This manuscript has been PEER REVIEWED and ACCEPTED for publication in THE JOURNAL OF SPORT AND EXERCISE SCIENCE (ISSN 2703-240X) - https://sesnz.org.nz/journal/

# Title: Physiological and Subjective Responses to a Novel Military Specific Load Carriage Treadmill Protocol

Vine Christopher AJ<sup>1</sup>, Coakley Sarah L<sup>1,2</sup>, Blacker Sam D<sup>1</sup>, Runswick Oliver R<sup>1,3</sup>, Myers Stephen D<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Occupational Performance Research Group, Institute of Sport, Nursing and Allied Health, University of Chichester, Chichester, UK, <sup>2</sup> Faculty of Sport, Allied Health and Performance Science, St Mary's University, London, UK, <sup>3</sup> Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, Kings College London, London, UK.

☑Address for correspondence:
Prof. Stephen Myers,
Institute of Sport, Nursing and Allied Health, University of Chichester,
Chichester,
PO19 6PE,
England.
Tel: +44 (0) 1243 816232, Email: <u>S.Myers@chi.ac.uk</u>

#### **Declarations:**

Funding. The authors declare no funding was received for this research.

**Conflicts of interest/Competing interests.** The authors declare there to be no conflicts of interest/competing interests.

**Ethics approval.** Ethical approval was granted by the University of Chichester's Research Ethics Committee (protocol number 1819\_45) and data collection was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. **Consent to participate.** Participants' provided full written consent, having received both a written and verbal brief.

Consent for publication. As part of the consent process, participants provided consent for publication.

Availability of data and material. The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Code availability. Not applicable.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Miss Julianne Doherty and Miss Faye Walker for their support with data collection, along with the participants for volunteering to take part in the current study.

# ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** Treadmill-based load carriage protocols typically use a single fixed speed; however, these are not representative of occupational load carriage tasks. This study aimed to quantify the metabolic, cardiovascular, thermal, neuromuscular, and perceptual responses to a treadmill-based, military-specific, fast load carriage protocol (FLCP). This protocol comprised of carrying 25 kg, for 20 minutes at 5.1 km·h<sup>-1</sup>; 40 minutes, at 6.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup>; and 8 x 9 s shuttles, at 11 km·h<sup>-1</sup> with 11 s recovery.

**Methods:** Twelve men (age,  $27 \pm 6$  y; stature,  $1.83 \pm 0.05$  m; body mass,  $80.6 \pm 8.0$  kg; maximal oxygen uptake,  $52.7 \pm 5.5$  mL·kg<sup>-1</sup>·min<sup>-1</sup>), completed a FLCP during which oxygen consumption (VO<sub>2</sub>), heart rate, core body temperature, and perceptual ratings were recorded. Performance assessments (weighted counter-movement jump [wCMJ], maximal isometric voluntary contraction [MIVC] of the quadriceps, seated medicine ball throw [SMBT]) were completed pre-FLCP, immediately-post and, 30, 60, 120 minutes' post.

**Results:**  $\dot{VO}_2$  was similar for 5.1 km·h<sup>-1</sup>, but increased by 7.4% during the 40 minutes at 6.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup> (p = 0.013). Core temperature increased by 0.92 ± 0.22 °C in response to the FLCP. Post-FLCP, SMBT was not dissimilar across measurement points, (p = 0.315), however, MIVC peak force reduced by 12.6 ± 10.9% 60 minutes post-FLCP (p = 0.031), and wCMJ height decreased by 8.7 ± 5.9% 120 minutes post-FLCP (p = 0.011).

**Conclusion:** The completion of the FLCP does not affect upper body power (SMBT), but appears to modestly decrease lower body explosiveness (wCMJ and MIVC) up to two hours post. Future investigations can use the FLCP protocol to investigate occupationally relevant scenarios, such as the interaction between physical and cognitive performance during load carriage, or the implications of multiple repeated load carriage bouts.

Keywords: Occupational, March, Soldier, Performance, Metabolic, Neuromuscular

#### INTRODUCTION

Load carriage is a strategically important facet of military training and operations; which can often be mission-critical (Knapik et al. 2004). Specifically, load carriage refers to the action of moving from one location to another, by way of walking or running, whilst carrying an external load of mission-specific equipment. As a consequence of its criticality, factors influencing load carriage performance have generally been well researched (see review by Knapik et al., 2012). In particular, the influence of external load mass has received considerable attention; with studies detailing an upward trend over time in loads carried during military operations (Knapik et al. 2004, 2012; Orr 2010). However, scenarios exist, where the combination of faster load carriage speeds (> 4.8  $km \cdot h^{-1}$ ) and lighter load masses (< 30 kg), to facilitate these movement speeds, are undertaken; termed herein a 'fast march'. For example, soldiers will be required to move at speed with lighter loads as when coming under fire or whilst assaulting an enemy position. This necessity to complete load carriage tasks at different speeds and with different loads is reflected in the new British Army annual fitness tests (British Army, 2020). Despite its relevance to military populations, the implications of this alternative speed-load combination have received considerably little attention. Notably, those studies investigating this combination have typically utilised purely rucksack borne loads at fixed speeds (e.g. Blacker et al. 2009, 2010), which does not reflect the external load distribution of soldiers during these aforementioned scenarios. Instead, the lighter load mass carried during a fast march would typically consists of a belt webbing system, body armour, a personal weapon, and in some instances a small rucksack; totalling ~25 kg. This ensemble is carried in situations where enemy contact is anticipated (Knapik et al. 2004), and represents a typical minimum load carried by dismounted infantry soldiers whilst patrolling. It is important to assess this load distribution given the known metabolic cost implications of different load mass carrying locations (e.g. Soule and Goldman 1969; Browning et al. 2007; Taylor et al. 2012).

Military load carriage and other arduous military tasks are rarely completed in isolation. As such, it is important to consider the impact of load carriage on subsequent military and physical performance (van Dijk 2007; Knapik et al. 2012). For example, following a fast march, soldiers may be likely to undertake a fire and manoeuvre task in response to enemy contact. In turn, this may be followed by other tasks such as a casualty evacuation, replenishment of stores or even subsequent assaults on enemy positions. However, due to factors such as high task complexity, the multitude of sequential task permutations, and the difficulty in accurately replicating military scenarios, investigating subsequent military task performance can be problematic. As a result, field-expedient tests are frequently used to assess changes in key physical competencies (Hauschild et al. 2017). These physical performance assessments can therefore act as an indicator of task-induced fatigue as well as indicators of role-specific physical readiness. Broadly, these physical assessments can be categorised into those assessing cardiorespiratory endurance (e.g. multi-stage fitness test), muscular strength (e.g. back squat), muscular endurance (e.g. repeated shuttles), and flexibility (e.g. sit-and-reach) (Hauschild et al. 2017). Of these assessment domains, cardiorespiratory endurance, lower body strength and upper body muscular endurance are among the most effective predictors of occupational performance (Knapik et al. 2006; Hauschild et al. 2017). These assessments, therefore, provide a time and space-efficient method for quantifying soldier physical readiness.

A number of studies have utilised physical performance assessments as indicators of fatigue following load carriage tasks. For example, Fallowfield et al., (2012) demonstrated a reduction in vertical jump height ( $8 \pm 9\%$ ) following a 19.3 km march at 4.3 km·h<sup>-1</sup> (including breaks), carrying 31 kg. Conversely, Knapik et al., (1991)

reported no decrement in soldiers vertical jump height following a 20 km march (mean completion speed 3.82 km·h<sup>-1</sup>), carrying 46 kg; however, grenade throw distance decreased by 9%. It was noted that this latter observation was likely due to nerve entrapment or pain in the shoulder region caused by the strenuous march (Knapik et al. 1991). Critically, these studies investigated load carriage tasks conducted at relatively modest paces (<4.8 km·h<sup>-1</sup>), using moderate to heavy loads (>30 kg), carried predominantly in a rucksack. As such, the implications of a fast march with load distributed on the torso and waist on indicators of soldier physical readiness are not well known.

