Bond University Research Repository



Profiling the sport of stand-up paddle boarding

Schram, Ben; Hing, Wayne; Climstein, Mike

Published in: Journal of Sports Sciences

DOI: 10.1080/02640414.2015.1079331

Licence: Unspecified

Link to output in Bond University research repository.

Recommended citation(APA): Schram, B., Hing, W., & Climstein, M. (2016). Profiling the sport of stand-up paddle boarding. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *34*(10), 937-944. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2015.1079331

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

Title: Profiling the Sport of Stand Up Paddle Boarding

Running Title: Profiling Stand Up Paddle Boarding

1 Abstract

2	Stand up paddle boarding (SUP) is a rapidly growing activity where only anecdotal evidence
3	exists for its proposed health and fitness benefits. The purpose of this study was to profile elite
4	and recreational SUP with respect to anthropometric, physiological and musculoskeletal
5	measurements. A total of 30 SUP participants (15 recreational, 15 elite) and 15 sedentary
6	controls participated in this study. Elite and recreational (rec) SUP participants had significantly
7	lower body fat than sedentary (sed) individuals, elite had significantly higher HDL and
8	significantly lower triglycerides than other groups during lipid profiling (P >0.05). There were
9	significant differences (P >0.05) between all groups in maximal oxygen uptake (elite 43.7, s =
10	5.89ml/kg/min vs rec 31.9, $s = 7.7$ ml/kg/min vs sed 20.4, $s = 3.7$ ml/kg/min) and anaerobic
11	power outputs (35.7, $s = 11.1$ W vs 25.0, $s = 11.7$ W vs 13.5, $s = 7.1$ W). The elite group
12	displayed significantly longer endurance than the recreational and sedentary group in the prone
13	bridge (elite 253.4, $s = 67.6$ sec vs rec 165.6, $s = 42.2$ sec vs sed 69.7, $s = 31.2$ sec) right sided
14	bridge (elite 107.9, $s = 34.0$ sec vs recreational 68.2, $s = 24.1$ sec vs sed 34.6, $s = 15.5$ sec) left
15	sided bridge (elite 99.8, $s = 24.9$ sec vs rec 68.2, $s = 27.2$ sec vs sed 32.5, $s = 15.2$ sec) and Biering
16	Sorensen test (elite 148.8, $s = 35.4$ sec vs rec 127.2, $s = 43.2$ sec vs sed 71.1, $s = 32.9$ sec). Elite
17	SUP had significantly better static and dynamic postural control when compared to the other
18	groups. This study demonstrates the anthropometric, physiological and musculoskeletal values
19	representative of elite and recreational SUP. SUP appears to be associated with increased levels
20	of aerobic and anaerobic fitness, increased static and dynamic balance and a high level of
21	isometric trunk endurance.
22	
23	Key words: profiling, water sports, aquatic, paddle boarding

26 Introduction

Stand up paddle boarding (SUP) is a new sport and recreational activity, which is increasing in
popularity around the world due to its proposed health and fitness benefits and enjoyment
(Hammer, 2011). SUP is a hybrid of surfing and paddling in which participants can either
distance paddle and/or surf waves (Walker, Nichols, & Forman, 2010). Many websites
anecdotally advocate the use of SUP to increase strength, fitness, core stability, balance and
decrease back pain. However, our recent review of the literature found no scientific evidence to
substantiate the proposed benefits.

34

Stand up paddle boarding is an activity in which the participant maintains a standing position on a board similar to a surfboard. However, SUP boards are longer in length (~8-15ft, 2.4-4.6m), thicker (4-8in, 10-20cm) and wider (26-31in, 66-78cm) than traditional surfboards. The SUP participant propels the board across the surface of the water by the use of a long, single-bladed paddle. While the standing position is unstable initially, it is continuously disturbed by the motion of the board and the movement of the arms whilst paddling, providing a constant postural challenge.

42

Stand up paddle boarding is low impact, making it suitable for all ages. Participants can utilize
almost any body of water to either paddle distances or surf waves and it is therefore an ideal
aquatic activity. Advantages to SUP include that it is performed whilst standing and that the
participant paddles bilaterally, alternating sides when required. It is a dynamic activity primarily
utilising the upper limbs with an isometric trunk muscle component.

48

As SUP can be performed in a competitive environment, it is assumed that participants would
require both aerobic and anaerobic fitness to be successful in distance competition. With a

number of competitive SUP endurance events lasting in excess of five hours (Molokai2Oahu), a
high level of aerobic fitness appears to be required from its elite participants. Anaerobic fitness
is essential for short speed bursts and to catch waves.

54

55 A high level of dynamic balance and trunk muscle endurance is required by its participants and 56 are both considered important attributes of a SUP participant. Research has shown that dynamic 57 exercise with isometric contraction of the core muscles can increase the strength of core muscles 58 (Danneels, Vanderstraeten, & Cambier, 2001) and that improved core stability occurs when 59 training on unstable surfaces (Behm, Leonard, Young, Bonsey, & Mackinnon, 2005). Core 60 stability training is commonly integrated in later stages of rehabilitation programs due to higher 61 demands on the motor control system and increased electromyographic (EMG) recordings from 62 the abdominal musculature (Vera-Garcia, Grenier, & McGill, 2000).

63

The importance of trunk muscle capability is twofold. Multidirectional stability is required in athletic performance to optimise performance and minimize the risk of injury while endurance of the muscles is required to support the passive structures of the spine (McGill, Grenier, Kavcic, & Cholewicki, 2003). It has therefore been suggested that trunk muscle assessment also be multidirectional to ensure that stability in all planes is confirmed (Evans, Refshauge, & Adams, 2007). It is assumed therefore that SUP participants would have both increased postural control and high levels of isometric trunk endurance due to the training effect of the activity.

71

72 The rationale for comparison of elite and recreational SUP participants is to identify the

73 physiological and musculoskeletal attributes which differentiate the two groups. An indication of

the fitness attributes of elite SUP participants provides a guideline for an individual wanting to

succeed in competitive SUP. The profiling of SUP participants has yet to be quantified, leaving a

gap in the scientific literature. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to provide original data
regarding the physiological and musculoskeletal profiles of SUP athletes and compare it to
sedentary individuals with no previous exposure to the activity.

