

**3rd BRICSCESS 2024-New Delhi
FLV Oral Presenter**



Yew Cheo NG
Graduate Student
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore

Yew CheoNg graduated with Bachelor in Sports and Physical Education. She is working full-time and concurrently running and training competitively at national level under her supervisor and coach, Dr. Balasekaran. She also does research that focuses on human performance and physical education. She is also an IAAF Youth level 1 certified coach and coaches voluntarily. She has also often gone beyond her time to help coach many young children and motivate their interest in running. She has also conducted workshops, developed videos and CDs on running tactics and prevention of injuries from running. She is also on Dr. Balasekaran's team that is working on the Brain Breaks study in Singapore.

Does External Pneumatic Compression Help with Recovery and Improve Performance after Cycle Ergometer Anaerobic Exercise?

Ng Yew Cheo¹, Govindasamy Balasekaran², NurulShafiqahBinte Mohamed Saiful²

¹Singapore University of Social Sciences

²National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University

Athletes are constantly searching for treatment strategies to boost performance to provide them that edge over their competitors. Therefore, this study investigated the effects of External Pneumatic Compression (EPC) on recovery and performance after anaerobic exercise. Ten male athletes (age: 25.2 ± 1.1 years, height: 173.1 ± 6.69 cm, weight: 75.77 ± 11.95 kg) participated in this counterbalanced cross-over study. Participants underwent the Wingate Anaerobic Test (WAnT) ergometer cycling session (CS1 & CS2). Total power in Joules (TW), mean power (MP) output in Watts and fatigue index (%FI) were extracted. Each session included a 5-min warm-up cycle, CS1 and CS2 (30 seconds), 20 minutes rest trial between CS1 and CS2 ((EPC/active recovery (AR)/static recovery (SR) – randomized). Heart rate (HR), ratings of perceived exertion (RPE) and blood lactate (BLa) were recorded. Results indicated TW for EPC (CS1: 19.14 ± 2.33 , CS2: 19.04 ± 2.83 , $p = 0.01$) and AR (CS1: 19.09 ± 2.54 , CS2: 19.02 ± 2.97 , $p = 0.02$) were significantly higher than SR (CS1: 18.58 ± 2.73 , CS2: 18.47 ± 3.03). No significance between EPC and AR. Similarly, MP for EPC (CS1: 642.55 ± 78.38 , CS2: 637.85 ± 95.62 , $p = 0.02$) and AR (AR CS1: 634.90 ± 81.18 , CS2: 638.06 ± 99.98 , $p = 0.02$) were significantly higher than SR (CS1: 623.21 ± 91.08 , CS2: 620.38 ± 103.03). No significance between EPC and AR ($p = 0.57$). %FI (EPC CS1: 63.40 ± 18.03 , CS2: 56.86 ± 15.15 vs. AR CS1: 64.80 ± 17.41 , CS2: 59.42 ± 17.78 vs. SR CS1: 62.23 ± 17.05 , CS2: 57.40 ± 15.98 , $p = 0.78$). We can conclude that EPC and AR help with recovery and performance. EPC may be a beneficial recovery method to use when static recovery is preferred.