Central and peripheral contributions to neuromuscular fatigue induced by a 24-h treadmill run
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Central and peripheral contributions to neuromuscular fatigue induced by a 24-h treadmill run. J Appl Physiol 108: 1224–1233, 2010. First published February 18, 2010; doi:10.1152/japplphysiol.01202.2009.—This experiment investigated the fatigue induced by a 24-h running exercise (24TR) and particularly aimed at testing the hypothesis that the central component would be the main mechanism responsible for neuromuscular fatigue. Neuromuscular function evaluation was performed before, every 4 h during, and at the end of the 24TR on 12 experienced ultramarathon runners. It consisted of a determination of the maximal voluntary contractions (MVC) of the knee extensors (KE) and plantar flexors (PF), the maximal voluntary activation (%VA) of the KE and PF, and the maximal compound muscle action potential amplitude (Mmax) on the soleus and vastus lateralis. Tetanic stimulations also were delivered to evaluate the presence of low-frequency fatigue and the KE maximal muscle force production ability. Strength loss occurred throughout the exercise, with large changes observed after 24TR in MVC for both the KE and PF muscles (−40.9 ± 17.0 and −30.3 ± 12.5%, respectively; P < 0.001) together with marked reductions of %VA (−33.0 ± 21.8 and −14.8 ± 18.9%, respectively; P < 0.001). A reduction of Mmax amplitude was observed only on soleus, and no low-frequency fatigue was observed for any muscle group. Finally, KE maximal force production ability was reduced to a moderate extent at the end of the 24TR (−10.2%; P < 0.001), but these alterations were highly variable (±15.7%). These results suggest that central factors are mainly responsible for the large maximal muscle torque reduction after ultraendurance running, especially on the KE muscles. Neural drive reduction may have contributed to the relative preservation of peripheral function and also affected the evolution of the running speed during the 24TR.

MUSCLE FATIGUE is an exercise-related decrease in the maximal voluntary force or power of a muscle or muscle group (3) associated with an increase in the perceived effort necessary to exert the desired force (9). This decline potentially involves processes at all levels of the motor pathway from the brain to the skeletal muscle. The typical strategy used to study fatigue has been to determine whether the mechanism responsible for fatigue is located in the exercising muscle or in the nervous system. This approach has resulted in the differentiation bet-

teen central, i.e., nervous, and peripheral, i.e., muscle, fatigue (e.g., Ref. 9).

The mechanisms underlying the decline in maximal force capacity depend on the characteristics of the task being performed. Critical task variables include the muscle activation pattern, the type of muscle group involved, and the type of muscle contraction (9). However, the intensity and duration of activity are probably among the most important factors. We previously established that low-intensity, prolonged running exercise induces a significant amount of central fatigue (for review, see Ref. 25). Running duration seems to determine the amount of central fatigue: average central activation deficits were found to be −8 and −28% after competitive running bouts of 3 and 8.5 h, respectively (26, 27).

Whether central activation deficit is linearly related to running duration remains unknown. In their review related to neuromuscular fatigue, Millet and Lepers (25) proposed a nonlinear relationship for strength loss-exercise duration: as running duration increases, force decrement would tend to plateau. This could represent the influence of a central protective mechanism, aimed at limiting muscle work during prolonged running, to prevent extensive homeostasis disturbance, muscle damage, and biological harm (29). Ultraendurance running, i.e., any distance greater than that of a marathon (e.g., 100 km, 24 h), constitutes an interesting paradigm to investigate this possibility. Indeed, that kind of exercise is challenging for the homeostasis, energetic, and muscular systems and therefore may be able to trigger central protective mechanisms. Ohta et al. (33) investigated biochemical modifications during a 24-h run and from their clinical observations concluded that this type of exercise induces some supraspinal fatigue. Therefore, we can reasonably hypothesize that ultraendurance running may induce a significant level of central fatigue. Reductions of voluntary activation for exercise durations of −8.5h (26) for field studies and 5 h for systematic laboratory studies (37) support this hypothesis. However, an extreme running duration is the model required to definitely challenge the idea that the intrinsic force-generating capacity of the muscle is not dramatically impaired after such a task and that central mechanisms are mainly responsible for neuromuscular fatigue.