79

80 Methods

This research utilized a cross-sectional observational study design. This study was approved by the University Human Research Ethics committee (RO-1550) and each participant formally consented to taking part in the study prior to any tests being performed. The physiological profile measures included aerobic and anaerobic capacity, blood lipid profile (total cholesterol, high density lipoprotein, low density lipoprotein and triglycerides) and body composition. A musculoskeletal profile included static and dynamic balance assessment and isometric trunk muscle endurance.

88

89 A total of 15 elite competitive (10 males & 5 females) SUP participants and 15 recreational SUP 90 participants (10 males, 5 females) were recruited from the Stand Up Paddle Surfers Association 91 (Gold Coast, QLD, Australia). Elite participants were currently actively competing and ranked in 92 the national competition. Participants were without a history of back pain and were free from 93 any physical and psychological impairment. The recreational paddlers were required to have a 94 minimum of 1 year experience in SUP and absolutely no competitive experience in SUP events. 95 The sedentary control group were to have never had any experience on a SUP and have been not 96 participating in any exercise in the last six months.

97

98 Participants attended the human performance laboratory where they were assessed for stature (to

99 the nearest 0.1cm) and mass (to the nearest 0.1kg) on a standard medical balance scale (Seca,

- 100 700, Hamburg, Deutschland). Body composition and basal metabolic rate was assessed using
- 101 bio-electrical impedance (BIA), Tanita Body Composition Analyzer MC-980MA, Illinois, USA)

as this has been shown to successfully determine body composition (Lukaski, Bolonchuk, Hall,
& Siders, 1986). Participants were advised to be rested from exercise for a minimum of 24 hrs,
be euhydrated and bladder and bowels emptied prior to the BIA assessment. Bloods lipids were
analysed prior to exercise using a portable analyser (Cardiochek, P.A. Indiana, USA) to ascertain
total cholesterol (TC), high density lipoproteins (HDL), low density lipoproteins (LDL) and
triglycerides (Trigs).

108

109 A continuous graded exercise test using a specialised SUP ergometer (KayakPro SUPErgo,

110 Miami, FL, USA) was used to determine maximal aerobic power (relative and absolute).

111 Maximal aerobic power (VO_{2max}) was determined using an automated expired gas analysis

system (Parvomedics TrueOne 2400 metabolic system, East Sandy, Utah, USA) which was

113 calibrated prior to each test. The expired gas analysis system meets Australian Institute of Sport

accreditation standards for precision and accuracy. The gas analysis software was configured to

breath by breath for collection however VO₂ max was determined from the average of 30

- 116 seconds of max data collected.
- 117

118 The SUP ergometer VO_2 max protocol involved participants familiarising themselves with the 119 equipment with a 2 minute warm up at their chosen intensity. The test then stared at an initial 120 power output of 5W with a 5W increase each minute until volitional exhaustion. Participants 121 were instructed to paddle as per normal, free to alternate paddling on each side ad libitum. Peak 122 exercise blood lactate levels were determined using a portable lactate monitor (Arkay Lactate 123 Pro Blood Lactate Monitor, Kyoto, Japan) and assessed at peak exercise, 1, 5 and 10 minutes 124 post exercise obtained from the finger. The highest blood lactate level measured was deemed the 125 peak lactate. Participant heart rates were monitored throughout the VO2max test with a 12 lead 126 ECG via telemetry (Mortara X-Scribe, WI, USA).

128 On the subsequent visit to the laboratory, maximal anaerobic power was determined using the 129 same SUP ergometer (KayakPro SUPErgo, USA). Participants were allowed to choose their 130 preferred paddling side on the ergometer to ensure that an indication of their maximal power 131 output could be reached. Participants then paddled maximally for 10 seconds from a stationary 132 start. The maximal power was then determined using specialised software incorporated into the 133 SUP ergometer (eMonitor Pro 2 KayakPro, New Rochelle, NY, USA) which is interfaced with a 134 computer. Other anaerobic power parameters measured included distance covered in 10 seconds 135 and peak speed. A minimum of two days and a maximum of three days were allowed between 136 testing maximal aerobic and anaerobic power.

137

Static and dynamic postural control was assessed via a portable force platform (Kistler 2812D with Bioware 4.0, 100 Hz sampling rate) with three piezoelectric force sensors used to calculate the centre of pressure (COP) foot positions. The protocol was similar to methods used previously by Palliard and colleagues (Palliard, Margnes, Portet, & Breucq, 2011) in which six postural conditions were tested. Static posture was tested for 50 seconds and dynamic posture was tested on a seesaw for 25 seconds. These conditions were tested with eyes open (EO) and then repeated with eyes closed (EC). The testing order was from most stable to least stable.

145

146 Center of Pressure (COP) signals were smoothed using a Butterworth filter with a 10Hz low pass 147 cut off frequency. The 100% square (a square in which all the samples lie) was calculated post 148 collection via the range of both the x and y deviations. The COP sway path length (the total 149 distance travelled by the COP over the course of the trial duration) was calculated via the 150 distance between each sampling point. From the COP excursion, the COP velocity was 151 calculated (velocity=distance/time).

153 Trunk muscle endurance was measured as per methodologies previously described by McGill
154 (McGill, Belore, Crosby, & Russell, 2010). The endurance of the flexors of the spine was
155 assessed with a prone bridge, lateral flexors with a side bridge and the extensors with a Biering
156 Sorensen. The tests were terminated when the participant could no longer maintain the required
157 position as determined by the tester and that time was recorded.

158

159

160 Statistical Analysis

A one-way analysis of variance was used to compare differences between the groups. Post hoc
Tukey analysis was utilised to assess differences between the groups. Alpha was set at *P*<0.05 *a priori*. All statistical analyses were completed using the IBM Statistical Package for the Social
Sciences (SPSS, Version 20.0) software program.

