

## **Consistency and applicability of return to activity guidelines in tactical-athletes with exertional heat illness. A systematic review.**

Matthew O'Reilly, DO<sup>1,2</sup>

Yao-Wen Eliot Hu, MD, MBA, FAAFP<sup>1</sup>

Jonathan Gruber, DO<sup>1,3</sup>

Douglas M. Jones, PhD<sup>4,5</sup>

Arthur Daniel, MD<sup>1</sup>

Janelle Marra, DO, FAAFP<sup>1,6</sup>

John J. Fraser, PT, DPT, PhD, FACSM<sup>1,4</sup>

email: [john.j.fraser8.mil@health.mil](mailto:john.j.fraser8.mil@health.mil), ORCID: 0000-0001-9697-3795, Twitter: @NavyPT

1. Primary Care Sports Medicine Fellowship, Naval Hospital Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, CA, USA
2. United States Navy Medicine Readiness and Training Unit, Naval Medical Center San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA
3. United States Navy Medicine Readiness and Training Unit, Naval Medical Center Camp Lejeune, Jacksonville, NC, USA
4. Operational Readiness & Health Directorate, Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA, USA
5. Leidos, Inc, San Diego, CA, USA
6. 17th Combat Logistics Regiment, 1<sup>st</sup> Marine Logistics Group, Camp Pendleton, CA, USA

\*Correspondence to: John J Fraser, Operational Readiness & Health Directorate, Naval Health Research Center, 140 Sylvester Road, San Diego, CA 92106-3521, USA. email: [john.j.fraser8.mil@health.mil](mailto:john.j.fraser8.mil@health.mil), Twitter: @NavyPT

**Disclaimer:** The authors are military service member or employees of the U.S. Government.

This work was prepared as part of their official duties. Title 17, U.S.C. §105 provides that copyright protection under this title is not available for any work of the U.S. Government. Title 17, U.S.C. §101 defines a U.S. Government work as work prepared by a military service member or employee of the U.S. Government as part of that person's official duties. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, nor the U.S. Government.

**Support:** No external funding was received for this work.

**Acknowledgement:** We greatly appreciate the assistance of Simona Konecna and Aileen Y Chang, PhD for their assistance in developing the search strategy and executing the preliminary search.

## ABSTRACT

1 **Objective:** To assess the consistency of return to sport and occupation recommendations  
2 following EHI provided in published clinical practice guidelines, consensus statements, position  
3 statements, and practice alerts. A secondary aim was to evaluate the consistency of medical  
4 policies governing the return to duty following EHI between the branches of the United States  
5 Armed Forces and the agreement with published recommendations.

6 **Methods:** Ovid MEDLINE, Web of Science, and CINAHL databases were searched for clinical  
7 practice guidelines and position statements published at any time that guided return to activity in  
8 individuals with EHI. Methodological quality was assessed and the specific recommendations for  
9 clinical management were extracted. Consistency of recommendations was evaluated.  
10 Agreement between published guidelines and the policies governing return to activity in military  
11 tactical athletes with heat injury were also evaluated.

12 **Results:** Two professional societal guidelines provided recommendations pertaining to return to  
13 function following EHI. There was consistency between guidelines regarding recommendations  
14 that addressed abstinence from activity; medical follow-up; graded resumption of activity; and  
15 return to function. Pertaining to military policy, contemporary regulations published in recent  
16 years reflected the best evidence provided in the professional guidelines. The greatest  
17 incongruency was noted in older military policies.

18 **Conclusions:** This systematic review highlights the need for consistent recommendation across  
19 all branches of the military when it comes to returning servicemembers to duty after EHI.  
20

21 **Key Words:** Heat Stress Disorders; Sports Medicine; Military Personnel; Guidelines as Topic;  
22 Health Policy.

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## INTRODUCTION

Exertional heat illness (EHI) is a clinical condition that encompasses both heat exhaustion and exertional heat stroke.<sup>25</sup> Heat exhaustion is defined as the inability to continue exercising with a core body temperature less than 40°C (typically ranging between 38.5°C and 40°C), with nausea, vomiting, headache, fainting, weakness and cold or clammy skin common.<sup>25,26</sup> Exertional heat stroke is substantially more severe, involves core temperatures greater than 40°C, and typically results in multiorgan failure and central nervous system dysfunction.<sup>25,26</sup> These conditions, which frequently affect athletes engaged in sport and tactical occupations, occur when physiological thermoregulation is impaired or cannot maintain equilibrium with heat generated during metabolism or environmental exposure.<sup>25</sup> Sports-related EHI occurs up to 4.19 per 1000 athlete-exposures during participation in American football.<sup>13</sup> The prevalence of EHI during more extreme sports during competition in warm environments is even more common, with up to 54.5% of desert ultramarathoners found to have EHI.<sup>13</sup> In military servicemembers (commonly referred to as tactical-athletes), these conditions occur at a rate of 0.48 per 1000 person-years.<sup>1</sup> With climbing environmental temperatures expected with the changing climate, EHI is expected to become more problematic in the future.<sup>10</sup>

As a result of common sequelae of EHI, which includes reduced exercise capacity and heat intolerance,<sup>22</sup> substantial limitations in physical activity and participation in sport or occupational tasks are likely. As such, impairments and activity limitations resulting from EHI not only affect the health of the individual tactical athlete, but can also have a profound effect on the ability of an organization (i.e. team or unit) to meet operational objectives. Therefore, proper

50 clinical management is especially salient to organizational function, especially when lives are  
51 dependent on the successful execution of the mission.

