

**Original citation:**

Arturo Casado, Diego Moreno-Pérez, Mar Larrosa & Andrew Renfree (2019) Different psychophysiological responses to a high-intensity repetition session performed alone or in a group by elite middle-distance runners, *European Journal of Sport Science*, DOI: 10.1080/17461391.2019.1593510

Permanent WRaP URL:

<https://eprints.worc.ac.uk/7686/>

Copyright and reuse:

The Worcester Research and Publications (WRaP) makes this work available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRaP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published online by Taylor & Francis in *European Journal of Sport Science* on 28 Mar 2019, available online:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17461391.2019.1593510>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRaP URL' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact wrapteam@worc.ac.uk



Different psychophysiological responses to a high-intensity repetition session performed alone or in a group by elite middle-distance runners.

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Sports Science</i>
Manuscript ID	TEJS-2018-0652.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Keywords:	Training, Behavior, Endurance, Performance

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Different psychophysiological responses to a high-intensity repetition session performed alone or in a group by elite middle-distance runners.

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Internal training load refers to the degree of disturbance in psychophysiological homeostasis provoked by a training session and has been traditionally measured through session-RPE, which is the product of the session Rate of Perceived Exertion (RPE) and the duration. External training load refers to the actual physical work completed, and depends on session volume, intensity, frequency and density. Drafting, which is achieved by running closely behind another runner has been demonstrated to reduce the energy cost of running at a fixed speed and to improve performance. Therefore, it is hypothesized that psychophysiological responses might reflect different levels of internal load if training is performed individually or collectively. 16 elite middle-distance runners performed two high-intensity training sessions consisting of 4 repetitions of 500 m separated by 3 minutes of active recovery. Sessions were performed individually and collectively. Times for each repetition, RPE, core affect (valence and felt arousal) and blood lactate concentrations [BLa] were measured after each repetition. Main time effect was significant and increased across repetitions for [BLa] and RPE ($p < 0.001$), and decreased for valence ($p = 0.001$). Main group effect was significant and values were higher when training individually for [BLa] ($p = 0.003$) and RPE ($p = 0.001$), and lower for valence ($p = 0.001$). No differential responses were found between conditions in terms of repeat time or felt arousal. Findings demonstrate that elite middle-distance athletes running collectively display lower levels of internal training load compared to running alone, despite external training load being similar.

Key words: Training, behavior, endurance, performance.

Introduction

The goal of physical training is to evoke an adaptive response to an imposed stimulus, and not necessarily to achieve maximal levels of performance within the individual training session itself (Mujika, 2017). Achieving the optimal stimulus required to achieve the desired adaptive response requires precise control and regulation of exercise intensity in order to allow careful manipulation of both internal and external loading. The external load refers to an objective measurement of the work an athlete produces during training or competition (such as distance covered or times achieved), whilst the internal load refers to the disturbance in homeostasis of the physiological (e.g. cardiovascular, respiratory and metabolic) and psychological processes provoked by a training session. It has been suggested that internal load is the primary stimulus to adaptation in endurance training (Mujika, 2017), and is therefore considered the most important feature of a training session.

Internal training load imposed by a single session can be quantified through calculation of a session-RPE score (Foster et al., 1998) which is the product of the session Rate of Perceived Exertion (RPE) and the duration. However, recently a three-dimensional framework of centrally regulated and goal directed exercise behaviour was proposed, which emphasises the dynamic and complex interplay of sensory, affective, and cognitive processes that underpin perceived fatigability (Venhorst, Micklewright & Noakes, 2018). This framework more comprehensively accounted for perception-thinking-action coupling in response to psychological distress than the traditional Gestalt concept of perceived exertion (Venhorst, Micklewright & Noakes, 2018). Accordingly, internal