165

166 **Results**

167 All three groups (n=45) were equally composed of 10 males and 5 females. Of the elite 168 competitors, six were rated amongst the top ten in the world while other competitors were 169 currently competing in the national competition of SUP in Australia. As seen in Table 1, there 170 were no significant differences between the groups with regards to age, stature or mass. Elite 171 SUP participants were on average, younger than both the recreational (-4.9%) and sedentary 172 groups (-13.8%). The sedentary group possessed the smallest stature with recreational SUP 173 being the tallest compared to both the sedentary (+1.3%) and the elite group (+0.5%). The elite 174 group was also the lightest with less total mass than both the recreational (-0.4%) and sedentary 175 groups (-13.3%). Both elite and recreational groups had significantly lower BMI ($F_{2,42} = 5.367$, P=0.008, $\eta^2=0.204$) than the sedentary group (-14.6%, -3.68kg/m², 95% CI [-6.94, -0.42], 176 *P*<0.01, *d*=0.42 and -15.7%, -3.92kg/m², 95% CI [-7.18, -0.66], *P*>0.05, *d*=0.43 respectively). 177 There were significant differences in body fat ($F_{2,42} = 13.098$, P = 0.001, $\eta^2 = 0.384$) with the elite 178

group the leanest with 31.2% (relative) less fat than the recreational group and 77.4% (relative) significantly less than the sedentary group (7.14% body fat, 95% CI [-17.68, -6.25], P<0.001, d=0.69). There were significant differences between the elite and recreational group when compared to the sedentary group with respect to BMI and percentage body fat (P<0.05).

	Elite $(n = 15)$	Recreational $(n = 15)$	Sedentary (n=15)
Age (years)	38.2 ± 9.37	40.07 ± 7.44	43.47 ± 12.59
Height (cm)	174.3 ± 8.0	175.1 ± 11.3	173.2 ± 9.9
Mass (kg)	76.5 ± 10.6	76.8 ± 13.1	86.7 ± 17.3
BMI (kg/m ²)	$25.18 \pm 2.56*$	$24.94 \pm 2.84*$	28.86 ± 5.09
Body fat (%)	$15.45 \pm 6.76*$	$20.27\pm6.86\texttt{*}$	27.41 ± 5.64

184 Table 1: Participant demographics (mean \pm SD) * = significant difference from sedentary (P < 0.05).

185

186 Blood lipid profiling demonstrated no significant differences between groups in total cholesterol,

although elites had lower TC than both the recreational (+15.2%) and the sedentary (+15.2%),

which is indicative of lower cardiovascular risk. The elite SUP had a significantly ($F_{2,42}$ =7.407,

189 P=0.002, $\eta^2 = 0.26$) higher HDL as compared to both recreational (+28%) and sedentary

190 controls (+57.9%). Elite SUP also demonstrated a significantly ($F_{2,42} = 5.396$, P=0.008, $\eta^2 =$

191 0.20) lower LDL as compared to both recreational (-25.1%) and controls (-58.2%). The elite

group displayed significantly lower triglyceride ($F_{2,42} = 6.483$, P=0.004, $\eta^2=0.24$) levels than the

recreational group (P < 0.05) and the control group (P < 0.01). There were no significant

differences between the recreational and sedentary groups with respect to triglycerides (Table 2).

195

196Table 2: Blood lipid profiles \dagger = significant difference from recreational * = significant difference from sedentary197(P<0.05).</th>

	Elite $(n = 15)$	Recreational $(n = 15)$	Sedentary (n=15)
Total cholesterol (mmol/L)	4.02 ± 0.79	4.63 ± 1.11	4.63 ± 0.67
HDL (mmol/L)	$2.10\pm0.47^*$	1.64 ± 0.61	1.33 ± 0.55
Triglycerides (mmol/L)	$0.82\pm0.19^{*}\dagger$	1.37 ± 0.68	1.40 ± 0.49
LDL (mmol/L)	$1.70 \pm 0.85^{*}$	2.27 ± 0.93	2.69 ± 0.67

with regard to maximal aerobic power, the VO_{2max} of the elite group was significantly higher
$F_{2,42} = 83.53, P=0.000, \eta^2=0.73)$ in both relative (+37.1%,+11.83ml/kg/min, 95% CI [6.53,
17.13], $P < 0.001$, $d = 0.65$) and absolute terms (F _{2,42} = 24.71, $P = 0.000$, $\eta^2 = 0.79$) (+51.3%,
+2.23L/min , 95% CI [1.79, 2.66], P<0.05, d=0.58) as compared to the recreational group and
the sedentary group (+114.9%, +23.37ml/kg/min, 95% CI [18.07, 28.67], +85.2%, +1.56L/min,
95% CI [1.12, 1.99] respectively) (Table 3). There was also a significant difference (P <0.01)
between the recreational and sedentary groups with these two parameters (VO ₂ max relative,
+56.8%, +11.55ml/kg/min, 95%CI [6.24, 16.85] VO ₂ max absolute, +33.3%, +0.67L/min, 95%
CI [0.23, 1.11]). With regard to gender differences, elite males recorded a mean 46.8, $s = 3.7$
ml/kg/min and elite female's 37.5, $s = 4.2$ ml/kg/min. Recreational participants were lower with
a mean score for the males 35.3, $s = 6.6$ ml/kg/min and recreational females 25.2, $s = 4.9$
ml/kg/min while the sedentary males achieved a mean VO2max of 21.9, $s = 3.1$ ml/kg/min and
females 17.4, $s = 3.0$ ml/kg/min.
There were no significant differences between groups in regards to respiratory exchange ratio,
peak heart rate or peak lactate. The elite group reached 102.7% of their age predicted maximum
heart rate (220-age), whilst recreational participant's attained103.9% and sedentary participants

217 98.0% of their age predicted maximum heart rate. The peak aerobic power achieved was

