Title: The impact of physical activity and exercise on aerobic capacity in individuals with spinal cord injury: A systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression

Authors: Daniel D. Hodgkiss[1], Gurjeet S. Bhangu[2,3], Carole Lunny[4], Catherine R. Jutzeler[5,6], Shin-Yi Chiou[1,7,8,9], Matthias Walter[2,10], Samuel J. E. Lucas[1,7], Andrei V. Krassioukov[2,11,12], Tom E. Nightingale[1,2,9*]

Running head: Exercise and fitness in SCI

Author Affiliations:

[1] School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, UK.

[2] International Collaboration on Repair Discoveries (ICORD), University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

[3] MD Undergraduate Program, Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

[4] Knowledge Translation Program, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, and the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

[5] Department of Health Sciences and Technology, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

[6] Schulthess Clinic, Zurich, Switzerland.

[7] Centre for Human Brain Health, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.

[8] MRC Versus Arthritis Centre for Musculoskeletal Ageing Research, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.

[9] Centre for Trauma Science Research, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.

[10] Department of Urology, University Hospital Basel, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.

[11] Department of Medicine, Division of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

[12] GF Strong Rehabilitation Centre, Vancouver Coastal Health, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Correspondence and requests should be addressed to:

Corresponding author*: Tom E. Nightingale PhD,

Assistant Professor, School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK,

Email: T.E.Nightingale@bham.ac.uk **Tel:** +44 (0)121 414 6977

Word count: 9,299/10,000; **Abstract word count:** 348

Number of tables: 5; **Number of figures:** 1

ABSTRACT

Background A low level of cardiorespiratory fitness [CRF; typically defined as peak oxygen uptake ($\dot{V}O_{2peak}$) or peak power output (PPO)] is a widely reported consequence of spinal cord injury (SCI). This systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression aimed to assess whether certain SCI characteristics and specific exercise considerations are moderators of changes in CRF.

Methods Eligible studies included randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and pre-post studies that conducted an exercise intervention lasting >2 weeks. The outcome measures of interest were absolute ($A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$) or relative $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ ($R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$), and/or PPO. Four databases were searched up to July 2021. The Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool and the National Institute of Health Quality Assessment Tool were used to assess bias/quality. The certainty of the evidence was assessed using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach. Random effects meta-analyses and meta-regressions were conducted.

Results Ninety studies (110 independent exercise interventions) with a total of 1,191 participants were included in our primary meta-analysis. There were significant improvements in $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ [0.22 (0.17, 0.26) L/min, $p<0.001$)], $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ [2.8 (2.2, 3.4) mL/kg/min, $p<0.001$)], and PPO [11 (8, 13) W, $p<0.001$]. There were no subgroup differences in $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ or $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$. There were subgroup differences ($p\leq0.008$) for changes in PPO based on time since injury, neurological level of injury, exercise modality, relative exercise intensity, method of exercise intensity prescription, and frequency. The meta-regression found that increased age was associated with increases in $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, and exercise intensity prescription and volume were associated with increases in PPO ($p<0.05$). GRADE assessments indicated a low level of certainty in the estimated effects due to study design, risk of bias, inconsistency, and imprecision.

Conclusion The pooled analysis indicates that performing exercise >2 weeks results in significant improvements in $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and PPO in individuals with SCI. Subgroup comparisons identify that upper-body aerobic exercise and resistance training appear the most effective at improving PPO. Furthermore, acutely-injured, individuals with paraplegia, exercising at a moderate-to-vigorous intensity, prescribed via a percentage of oxygen consumption or heart rate, for more than 3 sessions/week will likely experience the greatest change in PPO.

Registration PROSPERO CRD42018104342

KEYWORDS: Cardiorespiratory Fitness, Cardiopulmonary Fitness, Function, Spinal Cord Injuries, Rehabilitation, Exercise

Key Points

- Exercise interventions >2 weeks can significantly improve cardiorespiratory fitness in individuals with a spinal cord injury, by a magnitude greater than one spinal cord injury adjusted metabolic equivalent (i.e., ≥2.7 mL/kg/min). A one metabolic equivalent improvement has been associated with a reduction in cardiovascular related mortality risk in non-injured individuals.
- Our findings support the minimum 40 minutes of weekly moderate-to-vigorous intensity exercise recommended by the spinal cord injury-specific exercise guidelines to significantly improve fitness. However, a two-fold greater improvement in peak power output may be achieved with exercising ≥90 min/week in comparison to ≥40 min/week.
- Our secondary meta-analysis comparing cohort studies indicates that prolonged exercise participation benefits cardiorespiratory fitness in the long term. However, these studies are prone to confounding and are inherently biased.
- Future research should consider following the recommendations published in the exercise intervention reporting guidelines, investigate the dose-response relationship between exercise and cardiorespiratory fitness in this population, and identify whether differences in supraspinal sympathetic cardiovascular impacts changes in cardiorespiratory fitness.

1. INTRODUCTION

Spinal cord injury (SCI) is a complex neurological condition, caused by trauma, disease or degeneration, which results in sensory-motor deficits (i.e., paralysis or paresis) below the level of lesion and autonomic dysfunctions. Progressive physical deconditioning following injury results in increased health care utilisation, reliance on personal assistance services and a greater predisposition towards developing chronic diseases [1,2]. Individuals with SCI are at an increased risk of stroke, cardiovascular disease (CVD), and type-2 diabetes mellitus compared to non-injured counterparts [3–5]. The elevated incidence of these conditions in people with SCI emphasises the need for targeted interventions to address modifiable risk factors for these chronic diseases, such as cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF). In clinical populations cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF) is typically defined as an individual's peak oxygen uptake ($\dot{V}O_{2peak}$) or peak power output (PPO). $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and PPO are determined during graded cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET) to the point of volitional exhaustion, and represents the integrated functioning of different bodily systems (pulmonary, cardiovascular and skeletal) to uptake, transport and utilise oxygen for metabolic processes [6]. A number of prospective studies have indicated that CRF is at least as important, if not more so, than other traditional CVD risk factors (e.g., obesity, hypertension and smoking) and is strongly associated with mortality [7–12].

Low levels of CRF have been widely reported in the SCI-population [13], with the between-person variability partially explained by the neurological level and severity of injury (i.e., lower CRF reported in individuals with tetraplegia) [14]. SCI can damage somatic pathways involved in the voluntary control of skeletal muscles, but also sympatho-excitatory pathways involved in the autonomic control of the cardiovascular system. In individuals with cervical and upper-thoracic SCI, the diminished supra-spinal control to the heart and blood vessels in major capacitance beds can limit exercise capacity [15,16]. This may explain the minimal returns on investment highlighted in a recent systematic review on the effects of aerobic exercise interventions in individuals with tetraplegia [17]. A large proportion of the variance in CRF is also explained by physical activity [18], which is reduced in the SCI-population [19,20]. SCI is characterised by lower-limb impairments and an ensuing reliance on mobility aids that limits the engagement in sufficient levels of physical activity to achieve meaningful health benefits.

Performing regular physical activity and/or structured exercise has long been promoted for improving CRF in individuals with SCI [21,22]. In 2011, the first evidence-based exercise guidelines, specifically for individuals with SCI were developed [23], which stated that *"for important fitness benefits, adults with SCI should engage in at least 20 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous-intensity aerobic activity and strength-training exercises 2 times per week"*. This guideline has since been updated, yet remains the same with regards to CRF benefits [24]. Although this implies adults with SCI can accrue fitness benefits from volumes of activity well below that promoted in the general population, others have advocated that adults with a physical disability [25,26] and individuals with SCI [27] should aim to perform at least 150 minutes of aerobic exercise per week. For additional health benefits it has been suggested that adults should perform closer to 300 minutes per week of moderate-intensity physical activity [28,29]. While the current SCI-specific guidelines likely represent the *"minimum"* threshold required to achieve CRF benefits, it has been suggested that this creates an impression that individuals with SCI do not need to be as physically active as the general population [30]. The dose-response relationship between exercise and CRF improvements in individuals with SCI remains to be elucidated.

It is noteworthy that the aforementioned SCI-specific exercise guidelines utilise the terminology of *"moderate-to-vigorous"* to describe the desired exercise intensity. This is in contrast to accepted guidelines in the general population whereby moderate and vigorous-intensity exercise are distinguished from one another with specific thresholds (e.g., ≥150 minutes of moderate-intensity or ≥75 minutes of vigorous-intensity activity per week) [26]. Exercise intervention intensity has been shown to influence the magnitude of change in CRF in patients undergoing cardiac rehabilitation [31,32]. The feasibility/effectiveness of higher intensity exercise is also currently a topical area of research in the SCI-population [33–35]. There is the potential for vigorous-intensity exercise to be more time efficient or lead to superior health benefits, although its impact on CRF in individuals with SCI compared to moderate-intensity exercise is yet to be determined. A recent systematic review identified that exercise interventions of a specific modality yield distinct changes in certain cardiometabolic health outcomes and not others in individuals with SCI [36]. This provides rationale for wanting to investigate the efficacy of different exercise modalities on CRF in this population. Consequently, a number of research questions requiring further attention include:

1) Do injury-specific characteristics (e.g., tetraplegia vs. paraplegia, acute vs. chronic injuries, motor-complete vs. incomplete) mediate CRF responses to exercise?

2) What is the best intensity, frequency, and volume of weekly exercise?

3) Is there an optimal conditioning modality [e.g., upper-body aerobic exercise, resistance training, functional electrical stimulation (FES), hybrid or multimodal exercise interventions etc.]?

To address these questions, we performed a systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression to investigate the impact of different exercise interventions on changes in CRF in individuals with SCI. Moreover, we gathered evidence to determine whether key moderators (e.g., participant/injury characteristics, intervention/study characteristics and risk of bias) influence these intervention effects.

2. METHODS

This current review followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [37] and was prospectively registered (PROSPERO ID CRD42018104342). Randomised and non-randomised study designs [randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and pre-post interventions without a comparison control group] were included in the primary meta-analysis of this review. Our secondary meta-analyses included cohort, cross-sectional and observational studies.

2.1. Eligibility criteria

Studies met the following inclusion criteria: 1) Adult (≥18 years) participants; 2) any acquired (traumatic, infection, cancer) SCI (*note, studies were included if >80% of the sample met these two aforementioned inclusion criteria*); 3) an exercise or physical activity intervention lasting >2 weeks (RCTs and pre-post trials included in the primary meta-analysis); 4) report a measurable exposure variable (i.e., secondary meta-analysis cohort studies: athletes vs. non-athletes or sedentary vs. active participants; and cross-sectional studies: self-reported or objectively measured habitual physical activity level) and; 5) report CRF-specific outcomes [i.e., absolute or relative $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, evaluated via analysis of expired air during a peak (or symptom-limited) CPET or submaximal prediction, or PPO].

Studies were excluded if they met the following criteria: 1) non-human; 2) non-original work (i.e., reviews, guideline documents, editorials, viewpoints, letter-to-editor, protocol paper); 3) case-reports and

case series with a number (n) of participants <5 (to increase the robustness of our findings given the inclusion of smaller sample sizes in previous reviews [21,38,39]); 4) non-peer reviewed (i.e., conference proceeding/abstracts/posters); 5) children or adolescents (<18 years) ; 6) non-SCI (non-injured participants or other neurological conditions); 7) does not report a CRF-specific outcome; 8) single exercise sessions or an intervention <2 weeks; 9) no suitable comparison (i.e., control group or baseline data pre-intervention) or exposure variable measured; 10) no full text; and 11) not written in English. Studies with concurrent interventions (i.e., diet, lifestyle or respiratory training) were included only if the effects of exercise could be isolated.

2.2. Search strategy

A search of the following electronic databases: MEDLINE (via Pubmed), Excerpta Medica Database (EMBASE; via Ovid), Web of Science and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) was conducted from their respective inception through to July 18, 2021. Search terms were developed by the corresponding author (TN) and agreed upon by co-authors (AK, MW). The search strategy combined key words describing the following: 1) condition (e.g., SCI); 2) 'intervention or exposure variable' (e.g., rehabilitation, exercise and physical activity); and 3) 'outcome' (e.g., $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ or PPO). Details of the complete search strategy can be found as online supplementary material (S1). Search results were collated using Endnote software (Thomson Reuters, NY) and duplicates removed.

2.3. Study selection and data extraction

The citations retrieved from the search strategy were screened by title, abstract, and full text by two independent reviewers (DH, GB). At each stage of the evaluation, studies were excluded if the inclusion criteria were not satisfied. A conservative approach was taken, whereby if insufficient information was available to warrant study exclusion during the title and abstract stages of the screening, studies were retained in the sample for full text screening. TN resolved any disagreement with regards to study inclusion.

Two authors (DH, GB) independently extracted data in duplicate using Microsoft Excel. Any disagreements were resolved via mutual consensus. Where more than one publication was apparent for the same participants, data were extracted from the study with the largest sample size to avoid

duplication. Author, year, study design, sample size, participant demographics/injury characteristics, exercise parameters (including the type, frequency, duration, intensity and weekly volume), or physical activity exposure details (training history, objective wearable device or validated self-report questionnaire) and adverse events were extracted. For RCTs, pre-post interventions and observational studies, mean ± standard deviation (SD) for $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and PPO outcomes at baseline and post-intervention/control or observation period were extracted to assess change in CRF. For cross-sectional studies, mean ± SD outcomes were extracted for the unique cohorts, along with the significance and magnitude of associations between CRF and habitual physical activity. Where possible, $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ values were extracted in relative (mL/kg/min) and absolute (L/min) terms or calculated using pre- and post-intervention body mass values when provided. PPO values were extracted in watts (W) only. If there was insufficient information, the authors were contacted via email (N=12) and given a two-week window to provide additional data (responses received, N=8). Detailed notes were recorded outlining the reasons for study inclusion/exclusion and the number of studies included and excluded at each stage.

2.4. Data synthesis and analysis

A variety of methods [i.e., indices of heart rate (HR), $\dot{V}O_2$ or ratings of perceived exertion (RPE)] have been utilised in the literature to establish, prescribe and regulate exercise intensity in the SCI-population, which creates complexity when classifying the intensity of exercise. Each intervention was classified as having prescribed either light, moderate, vigorous or supramaximal-intensity aerobic exercise, based on thresholds proposed by the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) [40] (S2). If a study reported a progression in intensity that spanned the moderate and vigorous-intensity categories (e.g., 60-65% $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$), it was classified as 'moderate-to-vigorous'. If insufficient data were provided, studies were classified as 'mixed-intensity/cannot determine'. Furthermore, where a study reported frequency of sessions or length of interventions as a range (e.g., 6-8 weeks), the midpoint was extracted and if a study reported duration as a range (e.g., 40-45 min), the greater value was extracted. Descriptions of adverse events in the included studies were also collated. These were categorised into the following subgroups: 1) bone, joint or muscular pain, 2) autonomic or cardiovascular function, 3) skin irritation or pressure sores, and 4) other.

Means ± SD were estimated from median and interquartile range (IQR) [41] or median and range [42], where required. Where CRF data was only presented in figures, data were extrapolated using Photoshop (Adobe Inc). To combine within-study subgroups and to estimate SD of the delta (Δ) change in CRF using correlation factors, we followed guidance from the Cochrane handbook [41]. Correlation factors were calculated for $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and PPO using studies that reported pre-post SD and SD of the Δ change using the following equation:

$$Corr = \frac{(SD_{Pre})^2 + (SD_{Post})^2 - (SD_{Change})^2}{2 \times SD_{Pre} \times SD_{Post}}$$

The specific correlation factors that were calculated for each study were averaged across each study design (S3) and applied in the following equation to calculate SD of the change for studies where these values were not reported:

$$SD_{Change} = \sqrt{(SD_{Pre})^2 + (SD_{Post})^2 - 2 \times corr \times SD_{Pre} \times SD_{Post}}$$

where *corr* represents the correlation coefficient.