1
2
3 training load too may be better understood by assessing sensory, affective and
4
5 motivational components separately, rather than solely relying on an un-decomposable
6
7 Gestalt phenomenon. It is conceivable that several factors can differentially alter
8
9 perceived exertion, valence and arousal at the same absolute exercise intensity, thereby
10
11 leading to varying degrees of internal training for the same external training load. For
12
13 example, a high-intensity repetition running session may be expected to generate different
14
15 performance and perceptual responses in athletes with similar endurance capabilities
16
17 depending on whether the session is completed individually or collectively. Recent field
18
19 and laboratory studies have emphasized the importance of the presence of other
20
21 individuals on pacing behaviour, psychophysiological responses and performance.
22
23 Competition against virtual opponents during cycle time trials have been shown to
24
25 provoke the selection of faster initial speeds (Konings, Schoenmakers, Walker &
26
27 Hettinga, 2016), subsequently causing greater disruption of physiological homeostasis
28
29 despite unchanged values of perceived exertion (Konings, Parkinson, Zigdewind &
30
31 Hettinga, 2018). This effect of the presence of other individuals has been suggested to be
32
33 a hardwired human tendency to interact with others (Renfree, Crivoi do Carmo, Martin
34
35 & Peters, 2015). Moreover, Edwards et al. (2018) found that external verbal
36
37 encouragement improved performance and motivation to exercise on self-paced
38
39 endurance and sprint exercise. Reduced perceived exertion has been suggested to be a
40
41 result of a reduction in the cognitive work required to make complex pacing decisions
42
43 (Renfree et al., 2015). Another psychological state implicated in the regulation of
44
45 exercise intensity that has been demonstrated to be influenced by performance relative to
46
47 others is core affect. In particular, a more negative affective state appears to be induced
48
49 by poor performance relative to other individuals (Jones et al., 2015; Venhorst,
50
51 Micklewright & Noakes, 2018)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In addition to altered perceptual responses, performing running training sessions within a group may also reduce the energetic costs, and thereby internal load for the same external load (speed and volume). Drafting, which is achieved by running closely behind another runner has been demonstrated to reduce the energy cost of running at a fixed speed (Davies, 1980; Kyle, 1979; Pugh, 1970; Pugh, 1971). Additionally, Zouhall et al. (2015) reported that 10 elite middle and long-distance runners benefited from drafting behind another runner, improving their 3000 m run performance achieved during a non-drafting condition, despite no change in energetic expenditure. However, blood lactate concentrations were higher after the non-drafted 3000 m run than after the drafted 3000 m run. Furthermore, athletes perceived the non-drafted 3000 m run to be more strenuous than the drafted 3000 m run.

As previously described, determinants of pacing behaviour and performance have been studied extensively in both actual and simulated competitive situations. However, less information is available on these variables during training sessions which often involve athletes performing multiple runs over the same distance in either an interval or repetition format. Knowledge of the relationships between these variables would be of practical significance to coaches, as there is more opportunity to modify the environment in which training sessions are performed. For example, a coach has the opportunity to prescribe training sessions to be performed individually or collectively with other athletes if there is evidence that one format results in higher or lower levels of internal load than the other. This would seem to be particularly the case in high-intensity repetition training where achieving a specific programmed internal training load is considered a difficult task, given that small variations of external training load have been demonstrated to produce

substantial differences in internal training load (Billat, 2001). Furthermore, this kind of training is extremely important for middle-distance runners because it represents the only way of reproducing competition paces (Billat, 2001). Thus, according to the previously mentioned studies which focused on the benefits of drafting in running (Davies, 1980; Kyle, 1979; Pugh, 1970; Pugh, 1971; Zouhall et al., 2015), it is hypothesised that elite middle-distance runners conducting high-intensity running repetitions collectively would accumulate lower levels of blood lactate and experience lower levels of perceived exertion than when conducting the same repetitions individually. A greater degree of peripheral physiological disruption in the individual condition may also be related to a more negative affective state (Renfree et al., 2012). Therefore, the aim of the present study was to assess the differential responses in metabolic and perceptual variables to running when alone or in a group during high-intensity repetitions performed by elite middle-distance runners.

