REVIEW ARTICLE

VUSCUIUI UISCUSC UICVICW

provided by Academy of Science of South Africa (ASSAf): Open

B M Parr (MSc (Med) Exercise Science)¹ E W Derman (MB ChB, PhD)²

¹Cape Peninsula University of Technology

²University of Cape Town MRC/UCT Research Unit for Exercise Science and Sports Medicine

Abstract

Patients with peripheral vascular disease (PVD) suffer from the symptom of intermittent claudication and are therefore intolerant to walking. Exercise training has been shown to be a beneficial treatment for patients with PVD. Therefore studies have aimed to assess the efficacy of exercise training programmes. This review summarises the data on the efficacy of exercise training programmes in patients with PVD. Recommendations are made for the mode, duration, frequency and intensity of exercise training programmes.

A systematic review of Medline, Pubmed and Science Direct was done of studies on exercise training and patients with PVD, particularly those using randomised controlled trials.

Exercise training improves walking tolerance in patients with PVD. The common mode of training in patients with PVD in the past decade has been walking on a treadmill; however recently an upper-limb cycle ergometry programme proved to be as effective as lower-limb cycle ergometry in improving walking tolerance in patients with PVD. As weight-bearing walking programmes are uncomfortable for patients with PVD, this is an important development in exercise prescription for these patients. Most successful exercise programmes have been 3-6 months in duration for a period of 30 minutes to 1 hour, 2-3 times per week. However, 1 study showed that a shorter period (6 weeks) was of sufficient duration to improve functional capacity in patients with PVD. This is helpful for practitioners as exercise programmes of 3 or 6 months can be daunting

CORRESPONDENCE:

B M Parr Department of Sport Management Faculty of Business Cape Peninsula University of Technology PO Box 652 Cape Town Tel: 021-680 1573 Fax: 021-680 1562 E-mail: parrb@cput.ac.za for a patient to embark on. Finally, patients should exercise to maximal claudication pain in order to elicit the best training response.

Introduction

Peripheral vascular disease (PVD) is a leading cause of morbidity in the elderly in the United States where there are an estimated 5 million affected individuals.⁹ The prevalence of PVD increases with age and it has been estimated that the biennial incidence rate is 26.6 per 1 000 men and 13.3 per 1 000 women in the United States.²⁷ In the United Kingdom it occurs in approximately 1 in 20 of the population between the ages of 55 and 74 years.¹⁶

Data from the Framingham Heart Study revealed that risk factors for PVD include age, gender, serum cholesterol, hypertension, cigarette smoking, diabetes and coronary artery disease. Male gender, age and smoking were associated with a 1.5-fold increased risk for PVD; diabetes and stage 2 or greater hypertension conferred a >2-fold increased risk; and coronary heart disease nearly tripled the risk for PVD.³² These findings are similar to those reported by Newman et al.³³ who recognised cigarette smoking as a primary risk factor for PVD.

Twenty-five per cent of patients with PVD deteriorate steadily but only 5% deteriorate to the point that they require leg amputations.^{9,13} Intermittent claudication is the most common symptom of PVD; it causes severe walking intolerance and therefore impacts on the functional status and quality of life of the patient.^{4,38} Therefore treatment has focused on alleviating the symptom of intermittent claudication and improving walking tolerance.

Measurement of walking tolerance in patients with intermittent claudication

To prove that exercise training is effective, walking tests are necessary. Set testing protocols on the treadmill are common tools to assess walking tolerance in patients with PVD. A wide variety of treadmill walking tests have been used to quantify improvements in walking distances and functional capacity following training in patients with intermittent claudication (Table I).^{8,19,28,29,30,41}

Two parameters are usually measured on a treadmill: pain-free walking distance (PFWD) and maximum walking distance (MWD). $^{\rm 8,22,23}$

Use of the treadmill as a tool to measure walking distance has been criticised because the tests are not always reproducible.^{26,34,37} There is disagreement about whether a graded test (a test when the speed or gradient increases at set time intervals) is more or less reproducible than a constant load test (one that does not increase in speed or gradient).

It has been suggested that a constant load test is fairly reproducible.³ Others have found that both the constant load and the graded exercise test are equally well reproducible.⁵ In contrast Gardner *et al.*¹⁷ and Perakyla *et al.*³⁷ found the progressive test to be more reproducible and Gardner *et al.*¹⁷ suggested that only 1 progressive test is required to obtain