The implication of a central mechanism should confine peripheral fatigue to a moderate level. Current knowledge on the origins of peripheral fatigue after endurance exercise suggests that such exercise could impair three main components: the action potential transmission along the sarcolemma, the excitation-contraction coupling (E-C), i.e., the release and reuptake of calcium (Ca2+) within the muscle cell, and the actin-myosin
interaction (25). None of these mechanisms have been assessed for exercises of extreme duration such as a 24-h run. However, available evidence suggests that intrinsic muscle force is moderately reduced (~10%) after a 30-km trail run (27). Also, studies on prolonged running (8, 27, 37) have failed to detect low-frequency fatigue (LFF), which has been linked to E-C coupling alteration and muscle damage (16, 17). This was unexpected, since many studies have provided indirect evidence of muscle damage after prolonged running (10, 34). Finally, evidence for the occurrence of action potential transmission alteration after prolonged running is rather scarce (25). Therefore, we can reasonably suggest that extreme duration running exercise may induce a moderate peripheral fatigue.

Whether neuromuscular fatigue similarly affects locomotor muscles from the lower limbs during ultraendurance running remains unclear. Factors such as muscle fiber composition, running technique, and running course profile (i.e., level vs. uphill and downhill) could differentially influence the magnitude of strength loss on knee extensors (KE) and plantar flexors (PF). In particular, the relative contributions of these muscle groups to power production during slow running may influence their fatigue responses. Winter (43) reported that the positive work done by the PF averaged three times that done by the KE during slow, level running. This is consistent with the proposition of Novacheck (30), who reviewed the biomechanics of running and concluded that the relative contributions of the PF and KE to power generation changes such that relatively more power is generated proximally as speed increases. At slow running speeds, the PF would then produce relatively more power than the KE. Data from glycogen depletion studies also confirm that the PF are more active than KE during level running (20). In light of the above-mentioned findings, we suggest that level ultraendurance running would place a greater stress on PF compared with KE. As a consequence, greater force decrements could be expected to occur in the PF, since the 24-h running exercise was performed on a treadmill with no slope (24TR).

Therefore, the purpose of this experiment was to test the hypothesis that central fatigue would be the principal explanation for neuromuscular fatigue during a 24-h running bout and that this would minimize the extent of peripheral fatigue. The secondary purpose was to verify the assumption that PF muscles fatigue more than KE during ultraendurance running.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Subjects

Twelve healthy male subjects [age: 41.6 ± 7.7 yr; height: 1.78 ± 0.05 m; mass: 74.8 ± 7.4 kg; body fat: 17.9 ± 4.6%; maximal oxygen uptake (VO2max): 52.0 ± 6.2 ml·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹] were enrolled in this study after medical examination. Fourteen subjects were initially recruited, but only 12 were able to complete the 24TR. All the participants were experienced ultramarathon runners and had already run a race longer than 24 h or greater than 100 km. On average, they had 15.3 ± 7.1 yr of training history in running and 7.1 ± 4.4 yr of ultraendurance experience. The subjects were asked to refrain from strenuous exercise during the week preceding the 24TR. Force-production capacity was also assessed in a control group of 12 physically active subjects [age: 34.2 ± 9.6 yr; height: 1.77 ± 0.03 m; mass: 73.3 ± 6.2 kg] who did not run but stayed awake over the 24-h period. The experiment was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki. The participants were fully informed of the procedure and the risks involved and gave their written consent. They were also allowed to withdraw from the study at will. Approval for the project was obtained from the local ethics committee (Comité de Protection des Personnes Sud-Est 1, France) and registered on http://clinicaltrial.gov (NCT 00428779).

Experimental Design

The participants came in 3–4 wk before the experiment for a medical examination, including determination of body mass, height, and percentage of body fat (skinfold thickness measurements). The subjects performed a maximal test on a motorized treadmill (Gymrol S2500, HEF Tecmachine, Andrezieux-Boutheon, France) that aimed at determining anaerobic threshold, VO2max, and the velocity associated with VO2max [VVO2max; see Millet et al. (24) for exact protocol]. During this first visit, the subjects were also fully informed regarding the experimental procedures. Particular attention was paid to familiarizing them with the maximal voluntary contractions (MVC) and electrical stimulation of the KE and PF muscles. The subjects repeated trials of the procedures until they were able to produce consistent results.

During the 24TR session, neuromuscular function was evaluated before (pre-24TR), every 4 h during, and at the end of the 24-h treadmill run (post-24TR) to describe the progress of fatigue throughout the protocol. Neuromuscular evaluation consisted in determining the isometric MVC of KE and PF to provide a global index of fatigue. Maximal voluntary activation levels for KE and PF, as well as maximal vastus lateralis (VL) and soleus (SOL) electromyographic (EMG) activities normalized to the M-wave amplitudes, were evaluated to evidence central fatigue. Finally, a superimposed tetanus (for KE only) and single and multiple electrical stimulations were delivered to the relaxed muscle to determine the extent and origin of peripheral fatigue. The measurements were conducted first on KE and then on PF. The control group only performed the KE MVC trials and did not sleep during the experiment.

