

1 **ADVANCED ROCK CLIMBERS EXHIBIT GREATER FINGER FORCE AND**
2 **RESISTANCE TO FATIGUE COMPARED TO NOVICES DURING TREADWALL**
3 **CLIMBING**

4
5 Philip F. Ferrara III ^{*}, James Becker, John G. Seifert

6 Movement Science Laboratory, Department of Health and Human Development

7 Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, USA, 59715
8

9 **Abstract**

10 *Background:* The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of rock climbing experience
11 on time to fatigue (TTF), finger flexor force production relative to body weight (REL FP), and
12 changes in finger flexor muscle activity during tread wall climbing.

13 *Methods:* Eight advanced and seven novice sport rock climbers performed a climbing protocol
14 on a treadwall system. The protocol consisted of climbing for six 5-minute intervals or until
15 voluntary failure. A mounted force plate was used to measure finger force production before and
16 after the climbing protocol. Subjects performed a 20-second maximum voluntary isometric
17 contraction (MVIC) against the force plate with the dominant and non-dominant fingertips in a
18 common climbing hand configuration known as a half crimp. Muscle activity was monitored
19 with electromyographic electrodes placed bilaterally over the subject's *flexor digitorum*
20 *superficialis*. Median frequency (MF) and root mean square (RMS) were analyzed. The treadwall
21 was set at a difficulty of 9 IRCRA/5.9 YDS. It rotated at 7 m/min and was fixed at 7°
22 overhanging.

23 *Results:* Significant group differences were observed in subject characteristics, TTF (30±0 vs.
24 25.7±3.6 min), REL FP (5.6±1.2 vs. 3.2±0.9 N/kg BW), ΔFP (+1.5±12.3% vs. -31±16%), and
25 ΔMF (+6.3±22.4% vs. -17.6±10.9%).

26 *Conclusion:* The results of this study demonstrate that advanced climbers possess greater finger
27 flexor force production and resistance to fatigue compared to novices during bouts of climbing
28 on a treadwall system. This may be attributed to physiological changes due to years of training,
29 such as metabolic adaptations and oxygenation capacity in the forearm musculature.

30
31 **Keywords:** Rock climbing, electromyography, fatigue, finger strength

32
33 *Corresponding author:

34 E-mail address: PhilFerrara3@gmail.com (P. Ferrara)

37 **1. Introduction**

38 Rock climbing is a dynamic, multi-faceted sport with many specializations. One such variation,
39 known as free climbing, involves using the hands, feet, and safety equipment to ascend a rock
40 face.¹ During a free climbing ascent, the finger flexors (such as the *flexor digitorum superficialis*,
41 FDS), perform repeated isometric muscle contractions while the digits maintain tension against
42 rock holds.² These repetitive contractions slow blood flow to the forearm musculature, leading to
43 ischemia, acidosis and localized muscular fatigue. Colloquially known as “forearm pump,”
44 localized muscular fatigue is a primary cause of failure during a free climbing ascent.³ As
45 climbing standards progressed, rock climbers began implementing specialized training tools to
46 develop sport-specific strength and resistance to fatigue.⁴ These tools include the treadwall
47 system, a motorized, rotating climbing wall with fixed plastic holds.

48 High finger force production relative to body weight (REL FP) is also an essential component of
49 climbing, with an upward trend noted in trained participants.^{4-7, 9-13} Differences between trained
50 climbers and novice/non-trained counterparts have been documented in the literature, including
51 REL FP and finger flexor time to fatigue (TTF) during various tasks.⁵⁻¹⁴ While it does appear that
52 trained climbers have greater REL FP and TTF, many of the previous studies used imitation
53 climbing tasks to induce fatigue. This includes intermittent or sustained fingertip contractions
54 against a force plate in a fixed body position. Currently, few studies have used actual climbing as
55 a means of fatiguing subjects while monitoring acute changes in finger force production or
56 muscle activity.⁸