Since $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, and PPO are continuous variables, expressed using the same units across studies, we utilised weighted mean differences (WMDs) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) as summary statistics. A primary meta-analysis was carried out in R (Version 3.5.1, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) describing Δ in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-characterised exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks (e.g., combining exercise intervention-arms from RCTs and pre-post studies). Nine separate primary meta-analyses were performed to describe Δ in each CRF outcome with studies categorised into subgroups based on the following: 1) time since injury [(TSI), e.g., Acute (<1-year), chronic (≥1-year)]; 2) neurological level of injury (e.g., tetraplegia, paraplegia); 3) injury severity [e.g., grading in accordance with the American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale (AIS): motor-complete (AIS A-B), motor-incomplete (AIS C-D)]; 4) exercise modality [e.g., aerobic volitional upper-body, resistance training, FES, gait training, behaviour change]; 5) relative exercise intensity (e.g., light, moderate, moderate-to-vigorous, vigorous, supramaximal); 6) method used to prescribe exercise intensity (e.g., $\dot{V}O_2$, HR, RPE, workload); 7) frequency of exercise sessions (<3, ≥3

299 to <5, ≥5); 8) exercise volume [e.g., SCI-specific exercise guidelines for fitness (40 - 89 min/wk) [24],
300 SCI-specific exercise guidelines for cardiometabolic health (90 - 149 min/wk) [24], achieving general
301 population exercise guidelines (≥150 min/wk) [26], and 9) length of intervention (≤6 weeks, >6 to ≤12
302 weeks, >12 weeks). Studies were also classified as 'mixed' or 'not reported/cannot determine' subgroups
303 based on the aforementioned categories. Four secondary meta-analyses were also conducted for different
304 trial designs: 1. comparing inactive vs active participants (e.g., cross-sectional cohort studies); 2.
305 describing Δ in CRF outcomes with standard of care inpatient rehabilitation or free-living follow up (e.g.,
306 observational studies); 3. comparing Δ in CRF outcomes relative to control groups (RCTs only), and 4.
307 head-to-head comparison of different exercise intensities (RCTs with exercise interventions of differing
308 intensities). Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using the I^2 and accompanying p-value from the chi-
309 squared test. A fixed-effect model was used when no significant heterogeneity was detected among
310 studies (P>0.10, I^2<50%), otherwise, a random effect model was used. Evidence for differences in effects
311 between the subgroups was explored by comparing effects in the subgroups and the corresponding *p*-
312 values for interaction. To assess the effect of potential outlier studies, we conducted a sensitivity analysis
313 where studies were removed, and pooled WMD recalculated, when their CIs did not overlap with the CIs
314 of the pooled effect. Sensitivity analyses were also conducted by comparing the WMDs of low and high
315 risk of bias studies, as well as studies with and without imputed data (i.e., extracted from figures or where
316 mean ± SD were calculated from median, IQR or range), to confirm the robustness of our findings.
317 Potential publication bias in the dataset was assessed using funnel plots and Egger's tests in R. Data is
318 visualised in R (see Github for scripts: https://github.com/jutzca/Exercise-and-fitness-in-SCI). A 2.7
319 mL/kg/min, and thus 1 metabolic equivalent in SCI (1 SCI-MET) [43], change in R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ was
320 considered clinically meaningful.
321
322 To explore potential sources of heterogeneity, a random-effects meta-regression was performed using
323 preselected moderator variables in Stata (Version 13, StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA),
324 adjusted for multiple testing. As per Cochrane recommendations [44], for each included covariate in the
325 model a minimum of 10 studies were required. To achieve this, and to also overcome the issue of
326 collinearity between moderators, some moderators were not included in the analysis. Moderators were
327 selected *a priori*, based on their potential to influence CRF responses. Exercise intensity prescription was
328 later added as a moderator in the meta-regression in light of a recent study challenging strategies for

329 prescribing exercise intensity in individuals with SCI [45]. Moderators fell into two categories: model 1)
330 participant/injury characteristics [continuous variables: age, TSI and baseline CRF; categorical variables:
331 sex (n=male), neurological level of injury (n=PARA), severity (n=motor-complete)]; or model 2)
332 intervention/study characteristics [continuous variables: exercise session duration, frequency, weekly
333 exercise volume, intervention length; categorical variables: exercise modality, exercise intensity, method
334 of exercise intensity prescription, and risk of bias classification]. Any potential covariates of the effect
335 of $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, and PPO with $p \leq 0.10$ identified via univariate meta-regression were
336 subsequently included in multivariate meta-regression modelling. The level of significance for
337 multivariate meta-regression was set at $p \leq 0.10$. Because meta-regression can result in inflated false-
338 positive rates when heterogeneity is present, or when there are few studies, a permutation test described
339 by Higgins and Thompson [46] was used to verify the significance of the predictors in the final model,
340 whereby 10,000 permutations were generated.
341
342 **2.5. Risk of bias**
343 Study quality was appraised by at least two independent reviewers in duplicate (DH, GB, SYC), with
344 any conflicts resolved by a third reviewer (TN). The Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 (RoB 2) was used to assess
345 the risk of bias of the RCTs [47]. Reviewers determined the level of bias for each domain using the RoB
346 2 algorithms and is presented visually using robvis [48]. Non-randomised designs were assessed using
347 assessment tools generated by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Heart, Lung and
348 Blood Institute (NHLBI, Bethesda, MD). Pre-post studies were rated using the Quality Assessment Tool
349 for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies with No Control Group (12 items) and observational and cross-
350 sectional studies were rated using the Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-
351 Sectional Studies (14 items). Studies were subsequently classified as good, fair or poor quality using the
352 guidance provided within each tool and is presented visually in online supplementary material.
353
354 **2.6. Certainty on the body of the evidence assessment using the GRADE approach**
355 The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach [49]
356 was used to evaluate the certainty of the evidence for $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and PPO. Two authors (DH,
357 SYC) independently assessed the certainty of evidence for each outcome, with any conflicts resolved by
358 the corresponding author (TN). The certainty of the evidence was graded from 'High' to 'Moderate',

359 'Low' or 'Very Low'. GRADE certainty in the evidence was downgraded if one or more of the following
360 criteria were present: 1) risk of bias, 2) inconsistency in the results for a given outcome, 3) indirectness,
361 4) imprecision, and 5) publication bias.
362
363 **3. RESULTS**
364 The initial database search identified 12,885 articles after removal of duplicates. Further, 11,029 studies
365 were removed following the screening of titles and abstracts. The remaining 1,856 articles were selected
366 for full-text review based on inclusion and exclusion criteria (S1). Of these, a total of 110 eligible studies,
367 across each specific study design (RCT = 27, pre-post = 63, observational = 5, cross-sectional cohort =
368 9, cross-sectional association = 6), were included in this review. Ninety studies, comprising the RCTs
369 and pre-post studies, were included in the primary meta-analysis. Summaries of the pooled cohorts and
370 descriptions of the individual studies included within each secondary meta-analysis are provided as
371 supplementary material.
372
373 *[PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]*
374
375 **3.1. Primary meta-analysis: Effects of prescribed, prospective exercise intervention studies**
376 CRF responses were pooled across 90 studies, comprising 110 exercise interventions in total, taken from
377 76 pre-post exercise interventions and 34 independent exercise intervention arms from RCTs. Some
378 studies included multiple exercise intervention arms/phases, hence the greater total number of exercise
379 interventions than studies. A summary of the demographic/injury characteristics and intervention
380 parameters for the pooled cohort included in the primary analyses for $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, $R\dot{V}O_{2peak,}$ and PPO are
381 presented in Tables 1-2.
382
383 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]*
384
385 **3.1.1. Participants**
386 Across the 110 exercise interventions, there were a total of 1,191 participants. Most interventions
387 included both males and females (64% of studies), where females made up between 6-80% of the mixed
388 cohorts. There were no female-only cohorts. Mean age ranged between 24 to 58 years and the majority

389 of participants had chronic injuries (69% >1-year), with mean TSI ranging between 56 days to 24 years.
390 Sixty-three interventions included a mixed cohort of paraplegia and tetraplegia, of which individuals
391 with paraplegia made up between 10-88% of the mixed cohorts. Four interventions recruited individuals
392 with tetraplegia-only, 34 paraplegia-only, and nine did not specify. Participants across all AIS groups
393 were included, of which 39 interventions were motor-complete-only, 19 were motor-incomplete-only,
394 and 17 did not report. Thirty-five interventions recruited both motor-complete and incomplete
395 individuals, of which 32% were motor-incomplete. Mean $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ at baseline was 1.26
396 (0.51-3.50) L/min and 18.0 (7.3-36.9) mL/kg/min, respectively, and PPO was 49 (0-168) W.
397
398 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]*
399
400 **3.1.2. Exercise intervention characteristics**
401 Length of interventions ranged from 4 to 52 weeks, and whilst most studies reported a specific,
402 predetermined intervention length, some reported a range [50–52], a total or targeted number of sessions
403 [51,53–57], or provided an average [56,58,59]. Exercise sessions were completed between two to seven
404 times per week. Eleven studies reported a range (e.g., "two to three sessions") or maximum frequency
405 (e.g., "up to three sessions/week") [51,54,57,60–67], and frequency was either not reported or could not
406 be determined in five studies [68–72]. The remainder reported an exact frequency (e.g., three sessions
407 per week). The duration of exercise sessions ranged from 5 to 90 minutes, with four studies reporting a
408 range (e.g., 20-30 min) [51,73–75] and six studies reporting a progression to a target duration [54,76–
409 80]. Duration was not reported or could not be determined in 13 studies. Based on current exercise
410 guidelines, 22 interventions prescribed exercise within the SCI-specific exercise guidelines for fitness
411 (40-89 min/week), 44 interventions targeted the SCI-specific exercise guidelines for cardiometabolic
412 health (90-149 min/week), and 26 were greater than general population exercise guidelines (≥150
413 min/week).
414
415 Forty-one interventions utilised aerobic upper-body exercise, 5 upper-body resistance training/circuits,
416 22 FES, 15 gait training, 4 behaviour change, and 23 mixed/multimodal interventions. Following the
417 ACSM thresholds, one intervention prescribed light-intensity (<1%), 15 prescribed moderate-intensity
418 (14%), 33 prescribed moderate-to-vigorous-intensity (30%), 25 prescribed vigorous-intensity (23%), and

2 prescribed supramaximal-intensity exercise (2%). Intensity could not be determined from 34 interventions (31%). With regards to exercise intensity prescription methods, 32 interventions used HR, regulated either via HR_{peak} (%HR_{peak}, i.e., determined via a CPET; N=8), HR_{max} (%HR_{max}, i.e., age-predicted; N=11), or HR reserve (%HRR; N=13). Fourteen interventions established intensity using $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (%$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$; N=13) or $\dot{V}O_2$ reserve (%$\dot{V}O_{2reserve}$; N=1) calculated from the pre-intervention CPET. Thirteen interventions utilised RPE, using either the Borg CR10 scale (N=7) or the Borg 6-20 scale (N=6). Workload was used to prescribe intensity in 10 interventions, via a percentage of PPO (%PPO; N=5), one repetition maximum (%1RM; N=4), or maximal tolerated power (%MTP; N=1). Forty-one interventions either used a mixture of prescription methods or intensity could not be classified. Detail for the specific studies is presented in the forest plots in online supplementary material (S4).

3.1.3. Adverse events

Adverse events were described in 17 interventions, comprising 49/1,191 (4.1%) participants (S10). These events were related to: 1) bone, joint or muscular pain (n=10 participants), 2) autonomic or cardiovascular function (n=8 participants), 3) skin irritation or pressure sores (n=18 participants), and 4) other events including anxiety, nausea, dizziness and issues with testing equipment (n=3 participants). Adverse events were reported in three other pre-post studies. Beillot et al. [68] stated that participants experienced *"spontaneous fractures of lower limbs, occurrence of a syringomyelia and pressure sores at the foot and ankle"* (n=10), but did not define the number of participants who sustained each event. Likewise, Janssen and Pringle [61] reported *"lightheadedness in some subjects"*, and Gibbons et al. [81] stated that *"a number of participants showed some level of autonomic dysreflexia during the FES response test"*, but both studies did not quantify further.

3.1.4. Change in CRF outcomes

The summary statistics for the nine primary meta-analyses are presented in Tables 3-4 and their corresponding forest plots can be found in supplementary material (S4).

[PLEASE INSERT TABLES 3-4 HERE]

448 Sixty-nine exercise interventions assessed the change in A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, revealing a significant increase of
449 0.22 [0.17, 0.26] L/min (p<0.001). There were no significant subgroup differences for any of the nine
450 meta-analyses. Seventy-four exercise interventions assessed the change in R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, revealing a
451 significant increase of 2.8 [2.2, 3.4] mL/kg/min (p<0.001). There were no significant subgroup
452 differences for any of the nine meta-analyses. Sixty-one exercise interventions assessed the change in
453 PPO, revealing a significant increase of 11 [8, 13] W (p<0.001). There were significant subgroup
454 differences for TSI (p<0.001), neurological level of injury (p<0.001), exercise modality (p=0.003),
455 relative exercise intensity (p=0.003), method of exercise intensity prescription (p<0.001), and frequency
456 (p<0.001) (Tables 3-4).
457
458 *Sensitivity analyses*
459 The removal of potential outliers resulted in no meaningful changes to the overall pooled effects for any
460 outcome. A sensitivity analysis for risk of bias revealed no differences in the pooled effects for low and
461 high risk of bias studies (S11). A sensitivity analysis for imputed data revealed a greater R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ in
462 studies with imputed data (3.9 mL/kg/min) compared to studies without (2.5 mL/kg/min). Yet, there were
463 no differences in the pooled effects for A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ or PPO (S11). An additional analysis grouped
464 interventions into those that matched the CPET modality to the exercise intervention and those that did
465 not. Following the adjustment for subgroup comparisons, there was a significantly greater R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ in
466 studies with matched CPET and intervention modalities (p = 0.02). There were no significant differences
467 in A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ or PPO (S12). A sub-analysis on gait training CPETs alone also revealed no subgroup
468 differences in any outcome (S13).
469
470 **3.1.5. Meta-regression**
471 *Model 1 - Participant and injury characteristics*
472 Increased age was associated with increases in A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (p = 0.045) and R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (p = 0.025). There
473 were no associations between other moderator variables included in this model and CRF outcomes. There
474 were also no associations between PPO and the other moderator variables (Table 5).
475
476 *Model 2 - Exercise intervention and study characteristics*

There was no evidence that the exercise intervention and study characteristics included in model 2 were associated with increases in $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ or $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$. However, there was evidence for an association between the method of exercise intensity prescription and increases in PPO (p<0.01). Additionally, there was evidence for an association between exercise volume and increases in PPO (p = 0.04) (Table 5).

[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 5 HERE]

3.1.6. Publication bias

There was no significant publication bias for $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (Z = -1.23, p = 0.22), $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (Z = -0.54, p = 0.59), or PPO (Z = 0.73, p = 0.46). Funnel plots are provided in supplementary material (S4).

3.2. Secondary Meta-Analyses

3.2.1. Cross-sectional studies

Nine studies included cross-sectional data comparing CRF outcomes in active (n=129 participants) vs. inactive (n=115 participants) individuals with SCI. Inactive participants were mainly classified as sedentary, whereas active participants varied from recreationally active wheelchair sport players to paralympic athletes. A meta-analysis of cross-sectional cohort studies revealed significantly (p<0.001) higher $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ [0.54 (0.44, 0.63) L/min], $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, [9.4 (7.0, 11.8) mL/kg/min] and PPO [37 (29, 44) W] in active compared to inactive individuals with SCI (S5). Given the significant heterogeneity in $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, a sensitivity analysis was conducted to compare inactive individuals with either 'active' or 'elite athletes'. There was a significantly higher $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ [5.4 (3.0, 7.7) mL/kg/min, p<0.001] in 'active' compared to inactive individuals, but an even higher $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ [11.2 (9.6, 12.9) mL/kg/min, p<0.001] in 'elite athletes' compared to inactive.

Six studies (n=380 participants) included cross-sectional data and assessed associations between habitual physical activity level (as a continuous variable) and CRF outcomes. Five studies assessed physical activity exposure using self-report methods [82–86], whereas one study used a validated wearable device [87]. The measurement period used to capture physical activity dimensions ranged from 3 to 7 days. There was considerable variability across studies with regards to the physical activity dimensions captured: hours per week of exercise/sport, minutes per day or week of mild, moderate, heavy-intensity

for the subcategories of leisure time physical activity (LTPA), lifestyle or household activity or cumulative activity (S6). Collectively, data indicates significant positive correlations of a larger magnitude between CRF/PPO outcomes and the volume of sport, exercise or LTPA rather than household activity. The only study to use a validated wearable device indicated that participants performing ≥150 min/wk of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) had a significantly higher CRF relative to a low activity group (performing <40 min/wk). Whereas, there was no significant difference in CRF between the low activity group and participants achieving the SCI fitness specific exercise guidelines (40 - 149 min/wk) [87]. Significant, positive correlations were reported for the amount of moderate-to-vigorous LTPA or cumulative activity with CRF/PPO outcomes, which was not the case for mild or light-intensity activity.

3.2.2. Observational inpatient rehabilitation or community free-living studies

Five studies (n=343 participants) included observational longitudinal data and assessed changes in CRF outcomes following either standard of care inpatient rehabilitation [88–90] or a period of community free-living [88,91,92]. The duration between assessments for standard of care varied, ranging from 5 to 28 weeks, whereas the follow-up period for community observations ranged from 1 to 2.9 years. Reporting on the therapies used within standard of care was poor and only one study included a measurement of physical activity during the community-based free-living follow-up (self-reported mean sport activity) [91]. There were significant improvements following standard of care, but not following community-based free-living, in absolute [0.12 (0.07, 0.17) L/min, $p<0.001$ vs. 0.09 (0.00, 0.19) L/min, $p=0.06$] and relative $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ [2.1 (1.0, 3.2) mL/kg/min, $p<0.001$ vs -0.1 (-2.9, 2.7) mL/kg/min, $p=0.94$] (S7). Significant improvements in PPO were identified following both standard of care [6 (3, 9) W, $p<0.001$] and community-based free-living [7 (2, 12) W, $p=0.006$] (S7).