Protocol

The running exercise started between 4:30 and 6:00 PM and ended 24 h later. The protocol is described in Fig. 1. Test sessions (Fig. 1A) were organized every 4 h. The ultramarathon runners exercised on a calibrated level motorized treadmill (Gymrol S2500, HEF Tecma-
chine; and ProForm 585 Perspective, Health & Fitness, Logan, UT) in the laboratory at a freely chosen pace (slope = 0%). The subjects were instructed to choose their speed and ask the investigator to set it. The speed could be modified at any time during the 24TR as in a normal 24-h race. To avoid any influence of hypoglycemia and hyperthermia on the development of central fatigue (31, 32), the runners were cooled with fans and fed ad libitum with meals containing mainly carbohydrates, energy bars, and drinks. The food and water intake during the 24TR was recorded to ensure there was no major problem of energy intake during the experiment. This was checked "live" by an experienced investigator.

**Experimental Setting**

The neuromuscular function evaluation was based on the measurements summarized in Fig. 1B.

**Torque measurements.** For both muscle groups, the isometric contractions performed during the experiment included maximal voluntary and electrically evoked contractions. During all the MVCs, the subjects were strongly encouraged. For the KE testing, the subjects were seated in the frame of a Cybex II (Ronkonkoma, NY) and Velcro straps were wrapped around the chest and hips to avoid lateral and frontal displacements. Subjects were also instructed to grip the seat during the voluntary contractions to further stabilize the pelvis. The KE muscle mechanical response was recorded with a strain gauge (SBB 200 kg, Tempo Technologies, Taipei, Taiwan) located at the level of the external malleolus. Torque values were obtained from force measured by the strain gauge multiplied by the lever arm, i.e., knee-malleolus distance. All measurements were taken from the subject’s right leg, with the knee and hip flexed at 90° from full extension. MVC of the PF muscles was evaluated with a dynamometric pedal (Captels, Saint Mathieu de Treviers, France). For the PF testing, subjects were seated on an inclined bench, attached to the dynamometric pedal (see Ref. 38 for details). The hip, knee, and ankle angles were set at 90° from full extension. Velcro straps were also used to limit heel lift, hip extension, and trunk movement. The isometric contractions performed during the experiment included maximal voluntary and electrically evoked contractions. During all the MVCs, the subjects were strongly encouraged.

**Electrical stimulation.** After femoral (for KE) and posterior tibial nerve (for PF) detection with a ball probe cathode pressed into either the femoral triangle (KE) or the popliteal fossa (PF), electrical stimulation was applied percutaneously to the motor nerve via a self-adhesive electrode pressed manually (10-mm diameter, Ag-AgCl, type 0601000402; Contrôle Graphique Medical, Brie-Comte-Robert, France). The anode, a 10 × 5-cm self-adhesive stimulation electrode (Medicomplex, Ecublens, Switzerland), was located either in the gluteal fold for KE or on the patella for PF. A constant current (Medicompex, Ecublens, Switzerland), was located either in the isometric contractions performed during the experiment included maximal voluntary and electrically evoked contractions. During all the MVCs, the subjects were strongly encouraged.

**M-wave.** The optimal intensity of stimulation was set by progressively increasing the stimulus intensity until the maximal isometric twitch torque was reached. Three stimuli at supramaximal intensity (1.2 times the maximum M-wave stimulus intensity; range: 25–72 mA on KE and 31–66 mA on PF) were then delivered, and the mean value of the three recorded M waves was taken as the M_max value. This procedure was conducted on KE and PF. The same intensity was used over the whole experiment for a given subject. For data analysis, M-wave peak-to-peak amplitude and duration were measured. The M_max value was further used to normalize the maximal voluntary root mean square (RMS) EMG (RMS·M_max, see below) on VL and SOL.

**Mechanical responses to nerve stimulation.** The amplitude of the potentiated twitch peak torque (Pt) that followed the first MVC was determined for KE and PF (see Fig. 1B). To determine the maximal muscle force production ability, i.e., the true maximal force that can be produced by KE (27), a 0.3-s stimulation train (100 Hz) was delivered to the femoral nerve during the second MVC trial. The intensity of stimulation was the same as that used for M_max. The maximal absolute torque (MVC + superimposed evoked torque) was considered as the maximal muscle force production ability of KE (Fig. 2A). Maximal muscle force production ability could not be measured for PF because the first two subjects tested suffered from muscle cramps after the application of the stimulation train, so this measurement was removed from the protocol.

