Acute and chronic effects of training with a fixed gear on pedaling technique

Eneko Fernández-Peña (University of The Basque Country UPV/EHU) eneko.fernandezp@ehu.eus









INTRODUCTION

(or why pedaling technique matters)



Training with a fixed gear improves the round pedaling stroke.

Some random coach, 1995 ca.



















- ← Crank angle 270°





Open questions:

Which pedaling technique is more metabolically efficient?

Open questions:

Which pedaling technique is more metabolically efficient?

Open questions:

- Which pedaling technique is more metabolically efficient?
- Does training with a fixed gear actually modify the pedaling technique?

2. METHODS

(or how did we do it)







╉





-13 track and 9 road cyclists

-Elite E-motion roller at Low and High intensities

-60, 80 and 100 rpm

-Pedaling kinetics at 1000 Hz for 20'' (PowerForce, O-Tec, Germany)



VARIABLES

- -Left Power (W)
- -Positive (IMP+) and Negative (IMP-) impulses
- -Positive Impulse proportion (PIP)
- -Index of Effectiveness for the whole pedal stroke (IE $_{360}$), downstroke (IE $_{0-180}$) and upstroke (IE $_{180-360}$).





3. RESULTS

(or what interesting things we found)



ACUTE EFFECTS

ROAD cyclists	80 rpm, LOW resistance		80 rpm, HIGH resistance	
	Fixed gear	Freewheel	Fixed gear	Freewheel
Left power (W)	$\textbf{76.7} \pm \textbf{5.6}$	$\textbf{76.9} \pm \textbf{4.8}$	$\textbf{161.8} \pm \textbf{6.1}$	159.4 ± 5.9
IMP+ (N·s)	$\textbf{51.13} \pm \textbf{5.2}$	$\textbf{51.81} \pm \textbf{4.1}$	$\textbf{87.84} \pm \textbf{4.1}$	$\textbf{86.63} \pm \textbf{3.1}$
IMP- (N·s)	$\textbf{-11.44} \pm \textbf{3.2}$	$\textbf{-11.73} \pm \textbf{3.1}$	$\textbf{-3.82}\pm\textbf{3.1}$	$\textbf{-3.69}\pm\textbf{3.2}$
PIP (%)	81.7	81.5	95.8	95.9
IE ₃₆₀	$\textbf{0.43} \pm \textbf{0.1}$	0.42 ± 0.1	$\textbf{0.66} \pm \textbf{0.1}$	$\textbf{0.66} \pm \textbf{0.1}$
IE ₀₋₁₈₀	0.76 ± 0.0	$\textbf{0.76} \pm \textbf{0.0}$	$\textbf{0.79} \pm \textbf{0.0}$	0.79 ± 0.0
IE ₁₈₀₋₃₆₀	$\textbf{-0.32}\pm0.1$	$\textbf{-0.33}\pm0.1$	0.12 ± 0.2	0.14 ± 0.2



ACUTE EFFECTS





ACUTE EFFECTS





CHRONIC EFFECTS (on freewheel)

	80 rpm, LOW resistance		80 rpm, HIGH resistance	
	Road cyclists	Track cyclists	Road cyclists	Track cyclists
Left power (W)	$\textbf{76.9} \pm \textbf{4.8}$	* 87.3 \pm 7.6	159.4 ± 5.9	163.5 ± 10.9
IMP+ (N·s)	$\textbf{51.81} \pm \textbf{4.1}$	* 56.59 \pm 5.2	$\textbf{86.63} \pm \textbf{3.1}$	89.51 ± 5.9
IMP- (N·s)	$\textbf{-11.73} \pm \textbf{3.1}$	$\textbf{-11.92} \pm \textbf{2.6}$	$\textbf{-3.69}\pm\textbf{3.2}$	$\textbf{-4.85}\pm \textbf{2}$
PIP (%)	81.5	82.6	95.9	94.9
IE ₃₆₀	0.42 ± 0.1	0.44 ± 0	$\textbf{0.66} \pm \textbf{0.1}$	0.64 ± 0
IE ₀₋₁₈₀	0.76 ± 0	0.76 ± 0	0.79 ± 0	0.78 ± 0
IE ₁₈₀₋₃₆₀	$\textbf{-0.33} \pm \textbf{0.1}$	$\textbf{-0.36} \pm \textbf{0.1}$	$\textbf{0.14}\pm\textbf{0.2}$	$\textbf{-0.02} \pm \textbf{0.1}$

* Statistically significant between track and road cyclists (p < 0.05).

CHRONIC EFFECTS (on freewheel)





CHRONIC EFFECTS (on freewheel)





4. DISCUSION

(or what does it all mean)





THANKS!

Any questions?