3.2.3. RCTs

Twenty RCTs assessed changes in CRF outcomes between exercise intervention (n=255 participants) and control (n=229 participants) groups. A meta-analysis of RCTs revealed a significantly higher $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ [0.15 (0.06, 0.24) L/min, $p=0.001$], $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ [2.9 (1.7, 4.0) mL/kg/min, $p<0.001$], and PPO [10 (5, 14) W, $p<0.001$] following an exercise intervention relative to SCI controls (S8).

537 Seven RCTs compared changes in CRF outcomes between moderate (n=52 participants) and vigorous
538 (n=51 participants) exercise intensity groups. These studies utilised upper-body aerobic exercise and gait
539 training. A meta-analysis revealed no significant differences between moderate and vigorous-intensity
540 in $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (p=0.67), $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (p=0.88) or PPO (p=0.62) (S9). There were also no significant subgroup
541 differences between studies that matched exercise volume between intensity groups and those that did
542 not.
543
544 **3.3. Risk of Bias**
545 Full risk of bias assessments for pre-post and RCT interventions can be found in supplementary material
546 (S4, S8, S9). Twenty-six pre-post studies were rated as having good, 25 as having fair, and 12 as having
547 poor methodological quality. Six RCTs were rated as having a low risk of bias, 8 as having some
548 concerns, and 13 as having a high risk of bias. The most common domains in the RCTs with either some
549 concerns or high risk were 'bias in the measurement of the outcome' and 'bias in selection of the reported
550 result'. Reporting was inadequate in many of the included studies, which made the assessment of risk of
551 bias challenging. Notably, reporting of blinding, eligibility or selection criteria, as well as the enrollment
552 of participants (i.e., a lack of CONSORT flow diagrams) was poor. Individual risk of bias assessments
553 for each study design are provided in supplementary material (S4-9).
554
555 **3.4. Evidence appraisal using GRADE**
556 Overall, the GRADE assessment revealed a 'Low' certainty in the body of evidence for improvements
557 in all CRF outcomes (Table 6). The certainty rating for $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ was downgraded due to imprecision
558 and a lack of high quality study designs, whereas $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ was downgraded as a result of imprecision
559 and a high risk of bias in the RCTs. The confidence rating for PPO was downgraded due to imprecision
560 and inconsistency, resulting from considerable heterogeneity in the included exercise interventions.
561
562 *[PLEASE INSERT TABLE 6 HERE]*
563
564 **4. DISCUSSION**
565 This review provides a large evidence-based summary and appraisal on the effects of prescribed and
566 prospective exercise interventions >2 weeks on CRF in individuals with SCI. The results from the meta-

567 analysis support the role of exercise in improving CRF in this population by 0.22 L/min and 11W in
568 $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and PPO, respectively. The meta-analysis also indicates a clinically meaningful change in
569 $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ of 2.8 mL/kg/min. However, the GRADE assessment revealed 'Low' certainty in the evidence
570 for significant improvements in $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, and PPO. Subgroup analyses revealed no effects of
571 injury characteristics or exercise intervention parameters on $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ or $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$. However, there were
572 significant subgroup differences for PPO based on TSI, neurological level of injury, exercise modality,
573 exercise intensity, method of exercise intensity prescription, and frequency of sessions.
574
575 **4.1. Impact of injury characteristics**
576 **4.1.1. Time since injury**
577 Following exercise interventions $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ improves in individuals with both acute and chronic SCI.
578 However, this review highlights the need for more exercise interventions in the acute phase post-SCI.
579 Indeed, a recent review by Van der Scheer et al. [38] rated the confidence in the evidence base for
580 exercise in acute SCI as 'Very Low', and called for more RCTs to control for the deteriorations in fitness
581 and health occurring almost immediately following SCI. With regards to PPO in the current review,
582 subgroup analysis based on TSI reveals that individuals with acute SCI exhibit a greater change than
583 individuals with chronic SCI. This could be due to spontaneous motor recovery in the first few months
584 following SCI [93], or speculatively, a familiarisation effect to novel modalities of exercise or additive
585 upper-limb physiological adaptations in response to concurrent inpatient rehabilitation. To support this
586 point, the secondary meta-analysis with longitudinal observational studies indicates a 6W improvement
587 in PPO with standard of care inpatient rehabilitation during the subacute period. Ultimately, more
588 rigorous RCTs are required in the subacute phase post-SCI that compare standard of care versus standard
589 of care plus a specific exercise intervention to truly quantify improvements in CRF outcomes.
590
591 **4.1.2. Neurological level of injury**
592 Exercise results in improved $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ regardless of the neurological level of injury. In particular, this
593 review reveals a pooled improvement of 5.9 mL/kg/min in studies that included only individuals with
594 tetraplegia (N=3). For comparison, there is a considerably larger evidence-base for studies including only
595 individuals with paraplegia (N=28). A recent systematic review suggested that aerobic exercise results
596 in minimal returns on investment in individuals with tetraplegia, with $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ improving on average only

9% following 10-37 weeks of training [17]. However, their review excluded studies with a sample size <10. Consequently, the Dicarlo study [94], which reported a 94% increase in R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ was excluded from their analysis. Whilst the inclusion of this study in the current analysis may have augmented the overall effect, our findings indicate that exercise improves CRF in individuals with tetraplegia and that the magnitude of change is not significantly different to individuals with paraplegia. However, this meta-analysis highlights that individuals with paraplegia (16W) are likely to accrue greater absolute changes in PPO than those with tetraplegia (9W). Typically, higher neurological levels of injury result in a loss of trunk control, motor impairments in the upper-limbs and reduced mechanical efficiency, compared to lower levels of injury [95,96]. Therefore, individuals with tetraplegia may not have the physical or motor capacity to adapt as effectively as individuals with paraplegia, and thus could experience a ceiling effect with training. Indeed, a recent study identified lesion level as a significant predictor of PPO in a group of handcyclists with SCI [97]. To account for baseline motor function differences between individuals with tetraplegia and paraplegia, we determined relative percentage change for studies that included upper-body aerobic exercise interventions only. The relative percentage change was similar between neurological level of injury classifications: 46% tetraplegia (N=1) vs. 53% paraplegia (N=9). While only one tetraplegia-only intervention was included in this subgroup analysis [98], normalising for baseline values seems to indicate similar relative magnitudes of change in PPO.

Williams et al. [99] demonstrated that individuals with a lower level of injury (<T6) significantly improved PPO compared to individuals with a higher level of injury (≥T6), suggesting a potential role of disrupted cardiovascular control in mediating changes in PPO. Whilst methods for ameliorating the reduction in sympathetic cardiovascular control typically associated with injuries ≥T6 have been investigated (e.g., abdominal binding [100], lower-body positive pressure [101], and midodrine [102]), the evidence for an improved CRF is still mixed. A recent case-report has indicated that epidural spinal cord stimulation (SCS) can safely and effectively restore cardiovascular control and improve CRF [103]. With an explosion in SCS studies over the last few years [104], particularly including transcutaneous SCS, the pairing of exercise with novel and non-invasive neuromodulatory approaches will likely continue to receive considerable research attention. Future, adequately powered, research may want to consider separating participants into paraplegia and tetraplegia groups or dichotomize by injuries above and below T6 to account for differences in sympathetic cardiovascular control. Currently, there is a

627 paucity of studies analysing data in this fashion, which limits our understanding of how neurological
628 level of injury and the degree of impaired sympathetic cardiovascular control influences the magnitude
629 of change in CRF following an exercise intervention. Researchers may want to consider conducting a
630 battery of autonomic nervous system stress tests at baseline (e.g., Valsalva manoeuvre, head-up tilt,
631 sympathetic skin responses etc. [105]), to determine the degree of supraspinal sympathetic disruption
632 rather than relying on a neurological level of injury derived from a motor-sensory examination. This is
633 important as recent research has indicated that cardiovascular instability cannot be predicted by motor-
634 sensory level and completeness of SCI [106].
635
636 **4.1.3. Injury severity**
637 There were no significant subgroup differences in CRF. However, the subgroup analysis suggests that
638 individuals with a motor-incomplete SCI may not yield PPO improvements of the same magnitude as
639 individuals with a motor-complete SCI. This is most likely due to the majority of motor-incomplete
640 studies implementing gait training as its exercise modality, which we reveal is the least effective modality
641 for improving CRF. The gait training studies that measured PPO (N=2) used arm-crank ergometry (ACE)
642 as the CPET modality, demonstrating no transfer effect from lower-body to upper-body exercise. During
643 data extraction, reviewers noted a poor reporting of injury severity in a number of studies. Whilst this
644 may be due to older studies having used now outdated severity scales (e.g., International Stoke
645 Mandeville Games Federation or Frankel), researchers should endeavour to perform an International
646 Standards for Neurological Classification of SCI (ISNCSCI) exam during screening, and subsequently
647 report an AIS grade, to enable better comparisons to be made between injury severities in the future.
648
649 **4.2. Impact of exercise intervention parameters**
650 **4.2.1. Exercise modality**
651 Despite a number of recent reviews summarising the effects of specific exercise modalities on the change
652 in CRF following SCI, including aerobic ACE [107], FES-cycling [39], and aerobic plus muscle strength
653 training (mixed multimodal) interventions [108], this meta-analysis is the first to directly compare the
654 effects of a wide range of exercise modalities on the change in CRF in individuals with SCI.
655

This review revealed there were no significant subgroup differences between exercise modalities in A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ or R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, indicating that improvements can be gained from any form of exercise intervention. The change in R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ in the current review (21%) is equivalent to the average 21% improvement reported in a recent systematic review on the effects of ACE in chronic SCI [107]. Whilst the current review did not exclusively investigate ACE, it is evident that aerobic, volitional upper-body exercise training can improve CRF in individuals with SCI. Activating larger amounts of skeletal muscle mass via FES exercise interventions also appears to improve $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, yet it is noteworthy that more accessible and less expensive training modalities such as aerobic and resistance training may yield similar or even greater increases in $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, despite utilising less muscle mass. Additionally, $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ improves following multimodal/hybrid exercise interventions, which challenges a 2015 review reporting inconclusive findings on the effects of combined upper-body aerobic and muscle strength training on CRF [108]. Yet, as the current review included a wide range of interventions not restricted to the upper-body (e.g., aquatic treadmill [54], hybrid cycling [55,60,109], multimodal exercises [110,111], etc.), it is recommended that more research is conducted to delineate whether the improvements in $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ with multimodal/hybrid exercise interventions are due to the combination of upper- and lower-body exercise modalities, or due to concurrent training modalities that predominantly use the upper-body (e.g., aerobic plus muscle strength training). Finally, both gait training and behaviour change interventions appear less effective at improving $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and PPO.

Aerobic, upper-body exercise and resistance training modalities demonstrate the greatest improvements in PPO, by 15W and 20W, respectively. It is perhaps unsurprising that resistance training resulted in the largest change in PPO given that these interventions included upper-body exercises prescribed to increase muscular strength, as shown by Jacobs et al. [112]. Ultimately, improvements in PPO have important ramifications for individuals with SCI that are dependent on performing explosive upper-body movements during transfers or wheelchair propulsion [88,92], and may lead to increased quality of life with more functional independence [113].

Several studies directly compared the effects of specific exercise modalities on the change in CRF [54,76,114]. Notably, Gorman et al. [54] demonstrated that there were no transfer effects from a robotic treadmill exercise intervention to ACE performance in a CPET. This review also demonstrates that

686 greater changes in R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ are likely achieved when the CPET modality is matched to the intervention
687 (S12). Therefore, researchers should endeavour to match the CPET modality to their exercise
688 intervention, or at the very least be careful when interpreting changes in CRF when using different
689 modalities.
690
691 **4.2.2. Exercise intensity**
692 The current SCI-specific exercise guidelines recommend that exercise should be performed at a
693 moderate-to-vigorous intensity [24]. A recent overview of systematic reviews also advocated the use of
694 moderate-to-vigorous intensity for improving aerobic fitness [115]. The current meta-analysis
695 demonstrates robust improvements across all CRF outcomes for interventions prescribing exercise at this
696 particular intensity. Furthermore, the secondary meta-analysis including cross-sectional studies reveals
697 significant associations of a greater magnitude between MVPA and CRF, as compared to lower-intensity
698 activity. Despite this, our classification of moderate-to-vigorous exercise intensity spans two of the
699 ACSM exercise intensity thresholds (S2). There may be considerable variation in the actual intensity
700 performed by participants given the noticeable range across thresholds (e.g., 46-90% $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, 64-95%
701 HR_{peak}, 12-17 RPE etc.). Therefore, individuals with SCI and exercise practitioners should be cautious
702 when prescribing such a broad exercise intensity.
703
704 The secondary meta-analysis comparing RCT exercise intensities reveals similar changes in CRF
705 outcomes between moderate- and vigorous-intensity interventions. This is in agreement with a previous
706 review [33] and supports the viewpoint from a special communication on high-intensity interval training
707 (HIIT) [34], which suggested that vigorous-intensity exercise is more time efficient and may result in
708 similar if not superior CRF and skeletal muscle oxidative capacity improvements in comparison to
709 moderate-intensity exercise. Interestingly, in a response to a Letter-to-the-Editor [30], the SCI-specific
710 exercise guideline developers acknowledge the need for shorter, effective protocols to be documented in
711 the literature [116]. In the current review, a number of HIIT-based studies result in an improved CRF
712 [60,109,117–121]. Furthermore, recent evidence has suggested that HIIT may be more enjoyable than
713 moderate-intensity exercise for individuals with SCI [122]. Therefore, this form of training may offer a
714 more time efficient and readily available alternative to moderate-intensity protocols. However, in

echoing the thoughts of Astorino et al. [35], research must first corroborate its safety and feasibility in the SCI population before it can be recommended as an exercise strategy to improve CRF.

4.2.3. Exercise intensity prescription methods

This review reveals that $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ improves regardless of the method used to prescribe exercise intensity. With regards to PPO, the subgroup difference indicates that the magnitude of change is greater when prescribing intensity via indices of HR (i.e., $\%HR_{peak}$, $\%HR_{max}$, %HRR) or $\dot{V}O_2$ (i.e., $\%\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, $\%\dot{V}O_{2reserve}$), compared to RPE and workload. Previous research has revealed that RPE results in inter-individual responses to exercise, with the potential for two individuals to perform the same bout of exercise above or below lactate threshold despite being prescribed the same intensity, which prevents the development of SCI-specific RPE recommendations [123]. The difference in PPO may also be due to individuals with SCI being unaccustomed to subjective measures of exertion. Accordingly, recent systematic reviews have called for better reporting of the standardisation and familiarisation procedures used for RPE [124] and have only tentatively recommended its use before the evidence base is expanded [125]. Therefore, it seems plausible to suggest that the blunted improvements in PPO with intensity prescribed via RPE, as compared to other prescription methods, may have resulted from insufficient familiarisation before an exercise intervention.

Although HR and $\dot{V}O_2$ have long been used to prescribe exercise intensity, these approaches can result in large training ranges and ignore individual metabolic responses. Particularly, issues may arise with using HR for individuals with a neurological level of injury ≥T6, given that these individuals typically exhibit a lower HR_{peak} [126]. The use of fixed percentages (i.e, $\%HR_{peak}$, $\%\dot{V}O_{2peak}$) in the non-injured population has been questioned [127] and has recently been investigated in individuals with SCI, whereby Hutchinson et al. [45] showed that fixed $\%HR_{peak}$ and $\%\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ could not guarantee a homogenous domain-specific exercise intensity prescription. Notably, individuals were spread across moderate, heavy and severe domains at the “moderate” and “vigorous” intensity classifications; thereby questioning whether the “moderate-to-vigorous” terminology used in the SCI-specific exercise guidelines is suitable for adults with SCI.