**Low- to high-frequency torque ratio.** The variable measured was the ratio of the forces induced by tetani delivered at low (20 Hz) and high (80 Hz) frequencies for both KE and PF.

**MVCs and maximal activation level.** The subjects were asked to perform two MVCs of each muscle group for ~3 s separated by about 30 s. During the voluntary contractions, electrical stimulations were superimposed to evaluate the level of activation. The twitch interpolation technique (23) consisted of superimposing a single stimulation (supramaximal intensity) on the isometric plateau. A second stimulation (control twitch) was delivered to the relaxed muscle 1.5 s after the end of the contraction (Fig. 2B). This provided the opportunity to obtain a potentiated mechanical response and so reduce the variability in activation level (%VA) values. The ratio of the amplitude of the superimposed twitch over the size of the control twitch was then calculated to obtain %VA as follows:
The RMS values of the VL and SOL EMG activity and average torque level were calculated during the MVC trials over a 0.2-s period after the torque had reached a plateau and before the superimposed stimulation was evoked. This RMS value was then normalized to the maximal peak-to-peak amplitude of the M-wave (RMS·M<sub>amp</sub>).

**Blood samples.** Peripheral venous blood samples were taken from an antecubital vein of participants before, every 4 h during, and after the 24TR. Samples were drawn into nonadditive tubes under sterile conditions. Serum was separated from whole blood by centrifugation at 1,000 g for 10 min at room temperature. Plasma levels of myoglobin (Mb), creatine phosphokinase (CK), Na<sup>+</sup>, and K<sup>+</sup> were measured using an autoanalyzer (ADIVA 1650, Bayer, PA).

**Perceived exertion.** Every 2 h, running speed was set to 8 km/h for 4 min. At the end of this period, a rating of perceived exertion (RPE) was measured with the Borg RPE scale (4).

**Statistics**

All descriptive statistics presented in text are means ± SD. Normal distribution was checked using a Shapiro-Wilk test of normality. Each study variable was then compared between the different instances using a one-way (time) analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures. A two-way (time × group) ANOVA with repeated measures was performed for the variable measured in the control and experimental groups, i.e., KE MVC. Newman-Keuls post hoc tests were applied to determine between-means differences if the ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for any factor or interaction. Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients were also calculated for the following variable pairs: pre- to post-24TR KE %VA variation vs. pre- to post-24TR PF %VA variation; post-24TR [CK] values vs. post-24TR [Mb] values; and post-24TR [CK] values vs. post-24TR relative values (%PRE) for maximal absolute torque. For all statistical analyses, a P value of 0.05 was accepted as the level of significance. Data in Figs. 4–7 are normalized to corresponding baseline values and expressed as percentages (means ± SE).

**RESULTS**

**Running Performance, Perceived Exertion, and Maximal Voluntary Contraction**

The effective running time averaged 18 h and 39 min (±41 min) for an average distance of 149.2 ± 15.7 km. Average running speed, computed over 4-h periods, displayed a progressive decrease during the exercise (P < 0.001; Fig. 3). Overall, the average running speed represented 39 ± 4% of V<sub>̇O2max</sub>. Speed declined regularly from the start of the exercise to 16 h, but the first significant decrease occurred 8 h after the start (P < 0.001) and declined continuously until 16 h. Thereafter, average running speed remained constant.

RPE displayed the opposite pattern, i.e., increased regularly until 16 h compared with baseline (P < 0.001) and then tended...
The first significant increase was observed 2 h after the start (P < 0.05) and post-24TR (KE: 136 ± 49 N·m; PF: 118 ± 25 N·m; P < 0.01) compared with 8 h. At the end of the 24TR, MVC reductions from baseline reached −30.3 ± 12.5 and −40.9 ± 17.0% for PF and KE, respectively (P < 0.001). Torque decrements were significantly higher for KE compared with PF (P < 0.05). Two-way analysis of variance with repeated measures for KE MVC revealed that KE MVC did not vary significantly during the 24-h period in the control group (Fig. 4A). Therefore, KE MVC was significantly higher than in the experimental group from 8 h to post-24TR (P < 0.01 at 8 h; P < 0.001 from 12 h to post-24TR).

**Activation Level**

Variables related to nervous activation displayed a progressive decline throughout the exercise. On KE muscles, %VA declined regularly during the exercise (P < 0.001, Fig. 5A). Compared with baseline values (88 ± 9%), the first significant decline was observed at 8 h (73 ± 15%; P < 0.01). At post-24TR, %VA values (59 ± 20%) were further reduced compared with 8 h (P < 0.001), and the final decrement reached −33.0 ± 21.8%. EMG data further confirmed the progressive reduction of nervous activation: VL RMS·M ampl during the MVC was reduced at 8 h (P < 0.001) and then further declined at post-24TR (−46.1 ± 16.4%, P < 0.05).