Larsen et al. • Walking 206 (28) 7 6 months 4 months Home 1 hr 7x wk Placebo 282% NS 20% NS 4.6 km,h ⁻¹ @ 8 MS 1973 (25) • DLE • Control 6 4 months Supervised 30 min 3x wk NS 26%* NS 26%* NS 26%* NS 1973 (25) • OLE • Control 8 6 months Supervised 30 min 3x wk Supervised 1 hr 2x wk Supervised 1 hr 2x wk 67% 87% 3.2 km,h ⁻¹ d0 12 grade • Placebo 8 Placebo NS NS and 1.3 t% and 1.3 t% supervised 30 min 3x wk 165% 3.2 km,h ⁻¹ d0 0% 1989 (29) • Operation 9 No treatment NS NS 30% 4 km,h ⁻¹ d0 0% 1989 (29) • Operation 9 No treatment NS NS 3.2 km,h ⁻¹ d0 0% 1989 (20) • DLE 11 Supervised 30 min 3x kk 200% 300% 4 km,h ⁻¹ d0 0% 1999 (21) • DLE 16 months Supervised 1 hr 2x wk 315% 3.2 km,h ⁻¹ d1 0% 1996 (23) • Treadmill 6	Date and reference	Treatment	No of subjects	Program length	Exercise frequency/duration	MWD % increase	PFWD % increase	Protocol
Holm et al. • OLE 6 4 months Supervised 30 min 3x wk. 42% 26% 1973 (25) • Control 6 6 months Home 1 hr 1x wk. 67% 87% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ (2) 12 • Placebo 8 6 months Placebo NS NS 97% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ (2) 12 • Placebo 8 Placebo NS NS NS 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ (2) 12 • Placebo 8 Placebo NS NS NS 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ (2) 12 • Placebo 8 Placebo NS NS NS 9.2 km.h ⁻¹ (2) 12 • Control 9 No treatment NS NS per 3 min 106% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ (2) 0% 1990 (2) • Op + DLE 9 Supervised 30 min 3x wk 500% 300% 4 km.h ⁻¹ (2) 0% 1998 (8) • DLE 16 6 months Supervised 30 min 200% 300% and 1.3 5% per 3 min 1996 (35) • DLE 16 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS 3 km.h ⁻¹ (2) 0% and 1.3 5% per 3 min 1996 (35) • Ote 12 </td <td>Larsen <i>et al.</i> 1966 (28)</td> <td>Walking Control</td> <td>7 7</td> <td>6 months</td> <td>Home 1 hr 7x wk Placebo</td> <td>282% NS</td> <td>200% NS</td> <td>4.6 km.h⁻¹ @ 8%</td>	Larsen <i>et al.</i> 1966 (28)	Walking Control	7 7	6 months	Home 1 hr 7x wk Placebo	282% NS	200% NS	4.6 km.h ⁻¹ @ 8%
Manazinio et al. 1989 (30) • Walk/DLE 8 6 months Home 1 hr 1x wk Supervised 1 hr 2x wk 67% 87% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ @ 12 grade • Placebo 8 Placebo NS NS NS Hiatt et al. 1990 (22) • Treadmill 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 123% 165% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 73.5% Lundgren et al. • Operation 13 6 months Supervised 30 min 32 wk 900% 400% 4km.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 32 wk • DLE 11 5 months Supervised 30 min 32 wk 900% 300% 4 km.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 32 wk • DLE 11 5 months PTA Supervised 30 min 32 wk 200% 300% 3 km.h ⁻¹ @ 10% 32 wk • DLE 16 months PTA Leg 30 min 2x wk NS NS 3 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 7 3.5% per 3 min • 1990 (8) • Valking treadmill 6 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS 13 5.5% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 7 3.5% per 3 min 1996 (23) • Treadmill 6 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS NS	Holm <i>et al.</i> 1973 (25)	• DLE • Control	6 6	4 months	Supervised 30 min 3x wk Placebo	42% NS	26%* NS	
• Placebo 8 Placebo NS NS Hiat et al. 1990 (22) • Treadmill 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 123% 165% 3.2 km h ⁻¹ at 0% and 13.5 k% per 3 min Lundgren et al. 1989 (29) • Operation • Op + DLE 13 6 months Supervised 30 min 3x wk 900% 300% 4 km h ⁻¹ @ 0% 1989 (29) • DLE 11 Supervised 30 min 3x wk 200% 300% 4 km h ⁻¹ @ 0% 1990 (8) • DLE 16 6 months Eg 30 min 2x wk 310% NS 3 km h ⁻¹ @ 10% 1990 (3) • DLE 16 6 months Leg 30 min 2x wk 310% NS 3 km h ⁻¹ @ 10% 1990 (3) • DLE 16 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS 135.5s 3.2 km h ⁻¹ at 0% 1990 (3) • Treadmill 6 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43% * 61.6% * 3.2 km h ⁻¹ at 0% 1996 (23) • Walking 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 3.3 % 54.5% 3 min 1997 (30) </td <td rowspan="2">Mannarino <i>et al.</i> 1989 (30)</td> <td>• Walk/DLE</td> <td>8</td> <td>6 months</td> <td>Home 1 hr 1x wk Supervised 1 hr 2x wk</td> <td>67%</td> <td>87%</td> <td>3.2 km.h⁻¹ @ 12% grade</td>	Mannarino <i>et al.</i> 1989 (30)	• Walk/DLE	8	6 months	Home 1 hr 1x wk Supervised 1 hr 2x wk	67%	87%	3.2 km.h ⁻¹ @ 12% grade
Hiatt et al. • Treadmill 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 123% 165% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% 1990 (22) • Control 9 No treatment NS NS NS per 3 min Lundgren et al. • Operation 13 6 months Supervised 30 min 900% 400% 30% 4 km.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 1999 (29) • DLE 11 Supervised 30 min 200% 300% 4 km.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 1999 (29) • DLE 11 Supervised 30 min 200% 300% 4 km.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 1990 (3) • DLE 16 6 months PTA 20 6 months PTA 10 min 2x wk NS NS 3 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% 1990 (3) • DLE 16 6 months PTA NS NS 135.5s 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% 1996 (3) • Treadmill 6 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS 135.5s 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% 1996 (23) • Kreadmill 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43% * 61.6% * 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% 1997 (36) • Supervised 11 r 3x		Placebo	8		Placebo	NS	NS	
• Control 9 No treatment NS NS per 3 min Lundgren et al. 1989 (29) • Operation • DLE 13 6 months Supervised 30 min 3x wk 900% 400% 4 km.h ⁻¹ @ 0% Creasy et al. 1990 (8) • DLE 11 Supervised 30 min 3x wk 200% 300% 4 km.h ⁻¹ @ 10% Parker-Jones et al. 1996 (35) • DLE 16 6 months PTA Leg 30 min 2x wk NS NS 3 km.h ⁻¹ @ 10% Parker-Jones et al. 1996 (35) • DLE 6 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS 135.5s 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 13.5% per 3 min Hiat et al. 1996 (23) • Walking treadmill 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43%* 61.6%* 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 13.5% per 3 min 1996 (23) • Walking treadmill 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk NS NS NS 1997 (36) • Supervised 1 hr 3x wk NS NS NS NS Valker et al. 2001 (41) • Control 8 Supervised 40 min 2X per wk 57% 31% <	Hiatt <i>et al.</i> 1990 (22)	Treadmill	10	12 wks	Supervised 1 hr	123%	165%	3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ↑3.5%