57 Electromyography (EMG) is a means of measuring muscle activity via motor unit action
58 potentials.¹⁵ Post-processing techniques such as median frequency (MF) and root mean square
59 (RMS) have been used to verify shifts in motor unit composition and activation, respectively.¹¹
60 ¹⁵ Previous climbing research implemented EMG to estimate changes in muscular activity of the
61 finger flexors during fatiguing protocols.^{11, 12, 16-18} While previous literature suggests trained
62 climbers have functional differences in fiber recruitment and a resistance to fatigue when
63 compared to novices, these studies are again limited to isolated tasks as opposed to actual
64 climbing.¹²

65 Current literature has established important physiological adaptations to years of high-level rock
66 climbing, including changes in finger flexor force production, time to fatigue and muscle fiber
67 recruitment patterns, however the protocols implemented oftentimes lack sport specificity.^{2, 3, 11,}

68 ¹² For example, Watts et al., 2008 found that the traditional method for measuring grip strength,
69 the handgrip dynamometer, was not specific enough to measure muscle activation in common
70 rock climbing hand configurations like the half crimp.¹⁸ Moreover, many previous protocols did
71 not include any form of climbing to fatigue subjects. Thus, we have developed a new protocol to
72 induce fatigue and assess changes in finger force production and muscle activation.

73 In the current study, a climbing-specific fatiguing protocol utilizes repeated bouts of climbing on
74 a treadwall system to approximate climbing in the field. This protocol is used in combination
75 with a climbing-specific finger strength testing device which has been adapted from the literature
76 to measure change in finger flexor force production and muscle activation in a commonly-used
77 hand configuration known as the half crimp.^{5, 19} This is the first time these tools have been used
78 in conjunction, which allowed us to both assess fatigue patterns and measure change in force
79 production in a climbing-specific manner.

80 The purpose of the present study is to investigate how rock climbing ability level affects time to
81 fatigue, finger force production and muscle activation during intermittent bouts of tread wall
82 climbing. It is hypothesized advanced rock climbers will have a greater time to fatigue, greater
83 finger force production relative to body weight (REL FP), lesser change in finger force
84 production (Δ FP), lesser change in median frequency (Δ MF) and lesser change in root mean
85 square (Δ RMS) when compared to novice climbers.

86

87 **2. Methods**

88 *2.1 Participant Selection*

89 Subjects were selected for experience group (advanced vs. novice) based on self-described
90 ability level, years of rock climbing experience, mean onsight and mean project grade as
91 described by Draper et al.²⁰ An “onsight” is defined as climbing a route within one attempt with
92 no falls and no prior knowledge of the holds. A “project” is a route that is completed with no
93 falls within five attempts but with prior knowledge of the holds.

94 Grading systems are used to measure the overall difficulty of a climbing route. The higher the
95 grade, the more difficult the route and more skilled a climber needs to be to complete it without
96 falling. All grades are reported in the International Rock Climbing Research Association’s
97 universal scale (IRCRA), the American Yosemite Decimal System (YDS) and European French
98 grading system where applicable. Both male and female advanced climbers were required to

99 have at least five years of climbing experience. Advanced male subjects were required to climb a
100 minimum 18 IRCRA/5.12a YDS/7a+ French.²¹ Advanced female subjects were required to climb
101 a minimum rating of 15 IRCRA/5.11 YDS/6c French. Novice subjects were required to have at
102 least one year of climbing experience and climb up to a rating of 10 IRCRA/5.10a YDS/5+
103 French. All subjects reported at least 50% of their training in the last six months be route
104 climbing. This was done to ensure participants were conditioned to longer bouts of climbing.
105 Prior approval of the study protocol was obtained from the Montana State University's
106 Institutional Review Board. All individuals provided informed consent prior to participating.
107 Fifteen trained rock climbers participated in the study.

108

109 *2.2 Experimental Design*

110 This descriptive study used between-subject (advanced vs. novice) and within-subject (dominant
111 vs. non-dominant hand) fixed measures with repeated measurements (pre- to post-exercise) to
112 determine differences in finger flexor force production, endurance and muscle activity during
113 tread wall climbing.