52         The synthesis of findings and recommendations presented in clinical practice guidelines  
53 (CPGs), consensus statements, position statements, and practice alerts are highly useful during  
54 evidence-based decision-making, especially when planning resumption of sport and occupational  
55 activities following injury and illness. While CPGs have been found to be effective in improving  
56 the process and structure of medical care, they are frequently heterogenous in their  
57 recommendations.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, resumption of activity may be dictated by organizational policy  
58 informed by medical evidence and balanced by operational demands and risk management  
59 decision-making, factors that are also likely to be heterogenous. To our knowledge, there are  
60 limited professional society recommendations or consensus statements for progressive return to  
61 activity after EHI in the current literature and there have been no systematic reviews that have  
62 evaluated the consistency of recommendations pertaining to return to sport or occupation  
63 following EHI. Furthermore, an evaluation of the medical policies of the United States Armed  
64 Forces governing the return to duty following EHI and the congruency of the policies with  
65 published guidelines is also warranted to ensure that the most updated evidence-based  
66 management is provided to military tactical-athletes. Therefore, the purpose of this systematic  
67 review was to assess the consistency of return to sport and occupation recommendations  
68 following EHI provided in published CPGs, consensus statements, position statements, and  
69 practice alerts. A secondary aim was to evaluate the consistency of medical policies governing  
70 the return to duty following EHI between the branches of the United States Armed Forces and  
71 the agreement with published recommendations.

72

73 **METHODS**

74 The protocol for this study was registered *a priori* in PROSPERO (CRD42020216532,  
75 <http://bit.ly/MilitaryHeatRTD>). The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and  
76 Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)<sup>24</sup> and A Measurement Tool to Assess systematic Reviews version 2  
77 (AMSTAR 2)<sup>29</sup> were used to guide study reporting.

78 **Eligibility Criteria**

79 Guidelines were eligible for inclusion if they were a consensus guideline, society  
80 guideline, or CPG published at any time and addressed resumption of physical activity or duty  
81 requirements following EHI in adults.

82 **Search Strategy**

83 A research librarian was consulted to develop the search strategy. The search strategy,  
84 comprised of MeSH terms, subjects, and keywords is detailed in **Supplemental Table 1**. The  
85 searches were limited to records in English, the native language of the study team, published at  
86 any time of inquiry. Ovid MEDLINE, Web of Science (including Science Citation Index  
87 Expanded and Social Sciences Citation Index), and CINAHL, were queried on 31 December  
88 2019 and again on 31 January 2022 for CPGs, consensus statements, position statements, and  
89 practice alerts published at any time. and duplicates were removed using EndNote  
90 deduplication.<sup>4</sup> Records were organized, reviewed, and selected using Rayyan QCRI, an  
91 application used to facilitate study selection for systematic reviews (<https://rayyan.qcri.org/>).  
92 Two reviewers (MO and JG) independently reviewed each record by title and then abstract for  
93 inclusion. A third author (DJ) resolved any disagreements. Study selection is detailed in the  
94 PRISMA flowsheet (Figure 1).

95 **Data Extraction**

96 Two reviewers (MO and JG) independently assessed each guideline and extracted the  
97 specific recommendations for return to activity. Characteristics of the clinical guidelines are  
98 reported in **Supplemental table 2**. Similarly, policy statements guiding the return to duty in the  
99 United States Armed Forces were extracted using the same approach. Any disagreements were  
100 resolved by consensus. If consensus could not be achieved, a third author (DJ) resolved any  
101 disagreements.

## 102 **Risk of Bias Assessment**

103 Methodological quality of the included guidelines were assessed using the AGREE II  
104 tool.<sup>5</sup> While there are acknowledged differences in methodological quality between CPGs and  
105 consensus statements,<sup>18</sup> the AGREE II was employed in the current study to assess  
106 methodological quality across the full spectrum of guidelines. Each study was assessed in seven  
107 domains: Scope and Purpose; Stakeholder Involvement; Rigor of Development; Clarity of  
108 Presentation; Applicability; and Editorial Independence. Each domain was independently rated  
109 by three authors (JG, AD, and DJ). Reviewers resolved disagreements by consensus, and a fourth  
110 author (YEH) was consulted to resolve disagreements if needed.

## 111 **Synthesis Methods**

112 Consistency of recommendations between published guidelines and congruency of  
113 military medical policy with practice guidelines was evaluated using a matrix. Based on the  
114 nature of the current study and the limited number of guidelines addressing this topic, a meta-  
115 analysis was not performed.

116

## 117 **RESULTS**

### 118 **Study Selection**

119           The search strategy yielded 3,590 unique records after duplicates were removed, with  
120 four records identified through citation cross-referencing (**Figure 1**). The authors also searched  
121 content from the major medical associations representing sports medicine, family medicine,  
122 emergency medicine, occupational medicine, and wilderness medicine, which yielded two  
123 additional guidelines for review.<sup>14,15</sup> Based on the 24 abstracts reviewed for appropriateness, 13  
124 abstracts failed to meet criteria for this study since they did not address return to sport or activity  
125 following EHI. Of the 11 full-text records assessed for eligibility,<sup>2,3,7-9,14,15,22,23,25,26</sup> three records  
126 were excluded<sup>2,3,8</sup> since they were previous versions of more recent society consensus  
127 statements.<sup>26</sup> Of the remaining records, six were excluded<sup>7,14,15,22,23,25</sup> as they were not a  
128 consensus statement, CPG, society guideline, or did not specifically provide recommendations  
129 for resumption of activity following EHI. Two records were included in the systematic  
130 review.<sup>9,26</sup>

131           Pertaining to military medical policy in the US Armed Forces, the following regulations  
132 were identified and reviewed for specific guidance pertaining to return to duty following EHI:  
133 Department of Defense Medical Standards for Military Service, Retention (DOD Instruction  
134 6130.03, Volume 2); Navy Environmental Health Center Prevention of Heat/Cold Injuries  
135 (NEHC-TM-OEM 6260.6A); Manual of Naval Preventive Medicine Chapter 3, Prevention of  
136 Heat and Cold Stress Injuries (NAVMED P-5010-3); Marine Corps Heat Injury Prevention  
137 Program (Marine Corps Order 6200.1E w/Ch 1); US Army Standards of Medical Fitness (Army  
138 Regulation 40–501); Army & Air Force Heat Stress Control and Heat Casualty Management (TB  
139 MED 507/AFPAM 48-152); and US Army Training and Doctrine Command Prevention of Heat  
140 And Cold Casualties (TRADOC Regulation 350-29). Of these policy statements, only NEHC-



141 TM-OEM 6260.6A, AR 40–501, and TB MED 507 provided specific clinical guidance  
142 pertaining to return to activity following EHI.