The current study designed and employed a novel treadmill protocol to replicate the physical demands of a military specific fast march, and fire and manoeuvre task. Physical performance assessments were included to evaluate the effect of load carriage on subsequent indicators of soldier physical readiness in the 2 hours' post-task. Therefore, this study aimed to; 1) quantify the metabolic, cardiovascular, thermal, neuromuscular, and perceptual responses to a treadmill-based, military-specific, fast load carriage protocol (FLCP); and 2) identify the effects of the FLCP on subsequent indicators of soldier physical readiness.

### METHODS

#### Experimental Overview

Participants completed a familiarisation session followed by an experimental session, separated by a minimum of five days. For the familiarisation session participants had baseline measures of body composition recorded, after which they completed an unloaded treadmill walking assessment, followed by a maximal rate of oxygen consumption ( $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ ) test. Participants were also familiarised with the physical performance assessments (4 kg seated medicine ball throw [SMBT], weighted countermovement jump [wCMJ], quadriceps maximal isometric voluntary contraction [MIVC]), and an abridged version of the FLCP. For the experimental session, participants completed these performance assessments before completing the FLCP, immediately afterwards and at 30, 60, and 120 minutes' post. During the FLCP, oxygen consumption ( $\dot{V}O_2$ ), heart rate (HR), core temperature, and perceptual ratings were recorded. All testing was conducted in an air-conditioned laboratory.

# Fast Load Carriage Protocol Design

This occupationally relevant load carriage task was developed from prior literature and current military load carriage assessments. The FLCP (Figure 1), consisted of walking at 5.1 km·h<sup>-1</sup> and 6.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup> for 20 and 40 minutes respectively (1% gradient). At 60 minutes, participants walked for one minute at 2.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup> (1% gradient) before completing eight, nine-second shuttles at 11 km·h<sup>-1</sup> and 3% gradient. Shuttles were interspersed by an 11 second recovery period at 2.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup> and 3% gradient. The first part of the FLCP mimicked the load carriage speeds typical of fast marches undertaken by the British Army, and are speeds and distances that have been utilised effectively in both prior load carriage literature (Blacker et al. 2010, 2013a; Vine et al. 2020), and the new British Army physical employment standards (British Army 2020). The subsequent shuttle speed, distance, and work-to-rest ratio are in line with offence or defensive fire and manoeuvre based tasks, undertaken by militaries worldwide (Treloar and Billing 2011; Silk and Billing 2013; Myers et al. 2016), and again are in line with the new British Army physical employment standards (British Army 2020).



**Figure 1.** The fast load carriage protocol; detailing the changes in treadmill speed (solid black line) and gradient (dashed grey line and light grey fill)

Note number of shuttles are for diagrammatic clarity, as per the manuscript there are a total of eight, the time duration of the shuttle period is however correct. Vertical dashed lines denote cumulative distance covered.

# **Participants**

Twelve recreationally active men, with no military experience volunteered to participate (age,  $27 \pm 6$  y; stature,  $1.83 \pm 0.05$  m; body mass  $80.6 \pm 8.0$  kg; body fat percentage,  $13.3 \pm 2.8\%$ ;  $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ ,  $52.7 \pm 5.5$  mL·kg<sup>-1</sup>·min<sup>-1</sup>). Ethical approval was granted by the Institutional Research Ethics Committee and data collection was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Participants' provided full written consent, having received both a written and verbal brief.

For both sessions, participants were instructed to attend the laboratory in a hydrated state, having avoided caffeine and strenuous exercise for a minimum of three hours and 24 hours preceding respectively. In addition, participants were instructed to maintain a habitual diet in the lead up to, and between sessions, along with abstaining from nutritional supplements for the entirety of the data collection period, and two weeks preceding. For both sessions, participants wore a sports t-shirt, shorts, and training shoes.

# Familiarisation Session

Upon arrival at the laboratory, participants provided a urine sample to determine hydration status (urine specific gravity [ATAGO Uricon-Ne 2722, Fisher Scientific, UK]) (Sawka et al. 2007). Stature and body mass (837 digital scales & 213 portable stadiometer, Seca, Seca Ltd, UK) were then recorded to the nearest 0.01 m and

0.01 kg respectively, prior to body composition being assessed using the bioelectrical impedance method (Tanita BC – 418MA, Tanita EU, Netherlands). Participants then rested for 10 minutes before undertaking two six-minute periods of unloaded walking on a motorised treadmill (HP Cosmos Saturn, HP Cosmos, Germany) at 5.1 and 6.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup> with gradient fixed at 1% (replicating speeds and gradient of the full FLCP, described subsequently). In the final two minutes of each six-minute period  $\dot{V}O_2$  was assessed using the Douglas bag technique; allowing the calculation of load carriage economy utilising the external load index (described subsequently).

Upon completion of the unloaded walking periods, participants were familiarised with the three performance assessments (SMBT, wCMJ, MIVC). These were selected due to either their known correlations to military performance (Pihlainen et al. 2018; Spiering et al. 2019) or demonstrated sensitivity to load carriage tasks (Knapik et al. 1991; Blacker et al. 2010, 2013a; Fallowfield et al. 2012). For all performance assessments, three maximal attempts were conducted at each assessment interval, with peak performance reported.

*Seated Medicine Ball Throw.* Performance was assessed by measuring the maximum distance (to the nearest 0.01 m) an individual could throw a 4 kg medicine ball, using a chest pass technique. Participants conducted the SMBT whilst in a seated position, on the floor, with legs extended out in front of them and back upright against a wall (Cronin and Owen 2004).

*Weighted Counter Movement Jump.* Force data were collected using two force plates with a sampling rate of 1000 Hz, calibrated prior to use, in accordance with the manufacturer's guidelines (Pasport Force Platform, PASCO, USA). During the wCMJ, participants wore military webbing and a weighted vest (20 kg). To negate the influence of the upper body, participants were instructed to place their arms across their chest and maintain this position throughout the jump (Lake and McMahon 2018). Prior to jumping, a three-second quiet standing period was enforced, before the command "jump", where participants were instructed to jump as high and as fast as possible (Lake and McMahon 2018).

*Quadricep Maximal Isometric Voluntary Contraction.* Force data were collected using an adjustable custom-built chair (University of Chichester, Chichester, UK) and an s-beam load cell (RS 250kg, Tedea Huntleigh, Cardiff, UK). Data were recorded at 1000 Hz, using a PowerLab data acquisition device (AD Instruments, Oxford, UK), and a computer running Chart 4 software (V4.1.2, AD Instruments, Oxford, UK). Using the adjustable backrest, participants were positioned so that hip and knee angles were at 90° of flexion, whilst their right leg was attached to the base of the chair via the load cell and ankle cuff (Blacker et al. 2010). Chest and waist Velcro straps were used to restrict participant's upper body movement. Before the maximal contraction, participants were instructed to 'take up the slack' and remain still (three seconds), before the command "go", at which time participants were instructed to contract as hard and fast as possible.

*Maximal Aerobic Capacity Assessment.* Following familiarisation to the physical performance assessment, participants completed a  $\dot{VO}_{2max}$  assessment (Part 1) and subsequent verification (Part 2) (Draper et al. 2006; Midgley et al. 2009). For Part 1 participants commenced running at 9 km·h<sup>-1</sup>, with a gradient increase of 1 %·min<sup>-1</sup> until minute five, thereafter speed only was increased by 0.4 km·h<sup>-1</sup> every 20 s (1.2 km·h<sup>-1</sup>·min<sup>-1</sup>), until they reached volitional exhaustion. Participants were given verbal encouragement throughout. On completion, they rested for five minutes, before commencing Part 2. Here, participants initially ran for three minutes at 9 km·h<sup>-1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>, 5% gradient, after which the speed increased to 1 km $\cdot$ h<sup>-1</sup> above their peak treadmill speed from Part 1. Again, participants were instructed to run to volitional exhaustion.