Lundgren et al. 1989 (29) • Op + DLE 9 • DLE 111 Creasy et al. 1908 (3) • DLE 111 • DLE 112 wks • Supervised 30 min 3x wk Supervised 30 min 3x wk Supervised 30 min 200% 300% 4 m.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 400% 300% 4 m.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 400% 300% 4 m.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 4 m.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 3x wk Supervised 30 min 200% 300% 4 m.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 300% 4 m.h ⁻¹ @ 0% 300% 30% 30% 30% 30% 4 m.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 1 3.5% per 3 min 5 mi		Control	9	No treatment		NS	NS	per 3 min
• DLE 11 Supervised 30 min 3x wk 200% 300% Creasy et al. • PTA 20 6 months PTA NS NS 3 km.h ⁻¹ @10% 1990 (8) • DLE 16 6 months PTA NS NS 3 km.h ⁻¹ @10% Parker-Jones et al. • Stair-master 6 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS 135.5s 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% 1996 (35) • Treadmill 6 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS 117.7 sec 7117.7 sec Hiatt et al. • Walking treadmill 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43%* 61.6%* 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 1 3.5% per 3 min 1996 (23) • Walking treadmill 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk NS NS NS 3 min 1996 (23) • Supervised 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise instruction NS NS NS NS NS Patterson et al. • Supervised 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise instruction NS NS NS NS Valker et al. • Control <td< td=""><td rowspan="2">Lundgren <i>et al.</i> 1989 (29)</td><td> Operation Op + DLE</td><td>13 9</td><td>6 months</td><td>Supervised 30 min</td><td>600% 900%</td><td>300% 400%</td><td>4 km.h⁻¹ @ 0%</td></td<>	Lundgren <i>et al.</i> 1989 (29)	 Operation Op + DLE	13 9	6 months	Supervised 30 min	600% 900%	300% 400%	4 km.h ⁻¹ @ 0%
Creasy <i>et al.</i> 1990 (3) • PTA DLE 20 16 6 months 16 PTA Leg 30 min 2x wk NS 310% NS 310% 3 km.h ⁻¹ @10% Parker-Jones <i>et al.</i> 1996 (35) • Stair-master 6 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS 735.5s 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 1 3.5% per 3 min Hiat <i>et al.</i> 1996 (23) • Walking 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43%* 61.6%* 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 1 3.5% per 3 min Hiat <i>et al.</i> 1996 (23) • Walking 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43%* 61.6%* 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 1 3.5% per 3 min Patterson <i>et al.</i> 1997 (36) • Supervised 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise instruction NS NS Valker <i>et al.</i> 2001 (41) • Arm cranking • Cycling 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2X per wk 51% 29% Shuttle test Cardner <i>et al.</i> 2001 (41) • Walking 28 6 months Supervised 40 min 2X per wk 57% 31% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 1 2.2 km		• DLE	11		SX wk Supervised 30 min 3x wk	200%	300%	
Parker-Jones <i>et al.</i> • Stair-master 1996 (35) 6 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 2x wk NS 135.5s 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 13.5% per 3 min Hiatt <i>et al.</i> 1996 (23) • Walking treadmill 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43%* 61.6%* 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 13.5% per 3 min Hiatt <i>et al.</i> 1996 (23) • Walking treadmill 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43%* 61.6%* 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 13.5% per 3 min Patterson <i>et al.</i> 1997 (36) • Supervised exercise 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise instruction 33.9% 54.5% Walker <i>et al.</i> 2001 (41) • Arm cranking • Control 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 51% 29% Shuttle test Valker <i>et al.</i> 2001 (41) • Control 15 NS NS NS Gardner <i>et al.</i> 2005 (44) • Control 28 6 months 3x per wk Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 134% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 7 2% per 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 7 2% per 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 7 2% per Zwierska <i>et al.</i> 2005 (44) • Arm cranking • Control 24 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50%	Creasy <i>et al.</i> 1990 (8)	• PTA • DLE	20 16	6 months	PTA Leg 30 min 2x wk	NS 310%	NS	3 km.h ⁻¹ @10%
• Treadmill 6 Supervised 1 hr 2x wk î 117.7 sec î 117.7 sec î 117.7 sec Hiatt et al. 1996 (23) • Walking treadmill • Strength • Control 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43%* 61.6%* 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and î 3.5% per 3 min Patterson et al. 1997 (36) • Supervised 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise instruction 33.9% 54.5% Walker et al. 2001 (41) • Arm cranking 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 51% 29% Shuttle test • Control 15 NS NS NS 117.7 Valker et al. 2001 (41) • Arm cranking 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 51% 29% Shuttle test • Control 15 NS NS NS NS 117.7 sec Valker et al. 2001 (41) • Arm cranking 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 51% 29% Shuttle test 2001 (41) • Cycling 28 6 months Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 57% 31% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and î 2% per 2001 (19) • Control 24 24 wks	Parker-Jones <i>et al.</i> 1996 (35)	Stair-master	6	12 wks	Supervised 1 hr 2x wk	NS	135.5s	3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ↑ 3.5% per
Hiatt et al. 1996 (23) • Walking treadmill • Strength intaining • Control 10 12 wks Supervised 1 hr 3x wk 43%* 61.6%* 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 1 3.5% per 3 min Patterson et al. 1997 (36) • Supervised exercise • Home exercise 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise instruction 33.9% 54.5% Walker et al. 2001 (41) • Arm cranking 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 51% 29% Shuttle test Valker et al. 2001 (41) • Arm cranking 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 57% 31% Gardner et al. 2005 (44) • Walking 28 6 months Supervised 30 min 2x per wk 77% 134% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and 1 2% per 2 min Zwierska et al. 2005 (44) • Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% • Control 15 NS NS NS NS * Increase of time in percentage. * NS NS NS NS		Treadmill	6		Supervised 1 hr 2x wk	171.7 sec	117.7 sec	5 11111