### 143 **Study Characteristics**

144 **Table 1** details the extracted recommendations from the included societal guidelines and  
145 military policies. The included records consisted of a consensus statement from the American  
146 College of Sports Medicine (ACSM)<sup>26</sup> and a position statement from the National Athletic  
147 Trainers' Association (NATA).<sup>9</sup> While a brief report by O'Connor, et al.<sup>23</sup> summarizing the US  
148 military health policy pertaining to return to activity following EHI did not meet inclusion  
149 criteria as a guideline, this work provided context to how policy has changed since 2007 and was  
150 reported in **Table 1**. Both the ACSM and NATA statements provided practice recommendations  
151 regarding clinical management of EHI, to include prevention, recognition, treatment, and  
152 progressive resumption of physical activity in the general population and athletes alike.<sup>9,26</sup>

### 153 **Risk of Bias Assessment**

154 **Figure 2** displays the methodological quality of the included studies scored using the six  
155 domains covered by the AGREE 2. Both statements had the greatest scores (>80%) in the  
156 domains pertaining to scope and purpose, clarity of presentation, and applicability.<sup>9,26</sup> In domain  
157 2 (stakeholder involvement), both statements scored in the 50-61% range, with the lowest quality  
158 observed in the areas pertaining to rigor of development (31-32%) and editorial independence (4-  
159 22%).<sup>9,26</sup>

### 160 **Study Findings**

#### 161 *Abstinence From Activity*

162 Both the ACSM consensus statement<sup>26</sup> and the NATA position statement<sup>9</sup> recommended  
163 abstinence from exercise or physical activity for at least seven days after release from initial

164 medical care. The NATA consensus statement also specified an upper range of 21 days of  
165 abstinence until cleared by a physician for return.<sup>9</sup> Among the military policies, the Navy  
166 (NEHC-TM-OEM 6260.6A)<sup>21</sup> advocated for avoidance of all heat stress for 2 weeks following  
167 hospital discharge, stabilization, and normalization of all heat stroke related studies; the Army  
168 (AR 40–501)<sup>11</sup> required a minimum of 2-weeks of abstinence regardless of severity, with  
169 continued refrain in individuals with clinical sequelae; and the Army-Air Force (TB MED  
170 507/AFPAM 48-152)<sup>30</sup> recommended a more conservative 3-month limited duty status  
171 restricting soldiers from heat exposure and performing vigorous exercise greater than 15  
172 minutes. O’Connor et al.<sup>23</sup> also reported finding heterogeneity of recommendations among the  
173 service policies. In this report, the authors found that the Army guidelines for return to duty were  
174 dependent on severity of illness, patient symptoms, and laboratory values; with the Navy  
175 providing specific guidance for cessation the day of illness and the day following until medical  
176 reevaluation and clearance for return.<sup>23</sup>

### 177 *Medical Follow-Up*

178         Similar to the recommendations on abstinence, both ACSM and NATA guidelines  
179 recommended medical follow-up in 7 days to assess the course of heat illness and monitor organ  
180 function,<sup>9,26</sup> with the NATA statement recommending an upper limit of 21 days for follow up.<sup>9</sup>  
181 In the review of military policy, the Navy policy (NEHC-TM-OEM 6260.6A) did not provide a  
182 specific recommendation regarding timeframe for medical follow-up. Current Army-Air Force  
183 regulations (TB MED 507/AFPAM 48-152) recommend following up after 3-months to  
184 reevaluate light/limited duty.<sup>30</sup> In the more contemporary Army regulation (AR 40–501), follow  
185 up in 7 days followed by weekly reassessments of clinical complications and contributing risk  
186 factors was recommended.<sup>11</sup> In the 2007 brief report, both Army and Air Force policies guided

187 referral of personnel to the medical evaluation board to determine duty status, with follow-up  
188 driven based on clinical improvements in laboratory studies and reported symptoms.<sup>23</sup> The Navy  
189 policies in 2007 did not provide specific recommendations pertaining to timeframes for medical  
190 follow-up.<sup>23</sup>

### 191 *Graded Resumption of Exercise or Physical Activity*

192 The ACSM guidelines recommend a progressive return to activity that is incrementally  
193 reintroduced in a seven-stage process, with progression dependent on subjective reports of  
194 exercise intolerance and fatigue during activity.<sup>26</sup> The NATA guidelines do not specify a  
195 protocol for return to activity, but recommends **clinician**-supervised progression from low to  
196 high intensity activity once medically cleared.<sup>9</sup> The Navy policy (NEHC-TM-OEM 6260.6A)  
197 similarly recommends a symptom-based return to activity, starting with resumption of low level  
198 activity (eg. “brief, minimal exertions” such as short walks) once patients are symptom free,  
199 have normal physical examination and laboratory findings, and once motivated to do so.<sup>21</sup> The  
200 Army-Air Force policy (TB MED 507/ AFPAM 48-152) recommends clearance from a  
201 preventative medicine specialist following recovery from severe illness prior to resumption of  
202 activity.<sup>30</sup> While the Navy and Army-Air Force policies recommend gradual progression of  
203 activity at the service member’s own pace over several weeks once recovered from severe illness  
204 and cleared medically, there is no specific guidance provided.<sup>23</sup> In the more contemporary Army  
205 regulation (AR 40–501), a graded resumption of occupational and fitness requirements and re-  
206 acclimatization is prescribed based on signs and symptoms of tolerance.<sup>11</sup>