744 Given that prescribing exercise intensity via HR and $\dot{V}O_2$ can typically be resource and cost-intensive,
745 there is some scope for using RPE as a cheaper and more practical method for community-based exercise
746 prescription. However, this may not be as effective as other objective methods. Future research should
747 aim to identify the optimal methods of exercise intensity prescription, as well as consider revisiting the
748 current "moderate-to-vigorous intensity" recommendations.
749
750 **4.2.4. Frequency and exercise volume**
751 Subgroup analyses based on frequency of sessions and exercise volume reveal no differences in $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$,
752 thereby supporting the minimal volume of exercise required to attain CRF benefits in individuals with
753 SCI. Furthermore, although there are no subgroup differences in PPO, the meta-regression identifies that
754 a greater volume of exercise is associated with greater changes in PPO. Indeed, there is a greater
755 magnitude of change observed for individuals exercising 90-149 min/wk in comparison to 40-89 min/wk
756 (12W vs 6W change, respectively). A greater weekly exercise volume may therefore accrue greater
757 changes in PPO and, as already described, may be important in improving the capacity to perform daily
758 tasks such as bed or wheelchair transfers [88,92].
759
760 Although changes in CRF are similar between each exercise volume subgroup, and thus exercise
761 guideline, the secondary meta-analysis on cross-sectional cohorts indicates a significant cumulative
762 impact of prolonged participation in physical activity and exercise. To support this point, a sensitivity
763 analysis revealed a larger difference in $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ between inactive individuals and elite athletes,
764 compared to between inactive and active individuals, suggesting that those who exercise more exhibit a
765 greater CRF. Indeed, a cross-sectional association study [87], using a wearable device to objectively
766 monitor habitual physical activity, reported a significantly higher CRF in those performing the general
767 population exercise guidelines (≥150 min/wk) compared to the SCI-specific fitness guidelines (40-89
768 min/wk). In fact, a recent study by Hoevenaars et al. [128] explored whether meeting the guidelines
769 proposed by Tweedy et al. [27] ("≥150 min/wk of moderate or ≥60 min/wk of vigorous exercise"), which
770 are nearly consistent with the general population exercise guidelines, is associated with greater health
771 and fitness benefits than the current SCI-specific guidelines by Martin-Ginis et al. [24]. Individuals
772 meeting the Tweedy guidelines had a significantly greater $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and PPO than those meeting the
773 guidelines developed by Martin-Ginis et al. [24]. Looking forward, longitudinal RCTs with multiple

774 intervention arms would be the best way to explore dose-response changes with regards to differing
775 volumes of exercise, as has been done in the non-injured population [129–132].
776
777 **4.3. Adverse events**
778 Adverse events were reported for 4.1% of the total included participants, with the majority of events
779 related to skin sores, pressure sores or ulcers. Qualitatively, there was no particular exercise modality
780 that suggested an increased risk for an adverse event, but higher-intensity exercise appeared to reveal
781 more adverse events, albeit being swayed by one study in particular [111]. Reporting was poor in a
782 number of studies with reviewers at times unable to determine the exact number of events per participant.
783 Furthermore, there is generally a lack of follow-up assessments following exercise interventions, so it is
784 currently unknown whether there are any detrimental long-term effects of exercise in SCI.
785
786 **4.4. Strengths and limitations of the review and future directions**
787 **4.4.1. Limitations of the included studies**
788 Poor reporting of injury characteristics and exercise parameters prevented a perfect comparison of
789 exercise interventions. Overall, studies could have provided more precise descriptions of training
790 parameters to aid with any future refinements to the SCI-specific exercise guidelines. Reporting of
791 adherence to interventions was also poor and should be encouraged to provide an indication of the
792 feasibility or applicability of specific exercise interventions for individuals with SCI. Moreover, adverse
793 events should be transparently reported, even if none occur so that practitioners are able to identify forms
794 of exercise that are most likely to be safe for this population. Additionally, studies typically failed to
795 utilise the training principle of progression, which during prolonged exercise interventions is essential
796 for preventing a plateau in training adaptations and perhaps particularly important in this population for
797 supporting the transition from an inactive lifestyle to higher levels of activity, and ultimately achieving
798 greater CRF benefits [27]. On the whole, the reporting of $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ attainment criteria was poor, with only
799 16% of the included exercise interventions using at least three criterion methods for identifying when an
800 individual had reached peak capacity. Thus, the magnitude of change in these studies could be inflated
801 or underestimated. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, only 30% of interventions had a
802 prospectively registered clinical trial entry and only 6.4% had a protocol manuscript published. To

803 sustain the integrity and transparency of reporting in this field, researchers are encouraged to
804 prospectively register any planned clinical trials using publicly available repositories.
805
806 The risk of bias assessments on pre-post studies revealed that no study conducted multiple baseline or
807 follow-up assessments. Whilst often time-consuming and impractical with larger sample sizes, multiple
808 assessments ensure reproducibility by accounting for any technical or biological variation, as shown
809 previously in non-injured individuals at risk for type-2 diabetes [133]. In the SCI population, individuals
810 are typically deconditioned and often exhibit variable responses to a CPET. This variance may be
811 explained by profound blood pressure instability [134], including unintentional 'boosting' via episodes
812 of autonomic dysreflexia [135]. Researchers should therefore consider performing multiple CPETs at
813 baseline and follow-up to attain reliable assessments of CRF.
814
815 There are also several limitations with regards to the studies included in the secondary meta-analyses for
816 this review. First, there is only one cross-sectional study using a wearable device to investigate the
817 association between physical activity and CRF [87]. Whilst self-report questionnaires are valid tools for
818 estimating levels of physical activity [86,136–138], there are important drawbacks including the
819 difficulty of accurately capturing intensity, lack of questionnaires measuring activities of daily living,
820 and recall bias. Secondly, there is a lack of RCTs comparing near-maximal, maximal or supramaximal
821 exercise intensities to moderate-intensity exercise. The only supramaximal intervention included in this
822 review demonstrated a 17W improvement in PPO [120]. The inclusion of more RCTs comparing
823 vigorous-intensity to lower intensity exercise could identify whether there are, in fact, benefits to
824 performing shorter but more vigorous-intensity exercise bouts, in comparison to longer continuous forms
825 of exercise.
826
827 **4.4.2. Strengths and limitations of the review**
828 A major strength of the current study is that we pre-planned and prospectively registered (PROSPERO
829 ID CRD42018104342) our systematic review. We used GRADE to assess the certainty in the body of
830 evidence and used quality appraisal tools for the specific study designs included in this review. Our
831 GRADE assessment demonstrates generalisability within the SCI population, through the inclusion of
832 participants across the lifespan and with a wide range of injury characteristics. Yet, the 'Low' confidence

in the evidence across all CRF outcomes emphasises the need for more rigorous exercise interventions to address current gaps in the literature [38].

As there were not enough RCTs to perform a meta-regression on this study design specifically, we pooled pre-post and RCT exercise interventions. The changes in $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and PPO in the primary meta-analysis (2.8 mL/kg/min and 11W, respectively) are somewhat similar to those reported with RCT interventions relative to controls (2.9 mL/kg/min and 10W, respectively), and thus confirms the robustness of our overall findings. Furthermore, our rigorous approach of adjusting for multiple comparisons minimises any erroneous interpretations of subgroup differences and therefore strengthens our conclusions on the available evidence.

Despite this, the categorisation of interventions within each subgroup could be considered a limitation of the current review. Whilst this was done to directly compare the effects of different subgroups (i.e., acute vs chronic, tetraplegia vs paraplegia, aerobic vs resistance vs FES etc.), it resulted in an unequal number of interventions within each classification and likely underpowered the subgroup comparisons. For example, the subgroup analysis based on exercise intensity reveals an effect of exercise intensity on PPO, yet this may be influenced by the small number of interventions for light- and supramaximal-intensity. Despite reporting some significant subgroup differences across dichotomised studies, these variables were not identified as significant moderator variables in the random-effects meta-regression, meaning these findings should be viewed with caution. It is perhaps more of a limitation of the evidence-base *per se*, rather than our meta-analysis, in that more studies should be conducted to increase the power of these subgroups and to ascertain whether there would be any significant improvements with a greater study sample size.

Another limitation is that despite our comprehensive search strategy we may have missed relevant studies as we did not search the grey literature and abstracts were not included. Finally, this review excluded studies that were not published in English, introducing a source of language bias. However, of the full texts screened for eligibility only 0.6% were excluded for being unavailable in English and is therefore highly unlikely to have influenced the overall findings.

863 **4.4.3. Implications and future directions**

864 Our results support the current guidelines regarding the minimal weekly volume of exercise necessary to
865 improve CRF in the SCI population. However, our pooled analysis indicates subgroup differences for
866 PPO based on certain exercise intervention parameters. To the best of our knowledge, there are no large
867 scale epidemiological studies investigating the dose-response relationship between physical activity and
868 CRF in this population using sensitive and validated methods to quantify the exposure variable (e.g. free-
869 living physical activity). Such studies have been performed in non-injured individuals [139,140]. To
870 identify the optimal stimulus for beneficial CRF responses in this population, dose-ranging studies, akin
871 to those that are used in the pharmaceutical industry, should be conducted. A recent overview of
872 systematic reviews [141] highlighted the poor reporting in exercise interventions in health and disease
873 and called upon the inclusion of checklists [e.g., the Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template (CERT)
874 [142] or the Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) [143]] to improve study
875 quality. This would ultimately lead to a better understanding of the 'dose' of exercise as medicine
876 required to optimise CRF outcomes in this population.

877

878 Exercise interventions >2 weeks result in an overall pooled increase in $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ of 2.8 mL/kg/min, which
879 is roughly equivalent to 1 MET-SCI [metabolic equivalent in SCI (2.7 mL/kg/min)] [43]. An increase in
880 maximal aerobic capacity (an estimate of CRF) by 1 MET (3.5 mL/kg/min) in non-injured individuals is
881 associated with a 13% and 15% reduction in all-cause and cardiovascular mortality, respectively [144].
882 The current review shows that individuals meeting the SCI-specific guidelines for cardiometabolic health
883 [24] can improve $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ to a similar magnitude to the overall pooled effect (~1 MET-SCI),
884 highlighting that these guidelines may offer a reduction in CVD risk, and therefore mortality.
885 Nonetheless, an association between an improvement in CRF and a reduction in mortality is yet to be
886 established specifically in the SCI population, and remains an important avenue of research for the future.

887

888 **5. CONCLUSION**

889 This systematic review with meta-analysis provides an updated, evidence-based summary of the effects
890 of exercise interventions on CRF in individuals with SCI. It reveals that exercise interventions >2 weeks
891 are associated with significant improvements to CRF, and in particular, a clinically meaningful change
892 in $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$. Subgroup comparisons identified that upper-body aerobic exercise and resistance training

appear the most effective at improving PPO. Furthermore, acutely-injured, paraplegic individuals, exercising at a moderate-to-vigorous intensity, prescribed via $\dot{V}O_2$ or HR, for more than 3 sessions/week will likely experience the greatest change in PPO. Importantly, there is an ever-growing need for studies to establish a dose-response relationship between exercise and CRF in the SCI population to determine the most optimal form of exercise prescription to reduce the wide-ranging consequences typically associated with SCI.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Mr. Sajjad Tavassoly (Faculty of Medicine, UBC, Vancouver, Canada) for his assistance with piloting the initial database search. We would also like to thank Dr. Matthew Querée (Department of Physical Therapy, UBC, Spinal Cord Injury Research Evidence Team, GF Strong Rehabilitation Centre, Vancouver, Canada) for his assistance with the risk of bias assessments. We appreciate the assistance of Mr Adrian Cheng (ICORD) and Dr. Alex Williams (ICORD), who helped pilot the inclusion/exclusion of articles and supported the use of Photoshop to extract data from figures, respectively. We thank Dr. Sam Weaver (University of Birmingham) for support with the meta-analysis using R.

7. DECLARATIONS

7.1. Author Contributions

Conceptualisation and study design were conducted by MW, AK and TN. Literature searches were completed by DH, GB and TN. Risk of bias and GRADE assessments were completed by DH, GB, SYC and TN. Statistical analysis and data interpretation were performed by DH, CL, CJ and TN. All authors contributed to the drafting and critical revision of the work.

7.2. Funding

Daniel Hodgkiss is supported by a Nathalie Rose Barr PhD studentship (#NRB123) from the International Spinal Research Trust (ISRT), a registered charity in the UK. Gurjeet Bhangu was supported by the Faculty of Medicine within the University of British Columbia (UBC) via the Flexible and Enhanced Learning Program. Carole Lunny's postdoctoral work is supported by a CIHR project grant (2021-2023). Catherine Jutzeler was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Ambizione Grant [PZ00P3_186101]) and Wings for Life (Wings for Life Research Foundation [#ID 2020_118]). Tom Nightingale (grant number 17767) and Matthias Walter (grant number 17110) were recipients of Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research Trainee Awards in conjunction with the International Collaboration on Repair Discoveries and Rick Hansen Foundation, respectively.

7.3. Availability of data and materials

All data included in this systematic review can be provided upon request to the corresponding author.

7.4. Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

7.5. Consent for publication

Not applicable.

7.6. Code availability

R scripts can be found on the Github repository: https://github.com/jutzca/Exercise-and-fitness-in-SCI

7.7. Competing interests

Daniel Hodgkiss, Gurjeet Bhangu, Carole Lunny, Catherine Jutzeler, Shin-Yi Chiou, Matthias Walter, Samuel Lucas, Andrei Krassioukov and Tom Nightingale declare that they have no competing interests relevant to the content of this article.

979 **8. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

1RM	One repetition maximum
	Arm-crank ergometry
ACSM	American College of Sports Medicine
AIS	American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale
$A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$	Absolute peak oxygen uptake
CENTRAL	Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
CERT	Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template
CI	Confidence interval
CPET	Cardiopulmonary exercise test
CRF	Cardiorespiratory fitness
CVD	Cardiovascular disease
EMBASE	Excerpta Medica Database
FES	Functional electrical stimulation
GRADE	Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation
HIIT	High-intensity interval training
HR	Heart rate
HR_{max}	Maximum heart rate (age-predicted)
HR_{peak}	Peak heart rate
HRR	Heart rate reserve
IQR	Interquartile range
ISNCSCI	International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury
LTPA	Leisure time physical activity
MET	Metabolic equivalent
MTP	Maximal tolerated power
MVPA	Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity
PPO	Peak power output
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews

RCT	Randomised-controlled trial
RoB 2	The Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool
RPE	Rating of perceived exertion
R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$	Relative peak oxygen uptake
SCI	Spinal cord injury
SCS	Spinal cord stimulation
SD	Standard deviation
TIDieR	Template for Intervention Description and Replication
TSI	Time since injury
$\dot{V}O_2$	Oxygen uptake
$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$	Peak oxygen uptake
$\dot{V}O_{2reserve}$	Reserve oxygen uptake
W	Watts
WMD	Weighted mean difference

997 **9. REFERENCES**

998 1 Miller LE, Herbert WG. Health and economic benefits of physical activity for patients with spinal
999 cord injury. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res* 2016;**8**:551–8.

1000 2 Rimmer JH, Schiller W, Chen M-D. Effects of disability-associated low energy expenditure
1001 deconditioning syndrome. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev* 2012;**40**:22–9.

1002 3 Cragg JJ, Noonan VK, Dvorak M, *et al.* Spinal cord injury and type 2 diabetes: results from a
1003 population health survey. *Neurology* 2013;**81**:1864–8.

1004 4 Cragg JJ, Noonan VK, Krassioukov A, *et al.* Cardiovascular disease and spinal cord injury:
1005 results from a national population health survey. *Neurology* 2013;**81**:723–8.

1006 5 Wu J-C, Chen Y-C, Liu L, *et al.* Increased risk of stroke after spinal cord injury: a nationwide 4-
1007 year follow-up cohort study. *Neurology* 2012;**78**:1051–7.

1008 6 Ross R, Blair SN, Arena R, *et al.* Importance of Assessing Cardiorespiratory Fitness in Clinical
1009 Practice: A Case for Fitness as a Clinical Vital Sign: A Scientific Statement From the American
1010 Heart Association. *Circulation* 2016;**134**:e653–99.

1011 7 Clausen Johan S.R., Marott Jacob L., Holtermann Andreas, *et al.* Midlife Cardiorespiratory
1012 Fitness and the Long-Term Risk of Mortality. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;**72**:987–95.

1013 8 Lee D-C, Sui X, Artero EG, *et al.* Long-term effects of changes in cardiorespiratory fitness and
1014 body mass index on all-cause and cardiovascular disease mortality in men: the Aerobics Center
1015 Longitudinal Study. *Circulation* 2011;**124**:2483–90.

1016 9 Myers J, Prakash M, Froelicher V, *et al.* Exercise capacity and mortality among men referred for
1017 exercise testing. *N Engl J Med* 2002;**346**:793–801.

1018 10 Laukkanen JA, Kurl S, Salonen R, *et al.* The predictive value of cardiorespiratory fitness for
1019 cardiovascular events in men with various risk profiles: a prospective population-based cohort
1020 study. *Eur Heart J* 2004;**25**:1428–37.

1021 11 Erikssen G, Liestøl K, Bjørnholt J, *et al.* Changes in physical fitness and changes in mortality.

1022 *Lancet* 1998;**352**:759–62.

1023 12 Lee DC, Sui X, Ortega FB, *et al.* Comparisons of leisure-time physical activity and
1024 cardiorespiratory fitness as predictors of all-cause mortality in men and women. *Br J Sports Med*
1025 2011;**45**:504–10.

1026 13 Haisma JA, van der Woude LHV, Stam HJ, *et al.* Physical capacity in wheelchair-dependent
1027 persons with a spinal cord injury: a critical review of the literature. *Spinal Cord* 2006;**44**:642–52.

1028 14 Simmons OL, Kressler J, Nash MS. Reference fitness values in the untrained spinal cord injury
1029 population. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2014;**95**:2272–8.