Heart rate was recorded continuously throughout the assessment using short-range telemetry (RS800, Polar Electro, Finland), with HR averaged across 5 s epochs. Expired gas samples were collected via a mouthpiece, Salford type valve, and low resistance tubing into 150 L Douglas bags (Cranlea Human Performance Limited, Birmingham UK). Collections of ~60 seconds were taken with a minimum final sample of 75 L. Gas fractions were quantified using an offline gas analyser (Servomex 5200, Servomex, Crowborough, UK), volumes using a dry gas meter (Harvard Apparatus, Holliston, USA), and temperature measured using a digital thermometer (Fisher Scientific, Loughborough, UK). The gas analyser was calibrated using a two-point calibration, following the manufacturer's instructions.

After the participant was sufficiently rested, they were familiarised with an abridged version of the FLCP. comprising two, eight-minute bouts of walking at 5.1 and 6.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup> (1% gradient), followed by three, nine-second shuttles at 11 km·h<sup>-1</sup> (shuttles were separated by 11 seconds at 2.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup>). Throughout this protocol, participants wore a military-specific load mass ensemble  $(25.0 \pm 0.3 \text{ kg})$  consisting of a belt webbing system (10 kg), a weighted vest mimicking body armour (10 kg), and a replica assault rifle with sling (5 kg). Participants were instructed to carry the replica rifle in the 'ready position' with the weapon slung across their chest and supported by both hands.

#### Experimental Session.

Participants arrived at the laboratory, between 07:30-08:00, in a euhydrated and fed state. A standardised breakfast was provided (carbohydrate - 34 g; fat - 5.8 g; protein - 9.6, 0.95 MJ) 1.5 hours before the start of the trial with participants having fasted for the preceding 11 hours. Hydration status was assessed in the manner previously described.

Before commencing the baseline performance assessments, participants completed a standardised cycle ergometer (Wattbike, Nottingham, UK) warm-up comprising of five minutes at ~100 W at a rating of perceived exertion (RPE) (Borg 1970) ~10 (Lake et al. 2014). This warm-up was then repeated prior to all post-performance assessments, apart from immediately post-FLCP. Participants completed the three performance assessments to best effort, to obtain baseline performance data. Subsequently, nude and clothed (base layer minus shoes) body masses were collected. Participants then inserted a rectal thermistor (Grant Instruments, Cambridge, UK), for the measurement of core body temperature, fitted their HR monitor and donned the load ensemble. Participants then commenced the FLCP (Figure 1).

During the FLCP, participants RPE, load discomfort (Comfort Affective Labelled Magnitude, CALM) (Cardello et al. 2003), thermal comfort (Bedford 1936), and thermal sensation (ASHRAE Standard 1992) were collected at five-minute intervals (Table 1). A 90 second expired gas collection was taken at the end of the first 5 minutes, and then every 10 minutes subsequently, to assess  $\dot{V}O_2$ . Environmental conditions (QT-34 WBGT Monitor, 3M, Oconomowoc, USA), HR, and core temperature were recorded continuously (Squirrel 1000 series, Eltek, Cambridge, UK). To ensure euhydration, 150 mL of water was provided to participants every 15 minutes (Sawka et al. 2007). All measures taken throughout the protocol are detailed in Table 1.

	Time (minutes)													
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65 <sup>*</sup>
Speed $(km \cdot h^{-1})$	0	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	FM
Gradient (%)	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
Perceptual Scales	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
ΫO <sub>2</sub>		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		
HR	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
Environmental	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
Water Provision				$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$			~			$\checkmark$	

Table 1. Overview of Experimental Measures and their Timings during the Fast Load Carriage Protocol.

Where FM, Fire and Manoeuvre Speeds – see methodology for detailed description of the treadmill speed in this section of the protocol. \*note this block is not 5 minutes in duration – see methodology for detailed description of duration of this section of the protocol.

After completion of the treadmill protocol, clothed, and nude body mass were measured to determine sweat loss, euhydration was deemed to have been maintained if <1% reduction in nude body mass had occurred (Sawka et al. 2007). Additionally, a post-exercise urine sample was collected and assessed for urine specific gravity. Following completion of load carriage protocol, removal of the rectal thermistor, and assessment of body mass (seven minutes' post), participants then completed the three physical performance assessments (SMBT, wCMJ, MIVC). Participants then rested in a seated position until they repeated the performance assessments at 30, 60, and 120 minutes' post.

## Data Analysis

#### Physiological Variables

Measured  $\dot{V}O_2$ , HR, environmental data, and perceptual scales were time aligned; with HR data averaged over the final minute of each five-minute block. The highest  $\dot{V}O_2$  and HR values obtained during both assessments were taken as  $\dot{V}O_{2max}$  and HR maximum (HR<sub>max</sub>) respectively. For secondary analysis purposes,  $\dot{V}O_2$  and HR data were expressed relative to  $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ , HR<sub>max</sub>, and HR reserve (HRR; calculated using HR<sub>max</sub> and lowest resting value from the familiarisation session). Furthermore, using unloaded  $\dot{V}O_2$  (familiarisation session) and loaded  $\dot{V}O_2$ (experimental session), External Load Index was calculated to describe load carriage economy (Lloyd et al. 2010). It has been suggested that this approach has a distinct advantage over other economy metrics (such as  $\%\dot{V}O_{2max}$ ), as it factors in individual walking gait (Lloyd et al. 2010).

#### Performance Assessments

For the wCMJ, the performance variable of jump height was calculated using the flight time method described by Moir (2008). Take-off and landing were the first instances where resultant vertical force fell below and increased above 10 N, respectively. Flight time was the time between these instances. In addition, Reactive Strength Index Modified (RSI<sub>Mod</sub>) was calculated for each jump (McMahon et al. 2018). The onset of the wCMJ was identified as the instance where resultant force fell below the threshold of body mass minus five standard

deviations of the 'quiet standing' period. These variables were identified using visual inspection in combination with Dplot Jr software (version, 2.3.5.7; HydeSoft Computing, Vicksburg, USA).

For the MIVC, contractions lasted approximately five seconds and were separated by 45 seconds (Blacker et al. 2009). The onset of the contraction was identified as the instance where force exceeded mean 'slack' force plus three times standard deviations of this period. The variables of peak force, peak 250 ms, and 500 ms force epochs were calculated as these have been identified as reliable performance outcomes (Blacker et al. 2013b).

#### Statistical Analyses

Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation unless otherwise stated. Statistical analysis was conducted using JASP (version 0.11.1, University Amsterdam, Netherlands). The P-values were converted to base-2 log-transformed S-values (S) (Shannon 1948) to aid interpretation and clarity of statistical estimation (Cole et al. 2021). Data were assessed for normality, using skewness and kurtosis ratios, and sphericity; with the Greenhouse-Geisser correction applied if assumptions of sphericity were violated. For normally distributed data a one-way repeated measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to identify whether a main effect of time was present for both the physiological measures across the FLCP task and for the performance measures. Effect sizes are presented as Omega squared (GD<sup>2</sup>) (Levine and Hullett 2002), where 0.01, 0.06, 0.14 are classed as small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively (Field 2013). Where the combination of F-statistics, p-values / S-values, and effect sizes, indicate a likely incompatibility with the null model, post-hoc pairwise comparisons were made with a Holm-Bonferroni adjustment (denoted by subscript H). Mean differences and 95% compatibility (confidence) intervals, with Bonferroni adjustment, were calculated for pairwise comparisons. In addition, effect sizes were calculated as Cohen's standardised means and converted to Hedges  $g_z$  (Lakens 2013), to account for the overestimation of effect sizes from small sample sizes. From these *post-hoc* effect sizes, common language effect sizes (CLES) were also calculated (Lakens 2013). In some instances, where a large number of differences are observed ranges of p-values / S-values, and effect sizes are presented. For non-parametric data, a Friedman's test was employed with effect sizes presented using Kendall's W. Where the combination of  $\chi^2$ -statistics, p-values / S-values, and effect sizes, indicate a likely incompatibility with the null model, post hoc pairwise comparisons were made using Conover's test.