Strength training 8 Supervised 1 hr 3x wk NS NS 3 min Patterson et al. • Supervised 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise 33.9% 54.5% 1997 (36) • Supervised 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise 33.9% 54.5% 1997 (36) • Home exercise 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise NS NS Walker et al. • Arm cranking 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 21% 29% Shuttle test 2001 (41) • Cycling 26 6 months Supervised 40 min 21% 57% 31% Control 15 NS NS NS NS Gardner et al. • Walking 28 6 months Supervised 30 min 21% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ² / ₂ % per wk 2001 (19) • Control 24 12% 25% 2 min Zwierska et al. • Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2X per wk 50% 93% 2005 (44) • Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2X per wk 50% 93% 2005 (44) <	Hiatt <i>et al.</i> 1996 (23)	Walking treadmill	10	12 wks	Supervised 1 hr 3x wk	43%*	61.6%*	3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ↑ 3.5% per
• Control 8 NS NS NS Patterson et al. 1997 (36) • Supervised exercise • Home exercise 23 12 wks 1x wk lectures + exercise 33.9% 54.5% Walker et al. 2001 (41) • Arm cranking 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 51% 29% Shuttle test • Control 15 NS NS NS NS • Control 15 NS NS NS • Control 15 NS NS NS • Control 15 NS NS and ↑ 2% per and ↑ 2% per * Control 24 Zwierska et al. • Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 47% 122% Shuttle test 2005 (44) • Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% • Control 15 NS NS NS * Increase of time in percentage. 15 NS NS NS		Strength training	8		Supervised 1 hr 3x wk	NS	NS	3 min
Patterson et al. 1997 (36)• Supervised exercise23 exercise12 wks1x wk lectures + exercise33.9%54.5%1997 (36)• Home exercise2312 wks1x wk lectures + exerciseNSNSWalker et al. 2001 (41)• Arm cranking · Cycling266 wksSupervised 40 min 2x per wk51% Supervised 40 min 2x per wk29%Shuttle test• Control15NSNSNSGardner et al. 2001 (19)• Walking · Control286 monthsSupervised 3x per wk77%134% and $^{+}2\%$ per and $^{+}2\%$ per and $^{+}2\%$ per wkZwierska et al. 2005 (44)• Arm cranking · Cycling3424 wksSupervised 40 min 3x per wk47%122%Shuttle testZwierska et al. 2005 (44)• Cycling · Cycling37Supervised 40 min 2x per wk50%93% 2x per wk• Control15NSNSNSNS		Control	8			NS	NS	
• Home exercise 23 1x WK lectures + exercise instruction NS NS NS Walker et al. 2001 (41) • Arm cranking 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 51% 29% Shuttle test • Cycling 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 57% 31% • Control 15 NS NS NS • Control 15 NS NS nd ^2 x per wk • Control 15 NS NS nd ^2 x% per wk 2001 (19) • Control 24 77% 134% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ^2 2% per wk Zwierska et al. • Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 47% 122% Shuttle test 2005 (44) • Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% 2x per wk NS NS NS • Control 15 NS NS NS NS NS NS	Patterson <i>et al.</i> 1997 (36)	Supervised exercise	23	12 wks	1x wk lectures + exercise	33.9%	54.5%	
Walker et al. 2001 (41) • Arm cranking 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 51% 29% Shuttle test • Cycling 26 6 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 57% 31% 9% • Control 15 NS NS NS Gardner et al. 2001 (19) • Walking 28 6 months Supervised 3x per wk 77% 134% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ↑ 2% per Zwierska et al. 2005 (44) • Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 47% 122% Shuttle test • Control 24 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% • Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% • Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% • Control 15 NS NS NS * Increase of time in percentage. 15 NS NS		• Home exercise	23		1x WK lectures + exercise instruction	NS	NS	
• Cycling 26 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 57% 31% • Control 15 NS NS Gardner et al. 2001 (19) • Walking 28 6 months Supervised 3x per wk 77% 134% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ↑ 2% per Zwierska et al. 2005 (44) • Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 47% 122% Shuttle test • Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% 50% 93% • Control 15 NS NS NS NS	Walker <i>et al.</i> 2001 (41)	Arm cranking	26	6 wks	Supervised 40 min 2x per wk	51%	29%	Shuttle test
• Control 15 NS NS Gardner et al. 2001 (19) • Walking 28 6 months Supervised 3x per wk 77% 134% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ↑ 2% per and ↑ 2% per Zwierska et al. 2005 (44) • Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 47% 122% Shuttle test · Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% - · Control 15 NS NS NS		Cycling	26		Supervised 40 min 2x per wk	57%	31%	
Gardner et al. 2001 (19) • Walking 28 6 months Supervised 3x per wk 77% 134% 3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ↑ 2% per 2001 (19) • Control 24 12% 25% 2 min Zwierska et al. 2005 (44) • Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 47% 122% Shuttle test · Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% · Control 15 NS NS		Control	15			NS	NS	
· Control 24 12% 25% 2 min Zwierska et al. 2005 (44) · Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 47% 122% Shuttle test · Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% · Control 15 NS NS	Gardner <i>et al.</i> 2001 (19)	Walking	28	6 months	Supervised 3x per wk	77%	134%	3.2 km.h ⁻¹ at 0% and ↑ 2% per
Zwierska et al. • Arm cranking 34 24 wks Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 47% 122% Shuttle test 2005 (44) • Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 2x per wk 50% 93% • Control 15 NS NS * Increase of time in percentage. • Control 15		Control	24			12%	25%	2 min
Cycling 37 Supervised 40 min 50% 93% 2x per wk NS NS * Increase of time in percentage.	Zwierska <i>et al.</i> 2005 (44)	Arm cranking	34	24 wks	Supervised 40 min 2x per wk	47%	122%	Shuttle test
Control 15 NS NS * Increase of time in percentage.		Cycling	37		Supervised 40 min 2x per wk	50%	93%	
* Increase of time in percentage.		Control	15			NS	NS	
	* Increase of time in p	ercentage.						