### 207 *Indication for Heat Tolerance Testing*

208 Heat tolerance testing, which consists of assessment of thermoregulation during  
209 controlled and monitored physical activity in a hyperthermic environment, was first developed

210 by the Israeli Defense Forces over 30 years ago.<sup>20</sup> Further details regarding the heat tolerance test  
211 (HTT) will be discussed in later sections. The ACSM recommendations suggest that heat  
212 tolerance testing be performed for individuals who are unable to return to vigorous activity or  
213 adapt to exercise-related heat stress within four to six weeks.<sup>26</sup> While the NATA statement does  
214 not provide clear recommendations for indication or timing or heat tolerance testing, it does  
215 specify that physical activity be halted in athletes that do not adequately thermoregulate during  
216 testing. None of the reviewed military policies provided **specific** guidance pertaining to this  
217 clinical assessment, a finding that was similarly observed in the brief report by O'Connor et al.<sup>23</sup>

#### 218 *Return to sport and occupational duties*

219 The ACSM guidelines detail criteria for return to full competition that includes sports-  
220 specific exercise acclimatization and heat tolerance with no abnormal symptoms during re-  
221 acclimatization period, a period that last for least two to four weeks following illness.<sup>26</sup> The  
222 NATA recommendations are similar and state that clearance may proceed when there is  
223 complete recovery of exercise and heat tolerance.<sup>9</sup> The Navy guidance for return to duty (NEHC-  
224 TM-OEM 6260.6A) is dependent on patient signs and symptoms and includes specific criteria  
225 that include heat stress avoidance for two weeks after return to normal heat stroke related studies  
226 and delay of heat acclimatization until at least 40 days following complete recovery.<sup>21</sup> The  
227 guidance provided in the Army-Air Force policy (TB MED 507/AFPAM 48-152) specifies  
228 return to full duty is permissible if there is no heat intolerance manifested during a progressive  
229 return to duty and physical training requirements, with full clearance provided the season  
230 following exposure to environmental heat stress.<sup>30</sup> The contemporary Army regulation (AR 40-  
231 501) similarly uses the absence of symptomatology and work intolerance for disposition back to  
232 full duty.<sup>11</sup>

## 233 **Results of Syntheses**

234           There was convergence between four of the five recommendations provided in the recent  
235 ACSM<sup>26</sup> and NATA<sup>9</sup> guidelines. Specifically, there was consistency in recommendations  
236 pertaining to abstinence of exercises and physical activity timeframes (at least 7 days); medical  
237 follow-up in 7 days to assess symptoms, physical signs, and laboratory assessments indicative of  
238 organ impairment; graded resumption of physical activity dependent on patient tolerance; and  
239 clearance for resumption of all activity when signs and symptoms indicate acclimatization and  
240 functional thermoregulation. There was only lack of consistency pertaining to the indication and  
241 timeframe for heat tolerance testing,

242           While there was consistency between the Navy (NEHC-TM-OEM 6260.6A), the Army  
243 regulation (AR 40–501), and Army-Air Force (TB MED 507/AFPAM 48-152) policies  
244 pertaining to the necessity of abstaining from activity following EHI; monitoring physical signs,  
245 laboratory findings, and symptoms; progressive return to activity once signs and symptoms  
246 resolve; and trial by training, there is divergence in the details of the recommendations.  
247 Specifically, there was substantial heterogeneity observed pertaining to timelines of recovery,  
248 with the recommendations provided in the Army-Air Force regulation more specific and  
249 conservative than the Navy policy.

250           When the military policies published in 2003 (TB MED 507/AFPAM 48-152) and 2007  
251 (NEHC-TM-OEM 6260.6A) were contrasted to the contemporary clinical guidelines  
252 promulgated by the ACSM<sup>26</sup> and the NATA,<sup>9</sup> incongruencies in many of the criteria were noted.  
253 The Army regulation (AR 40–501) had the greatest alignment with the professional guidelines  
254 that were published around the same time.

255

256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278

## DISCUSSION

The primary finding of this study was that among the multiple medical specialties that manage patients with EHI, only two professional societal guidelines provided clinical recommendations pertaining to return to function. Of these guidelines, there was consistency between recommendations that addressed abstinence from activity; medical follow-up; graded resumption of activity; and return to function. Pertaining to military policy, contemporary regulations published in recent years reflected the best evidence provided in the professional guidelines. The greatest incongruency was noted in older military policies, a likely function of changing practice patterns over the past 15 years.

One of the more surprising findings of this study was that among the sports medicine, family medicine, emergency medicine, occupational medicine, and wilderness medicine disciplines, only two sports medicine societies promulgated specific guidance germane to this topic. While certain disciplines, such as emergency medicine, only manage the patient during the most acute stages of illness and in facilities capable of providing higher levels of care, other disciplines are responsible for patient management throughout the full course of illness and in all possible clinical environments. While the astute clinician will search for evidence among multiple databases and resources within and external to their primary specialty, cooperation between the medical specialty organizations during guideline development may help to improve care through increased diversity of perspective, increase synchrony of recommendations, and facilitate greater dissemination via promulgation through the different societies' memberships.