218	significantly higher in the elite group (30.5, $s = 6.0$ W) as compared to the recreational group
219	(P < 0.01, +43.7%) and the sedentary group $(P < 0.01, +188.8%)$ and also when comparing the
220	recreational to sedentary groups ($P < 0.01, +101.0\%$). A significantly greater peak stroke rate
221	($P < 0.01, +25.5\%$), distance covered during the test ($P < 0.01, +48.5\%$) and peak aerobic speed
222	(P < 0.01, +13.0%) was recorded from the elite group when compared to the recreational group
223	and the sedentary group (P<0.01, +64.7%; P<0.01, 102.7%; P<0.01, +45.3). Significant
224	differences were also observed in peak stroke rate ($P < 0.01, +31.2\%$), distance covered ($P < 0.05$,
225	+36.5%) and peak speed achieved during the test ($P \le 0.01$, +28.7%) between the recreational and
226	sedentary groups.
227	
228	The anaerobic test displayed significant differences between all of the groups in all

229 measurements (Table 3). The peak power output of the elite group was significantly higher than

230 the recreational group (P < 0.05, +42.5%, +10.63W, 95% CI [1.62, 19.63], $\eta^2 = 0.461$) and the

231 sedentary group (*P*<0.01, +165.4%, +22.22W, 95% CI [13.21, 31.23]). There was also a

significant difference between the recreational and sedentary group (P < 0.01, +86.3%, +11.59W,

233 95% CI [2.58, 20.59]). The peak speed of the elite group was significantly higher than the

recreational (P < 0.05, +18.1%) and the sedentary groups (P < 0.01, +45.1%) and the recreational

group was significantly higher than the sedentary (P < 0.05, +28.7%). The elite group covered

significantly more distance during the test than the recreational (P < 0.05, +19.1%) and the

237 sedentary group (P < 0.01, +46.4%). Once again, significant differences were also evident

between the recreational and sedentary groups in the distance covered (P < 0.05, +22.9%).

239

240

Table 3: Maximal aerobic and anaerobic test results of elite, recreational SUP. Results expressed as

243	mean±SD.	. †=significant	difference from	recreational	* =significant	difference from	sedentary	P < 0.0)5)
		Bunne		reereau	o-B		Jeachter	(- 0.0	~~

Parameter	Elite (n = 15)	Recreational (n = 15)	Sedentary (n=15)	
Aerobic Performance			-	
VO _{2max} (L/min)	$3.39 \pm 0.63 ^{+*}$	$2.44 \pm 0.77*$	1.83 ± 0.57	
VO _{2max} (ml/kg/min)	$43.73\pm5.87^{\dagger}*$	$31.90 \pm 7.68^*$	20.35 ± 3.69	
Respiratory exchange ratio	1.13 ± 0.05	1.16 ± 0.11	1.18 ± 0.07	
HR _{peak} (bpm)	186.60 ± 15.00	187.6 ± 13.71	173.93 ± 17.21	
Peak lactate (mmol/L)	13.70 ± 3.59	12.43 ± 3.56		
Aerobic power (W)	$30.50\pm5.98^{\dagger*}$	21.23 ± 7.86*	10.56 ± 3.21	
Peak stroke rate (strokes/min)	$69.60 \pm 10.59 \dagger *$	55.47 ± 7.99*	42.27 ± 9.02	
Average stroke length (m)	2.19 ± 0.28	2.24 ± 0.27	2.34 ± 0.48	
Distance covered (m)	$747.59 \pm 128.66^{\dagger}*$	$503.51 \pm 159.97 *$	368.90 ± 68.42	
Peak speed (m/s)	$2.18\pm0.16^{\dagger*}$	$1.93 \pm 0.24*$	$1.50\pm\ 0.15$	
Anaerobic Performance				
Anaerobic power (W)	35.67 ± 11.08†*	$25.04 \pm 11.69^*$	13.44 ± 7.05	
Relative anaerobic power (W/kg)	0.46±0.12†*	$0.32 \pm 0.13^*$	0.15 ± 0.06	
Peak speed (m/s)	$2.35 \pm 0.32^{+*}$	$1.99 \pm 0.40^{*}$	1.62 ± 0.31	
Distance covered (m)	$20.60\pm3.08\dagger^*$	$17.29 \pm 3.60^{*}$	14.07 ± 2.88	

244

245 Figure 1 shows the elite group had significantly smaller 100% squares than the sedentary group 246 in all but the EOML condition and significantly smaller than the recreational group in all but the 247 EO and EOML condition. There were no significant differences between the recreational and 248 sedentary groups with respect to the 100% square. Overall the EO condition displayed the best 249 postural control as indicated by the lowest velocity of sway and smallest 100% square of the 250 static tests for all groups. Under the dynamic conditions the EOAP demonstrated the lowest 251 velocity of sway for all groups and the EOAP had the smallest 100% square amongst the elite 252 and sedentary group while it was smallest in the EOML condition for the recreational group.





Figure 1: Balance results of participants. Results expressed as mean \pm SD. Where * = P<0.05; EO = eyes open, EC = eyes closed, AP = Anterior Posterior Instability, ML = Medial Lateral Instability.

Condition

EOAP

ECAP

EOML

ECML

257

Figure 2 shows that elite group had significantly lower velocity of sway compared to the 258 259 recreational group in all conditions, and significantly lower velocity than the sedentary group in 260 both dynamic tests with eyes closed (ECAP, ECML). There were no significant differences 261 between the recreational and sedentary groups with respect to velocity. The highest velocities 262 were recorded in the ECML condition for all groups and the greatest 100% square was in the 263 ECAP condition for the elite group and ECML for the recreational and sedentary group. There 264 was a significant increase (P<0.05) in velocity and 100% square for each condition when the 265 subject's eyes were closed as opposed to when they had visual feedback to rely on.

9000

8000

7000

6000

5000

4000

3000

2000

1000

0

ΕO

EC

Square (mm2)



ECAP

EOML

ECML



Figure 2: Balance results EO = eyes open, EC = eyes closed, AP = Anterior Posterior Instability, ML = Medial Lateral Instability. Results are expressed as mean \pm SD. * = Significant difference (*P*<0.05).