Materials and methods

Participants

Sixteen elite middle-distance runners (Male: $n = 13$, Female: $n = 3$; age = 24 ± 4 years old) were recruited from a professional middle-distance running group. Runners are currently active at national or international level and 10 of them have been selected by their national federation to compete in international events. Runners regularly compete at the 1500 m event, and the mean 1500m best performance during the 12 months preceding the study was 229 ± 7.53 s for males, and 270 ± 8.78 s for females. Participants completed 7.1 ± 1.2 training sessions per week and have been systematically training for 7.1 ± 3 years. All

1
2
3 participants provided written informed consent prior to participation in the experimental
4
5 procedures, which was approved by the ethics committee at the Isabel I de Castilla
6
7 University, and conducted in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki.
8
9

10 11 12 **Design**

13
14
15
16
17 A repeated measures experimental AB/BA counterbalanced crossover design was
18
19 employed involving assessment of performance, metabolic and psychological variables
20
21 during two sessions of high-intensity repetition running. Each session consisted of 4
22
23 repetitions of 500 m runs separated by 3 minutes of recovery. Sessions were performed
24
25 either individually or collectively whereby athletes adopted different positions within the
26
27 group during each repetition.
28
29

30 31 32 **Procedures**

33
34
35
36
37 Participants were instructed to arrive for testing in a rested (having avoided strenuous
38
39 exercise in the previous 48 hours), fully hydrated state and having refrained from eating
40
41 for at least 3 hours. Accordingly, they were asked to prepare their training and diet for 48
42
43 h prior to both high-intensity running sessions in a way that resembled their routine before
44
45 an important race or high-intensity running session. This session was completed twice 7
46
47 days apart on a synthetic 400 m athletics running track. Weather conditions were similar
48
49 on both occasions (sunny, wind speed average 1.11 ± 0.7 m/s, 24 ± 0.8 °C and 31 ± 6.1
50
51 % of humidity). Both sessions were performed at 11 a. m. to control for diurnal variations.
52
53
54 At the first training session, male participants were divided into 2 groups with 7 and 6
55
56 male participants completing the first session individually and collectively, respectively.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 All female participants completed the first session collectively. Male groups were formed
4 in consultation with the athletes' coach, and athletes were allocated to groups based on
5
6 the coach's subjective rating of current performance level. One week later, participants
7
8 completed the session in the other condition (individually or collectively).
9
10
11
12
13

14 Before experimental trials, participants completed a standardised warm-up of 15 minutes
15 easy running and 10 minutes of dynamic stretching and drills as part of their usual training
16 routine. In each training session, participants completed four consecutive 500 m
17 repetitions with 3 minutes of active recovery (standing during the measurement period
18 and walking for 100 meters) between each. Repetitions were hand timed twice to the
19 nearest tenth of second by the coach and a researcher and the average between both
20 measures was therefore calculated 'in situ'. The four fastest athletes in each male group
21 (based on recent 1500m performances) were allocated to lead one of the four repetitions
22 during the group running session. While the four strongest runners shared the pacemaker
23 role, the remaining runners had to stay in contact with the rest of the group. In contrast,
24 the female group had to share this role among just three athletes. Accordingly, they were
25 assisted with the inclusion of one experienced male pacemaker across the four repetitions.
26 It also increased the number of the runners who ran collectively in this group. Thus, the
27 effect of the different size between the female group and the male groups was slightly
28 reduced by the inclusion of a pacemaker in the female group. Realistic session time goals
29 were agreed by athletes in consultation with their coach. The coach set a maximum
30 running pace for each repetition for each athlete according to his knowledge of their
31 current condition and performance level for the individual running session and a
32 maximum running pace for the whole group for each repetition for the collective running
33 session taking into consideration the level of performance of each runner who formed the
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 group and that the group had to keep united throughout the whole session. The pacesetter
4 and the participants were allowed to wear their own watches to assist with pace
5 judgement. During each session and immediately after each repetition, participants
6 provided subjective ratings of perceived exertion, valence, and felt activation using
7 single-item scales. Ratings of felt arousal were also provided prior to the first repetition.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 Capillary blood samples for blood lactate [BLa] analysis was taken within the first minute
15 post each repetition. Due to the reduced amount of time available to collect and analyse
16 the capillary blood samples for multiple athletes between group running repetitions, two
17 researchers and two lactate analysers were required to perform this task.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Measures during exercise**