1030 15 Cruz S, Blauwet CA. Implications of altered autonomic control on sports performance in athletes
1031 with spinal cord injury. *Auton Neurosci* 2018;**209**:100–4.

1032 16 West CR, Gee CM, Voss C, *et al.* Cardiovascular control, autonomic function, and elite
1033 endurance performance in spinal cord injury. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2015;**25**:476–85.

1034 17 Figoni SF, Dolbow DR, Crawford EC, *et al.* Does aerobic exercise benefit persons with
1035 tetraplegia from spinal cord injury? A systematic review. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2021;**44**:690–703.

1036 18 Stofan JR, DiPietro L, Davis D, *et al.* Physical activity patterns associated with cardiorespiratory
1037 fitness and reduced mortality: the Aerobics Center Longitudinal Study. *Am J Public Health*
1038 1998;**88**:1807–13.

1039 19 Nightingale TE, Williams S, Thompson D, *et al.* Energy balance components in persons with
1040 paraplegia: daily variation and appropriate measurement duration. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*
1041 2017;**14**:132.

1042 20 van den Berg-Emons RJ, Bussmann JB, Stam HJ. Accelerometry-based activity spectrum in
1043 persons with chronic physical conditions. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2010;**91**:1856–61.

1044 21 Hicks AL, Martin Ginis KA, Pelletier CA, *et al.* The effects of exercise training on physical
1045 capacity, strength, body composition and functional performance among adults with spinal cord
1046 injury: a systematic review. *Spinal Cord* 2011;**49**:1103–27.

1047 22 Valent L, Dallmeijer A, Houdijk H, *et al.* The effects of upper body exercise on the physical
1048 capacity of people with a spinal cord injury: a systematic review. *Clin Rehabil* 2007;**21**:315–30.

1049 23 Ginis KAM, Hicks AL, Latimer AE, *et al.* The development of evidence-informed physical
1050 activity guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2011;**49**:1088–96.

1051 24 Martin Ginis KA, van der Scheer JW, Latimer-Cheung AE, *et al.* Evidence-based scientific
1052 exercise guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury: an update and a new guideline. *Spinal Cord*
1053 2018;**56**:308–21.

1054 25 Smith B, Kirby N, Skinner B, *et al.* Infographic. Physical activity for disabled adults. *Br J Sports*
1055 *Med* 2019;**53**:335–6.

1056 26 Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, *et al.* World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical
1057 activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J Sports Med* 2020;**54**:1451–62.

1058 27 Tweedy SM, Beckman EM, Geraghty TJ, *et al.* Exercise and sports science Australia (ESSA)
1059 position statement on exercise and spinal cord injury. *J Sci Med Sport* 2017;**20**:108–15.

1060 28 Piercy KL, Troiano RP, Ballard RM, *et al.* The Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans.
1061 *JAMA* 2018;**320**:2020–8.

1062 29 Powell KE, Paluch AE, Blair SN. Physical activity for health: What kind? How much? How
1063 intense? On top of what? *Annu Rev Public Health* 2011;**32**:349–65.

1064 30 Tweedy SM, Beckman EM, Connick MJ, *et al.* Correspondence re 'Evidence-based scientific
1065 exercise guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury: an update and new guideline'. Spinal Cord.
1066 2018;**56**:406–8.

1067 31 Yue T, Wang Y, Liu H, *et al.* Effects of High-Intensity Interval vs. Moderate-Intensity
1068 Continuous Training on Cardiac Rehabilitation in Patients With Cardiovascular Disease: A
1069 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Cardiovasc Med* 2022;**9**:845225.

1070 32 Hannan AL, Hing W, Simas V, *et al.* High-intensity interval training versus moderate-intensity
1071 continuous training within cardiac rehabilitation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Open*
1072 *Access J Sports Med* 2018;**9**:1–17.

1073 33 Peters J, Abou L, Rice LA, *et al.* The effectiveness of vigorous training on cardiorespiratory
1074 fitness in persons with spinal cord injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Spinal Cord*
1075 2021;**59**:1035–44.

1076 34 Nightingale TE, Metcalfe RS, Vollaard NB, *et al.* Exercise Guidelines to Promote
1077 Cardiometabolic Health in Spinal Cord Injured Humans: Time to Raise the Intensity? *Arch Phys*
1078 *Med Rehabil* 2017;**98**:1693–704.

1079 35 Astorino TA, Hicks AL, Bilzon JLJ. Viability of high intensity interval training in persons with
1080 spinal cord injury-a perspective review. *Spinal Cord* 2021;**59**:3–8.

1081 36 Farrow M, Nightingale TE, Maher J, *et al.* Effect of Exercise on Cardiometabolic Risk Factors in
1082 Adults With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*
1083 2020;**101**:2177–205.

1084 37 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-
1085 analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009;**339**:b2535.

1086 38 van der Scheer JW, Martin Ginis KA, Ditor DS, *et al.* Effects of exercise on fitness and health of
1087 adults with spinal cord injury: A systematic review. *Neurology* 2017;**89**:736–45.

1088 39 van der Scheer JW, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, Valentino SE, *et al.* Functional electrical stimulation
1089 cycling exercise after spinal cord injury: a systematic review of health and fitness-related
1090 outcomes. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2021;**18**:99.

1091 40 American College Medicine. *ACSM's guidelines for exercise testing and prescription*. 9th ed.
1092 Lippincott Williams & Wilkins 2013. https://shop.lww.com/ACSM-s-Guidelines-for-Exercise-
1093 Testing-and-Prescription/p/9781975150181 (accessed 3 Dec 2021).

1094 41 Higgins JPT, Li T, Deeks JJ. Choosing effect measures and computing estimates of effect.
1095 Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. 2019;:143–76.
1096 doi:10.1002/9781119536604.ch6

1097 42 Hozo SP, Djulbegovic B, Hozo I. Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and
1098 the size of a sample. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2005;**5**:13.

1099 43 Collins EG, Gater D, Kiratli J, *et al.* Energy cost of physical activities in persons with spinal cord
1100 injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2010;**42**:691–700.

1101 44 Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*
1102 *Interventions*. John Wiley & Sons 2019.

1103 45 Hutchinson MJ, Goosey-Tolfrey VL. Rethinking aerobic exercise intensity prescription in adults
1104 with spinal cord injury: time to end the use of 'moderate to vigorous' intensity? *Spinal Cord*
1105 2021;:1–7.

1106 46 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Controlling the risk of spurious findings from meta-regression. *Stat*
1107 *Med* 2004;**23**:1663–82.

1108 47 Higgins JPT, Sterne JAC, Savovic J, *et al.* A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomized
1109 trials. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;**10**:29–31.

1110 48 McGuinness LA, Higgins JPT. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and Shiny web
1111 app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. *Res Synth Methods* 2021;**12**:55–61.

1112 49 Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, *et al.* GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of
1113 evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;**336**:924–6.

1114 50 Han D-S, Hsiao M-Y, Wang T-G, *et al.* Association of serum myokines and aerobic exercise
1115 training in patients with spinal cord injury: an observational study. *BMC Neurol* 2016;**16**:142.

1116 51 Hoekstra F, van Nunen MPM, Gerrits KHL, *et al.* Effect of robotic gait training on
1117 cardiorespiratory system in incomplete spinal cord injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2013;**50**:1411–22.

1118 52 Pollack SF, Axen K, Spielholz N, *et al.* Aerobic training effects of electrically induced lower
1119 extremity exercises in spinal cord injured people. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1989;**70**:214–9.

1120 53 Barstow TJ, Scremin AM, Mutton DL, *et al.* Changes in gas exchange kinetics with training in
1121 patients with spinal cord injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1996;**28**:1221–8.

1122 54 Gorman PH, Scott W, VanHiel L, *et al.* Comparison of peak oxygen consumption response to
1123 aquatic and robotic therapy in individuals with chronic motor incomplete spinal cord injury: a

1124 randomized controlled trial. *Spinal Cord* 2019;**57**:471–81.

1125 55 Heesterbeek PJC, Berkelmans HWA, Thijssen DHJ, *et al.* Increased physical fitness after 4-week
1126 training on a new hybrid FES-cycle in persons with spinal cord injury. *Technol Disabil*
1127 2005;**17**:103–10.

1128 56 Mutton DL, Scremin AM, Barstow TJ, *et al.* Physiologic responses during functional electrical
1129 stimulation leg cycling and hybrid exercise in spinal cord injured subjects. *Arch Phys Med*
1130 *Rehabil* 1997;**78**:712–8.

1131 57 Ozturk ED, Lapointe MS, Kim D-I, *et al.* Effect of 6-Month Exercise Training on Neurovascular
1132 Function in Spinal Cord Injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2021;**53**:38–46.

1133 58 Hooker SP, Scremin AM, Mutton DL, *et al.* Peak and submaximal physiologic responses
1134 following electrical stimulation leg cycle ergometer training. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 1995;**32**:361–6.

1135 59 Hooker SP, Figoni SF, Rodgers MM, *et al.* Physiologic effects of electrical stimulation leg cycle
1136 exercise training in spinal cord injured persons. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1992;**73**:470–6.

1137 60 Hasnan N, Engkasan JP, Husain R, *et al.* High-Intensity Virtual-reality Arm plus FES-leg Interval
1138 Training in Individuals with Spinal Cord Injury. *Biomed Tech* 2013;**58 Suppl 1**.
1139 doi:10.1515/bmt-2013-4028

1140 61 Janssen TWJ, Pringle DD. Effects of modified electrical stimulation-induced leg cycle ergometer
1141 training for individuals with spinal cord injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2008;**45**:819–30.

1142 62 Jeon JY, Hettinga D, Steadward RD, *et al.* Reduced plasma glucose and leptin after 12 weeks of
1143 functional electrical stimulation-rowing exercise training in spinal cord injury patients. *Arch Phys*
1144 *Med Rehabil* 2010;**91**:1957–9.

1145 63 Midha M, Schmitt JK, Sclater M. Exercise effect with the wheelchair aerobic fitness trainer on
1146 conditioning and metabolic function in disabled persons: a pilot study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*
1147 1999;**80**:258–61.

1148 64 Milia R, Roberto S, Marongiu E, *et al.* Improvement in hemodynamic responses to metaboreflex
1149 activation after one year of training in spinal cord injured humans. *Biomed Res Int*

1150 2014;**2014**:893468.

1151 65 Solinsky R, Mercier H, Picard G, *et al.* Cardiometabolic Effects of High-Intensity Hybrid
1152 Functional Electrical Stimulation Exercise after Spinal Cord Injury. *PM R* 2021;**13**:937–44.

1153 66 Lavado EL, Cardoso JR, Silva LGA, *et al.* Effectiveness of aerobic physical training for treatment
1154 of chronic asymptomatic bacteriuria in subjects with spinal cord injury: a randomized controlled
1155 trial. *Clin Rehabil* 2013;**27**:142–9.

1156 67 Brazg G, Fahey M, Holleran CL, *et al.* Effects of Training Intensity on Locomotor Performance
1157 in Individuals With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Randomized Crossover Study. *Neurorehabil*
1158 *Neural Repair* 2017;**31**:944–54.

1159 68 Beillot J, Carré F, Le Claire G, *et al.* Energy consumption of paraplegic locomotion using
1160 reciprocating gait orthosis. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 1996;**73**:376–81.

1161 69 Bombardier CH, Dyer JR, Burns P, *et al.* A tele-health intervention to increase physical fitness in
1162 people with spinal cord injury and cardiometabolic disease or risk factors: a pilot randomized
1163 controlled trial. *Spinal Cord* 2021;**59**:63–73.

1164 70 Kooijmans H, Post MWM, Stam HJ, *et al.* Effectiveness of a Self-Management Intervention to
1165 Promote an Active Lifestyle in Persons With Long-Term Spinal Cord Injury: The HABITS
1166 Randomized Clinical Trial. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2017;**31**:991–1004.

1167 71 Ma JK, West CR, Martin Ginis KA. The Effects of a Patient and Provider Co-Developed,
1168 Behavioral Physical Activity Intervention on Physical Activity, Psychosocial Predictors, and
1169 Fitness in Individuals with Spinal Cord Injury: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Sports Med*
1170 2019;**49**:1117–31.

1171 72 Nooijen CF, Stam HJ, Sluis T, *et al.* A behavioral intervention promoting physical activity in
1172 people with subacute spinal cord injury: secondary effects on health, social participation and
1173 quality of life. *Clin Rehabil* 2017;**31**:772–80.

1174 73 Bakkum AJT, de Groot S, Stolwijk-Swüste JM, *et al.* Effects of hybrid cycling versus
1175 handcycling on wheelchair-specific fitness and physical activity in people with long-term spinal

1176 cord injury: a 16-week randomized controlled trial. *Spinal Cord* 2015;**53**:395–401.

1177 74 Capodaglio P, Grilli C, Bazzini G. Tolerable exercise intensity in the early rehabilitation of
1178 paraplegic patients. A preliminary study. *Spinal Cord* 1996;**34**:684–90.

1179 75 Gorgey AS, Lai RE, Khalil RE, *et al.* Neuromuscular electrical stimulation resistance training
1180 enhances oxygen uptake and ventilatory efficiency independent of mitochondrial complexes after
1181 spinal cord injury: a randomized clinical trial. *J Appl Physiol* 2021;**131**:265–76.

1182 76 Alrashidi AA, Nightingale TE, Currie KD, *et al.* Exercise Improves Cardiorespiratory Fitness, but
1183 Not Arterial Health, after Spinal Cord Injury: The CHOICES Trial. *J Neurotrauma*
1184 2021;**38**:3020–9.

1185 77 Berry HR, Perret C, Saunders BA, *et al.* Cardiorespiratory and power adaptations to stimulated
1186 cycle training in paraplegia. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2008;**40**:1573–80.

1187 78 Duffell LD, Paddison S, Alahmary AF, *et al.* The effects of FES cycling combined with virtual
1188 reality racing biofeedback on voluntary function after incomplete SCI: a pilot study. *J Neuroeng*
1189 *Rehabil* 2019;**16**:149.

1190 79 Durán FS, Lugo L, Ramírez L, *et al.* Effects of an exercise program on the rehabilitation of
1191 patients with spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2001;**82**:1349–54.

1192 80 Gorman PH, Scott W, York H, *et al.* Robotically assisted treadmill exercise training for
1193 improving peak fitness in chronic motor incomplete spinal cord injury: A randomized controlled
1194 trial. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2016;**39**:32–44.

1195 81 Gibbons RS, Stock CG, Andrews BJ, *et al.* The effect of FES-rowing training on cardiac structure
1196 and function: pilot studies in people with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2016;**54**:822–9.

1197 82 Janssen TWJ, Dallmeijer AJ, Veeger DJHEJ, *et al.* Normative values and determinants of
1198 physical capacity in individuals with spinal cord injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2002;**39**:29–39.

1199 83 Lannem AM, Sørensen M, Lidal IB, *et al.* Perceptions of exercise mastery in persons with
1200 complete and incomplete spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2010;**48**:388–92.

1201 84 Latimer AE, Ginis KAM, Craven BC, *et al.* The physical activity recall assessment for people
1202 with spinal cord injury: validity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2006;**38**:208–16.

1203 85 Manns PJ, McCubbin JA, Williams DP. Fitness, inflammation, and the metabolic syndrome in
1204 men with paraplegia. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2005;**86**:1176–81.

1205 86 Martin Ginis KA, Úbeda-Colomer J, Alrashidi AA, *et al.* Construct validation of the leisure time
1206 physical activity questionnaire for people with SCI (LTPAQ-SCI). *Spinal Cord* 2021;**59**:311–8.

1207 87 Nightingale TE, Walhin J-P, Thompson D, *et al.* Biomarkers of cardiometabolic health are
1208 associated with body composition characteristics but not physical activity in persons with spinal
1209 cord injury. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2019;**42**:328–37.

1210 88 Haisma JA, Post MW, van der Woude LH, *et al.* Functional independence and health-related
1211 functional status following spinal cord injury: a prospective study of the association with physical
1212 capacity. *J Rehabil Med* 2008;**40**:812–8.

1213 89 Leving MT, de Groot S, Woldring FAB, *et al.* Motor learning outcomes of handrim wheelchair
1214 propulsion during active spinal cord injury rehabilitation in comparison with experienced
1215 wheelchair users. *Disabil Rehabil* 2021;**43**:1429–42.

1216 90 Stewart MW, Melton-Rogers SL, Morrison S, *et al.* The measurement properties of fitness
1217 measures and health status for persons with spinal cord injuries. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*
1218 2000;**81**:394–400.

1219 91 Dallmeijer AJ, van der Woude LH, Hollander PA, *et al.* Physical performance in persons with
1220 spinal cord injuries after discharge from rehabilitation. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1999;**31**:1111–7.

1221 92 Janssen TW, van Oers CA, Rozendaal EP, *et al.* Changes in physical strain and physical capacity
1222 in men with spinal cord injuries. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1996;**28**:551–9.

1223 93 Steeves JD, Kramer JK, Fawcett JW, *et al.* Extent of spontaneous motor recovery after traumatic
1224 cervical sensorimotor complete spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2011;**49**:257–65.