![Fig. 4. Evolution of MVC impairment on KE muscles in the control group (A), in the experimental group (B), and on the PF muscles (C) in the experimental group during the 24TR. Values are means ± SE expressed as a percentage of baseline value (%PRE). ###P < 0.001 indicates a significant effect of time, revealed by analysis of variance. *P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001, significance level of pairwise comparisons between different instances, revealed by post-hoc analysis. §§P < 0.01; §§§P < 0.001, significance level of pairwise comparisons between the 2 groups at different instances, revealed by post hoc analysis.](http://jap.physiology.org)

![Fig. 5. Evolution of the maximal activation level (%VA) of the KE (A) and PF (B) muscles during the 24TR. Values are means ± SE expressed as %PRE. ###P < 0.001 indicates a significant effect of time, revealed by analysis of variance. **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001, significance level of pairwise comparisons between different instances, revealed by post hoc analysis.](http://jap.physiology.org)
The development of central alterations was less pronounced in the PF muscle group. Although %VA declined progressively from baseline (97 ± 4%) during the exercise (P < 0.001), these alterations only became significantly different at 16 h (84 ± 14%); and were maintained depreciated until post-24TR (83 ± 20%; P < 0.01, Fig. 5B). After the 24TR, the PF %VA decriment was about one-half (−14.8 ± 18.9%) the %VA decrement measured on the KE muscles. Nevertheless, %VA variations between pre- and post-24TR were significantly correlated between KE and PF (R = 0.51; P < 0.001). EMG data were less clear. Although a tendency toward a gradual decline during exercise was observed, analysis of variance did not reveal any statistical difference.

**Single Twitch**

Tables 1 and 2 display the results of mechanical and EMG responses to a single electrical stimulation of the femoral and tibial motor nerves. Potentiated Pt decreased continuously until 16 h for KE and 12 h for PF. The values then stabilized during the second part of the event (from 12–16 h to post-24TR). Final twitch peak torque reductions were similar for KE and PF (−25 vs. −23%, respectively). The VL M-wave amplitude showed slight but nonsignificant changes at 12 h. Conversely, the SOL M-wave amplitude began to decrease at 4 h (P < 0.01) and remained reduced until the end of the 24TR (P < 0.001). The peak-to-peak duration of the VL and SOL M waves did not change over the 24TR.

**Trains of Stimuli**

The low- to high-frequency torque ratio remained unchanged over the 24TR for both KE and PF (range: 68–72%; Fig. 6). The decrease in maximal absolute torque from baseline (242 ± 33 N·m) is shown in Fig. 7. The alteration was significant at 8h (231 ± 33 N·m; P < 0.01), further decreased until 16 h (216 ± 32 N·m; P < 0.001), and stayed at a similar level until the end of the 24TR (216 ± 43 N·m; P < 0.001). The final decriment averaged −10.2 ± 15.7% (P < 0.001). A broad range of interindividual responses was observed for this variable (Fig. 8B).

**Blood Analysis**

Plasma [K+] and [Na+] remained stable throughout the 24TR. Conversely, there was considerable variation in [CK] responses between subjects, ranging post-24TR from 812 to 42,711 IU/l (Fig. 8A) with an average value of 13,319 IU/l. The [Mb] response was similarly broad, ranging post-24TR from 129 to 7,014 μg/l with an average value of 2,035 μg/l. These two indexes of muscle damage were correlated at post-24TR (R = 0.90; P < 0.001). Interestingly, post-24TR [CK] values were slightly but significantly correlated with the post-24TR relative values for maximal absolute torque (R = −0.65; P < 0.05; Fig. 8B).

**DISCUSSION**

The main purpose was to test the hypothesis that central fatigue would be the principal explanation for neuromuscular fatigue during a 24-h running bout and that this would minimize the extent of peripheral fatigue. The results confirmed this hypothesis, since large central activation deficits were observed, especially on the KE muscles. As expected, the extent of peripheral fatigue was moderate, since no low-frequency fatigue was observed on any muscle group, the decline of KE maximal muscle force production ability was confined to a low level, and M-wave alterations were only observed on PF muscles. The present experiment also describes for the first time the development of central and peripheral fatigue appearance on a simulated ultramarathon, showing that the muscle alterations were limited to the first part (12–16 h) of the event. The secondary purpose of this experiment was to verify the assumption that PF muscles would fatigue more than KE during level ultraendurance running. Although some M-wave alterations were observed only on PF, MVC was altered to a larger extent on the KE compared with the PF muscles.