114

115 *2.3 Experimental Procedure*

116 *2.3.1 Instrumentation*

117 To assess finger flexor force production in a climbing-specific hand configuration, a mounted
118 force plate was adopted from Grant et al., 1996 (Fig. 1).⁵ The force plate (AMTI© MC3A-1000,
119 Watertown, MA) was mounted to a reinforced wooden box with an adjustable elbow rest. All
120 subjects were seated in 120° of horizontal abduction at the shoulder and 90° of elbow flexion, 0°
121 of wrist flexion, and 90° flexion at the proximal interphalangeal joint.⁵ Joint angles were
122 measured manually with a goniometer. The force plate was calibrated before each subject's test
123 using a fixed 5 gram weight. Prior to each MVIC, the force plate was tared to 0 ± 0.1 N.
124 An electromyographic electrode (Delsys Trigno™, Delsys Inc., Natick, MA, USA) was placed
125 bilaterally over the belly of the FDS. To find the muscle belly, subjects were asked to flex the
126 middle three digits at the proximal interphalangeal joint against an external force while the
127 muscle was palpated, as per Blackwell et al.²² Hair was removed, the skin was abraded and
128 cleansed with alcohol. Electrodes were placed over the muscle belly with respect to the

129 pennation angle of the muscle.¹⁵ The electrodes were then fixed with sports tape and secured
130 with athletic pre-wrap.

131 *2.3.2 Habituation and Warm-Up.* A five-minute warm-up and habituation period were given to
132 all participants, allowing for acclimation to the tread wall system (The Rock™, Ascent, Salt
133 Lake City, UT, USA). Participants then completed a mock finger force test on the mounted force
134 plate as a warm-up. The mock test involved two, 20-second submaximal isometric contractions
135 against the force plate in the half crimp position with the dominant hand (DH) and non-dominant
136 hand (NDH).¹⁹ A half crimp is a commonly-used hand configuration in climbing. The proximal
137 interphalangeal joint is flexed to 90° while the finger tips apply force to rock holds. (see figure
138 1). During this mock test, joint angles and body positions were standardized across all subjects.

139 *2.3.3 MVIC Test Protocol.* The MVIC test consisted of one 20-second maximal fingertip
140 contraction in the half-crimp position with both the dominant and non-dominant hand. A
141 countdown was given, at which point both force and EMG recording devices were triggered
142 simultaneously. Verbal encouragement was given at the 10-, 15- and 18-second mark.

143 *2.3.4 Treadwall Protocol.* All participants climbed the same treadwall route with no alternatives.
144 The route was set with the assistance of USA Climbing-certified level 1 route setter at a rating of
145 9 IRCRA/5.9 YDS/5 French. Plastic holds were mirrored to fatigue both arms equally. The
146 treadwall rotated at 7m/min and was set to 7° overhanging to promote fatigue in the finger
147 flexors.²³ Subjects were allowed to drop one arm between holds, however they were not allowed
148 to “shake out” during the test. A shake out is when the arms are alternately lifted over the head
149 and shook to improve blood flow to the forearms.

150 Following the pre-exercise MVIC (MVIC_{PRE}), subjects began the treadwall protocol. Subjects
151 climbed for five-minute intervals, which mimicked the time a climber may spend on a route.
152 Following the climbing interval, subjects immediately performed another MVIC test beginning
153 with the dominant hand. No rest was given between DH and NDH. Finger strength tests were
154 kept to less than two minutes to minimize recovery. Subjects then immediately climbed for
155 another five minutes. This was repeated for a maximum of six sets or until subjects could no
156 longer hang on to the holds (failure). Immediately after completion of the climbing protocol or at
157 the point of volitional failure, the post-exercise MVIC was performed.

158

159

160 2.4 Data Analysis

161 Comparisons were made between the first ($MVIC_{PRE}$) and fifth MVIC ($MVIC_{POST}$) to account
162 for differences in climb time. Force and EMG data were cropped to remove zeroes before and
163 after the contraction. The remaining 20-second data set was cropped again, removing the first
164 and last 10% (2 seconds) to account for transient phenomena.

165 *2.4.1 Force Data Processing.* Force data was recorded with AMTI NetForce™ software and
166 collected at 4096 Hz. Force data was analyzed using a custom written Matlab code (Mathworks,
167 Natick, MA, USA). Raw data was filtered with a zero-phase, low pass 2nd order Butterworth
168 filter with an 8 Hz cut-off.