The dearth of recommendations from multiple professional societies and inconsistencies between societal guidelines may cause confusion for return to activity after EHI, a sentiment

279 shared by sports medicine providers in Australia.<sup>12</sup> Sports organizations and military leadership  
280 often depend solely on professional societies for guidelines when designing their own policies  
281 and regulations. Without consistent and congruent recommendations from the various  
282 professional societies, there is a potential risk for organizational interests (e.g. earlier return to  
283 sport prior to full recovery for organizational gain) to be prioritized over the individual athlete's  
284 safety. Moreover, there is increased onus on the professional societies to continually update  
285 guidelines with the most current evidence available, especially with expectations of exclusive  
286 sports organizational use.<sup>12</sup>

287       Mission execution and personnel readiness are pivotal to the goals of the military.  
288 Standardization of protocols and guidelines will help to ensure that the best quality of care is  
289 provided across the different branches of the military, while reducing unneeded duplication and  
290 waste of resources. Clinical practice is best guided by scientific evidence (to include professional  
291 society recommendations), clinical experience, and the individual needs of the patient and  
292 organization. However, each branch of the military differs in its exposure of EHI and  
293 interpretations of existing guidelines. An increasing number of female tactical athletes now serve  
294 in roles that were previously closed to them, a standard that was in effect when many of the  
295 existing military EHI policies were published. Since sex has been identified as a non-modifiable  
296 intrinsic risk factor for EHI,<sup>1</sup> it behooves the military to provide updated guidelines with  
297 consideration of changes in force composition. Now that the US military health system is aligned  
298 under common leadership in the Defense Health Agency with a focus on high reliability  
299 practices and standardizing operations across service-branches, the development of updated,  
300 consistent clinical pathways among the military service branches is warranted. The  
301 recommendations provided by the ACSM<sup>26</sup> and NATA<sup>9</sup> pertaining to abstinence of activity,

302 medical follow-up, titrated and clinician-supervised resumption of activity, and progressive  
303 environmental exposure to occupational duties following EHI can be readily adopted into  
304 military medical policy. Collaboration amongst the service branches will be needed to formulate  
305 evidence-based guidelines that can be implemented throughout the US Department of Defense.

306       Development of military policy that provides sound evidence for clinical management of  
307 EHI, while equally considering clinician experience, patient preference, and command objectives  
308 in decision-making is essential and integrates all the tenets of evidence-based practice.<sup>27</sup> There is  
309 substantial heterogeneity regarding physical requirements and environments in which a tactical  
310 athlete functions. Factors such as service branch, military occupation, and the mode, tempo, and  
311 location of military operations are substantive when managing this population. Furthermore,  
312 variations in medical training and clinical experience require individualized clinician  
313 interpretation and utilization of policy statements for guidance. Striking a balance between  
314 clinical direction and protection of clinician autonomy will be essential in the provision of  
315 updated clinical pathways and military health policies concerning EHI. Specifically, guidelines  
316 that are not dogmatic, prescriptive, and are agnostic to service branch and occupation are  
317 recommended, as this will ensure the managing clinician making nuanced clinical decisions  
318 based on the individual needs and circumstances of the patient.

319       Heat tolerance testing is regularly used by the Israeli military as a clinical correlate in the  
320 diagnosis of heat intolerance and as criteria for return to function in tactical-athletes.<sup>20</sup> The HTT  
321 protocol was developed to assess thermoregulation in Israeli military members, aged 17 to 30, 6  
322 to 8 weeks following an EHI. The test consists of 120 minutes of treadmill walking at 5 km/h at a  
323 2% grade in 40° C and 40% relative humidity.<sup>19,20</sup> For safety considerations, testing is aborted if  
324 rectal temperature reaches 39° C, heart rate rises above 180 beats/minute, or if the participant



325 develops symptoms of EHI.<sup>20</sup> Interpretation of results to determine heat tolerance depends on the  
326 rectal temperature and the heart rate. Specifically, individuals are classified as heat intolerant if  
327 the in-test rectal temperature is greater than 38.5° C, the heart rate rises above 150 beats per  
328 minute during the test, or if the change in rectal temperature between 60 and 120 minutes is  
329 greater than 0.45.<sup>28</sup> In addition, an individual is classified as potentially or borderline heat  
330 intolerant if the in-test rectal temperature is greater than 38.2° C, the heart rate is between 120 to  
331 150 beats per minute during the test, or if the change in rectal temperature between 60 and 120  
332 minutes is between 0.25° and 0.45° C.<sup>28</sup> Heat tolerance is achieved if the in-test rectal  
333 temperature is less than 38.2° C, in-test heart rate remains less than 120 beats per minute, and the  
334 change in rectal temperature between 60 and 120 minutes is less than 0.25.<sup>28</sup> Typically, the HTT  
335 is performed 6 to 8 weeks after EHI and if found to be heat intolerant, they are retested in 3  
336 months.<sup>19,20</sup> Continued heat intolerance at that time prompts changes in responsibilities and  
337 environments within the military.

338 In contrast, only US Navy policy mentioned indication of heat tolerance testing when  
339 making clinical decisions pertaining to disposition following EHI.<sup>21</sup> Heat tolerance testing is  
340 typically indicated when a patient with EHI cannot effectively thermoregulate during physical  
341 requirements, especially when exposed to environmental heat and humidity over time.<sup>19,20</sup> While  
342 a positive heat tolerance test is indicative of heat intolerance, this is but one clinical correlate to  
343 be used in conjunction with a detailed history, reported symptomatology, physical examination,  
344 and other objective measures of potential body system impairment and functional activity. It is  
345 unclear if heat tolerance testing improves diagnostic and prognostic accuracy over a  
346 comprehensive medical evaluation and more readily available laboratory tests in tactical-athletes  
347 with EHI, although there has been evidence correlating heat intolerance as defined by HTT to

348 low cardiorespiratory fitness<sup>16</sup> and heat tolerance as defined by HTT to significant recurrent EHI  
349 risk reduction.<sup>28</sup> This question warrants further investigation.