27 **Ratings of perceived exertion (RPE)**

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 The 15-point (6 – 20) Borg scale (Borg, 1982) with the indicator terms ‘easy’ and ‘hard’
36 was used to record RPE. Participants provided a whole number response, and the scale
37 was ‘anchored’ by explaining that a score of 20 should equate to a previous memory of
38 absolute exhaustion. They were directly asked to report ‘how hard, heavy and strenuous
39 this repetition was’ (Pageaux, 2016). Therefore, participants were instructed to report the
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

51 **Core affect**

52
53
54
55
56 According to recent recommendations (Ekkekakis, 2013), a detailed three-tiered
57 justification process has been described for measurement selection in the assessment of
58
59
60

1
2
3 dynamic changes in core affective state during prolonged endurance exercise (Venhorst,
4 Mickelwright & Noakes, 2018). Accordingly, participants were asked to approximate
5 dynamic changes in valence from -5 ('very bad') to 0 ('neutral') to +5 ('very good') after
6 each 500 m repetition using the 11-point Feeling Scale (FS, Hardy & Rejesky, 1989). Felt
7 arousal was approximated just before the first 500 m repetition and after each 500 m
8 repetition using the 6-point Felt Arousal Scale (FAS, Svebak & Murgatroyd, 1985) from
9 1 ('low activation') to 6 ('high activation'). Participants were encouraged to use decimals
10 when rating felt arousal.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Blood analysis**

25
26
27
28 Post repetition lactate concentrations were determined from capillarised blood samples
29 taken from the earlobe using the Lactate Scout analyser (Senslab, Leipzig, Germany).
30 This analyser has shown high levels of intra analyser reliability ($r=0.910$), inter analyser
31 reliability ($r = 0.951$), between portable analyser accuracy ($r=0.967$) and portable analyser
32 versus laboratory analyser accuracy ($r=0.837$) (Tanner, Fuller & Ross, 2010).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

42 **Statistical analyses**

47 Statistical analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
48 24.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). Data were checked for normality of distribution,
49 equality of variances and assumption of sphericity as appropriate. When the sphericity
50 assumption was violated, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was employed. A paired
51 samples t-test and the determination of the corresponding effect size (ES) using Cohen's
52 d were used to examine differences in average time for the 500 m repetitions between
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 experimental conditions. ES were considered to be either small (0.21 – 0.50), moderate
4 (0.51 – 0.80) or large (>0.80) (Cohen, 1988). Two-way (group x repetitions) repeated
5
6 measures ANOVAs were used to examine the differences in performance, expressed as
7
8 the percentage of the average of the four 500 m repetitions speed, and to examine
9
10 differences in the blood lactate concentrations, perceived exertion, valence and felt
11
12 arousal. Where appropriate post hoc pairwise comparisons were made with Bonferroni
13
14 correction. Effect sizes were calculated using partial eta-squared. All data are presented
15
16 as mean and standard deviation (mean \pm SD).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Results

25
26
27
28 Average 500 m repetition time was 76.9 ± 5.07 s in individual sessions, and 77.38 ± 5.34
29
30 s in collective sessions, respectively ($t=2.02$, $p=0.058$, $d=0.091$).
31
32
33
34

35 Neither the group x time interaction effect for the 500 m repetitions time ($F_{3,45}=1.898$, p
36
37 $=0.189$, $\eta_p^2=0.112$) nor main group effect were significant. However, there was a main
38
39 significant time effect ($F_{3,45}=4.320$, $p=0.014$, $\eta_p^2=0.224$), with the third repetition being
40
41 slower than the second ($p=0.009$) (Figure 1A).
42
43
44
45