reliable measurements of PFWD and MWD while 3 tests are necessary when using constant load treadmill tests.

It has also been questioned whether walking on the treadmill accurately assesses walking distance because it measures an 'artificial' walking distance, i.e. subjects are not walking on land. This was made apparent in a study where 76% of study patients were found to walk much further on a ward corridor walk test than on the treadmill, even though the treadmill was slower.⁴² Due to this finding, other, less artificial methods of assessing walking capacity have been explored. In a study by Montgomery *et al.*³¹ 64 patients repeated two 6-minute walk tests a week apart. The distances walked during the two 6-minute walk tests were similar, resulting in a high reliability coefficient (R = 0.94) and a low coefficient of variation (10%). Only a small non-significant 3 - 4% increase in distance and steps was found on the second test.

More recently a group of researchers have used a shuttle walk test.⁴¹ Patients walk back and forth between 2 cones placed 10 m apart. The speed at which the patients walk is controlled by audible tones recorded on a cassette. Patients begin walking on the first tone and aim to reach the second cone by the next tone. The time span between tones is decreased over time thereby increasing the speed. The patient stops walking when he/she cannot keep up with the required speed. The authors found that this test offered the advantage of testing more than 1 patient at a time, and was also reproducible, having less than 10% variability in PFWD and MWD in patients with claudication.

Future research should use tests that are reproducible. From this review it seems that the 6-minute walk test, the progressive treadmill test and the shuttle test are the preferred tests to use.

Exercise training as a treatment for patients with PVD

Percutaneous transluminal angioplasty (PTA), as well as vascular bypass grafting are accepted methods of treatment for limb ischaemia.^{6,8,43} Conservative treatment for claudication was advocated as early as 1898 when Wilhelm Erb suggested that muscular exercise increased blood flow to the ischaemic limb.¹⁴ Despite this recommendation, for many years passive exercise (the limb is moved by the nurse or exercise therapist through its range of motion) was the recognised therapy for these patients.² The importance of dynamic (the patient actively performs the exercise him or herself) exercise training as a therapy for patients with intermittent claudication was rediscovered in the 1950s and 1960s.^{3,15,28,40}

Larsen and Lassen²⁸ performed the first randomised controlled study comparing an exercise training group of patients with a placebo-controlled group and found that pain-free walking time (PFWT) increased from 1.7 minutes to 3.5 minutes after exercise training for 6 months. The mean maximum walking time (MWT) increased from 2.9 minutes to 8.2 minutes. In the control group no significant change was noted. Since this study a number

of randomised controlled trials (Table I) have shown similar results.^{8,19,22,23,25,29,30,35,36,41,44}

It is clear from Table I that exercise training improves walking tolerance in patients with PVD. Indeed when comparing the effects of exercise training with PTA, exercise training was more beneficial after a 6-month period.⁸

Only 1 study²¹ has found no value to exercise training. The effects of surgical intervention, supervised physical exercise training and no treatment on walking tolerance was studied in patients with intermittent claudication. This group found that exercise training offered no therapeutic advantage compared with untreated controls. A methodological flaw in this study was that patients, despite being recruited between 1994 and 1997, were trained using methods dating from the 1970s. The exercises consisted of dynamic leg exercises while seated in a chair. In an upright position exercises consisted of marking time, walking, running, dancing and playing ball. The response to exercise training was determined by using a treadmill walking test and measuring maximum walking distance. Furthermore the intervention lasted for 1 year and compliance was not reported for the exercise training group.

