participants’ own HR–[La] exponential relationship, obtained during the preliminary testing. iTRIMP was calculated for each HIIT session by summing the weighted scores from every 5-second HR mean.

### Data Analyses

Dependent variables were assessed for normality using Shapiro–Wilks tests. Paired t tests were used to compare time at >90% VO2max, sRPE, and iTRIMP between HIIT sessions. Two-way repeated-measures analyses of variance (work interval mode × work interval number) were performed to test for differences in mean VO2 as a percentage of maximal (%VO2max), total VO2, mean VE, mean ventilatory equivalent for oxygen (VE · VO2−1), mean fR, mean tidal volume (VT), mean carbon dioxide output (VCO2), mean HR, [La], RPE, and mean cadence. Following the analysis of variance, Bonferroni pairwise comparisons were used to identify where significant differences existed within the data. Cohen d or partial eta squared (ηp2) were computed as effect size estimates. Absolute changes between HIIT sessions were calculated for mean VE (ΔVE) and total VO2 (ΔVO2) per work interval. The association between ΔVE and ΔVO2 was modeled by multilevel analysis with participant as a random effect (ie, random intercept). A correlation coefficient (r) was then computed by adjusting for repeated observations within participants. Data were analyzed using SPSS (SPSS Statistics 25; IBM, Armonk, NY), and significance level was set at P ≤ .05. Results are presented as mean (SD) (90% CLs).

### Results

Participants’ characteristics are presented in Table 1. There was a longer time at >90% VO2max for HIIT with varied-intensity compared with constant-intensity work intervals (410 [207] vs 286 [162] s [90% CL, 312 to 508 vs 209 to 362 s]; t = 2.63; P = .02; d = 0.16; Figure 2A), despite no difference in mean power output as measured by the SRM crank (324 [30] vs 323 [30] W [90% CL, 310 to 338 vs 309 to 337 W]; t = 1.35; P = .20; d = 0.01). There was also no differences in sRPE (6.0 [1.8] vs 6.6 [1.7] [90% CL, 5.2 to 6.9 vs 5.8 to 7.5]; t = −1.62; P = .13; d = −0.09; Figure 2B), or iTRIMP (178 [43] vs 181 [46] [90% CL, 157 to 198 vs 160 to 203]; t = −.43; P = .68; d = −0.02; Figure 2C). The mean VO2 responses to both types of work intervals are presented in Figure 3.

Statistics and effect size estimations from the analysis of variance are given in Table 2. No interactions between work interval mode and work interval number were found for %VO2max (Figure 4A), total VO2 (Figure 4B), VE (Figure 4C), VE · VO2−1, fR (Figure 4D), VT (Figure 4E), VCO2 (Figure 4F), HR, [La] (Figure 4G), RPE (Figure 4H), or cadence (Figure 4I). There was a main effect of work interval mode for %VO2max, total VO2, VE, VE · VO2−1, and VCO2, but not for fR, VT, HR, [La], RPE, or cadence. A moderate correlation was found between ΔVE and ΔVO2 (r = .36; r2 = .13; P = .002).

| Table 1 Participant Characteristics and Preliminary Testing Results, Mean (SD) |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Age, y                                   | 24 (6)          | Height, cm      | 184 (5)         |
| Body mass, kg                            | 75.0 (5.2)      | VO2max, mL·kg−1·min−1 | 69.2 (6.6) |
| VO2max, L·min−1                          | 5.16 (0.35)     | Wmax, W·kg−1    | 5.77 (0.66)     |
| Wmax, W                                  | 430 (35)        | Maximal aerobic power, W·kg−1 | 5.18 (0.56) |
| Maximal aerobic power, W                 | 387 (33)        | RERpeak         | 191 (9)         |
| Maximal heart rate, beats-min−1           | 4 mmol·L−1·T−1   | RPEpeak         | 1.19 (0.04)     |
| 4 mmol·L−1·T−1                           | 63 (10)         | RPEpeak         | 19.4 (0.6)      |
| VO2max, maximal oxygen uptake; VTpeak, peak tidal volume; Wmax, maximal work rate during the incremental test. |

{\text{Abbreviations: [La]peak, peak blood lactate concentration; fRpeak, peak breathing frequency; LT, lactate threshold; RERpeak, peak respiratory exchange ratio; RPEpeak, peak rating of perceived exertion; VEpeak, peak minute ventilation; VO2max, maximal oxygen uptake; VTpeak, peak tidal volume; Wmax, maximal work rate during the incremental test.}}

A moderate correlation was found between ΔVE and ΔVO2 (r = .36; r2 = .13; P = .002).