#### RESULTS

The environmental conditions in the laboratory were  $12.3 \pm 1.5$  °C Wet Bulb Globe Temperature indoors,  $64.9 \pm 9.9$  % relative humidity with a mean change across the trials of  $0.9 \pm 0.5$  °C and  $6.3 \pm 4.3$ % respectively. Pre- and post-FLCP urine specific gravity values were  $1.010 \pm 0.006$  and  $1.007 \pm 0.003$  respectively.

#### Physiological and Subjective Responses

Relative  $\dot{V}O_2$  increased throughout the FLCP ( $F_{(1.207, 12.07)} = 189.423$ , p < 0.001, S > 9.97,  $GD^2 = 0.743$ ) (Figure 2a). *Post-hoc* comparisons did not provide evidence that  $\dot{V}O_2$  values differed between both measurement points at 5.1 km·h<sup>-1</sup> ( $t_{(11)} = -0.696$ ,  $p_H = 0.503$ ,  $S_H = 0.99$ ,  $g_z = -0.187$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [0.396, -0.572]). However, compared with the first measurement point, at 6.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup> (25 minutes) mean  $\dot{V}O_2$  increased by 2.5%, 5.9%, and 7.4% at 35, 45 and 55 minutes respectively (35 minutes:  $t_{(11)} = -2.473$ ,  $p_H = 0.105$ ,  $S_H = 3.25$ ,  $g_z = -0.654$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [0.423, -1.905]; 45 minutes:  $t_{(11)} = 3.608$ ,  $p_H = 0.024$ ,  $S_H = 5.38$ ,  $g_z = -0.969$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [0.078, -2.655]; 55 minutes:  $t_{(11)} = 4.177$ ,  $p_H = 0.013$ ,  $S_H = 6.27$ ,  $g_z = -1.122$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [-0.139, -3.174]). As such, controlling for individual differences, the likelihood that an individual had a greater relative  $\dot{V}O_2$  at 35, 45, and 55 minutes, compared with 25 minutes was 76%, 85%, and 89% respectively; as indicated by the CLES. External Load Index also increased across measurement points ( $F_{(1.186, 11.859)} = 24.581$ ,  $p_H < 0.001$ ,  $S_H > 9.97$ ,  $GD^2 = 0.435$ ). Compared with External Load Index values at 25 minutes there was an increase of 3.6%, 5.9%, and 7.4% at measurement points 35, 45 and 55 minutes respectively (35 minutes:  $t_{(11)} = -2.322$ ,  $p_H = 0.128$ ,  $S_H = 2.97$ ,  $g_z = -0.624$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [0.02, -0.081]; 45 minutes  $t_{(11)} = -3.521$ ,  $p_H = 0.028$ ,  $S_H = 5.16$ ,  $g_z = -1.100$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [0.005, -1.111]; 55 minutes:  $t_{(11)} = -4.097$ ,  $p_H = 0.015$ ,  $S_H = 6.06$ ,  $g_z = -1.122$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [-0.005, -0.133]). Thus the likelihood that an individual had a greater External Load Index at 35, 45, and 55, compared with 25 minutes, when controlling for individual differences was 75%, 85%, and 88% respectively; as indicated by the CLES. Conversely, External Load Index values at 5.1 km·h<sup>-1</sup> did not appear to differ according to *post-hoc* comparisons ( $t_{(11)} = -0.611$ ,  $p_H = 0.555$ ,  $S_H =$ 0.85,  $g_z = -0.164$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [0.023, -0.032]).

A large effect for measurement point was also evident in HR responses ( $F_{(1.599, 17.594)} = 116.344$ , p < 0.001, S > 9.97, GD<sup>2</sup>= 0.616) (Figure 2b). At 5.1 km·h<sup>-1</sup>, measurements at 5 and 10 minutes, did not appear to be different according to *post-hoc* comparisons ( $t_{(11)} = 1.168$ ,  $p_H = 1.000$ ,  $S_H = 0.00$ ,  $g_z = 0.314$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [4.808, -2.863]); however, mean HR increased from minutes 5 to 15 ( $t_{(11)} = 3.963$ ,  $p_H = 0.033$ ,  $S_H = 4.92$ ,  $g_z = 1.064$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [8.499, -0.638]). When compared with the first measurement point at 6.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup> (25 minutes), there was an increase in HR across all subsequent measurement points ( $p_H = 0.033 - \langle 0.001, S_H = 4.92 - \rangle 9.97$ ,  $g_z = -1.056 - 1.941$ ). During the shuttles phase of the FLCP, peak HR corresponded to 81.9 ± 5.9% and 73.5 ± 8.7% HR<sub>max</sub> and HRR, respectively.

Core body temperature also displayed a large effect for measurement point ( $F_{(12, 108)} = 50.153$ , p < 0.001, S > 9.97, GD<sup>2</sup>= 0.584); with a mean increase of 0.92 ± 0.22 °C in response to the FLCP (Figure 2b; n=10 participants only). *Post-hoc* comparisons did not provide an indication that core body temperature differed from baseline to measurements at 5 and 10 minutes but did at all following measurement points ( $p_H = 0.031 - <0.001$ ,  $S_H = 5.01 - >9.97$ ,  $g_z = -1.383 - -3.748$ ). Pre- to post-FLCP nude body mass remained similar, with a change in body mass of  $0.0 \pm 0.4\%$  (n=11; one participant's data was removed due to a transcriptional error leading to an implausible post-FLCP body mass).



**Figure 2.** The relative  $\dot{VO}_2(a)$ , heart rate and core temperature (b), Comfort Affective Labelled Magnitude (CALM) and Ratings of Perceived Exertion (RPE) (c), and thermal sensation and thermal comfort (d) during the Fast Load Carriage Protocol

Data are presented as mean  $\pm$  SD. The light grey, white, and dark grey areas denote the 5.1 km·h<sup>-1</sup>, 6.5 km·h<sup>-1</sup>, and simulated fire and manoeuvre portions of the protocol respectively. Note core temperature values were only obtained for 10 participants

Perceived exertion increased across the protocol ( $F_{(12, 132)} = 85.153$ , p < 0.001, S > 9.97, GD<sup>2</sup>= 0.693) with a mean change of 7 ± 1 points (Figure 2c). This change reflected a transition from a median response of 'extremely light' to a median response of 'hard' at 60 minutes. Conversely, CALM, had a mean reduction of 49 ± 32 points ( $\chi^2_{(12)} = 132.427$ , p < 0.001, S >9.97, Kendall's W = 0.637); indicating participants were finding the load carried during the protocol progressively more uncomfortable (Figure 2c). Median ratings decline from around 'neither comfortable nor uncomfortable' pre-FLCP to around 'moderately uncomfortable'. Ratings of thermal comfort ( $F_{(12, 132)} = 31.771$ , p < 0.001, S > 9.97, GD<sup>2</sup>= 0.556) and thermal sensation ( $F_{(12, 132)} = 35.195$ , p < 0.001, S > 9.97, GD<sup>2</sup>= 0.593) both increased across measurement points, with a mean change of 2 ± 1, and 3 ± 1 for thermal comfort and sensation respectively. Thus, indicating participants perceived they were getting hotter and becoming less comfortable throughout the FLCP, transitioning from 'comfortably cool' and 'slightly cool' to 'too warm' and 'warm'.