However earlier findings by this same group reported that surgical reconstruction (vascular bypass graft) combined with exercise training was more effective in improving MWD and PFWD in patients with intermittent claudication than training alone or surgery alone.²⁹ Similarly, in other studies, this group did report improvements in MWD and PFWD in patients with intermittent claudication following exercise training.^{10,11}

Mode of training used in patients with PVD

Early studies used walking as the mode of exercise training in patients with PVD.^{3,28} Later studies included 'dynamic leg exercises'.¹⁰⁻¹² In a study by Creasy *et al.*⁸ dynamic leg exercises included 'walking, walking on tip toe, walking and running on the spot, static bicycling, step ups, going up and down on tip toes while on an incline and dribbling with a ball'.

In the early 1990s, treadmills became more commonplace in gymnasia and exercise laboratories and treadmill walking replaced 'dynamic leg exercises'. Studies showed that training on a treadmill produced substantial increases in walking distances.^{22,23,35,39} Treadmill walking was established as the accepted mode of exercise training and few studies explored the effects of alternative modes of training on walking distances in patients with PVD.

Two studies did however examine the effects of stairmaster exercise and lower-body resistance training on walking distances in patients with PVD.^{24,35} Neither mode of training produced improvements in walking tolerance. Therefore the researchers concluded that training effects in patients with PVD were specific to the mode of training used. Therefore it seemed logical that treadmill walking would be the most beneficial form of training for improving walking tolerance in patients with PVD.

More recently, studies have again ventured to explore the effects of modes of training outside of treadmill walking on MWD and PFWD in patients with intermittent claudication. Polestriding, a stationary form of exercise similar to skiing has proved to be beneficial to patients with intermittent claudication, as has upper-limb cycle ergometry.^{7,41,44} The effect of upperlimb and lower-limb cycle ergometry on walking tolerance in patients with intermittent claudication was assessed in the United Kingdom.^{41,44} Patients were randomised to an upperlimb cycle ergometry group or a lower-limb cycle ergometry group and trained twice a week for 6 weeks.⁴¹ PFWD and MWD on a graded treadmill exercise test improved similarly in both training groups. The authors suggested that central cardiovascular adaptations contributed to the increased walking tolerance in both groups because the heart rate response to submaximal work loads during the upper and lower-limb assessments was reduced after training. The authors pointed out that exercise training using lower-limb weight-bearing exercise can be most uncomfortable for the patient and that an upper-limb programme (using upper-limb cycle ergometers) which produced similar results would be a welcome relief to patients with intermittent claudication.

However, upper-limb cycle ergometers are not available in most gymnasia. Upper-body strength training apparatus is available in all gymnasiums and the efficacy of upper-body strength training programmes on patients with PVD needs to be assessed.

It seems that over the years, the mode of exercise training in patients with PVD has mirrored the trends of the mode of exercise training prescribed to the general population. Most gymnasium programmes today include a combination of treadmill walking, cycling, strength training (using plateloaded machines) and stretching. It is recommended that future research assess the efficacy of conventional exercise programmes.

Duration, frequency and intensity of exercise training in patients with PVD

The duration of most training programmes, whether home based or hospital based, is 12 weeks - 6 months (Table I), only 1 study⁴¹ has had a shorter training period (6 weeks). This study showed that training was effective in this time period.⁴¹ More studies need to ascertain whether a short-term (6-week) exercise rehabilitation programme is of sufficient duration to affect functional improvements in patients with PVD. It can be daunting for a patient to embark on a 6-month programme; a short-term (6-week) programme may be easier to commit to and if the patient improves functionally, they will feel encouraged which will improve compliance.

Although the American College of Sports Medicine has advocated that 30 minutes of exercise every day is the exercise prescription guideline to obtain the health benefits of exercise, no studies have examined the effects of 30 minutes of exercise every day for patients with PVD.¹ The frequency of most training programmes in patients with PVD has been 2 - 3 times per week usually for a period of between 30 minutes and 1 hour (Table I). This is the most practical for patients with PVD as most people in this group are elderly and do not want to commit to more than 2 - 3 times a week for exercise training.

The effects of intensity of a training programme was examined in a meta-analysis. Claudication end point used during an exercise training programme was the most important independently related predictor of the positive change in PFWD and MWD in patients with intermittent claudication.¹⁸ More recently, this same group of researchers assessed the efficacy of a 6-month exercise rehabilitation programme consisting of treadmill walking to near-maximal pain at either 40% or 80% of maximal exercise capacity. Those who trained at a lower exercise intensity walked for a longer time period and therefore total work performed in the 2 groups was the same. There was no difference between the 2 groups with respect to MWD and PFWD at the end of the intervention period. Both groups improved equally.²⁰ This indicates that patients should walk at a speed to illicit near-maximal pain. If they choose to train at a lower maximal exercise capacity, they should exercise for a longer period so that the total amount of work completed is similar to that of a training programme using a higher intensity.

Supervised hospital-based exercise programmes v. home-based exercise programmes in patients with PVD

Only a few studies have compared the effects of home v. hospital-based exercise programmes in patients with PVD.^{36,38,39} Regensteiner *et al.*³⁸ showed no improvement in MWD or PFWD in a home-based exercise programme after 12 weeks of training. Patterson *et al.*³⁶ and Savage *et al.*³⁹ found that although the home exercise groups improved, supervised exercise programmes over a 3 - 6-month period. Since only a few studies have compared the effects of home v. hospital-based exercise programmes, more research is needed in this area.