**Table 1. Twitch peak force of knee extensor and plantar flexor muscles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 h</th>
<th>8 h</th>
<th>12 h</th>
<th>16 h</th>
<th>20 h</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KE potentiated</td>
<td>94 ± 7</td>
<td>92 ± 12*</td>
<td>87 ± 11‡</td>
<td>80 ± 12‡</td>
<td>78 ± 10‡</td>
<td>75 ± 10‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF potentiated</td>
<td>87 ± 15†</td>
<td>82 ± 9‡</td>
<td>74 ± 8‡</td>
<td>79 ± 13‡</td>
<td>78 ± 10‡</td>
<td>77 ± 9‡</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are means ± SD expressed as a percentage of initial values (%PRE) for knee extensor (KE) and plantar flexor (PF) muscles during and after (post) a 24-h treadmill run. *P < 0.05; †P < 0.01; ‡P < 0.001, significantly different from PRE.

**Table 2. M-wave characteristics of vastus lateralis and soleus muscles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 h</th>
<th>8 h</th>
<th>12 h</th>
<th>16 h</th>
<th>20 h</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak-to-peak amplitude, %PRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>89 ± 9</td>
<td>90 ± 24</td>
<td>83 ± 26</td>
<td>93 ± 23</td>
<td>100 ± 15</td>
<td>88 ± 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL</td>
<td>77 ± 13†</td>
<td>69 ± 25‡</td>
<td>72 ± 18‡</td>
<td>69 ± 23‡</td>
<td>68 ± 23‡</td>
<td>64 ± 22‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak-to-peak duration, %PRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>98 ± 8</td>
<td>103 ± 12</td>
<td>98 ± 5</td>
<td>99 ± 7</td>
<td>101 ± 15</td>
<td>96 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL</td>
<td>95 ± 10</td>
<td>99 ± 15</td>
<td>99 ± 15</td>
<td>99 ± 13</td>
<td>99 ± 15</td>
<td>102 ± 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are means ± SD expressed as %PRE for vastus lateralis (VL) and soleus (SOL) muscles during and after a 24-h treadmill run. †P < 0.01; ‡P < 0.001, significantly different from PRE.

1229

**Figure 8B**

Downloaded from http://jap.physiology.org/ by 10.220.33.1 on April 6, 2017
therefore rejecting the initial hypothesis. Overall, this study shows that the etiology and amplitude, but not the evolution, of the decrease in maximal strength capacity of the locomotor muscles after ultraendurance running are dependent on the muscle group under consideration but that fatigue is mainly due to central alterations.

**Torque Impairment**

The torque decrements reported in the current study are in accordance with the literature. Despite the flat terrain, strength loss is larger than those reported for shorter running exercises. Millet et al. (26) reported a 28% reduction of KE MVC after a running bout of 8.5 h. In their literature review, Millet and Lepers (25) also referred to a reduction of 34% after a running exercise lasting 18.4 h (unpublished data). In the present study, the KE MVC decrement averaged 41% over the 24TR. This value agrees with the nonlinear relationship for strength loss-exercise duration proposed by Millet and Lepers (25) for running exercises of sufficient duration that the anaerobic metabolism does not play a significant role: as running duration increases, force loss first dramatically increases for exercise durations of 2–5 h and then tends to plateau for extreme exercise durations. The shape of this relationship could reflect the involvement of protective mechanisms brought into play to avoid extensive muscle damage, homeostasis disturbances, and thus biological harm (29).

There is less information available on the evolution of PF MVC after endurance running, especially for running durations above 3 h. MVC reductions after 1-h and 30-min to 2-h and 30-min flat running exercises have been reported between 11 and 18% (35, 38, 40). The PF MVC impairment (~30%) of the present study seems to agree with these findings but is in contradiction with the results of Avela et al. (1), who observed a drop of 30% after a marathon run completed in ~3 h. However, Avela et al. measured MVC while the blood flow was occluded with a pressure cuff, to avoid any recovery of metabolic fatigue during the measurements. This was not the

![Fig. 6](image1.png)

Fig. 6. Changes in the low- to high-frequency torque ratio (P30/P80) for the KE (A) and PF muscles (B) over the 24TR. N.S., nonsignificant. Values are %PRE.

![Fig. 7](image2.png)

Fig. 7. Changes in maximal absolute torque of the KE muscles over the 24TR. Values are means ± SE expressed as %PRE. ###P < 0.001 indicates a significant effect of time, revealed by analysis of variance. **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001, significance level of pairwise comparisons between different periods, revealed by post hoc analysis.
case in the other studies mentioned above and in the present one. This procedure may have affected the amplitude of MVC reduction after the exercise.