#### Performance and Neuromuscular Responses

Table 2 lists physical performance assessments outcomes, whilst Figure 3 displays the percentage change in performance compared with pre-FLCP values. Statistical analysis did not provide evidence that SMBT distance differed across measurement points ( $F_{(4, 44)} = 1.223$ , p = 0.315,  $S = 1.67 \text{ GD}^2 = 0.001$ ). Conversely, for wCMJ, both jump height and RSI<sub>Mod</sub> displayed a moderate main effect for measurement point (jump height:  $F_{(4,44)} = 3.441$ , p = 0.016, S = 5.97,  $GD^2 = 0.013$ , RSI<sub>Mod</sub>:  $F_{(4,44)} = 5.145$ , p = 0.002, S = 8.97,  $GD^2 = 0.024$ ). *Post-hoc* comparisons identified a mean reduction in jump height of  $13.6 \pm 7.2\%$  at 120 minutes post-FLCP ( $t_{(11)} = -4.386$ ,  $p_H = 0.011$ ,  $S_H = 6.51$ ,  $g_z = -1.178$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [-0.005, -0.041]). Thus, as indicated by the CLES, the likelihood that an individual had a reduced jump height at 120 minutes post-FLCP compared with pre-FLCP was 90%, when controlling for individual differences. Compared with pre-FLCP values, a reduction in RSI<sub>Mod</sub> were observed for 30, 60, and 120 minutes post-FLCP (30 minutes:  $t_{(11)} = -3.44$ ,  $p_H = 0.05$ ,  $S_H = 4.32$ ,  $g_z = -0.924$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [0.000, -0.053]; 60 minutes:  $t_{(11)} = -3.154$ ,  $p_H = 0.073$ ,  $S_H = 3.78$ ,  $g_z = -0.847$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [0.003, -0.066]; 120 minutes:  $t_{(11)} = -5.154$ ,  $p_H$ = 0.003,  $S_H = 6.51$ ,  $g_z = -1.178$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [-0.005, -0.041]). Correspondingly, CLES indicated that the likelihood that an individual had a reduction in RSI<sub>Mod</sub> at 30, 60, and 120-minutes post-FLCP was 84%, 82%, and 93% respectively, when controlling for individual differences.

For all MIVC variables a moderate main effect of measurement point was evident (peak force:  $F_{(1.480,16.281)} = 7.192$ , p = 0.009, S = 6.80, GD<sup>2</sup> = 0.092; peak 250 ms epoch:  $F_{(1.510,16.607)} = 7.061$ , p = 0.010, S = 6.64, GD<sup>2</sup> = 0.097; and peak 500 ms epoch:  $F_{(1.860,20.461)} = 5.539$ , p = 0.013, S = 6.27, GD<sup>2</sup> = 0.071). Compared with pre-FLCP values, peak force reduced by 8.4 ± 8.2% immediately post-FLCP ( $t_{(11)} = -3.219$ ,  $p_H = 0.074$ , S<sub>H</sub> = 3.76,  $g_z = -0.864$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [6.208, -150.36], and by 12.6 ± 10.9% 60 minutes' post FLCP ( $t_{(11)} = -3.776$ ,  $p_H = 0.031$ , S<sub>H</sub> = 5.01,  $g_z = -1.014$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [-7.83, -203.49]). Similarly, 250 ms peak force epochs reduced at these two measurement points by 9.1 ± 9.1% and 13.2 ± 11.2% respectively (post:  $t_{(11)} = -3.16$ ,  $p_H = 0.082$ , S<sub>H</sub> = 3.61,  $g_z = -0.849$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [-8.361, -165.305]; 60 minutes:  $t_{(11)} = -3.828$ ,  $p_H = 0.028$ , S<sub>H</sub> = 5.16,  $g_z = -1.024$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [-9.464, -209.209]). 500 ms peak force epochs also reduced at 60 minutes post-FLCP by 14.0 ± 13.9% ( $t_{(11)} = -3.412$ ,  $p_H = 0.058$ , S<sub>H</sub> = 4.11,  $g_z = -0.916$ , 95% CI<sub>H</sub> [2.265, -184.061]). According to all other *post-hoc* comparisons for the MIVC variables post-FLCP performance did not differ compared with pre-FLCP values.



**Figure 3** Percentage change in seated medicine ball throw (SMBT) distance (a), weighted countermovement jump (wCMJ) height (b), and maximal isometric voluntary contraction of the quadriceps (MIVC) force (c) post-Fast Load Carriage Protocol.

Data are presented as mean  $\pm SD$ 

			Effect Size for Assessment	Post-Load Carriage Protocol Mean Difference [95% Compatibility Intervals]							
Per	formance Measure	Pre-FLCP Performance	Time Point (GD <sup>2</sup> )	Post	30 min post	60 min post	120 min post				
SMBT	Distance (m)	$4.48\pm0.40$	0.001	-0.03 [-0.10, 0.05]	0.00 [-0.08, 0.07]	-0.03 [-0.11, 0.05]	-0.06 [-0.15, 0.03]				
wCMI	Jump Height (m)	$0.26\pm0.06$	0.013	-0.01 [0.03, 0.02]	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.01]	-0.02 [-0.04, 0.01]	-0.02 [-0.04, -0.01]*				
WCMJ	RSI <sub>Mod</sub> (ratio)	$0.27\pm0.08$	0.024	-0.02 [-0.06, 0.02]	-0.03 [-0.05, 0.00]	-0.03 [-0.07, 0.00]	-0.04 [-0.06, -0.01]**				
	Peak Force (N)	$816.0\pm108.6$	0.092	-72.1 [-150.4, 6.2]	-85.6 [-198.8, 27.7]	-105.7 [-203.5, -7.8]*	-99.0 [-229.2, 31.3]				
MIVC	250 s Force Epoch (N)	$808.4 \pm 108.4$	0.097	-78.5 [-165.3, 8.4]	-91.6 [-217.3, 34.1]	-109.3 [-209.2, -9.5]*	-102.4 [-234.7, 30.0]				
	500 s Force Epoch (N)	$570 \pm 149.6$	0.071	-67.0 [-163.2, 29.2]	-86.7 [-201.9, 28.4]	-90.9 [-184.1, 2.3]	-86.2 [-207.7, 35.3]				

**Table 2** *Change in performance for each performance metric across assessment time points Post-Fast Load Carriage Protocol (Mean* ± *SD).* 

2 Where, SMBT, Seated Medicine Ball Throw; wCMJ, weighted Counter Movement Jump; MIVC, Maximal Isometric Voluntary Contraction of the quadriceps; RSI<sub>Mod</sub>,

3 Reactive Strength Index Modified. \* p <0.05; \*\* p <0.01 compared to pre-Fast Load Carriage Protocol performance. Note where post hoc comparisons have occurred

4 (*wCMJ & MIVC*) compatibility intervals are Bonferroni adjusted.

#### 5 DISCUSSION

6 This is the first study to collectively measure the metabolic cardiovascular, thermoregulatory, 7 neuromuscular, and perceptual responses to a military-specific and occupationally relevant treadmill-based load 8 carriage protocol. The  $\dot{VO}_2$  remained similar during the 5.1 km h<sup>-1</sup> portion of the protocol and an upwards drift 9 was apparent during the 6.5 km h<sup>-1</sup> portion. A similar observation was apparent for HR; collectively indicating an 10 increased metabolic cost as the protocol ensued. With respect to the FLCP's effect on subsequent physical 11 performance, it appeared not to affect the upper body, as indicated by no change in SMBT performance but did 12 affect the lower body, demonstrated by reduced wCMJ peak height, RSI<sub>Mod</sub>, MIVC peak force, peak 250 ms force 13 epoch, and peak 500 ms force epoch at measurement points up to two hours' post.