350         The adoption of heat tolerance testing as a standard for return to play or duty has  
351 substantial challenges. While the HTT protocol developed by the Israeli military is the most  
352 widely used method assessment of thermoregulation, there are alternative protocols that have  
353 been developed for military, athletic, occupational medicine, and research applications.<sup>6</sup> The  
354 validity of HTT pertaining to EHI case specificity, individual factors such as heat  
355 acclimatization, heat intolerance characteristics, and HTT timing have yet to be established.<sup>6</sup>  
356 Furthermore, heat tolerance testing facilities are not readily accessible, requires the patient to  
357 travel to limited specialized testing facilities, and has considerable costs for the equipment and  
358 personnel required to operate and interpret results. With the advent of readily available worn or  
359 ingestible thermistor sensors, monitoring thermoregulation during function in the execution of  
360 sport and duty requirements may be a feasible alternative to traditional testing. While general  
361 medical monitoring can be provided locally for patient safety, technology allows for consultation  
362 by experts in thermoregulation that can be performed remotely and in real-time. The feasibility  
363 and clinical utility of newer technology in assessment of tactical athletes with EHI will require  
364 further study.

### 365 **Limitations**

366         There are limitations to this study. This systematic review included studies that were only  
367 CPGs, consensus statements, position statements, and practice alerts. While it is plausible that  
368 practice recommendations included in other study types were omitted due to this delimitation, a  
369 boon of this decision was this highlighted an identified gap in the literature for these study types.  
370 This study also assessed guidelines specifically written for the clinical management of EHI. It is

371 possible that more generic sport medicine or occupational guidelines that address return to  
372 physical activity following illness were not included in this study. Due to the unique presentation  
373 and clinical requirements of EHI, this decision was purposefully made *a priori* while  
374 acknowledging the potential drawbacks.

375

376

## CONCLUSIONS

377

378 Despite the multiple medical specialties that manage patients with EHI, only two  
379 professional societal guidelines provided clinical recommendations pertaining to return to  
380 function during recovery. There was consistency between recommendations that addressed  
381 abstinence from activity; medical follow-up; graded resumption of activity; and return to  
382 function. Contemporary military regulations published in recent years reflected the best evidence  
383 provided in the professional guidelines. The greatest incongruency was noted in older military  
384 policies, a likely function of changing practice patterns over the past 15 years. This systematic  
385 review highlights the need for consistent recommendation across all branches of the military  
386 when it comes to returning servicemembers to duty after EHI.

387

388 **List of Figures**

389 **Figure 1.** PRISMA flowsheet

390 **Figure 2.** Assessment of methodological quality of included guidelines.

391

392 **List of Tables**

393 **Table 1.** Summary of the included clinical guidelines and US military policies pertaining to  
394 activity resumption following exertional heat illness.

395

396 **Supplemental Table 1.** Search strategy.

397 **Supplemental Table 2.** Characteristics of included guidelines

398

399

400

## REFERENCES

401

- 402 1. Alele F, Malau-Aduli B, Malau-Aduli A, Crowe M. Systematic review of gender differences  
403 in the epidemiology and risk factors of exertional heat illness and heat tolerance in the  
404 armed forces. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10:e031825. PMID: 32265238
- 405 2. Armstrong LE, Casa DJ, Millard-Stafford M, Moran DS, Pyne SW, Roberts WO. Exertional  
406 heat illness during training and competition. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2007;39:556-572.
- 407 3. Binkley HM, Beckett J, Casa DJ, Kleiner DM, Plummer PE. National Athletic Trainers'  
408 Association position statement: exertional heat illnesses. *J Athl Train*. 2002;37:329.
- 409 4. Bramer WM, Giustini D, de Jonge GB, Holland L, Bekhuis T. De-duplication of database  
410 search results for systematic reviews in EndNote. *J Med Libr Assoc JMLA*. 2016;104:240-  
411 243. PMID: 27366130
- 412 5. Brouwers MC, Kerkvliet K, Spithoff K, Consortium ANS. The AGREE Reporting Checklist:  
413 a tool to improve reporting of clinical practice guidelines. *BMJ*. 2016;352:i1152. PMID:  
414 26957104
- 415 6. Butler CR, Dierickx E, Bruneau M, Stearns R, Casa DJ. Current Clinical Concepts: Heat  
416 Tolerance Testing. *J Athl Train*. [Epub ahead of print] 2021.
- 417 7. Casa DJ, Armstrong LE, Kenny GP, O'Connor FG, Huggins RA. Exertional Heat Stroke:  
418 New Concepts Regarding Cause and Care. *Curr Sports Med Rep*. 2012;11:115-123.
- 419 8. Casa DJ, Clarkson PM, Roberts WO. American College of Sports Medicine roundtable on  
420 hydration and physical activity: consensus statements. *Curr Sports Med Rep*. 2005;4:115-  
421 127.
- 422 9. Casa DJ, DeMartini JK, Bergeron MF, et al. National Athletic Trainers' Association Position  
423 Statement: Exertional Heat Illnesses. *J Athl Train*. 2015;50:986-1000.
- 424 10. Dahl K, Licker R, Abatzoglou JT, Declet-Barreto J. Increased frequency of and population  
425 exposure to extreme heat index days in the United States during the 21st century. *Environ*  
426 *Res Commun*. 2019;1:075002.
- 427 11. Department of the Army. Army Regulation (AR) 40–501. Standards of Medical Fitness.Heat  
428 Illness Medical Evaluation Board and Profile Policy. [Epub ahead of print] 2017.
- 429 12. Gamage PJ, Finch CF, Fortington LV. Document analysis of exertional heat illness policies  
430 and guidelines published by sports organisations in Victoria, Australia. *BMJ Open Sport*  
431 *Exerc Med*. 2020;6:e000591.
- 432 13. Gamage PJ, Fortington LV, Finch CF. Epidemiology of exertional heat illnesses in organised  
433 sports: A systematic review. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2020;23:701-709.