One could also suggest that circadian rhythms and sleep deprivation would have influenced maximal strength (6, 12). Indeed, the 4th- to 12th-h period of exercise corresponded to nighttime, and the torque decrement in the first half of the run tended to be larger than in the second half (Fig. 4). This may have resulted from the combined influence of fatigue and circadian rhythms. Although MVC did not vary significantly in the control group, it tended to decrease from 4 to 12 h and to increase in the second part of the experiment (i.e., during daytime) with a return to baseline values at post-24TR. Therefore, it can reasonably be suggested that MVC kinetics observed in the runners were influenced mainly by fatigue and only slightly by circadian rhythms.

Several studies have shown that the PF muscles are more active than KE during slow level running (20, 30, 43), leading to the hypothesis that larger force decrements would occur in PF than in KE. Since the decrease in PF MVC was ~30% vs. ~41% in KE, it can be suggested that KE was less resistant to fatigue than PF, maybe due to a lower percentage of type I fibers. These results are in agreement with those of Petersen et al. (35), who reported MVC decrements after a marathon of 17 and 22% for PF and KE, respectively. The relative contribution and fatigue of PF and KE muscles probably also depend on the runner’s level of performance and training background or the runner’s technique.

Central Fatigue

The large central fatigue observed in the current study agrees well with previous data observed on the KE muscles after an ultramarathon (26). The occurrence of central fatigue on the PF muscles after ultraendurance running is an original finding. Although the amplitude of central drive reduction was lower for the PF muscles, there was a significant correlation between %VA changes for KE and PF. This result could reflect the existence of a common central mechanism aimed at reducing the sensitivity of myofilaments to Ca²⁺ and the loss of muscle K⁺ to the extracellular compartments from contracting muscles depend on the intensity of the work performed (7, 28), especially at low to moderate intensities (13). Contrary to measurements obtained after a 100-km run (34), no significant change in plasma [K⁺] and [Na⁺] was observed during the 24TR in the present study. Therefore, we suggest that in the current study, the exercise intensity was too low to cause marked ionic imbalance that would disturb muscle membrane excitability on the VL muscle. Although M-wave amplitude was unchanged on the VL muscle, a significant reduction was observed on the SOL muscle. These findings are consistent with those of Behm and St-Pierre (2), who showed that PF were more susceptible to M-wave amplitude reductions than KE muscles.

Lack of low-frequency fatigue. In line with previous studies on prolonged running, although not as extreme as in the present experiment (8, 27, 37), LFF was not observed for KE during the 24TR. Another original finding of the present study is that no LFF was detected for the PF muscles, as for the KE muscles. It is then suggested that minimal exercise intensity is necessary to induce mechanical and metabolic disturbances that may promote the development of LFF (16, 17). The low speed of the current exercise (9.0 to 7.2 km/h) may have been insufficient to reach this threshold.

Intrinsic force and muscle damage. Since there was no change in the VL M wave, no LFF, and a moderate loss of maximal force production ability (~10%), average peripheral fatigue of the KE muscles appears very limited, with nevertheless a large interindividual variability. Similar results were reported after a 30-km trail run (27). One limit of the present study is the fact that superimposed tetanus was performed only once at each instance due to the pain. As a result, two subjects reached 108 and 112% of initial values at the end of the 24TR (see Fig. 8B), especially because their baseline values were low. One may argue that the stimulation intensity was insufficient to be genuinely supramaximal throughout the experiment, i.e., notwithstanding potential changes in impedance over time, electrode-nerve position during contraction relative to rest, and axonal refractoriness. However, on the KE muscles, VL M-wave amplitude was not modified during the 24TR, whereas twitch peak torque declined, suggesting that stimulation stayed maximal. To explain the increase in superimposed tetanus between pre- and post-24TR in these two subjects, we rather suggest that the contraction of the antagonist muscles during superimposed tetanic stimulation may have influenced the results at baseline, despite the familiarization session.

The correlation reported in Fig. 8B suggests that the loss of maximal force production ability was partly influenced by the structural status of the fibers, as indirectly evidenced by CK activities. Nevertheless, whereas CK activities provide a gross indication of skeletal muscle injury, they do not inform on any relative degree of muscle damage or impairment of muscle function (11). In particular, the very long exercise duration in the present study may have accentuated the accumulation of CK and Mb in the blood. Other factors, such as reduction in the force produced by the active cross bridges or modifications of the sensitivity of myofilaments to Ca²⁺ (36) also may account for the reduction in maximal force production ability.