14 The slowest portion of the FLCP (5.1 km  $\cdot$ h<sup>-1</sup>) resulted in no discernible difference between VO<sub>2</sub> values 15 from 5 to 15 minutes ( $\sim$ 32%  $\dot{VO}_{2max}$ ) indicative of individuals achieving a steady-state. Conversely, when the 16 treadmill speed was increased to 6.5 km  $h^{-1}$ , there was a notable increase in  $VO_2$  at the final two assessment points 17 (45 and 55 minutes; 50-53% VO<sub>2max</sub>) compared to the first assessment point (25 minutes); indicative of VO<sub>2</sub> drift. 18 Previously a VO<sub>2</sub> drift has been demonstrated in prolonged load carriage exercise, at intensities generally above 19 50% VO<sub>2max</sub> (Epstein et al. 1988; Patton et al. 1991; Blacker et al. 2009). The observed 7.4% increase in VO<sub>2</sub> over 20 the faster portion of the FLCP, is broadly in line with the magnitudes of change observed in these aforementioned 21 investigations. For example, an 8.8% increase was observed for a 2-hour march at 4.5 km h<sup>-1</sup>, 5% gradient, 22 carrying 40 kg (Epstein et al. 1988). With VO<sub>2</sub> drift evident, participant's movement efficiency worsened 23 throughout the FLCP; evidenced by the rising External Load Index values. Specifically, the rising External Load 24 Index scores suggest a reduction in efficiency compared with unloaded walking at the same speed, when corrected 25 for the additional load mass carried. External Load Index values are, broadly comparable to those previously 26 published in non-military personnel (6 km·h<sup>-1</sup> and 20 kg) (Hudson et al. 2017). However, the progressive inefficiency, resulting from a  $\dot{V}O_2$  drift, has not previously been demonstrated using External Load Index. 27

28 Similar to  $VO_2$ , a HR drift was evident across the 6.5 km h<sup>-1</sup> element of the protocol, with a ~15 beat mean 29 change between minutes 25 and 60. This cardiovascular drift, the magnitude of change in HR, and average HR 30 values are comparable to previously reported data during similar load carriage conditions, despite the difference 31 in load mass distributions walking at a fixed pace (Quesada et al. 2000; Blacker et al. 2009). Moreover, mean 32 changes in RPE across the time course of the current study are similar to those reported previously (+5 vs +4) 33 (Blacker et al. 2009); when calculated in the same manner. However, the task duration in the current study was 34 half that of Blacker and colleagues (2009). This difference could therefore be attributed to the manner in which 35 the load mass was distributed in the current study (belt webbing, weighted vest, and weapon vs. rucksack), and 36 the perceived additional effort associated with the increased thermal discomfort of the weighted vest.

The thermal implications of the load carriage protocol in the present study resulted in an average core temperature increase of approximately 1°C. This response is similar to that observed during a field-based load carriage study, where 60 soldiers undertook the load carriage element of the British Army's new physical employment standards (Waldock et al. 2021). Moreover, the thermal load of the current study resulted in thermal comfort and sensation increases of approximately 2.5 and 3 points respectively; indicating participants perceived they were getting hotter and becoming less comfortable across the time course of the FLCP. As well as participants perceiving they were getting hotter their ratings of comfort associated with the load also reduced with a mean 44 change of -50 points; indicating participants were finding the load carried progressively more uncomfortable. 45 Initial CALM values were similar to those reported previously for heavier load masses (44.45 kg) in combatants 46 (Kobus et al. 2010); which is likely a result of the participant's familiarity with the load. A decline in comfort 47 ratings has also been reported by Mullins et al. (2015), who reported progressive increases in shoulder/upper-back 48 pain and discomfort scores over 2 hours of walking at 5.5 km h<sup>-1</sup>, carrying 22 kg. The current study demonstrated 49 no discernible effect on upper body neuromuscular performance, as measured through the SMBT, as a result of 50 the FLCP. Previously grenade throw distance has reduced following a load carriage task (Knapik et al. 1991), 51 however, the authors suggested this decrement may be the result of brachial plexus nerve entrapment in the 52 shoulder region. Plausibly, this difference between studies is a result of the differences in load (20 versus 46 kg), 53 load distribution (hands, hips, torso, vs. back, hands and head), and task duration (~65 minutes vs.  $314 \pm 70$ 54 minutes). Load carriage has also previously been shown to reduce shoulder peak torque at slow velocities 55 immediately post a load carriage task (Blacker et al. 2010). Whilst a similar additional load mass was carried in 56 this investigation, a duration two-fold greater, and a load purely supported by the shoulders is likely to contribute 57 to the differences in findings. Moreover, with load carriage increasing trapezius activity (Holewijn 1990), and 58 subsequently reducing muscle function, it is likely that the overhead shoulder flexion and extension protocol 59 employed by Blacker et al. (2010) to assess shoulder function would be attenuated to a greater extent than the 60 SMBT by a reduction in trapezius function. The current results, therefore, suggest operationally relevant upper 61 body 'push' capabilities, for tasks such climbing through a window or overhead lifts are unlikely to be impacted. 62 Moreover, with upper body strength, which contributes to power, being demonstrated to correlate well with load 63 carriage performance (e.g. Robinson et al. 2018; Orr et al. 2021), it is unlikely that subsequent load carriage tasks 64 are going to be influenced by changes in upper body performance.

65 In contrast, lower body neuromuscular performance was likely affected by the FLCP. A decrease in wCMJ performance was apparent at 120 minutes' post-FLCP, with an approximately 9% reduction in jump height 66 67 evident. This modest decrement in performance corresponds to a mean jump height reduction of 2.2 cm. There 68 was a large degree of variation in performance change from the pre-performance scores, particularly across the 69 first two assessment points as evidenced by a standard deviation of 11.4 and 9.6% respectively. This variability 70 in performance immediately post-task perhaps, partially explains the opposing outcomes of Knapik et al. (1991) 71 and Fallowfield et al. (2012); where following their respective load carriage tasks no change ( $0.46 \pm 0.07$  m vs 72  $0.45 \pm 0.07$  m) and a reduction (0.37  $\pm 0.05$  m vs.  $0.34 \pm 0.06$  m) in jump height was observed. Differences 73 between studies could be attributed to the study populations employed and their load carriage experience (e.g. 74 serving soldiers (Knapik et al. 1991); Royal Marines recruits (Fallowfield et al. 2012); vs. a civilian population, 75 in the current study. A progressive decline in RSI<sub>Mod</sub> values was also observed. The RSI<sub>Mod</sub> has been suggested to 76 be indicative of an individual's slow stretch-shortening capabilities (Suchomel et al. 2015), with data indicating 77 that individuals are prolonging their impulse generation period; a change considered to be less desirable for 78 performance (McMahon et al. 2018). However, to date, the RSI<sub>Mod</sub> literature is limited to sporting contexts, with 79 no data linking decrements to occupational or military tasks. That being said, with a lower RSI<sub>Mod</sub> being suggestive 80 of a reduced force and power capacity, it could be purported that explosive and/or anaerobic-based military tasks 81 such as a fire and manoeuvre or casualty drag task could be negatively impacted post-load carriage task. Further 82 research within this area is therefore warranted to ascertain whether this is a meaningful metric for occupational 83 and military testing.

84 The MIVC values in the present study are similar to those previously reported (Blacker et al. 2013a), 85 although differences in magnitudes of change do exist. As with the SMBT performance, differences could be 86 principally attributed to the longer load carriage duration (~65 min vs 120 min for Blacker et al. 2013a). However, 87 the inclusion of the repeated shuttles, in the current study, may somewhat attenuate these differences observed, 88 due to the rapid accelerations and decelerations of the fire and manoeuvre aspect of the FLCP. Previously a similar 89 magnitude (~5%) of knee flexor strength reduction has been observed following a 12.1 km march (4.8 km h<sup>-1</sup>) 90 carrying between 13.2-18.6 kg (Clarke et al. 1955), although as noted by Blacker et al. (2010) caution should be 91 used when interpreting these data due to the rudimentary data collection techniques. Collectively, these 92 investigations support those data presented in the current study. In addition, the current study demonstrates this 93 neuromuscular impairment and performance reduction may last upwards of two hours. This is despite carrying a relatively 'light' load compared with load masses commonly carried during operations (Dean 2003; Knapik et al. 94 95 2012). Previously, neuromuscular function has been investigated over successive days post load carriage task 96 (Blacker et al. 2010), but not within the hours proceeding the task. The study by Blacker et al. (2010) demonstrated 97 that peak torque values remained suppressed for up to 48 hours post a load carriage task. From an applied 98 perspective, a decrement in muscle function may increase musculoskeletal injury risk whilst also degrading 99 military physical and skilled task performance (Blacker et al. 2010); an outcome likely compounded by the 100 frequent operational requirement for multiple military tasks to be completed successively.