- 434 14. Gauer R, Meyers BK. Heat-Related Illnesses. *Am Fam Physician*. 2019;99:482-489. PMID:  
435 30990296
- 436 15. Lipman GS, Gaudio FG, Eifling KP, Ellis MA, Otten EM, Grissom CK. Wilderness Medical  
437 Society Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Prevention and Treatment of Heat Illness: 2019  
438 Update. *Wilderness Environ Med*. 2019;30:S33-S46.
- 439 16. Lisman P, Kazman JB, O'Connor FG, Heled Y, Deuster PA. Heat tolerance testing:  
440 association between heat intolerance and anthropometric and fitness measurements. *Mil*  
441 *Med*. 2014;179:1339-1346.
- 442 17. Lugtenberg M, Burgers JS, Westert GP. Effects of evidence-based clinical practice  
443 guidelines on quality of care: a systematic review. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2009;18:385-392.
- 444 18. Machotka Z, Perraton L, Grimmer K. Clinical Guidelines in Sports Medicine: Am I Reading  
445 a Guideline or a Consensus Statement: What's the Difference? Does it Matter? [Epub ahead  
446 of print] 2015:12.
- 447 19. Mitchell KM, Chevront SN, King MA, Mayer TA, Leon LR, Kenefick RW. Use of the heat  
448 tolerance test to assess recovery from exertional heat stroke. *Temperature*. 2019;6:106-119.
- 449 20. Moran DS, Erlich T, Epstein Y. The Heat Tolerance Test: An Efficient Screening Tool for  
450 Evaluating Susceptibility to Heat. *J Sport Rehabil*. 2007;16:215-221.
- 451 21. Navy Environmental Health Center, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. Technical Manual  
452 NEHC-TM-OEM 6260.6A : Prevention and Treatment of Heat and Cold Stress Injuries.  
453 [Epub ahead of print] June 2007. Accessed January 28, 2022.  
454 [https://www.med.navy.mil/Navy-Marine-Corps-Public-Health-Center/Environmental-](https://www.med.navy.mil/Navy-Marine-Corps-Public-Health-Center/Environmental-Health/Occupational-and-Environmental-Medicine/Occupational-and-Environmental-Medicine-Division/Technical-Manuals-and-Guidance/)  
455 [Health/Occupational-and-Environmental-Medicine/Occupational-and-Environmental-](https://www.med.navy.mil/Navy-Marine-Corps-Public-Health-Center/Environmental-Health/Occupational-and-Environmental-Medicine/Occupational-and-Environmental-Medicine-Division/Technical-Manuals-and-Guidance/)  
456 [Medicine-Division/Technical-Manuals-and-Guidance/](https://www.med.navy.mil/Navy-Marine-Corps-Public-Health-Center/Environmental-Health/Occupational-and-Environmental-Medicine/Occupational-and-Environmental-Medicine-Division/Technical-Manuals-and-Guidance/)
- 457 22. O'Connor FG, Casa DJ, Bergeron MF, et al. American College of Sports Medicine  
458 Roundtable on exertional heat stroke-return to duty/return to play: conference proceedings.  
459 *Curr Sports Med Rep*. 2010;9:314-321.
- 460 23. O'Connor FG, Williams AD, Blivin S, Heled Y, Deuster P, Flinn SD. Guidelines for return  
461 to duty (play) after heat illness: a military perspective. *J Sport Rehabil*. 2007;16:227-237.
- 462 24. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated  
463 guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. PMID: 33782057
- 464 25. Periard JD, Eijsvogels TMH, Daanen HAM. Exercise under heat stress: thermoregulation,  
465 hydration, performance implications and mitigation strategies. *Physiol Rev*. [Epub ahead of  
466 print] April 8, 2021. Accessed August 18, 2021.  
467 <https://journals.physiology.org/doi/abs/10.1152/physrev.00038.2020>

- 468 26. Roberts WO, Armstrong LE, Sawka MN, Yeargin SW, Heled Y, O'Connor FG. ACSM  
469 Expert Consensus Statement on Exertional Heat Illness: Recognition, Management, and  
470 Return to Activity. *Curr Sports Med Rep*. 2021;20:470-484.
- 471 27. Sackett DL, Rosenberg WMC, Gray JAM, Haynes RB, Richardson WS. Evidence based  
472 medicine: what it is and what it isn't. *BMJ*. 1996;312:71-72.
- 473 28. Schermann H, Craig E, Yanovich E, Ketko I, Kalmanovich G, Yanovich R. Probability of  
474 heat intolerance: standardized interpretation of heat-tolerance testing results versus  
475 specialist judgment. *J Athl Train*. 2018;53:423-430.
- 476 29. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic  
477 reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or  
478 both. *BMJ*. 2017;358:j4008. PMID: 28935701
- 479 30. US Department of Defense. Army Technical Bulletin Medical 507/Air Force Pamphlet 48-  
480 152. Heat Stress Control and Heat Casualty Management. Washington, DC: Headquarters,  
481 Department of the Army and Air Force. [Epub ahead of print] March 2003. Accessed  
482 January 28, 2022.  
483 [https://armypubs.army.mil/ProductMaps/PubForm/Details.aspx?PUB\\_ID=46205](https://armypubs.army.mil/ProductMaps/PubForm/Details.aspx?PUB_ID=46205)
- 484