46
47 The group x time interaction effect for blood lactate concentrations wasn't significant
48
49 ($F_{3,45}=0.661$, $p=0.581$, $\eta_p^2=0.042$). Blood lactate concentrations were greater in the
50
51 individual trial than during the group trial. The main group effect was significant ($F_{1,15}$
52
53 $=12.65$, $p=0.003$, $\eta_p^2=0.457$). Furthermore, blood lactate concentrations increased
54
55 across the session. The main time effect was significant ($F_{1,84,27.63}=83.98$, p
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 <0.001, $\eta_p^2 = 0.848$). Blood lactate concentrations differed ($p < 0.001$) between all
4 repetitions other than the third and fourth ($p = 0.443$) (Figure 1B)

5
6
7 The group x time interaction effect for perceived exertion wasn't significant ($F_{3,45} = 1.758$,
8 $p = 0.169$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.105$). Perceived exertion ratings were greater in the individual trial than
9 during the group trial. The main group effect was significant ($F_{1,15} = 19.05$, p
10 $= 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.560$). Perceived exertion increased across the session and differences were
11 significant between all repetitions. The main time effect was significant ($F_{2,02,30,30} = 46.85$,
12 $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.757$) (Figure 1C).

13
14
15 The group x time interaction effect for valence wasn't significant ($F_{3,45} = 2.569$, p
16 $= 0.066$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.146$). Valence ratings were lower in the individual trial than during the
17 group trial. The main group effect was significant ($F_{1,15} = 15.69$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.511$).
18 Valence became more negative as the session progressed. The main time effect was
19 significant ($F_{1,98,29,65} = 8.62$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.365$) (Figure 1D).

20
21
22 The group x time interaction effect for felt arousal wasn't significant ($F_{4,60} = 0.350$, p
23 $= 0.843$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.023$). The main group effect wasn't significant ($F_{1,15} = 0.14$, $p =$
24 0.713 , $\eta_p^2 = 0.009$). The main time effect wasn't significant ($F_{2,02,30,30} = 0.94$, p
25 $= 0.444$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.059$).

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 *FIGURE 1 HERE
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

The findings of the current study demonstrate the existence of differences in metabolic strain, and perceptual responses during high-intensity repetition running **conducted at similar levels of performance** either individually or collectively by a group of elite middle-distance runners. We found that although overall performance and pacing behaviour across the training session did not differ between conditions, the sessions performed collectively resulted in lower post-repetition blood lactate concentrations, reduced perceived exertion, and more positive affective state. A noticeable feature of this study was the high-performance level of the experimental participants, and the 'real world' scenario, whereby data were collected during training sessions of the type routinely performed during the pre-competition phase of preparation. Another key feature of this study is that it investigated the psychophysiological responses to training stimuli, which may be under-researched given **a typically greater interest in competition effects**.

Overall performance did not differ between conditions, nor did pacing behaviour across the entire session. This may be considered slightly surprising given that research performed in the laboratory has demonstrated **that** the presence of other (virtual) competitors influences performance, pacing, and the decline in muscle force experienced during 4 km cycle time trials (Konings et al., 2016). However, Konings et al. (2018) also found that these changes occurred despite **similar ratings of perceived exertion**, whereas we found performance was similar despite lower perceived exertion in the collective condition. Nonetheless, those studies were not conducted in a real training environment and did not assess the influence of a group, which should be taken into consideration