101 A key focus of the present study was to maximise the external validity of the load carriage task, the external 102 load mass, and how it was distributed. The protocol was designed to replicate the demands of a fast approach 103 march or advance to contact, and the subsequent fire and manoeuvre task, a highly probable pairing during military 104 operations. As such, all parameters of the load carriage protocol were derived from the literature (Treloar and 105 Billing 2011; Silk and Billing 2013; Myers et al. 2016). Critically, due to the protocol being undertaken on a 106 motorised treadmill, participants were unable to safely undergo the prone to standing and standing to prone 107 transitions typical in a fire and manoeuvre task. To mitigate this limitation, shuttle speed was increased along with 108 shuttle duration. These alterations resulted in the attainment of work rates corresponding to  $81.9 \pm 5.9\%$  and 73.5109  $\pm$  8.7% of HR<sub>max</sub> and HRR respectively, which match well to previous data [~80% HR<sub>max</sub> (Myers et al. 2016); 110 ~80% HRR, (Silk and Billing 2013)]. The external validity of the FLCP's design therefore makes it suitable for 111 future intervention studies which wish to use a laboratory based treadmill protocol. An additional limitation of the 112 present study was the use of non-military male participants. However, markers of both aerobic fitness ( $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ ) 113 and strength (wCMJ) match those previously reported for military populations (Pihlainen et al. 2018; Vine et al. 114 2020). However, differences pertaining to load carriage efficiency between trained and untrained populations may exist. As such, changes in performance measures may be different for populations more accustomed to load 115 116 carriage. Moreover, differences in load carriage kinematics between sexes have also been reported, with females 117 working at a higher relative intensity for a fixed load carried, and having a higher cadence and shorter stance time; 118 although this may in fact be a repercussion of differences in body mass and stature (Vickery-Howe et al. 2020). To 119 extend this applied focus, future investigations should look beyond discrete bouts of load carriage and characterise 120 the physiological responses and military performance repercussions of repeated bouts. Despite the high relevance 121 of sequential military taskings, only two studies have investigated this previously, with both having alternative 122 primary focuses (Giles et al. 2019; Scales et al. 2021).

123 In conclusion, the present study has developed a treadmill-based FLCP that combines the individual 124 aspects of an approach march and a fire and manoeuvre task. The demands of this protocol resulted in an increased 125 metabolic and cardiovascular requirement when moving at a faster pace. These data also demonstrate that the 126 completion of a single FLCP does not affect neuromuscular performance in the upper body power (SMBT), but 127 appears to modestly decrease neuromuscular performance in the lower body (wCMJ and MIVC) up to two hours' 128 post. Moreover, those RSI<sub>Mod</sub> data demonstrate that individuals may be prolonging their impulse generation 129 period, which is suggested to be less favourable, although a greater understanding of these implications within the 130 military context is required. Future investigations can use the FLCP protocol to investigate externally relevant 131 scenarios, such as the interaction between physical and cognitive performance during load carriage, or the 132 implications of multiple repeated load carriage bouts.

133

# **134 REFERENCES**

- ASHRAE Standard (1992) Standard 55-1992, Thermal environmental conditions for human occupancy. Am Soc
   heating, Refrig Air Cond Eng
- **137** Bedford T (1936) The warmth factor in comfort at work. Rep Ind Hith Res Bd 76:
- Blacker SD, Fallowfield JL, Bilzon JLJ, Willems MET (2010) Neuromuscular function following prolonged
   load carriage on level and downhill gradients. Aviat Space Environ Med 81:745–753
- Blacker SD, Fallowfield JL, Bilzon JLJ, Willems MET (2013a) Neuromuscular impairment following backpack
  load carriage. J Hum Kinet 37:91–98
- Blacker SD, Fallowfield JL, Bilzon JLJ, Willems MET (2009) Physiological responses to load carriage during
  level and downhill treadmill walking. Med Sport 13:116–124
- Blacker SD, Fallowfield JL, Willems MET (2013b) Intra-and interday reliability of voluntary and electrically
   stimulated isometric contractions of the quadriceps femoris. J Electromyogr Kinesiol 23:886–891
- 146 Borg G (1970) Perceived exertion as an indicator of somatic stress. Scand J Rehabil Med 2:92
- British Army (2020) New Physical Employment Standards. https://www.army.mod.uk/physical-employment standards/. Accessed 28 Oct 2020
- Browning RC, Modica JR, Kram R, Goswami A (2007) The effects of adding mass to the legs on the energetics
  and biomechanics of walking. Med Sci Sport Exerc 39:515–525
- 151 Cardello A V, Winterhalter C, Schutz HG (2003) Predicting the handle and comfort of military clothing fabrics
   152 from sensory and instrumental data: development and application of new psychophysical methods. Text
   153 Res J 73:221–237
- Clarke HH, Shay CT, Mathews DK (1955) Strength decrements from carrying various army packs on military
   marches. Res Quarterly Am Assoc Heal Phys Educ Recreat 26:253–265
- 156 Cole SR, Edwards JK, Greenland S (2021) Surprise! Am J Epidemiol 190:191–193

- 157 Cronin JB, Owen GJ (2004) Upper-body strength and power assessment in women using a chest pass. J Strength
   158 Cond Res 18:401–404
- 159 Dean C (2003) The modern warriors combat load. Dismounted operations in Afghanistan April-May 2003. U.S.
   160 Army, U.S. Army Center for Army Lessons Learned
- Draper SB, Wood DM, Corbett J, et al (2006) The effect of prior moderate-and heavy-intensity running on the
   VO2 response to exhaustive severe-intensity running. Int J Sports Physiol Perform 1:361–374
- 163 Epstein Y, Rosenblum J, Burstein R, Sawka MN (1988) External load can alter the energy cost of prolonged
- 164 exercise. Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol 57:243–247
- Fallowfield JL, Blacker SD, Willems MET, et al (2012) Neuromuscular and cardiovascular responses of Royal
   Marine recruits to load carriage in the field. Appl Ergon 43:1131–1137
- 167 Field A (2013) Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics. sage
- Giles GE, Hasselquist L, Caruso C, Eddy MD (2019) Load Carriage and Physical Exertion Influence Cognitive
   Control in Military Scenarios. Med Sci Sports Exerc
- Hauschild VD, DeGroot DW, Hall SM, et al (2017) Fitness tests and occupational tasks of military interest: a
   systematic review of correlations. Occup Env Med 74:144–153
- 172 Holewijn M (1990) Physiological strain due to load carrying. Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol 61:237–245
- Hudson S, Cooke C, Lloyd R (2017) The reliability of the Extra Load Index as a measure of relative load
   carriage economy. Ergonomics 60:1250–1254
- Knapik J, Reynolds K, Santee WR, Friedl KE (2012) Load carriage in military operations: a review of historical,
  physiological, biomechanical and medical aspects. Mil Quant Physiol Probl Concepts Mil Oper Med Off
  Surg Gen Borden Institute, Ft Detrick, MD 303–337
- Knapik J, Staab J, Michael B, et al (1991) Soldier performance and mood states following a strenuous road
  march. Mil Med 156:197–200
- 180 Knapik JJ, Reynolds KL, Harman E (2004) Soldier load carriage: historical, physiological, biomechanical, and
   181 medical aspects. Mil Med 169:45–56
- 182 Knapik JJ, Sharp MA, Darakjy S, et al (2006) Temporal changes in the physical fitness of US Army recruits.
   183 Sport Med 36:613–634
- 184 Kobus DA, Brown CM, Wu L, et al (2010) Cognitive Performance and Physiological Changes under Heavy
   185 Load Carriage. PACIFIC SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING GROUP INC SAN DIEGO CA
- Lake J, McMahon J (2018) Within-Subject Consistency of Unimodal and Bimodal Force Application during the
   Countermovement Jump. Sports 6:143. https://doi.org/10.3390/sports6040143
- Lake JP, Mundy PD, Comfort P (2014) Power and impulse applied during push press exercise. J Strength Cond
   Res 28:2552–2559