169 The pre-exercise MVIC was used to determine each subject's maximal force production. It was
170 calculated as the mean of the filtered 16-second data set. Mean force production for each
171 subsequent MVIC was divided by $MVIC_{PRE}$ to normalize change in finger strength amongst all
172 subjects over time.

173 *2.4.2 EMG Data Processing.* Electromyographic data was recorded in Delsys EMGWorks®
174 Acquisition software and collected at 1926 Hz. It was converted via a 16-bit A/D board
175 (National Instruments USB-6225, Austin, Texas, USA). Electromyographic data was analyzed in
176 Delsys EMGWorks® Analysis and filtered using a zero-phase, low pass 4th order Butterworth
177 filter with 300 Hz cut-off.¹¹ Root mean square and MF was calculated on the filtered, cropped
178 data. The RMS time window was 125 ms with a window overlap of 62.5 ms.

179

180 2.5 Statistical Analysis

181 Unpaired t-tests were used to analyze subject characteristics and TTF. A 2x2x2 (group by hand
182 by time) mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to analyze force production
183 during $MVIC_{PRE}$ and $MVIC_{POST}$. A 2x2 (group by hand) mixed ANOVA was performed to
184 analyze ΔFP , ΔMF , and ΔRMS from $MVIC_{PRE}$ to $MVIC_{POST}$. Significance level was set at
185 $p \leq 0.05$ (SPSS 25.0; SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). *Post hoc* comparisons were made using a
186 Bonferroni procedure. All statistics are reported as mean \pm standard deviation (SD). Data was
187 stored in Excel® (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, USA) spreadsheets.

188

189

190

191 3. Results

192 *3.1 Subject Characteristics*

193 Age ($p=0.001$), years of climbing experience ($p=0.001$), mean project grade ($p=0.001$) and
194 mean onsight grade ($p=0.002$) were significantly different between advanced and novice
195 participants. Subject characteristics reported and summarized in Table 1. Two novice subjects
196 were excluded from data analysis due to premature muscular failure at six and eight minutes,
197 respectively.

198

199 *3.2 Time to Fatigue*

200 Time to fatigue was significantly longer for advanced climbers (30 ± 0 min) compared to the
201 novice climbers (25.7 ± 3.6 min; $p=0.001$). All advanced subjects completed the climbing
202 protocol. Only one novice subject completed the full, 30-minute protocol.

203

204 *3.3 Relative Force Production*

205 A significant group by hand interaction was observed for REL FP ($F_{1,1} = 8.23$, $p=0.008$). *Post-*
206 *hoc* analysis revealed the advanced groups' DH (5.6 ± 1.2 N/kg BW) produced significantly
207 more force than the advanced NDH (5.2 ± 1.3 N/kg BW, $F_1 = 11.78$, $p=0.004$). No difference
208 was observed in the novice group's DH (3.2 ± 0.8 N/kg BW) and NDH (3.2 ± 1.0 N/kg BW).
209 Moreover, the advanced group produced significantly more force on average (5.4 ± 1.3 N/kg)
210 when compared to the novice group (3.2 ± 0.9 N/kg BW, $F_1 = 39.6$, $p=0.001$). (Table 2)

211

212 *3.4 Change in Force Production*

213 A significant group effect was observed for Δ FP ($F_1 = 16.1$, $p=0.001$). The advanced group
214 experienced no reduction in FP, while the novice group's FP significantly decreased from
215 $MVIC_{PRE}$ to $MVIC_{POST}$ by $27.8 \pm 16.7\%$.

216

217 *3.5 Change in Muscle Activity*

218 A significant main group effect was observed for FDS Δ MF ($F_1 = 15.1$, $p=0.002$), but not Δ RMS
219 ($F_1 = 2.56$, $p=0.135$). The advanced group experienced no change from baseline in Δ MF, but the
220 novice group's Δ MF decreased significantly by $17.6 \pm 10.9\%$. Neither advanced nor novice
221 participants experienced a change in RMS. [Figure 2 near here].