1
2
3 when interpreting and comparing their results with this study. It may be the case that we
4
5 found no significant performance difference between conditions because the participants
6
7 had agreed on goal times prior to the training sessions, and we speculate that if they had
8
9 been blinded to feedback during repetitions then we may have observed faster repetitions
10
11 in the collective condition, but at similar perceived exertion values. The lower blood
12
13 lactate concentrations in the collective condition indicate that the degree of metabolic
14
15 strain was lower. A plausible explanation for these findings is that in the collective
16
17 condition athletes benefitted from the energetic savings conferred by drafting. Pugh
18
19 (1970) estimated that the energy cost of overcoming air resistance in track running is
20
21 about 8% of total energy cost at 6 m/s and observed that the relation between VO_2 and
22
23 speed was linear in the treadmill and curvilinear in the track. The same author (1971) also
24
25 found that running 1m behind another runner virtually eliminated air resistance and
26
27 reduced VO_2 by 6.5% at 6 m/s. At the speeds athletes were running in this study, the VO_2
28
29 reduction might be likely higher than the mentioned ~6.5%. Indeed, our results are in
30
31 general agreement with those of Zouhal et al. (2015) who reported an improvement in
32
33 3km running performance accompanied by reduced perceived exertion and blood lactate
34
35 concentrations when runners were able to follow a pacemaker. However, in contrast with
36
37 our study and although trials were conducted on a track, participants had to carry a
38
39 portable VO_2 analyser during the trials, they were drafting for just 66.6% of the whole
40
41 distance, and no training partners were participating in the trials (just the pacemakers).
42
43 These circumstances are therefore very different to those of a real collective training
44
45 environment. Thus, no other study has analysed the influence of running in a group while
46
47 external load has remained stable in both conditions and the change of the internal load
48
49 was determined and quantified by the increment of perceived exertion, valence and blood
50
51 lactate concentrations. In this sense, the change of the energy cost observed in this study
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 seems to be not fully explained by drafting effects but also by other aspects like the need
4 of setting a pre-agreed stable pace. For example, Lander, Butterly & Edwards (2009)
5 found that participants who were required to row 5000 m at a constant submaximal rating
6 of perceived exertion produced lower levels of blood lactate concentrations than at an
7 enforced constant submaximal pace equivalent to the mean power output of the other
8 condition.
9

10
11 A key finding of the present study was that affective valence was more positive after each
12 of the repetitions in the collective condition. Given that internal training load was higher
13 in the individual condition (evidenced by higher RPE and blood lactate concentration), a
14 potential explanation for this observation is that the more negative affective valence in
15 the individual condition resulted from a greater degree of peripheral physiological
16 disruption (Renfree et al. 2012).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 However, felt arousal remained similar throughout the session and did not differ between
36 conditions. Although the reasons for this are not entirely clear, we suggest that the
37 collaborative rather than the competitive nature of the exercise protocol may have had
38 some impact on the results. Rather than attempting to 'beat' opponents, participants were
39 working towards pre-agreed goal levels of performance, and did so by sharing the
40 energetically costly leading positions between themselves. In this sense, Kilpatrick et al.
41 (2007) found that untrained subjects modified their felt arousal depending on the intensity
42 of the exercise and that it slightly varied across time but not at every stage of the exercise
43 bout. In contrast with that research, it is important to emphasize that the participants in
44 this study were very well trained with extensive experience of high-intensity training
45 sessions of this type, which may account for the similar arousal levels reported in each
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 condition. This was also a routinely performed training session rather than a performance
4 directed time trial or race. Accordingly, it was proposed that unconscious calculations
5 continuously control emotion arousal and induce the choice of optimal intensity in order
6 that the optimum exercise intensity can be maintained until the end point and, therefore,
7 experienced athletes are trained to control it in a more sophisticated way (Renfree &
8 Casado, 2018).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Two limitations have to be acknowledged in this study. Blood lactate concentrations
20 could not be assessed in duplicate due to the reduced amount of time available to measure
21 a considerable number of athletes after each repetition. Secondly, the runners who
22 displayed superior performance levels during previous competitions were not allowed to
23 set a maximum intensity during the repetitions in order to preserve group structure. Thus,
24 maximal performance was not assessed in this study.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Given that these observations were made in a training session rather than a performance
36 test, the findings that valence and perceived exertion differed between conditions have
37 potentially important implications for training prescription. Our findings would therefore
38 imply that whether a high-intensity repetition session is performed individually or
39 collectively would influence the internal training load (as measure by session-RPE),
40 which may not only be determined by perceived exertion and training time but also
41 valence.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Practical implications.**