Table 1. Summary of the included clinical guidelines and US military policies pertaining to activity resumption following exertional heat illness.						
Recommendation	ACSM Position Stand Roberts 2021	NATA Position Statement Casa 2015	Military Guidelines			
			Guidelines for Return to Duty (Play) After Heat Illness: A Military Perspective O'Connor 2007	US Navy Environmental Health Center Prevention of Heat/ Cold Injuries (NEHC-TM-OEM 6260.6A) 2007	US Army & Air Force Heat Stress Control and Heat Casualty Management (TB MED 507) 2003	US Army Standards of Medical Fitness (AR 40-501) 2019
Abstinence from physical activity	At least 7 days after release from initial medical care until medical follow up	7-21 days until cleared by physician for return	<p><u>Army:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If mild illness and recovered in Emergency Department without lab abnormalities, return to light duty the next day. Strenuous exercise avoided for several days</li> <li>If not fully recovered in Emergency Department and with lab abnormalities, lab evaluation needed and follow-up the following day.</li> <li>If severe illness, follow-up with preventative medicine for reporting and medical evaluation board (MEB) referral required. Work restriction until all symptoms and lab tests have returned to normal</li> </ul>	Avoidance of all heat stress for 2 weeks following hospital discharge, stabilization, and normalization of all heat stroke related studies	Three-months limited duty profile restricting soldier from heat exposure and performing vigorous exercise greater than 15 minutes	<p>Complete duty restrictions for a minimum of 2 weeks. After initial 2 weeks, disposition is based on clinical classification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heat stress without sequelae: Titrated resumption of activity</li> <li>Heat stress with sequelae: Limited duty persists until clinically resolved</li> <li>Complex heat stress (recurrent or occurring in the presence of a nonmodifiable risk factor): Referral to the disability evaluation board for dispositioning.</li> </ul>



			<u>Navy</u> : All patients placed on light/limited duty (no exertion) the day of the episode and the following day until reevaluated by a physician.			
Medical follow-up	7 days to assess clinical course and the status of end-organ function	Within 7-21 days to ensure normalization of lab abnormalities and obtain physician clearance	<u>Army</u> : All soldiers referred for medical evaluation board (MEB). If full clinical recovery and normalization of labs occurs, then trial of duty at a limited profile (no vigorous physical exercise for longer than 15 minutes) is allowed. If no heat intolerance is exhibited, light/limited duty may be modified to include normal, unrestricted work, but no maximal exertion or significant heat exposure. If no further heat intolerance is exhibited, then soldier may return to full duty.  <u>Navy</u> : No recommendation provided.	No recommendation provided	Acute follow-up timeframe not provided. Post-acute 3-months follow up following injury to reevaluate light/limited duty	Weekly reassessment for presence/absence of complications and contributing risk factors
Graded resumption of physical activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7 stage process which relies on subjective measures of exercise intolerance and fatigue.</li> <li>Each stage may take</li> </ul>	Once medically cleared, progression of supervised low to high intensity exercise and physical activity with increasing duration,	<u>Army</u> : When recovered from severe illness and cleared by a preventative medicine specialist, patient may gradually resume exercise at own pace and build up to maximal exercise over several weeks.  <u>Navy</u> : No recommendation provided.	"Brief," minimal exertions (short walks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When medically cleared, activities of daily living only for 2 weeks.</li> <li>When all signs/symptoms resolved, physical training can be</li> </ul>	Physical training and running, walking, swimming, or bicycling at own pace and distance not to exceed 60 minutes per day. No maximal effort; no physical fitness testing; no wear of body armor; no wear of chemical/biological (eg, MOPP) gear; no ruck marching. No airborne

	up to 2 weeks to complete.	temperature, and sport-specific activity			gradually increased to 60 min/day at low to moderate intensity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If exercise is well tolerated, a heat acclimatization plan can be started</li> <li>If no heat intolerance manifested after 3 months, normal work is then permitted.</li> </ul>	operations. General acclimatization. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heat stress without sequelae: 1 month minimum</li> <li>Heat stress with sequelae: 2 months minimum</li> </ul>
Indication for heat-tolerance testing	If unable to return to vigorous activity, or to adapt to exercise-heat stress is not accomplished within 4 to 6 weeks	No clear recommendation when to perform testing. If testing is performed, and the patient has poor test results, halt progression.	<u>Army</u> : No recommendation provided <u>Navy</u> : No recommendation provided	8-12 weeks following injury, dependent on clinical improvement	No recommendation provided	No recommendation provided
Return to sport and occupational duties	Resume full competition after demonstrating sports specific exercise acclimatization and heat tolerance with	When complete recovery of exercise and heat tolerance has been achieved	<u>Army</u> : Protocol based trial of resumption of duty requirements and progression of activity. Heat tolerance is monitored at each stage. Servicemembers are cleared following one	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All heat stress avoided for 2 weeks after normalization of all heat stroke related studies</li> </ul>	If no heat intolerance manifested during the summer following the initial heat injury, servicemember may return to full duty	Soldiers not manifesting heat illness symptomatology or work intolerance after completion of profile restrictions can advance and return to duty without a medical evaluation board. Any

---

no abnormal symptoms during the re-acclimatization period (minimum of 2 to 4 weeks)	season exposure to environmental heat stress.  <u>Navy</u> : Symptom free patients with normal exams and normal heat labs may return to full duty once motivated to do so. Most return to full duty between 2 days and 2-3 weeks.	• Attempts at heat acclimatization should be delayed until at least 40 days after complete recovery	evidence or manifestation of heat illness symptomatology during the period of the profile requires a medical evaluation board referral for dispositioning.
---	---	---	--

---

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases, registers and other sources