Conclusion

Exercise training improves walking capacity in patients with PVD, indeed 1 study proved that exercise training was more beneficial than angioplasty as a treatment for patients with PVD.

The preferred mode of exercise training in the past decade has been walking on the treadmill. Recent studies have shown that upper-body cycle ergometry proved to be an effective form of treatment for patients with PVD. This is an important development in exercise training for patients with PVD as walking is painful whereas upper-limb cycle ergometry is pain free.

Furthermore, the efficacy of conventional exercise rehabilitation programmes (a combination of treadmill walking, cycling, strength training and stretching) should be assessed

as conventional exercise is the most commonly prescribed exercise in gymnasia today.

Training programmes of 3 - 6 months duration have proved to be beneficial for patients with PVD. However a shorter (6-week) exercise training programme has proved to be of sufficient duration to affect functional improvements in patients with PVD. It is easier to encourage a patient to join a 6-week exercise programme than a 6-month programme which can be a daunting undertaking for the patient.

It is evident from this review that most studies prescribe half an hour to an hour of exercise 2 - 3 times per week. The ACSM exercise guidelines¹ are half an hour of exercise daily. However, because of the age of these patients it is difficult to expect them to attend daily exercise classes. They can be encouraged to attend classes 2 or 3 times per week and walk at home on the remaining days.

Both high and low-intensity exercise training programmes have proved to be beneficial for patients with PVD. However, should patients choose to train at a lower maximal exercise capacity, they should exercise for a longer period so that the total amount of work completed is similar to a training programme using a higher intensity.

REFERENCES

- American College of Sports Medicine. ACSM Guidelines for Exercise Testing and Prescription. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1995.
- Allen EV, Barker NW, Hines EAJ. Peripheral Vascular Diseases. Philadelphia: WB Saunders, 1955.
- Alpert J, Larsen A, Lassen NA. Exercise and intermittent claudication: blood flow in the calf muscle during walking studied by the Xenon-133 clearance method. *Circulation* 1969; **39:** 353-9.
- Breek JC, Hamming JF, De Vries J, Ven Berge Henegouwen DP, Van Heck GL. The impact of walking impairment, cardiovascular risk factors, and comorbidity on quality of life in patients with intermittent claudication. *J Vasc Surg* 2002; **36**: 94-9.
- Cachovan M, Rogatti W, Woltering F, et al. Randomised reliability study evaluating constant-load and graded-exercise treadmill test for intermittent claudication. Angiology 1999; 50: 193-200.
- Chetter IC, Spark JI, Scott JA, Kester RC. Does angioplasty improve the quality of life for claudicants? A prospective study. *Ann Vasc Surg* 1999; 13: 93-103.
- Collins EG, Langbein WE, Orebaugh C, et al. Polestriding exercise and vitiamin E for management of peripheral vascular disease. Med Sci Sports Exer 2003; 35: 384-93.
- Creasy TA, McMillan PJ, Fletcher EW, Collin J, Morris PJ. Is percutaneous transluminal angioplasty better than exercise for claudication? – preliminary results from a prospective randomised trial. *Eur J Vasc Surg* 1990; 4: 135-9.
- Criqui MH, Fronek A, Barrett-Conner B. The prevalence of peripheral arterial disease in a defined population. *Circulation* 1985; **71**: 510-5.
- Dahloff AG, Bjorntorp, Holm J, Schersten T. Metabolic activity of skeletal muscle in patients with peripheral arterial insufficiency. *Eur J Clin Invest* 1974; 4: 9-15.
- Dahloff AG, Holm J, Schersetn T, Sivertsson R. Peripheral arterial insufficiency. Scand J Rehabil Med 1976; 8: 19-26.
- Dahloff AG, Holm J, Schersten T. Exercise training of patients with intermittent claudication. Scand J Rehabil Med 1983; 15: 20-6.
- Dormandy J, Heeck L, Vig S. The natural history of claudication: risk to life and limb. Semin Vasc Surg 1999; 12: 123-37.
- 14. Erb W. Intermittierende hinken und andere nervosa storungen in folde van gefaberkrankungen. Klin Wochenschr 1898.
- Foley WT. Treatment of gangrene of the feet and legs by walking. Circulation 1957; 15: 689.