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Given that an effective training program is characterized by low levels of monotony
4 (Foster, 1998), which is a measure of day to day variability in training load, then this
5
6 implies that consideration should be given to whether sessions should be performed alone
7
8 or as part of a group, as manipulation of this factor has potential to alter monotony through
9
10 its influence on individual session-RPE score. Accordingly, coaches are encouraged to
11
12 elaborate the design of training programming accounting for these variables through
13
14 setting programmed higher intensity when the high-intensity repetition session is
15
16 conducted collectively than individually. In this manner, session-RPE would keep stable
17
18 in both sessions.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Acknowledgements.**

27
28
29
30 Authors gratefully acknowledge the outstanding contributions of the coach and the
31
32 athletes who participated in this study. Authors also thank the colleagues who reviewed
33
34 draft versions of this article and provided useful suggestions and advice for revision.
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Disclosure statement.**

41
42
43
44 Authors disclose the absence of professional relationships with companies or
45
46 manufacturers who would benefit from the results of the present study.
47
48
49

50 **Fundings.**

51
52
53
54
55
56 Authors report the absence of any kind of funding for the development of the present
57
58 study.
59
60

References

Billat, L. V. (2001) Interval Training for Performance: A Scientific and Empirical Practice. Special Recommendations for Middle- and Long-Distance Running. Part II: Anaerobic Interval Training. *Sports Medicine*, 31(2), 75–90.

Borg, G.A. (1982). Psychophysical bases of perceived exertion. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 14(5): 377–381.

Davies, C.T. (1980). Effects of wind assistance and resistance on the forward motion of a runner. *Journal of Applied Physiology: Respiratory Environmental and Exercise Physiology*, 48(4), 702–9.

Edwards, A. M., Dutton-Challis, L., Cottrell, D., Guy, J. H., & Hettinga, F. J. (2018). Impact of active and passive social facilitation on self-paced endurance and sprint exercise: encouragement augments performance and motivation to exercise. *British Medical Journal Open Sport & Exercise Medicine*, Ahead of print, doi:10.1136/bmjsem-2018-000368

Ekkekakis, P. (2016). *The measurement of affect, emotion, and mood a guide for health-behavioral research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foster, C. (1998). Monitoring training in athletes with reference to overtraining syndrome. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 30(7), 1164–1168.

Foster, C., Florhaug, J. A., Franklin, J., Gottschall, L., Hrovatin, L. A., Parker, S., Doleshal, P., & Dodge, C. (2001). A new approach to monitoring exercise training. *The Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 15, 109–115.

1
2
3 Hardy, C., & Rejeski, W. (1989). Not what, but how one feels: the measurement of
4 affect during exercise. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *11*(3), 304–17.

7 Jones, H. S., Williams, E. L., Marchant, D., Sparks, A. S., Midgley, A. W., Bridge, C.
8 A., & McNaughton, L. (2015). Distance-dependent association of affect with pacing
9 strategy in cycling time trials. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, *47*(4), 825–
10 32.

13 Kilpatrick, M., Kraemer, J., Bartholomew, E., Acevedo, E. & Jarreu, D. (2007). Affective
14 responses to exercise are dependent on intensity rather than total work. *Medicine &*
15 *Science in Sports & Exercise*, *39*(8), 1417–1422.

18 Konings, M. J., Schoenmakers, P. J., Walker, A. J., & Hettinga, F. J. (2016). The
19 behavior of an opponent alters pacing decisions in 4-km cycling trials. *Physiology &*
20 *Behavior*, *158*, 1–5.

23 Konings, MJ, Parkinson, J, Zigdewind, I., & Hettinga, F. (2018). Racing an opponent:
24 alteration of pacing, performance, and muscle-force decline but not rating of perceived
25 exertion *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, *13*(3), 283–289.

28 Kyle, C. R. (1979). Reduction of wind resistance and power output of racing cyclists and
29 runners traveling in groups. *Ergonomics*, *22*, 387–397.