1225 94 DiCarlo SE. Effect of arm ergometry training on wheelchair propulsion endurance of individuals
1226 with quadriplegia. *Phys Ther* 1988;**68**:40–4.

1227 95 de Groot S, Dallmeijer AJ, Kilkens OJ, *et al.* Course of gross mechanical efficiency in handrim
1228 wheelchair propulsion during rehabilitation of people with spinal cord injury: a prospective cohort
1229 study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2005;**86**:1452–60.

1230 96 Sprigle S, Maurer C, Holowka M. Development of valid and reliable measures of postural
1231 stability. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2007;**30**:40–9.

1232 97 Kouwijzer I, Valent L, Osterthun R, *et al.* Peak power output in handcycling of individuals with a
1233 chronic spinal cord injury: predictive modeling, validation and reference values. *Disabil Rehabil*
1234 2020;**42**:400–9.

1235 98 Hjeltnes N, Wallberg-Henriksson H. Improved work capacity but unchanged peak oxygen uptake
1236 during primary rehabilitation in tetraplegic patients. *Spinal Cord* 1998;**36**:691–8.

1237 99 Williams AM, Ma JK, Martin Ginis KA, *et al.* Effects of a Tailored Physical Activity
1238 Intervention on Cardiovascular Structure and Function in Individuals With Spinal Cord Injury.
1239 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2021;**35**:692–703.

1240 100 West CR, Campbell IG, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, *et al.* Effects of abdominal binding on field-based
1241 exercise responses in Paralympic athletes with cervical spinal cord injury. *J Sci Med Sport*
1242 2014;**17**:351–5.

1243 101 Pitetti KH, Barrett PJ, Campbell KD, *et al.* The effect of lower body positive pressure on the
1244 exercise capacity of individuals with spinal cord injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1994;**26**:463–8.

1245 102 Nieshoff EC, Birk TJ, Birk CA, *et al.* Double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial of midodrine for
1246 exercise performance enhancement in tetraplegia: a pilot study. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2004;**27**:219–
1247 25.

1248 103 Nightingale TE, Walter M, Williams AMM, *et al.* Ergogenic effects of an epidural
1249 neuroprosthesis in one individual with spinal cord injury. *Neurology* 2019;**92**:338–40.

1250 104 Laskin JJ, Waheed Z, Thorogood NP, *et al.* Spinal Cord Stimulation Research in the Restoration
1251 of Motor, Sensory, and Autonomic Function for Individuals Living With Spinal Cord Injuries: A
1252 Scoping Review. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* Published Online First: 23 February 2022.

1253 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.01.161

1254 105 Berger MJ, Kimpinski K, Currie KD, *et al.* Multi-Domain Assessment of Autonomic Function in
1255 Spinal Cord Injury Using a Modified Autonomic Reflex Screen. *J Neurotrauma* 2017;**34**:2624–
1256 33.

1257 106 Wang S, Wecht JM, Legg Ditterline B, *et al.* Heart rate and blood pressure response improve the
1258 prediction of orthostatic cardiovascular dysregulation in persons with chronic spinal cord injury.
1259 *Physiol Rep* 2020;**8**:e14617.

1260 107 Chiou SY, Clarke E, Lam C, *et al.* Effects of Arm-Crank Exercise on Fitness and Health in
1261 Adults With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review. *Front Physiol* 2022;**13**:831372.

1262 108 Bochkezanian V, Raymond J, de Oliveira CQ, *et al.* Can combined aerobic and muscle strength
1263 training improve aerobic fitness, muscle strength, function and quality of life in people with
1264 spinal cord injury? A systematic review. *Spinal Cord* 2015;**53**:418–31.

1265 109 Brurok B, Helgerud J, Karlsen T, *et al.* Effect of aerobic high-intensity hybrid training on stroke
1266 volume and peak oxygen consumption in men with spinal cord injury. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*
1267 2011;**90**:407–14.

1268 110 Gant KL, Nagle KG, Cowan RE, *et al.* Body System Effects of a Multi-Modal Training Program
1269 Targeting Chronic, Motor Complete Thoracic Spinal Cord Injury. *J Neurotrauma* 2018;**35**:411–
1270 23.

1271 111 Lotter JK, Henderson CE, Plawecki A, *et al.* Task-Specific Versus Impairment-Based Training on
1272 Locomotor Performance in Individuals With Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Randomized
1273 Crossover Study. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2020;**34**:627–39.

1274 112 Jacobs PL, Nash MS, Rusinowski JW. Circuit training provides cardiorespiratory and strength
1275 benefits in persons with paraplegia. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001;**33**:711–7.

1276 113 Sweet SN, Martin Ginis KA, Tomasone JR. Investigating intermediary variables in the physical
1277 activity and quality of life relationship in persons with spinal cord injury. *Health Psychol*
1278 2013;**32**:877–85.

1279 114 Farkas GJ, Gorgey AS, Dolbow DR, *et al.* Energy Expenditure, Cardiorespiratory Fitness, and
1280 Body Composition Following Arm Cycling or Functional Electrical Stimulation Exercises in
1281 Spinal Cord Injury: A 16-Week Randomized Controlled Trial. *Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil*
1282 2021;**27**:121–34.

1283 115 Eitivipart AC, de Oliveira CQ, Arora M, *et al.* Overview of Systematic Reviews of Aerobic
1284 Fitness and Muscle Strength Training after Spinal Cord Injury. *J Neurotrauma* 2019;**36**:2943–63.

1285 116 Martin Ginis KA, van der Scheer JW, Latimer-Cheung AE, *et al.* Response to correspondence
1286 from the ESSA Statement authors. Spinal Cord. 2018;**56**:409–11.

1287 117 Tordi N, Dugue B, Klupzinski D, *et al.* Interval training program on a wheelchair ergometer for
1288 paraplegic subjects. *Spinal Cord* 2001;**39**:532–7.

1289 118 de Groot PCE, Hjeltnes N, Heijboer AC, *et al.* Effect of training intensity on physical capacity,
1290 lipid profile and insulin sensitivity in early rehabilitation of spinal cord injured individuals. *Spinal*
1291 *Cord* 2003;**41**:673–9.

1292 119 Gauthier C, Brosseau R, Hicks AL, *et al.* Feasibility, Safety, and Preliminary Effectiveness of a
1293 Home-Based Self-Managed High-Intensity Interval Training Program Offered to Long-Term
1294 Manual Wheelchair Users. *Rehabil Res Pract* 2018;**2018**:8209360.

1295 120 Mcleod JC, Diana H, Hicks AL. Sprint interval training versus moderate-intensity continuous
1296 training during inpatient rehabilitation after spinal cord injury: a randomized trial. *Spinal Cord*
1297 2020;**58**:106–15.

1298 121 Graham K, Yarar-Fisher C, Li J, *et al.* Effects of High-Intensity Interval Training Versus
1299 Moderate-Intensity Training on Cardiometabolic Health Markers in Individuals With Spinal Cord
1300 Injury: A Pilot Study. *Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil* 2019;**25**:248–59.

1301 122 Astorino TA, Thum JS. Within-session responses to high-intensity interval training in spinal cord
1302 injury. *Disabil Rehabil* 2018;**40**:444–9.

1303 123 Hutchinson MJ, Kouwijzer I, de Groot S, *et al.* Comparison of two Borg exertion scales for
1304 monitoring exercise intensity in able-bodied participants, and those with paraplegia and

1305 tetraplegia. *Spinal Cord* 2021;**59**:1162–9.

1306 124 Valentino SE, Hutchinson MJ, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, *et al.* Effects of Perceptually Regulated
1307 Exercise Training on Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Peak Power Output in Adults With Spinal
1308 Cord Injury: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* Published Online
1309 First: 6 April 2022. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.008

1310 125 van der Scheer JW, Hutchinson MJ, Paulson T, *et al.* Reliability and Validity of Subjective
1311 Measures of Aerobic Intensity in Adults With Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review. *PM R*
1312 2018;**10**:194–207.

1313 126 Cowley KC. A new conceptual framework for the integrated neural control of locomotor and
1314 sympathetic function: implications for exercise after spinal cord injury. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab*
1315 2018;**43**:1140–50.

1316 127 Jamnick NA, Pettitt RW, Granata C, *et al.* An Examination and Critique of Current Methods to
1317 Determine Exercise Intensity. *Sports Med* 2020;**50**:1729–56.

1318 128 Hoevenaars D, Holla JFM, Postma K, *et al.* Associations between meeting exercise guidelines,
1319 physical fitness, and health in people with spinal cord injury. *Disabil Rehabil* 2022;:1–8.

1320 129 Tjønna AE, Leinan IM, Bartnes AT, *et al.* Low- and high-volume of intensive endurance training
1321 significantly improves maximal oxygen uptake after 10-weeks of training in healthy men. *PLoS*
1322 *One* 2013;**8**:e65382.

1323 130 Stensvold D, Viken H, Steinshamn SL, *et al.* Effect of exercise training for five years on all cause
1324 mortality in older adults-the Generation 100 study: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*
1325 2020;**371**:m3485.

1326 131 Church TS, Earnest CP, Skinner JS, *et al.* Effects of different doses of physical activity on
1327 cardiorespiratory fitness among sedentary, overweight or obese postmenopausal women with
1328 elevated blood pressure: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2007;**297**:2081–91.

1329 132 Foulds HJA, Bredin SSD, Charlesworth SA, *et al.* Exercise volume and intensity: a dose-response
1330 relationship with health benefits. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2014;**114**:1563–71.

1331 133 Phillips BE, Kelly BM, Lilja M, *et al.* A Practical and Time-Efficient High-Intensity Interval
1332 Training Program Modifies Cardio-Metabolic Risk Factors in Adults with Risk Factors for Type
1333 II Diabetes. *Front Endocrinol* 2017;**8**:229.

1334 134 Katzelnick CG, Weir JP, Jones A, *et al.* Blood Pressure Instability in Persons With SCI: Evidence
1335 From a 30-Day Home Monitoring Observation. *Am J Hypertens* 2019;**32**:938–44.

1336 135 Nightingale TE, Eginyan G, Balthazaar SJT, *et al.* Accidental boosting in an individual with
1337 tetraplegia - considerations for the interpretation of cardiopulmonary exercise testing. *J Spinal*
1338 *Cord Med* 2021;:1–6.

1339 136 Martin Ginis KA, Phang SH, Latimer AE, *et al.* Reliability and validity tests of the leisure time
1340 physical activity questionnaire for people with spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*
1341 2012;**93**:677–82.

1342 137 Ginis KAM, Latimer AE, Hicks AL, *et al.* Development and evaluation of an activity measure for
1343 people with spinal cord injury. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2005;**37**:1099–111.

1344 138 de Groot S, van der Woude LHV, Niezen A, *et al.* Evaluation of the physical activity scale for
1345 individuals with physical disabilities in people with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2010;**48**:542–
1346 7.

1347 139 Healy GN, Wijndaele K, Dunstan DW, *et al.* Objectively measured sedentary time, physical
1348 activity, and metabolic risk: the Australian Diabetes, Obesity and Lifestyle Study (AusDiab).
1349 *Diabetes Care* 2008;**31**:369–71.

1350 140 O'Donovan G, Hillsdon M, Ukoumunne OC, *et al.* Objectively measured physical activity,
1351 cardiorespiratory fitness and cardiometabolic risk factors in the Health Survey for England. *Prev*
1352 *Med* 2013;**57**:201–5.

1353 141 Hansford HJ, Wewege MA, Cashin AG, *et al.* If exercise is medicine, why don't we know the
1354 dose? An overview of systematic reviews assessing reporting quality of exercise interventions in
1355 health and disease. *Br J Sports Med* 2022;**56**:692–700.

1356 142 Slade SC, Dionne CE, Underwood M, *et al.* Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template (CERT):

Explanation and Elaboration Statement. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;**50**:1428–37.

143 Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, *et al.* Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ* 2014;**348**:g1687.

144 Kodama S, Saito K, Tanaka S, *et al.* Cardiorespiratory fitness as a quantitative predictor of all-cause mortality and cardiovascular events in healthy men and women: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2009;**301**:2024–35.

1379 **FIGURE/TABLE LEGEND**

1380 **Figure 1.** PRISMA flow diagram. Abbreviation: PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
1381 Reviews and Meta-Analyses

1382 **Table 1.** Participant demographics and injury characteristics reported within the included studies of the
1383 primary meta-analysis.

1384 **Table 2.** Exercise intervention parameters reported within the included studies of the primary meta-
1385 analysis.

1386 **Table 3.** Summary statistics of the three subgroup analyses on injury characteristics describing Δ in CRF
1387 outcomes.

1388 **Table 4.** Summary statistics of the three subgroup analyses on exercise parameters describing Δ in CRF
1389 outcomes.

1390 **Table 5.** Meta-regression models with adjusted values for each cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

1391 **Table 6.** Grading of recommendations assessment, development and evaluation analysis for each
1392 cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

1393

1394 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

1395 **Supplementary file 1 (S1): Systematic Review Search Strategy**

1396 **Supplementary file 2 (S2): Description of Exercise Intensity Classifications as per the American**
1397 **College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) guidelines**

1398 **Supplementary file 3 (S3): Calculated Correlation Factors**

1399 **Supplementary file 4 (S4): Change in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-**
1400 **characterised exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks (Primary meta-analysis)**

1401 1. Summary of the individual studies included in the review
1402 2. Forest and funnel plots for change in each CRF outcome for each subgroup comparison (time since
1403 injury, neurological level of injury, injury severity, exercise modality, length of intervention,
1404 relative exercise intensity, method of exercise intensity prescription, frequency of exercise sessions,
1405 and exercise volume)
1406 3. Quality assessment ratings for each pre-post study included in the primary meta-analysis

4. Risk of bias for each RCT intervention arm included in the primary meta-analysis
5. References

Supplementary file 5 (S5): Cross-sectional cohort comparisons summary (secondary meta-analysis 1)

1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled cohort comparisons
2. Summary of the individual studies included in the review
3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the NIH tool for observational cohort and cross-sectional studies
4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome
5. Sensitivity analysis on $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$
6. References

Supplementary file 6 (S6): Cross-sectional associations between physical activity and CRF outcomes

1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled association comparisons
2. Summary of the individual studies included in the review
3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the NIH tool for observational cohort and cross-sectional studies
4. Visualisation of correlation coefficients between physical activity dimensions and CRF outcomes across included studies
5. References

Supplementary file 7 (S7): Observational studies (secondary meta-analysis 2)

1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled observational studies
2. Summary of the individual studies included in the review

1433 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the NIH tool for observational cohort and cross-
1434 sectional studies
1435 4. Forest plots for absolute and relative $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and peak power output
1436 5. Funnel plots for absolute and relative $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and peak power output
1437 6. References

1438 **Supplementary file 8 (S8): RCTs (secondary meta-analysis 3)**

1439 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled RCTs (exercise
1440 intervention vs. true-world control or standard of care)
1441 2. Summary of the individual RCTs included in the review
1442 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool
1443 4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome
1444 5. References

1445 **Supplementary file 9 (S9): RCTs intensity comparisons (secondary meta-analysis 4)**

1446 1. Overview of participant demographics and injury characteristics for the pooled RCTs comparing
1447 the effects of different exercise intensities
1448 2. Summary of the individual RCTs comparing exercise intensity included in the review
1449 3. Quality assessment rating for each study using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool
1450 4. Forest plots and funnel plots for each CRF outcome
1451 5. References

1452 **Supplementary file 10 (S10): Adverse events**

1453 **Supplementary file 11 (S11): Sensitivity analyses**

1454 **Supplementary file 11 (S12): CPET vs. exercise intervention modality**

1455 1. Forest plots for each CRF outcome

1456 **Supplementary file 10 (S13): Gait-training sub-analysis**

1457 1. Forest plots for each CRF outcome

Table 1. Participant demographics and injury characteristics reported within the included studies of the primary meta-analysis.

