

## Response to: Lessons from Popper for science, paradigm shifts, scientific revolutions and exercise physiology

Robergs<sup>1</sup> claims that the central governor model (CGM) of exercise performance has been re-stated so frequently that it can no longer be properly falsified according to the Popperian model of scientific disproof. In response I argue that the CGM is based on our and others' absolute disproof of the Hill model that has dominated the teaching of the exercise sciences for the past century. The basic disprovable assertion of the CGM is that the brain regulates exercise performance to ensure that a catastrophic failure of homeostasis does not occur. Even though the CGM is now more than 21 years old, no one has yet published experimental data that refute it.

### THE TRUE HISTORY OF HOW THE CGM CAME ABOUT

Before the CGM, there was one undisputed truth in the exercise sciences: exercise performance is limited by the development of anaerobiosis in the exercising muscles.<sup>2 3</sup> This explanation was developed by Nobel Laureate A V Hill<sup>4 5</sup> in clear breach of Popperian science. Hill had formulated his theory without ever attempting to disprove any existing models, the most popular of which was perhaps that of Musso.<sup>6</sup> In 1904, Musso<sup>7</sup> described what he considered the features of exercise fatigue: 'The first is the diminution of the muscular force. The second is fatigue as a sensation. That is to say, we have a physical fact which can be measured and compared and a psychic fact which eludes measurement' (p 154). Interestingly Robergs does not accuse the Nobel Laureate A V Hill of 'pseudoscience'.

In the 1980s, we began to question the Hill's model as we were consistently unable to detect its most important underpinning, the

so-called 'plateau phenomenon'.<sup>8</sup> We have since confirmed that this is a highly variable, indeed elusive, phenomenon.<sup>9 10</sup> Thus, by 1988, we had established that Hill presumed, but did not ever prove, the presence of this mysterious phenomenon,<sup>8</sup> thereby disproving the foundation myth on which Hill conceived his model.<sup>11</sup> Robergs ignores this information.

As Robergs writes, he was present in 1996 when I presented the first iteration of how our ideas had progressed by then.<sup>12</sup> The key advance was my realisation that Hill's model violates a fundamental physiological principle necessary to maintain health—the preservation of homeostasis in all bodily systems (regardless of the imposed stress). But Hill's model requires that skeletal muscle anaerobiosis develops as a result, he proposed, of a developing but regulated cardiac failure.<sup>5 13</sup> Since this model must lead to an inevitable myocardial ischaemia, it cannot be correct. We subsequently labelled Hill's model, the catastrophic anaerobic model of exercise performance,<sup>14</sup> to indicate its deviance from normal physiology as is currently taught.

These new ideas have been vigorously rebutted by those defending Hill's model.<sup>3 15</sup> We have rebutted all these criticisms<sup>13 16 17</sup> and have completed novel experiments designed to determine whether Hill's model or the CGM is more probable.

### OUR STUDIES DISPROVING HILL'S CATASTROPHIC MODEL

In 2001, we described the evidence that formed the intellectual basis for our new model: '...peak cardiovascular function is reduced during maximal exercise in both acute and chronic hypoxia with no evidence for any primary alterations in myocardial function. Since peak skeletal muscle electromyographic activity is also reduced during hypoxia, these data support a model in which a central, neural governor constrains the cardiac output by regulating the mass of skeletal muscle that can be

activated during maximal exercise in both acute and chronic hypoxia'.<sup>18</sup>

In a 2004 paper, we proved that, when exercising in the heat, athletes reduce their pace 'in anticipation' by decreasing the extent to which they recruit their exercising muscles.<sup>19</sup> By showing that athletes do not continue to exercise at an intensity that, if maintained, would cause physical harm (heat injury), we definitively disproved Hill's catastrophic model. This anticipatory slowing confirmed an observation we had made previously.<sup>20</sup>

In 2005, we collated published evidence from more than 100 scientific papers that are logically incompatible with Hill's catastrophic model.<sup>14</sup>

We then showed that persons exercising at a fixed rating of perceived exertion (RPE) completed less exercise in the heat than in cooler conditions,<sup>21</sup> confirming the presence of a central regulator of their exercise performance. Amann *et al*,<sup>22</sup> among many others, have provided independent confirmation for this anticipatory control of exercise performance, most unambiguously shown during exercise in hypoxia.

Hill's catastrophic model also predicts that exercise can only terminate after there has been 100% recruitment of all the skeletal muscle fibres in the exercising limb.<sup>14</sup> In contrast, we have shown that athletes do not recruit 100% of their active muscles during maximal running exercise.<sup>23</sup> The same applies during maximal voluntary exercise with the knee extensors.<sup>24</sup>

### CONCLUSION

We appreciate Robergs' letter that allows us to collate the evidence we have provided to disprove Hill's catastrophic model. As Robergs points out, our model has gone through multiple reiterations since first conceptualised and that is a marker of openness, honesty and good science.

The basic disprovable assertion of the CGM is simple: the brain regulates exercise performance to ensure that a catastrophic failure of homeostasis

does not occur.<sup>12 13 16–18 25</sup> Our most recent iteration which represents a further significant advance in the development of this model of exercise regulation has just been published.<sup>26</sup>

I note that even though the CGM is now more than 21 years old, no one has yet published experimental data that refute it.