Condition

EOAP

270

271 Results for the isometric tests (Figure 3) show many significant differences between the three groups. The elite group had significantly (P < 0.05, $\eta^2 = 0.71$) longer hold times in the prone 272 bridge than both the recreational (+53.1%, +87.83sec, 95% CI [44.01,131.65]) and sedentary 273 274 group (+263.4%, +183.67sec, 95% CI [139.85, 227.49]). The recreational group also displayed 275 significantly (P < 0.05) longer hold times than the sedentary group (+137.5%, +95.83sec, 95% CI [52.01, 139.65]). The right sided bridge was significantly greater (P < 0.05, $\eta^2 = 0.59$) in the elite 276 277 group than the recreational (+58.3%, +39.73sec, 95% CI [16.97, 62.48]) and sedentary groups 278 (+212.2%, +73.36sec, 95%CI [50.60, 96.12]). The recreational group showed a significantly 279 longer right sided bridge than the sedentary group (+97.3%, +33.63sec, 95% CI [10.88, 56.39]). The left side bridge was significantly (P < 0.05, $\eta^2 = 0.61$) greater in the elite than the recreational 280 (+46.4%,+31.62sec, 95% CI [11.20, 52.03]) and the sedentary (+207.2%, +67.28sec, 95% CI 281 282 [46.87, 87.70]) while the recreational was significantly (P < 0.05) greater than the sedentary 283 (+109.8%, +35.67sec, 95% CI [15.26,56.08]).

Velocity of Sway (mm/s)

0

ΕO

EC

The elite group demonstrated a non-significant difference in the Biering Sorensen test with the recreational group (+17.0%) however a significantly higher (P < 0.05, $\eta^2 = 0.45$) result in this test when compared to the sedentary group (+109.3%, +77.68sec, 95% CI [44.45, 110.91]). The difference between the recreational group and the sedentary group was also significant (P < 0.05), +78.9%, +56.08sec, 95% CI [22.85, 89.31]). There were no significant differences between either group (recreational and sedentary) with regards to right and left bridging.





Figure 3: Results of isometric endurance tests. * = significant difference (P < 0.05).

294

292

295 Discussion

296 This was the first study to examine the physiological and musculoskeletal profiles of elite and

recreational SUP participants as compared to a sedentary population. The lean body composition

- finding is similar to Ackland's study on the morphological characteristics of the canoe and kayak
- athletes attending the 2000 Olympic Games in Sydney (Ackland, Ong, Kerr, & Ridge, 2003).
- 300 The elite SUP participants also displayed lower cholesterol, LDL and higher HDL when
- 301 compared to the recreational and sedentary groups. The elite SUP group demonstrated lipid

302 profiles within the recommended guidelines set by the Australian Heart Foundation; total

303 cholesterol < 5.5mmol/L, HDL > 1.0mmol/L, LDL < 2.0mol/L and triglycerides < 1.5mmol/L

304 (Tonkin et al., 2005). The low BMI, high HDL and low LDL and body fat percentage of the elite

305 groups are possibly associated with the training effect of SUP, beckoning further investigation of

- the actual health benefits of SUP on cardiovascular risk.
- 307

308 The elite participants profiled in this study displayed comparable levels of maximal aerobic

309 power as seen in other water sports which are upper limb dominant. Previous research has

reported surfer's maximal aerobic fitness ranging from 37.8ml/kg/min to 54.2ml/kg/min

311 (Loveless & Minahan, 2010a; Meir, Lowdon, & Davie, 1991), canoeists from 44.2ml/kg/min to

312 51.9ml/kg/min (Bunc & Heller, 1991; Hahn, Pang, Tumilty, & Telford, 1988) and dragon boat

racers from 42.3ml/kg/min to 50.2ml/kg/min. It should be noted this group included males and

females. If adjusted for only the males group the average of 46.84ml/kg/min is comparable to the

315 numbers reported previously.

316

317 Caution should be used when comparing an upper limb dominant sport with full body water 318 based sports such as rowing and swimming due to the larger muscle mass utilised. It has 319 previously been reported that decreases of 39.36% in VO₂ max when being tested on a treadmill 320 versus being tested on a swim bench (Lowdon, Bedi, & Horvath, 1989). If a factor of this 321 decrease is added to the figures reported, measures of 65.28ml/kg/min are achieved, which is 322 comparable to other elite athletes of full body water based sports such as rowing 323 (62.88ml/kg/min) (Jurimae, Meaetsu, & Jurimae, 2000) and swimming with 58.4ml/kg/min 324 (Roels et al., 2005). Also, to our knowledge, no studies have compared the power output of these 325 various upper limb dominant sports.

327 The necessity to use caution when comparing aerobic power amongst SUP to other sports is 328 indicated by the results from the sedentary group. In this study, average aerobic power outputs of 329 21.85 ml/kg/min from the sedentary males and 17.37 ml/kg/min from the females are much 330 lower than previously reported references. Age stratified measures of 35.6, s = 7.7 ml/kg/min 331 have been reported from sedentary males and 27.2, s = 5.0 ml/kg/min from sedentary females 332 when utilising cycle ergometers to assess maximal aerobic power (Herdy & Uhlendorf, 2011). 333 334 There was a difference in aerobic power outputs reported previously utilising ergometers such as 335 swim bench and rowing ergometers to these SUP results (Farley, Harris, & Kilding, 2012; 336 Loveless & Minahan, 2010a). Aerobic power outputs amongst surfers using a swim bench have 337 reached 199W (Loveless & Minahan, 2010a) and 118W to 158W using modified kayak 338 ergometers (Farley, et al., 2012; Mendez-Villaneuva & Bishop, 2005). Other water sports have 339 also exhibited large aerobic power outputs including 239W from kayakers (Billat, 1996) 371W 340 from rowers (Jurimae, et al., 2000) and 195W from dragon boat racers (Ho, Smith, Chapman, 341 Sinclair, & Funato, 2012). It is assumed that due to the extensive amount of muscle mass used 342 for stabilization, a small percentage of muscle force may actually contribute toward propulsion 343 of the SUP across the water. 344 345 Although there was a greater average stroke length of the sedentary group when compared to the 346 recreational (+4.46%) and the elite group (+6.85%) in the aerobic test, this does not necessarily 347 reflect a better stroke. It can be seen that the stroke rate achieved by the elite group is

significantly higher than the recreational group (+25.5%) and sedentary group (+64.7%) and a

- 349 shorter more powerful stroke is more beneficial to overall performance as indicated by a much
- 350 greater power output amongst the elites than the recreational group (+43.7%) and the sedentary
- group (+188.8%). This higher stroke rate with a shorter stroke distance is related to greater

power output, and therefore an increased speed across the water. The inversely proportional
relationship found between stroke length and rate is also found in swimming, rowing and
outrigging and both of these variables are found to be directly proportional to performance
(Sealey, Ness, & Leicht, 2011).