	A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (L/min)	**R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (mL/kg/min)**	**PPO (W)**
Baseline CRF			
Total number of interventions [sum of participants] Mean (range)	69 [766] 1.26 (0.51 – 3.50)	74 [768] 18.0 (7.3 – 36.9)	61 [662] 49 (0 – 168)
Participant demographics			
Age (years)	38 (24 - 54)	39 (24 - 58)	39 (25 - 57)
Sex			
Male	22 [181]	21 [150]	20 [157]
Female	-	-	-
Mixed (% F)	43 [559] (22%)	44 [535] (24%)	39 [492] (28%)
Not reported/cannot determine	4 [26]	9 [83]	2 [13]
Injury characteristics			
Time since injury (years)	8 (0 - 21)	6 (0 - 24)	7 (0 - 21)
Acute (<1-year)	7 [111]	8 [95]	9 [117]
Chronic (>1-year)	47 [472]	48 [443]	38 [367]
Mixed (% acute)	7 [89] (13.5%)	6 [64] (17%)	7 [84] (24%)
Not reported/cannot determine	8 [94]	12 [166]	7 [94]
Neurological level of injury (TETRA/PARA)			
TETRA	2 [18]	3 [23]	3 [23]
PARA	19 [176]	27 [264]	22 [220]
Mixed (% PARA)	41 [488] (59%)	36 [398] (51%)	32 [382] (62%)
Not reported/cannot determine	7 [84]	8 [83]	4 [37]
Severity			
Motor-complete (AIS A-B)	27 [248]	29 [253]	24 [219]
Motor-incomplete (AIS C-D)	8 [102]	13 [142]	2 [14]
Mixed (% motor-incomplete)	22 [303] (32%)	21 [270] (34%)	25 [344] (35%)
Not reported/cannot determine	12 [113]	11 [103]	10 [85]

Total number of studies (N) and participants (Σ), along with descriptive characteristics for the primary meta-analysis included in this systematic review that describes Δ in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-characterised exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks (e.g., combining exercise intervention-arms from RCTs and pre-post studies). Continuous variables are displayed as weighted means (range: lowest – highest mean values reported from studies). Categorical variables are displayed as n (%). Weighted means were calculated to account for differences in sample size between studies using the following formula: $\Sigma n^*\bar{x} / \Sigma n$, where Σ = the sum of, n = number of participants in each study, and $\bar{x}$ = mean CRF outcome of each study. AIS, American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale; F, females; M, males; NR, not reported; PARA, paraplegia; PPO, peak power output; TETRA, tetraplegia; $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, peak oxygen consumption; W, watts.

Table 2. Exercise intervention parameters reported within the included studies of the primary meta-analysis.

	A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (L/min)	**R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (mL/kg/min)**	**PPO (W)**
Baseline CRF			
Total number of interventions [sum of participants] Mean (range)	69 [766] 1.26 (0.51 – 3.50)	74 [768] 18.0 (7.3 – 36.9)	61 [662] 49 (0 – 168)
Exercise intervention parameters			
Modality			
Upper-body aerobic exercise	25 [272]	33 [299]	26 [259]
Upper-body resistance training/circuits	4 [33]	3 [29]	3 [25]
Functional electrical stimulation	17 [170]	8 [66]	14 [140]
Gait/locomotor training	10 [130]	10 [126]	2 [28]
Mixed/multimodal	10 [94]	18 [227]	12 [136]
Behaviour change	3 [67]	2 [21]	4 [74]
Relative intensity			
Light	1 [14]	-	1 [14]
Moderate	8 [58]	12 [94]	10 [73]
Moderate-to-vigorous	21 [270]	24 [305]	16 [183]
Vigorous	14 [119]	20 [194]	11 [104]
Supramaximal	-	1 [4]	1 [10]
Mixed/cannot determine	25 [305]	17 [171]	22 [278]
Relative intensity prescription method			
VO_2 (%peak, %reserve)	8 [61]	12 [112]	9 [93]
Heart rate (%HRR, %HR_{peak}, %HR_{max})	16 [156]	26 [285]	14 [113]
RPE	9 [144]	8 [111]	6 [90]
Workload (%PPO, %MTP, %1RM)	9 [71]	6 [49]	7 [53]
Mixed/cannot determine	27 [334]	22 [211]	25 [313]
Session duration (min)	41 (20 - 90)	41 (15 - 90)	39 (5 - 90)
Frequency (sessions/week)	3 (2 - 7)	3 (2 - 7)	3 (2 - 7)
< 3	19 [230]	13 [168]	13 [156]
≥ 3 and < 5	35 [339]	49 [500]	38 [387]
≥ 5	11 [116]	9 [65]	5 [31]
Not reported	4 [81]	3 [35]	5 [88]
Volume (min/week)	113 (40 - 450)	116 (40 - 330)	107 (15 - 330)
SCI-specific exercise guidelines [fitness (40 – 89 min/wk)]	13 [140] 45 (40 - 84)	14 [156] 47 (40 - 88)	15 [146] 48 (15 - 88)
SCI-specific exercise guidelines [cardiometabolic (90 – 149 min/wk)]	30 [309] 99 (90 - 135)	31 [336] 102 (90 - 135)	26 [290] 113 (90 - 135)
Achieving general population exercise guidelines (≥150 min/wk)	13 [135] 229 (150 - 450)	21 [197] 206 (150 - 330)	13 [117] 212 (171 - 330)
Cannot classify	13 [182]	8 [79]	7 [109]
Length (weeks)	17 (6 - 52)	12 (4 - 52)	16 (4 - 52)
≤ 6 weeks	10 [85]	23 [215]	18 [175]
> 6 and ≤ 12 weeks	33 [368]	36 [371]	21 [223]
> 12 weeks	26 [313]	15 [182]	22 [264]
Adverse events reported			
Bone, joint or muscular pain	5 [5] [a]	6 [9] [a]	4 [4] [a]

Autonomic or cardiovascular function	3 [5]	2 [1]	4 [3]
Skin irritation or pressure sores	2 [2] [a]	5 [18] [a]	2 [2] [a]
Other [d]	2 [NR] [a,c]	4 [3] [a]	3 [1] [a,c]

Total number of studies (N) and participants, (Σ) along with descriptive characteristics for the primary meta-analysis included in this systematic review that describes Δ in CRF outcomes in response to prospective, well-characterised exercise interventions lasting >2 weeks (e.g., combining exercise intervention-arms from RCTs and pre-post studies). Continuous variables are displayed as weighted means (range: lowest – highest mean values reported from studies). Categorical variables are displayed as n (%). Weighted means were calculated to account for differences in sample size between studies using the following formula: $\Sigma n * \bar{x} / \Sigma n$, where Σ = the sum of, n = number of participants in each study, and $\bar{x}$ = mean CRF outcome of each study. F, females; HR_{max}, maximal heart rate; HR_{peak}, peak heart rate; HRR, heart rate reserve; 1RM, one repetition maximum; M, males; MTP, maximal tolerated power; NR, not reported; PPO, peak power output; $\dot{V}O_{2\ peak}$, peak oxygen consumption; W, watts. [a] Beillot et al. [68] (pre-post intervention study) reported n=10 suffered major complications including spontaneous fractures of lower limbs, occurrence of syringomyelia and pressure sores but did not specify the sum of participants for each adverse event. [b] Gibbons et al. [81] reported that some individuals experienced autonomic dysreflexia during the FES response test but did not quantify further. [c] Sum of participants experiencing adverse events were not reported by Janssen and Pringle [61]. [d] Other adverse events included: anxiety, nausea, dizziness and issues with testing equipment.

Table 3. Summary statistics of the three subgroup analyses on injury characteristics describing Δ in CRF outcomes.

	$A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (L/min)		**$R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (mL/kg/min)**		**PPO (W)**	
	N [Σ] (%)	**WMD (95% CIs) *p*-values**	**N [Σ] (%)**	**WMD (95% CIs) *p-values***	**N [Σ] (%)**	**WMD (95% CIs) *p*-values**
Main effect	69 [696]	0.22 [0.17, 0.26] **$p < 0.001$**	74 [716]	2.8 [2.2, 3.4] **$p < 0.001$**	61 [602]	11 [8, 13] **$p < 0.001$**
Heterogeneity (I^2)	74% ($p < 0.001$)		52% ($p < 0.001$)		78% ($p < 0.001$)	
Time since injury						
Acute (<1-year)	7 [86] (10.4%)	0.23 [0.11, 0.35] **$p < 0.001$**	8 [70] (10.9%)	3.4 [1.5, 6.1] **$p = 0.002$**	9 [95] (13.6%)	16 [11, 22] **$p < 0.001$**
Chronic (≥1-year)	47 [461] (62.6%)	0.20 [0.14, 0.27) **$p < 0.001$**	48 [431] (61.8%)	2.7 [1.9, 3.5] **$p < 0.003$**	38 [343] (61.8%)	9 [6, 12] **$p < 0.001$**
Mixed	7 [79] (14%)	0.25 [0.10, 0.39] **$p < 0.001$**	6 [54] (5.9%)	1.9 [0.1, 3.7] **$p = 0.03$**	7 [75] (12.8%)	6 [5, 7] **$p < 0.001$**
Not reported/cannot determine	8 [70] (13%)	0.25 [0.11, 0.38] **$p < 0.001$**	12 [161] (21.4%)	2.6 [2.0, 3.3] **$p < 0.003$**	7 [89] (11.8%)	16 [9, 23] **$p < 0.001$**
Subgroup differences	-	$p = 0.87$	-	$p = 0.64$	-	**$p < 0.001$**
Neurological level of injury						
Tetraplegia	2 [18] (5.1%)	0.45 [-0.28, 1.19] $p = 0.23$	3 [23] (8.5%)	5.9 [0.2, 11.7] **$p = 0.04$**	3 [23] (6.8%)	9 [6, 13] **$p < 0.002$**
Paraplegia	20 [174] (28.4%)	0.24 [0.17, 0.32] **$p < 0.002$**	28 [262] (45.2%)	2.8 [2.2, 3.4] **$p < 0.003$**	22 [216] (42.2%)	16 [12, 19] **$p < 0.002$**
Mixed	44 [470] (58.9%)	0.20 [0.15, 0.25] **$p < 0.002$**	41 [418] (42.5%)	2.2 [1.5, 2.8] **$p < 0.003$**	34 [350] (48.6%)	6 [4, 8] **$p < 0.002$**
Not reported/cannot determine	3 [34] (7.6%)	0.19 [0.11, 0.27] **$p < 0.002$**	2 [13] (3.8%)	2.8 [0.7, 4.8] **$p = 0.02$**	2 [13] (2.4%)	17 [7, 27] **$p = 0.001$**
Subgroup differences	-	$p = 0.65$	-	$p = 0.34$	-	**$p < 0.001$**
Injury severity						
Motor-complete (AIS A-B)	27 [235] (40%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.27] **$p < 0.002$**	29 [241] (47.4%)	2.7 [2.0, 3.4] **$p < 0.002$**	24 [210] (49.2%)	11 [8, 15] **$p < 0.002$**
Motor-incomplete (AIS C-D)	8 [103] (9%)	0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] $p = 0.08$	13 [139] (12.5%)	1.6 [0.2, 2.9] **$p = 0.02$**	2 [14] (3.1%)	4 [-3, 12] $p = 0.25$
Mixed (AIS A-D)	22 [247] (26.2%)	0.18 [0.13, 0.24] **$p < 0.002$**	21 [244] (23.3%)	2.7 [1.7, 3.6] **$p < 0.002$**	25 [296] (31.1%)	10 [6, 14] **$p < 0.002$**
Not reported/cannot determine	12 [111] (24.8%)	0.32 [0.20, 0.44] **$p < 0.002$**	11 [92] (16.8%)	3.9 [1.7, 6.1] **$p < 0.002$**	10 [82] (16.6%)	11 [5, 17] **$p < 0.002$**
Subgroup differences	-	$p = 0.06$	-	$p = 0.28$	-	$p = 0.43$

Total number of interventions (N), sum of participants analysed at post-intervention (Σ), weighting of subgroups (%). Thresholds for statistically significant subgroup differences were adjusted for the number of subgroup comparisons and are highlighted in bold: time since injury ($p<0.0125$), neurological level of injury ($p<0.0125$) and injury severity ($p<0.0125$). Individual subgroup p-values were adjusted for multiple comparisons via the Bonferroni correction method. AIS, Americal Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale; $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, absolute peak oxygen consumption; CIs, confidence intervals; PPO, peak power output; $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, relative peak oxygen consumption; WMD, weighted mean difference.

1498

Table 4. Summary statistics of the six subgroup analyses on exercise parameters describing Δ in CRF outcomes.

	A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (L/min)		**R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (mL/kg/min)**		**PPO (W)**	
	N [Σ] (%)	**WMD (95% CIs) *p*-values**	**N [Σ] (%)**	**WMD (95% CIs) *p-values***	**N [Σ] (%)**	**WMD (95% CIs) *p*-values**
Main effect	69 [696]	0.22 [0.17, 0.26] ***p* < 0.001**	74 [716]	2.8 [2.2, 3.4] ***p* < 0.001**	61 [602]	11 [8, 13] ***p* < 0.001**
Heterogeneity (I^2)	74% ($p < 0.001$)		52% ($p < 0.001$)		78% ($p < 0.001$)	
Exercise modality						
Aerobic, volitional upper-body	25 [235] (33.5%)	0.25 [0.16, 0.34] ***p* < 0.004**	33 [264] (43.1%)	3.4 [2.4, 4.4] ***p* < 0.004**	26 [223] (32.5%)	15 [11, 19] ***p* < 0.003**
Resistance training	4 [31] (3.5%)	0.33 [0.13, 0.52] ***p* = 0.003**	3 [27] (3.9%)	5.0 [2.9, 7.0] ***p* < 0.004**	3 [25] (4.6%)	20 [12, 28] ***p* < 0.003**
Functional electrical stimulation	17 [168] (33.9%)	0.22 [0.15, 0.29] ***p* < 0.004**	8 [66] (14.4%)	2.4 [0.9, 3.9] ***p* = 0.006**	14 [138] (37.1%)	6 [3, 10] ***p* < 0.003**
Gait training	10 [127] (12%)	0.07 [-0.02, 0.17] *p* = 0.14	10 [120] (9.7%)	1.0 [-0.5, 2.6] *p* = 0.40	2 [24] (2.2%)	4 [-9, 18] *p* = 0.54
Behaviour change	3 [49] (2.5%)	0.22 [0.00, 0.44] *p* = 0.10	2 [21] (3.3%)	1.1 [-1.2, 3.5] *p* = 0.35	4 [56] (4.6%)	12 [-1, 24] *p* = 0.12
Mixed	10 [86] (14.6%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.27] ***p* < 0.004**	18 [218] (25.6%)	2.4 [1.7, 3.2] ***p* < 0.004**	12 [136] (19%)	10 [5, 16] ***p* < 0.003**
Subgroup differences	-	*p* = 0.07	-	*p* = 0.02	-	***p* = 0.003**
Length of intervention						
≤6 weeks	10 [79] (14.5%)	0.26 [0.19, 0.39] ***p* < 0.001**	23 [206] (23.1%)	2.9 [1.9, 3.9] ***p* < 0.001**	17 [159] (26.7%)	10 [6, 14] ***p* < 0.001**
>6 – ≤12 weeks	32 [327] (46.6%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.29] ***p* < 0.001**	36 [337] (54.6%)	3.2 [2.3, 4.1] ***p* < 0.001**	22 [202] (34.5%)	13 [8, 17] ***p* < 0.001**
>12 weeks	27 [290] (38.9%)	0.22 [0.15, 0.28] ***p* < 0.001**	15 [173] (22.3%)	1.8 [1.0, 2.6] ***p* < 0.001**	22 [241] (38.8%)	9 [5, 13] ***p* < 0.001**
Subgroup differences	-	*p* = 0.59	-	*p* = 0.05	-	*p* = 0.49
Relative exercise intensity						
Light	1 [10] (0.6%)	-0.05 [-0.57, 0.47] *p* = 0.85	-	-	1 [10] (1%)	-1 [-22, 20] *p* = 0.92
Moderate	8 [58] (9.5%)	0.32 [0.09, 0.54] ***p* = 0.01**	12 [92] (18.1%)	3.2 [1.1, 5.3] ***p* = 0.006**	10 [71] (15.9%)	13 [4, 21] ***p* = 0.009**
Moderate-to-vigorous	21 [247] (33.7%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.27] ***p* < 0.003**	24 [279] (32.5%)	2.7 [2.0, 3.5] ***p* < 0.003**	16 [161] (24.1%)	17 [13, 21] ***p* < 0.004**
Vigorous	14 [109] (15.2%)	0.19 [0.14, 0.25] ***p* < 0.003**	20 [183] (21.6%)	2.2 [1.4, 3.0] ***p* < 0.003**	11 [96] (12%)	10 [7, 16] ***p* < 0.004**
Supramaximal	-	-	1 [4] (0.4%)	1.1 [-8.2, 10.4] *p* = 0.82	1 [10] (0.6%)	17 [-12, 46] *p* = 0.50
Mixed/cannot determine	25 [272] (41%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.29] ***p* < 0.003**	17 [158] (27.4%)	2.6 [1.5, 3.8] ***p* < 0.003**	22 [254] (46.4%)	8 [5, 10] ***p* < 0.004**
Subgroup differences	-	*p* = 0.71	-	*p* = 0.67	-	***p* = 0.003**