#### Timothy David Noakes

Department of Human Biology, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, Western Cape, South Africa

**Correspondence to** Dr Timothy David Noakes; Timothy.Noakes@uct.ac.za

**Competing interests** None declared.

**Provenance and peer review** Commissioned; externally peer reviewed.



## OPEN ACCESS

**Open Access** This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

© Article author(s) (or their employer(s) unless otherwise stated in the text of the article) 2017. All rights reserved. No commercial use is permitted unless otherwise expressly granted.

**To cite** Noakes TD. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med* 2017;4.

Accepted 19 October 2017



<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjsem-2017-000226>

*BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med* 2017;4.  
doi:10.1136/bmjsem-2017-000277

## REFERENCES

1. Robergs RA. Lessons from Popper for science, paradigm shifts, scientific revolutions and exercise physiology. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med* 2017;3:e000226.
2. Levine BD. VO<sub>2</sub>max: what do we know, and what do we still need to know? *J Physiol* 2008;586:25–34.
3. Shephard RJ. Is it time to retire the ‘central governor’? *Sports Med* 2009;39:709–21.
4. Hill AV, Lupton H. Muscular exercise, lactic acid, and the supply and utilization of oxygen. *QJM* 1923;16:135–71.
5. Noakes TD. How did A V Hill understand the VO<sub>2</sub>max and the “plateau phenomenon”? Still no clarity? *Br J Sports Med* 2008;42:574–80.
6. Marino FE, Gard M, Drinkwater EJ. The limits to exercise performance and the future of fatigue research. *Br J Sports Med* 2011;45:65–7.
7. Mosso A. *Fatigue*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co Ltd, 1904.
8. Noakes TD. Implications of exercise testing for prediction of athletic performance: a contemporary perspective. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1988;20:319–30.
9. Doherty M, Nobbs L, Noakes TD. Low frequency of the “plateau phenomenon” during maximal exercise in elite British athletes. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2003;89:619–23.
10. Beltrami FG, Wong delP, Noakes TD. High prevalence of false-positive plateau phenomena during VO<sub>2</sub>max testing in adolescents. *J Sci Med Sport* 2014;17:526–30.
11. Noakes TD. How does a foundational myth become sacred scientific dogma? The case of A.V. Hill and the anaerobiosis controversy. McNamee M, edn. *Philosophy and the sciences of exercise, health and sport*. Oxon, U.K: Routledge, 2005:56–84.
12. Noakes TD. Challenging beliefs: ex Africa semper aliquid novi: 1996 J.B. Wolfe memorial lecture. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1997;29:571–90.
13. Noakes TD. Maximal oxygen uptake: “classical” versus “contemporary” viewpoints: a rebuttal. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1998;30:1381–98.
14. Noakes TD, St Clair Gibson A. Logical limitations to the “catastrophe” models of fatigue during exercise in humans. *Br J Sports Med* 2004;38:648–9.
15. Bassett DR, Howley ET. Maximal oxygen uptake: “classical” versus “contemporary” viewpoints. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1997;29:591–603.
16. Noakes TD. Is it time to retire the A.V. Hill Model?: a rebuttal to the article by Professor Roy Shephard. *Sports Med* 2011;41:263–77.
17. Noakes TD. Time to move beyond a brainless exercise physiology: the evidence for complex regulation of human exercise performance. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2011;36:23–35.
18. Noakes TD, Peltonen JE, Rusko HK. Evidence that a central governor regulates exercise performance during acute hypoxia and hyperoxia. *J Exp Biol* 2001;204:3225–34.
19. Tucker R, Rauch L, Harley YX, et al. Impaired exercise performance in the heat is associated with an anticipatory reduction in skeletal muscle recruitment. *Pflügers Arch* 2004;448:422–30.
20. Marino FE, Mbambo Z, Kortekaas E, et al. Advantages of smaller body mass during distance running in warm, humid environments. *Pflügers Arch* 2000;441:359–67.
21. Tucker R, Marle T, Lambert EV, et al. The rate of heat storage mediates an anticipatory reduction in exercise intensity during cycling at a fixed rating of perceived exertion. *J Physiol* 2006;574:905–15.
22. Amann M, Eldridge MW, Lovering AT, et al. Arterial oxygenation influences central motor output and exercise performance via effects on peripheral locomotor muscle fatigue in humans. *J Physiol* 2006;575:937–52.
23. Albertus Y. *Critical analysis of techniques for normalising electromyographic data*. Cape Town, South Africa: University of Cape Town, 2008:1–219.
24. Kendall TL, Black CD, Elder CP, et al. Determining the extent of neural activation during maximal effort. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2006;38:1470–5.
25. Noakes TD. Fatigue is a brain-derived emotion that regulates the exercise behavior to ensure the protection of whole body homeostasis. *Front Physiol* 2012;3:82.
26. Venhorst A, Micklewright D, Noakes TD. Towards a three-dimensional framework of centrally regulated and goal-directed exercise behaviour: a narrative review. *Br J Sports Med* 2017 (Epub ahead of print: 23 Aug 2017).