222 4. Discussion

223 The purpose of this study is to measure changes in finger force production and muscle activity in
224 advance and novice sport rock climbers during a climbing protocol on a treadwall system. The
225 results support our hypothesis that trained climbers will have a greater TTF, REL FP but lesser
226 Δ FP and Δ MF over time when compared to the novices. While previous literature established
227 differences between advanced climbers and novice/untrained counterparts during fatigue-
228 inducing protocols, much of the research lacked sport-specificity. The current study utilizes a
229 novel protocol, combining a mounted force plate to measure maximal finger force production
230 with a treadwall system to fatigue climbers in a controlled, sport-specific setting.

231

232 *4.1 Time to Fatigue*

233 Previous research demonstrates trained climbers have greater localized endurance during both
234 continuous and intermittent fingertip contractions against a force plate at fixed percentages of the
235 subject's MVIC.^{9, 10, 15} In the current study, advanced climbers also exhibited greater finger
236 flexor endurance during actual bouts of climbing. This may be attributed to years of training,
237 including metabolic adaptations and psychological conditioning of the forearm musculature. It
238 has been suggested that forearm and whole body aerobic capacity can be used to predict
239 climbing performance.^{2, 24} Specifically, advanced climbers have shown greater oxygenation
240 capacity in the forearm musculature, leading to less reliance on anaerobic metabolism and a
241 longer climb time. While muscle oxygenation capacity was not measured in the present study, a
242 higher sport-specific aerobic capacity could account for differences in TTF between ability
243 groups.

244

245 *4.2 Force Production*

246 Advanced climbers had greater finger force production relative to body weight (REL FP) during
247 both pre- and post-climbing conditions compared to novice climbers (see Figure 2). Previous
248 literature also described similar findings. Grant et. al, MacLeod et al., Phillippe et al., and Fryer
249 et al. had comparable results, reporting trained climbers producing between 5.2 and 7.2 N/kg BW
250 on a similarly mounted force plate.^{2, 5, 13, 17} In the current study, advanced climbers produced an
251 average of 5.4 N/kg BW. Previous studies also reported a trend of increasing maximal FP with

252 experience level, illustrating the importance of strength-to-weight ratio in high-performance free
253 climbing.^{5-7, 9-11, 13}

254 When comparing Δ FP from MVIC_{PRE} to MVIC_{POST}, the advanced group experienced no decline
255 in force production after 30 minutes of climbing, whereas the novice group experienced
256 significant decline. No direct comparisons to previous research can be made due to differences in
257 protocol. However, Limonta et al. and Phillippe et al. reported similar findings during exhaustive
258 simulated climbing protocols using sustained contractions against a force plate at 80% MVIC
259 and intermittent contractions at 40% MVIC, respectively.^{3, 17} Both research groups found that
260 trained climbers maintained higher levels of finger force production compared to novice/non-
261 trained subjects. In the present study, the novice subjects' FP tapered by 24-30% (and as much as
262 61%) at the point of failure during treadwall climbing. The advanced group, however,
263 experienced no statistical decrease in FP after 30 min. of treadwall climbing. These findings
264 again may suggest metabolic differences between advanced and novice climbers, possibly
265 pointing to greater reliance on aerobic energy pathways in the forearm musculature.

266

267 *4.3 EMG Data*

268 Electromyographic data collected from the FDS supports the hypothesis for Δ MF, but not
269 Δ RMS. No statistically significant Δ MF was observed in the advanced group, however the
270 novice group's MF decreased by 22% and 12% in the DH and NDH, respectively. (Fig. 3)
271 Median frequency findings agree with Vigoroux & Quaine, who found elite-level climber's MF
272 decreases less quickly during fatiguing contractions when compared to non-trained
273 counterparts.¹¹ Previous research also demonstrates a correlation between MF and contraction
274 intensity, relating to the recruitment of larger motor units with higher conduction velocities.¹⁶ It
275 has been suggested that greater vasodilatory capacity of the forearm musculature could allow for
276 greater recovery between contractions, thereby reducing the build-up of metabolites and
277 "inducing a smaller change in the action potential velocity."¹² The lack of significant results in
278 RMS could be attributed to the decline in overall fiber recruitment and reliance on Type I fibers
279 for force production. More research should be devoted to activation patterns during fatigued
280 states in rock climbers of all ability groups.