- Fowkes FGR, Houseley E, Cawood EH. Edinburgh artery study: Prevalence of asymptomatic and symptomatic peripheral arterial disease in the general population. *Int J Epidemiol* 1991; 20: 384-92.
- Gardner AW, Skinner JS, Cantwell BW, Kent Smith L. Progressive v. single stage treadmill tests for evaluation of claudication. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1991; 23: 402-7.
- Gardner AW, Poelman ET. Exercise rehabilitation programmes for the treatment of claudication pain. JAMA 1995; 274: 975-1000.
- Gardner AW, Katzel LI, Sorkin JD, et al. Exercise rehabilitation improves functional outcomes and peripheral circulation in patients with intermittent claudication: A randomised controlled trial. J Am Geriatr Soc 2001; 49: 755-62.
- Gardner AW, Montgomery PS, Flinn WR, Katzel LI. The effect of exercise intensity on the response to exercise rehabilitation in patients with intermittent claudication. J Vasc Surg 2005; 42: 702-9.
- Gelin J, Jivegard L, Taft C, et al. Treatment efficacy of intermittent claudication by surgical intervention, supervised physical exercise training compared to no treatment in unselected randomized patients: One year results of functional and physiological improvements. *Eur J Vasc Surg* 2001; 22: 107-13.
- Hiatt WR, Regensteiner JG, Hargarten ME, Wolfel EE, Brass EP. Benefit of exercise conditioning for patients with peripheral arterial disease. *Circulation* 1990; 81: 602-9.
- Hiatt WR, Regensteiner JG, Wolfel EE, Carry MR, Brass EP. Effect of exercise training on skeletal muscle histology and metabolism in peripheral arterial disease. J Appl Physiol 1996; 81: 780-8.
- Hiatt WR, Wolfel EE, Meier RH, Regensteiner JG. Superiority of treadmill walking exercise v. strength training for patients with peripheral arterial disease. Implications for mechanism of the training response. *Circulation* 1994; **90**: 1866-74.
- Holm J, Dahloff AG, Bjorntorp P, Schersten T. Enzyme studies in muscles of patients with intermittent claudication. J Clin Lab Invest 1973; 31: 201-5.
- Johnston KW, Hosang MY, Andrews DF. Reproducibility of noninvasive vascular laboratory measurements of the peripheral circulation. J Vasc Surg 1987; 6: 147-51.
- Kannel WD. The demographics of claudication and the aging of the American population. Vasc Med 1996; 1: 60-4.
- Larsen OA, Lassen NA. Effect of daily muscular exercise in patients with intermittent claudication. *Lancet* 1966; 2: 1093-5.
- Lundgren F, Dahloff AG, Schersten T, Volkmann R. Intermittent claudication

 surgical reconstruction or physical training. Ann Vasc Surg 1989; 209: 346-55.
- Mannarino E, Pasqualini L, Menna M, Maragoni G, Orlandi U. Effects of physical training on peripheral vascular disease. A controlled study. *Angiology* 1989; 1: 5-9.
- Montgomery PS, Gardner AW. The clinical utility of a six minute walk test in peripheral arterial occlusive disease patients. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1988; 46: 706-11.
- Murabito JM, Agostino RB, Silbershaatz H, Wilson PWF. Intermittent claudication: A risk profile from the Framingham Heart Study. *Circulation* 1997; 96: 44-9.
- Newman AB, Siscovick D, Manolio TA, et al. Ankle arm index as a marker of atherosclerosis in the cardiovascular health study. *Circulation* 1993; 88: 837-45.
- Ouriel N, McDonnell AE, Metz CE, Zarius CK. A critical evaluation of stress testing in the diagnosis of peripheral vascular disease. *Surgery* 1982; 91: 686-93.
- Parker Jones P, Skinner JS, Kent Smith L, John FM, Bryant CX. Functional improvements following stairmaster v. treadmill exercise training for patients with intermittent claudication. J Cardiopulm Rehabil 1996; 16: 47-55.
- Patterson RB, Pinto B, Marcus B, Colucci A, Braun T, Roberts M. Value of a supervised exercise program for the therapy of arterial claudication. J Vasc Surg 1997; 25: 312-9.
- Perakyla T, Tikkanen H, Van Knorring J, Lepantalo M. Poor reproducibility of exercise test in assessment of claudication. *Clin Physiol* 1998; 18: 187-93.
- Regensteiner JG, Meyer TJ, Krupski WC, Cranford LS, Hiatt WR. Hospital v. home-based exercise rehabilitation for patients with peripheral arterial occlusive disease. *Angiology* 1997; 48: 291-300.
- Savage P, Ricci MA, Lynn M, et al. Effects of home versus supervised exercise for patients with intermittent claudication. J Cardiopulm Rehabil 2001; 21: 152-7.

- 40. Skinner JS, Strandness DE. Exercise and intermittent claudication. *Circulation* 1967; **36**: 23-9.
- 41. Walker RD, Nawaz S, Wilkinson CH, Saxton JM, Pockley AG, Wood RFM. Influence of upper- and lower-limb exercise training on cardiovascular function and walking distances in patients with intermittent claudication. J Vasc Surg 2000; 31: 662-9.
- 42. Watson CJE, Phillips D, Hands L, Collin J. Claudication distance is poorly

estimated and inappropriately measured. Br J Surg 1997; 84: 1107-9.

- Whyman MR, Ruckley CV. Should claudicants receive angioplasty or just exercise training? *Cardiovasc Surg* 1998; 6: 226-31.
- 44. Zwierska I, Walker RD, Choksky SA, Male JS, Pockley, G Saxton JM. Upper- vs lower-limb aerobic exercise rehabilitation in patients with symptomatic peripheral arterial disease: A randomized controlled trial. J Vasc Surg 2005; 42: 1122-30.



Health & Medical Publishing Group Surgery of the Foot and Ankle e-dition, 8th edition

Text with Continually Updated Online Reference

By **Michael J. Coughlin**, MD, Private Practice of Orthopaedic Surgery; Clinical Professor, Department of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, OR; **Roger A. Mann**, MD, Director of Foot Fellowship Program, Oakland CA;

Associate Clinical Professor, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of California at San Francisco School of Medicine, San Francisco, CA; and **Charles L. Saltzman**, MD, Professor, Departments of Orthopaedic Surgery and Biomedical Engineering, University of Iowa College of Medicine, Iowa City, IA

ISBN 0323040292 · Book/Electronic Media · 1511 Pages · 1580 Illustrations Mosby · Forthcoming Title (December 2006)

> Health & Medical Publishing Group, Private bag X1, Pinelands, 7430 Tel: 021-6578200 Fax: 021-6834509 e-mail: carmena@hmpg.co.za brents@hmpg.co.za





Health & Medical Books