356

357 The anaerobic power outputs measured in this study are below those recorded in other water 358 based activities including surfing (205W - 348W, (Loveless & Minahan, 2010b)), swimming 359 (304W, (Hawley & Williams, 1991)), surf lifesaving (326W (Morton & Gaston, 1997)) and 360 kayaking (223W, (Fry & Morton, 1991)). The low numbers could be due to the high amount of 361 muscle activity being used for stabilization on a dynamic surface and consequently minimal 362 muscle activity being used for the overall propulsion. Given our findings, particularly the high 363 levels of maximal aerobic and anaerobic capacity amongst its participants, SUP may be useful 364 for cross-training or athletes wishing to avoid impact after minor injury whilst still developing or 365 maintaining aerobic and anaerobic fitness.

366

367 The potential health benefits of SUP should also be considered. Both elite groups and 368 recreational groups had good to very high maximal oxygen consumptions and favourable lipid profiles. For example, over 83% of SUP participants (elite and recreational combined) had total 369 370 cholesterol levels at target (<5.5mmol/L) and 93% had HDL levels at target (>1.0mmol/L). 371 However participant's diet and activity levels were not assessed and these parameters would 372 have significant influence on lipid profiles. These lipid profiles combined with favourable BMI 373 and elevated aerobic fitness would afford SUP participants with reduced cardiovascular risk, 374 thereby also providing improved health associated with participation.

The elite group displaying a greatest 100% square in the ECAP condition is most likely due to the lack of exposure to the AP direction and the familiarity ML instability encountered when standing on a SUP. Due to the length of a board, the greatest postural challenge is in the medial lateral direction, possibly explaining why the sedentary and recreational group had the greatest 100% square in the medial – lateral condition. Due to exposure to this condition, their postural control may be increased in this direction amongst the elite.

382

383 It can be seen in this study that expertise decreases both the velocity of sway and area indicated 384 by the 100% square during postural challenges amongst SUP athletes. This increased dynamic 385 postural control could be due to specific adaptation due to the sport or alternatively, as Chapman 386 discussed, possible due to a gravitation toward, and subsequent success in balance related 387 activities from those who have a genetic predisposition toward superior postural control 388 (Chapman, Needham, Allison, Lay, & Edwards, 2008). It could also be that this way of 389 measuring dynamic balance is not specific for this sport and therefore not a true reflection of the 390 postural control of SUP participants.

391

392 It is proposed that instability training stresses the neuromuscular system more than traditional 393 training (Anderson & Behm, 2005) and instability training has been shown to increase knee 394 flexor and extensor strength and also diminish muscle imbalances between dominant and non-395 dominant sides (Heitkamp, Horstmann, Mayer, Weller, & Dickhuth, 2001). Kidgell 396 demonstrated that six weeks of training on a mini-tramp was as effective as a dura disc for 397 people who have sustained lateral ankle sprains (Kidgell, Horvath, Jackson, & Seymour, 2007). 398 Whether SUP would have a similar effect on muscle strength, balance and rehabilitation due to it 399 having a similar unstable surface, is currently unclear. 400

401	Past studies regarding endurance of the trunk musculature have been centred on back pain with
402	researchers claiming that inadequate trunk endurance is a risk factor in the development and
403	chronicity of low back pain (Arab, Salavati, Ebrahimi, & Ebrahim Mousavi, 2007; Biering-
404	Sorensen, 1984; O'Sullivan, Mitchell, Bulich, Waller, & Holte, 2006). The prone bridge has
405	been used to assess trunk flexor endurance previously, and decreased endurance times as low as
406	28.3, $s = 26.8$ seconds have been found amongst symptomatic back pain sufferers (Schellenberg,
407	Lang, Chan, & Burnham, 2007). Ranges of between 92 and 124 seconds have been reported
408	from fit, healthy firefighters,(McGill, et al., 2010) well below the numbers reported amongst
409	these SUP athletes. The endurance hold times of the lateral abdominal wall measured with the
410	side bridges amongst SUP athletes were similar to an athletic population of 87.5, $s = 36.4$
411	seconds on the right and 92, $s = 45.8$ seconds on the left (Evans, et al., 2007).

412

413 The extensor endurance amongst the both SUP groups were similiar to previously published 414 papers including McGill's study which showed an average men's endurance time of 146s, 415 women's 189s amongst young, healthy individuals (McGill, Childs, & Leiebenson, 1999), 416 higher than Adedoyin's of 119, s = 47s for men and 106, s = 44s for women (Adedoyin, Mbada, 417 Farotimi, Johnson, & Emechete, 2011), and much higher than Alaranta, who demonstrated 97s 418 men and 87s women (Alaranta, 1994). Results obtained in this study are also greater than a 419 group of athletes who had back pain with an average hold times of 107.5s (Stewart, Latimer, & 420 Jamieson, 2003).

421

It has been demonstrated previously that the endurance of the core muscles can be improved
with core training (Aggarwal, Kumar, & Kumar, 2010). Significant improvements in hold times
of all the above tests were made with six weeks of core training including multidirectional
movements and instability with the use of a swiss ball. As the core muscles seem to be activated

426 by SUP and these athletes demonstrate adequate endurance hold times, perhaps SUP could be
427 used to increase endurance of the core muscles and therefore be used as a prophylactic treatment
428 for back pain.