281

282

283 5. Conclusion

284 In this paper, we demonstrate differences between advanced and novice rock climbers using a
285 treadwall system and mounted force plate. Rock climbing is a peculiar sport, requiring finger
286 flexor force production, endurance and specific hand configurations not utilized in other grip
287 strength-dependent sports like weightlifting. Previous climbing-related research used non-
288 climbing means to induce fatigue in subject. Results of the present study build upon this
289 literature, demonstrating advanced climbers have greater resistance to fatigue during actual bouts
290 of climbing. Moreover, compared to the novice group, advanced climbers displayed greater
291 finger force production relative to body weight and saw lesser decline in force production and
292 MF. The results are significant, as it confirms previous findings and provides a new, sport-
293 specific protocol for future rock climbing research.

294
295 Future studies may utilize a similar protocol to analyze the effect of supplementation, training
296 intervention or further investigate climbing-specific metabolic capacities. Moreover, the force
297 plate and treadwall system together could be used to identify differences between climbing
298 subdisciplines.

299
300

301 **Acknowledgements**

302 Thank you to Dr. Sophie Cowling, Dr. Tony Chang and Merrilee Thomas for their technical
303 assistance and to the subjects for their participation in this study.

304

305 **Author Contributions**

306 PF contributed in the design and implementation of the study protocol, data collection, data
307 analysis and final manuscript writing. JB contributed in design of the protocol and editing of the
308 final manuscript. JS contributed in the design and implementation of the study protocol, editing
309 of the final manuscript and overall supervision.

310

311 **Competing Interests**

312 No potential conflicts of interest were reported by the authors.

313

314

315 **References**


- 316 1. Roper S. *Camp 4: Recollections of a Yosemite Rock Climber*. The Mountaineers Books;
317 2013.
- 318 2. Fryer S, Stoner L, Lucero A, et al. Haemodynamic kinetics and intermittent finger flexor
319 performance in rock climbers. *International journal of sports medicine*. 2015;36(02):137-
320 142.
- 321 3. Philippe M, Wegst D, Müller T, Raschner C, Burtscher M. Climbing-specific finger
322 flexor performance and forearm muscle oxygenation in elite male and female sport
323 climbers. *European journal of applied physiology*. 2012;112(8):2839-2847.
- 324 4. Horst E. *Training for Climbing: The Definitive Guide to Improving Your Performance*.
325 Rowman & Littlefield; 2016.
- 326 5. Grant S, Hynes V, Whittaker A, Aitchison T. Anthropometric, strength, endurance and
327 flexibility characteristics of elite and recreational climbers. *Journal of sports sciences*.
328 1996;14(4):301-309.
- 329 6. Mermier CM, Janot JM, Parker DL, Swan JG. Physiological and anthropometric
330 determinants of sport climbing performance. *British journal of sports medicine*.
331 2000;34(5):359-365.
- 332 7. Sheel A. Physiology of sport rock climbing. *British journal of sports medicine*.
333 2004;38(3):355-359.
- 334 8. Watts P, Newbury V, Sulentic J. Acute changes in handgrip strength, endurance, and
335 blood lactate with sustained sport rock climbing. *The Journal of sports medicine and*
336 *physical fitness*. 1996;36(4):255-260.
- 337 9. Vigouroux L, De Monsabert BG, Berton E. Estimation of hand and wrist muscle
338 capacities in rock climbers. *European journal of applied physiology*. 2015;115(5):947-
339 957.
- 340 10. Grant S, Shields C, Fitzpatrick V, et al. Climbing-specific finger endurance: a
341 comparative study of intermediate rock climbers, rowers and aerobically trained
342 individuals. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2003;21(8):621-630.
- 343 11. Vigouroux L, Quaine F. Fingertip force and electromyography of finger flexor muscles
344 during a prolonged intermittent exercise in elite climbers and sedentary individuals.
345 *Journal of sports sciences*. 2006;24(2):181-186.
- 346 12. Quaine F, Vigouroux L. Maximal resultant four fingertip force and fatigue of the
347 extrinsic muscles of the hand in different sport climbing finger grips. *International*
348 *journal of sports medicine*. 2004;25(08):634-637.
- 349 13. MacLeod D, Sutherland D, Buntin L, et al. Physiological determinants of climbing-
350 specific finger endurance and sport rock climbing performance. *Journal of sports*
351 *sciences*. 2007;25(12):1433-1443.
- 352 14. Watts PB, Drobish KM. Physiological responses to simulated rock climbing at different
353 angles. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*. 1998;30(7):1118-1122.
- 354 15. Cram JR. *Introduction to Surface Electromyography*. Aspen Publishers; 1998.
- 355 16. Esposito F, Limonta E, Cè E, Gobbo M, Veicsteinas A, Orizio C. Electrical and
356 mechanical response of finger flexor muscles during voluntary isometric contractions in
357 elite rock-climbers. *European journal of applied physiology*. 2009;105(1):81..
- 358 17. Limonta E, Cè E, Gobbo M, Veicsteinas A, Orizio C, Esposito F. Motor unit activation
359 strategy during a sustained isometric contraction of finger flexor muscles in elite
360 climbers. *Journal of sports sciences*. 2016;34(2):133-142.

