We assessed the effects of prescribing different PA intensities, compared to no additional PA, on cardiorespiratory fitness (VO2peak), anthropometry and body composition in breast cancer survivors. The Breast Cancer and Physical Activity Level (BC-PAL) Trial is a three-arm, 12-week RCT. Forty-five inactive breast cancer survivors were randomized to one of three groups: no additional PA (CON), 300 min/wk of lighter-intensity PA (LIPA; 40-60% HRR) and 150 min/wk of higher-intensity PA (HIPA; 60-80% HRR). VO2peak (maximal Balke protocol), anthropometric measures (height, weight, waist and hip circumferences) and body composition (DXA) were assessed at baseline and end of study. Participants in both PA groups received resources on PA, an activity tracker (Polar A360®) to record heart rate and PA time, and a diary to record PA goals, facilitators and barriers throughout the intervention. In-person/telephone meetings occurred every three weeks. Statistical differences in VO2peak between groups were noted. Specifically, increases in VO2peak were noted in HIPA vs. CON (5.9±6.4 vs. 0.5±3.0 ml/kg/min; P = 0.01) and LIPA vs. CON (4.2±4.9 vs. 0.5±3.0 ml/kg/min; P = 0.03). No significant changes in BMI (0.3±0.9, -0.1±0.8, -0.0±1.4 kg/m2; P = 0.6), waist (1.2±4.2, -1.1±3.3, -1.1±3.8 cm; P = 0.2) and hip (0.8±1.7, -0.2±2.7, -0.2±2.1 cm; P = 0.4) circumferences, body fat (0.1±1.4, -0.4±1.9, -1.1±2.3 kg; P = 0.3) and lean (0.4±0.8, -0.1±1.4, 0.7±1.5 kg; P = 0.3) mass were observed between CON, LIPA and HIPA, respectively. Results indicate that improvements in cardiorespiratory fitness can be achieved with both higher- and lower-intensity PA in breast cancer survivors.
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