### Discussion

Consistent with our first hypothesis, well-trained cyclists sustained higher fractions of VO2max when they performed the varied-intensity compared with constant-intensity work intervals during a HIIT session. Time at >90% VO2max, %VO2max sustained, and total VO2, all suggest an increased aerobic cost elicited by the varied-intensity work intervals. Importantly, this increased demand was not accompanied by a higher fR, HR, [La], RPE, or cadence. Furthermore, we found no differences between conditions in sRPE or iTRIMP, which may suggest that varied-intensity work intervals produce a higher training stimulus per dose of exercise. Consistent with our second hypothesis, VE was also higher during the varied-intensity compared with constant-intensity work intervals. In addition, ΔVE was moderately associated with ΔVO2, suggesting differences in the oxygen cost of hyperpnoea partially explain the magnitude of VO2 differences between HIIT sessions.

Varying power output between 100% and 77%MAP within the work intervals of a HIIT session increased the mean time at >90% VO2max by 43%, from 286 seconds (4 min 46 s) produced by...
the constant-intensity work intervals (84%MAP) to 410 seconds (6 min 50 s). This result stands out as we did not manipulate the mean intensity and length of the work and recovery intervals, or total HIIT duration, which often is the case in studies assessing time at or close to VO₂max.²,⁶,⁷,³² Previously, Billat et al.³³ demonstrated that effort could be minimized, and exercise sustained for more than 15 minutes at >95%VO₂max, when power output was manipulated according to expired gas responses. Despite HIIT with varied-intensity work intervals produced a shorter duration at >90%VO₂max compared with that of Billat et al.³³ our results provide evidence for a more practical approach to programming this type of training.

Unique to our study was that varied-intensity work intervals increased VO₂ without affecting most variables reflecting the physiological and perceptual strain of exercise. In contrast, Zadow et al.⁹ reported times at >85%VO₂max of 2 minutes 31 seconds and 2 minutes 4 seconds, for respectively all-out and constant-intensity work intervals, but with greater HR, RPE, and sRPE.⁹ Collectively, these results suggest there may be a tolerance limit for the magnitude of power output variation that allows cyclists to optimize time at >90%VO₂max without compromising exercise capacity. Another strength of our work is that HIIT sessions were matched for all prescription elements affecting the exercise dose, except power output distribution. For instance, Lisbôa et al.⁶ reported longer time at >90%VO₂max (4 min 19 s vs 2 min 03 s) following decreasing-intensity versus constant-intensity work intervals, but conditions were matched by participant’s capacity to perform work above critical power.⁶ Work and recovery interval durations were not controlled, potentially affecting time at a high fraction of VO₂max more than the power output distribution itself.¹⁻³,⁷,⁸ Thus, the higher time at >90%VO₂max was likely achieved by a change in exercise dose.

High-intensity interval training can be prescribed with different formats according to the aim of the training session. To produce the longest times at or close to VO₂max, short work intervals (<1 min) have been recommended.¹⁻³,⁷,⁸ In agreement with this proposition, adding repeated power output variations within longer 5-minute work intervals increased time at >90%VO₂max. Nevertheless, there is contrasting evidence from training studies, with evidence that both short⁸,⁹ and long work intervals⁴,³⁰ may trigger a potent stimulus for increasing VO₂max enhancements. Its relatively poor reliability must also be considered.³¹ Despite these considerations, we speculate that our novel HIIT session, if repeated over time, may combine the benefits of both short and longer work intervals. Further work is necessary to confirm this hypothesis.

Ventilatory responses to work intervals of different power output distributions have been previously neglected.⁶,⁹
### Table 2  Statistics and Effect-Size Estimations From the Analysis of Variance for Each Variable Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Main effect of interval mode</th>
<th>Main effect of interval number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%VO$_2$max</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total VO$_2$</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE · VO$_2^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_R$</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_T$</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$VCO_2$</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart rate</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood lactate concentration</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating of perceived exertion</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** %VO$_2$max, percentage of maximal oxygen uptake; $f_R$, breathing frequency; VO$_2$, oxygen uptake; VCO$_2$, carbon dioxide output; VE, minute ventilation; VE · VO$_2^{-1}$, ventilatory equivalent for oxygen; $V_T$, tidal volume. *Statistical significance.