32 Lander, P. J., Butterly, R. J., & Edwards, A. M. (2009). Self-paced exercise is less
33 physically challenging than enforced constant pace exercise of the same intensity:
34 influence of complex central metabolic control. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *43*,
35 789–795. doi:10.1136/bjism.2008.056085

38 Mujika, I. (2017). Quantification of training and competition training loads in endurance
39 sports: methods and applications. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and*
40 *Performance*, *12*(2), 9–17.

1
2
3 Pageaux, B. (2016). Perception of effort in exercise science: definition, measurement and
4 perspectives. *European Journal of Sports Science*, 16(8), 885–894.
5
6

7
8
9 Pugh, L. G. (1970). Oxygen intake in track and treadmill running with observations on
10 the effect of air-resistance. *The Journal of Physiology*, 207(3), 823–835.
11
12

13
14 Pugh, L. G. (1971). The influence of wind resistance in running and walking and the
15 mechanical efficiency of work against horizontal or vertical forces. *The Journal of*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Physiology, 213(2), 255–276.

Renfree, A., & Casado, A. (2018) Athletic Races Represent Complex Systems, and
Pacing Behavior Should Be Viewed as an Emergent Phenomenon. *Frontiers in*
Physiology, 9, 1432. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2018.01432

Renfree, A., Crivoi do Carmo, E., Martin, L., & Peters, D. M. (2015). The influence of
collective behavior on pacing in endurance competitions. *Frontiers in Physiology*,
373(6), 1–5.

Renfree, A., West, J., Corbett, M., Rhoden, C., & St Clair Gibson, A. (2012). Complex
interplay between determinants of pacing and performance during 20 km cycle time trials.
International Journal of Sports Physiology & Performance, 7, 121–129.

Svebak, S., & Murgatroyd, S. (1985). Metamotivational dominance: a multimethod
validation of reversal theory constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
48(1), 107–16.

Tanner, R. K., Fuller, K. L., & ross, M. L. R. (2010). Evaluation of three portable blood
lactate analysers: Lactate Pro, Lactate Scout and Lactate Plus. *European Journal of*
Applied Physiology, 109, 551–559.

1
2
3 Venhorst, A., Micklewright, D., & Noakes T. D. (2018). Towards a three-dimensional
4 framework of centrally regulated and goal-directed exercise behaviour: a narrative
5 review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 52(15), 957–966. DOI: 10.1136/bjsports-
6
7
8
9
10 2016-096907.

11
12
13 Venhorst, A., Micklewright, D. P., & Noakes, T. D. (2018). The psychophysiological
14 determinants of pacing behavior and performance during prolonged endurance exercise:
15 a performance level and competition outcome comparison. *Sports*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 *Medicine*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-0893-5>.

23 Zouhal, H., Abderrahman, A. B., Prioux, J., Knechtle, B., Bouguerra, L., Keksi, W., &
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Noakes, T. D. (2015). Drafting's improvement of 3000-m running performance in elite
athletes: is it a placebo effect? *International Journal of Sports Physiology and*
Performance, 10(2), 147–152.

Figure legends

Figure 1. A. Times recorded for each repetition. $p = 0.009$ between the second and the third repetition. B. Blood lactate concentrations after each repetition. $p < 0.001$ between repetitions other than the third and the fourth. C. Perceived exertion after each repetition. $p < 0.001$ between all repetitions. D. Valence after each repetition. $p = 0.001$ between repetitions. Rep =repetition. & =main time effect; # =main group effect; Significance is accepted at $\alpha < 0.05$




Figure 1. A. Times recorded for each repetition. $p = 0.009$ between the second and the third repetition. B. Blood lactate concentrations after each repetition. $p < 0.001$ between repetitions other than the third and the fourth. C. Perceived exertion after each repetition. $p < 0.001$ between all repetitions. D. Valence after each repetition. $p = 0.001$ between repetitions. Rep = repetition. & = main time effect; # = main group effect; Significance is accepted at $\alpha < 0.05$

184x111mm (300 x 300 DPI)