Exercise intensity prescription						
Oxygen consumption	8 [57] (13.1%)	0.19 [0.07, 0.32] **p = 0.003**	12 [107] (17.9%)	2.3 [1.5, 3.2] **p < 0.003**	9 [89] (12.6%)	20 [15, 25] **p < 0.003**
Heart rate	16 [156] (20.2%)	0.28 [0.15, 0.40] **p < 0.002**	26 [284] (37.7%)	3.1 [2.0, 4.3] **p < 0.003**	14 [113] (21.8%)	14 [8, 19] **p < 0.003**
Rating of perceived exertion	9 [121] (12.1%)	0.18 [0.09, 0.26] **p < 0.002**	8 [84] (8.3%)	3.5 [1.2, 5.07] **p = 0.002**	6 [66] (5.7%)	9 [1, 17] **p = 0.03**
Workload	9 [65] (9.9%)	0.23 [0.13, 0.33] **p < 0.002**	6 [43] (6.5%)	3.0 [1.2, 4.8] **p = 0.002**	7 [49] (11.9%)	11 [4, 19] **p = 0.01**
Mixed/cannot determine	27 [297] (44.7%)	0.21 [0.14, 0.27] **p < 0.002**	22 [198] (29.6%)	2.4 [1.4, 3.3] **p < 0.003**	25 [285] (48%)	7 [5, 10] **p < 0.003**
Subgroup differences	-	p = 0.72	-	p = 0.71	-	**p < 0.001**
Frequency of exercise sessions						
<3 sessions/wk	19 [213] (24%)	0.18 [0.12, 0.25] **p < 0.002**	13 [155] (15.2%)	2.8 [1.5, 4.0] **p < 0.002**	13 [148] (21.4%)	4 [1, 6] **p = 0.003**
≥3 – <5 sessions/wk	35 [306] (57.6%)	0.26 [0.19, 0.33] **p < 0.002**	49 [465] (65.9%)	2.8 [2.1, 3.6] **p < 0.002**	38 [357] (61.8%)	13 [10, 15] **p < 0.004**
≥5 sessions/wk	11 [118] (14.4%)	0.15 [0.07, 0.23] **p < 0.002**	9 [65] (14.2%)	3.6 [1.7, 5.4] **p < 0.002**	5 [31] (10.9%)	10 [-2, 23] p = 0.10
Not reported/cannot determine	4 [59] (4%)	0.13 [-0.05, 0.31] p = 0.15	3 [31] (4.7%)	0.8 [-1.2, 2.8] p = 0.42	5 [66] (5.9%)	9 [0, 18] p = 0.10
Subgroup differences	-	p = 0.14	-	p = 0.24	-	**p < 0.001**
Exercise volume						
SCI-specific exercise guidelines for fitness (40 - 89 min/wk)	13 [132] (13.1%)	0.23 [0.13, 0.33] **p < 0.001**	14 [151] (13.9%)	3.2 [2.0, 4.5] **p < 0.002**	15 [138] (19.1%)	6 [2, 10] **p = 0.002**
SCI-specific exercise guidelines for cardiometabolic health (90 - 149 min/wk)	30 [269] (52.3%)	0.23 [0.16, 0.30] **p < 0.001**	31 [295] (48.3%)	2.8 [1.9, 3.8] **p < 0.002**	26 [260] (48.7%)	12 [9, 16] **p < 0.002**
Achieving general population exercise guidelines (≥150 min/wk)	13 [133] (18%)	0.18 [0.11, 0.25] **p < 0.001**	21 [195] (28.1%)	2.8 [1.8, 3.9] **p < 0.002**	13 [117] (23.9%)	11 [5, 17] **p < 0.002**
Not reported/cannot determine	13 [162] (16.6%)	0.24 [0.12, 0.36] **p < 0.001**	8 [75] (9.7%)	2.1 [0.7, 3.5] **p = 0.003**	7 [87] (8.3%)	10 [4, 17] **p = 0.002**
Subgroup differences	-	p = 0.67	-	p = 0.70	-	p = 0.17

Total number of interventions (N), sum of participants analysed at post-intervention (Σ), weighting of subgroups (%). Thresholds for statistically significant subgroup differences were adjusted for the number of subgroup comparisons and are highlighted in bold: exercise modality (p<0.008), length of intervention (p<0.017), relative exercise intensity [$A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ and $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (p<0.01), PPO (p<0.008)], exercise intensity prescription (p<0.01), frequency of exercise sessions (p<0.025), and exercise volume (p<0.025). Individual subgroup p-values were adjusted for multiple comparisons via the Bonferroni correction method. $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, absolute peak oxygen consumption; CIs, confidence intervals; PPO, peak power output; $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, relative peak oxygen consumption; WMD, weighted mean difference.

1499

1500

Table 5: Meta-regression models with adjusted values for each cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

Covariate	Coef.	Std.Err.	t	Unadjusted P>t	95% CI	Adjusted P>t
$A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ Model 1 (N = 69)[1] (# covariates = 5)						
Male	0.006	0.004	1.610	0.084	-0.001 to 0.013	0.322
Mean age	-0.003	0.001	-2.580	0.010	-0.006 to -0.001	0.045
TSI	0.000	0.001	0.260	0.714	-0.002 to 0.003	0.999
Neurological level of injury	-0.002	0.004	-0.470	0.584	-0.010 to 0.006	0.984
Severity	-0.005	0.003	-1.340	0.153	-0.012 to 0.002	0.534
$A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ Model 2 (N = 69)[2] (# covariates = 6)						
Exercise modality	-0.015	0.016	-0.940	0.281	-0.048 to 0.017	0.865
Exercise intensity	-0.006	0.016	-0.390	0.666	-0.038 to 0.026	0.999
Length of intervention	0.000	0.002	0.050	0.828	-0.004 to 0.004	1.000
Duration (mins)	-0.005	0.006	-0.790	0.327	-0.018 to 0.008	0.917
Frequency	0.002	0.011	0.180	0.902	-0.019 to 0.023	1.000
Volume	-0.000	0.003	-0.040	0.929	-0.006 to 0.006	1.000
$R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ Model 1 (N = 74)[3] (# covariates = 5)						
Male	0.084	0.047	1.790	0.84	-0.010 to 0.177	0.395
Mean age	-0.041	0.013	-3.010	0.004	-0.068 to -0.014	0.025
TSI	-0.012	0.013	-0.940	0.386	-0.039 to 0.014	0.932
Neurological level of injury	-0.043	0.042	-1.020	0.356	-0.128 to 0.042	0.907
Severity	-0.030	0.047	-0.650	0.521	-0.124 to 0.063	0.983
$R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ Model 2 (N = 74)[4] (# covariates = 6)						
Exercise modality	-0.276	0.164	-1.680	0.110	-0.603 to 0.051	0.511
Exercise intensity	-0.076	0.200	-0.380	0.718	-0.474 to 0.323	1.00
Length of intervention	-0.024	0.033	-0.740	0.437	-0.089 to 0.041	0.982
Risk of bias	-0.057	0.350	-0.160	0.866	-0.756 to 0.642	1.000
Duration (mins)	-0.043	0.063	-0.690	0.494	-0.169 to 0.082	0.986
Frequency	0.143	0.139	1.030	0.308	-0.133 to 0.420	0.908
PPO Model 1 (N = 61)[5] (# covariates = 6)						
Male	-0.090	0.236	-0.380	0.712	-0.562 to 0.383	0.997
Mean age	-0.035	0.082	-0.420	0.694	-0.199 to 0.130	0.995
TSI	-0.149	0.077	-1.940	0.075	-0.303 to 0.005	0.296
Neurological level of injury	-0.122	0.193	-0.630	0.556	-0.509 to 0.265	0.972
Severity	-0.051	0.182	-0.280	0.796	-0.416 to 0.314	1.000
PPO Model 2 (N = 61)[6] (# covariates = 5)						
Exercise modality	-0.685	0.733	-0.930	0.068	-2.156 to 0.786	0.266
Exercise intensity prescription	-1.465	0.749	-1.960	0.001	-2.967 to 0.036	0.002
Duration (mins)	-0.170	0.361	-0.470	0.476	-0.893 to 0.554	0.945
Frequency	0.254	0.643	0.390	0.997	-1.036 to 1.543	1.00
Volume	-0.217	0.178	-1.220	0.009	-0.574 to 0.140	0.041

* Permutations = 10,000

[1] $tau^2 = 0.02339$; I^2 res = 98.61%; Adj R^2 = 13.00%; Model F (5,63) = 2.77; Prob > F = 0.0252

[2] $tau^2 = 0.2932$; I^2 res = 98.52%; Adj R^2 = -9.04%; Model F (7,61) = 0.31; Prob > F = 0.9446

[3] $tau^2 = 3.639$; I^2 res = 97.98%; Adj R^2 = 11.98%; Model F (5,68) = 2.89; Prob > F = 0.0201

[4] tau^2 = 4.108; I^2 res = 98.13%; Adj R^2 = 0.63%; Model F (7,66) = 1.04; Prob > F = 0.4124
[5] tau^2 = 65.65; I^2 res = 99.56%; Adj R^2 = 1.07%; Model F (5,55) = 1.16; Prob > F = 0.3399
[6] tau^2 = 64.86; I^2 res = 99.34%; Adj R^2 = 2.26%; Model F (7,53) = 1.17; Prob > F = 0.3333
Adj R^2, proportion of between-study variance explained; $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, absolute peak oxygen consumption; Coef, coefficient of variation; I^2 res, I^2 residual variation due to heterogeneity; Model F, joint test for all covariates; PP Prob > F, with Knapp-Hartung modification; $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, relative peak oxygen consumption; Std.Err, standard error; TSI, time since injury.

1501

Table 6. Grading of recommendations assessment, development and evaluation analysis for each cardiorespiratory fitness outcome.

	A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (L/min)	**R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ (mL/kg/min)**	**PPO (W)**
Summary of findings according to GRADE analysis			
GRADE	LOW	LOW	LOW
Comments	Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect. Study design, imprecision, an unclear dose response and residual confounding reduced the Grade to Low. The evidence supporting improvements in A$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ is predominantly in young and middle-aged males that had been injured for >1-year (chronic TSI). Participants were mostly paraplegic (70%) but there were a mixture of injury severities (AIS A-D). There were no subgroup differences in exercise intervention characteristics to suggest the optimal training parameters.	Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect. High risk of bias, imprecision, an unclear dose response and residual confounding reduced the Grade to Low. The evidence supporting improvements in R$\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ is predominantly in young and middle-aged males that had been injured for >1-year (chronic TSI). Participants were mostly paraplegic (70.5%) but there were a mixture of injury severities (AIS A-D). There were no subgroup differences in exercise intervention characteristics to suggest the optimal training parameters.	Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect. Inconsistency, imprecision, an unclear dose response and residual confounding reduced the Grade to Moderate. The evidence supporting improvements in PPO is predominantly in young and middle-aged males that had been injured for >1-year (chronic TSI). Participants were mostly paraplegic (76%) but there were a mixture of injury severities (AIS A-D). Subgroup differences suggest that upper-body aerobic exercise and resistance training appear the most effective at improving PPO. Furthermore, acutely-injured, individuals with paraplegia, exercising for >3 sessions/week at a moderate-to-vigorous-intensity, prescribed via $\dot{V}O_2$ or heart rate, will likely experience the greatest change in PPO.
Lower quality criteria			
Study design	Mixture of RCTs and pre-post studies with no control groups.	Mixture of RCTs and pre-post studies with no control groups.	Mixture of RCTs and pre-post studies with no control groups.

	Overall WMDs for RCT interventions relative to controls and pre-post interventions only: RCTs (0.15 L/min) and pre-post studies (0.23 L/min). **DOWNGRADE**	Overall WMDs for RCT interventions relative to controls and pre-post interventions only: RCTs (2.9 mL/kg/min) and pre-post studies (2.9 mL/kg/min). **NO DOWNGRADE**	Overall WMDs for RCT interventions relative to controls and pre-post interventions only: RCTs (10 W) and pre-post studies (11 W). **NO DOWNGRADE**
Risk of bias (RoB)	28% of pre-post studies were rated as good, 56% as fair, and 16% as poor. 31% of RCTs had low RoB, 23% had some concerns, and 46% had high RoB. **NO DOWNGRADE**	38% of pre-post studies were rated as good, 48% as fair, and 14% as poor. 15% of RCTs had low RoB, 25% had some concerns, and 60% had high RoB. **DOWNGRADE**	26% of pre-post studies were rated as good, 59% as fair, and 15% as poor. 23% of RCTs had low RoB, 38.5% had some concerns, and 38.5% had high RoB. **NO DOWNGRADE**
Inconsistency of results	Effect estimates were consistent, with 91% of the included exercise interventions favouring an increase in $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, but most had a low effect estimate. $I^2 = 74\%$ **NO DOWNGRADE**	Effect estimates were consistent, with 91% of the included exercise interventions favouring an increase in $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, and most had a large effect estimate. $I^2 = 52\%$ **NO DOWNGRADE**	Effect estimates were consistent, with 93% of the included exercise interventions favouring an increase in PPO, and most had a large effect estimate. $I^2 = 78\%$ **DOWNGRADE**
Indirectness	Most studies (83%) included $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ in their main outcome measures, across a range of participant characteristics. **NO DOWNGRADE**	Most studies (72%) included $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ in their main outcome measures, across a range of participant characteristics. **NO DOWNGRADE**	Most studies (82%) included PPO in their main outcome measures, across a range of participant characteristics. **NO DOWNGRADE**
Imprecision	Large sample size (N=696), however, 62% of the included exercise interventions had 95% CI overlap 0. **DOWNGRADE**	Large sample size (N=716), however, 76% of the included exercise interventions had 95% CI overlap 0. **DOWNGRADE**	Large sample size (N=601), however, 67% of the included exercise interventions had 95% CI overlap 0. **DOWNGRADE**
Publication bias	An exhaustive approach was used during the search strategy (i.e., scientific databases and grey literature search). Egger's test: Z = -1.23 (p = 0.22). Visual inspection of the funnel plots, data extraction sheets and Tables 3-4 revealed no noticeable publication bias. **NO DOWNGRADE**	An exhaustive approach was used during the search strategy (i.e., scientific databases and grey literature search). Egger's test: Z = -0.54 (p = 0.59). Visual inspection of the funnel plots, data extraction sheets and Tables 3-4 revealed no noticeable publication bias. **NO DOWNGRADE**	An exhaustive approach was used during the search strategy (i.e., scientific databases and grey literature search). Egger's test: Z = 0.73 (p = 0.46). Visual inspection of the funnel plots, data extraction sheets and Tables 3-4 revealed no noticeable publication bias. **NO DOWNGRADE**
Higher quality criteria			
Large effect	Yes Z = 9.5 ($p < 0.001$) **NO UPGRADE**	Yes Z = 9.4 ($p < 0.001$) **NO UPGRADE**	Yes Z = 8.7 ($p < 0.001$) **NO UPGRADE**

Dose response	No clear dose response. **NO UPGRADE**	No clear dose response. **NO UPGRADE**	No clear dose response. **NO UPGRADE**
Residual confounding	Mixture of exercise modalities, levels of injury, etc. **NO UPGRADE**	Mixture of exercise modalities, levels of injury, etc. **NO UPGRADE**	Mixture of exercise modalities, levels of injury, etc. **NO UPGRADE**

GRADE certainty in the evidence can be 'High', 'Moderate', 'Low' or 'Very Low' according to published guidelines [34]. Risk of bias was downgraded where >50% of RCTs had a high risk of bias. Heterogeneity was also included as a measure of inconsistency, whereby an outcome with I^2 >75% was classed as considerable and resulted in a downgrade. Imprecision was downgraded where >50% of studies had confidence intervals overlap the no effect line. Indirectness would have been downgraded where <50% of studies did not include the appropriate main outcome measure or assess a range of participant characteristics. Overall effect sizes are presented as Z-scores. Statistical significance accepted as $p < 0.05$. AIS, American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale; $A\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, absolute peak oxygen consumption; CI, confidence intervals; CRF, cardiorespiratory fitness; PPO, peak power output; RCTs, randomised-controlled trials; RoB, risk of bias; $R\dot{V}O_{2peak}$, relative peak oxygen consumption; $\dot{V}O_2$, peak oxygen consumption.


Identification
Records identified through database searches: MEDLINE (PubMed), EMBASE (Ovid), Web of Science and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (n = 19,011)
Duplicate records removed (n = 6,126)
Screening
Records screened (n = 12,885)
Records excluded based on title/abstract (n = 11,029)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 1,856)
Full text articles excluded, with reasons:
Unable to find text (n = 268)
Duplicate identified (n = 11)
Non-original work (n = 49)
Case-reports or series (n = 59)
Non-peer reviewed (n = 26)
Children/adolescents (n = 2)
Non-SCI (n = 74)
No outcomes reported (n = 751)
Intervention too short (n = 397)
No suitable comparison (n = 49)
Not in English (n = 11)
Other (n = 49)
Included
Studies included in the systematic review (n = 110)
Cross-sectional association studies included in the qualitative synthesis (n = 6)
Studies included in the quantitative synthesis (n = 104)
Studies included in the secondary meta-analyses:
Cross-sectional cohort (n = 9)
Observational (n = 5)
Studies included in the primary meta-analysis (exercise interventions):
RCTs (n = 27)
Pre-post studies (n = 63)
RCTs included in the primary meta-analysis, also included in the secondary meta-analyses:
RCT interventions vs controls (n = 20)
RCT intensity comparisons (n = 7)