Because the nerve stimulation trains generated cramps on PF, it was unfortunately not possible to evaluate the maximal force production ability of this muscle group. However, twitch peak torque was depressed to the same extent on the PF and KE muscles. Although the reduction of M-wave amplitude may partly explain the peripheral alterations, it can be supposed that
there would have been a loss of PF maximal force production ability, since no LFF occurred.

Implications for Ultraendurance Running Performance

The current results do not allow predicting directly the extent to which the fatigue mechanisms identified during maximal isometric contractions would affect submaximal muscle function during ultraendurance running. It may nevertheless be speculated that the relative level of muscle activation required for a constant running speed was progressively increased, due to the reduction of maximal neural drive. In addition, peripheral fatigue implies that higher muscle activation is required for a given mechanical power produced. As a consequence, there was an increase of the subjective effort required for a given task (i.e., running at 8 km/h). Together with nociceptive feedback, this may eventually lead the subject to reduce the speed so that their relative level of activation during running would stay below a maximal tolerated activation level. The progressive mismatch between perceived effort and motor output, i.e., running speed, strongly suggests that central processes do impair some aspects of ultraendurance running performance (41).

A few limitations of our study must be noted. First, the stimulation intensity was 1.2 times optimal intensity rather than 1.5 times, which further ensures supramaximality. We chose this intensity because it was better tolerated by the subjects during repetitive testing over the 24-h running exercise. A higher intensity also may increase the activation of the antagonist muscles for PF. This intensity (120%) was used in several studies investigating neuromuscular function alteration with fatigue (14, 19, 21, 39). Another limitation is the possibility that axonal hyperpolarization may have affected our measurements (5), especially during the maximal evoked torque (MVC + superimposed tetanic train). This variable also needs to be interpreted with caution, because antagonistic coactivation may affect force development in this situation. This measurement should be interpreted as a relative indicator of muscle contractile status, rather than an absolute measure of maximal intrinsic force. In addition, axonal hyperpolarization could have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at different intensities. In addition, antagonist cocontraction would have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at different intensities. In addition, antagonist cocontraction would have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at different intensities. In addition, antagonist cocontraction would have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at different intensities. In addition, antagonist cocontraction would have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at different intensities. In addition, antagonist cocontraction would have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at different intensities. In addition, antagonist cocontraction would have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at different intensities. In addition, antagonist cocontraction would have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at different intensities. In addition, antagonist cocontraction would have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at different intensities. In addition, antagonist cocontraction would have preferred the activation of the antagonist muscles for PF. This intensity (120%) was used in several studies investigating neuromuscular function alteration with fatigue (14, 19, 21, 39). Another limitation is the possibility that axonal hyperpolarization may have affected our measurements (5), especially during the maximal evoked torque (MVC + superimposed tetanic train). This variable also needs to be interpreted with caution, because antagonistic coactivation may affect force development in this situation. This measurement should be interpreted as a relative indicator of muscle contractile status, rather than an absolute measure of maximal intrinsic force. In addition, axonal hyperpolarization could have preferentially depressed the high-frequency response during tetanic muscle stimulation at submaximal intensity. Therefore, the absence of modification of the low- to high-frequency torque ratio could have resulted from the combined effects of LFF, which preferentially depresses low-frequency response, and hyperpolarization, which preferentially depresses high-frequency response. This limit is nevertheless present in all studies that have compared stimulations at low and high frequency to investigate the type of fatigue. Finally, the muscles were tested in the same order (KE then PF), which may have induced a small recovery for PF.

Conclusion

The purpose of this experiment was to investigate the development of fatigue over an extreme duration exercise, a unique occasion to study human physiology as it is stretched toward breaking point. More particularly, we aimed at testing the hypothesis that central fatigue would be the principal explanation for neuromuscular fatigue during a 24-h running bout and that this would minimize the extent of peripheral fatigue. The results confirmed this hypothesis, since large central activation deficits were observed, especially on the knee extensor muscles, as well as limited peripheral alterations. In addition to their relatively low amplitude, the muscle alterations were limited to the first part of the run. The disproportionate increase in the perceived effort during a slow running task strongly suggests that central fatigue did limit the performance during the 24-h running bout. These findings add support to the theories stating that the central nervous system is mainly responsible for exercise limitation in humans even if exact relationships between central fatigue and teleoanticipation mechanisms still have to be determined.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Dr. Jean-Paul Micaleff for building the plantar flexor measurement device.

DISCLOSURES

No conflicts of interest are declared by the author(s).

REFERENCES