430	The minimal difference amongst the SUP participants in regards to left and right bridge times is
431	most probably due to the paddling motion being performed bilaterally, typically alternating on a
432	regular 10-14 stroke basis. Muscle imbalances are rife amongst competitive canoeists and
433	outriggers who paddle on the one side (Stambolieva, Diafas, Bachev, Christova, & Gatev, 2011)
434	and it is thought that muscle imbalance could be related to injury occurrence (Franettovich,
435	Hides, Mendis, & Littleworth, 2011). The slightly higher, difference right sided bridge score is
436	most likely due to the prevalence of right hand dominance.
437	
438	The aim of this investigation was to profile SUP in regards to physiological and musculoskeletal
439	parameters. In summary, there appears to be a high level of aerobic and anaerobic fitness,
440	dynamic postural control and a high level of trunk muscle endurance amongst those who
441	participate in SUP. It would appear as though greater levels of fitness, strength and balance are
442	associated with higher participation.
443	
444	
445	

References

448	Ackland, T. R., Ong, K. B., Kerr, D. A., & Ridge, B. (2003). Morphological characteristics of
449	Olympic spring canoe and kayak paddlers. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport
450	6(3), 285-294.
451	Adedoyin, R. A., Mbada, C. E., Farotimi, A. O., Johnson, O. E., & Emechete, A. I. (2011).
452	Endurance of low back musculature: Normative data for adults. Journal of back and
453	Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation, 24, 101-109.
454	Aggarwal, A., Kumar, S., & Kumar, D. (2010). Effect of Core Stabilization Training on the
455	Lower Back Endurance in Recreationally Active Individuals. Journal of Musculoskeletal
456	Research, 13(4), 167-176.
457	Alaranta, A. M., M. Elmqvist, L. G, Held, J. Pope, M. Renstrom, P. (1994). Postural Control of
458	Adults with Musculoskeletal Impairment. Critical Reviews in Physical and
459	Rehabilitation Medicine, 6, 337-370.
460	Anderson, K., & Behm, D. (2005). The impact of instability resistance training on balance and
461	stability Sports Medicine, 35(1), 43-53.
462	Arab, A. M., Salavati, M., Ebrahimi, I., & Ebrahim Mousavi, M. (2007). Sensitivity, specificity
463	and predictive value of the clinical trunk muscle endurance tests in low back pain.
464	Clinical Rehabilitation, 21, 640-647.
465	Behm, D., G., Leonard, A., M., Young, W., B., Bonsey, W., A, C., & Mackinnon, S., N. (2005).
466	Trunk muscle electromyographic activity with unstable and unilateral exercises. Journal
467	of Strength and Conditioning Research, 19, 106-119.
468	Biering-Sorensen, F. (1984). Physical measurements as risk indicators for low back trouble over
469	a one year period. Spine, 9, 106-119.
470	Billat, V., Faina, M., Sardella, F., Marini, C., Fanton, F., Lupo, S., Faccini, P., De Angelis, M.,
471	Koralsztein, J.P., Dalmonte, A. (1996). A comparison of time to exhaustion at VO2 max
472	in elite cyclists, kayak paddlers, swimmers and runners. Ergonomics, 39(2).
473	Bunc, V., & Heller, J. (1991). Ventilatory threshold and work efficiency on a bicycle and
474	paddling ergometer in top canoeists. Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness,
475	31(3), 376-379.
476	Chapman, D. W., Needham, K. J., Allison, G. T., Lay, B., & Edwards, D. J. (2008). Effects of
477	experience in a dynamic environment on postural control. British Journal of Sports
478	<i>Medicine</i> , 42(1), 16-21. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.2006.033688
479	Danneels, L. A., Vanderstraeten, G. G., & Cambier, D. C. (2001). Effects of three different
480	training modalities on the cross-sectional area of the lumbar multifidus muscle in
481	patients with chronic low back pain. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 35, 186-191.
482	Evans, K., Refshauge, K. M., & Adams, R. (2007). Trunk muscle endurance tests: reliability,
483	and gender differences in athletes. [Evaluation Studies]. Journal of Science and
484	Medicine in Sport / Sports Medicine Australia, 10(6), 447-455. doi:
485	10.1016/j.jsams.2006.09.003
486	Farley, O., Harris, N. K., & Kilding, A. E. (2012). Anaerobic and aerobic fitness profiling of
487	competitive surfers. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research / National Strength
488	& Conditioning Association, 20(8), 2243-2248. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0001363182383681
489	Franettovich, M., Hides, J., Mendis, M. D., & Littleworth, H. (2011). Muscle imbalance among
490	ente atnieles. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 45(4), 548-549. doi:
491	10.1130/0JSM.2011.084038.109
492 102	FIY, F. K., & IVIOLIOII, A. K. (1991). FHYSIOLOGICAL AND KINARINFOPOMETRIC AUFIDURES OF EIRE flatwater keyekiets. Madioing and Science in Sports and Evension, 22(11), 1207–1201
493 101	Halwaler Kayakisis. Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, 25(11), 129/-1301.
434 105	nower of elite marathon kayakers and canonists EVCEL 5(2) 14-10
490	Hammer S (2011) Catch the wave of stand up neddling. The Dravidence Journal Sep 5, 2
450	manniner, 5. (2011). Caten the wave of stand up padding. The Providence Journal, Sep 3, 5.