### Figure 4

- **A** Mean %VO$_2$max, **B** total VO$_2$, **C** mean VE, **D** mean $f_R$, **E** mean $V_T$, **F** $VCO_2$, **G** [La], **H** RPE, and **I** mean cadence. Data are displayed per work interval as mean (SD) for high-intensity interval-training sessions with varied- (triangles) and constant-intensity work intervals (squares). $f_R$ indicates breathing frequency; [La], blood lactate concentration; RPE, rating of perceived exertion; VCO$_2$, mean carbon dioxide output; VE, mean minute ventilation; %VO$_2$max, mean oxygen uptake as a percentage of maximal; VO$_2$, total oxygen uptake; $V_T$, tidal volume. *Different from previous work interval (all $P \leq .03$). †Different from work intervals 3, 4, 5, and 6 (all $P \leq .02$). ‡Main effect of work-interval mode (all $P \leq .01$). §Main effect of work-interval number (all $P < .001$).
Interestingly, our results suggest they play a role in the observed changes in total VO₂. Compared with constant-intensity work intervals, varied intensity produced higher VE and VE · VO₂⁻¹, implying a greater mechanical work of the pulmonary system and an increased oxygen cost of hyperpnoea.¹⁷,¹⁸,³² Indeed, the multi-level analysis used in this study predicted that for each liter of increase in VE, VO₂ is increased by 4.7 mL. This is nevertheless higher than the cost of exercise hyperpnoea reported by Aaron et al.³² as 2.9 mL of oxygen per liter of VE, or more recently by Dominelli et al.¹⁸ as 2.4 mL·L⁻¹. Altogether the model intercept of 239.6 mL results suggest mechanisms other than an increased VE may account to a greater extent for the observed changes in aerobic cost of HIIT. It is therefore not surprising that only a moderate correlation between ΔVE and ΔVO₂ (r = .36) was found in the present study.

The fact that we did not find differences in fR or V̇T between varied-intensity and constant-intensity work intervals, alongside the differences in VE, has some practical and mechanistic implications. Practically, fR has been considered a marker of physical effort,²⁰ reinforcing the sense of equivalence in strain levels between both types of HIIT. Mechanistically, a higher VE with no significant changes in either fR or V̇T indicates that both contributed to the increases in VE, although in small magnitudes or with interindividual differences, challenging the hypothesis of a distinct mechanistic control of fR and V̇T during exercise.²⁰ Indeed, it has been previously suggested that during high-intensity exercise central command regulates VE preferentially through changes in fR,²⁰ which our data do not support. Instead, Tipton et al.³³ have proposed VE is regulated by a complex integration of mechanical and physiological factors, making it difficult to completely associate fR and V̇T with a particular type of reflex. Therefore, the higher VE in the varied-intensity compared with the constant-intensity work intervals is likely the result of a tightly coupled interaction between the increases in fR and V̇T that manifest during this type of exercise.

Additional mechanistic insight can be gained from a close inspection of Figure 3. Repeated surges at 100%MAP, as opposed to a single surge at the start of each work interval, seem required to produce the observed differences in time at >90%VO₂max. Not only the oxygen cost of hyperpnoea, but also the oxygen cost of muscle contraction, may have been greater during the varied-intensity compared with the constant-intensity work intervals. Higher exercise intensities have been shown to elicit a more uniform activation of the quadriceps femoris muscles³⁴ and their motor units.³⁴,³⁵ Thus, it is reasonable to assume some high-threshold fibers were only recruited at 100%MAP. The low efficiency and high fatigability of these fibers may have contributed to an increased whole-body VO₂ and time at >90%VO₂max.¹³ Besides, we cannot discard the VO₂ kinetics hypothesis as proposed by other authors.⁶,⁹,¹¹,¹² If the initial 30-second surges of the varied-intensity work intervals did not directly affect time at >90%VO₂max, faster VO₂ kinetics apparently contributed to a higher %VO₂max sustained and total VO₂. Future studies should use breath ergospirometry and leg electromyography to provide evidence for these hypotheses.

**Practical Applications**

Well-trained cyclists looking for alternative strategies to optimize training stimulus are advised to try the varied-intensity work intervals as outlined here. Whether performance adaptations will be superior to constant-intensity work intervals remain to be established by a longitudinal study; but similar fR, HR, [La], RPE, and training load metrics suggest that it is unlikely that negative training outcomes occur.

**Conclusions**

In comparison with a HIIT session with constant-intensity work intervals, well-trained cyclists sustain higher fractions of VO₂max when power output is repeatedly varied within the work intervals. This effect is partially mediated by an increased oxygen cost of hyperpnoea.
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