- 361 18. Watts PB, Jensen RL, Gannon E, Kobeinia R, Maynard J, Sansom J. Forearm EMG
362 during rock climbing differs from EMG during handgrip dynamometry. *International*
363 *Journal of Exercise Science*. 2008;1(1):2.
- 364 19. Schweizer A, Furrer M. Correlation of forearm strength and sport climbing performance.
365 *Isokinetics and Exercise Science*. 2007;15(3):211-216.
- 366 20. Draper N, Dickson T, Blackwell G, et al. Self-reported ability assessment in rock
367 climbing. *Journal of sports sciences*. 2011;29(8):851-858.
- 368 21. Draper N, Simon F, David W, et al. Reporting climbing grades and grouping categories
369 for rock climbng. *Isokinetics and exercise science*. 2011;19:273-280.
370 doi:[10.3233/IES20110424](https://doi.org/10.3233/IES20110424)
- 371 22. Blackwell JR, Kornatz KW, Heath EM. Effect of grip span on maximal grip force and
372 fatigue of flexor digitorum superficialis. *Applied ergonomics*. 1999;30(5):401-405.
- 373 23. Watts PB, Jensen RL, Moss DM, Wagensomer JA. Finger strength does not decrease
374 with rock climbing to the point of failure. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*.
375 2003;35(5):S264.
- 376 24. Fryer SM, Giles D, Palomino IG, de la O Puerta A, España-Romero V. Hemodynamic
377 and cardiorespiratory predictors of sport rock climbing performance. *The Journal of*
378 *Strength & Conditioning Research*. 2018;32(12):3534-3541.

379
380
381

382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395

Relative FFP (N/kg)



◆ Adv DH ■ Adv NDH ▲ Nov DH ✕ Nov NDH






Table 1
Subject selection summary table (n=15)

Subject	N	Age	Body Mass	Height	Years Experience	Mean Onsight Grade	Mean Project Grade
<i>Nov</i>	7	21 ± 2.3*	67.6 ± 3.8	67.6 ± 3.8	3.0 ± 2.6*	10.0 ± 2.0*	11.0 ± 1.0*
<i>Adv</i>	8	29.3 ± 4.7	69.1 ± 6.9	69.1 ± 6.9	11.1 ± 5.2	20.0 ± 1.0	26.0 ± 1.0

* = significant differences between groups at $p < 0.05$. Reported as mean ± SD.

Climbing grades reported in the IRCRA rating scale.

Reported as mean ± SD.

Table 2

Change in finger force production and muscle activity (n=15)

		REL FP	ΔFP	ΔMF	ΔRMS
Adv	<i>DH</i>	5.6 ± 1.2**	+1.5 ± 12.3	+4.8 ± 25.9	+2.8 ± 17.5
	<i>NDH</i>	5.2 ± 1.3**	+2.0 ± 16.6	+7.7 ± 18.8	+30.7 ± 39.1
Nov	<i>DH</i>	3.2 ± 0.8	-30.8 ± 16.0*	-22.7 ± 6.5*	-18.3 ± 29.7
	<i>NDH</i>	3.2 ± 1.0	-24.9 ± 18.6*	-12.6 ± 15.5*	-12.9 ± 17.5

** = significant group by hand interaction; $p < 0.05$.

* = significant group differences; $p < 0.05$.

Reported as mean ± SD.