497	Hawley, J. A., & Williams, M. M. (1991). Relationship between upper body anaerobic power
498	and freestyle swimming performance. International Journal of Sports Medicine, 12(1),
499	1-5.
500	Heitkamp, H. C., Horstmann, T., Mayer, F., Weller, J., & Dickhuth, H. H. (2001). Gain in
501	strength and muscular balance after balance training. International Journal of Sports
502	Medicine, 22(4), 285-290. doi: 10.1055/s-2001-13819
503	Herdy, A. H., & Uhlendorf, D. (2011). Reference Values for Cardiopulmonary Exercise Testing
504	for Sedentary and Active Men and Women. Arquivos Brasileiros de Cardiologia, 96(1),
505	54-59.
506	Ho, S. R., Smith, R. M., Chapman, P. G., Sinclair, P. J., & Funato, K. (2012). Physiological and
507	Physical characteristics of elite dragon boat paddlers. Journal of Strength and
508	Conditioning Research, Publish Ahead of Print.
509	Jurimae, J., Meaetsu, J., & Jurimae, T. (2000). Prediction of rowing performance on single
510	sculls from metabolic and antropometric variables. Journal of Human Movement
511	<i>Studies</i> , 38, 123-136.
512	Kidgell, D., J, Horvath, D., M, Jackson, B., M, & Seymour, P., J. (2007). Effect of six weeks of
513	dura disc and mini trampoline balance training on postural sway in athletes with
514	functional ankle instability. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 21(2), 466-
515	469.
516	Loveless, D., & Minahan, C. (2010a). Peak aerobic power and paddling efficiency in
517	recreational and competitive junior male surfers. European Journal of Sports Science,
518	10(6), 407-415. doi: 10.1080/17461391003770483
519	Loveless, D., & Minahan, C. (2010b). Two reliable protocols for assessing maximal-paddling
520	performance in surfboard riders. Journal of Sports Science, 28(7), 797-803. doi:
521	10.1080/02640411003770220
522	Lowdon, B. J., Bedi, J. F., & Horvath, S. M. (1989). Specificity of aerobic fitness testing of
523	surfers. Australian Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 21, 7-10.
524	Lukaski, H. C., Bolonchuk, W. W., Hall, C. B., & Siders, W. A. (1986). Validation of tetrapolar
525	bioelectrical impedance method to assess human body composition. Journal of Applied
526	<i>Physiology</i> , <i>60</i> (4), 1327-1332.
527	McGill, S., M., Belore, M., Crosby, I., & Russell, C. (2010). Clinical tools to quantify torso
528	flexion endurance: Normative data from student and firefighter populations.
529	Occupational Ergonomics, 9, 55-61. doi: 10.3233/oer-2010-0181
530	McGill, S., M., Childs, A., & Leiebenson, C. (1999). Endurance times for stabilisation exercises:
531	Clincal targets for testing and training from a normal database. Archive of Physical
532	Medicine and Rehabilitation(80), 941-944.
533	McGill, S., M., Grenier, S., Kavcic, N., & Cholewicki, J. (2003). Coordination of muscle
534	activity to assure stability of the lumbar spine. Journal of Electromyography and
535	Kinesiology, 13(4), 353-359. doi: 10.1016/s1050-6411(03)00043-9
536	Meir, R., Lowdon, B. J., & Davie, A., J. (1991). Heart rates and estimated energy expenditure
537	during recreational surfing. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport 23, 70-74.
538	Mendez-Villaneuva, A., & Bishop, D. (2005). Physiological Aspects of Surfboard Riding
539	Performance. Journal of Sports Medicine, 35(1), 55-70.
540	Molokai2Oahu. Retrieved 9th December, 2012 from www.molokai2oahu.com
541	Morton, D. P., & Gaston, P. B. (1997). Effect of high intensity board training on upper body
542	anaerobic capacity and short-lasting exercise performance. Australian Journal of
543	Science and Medicine in Sport, 29, 17-21.
544	O'Sullivan, P. B., Mitchell, T., Bulich, P., Waller, R., & Holte, J. (2006). The relationship
545	beween posture and back muscle endurance in industrial workers with flexion-related
546	low back pain. Manual Therapy, 11(4), 264-271. doi: 10.1016/j.math.2005.04.004

547 548	Palliard, T., Margnes, E., Portet, M., & Breucq, A. (2011). Postural ability reflects the athletic skill level of surfers. <i>European Journal of Applied Physiology</i> 111(8) 1619-1623 doi:
540	10 1007/s00/21 010 1782 2
545	Poels P. Schmitt I. Libioz S. Pontlay D. Pichalet I. P. & Millet G. (2005). Specificity of
550	VO2 may and the ventilatory threshold in free swimming and evale argometry.
221	vO2 max and the ventilatory threshold in nee swimming and cycle eigometry.
552	comparison between triathletes and swimmers. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 39,
553	905-908.
554	Schellenberg, K. L., Lang, J. M., Chan, K. M., & Burnham, R. S. (2007). A clinical tool for
555	office assessment of lumbar spine stabilization endurance: prone and supine bridge
556	maneuvers. American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 86(5), 380-386.
557	Sealey, R. M., Ness, K. F., & Leicht, A. S. (2011). Effect of self-selected and induced slow and
558	fast paddling on stroke kinematics during 1000m outrigger canoeing ergometry. Journal
559	of Sports Science and Medicine 10, 52-58.
560	Stambolieva, K., Diafas, V., Bachev, V., Christova, L., & Gatev, P. (2011). Postural stability of
561	canoeing and kayaking young male athletes during quiet stance. European Journal of
562	Applied Physiology. doi: 10.1007/s00421-011-2151-5
563	Stewart, M., Latimer, J., & Jamieson, M. (2003). Back Extensor Endurance Test Scores in Coal
564	Miners in Australia. Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 13(2), 79-89.
565	Tonkin, A., Cooper, C., Robinson, M., Clune, E., Barter, P., Best, J., New, Z. (2005).
566	National Heart Foundation of Australia and the Cardiac Society of Australia and New
567	Zealand: position statement on lipid management2005. Heart, Lung & Circulation,
568	14(4), 275-291.
569	Vera-Garcia, F., J., Grenier, S., G., & McGill, S., M. (2000). Abdominal muscle response during
570	curl ups on both stable and labile surfaces. <i>Physical Therapy</i> , 80, 564-569.
571	Walker, C., Nichols, A., & Forman, T. (2010). A Survey of Injuries and Medical Conditions
572	Affecting Stand-Up Paddle Surfboarding Participants. Clinical Journal of Sports
573	Medicine, 20(2), 144.
574	
575	
576	
577	
578	
570	
579	
E 9 0	
580	
581	
582	
583	
584	

-	0	-
5	×	5
-	J	-