- Lakens D (2013) Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for t tests and ANOVAs. Front Psychol 4:863
- Levine TR, Hullett CR (2002) Eta squared, partial eta squared, and misreporting of effect size in communication
   research. Hum Commun Res 28:612–625
- Lloyd R, Hind K, Parr B, et al (2010) The Extra Load Index as a method for comparing the relative economy of
   load carriage systems. Ergonomics 53:1500–1504
- 196 McMahon JJ, Jones PA, Suchomel TJ, et al (2018) Influence of the reactive strength index modified on force–
- and power-time curves. Int J Sports Physiol Perform 13:220–227. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2017-0056
- Midgley AW, Carroll S, Marchant D, et al (2009) Evaluation of true maximal oxygen uptake based on a novel
   set of standardized criteria. Appl Physiol Nutr Metab 34:115–123
- 200 Moir GL (2008) Three different methods of calculating vertical jump height from force platform data in men
   201 and women. Meas Phys Educ Exerc Sci 12:207–218
- Mullins AK, Annett LE, Drain JR, et al (2015) Lower limb kinematics and physiological responses to prolonged
   load carriage in untrained individuals. Ergonomics 58:770–780
- 204 Myers SD, McGuire SJ, Blacker SD, Wilkinson DM (2016) Simulated Military Dismounted Assault Task:
   205 Metabolic demands and Relationship to Field Expedient Physical Tests. Med Sci Sport Exerc 48:482–483
- 206 Orr R (2010) The history of the soldier's load. Aust Army J 7:67
- 207 Orr RM, Robinson J, Hasanki K, et al (2021) The relationship between strength measures and task performance
   208 in specialist tactical police. J Strength Cond Res
- Patton JF, Kaszuba J, Mello RP, Reynolds KL (1991) Physiological responses to prolonged treadmill walking
   with external loads. Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol 63:89–93
- Pihlainen K, Santtila M, Häkkinen K, Kyröläinen H (2018) Associations of physical fitness and body
   composition characteristics with simulated military task performance. J Strength Cond Res 32:1089–1098
- Quesada PM, Mengelkoch LJ, Hale RC, Simon SR (2000) Biomechanical and metabolic effects of varying
   backpack loading on simulated marching. Ergonomics 43:293–309
- Robinson J, Roberts A, Irving S, Orr R (2018) Aerobic fitness is of greater importance than strength and power
  in the load carriage performance of specialist police. Int J Exerc Sci 11:987
- Sawka MN, Burke LM, Eichner ER, et al (2007) American College of Sports Medicine position stand. Exercise
   and fluid replacement. Med Sci Sports Exerc 39:377–390
- Scales J, Coleman D, Brown M (2021) Energy cost and knee extensor strength changes following multiple day
   military load carriage. Appl Ergon 97:103503
- 221 Shannon CE (1948) A mathematical theory of communication. Bell Syst Tech J 27:379–423

- Silk AJ, Billing DC (2013) Development of a valid simulation assessment for a military dismounted assault
   task. Mil Med 178:315–320
- Soule RG, Goldman RF (1969) Energy cost of loads carried on the head, hands, or feet. J Appl Physiol 27:687–
   690
- Spiering BA, Walker LA, Larcom K, et al (2019) Predicting Soldier Task Performance From Physical Fitness
   Tests: Reliability and Construct Validity of a Soldier Task Test Battery. J Strength Cond Res
- Suchomel TJ, Sole CJ, Bailey CA, et al (2015) A comparison of reactive strength index-modified between six
   US collegiate athletic teams. J Strength Cond Res 29:1310–1316
- Taylor NAS, Lewis MC, Notley SR, Peoples GE (2012) A fractionation of the physiological burden of the
   personal protective equipment worn by firefighters. Eur J Appl Physiol 112:2913–2921
- Treloar AKL, Billing DC (2011) Effect of load carriage on performance of an explosive, anaerobic military task.
   Mil Med 176:1027–1031
- van Dijk J (2007) Chapter 3–Common Military Task: Marching. RTO-TR-HFM-080: Optimizing Operational
   Physical Fitness
- Vickery-Howe DM, Clarke AC, Drain JR, et al (2020) No physiological or biomechanical sex-by-load
   interactions during treadmill-based load carriage. Ergonomics 63:1175–1181
- Vine CAJ, Coakley SL, Blacker SD, et al (2020) Accuracy of Metabolic Cost Predictive Equations During
   Military Load Carriage. J Strength Cond Res
- Waldock KAM, Lee BJ, Powell S, et al (2021) Field validation of The Heat Strain Decision Aid during military
  load carriage. Comput Biol Med 134:104506
- 242

		Measurement Time point (minutes)										
	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60
$\dot{V}O_2$ (mL·kg <sup>-1</sup> ·min <sup>-1</sup> )	17.1 ± 2.1		17.1 ± 1.9		25.9 ± 2.7		26.9 ± 3.1		27.5 ± 3.1		27.9 ± 2.9	
External Load Index	$0.98 \pm 0.07$		$0.98 \pm 0.07$		$1.07\pm0.07$		1.11 ± 0.09		$1.14 \pm 0.09$		$1.15\pm0.09$	
Core Temperature (°C)	$36.9\pm0.3$	$37\pm0.2$	$37.1\pm0.3$	$37.2\pm0.3$	$37.3\pm0.3$	$37.5 \pm 0.2$	37.6 ± 0.3	37.7 ± 0.3	$37.7\pm0.3$	$37.7\pm0.3$	$37.7\pm0.3$	$37.8\pm0.3$
Heart Rate (beats·min <sup>-1</sup> )	$95 \pm 10$	96 ± 10	$99 \pm 9$	99 ± 9	119 ± 11	125 ± 12	127 ± 12	$128 \pm 14$	131 ± 14	$132 \pm 15$	$133 \pm 15$	134 ± 13
RPE	$10 \pm 2$	$10 \pm 2$	11 ± 2	$12 \pm 2$	13 ± 1	14 ± 1	14 ± 1	$14 \pm 2$	$15 \pm 2$	15 ± 1	$15 \pm 1$	15 ± 1
CALM	$2 \pm 32$	$-2 \pm 30$	$-7 \pm 30$	-11 ± 28	-23 ± 23	-27 ± 23	$-30 \pm 24$	-34 ± 23	-37 ± 25	$-40 \pm 24$	$-40 \pm 27$	-41 ± 25
Thermal Comfort	-1 ± 1	$0 \pm 1$	$0 \pm 1$	0 ± 1	1 ± 1	$1 \pm 1$	$1 \pm 1$	$1 \pm 1$	$1 \pm 1$	$2 \pm 1$	$2\pm 1$	$2 \pm 1$
Thermal Sensation	-1 ± 1	$0\pm 1$	$0 \pm 1$	$0 \pm 1$	1 ± 1	$1 \pm 1$	$1 \pm 1$	$2\pm 1$	$2\pm 1$	$2\pm 1$	$2\pm 1$	$2\pm1$

# 243 Supplementary Data Table – Physiological and Subjective Data

244 Where:  $\dot{VO}_2$ , oxygen consumption; RPE, Ratings of Perceived Exertion; CALM, Comfort Affective Labelled Magnitude. Data are presented as mean  $\pm$  SD. Greyed area denotes

245 *that measurements were not taken.*