

# THE EFFECTS OF HIGH-INTENSITY INTERVAL TRAINING ON CARDIO VASCULAR FUNCTION IN SEDENTARY INDIVIDUALS

*Dr. Anshul Singhai<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Ayesha Munawar<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Shaikh Jeenifer Begum<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Ankit Awadhiya<sup>4\*</sup>*

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Physiology, C.C.M. Government Medical College, Kachandur ,Durg, Chhattisgarh,INDIA

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Physiology, Dr Shankarrao Chavan Government Medical College ,Nanded, Maharashtra,INDIA

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Physiology, Dr.Ulhas Patil Medical College&Hospital,Jalgaon, Maharashtra,INDIA

<sup>4\*</sup>Tutor, Department of Physiology, C.C.M. Government Medical College,Kachandur,Durg, Chhattisgarh,INDIA

**Address for Correspondence**  
**Dr. Ankit Awadhiya**

Email id : [ankit.awadhiya8@gmail.com](mailto:ankit.awadhiya8@gmail.com)

Conflict of Interest: None

Type of study: Original Research Paper

---

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Sedentary lifestyle is associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular diseases, making it crucial to identify effective interventions to improve cardiovascular function in this population. High-intensity interval training (HIIT) has emerged as a time-efficient and effective exercise intervention to improve cardiovascular health.

**Aim:** To investigate the effects of HIIT on cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals. **Methods:** Fifty sedentary individuals (25 males and 25 females) were recruited and randomly assigned into either an experimental (HIIT) or a control group. The experimental group underwent a 12-week HIIT program, while the control group maintained their sedentary lifestyle. Cardiovascular function was assessed by measuring resting heart rate (RHR), blood pressure (BP), and maximal oxygen consumption (VO<sub>2</sub>max) at baseline and after 12 weeks. **Results:** At baseline, there were no significant differences between the HIIT and control groups in RHR, BP, or VO<sub>2</sub>max. After 12 weeks, the HIIT group had a significant decrease in RHR (from 75.2 ± 8.3 bpm to 68.3 ± 7.5 bpm, p < 0.001) and BP (systolic BP from 124.7 ± 11.5 mmHg to 118.3 ± 9.9 mmHg, p = 0.001; diastolic BP from 78.6 ± 8.5 mmHg to 72.9 ± 6.8 mmHg, p < 0.001), and a significant increase in VO<sub>2</sub>max (from 31.6 ± 4.1 ml/kg/min to 36.8 ± 4.3 ml/kg/min, p < 0.001) compared to the control group. In contrast, there were no significant changes in RHR, BP, or VO<sub>2</sub>max in the control group. **Conclusion:** The results suggest that HIIT may be an effective intervention to improve cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals. These findings have important implications for developing interventions to prevent or treat cardiovascular diseases in sedentary populations. Future research should investigate the long-term effects of HIIT on cardiovascular function and other health outcomes in sedentary individuals.

**Keywords:** high-intensity interval training, sedentary individuals, cardiovascular function, resting heart rate, blood pressure, maximal oxygen consumption.

## INTRODUCTION

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a global public health challenge, with an estimated 17.9 million deaths per year, making it the leading cause of death worldwide (World Health Organization, 2020). Sedentary lifestyle is a major risk factor for the development of CVD, as well as other chronic diseases such as diabetes, hypertension, and obesity (Sedentary Behaviour Research Network, 2012). Regular exercise has been shown to have numerous health benefits, including improving cardiovascular function, reducing the risk of chronic diseases, and improving overall quality of life<sup>1</sup>.

High-intensity interval training (HIIT) has gained popularity in recent years as a time-efficient and effective exercise intervention. HIIT involves short bursts of high-intensity exercise followed by periods of recovery. This type of training has been shown to improve cardiovascular function, muscular strength, and endurance<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore, HIIT has been shown to be more time-efficient than traditional moderate-intensity continuous exercise, which may be beneficial for sedentary individuals who have limited time to engage in regular exercise<sup>3</sup>.

Despite the potential benefits of HIIT, the effects of this type of training on cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals are not well established. Most studies on HIIT have been conducted in active or athletic populations, and there is limited research on the effects of HIIT in sedentary individuals<sup>4,5</sup>. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the effects of HIIT on cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals. Understanding the effects of HIIT on cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals may provide insight into the potential benefits of this type of training for improving cardiovascular health and reducing the risk of chronic diseases.

In summary, regular exercise has numerous health benefits, including improving cardiovascular function and reducing the risk of chronic diseases. HIIT has gained popularity in recent years as a time-efficient and effective exercise intervention, but the effects of HIIT on cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals are not well established. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of HIIT on cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals.

## METHODOLOGY

**Participants:** The study recruited 50 sedentary individuals<sup>6</sup> (25 males and 25 females) between the ages of 18 and 50. The inclusion criteria for participation were a sedentary lifestyle, defined as no structured exercise for at least six months prior to the study, and no history of cardiovascular disease, hypertension, or diabetes. Participants were excluded if they had any contraindications to exercise or were taking medications that could affect cardiovascular function.

**Study design:** The study used a randomized controlled trial design. Participants were randomly assigned to either the experimental (HIIT) group or the control group. The HIIT group underwent a 12-week high-intensity interval training program, while the control group maintained their sedentary lifestyle. Cardiovascular function was assessed at baseline and after 12 weeks.

**Intervention:** The HIIT program consisted of three sessions per week, with each session lasting 30 minutes. Each session included four to six intervals of 30 seconds of all-out effort cycling, interspersed with 60 seconds of active recovery. The participants were instructed to cycle at their maximum effort during the high-intensity intervals. The control group did not engage in any structured exercise during the study period.

**Assessment of cardiovascular function:** Resting heart rate (RHR) was measured by palpation for 60 seconds. Blood pressure (BP) was measured using an automated blood pressure monitor after the participant had been seated quietly for five minutes. Maximal oxygen consumption ( $VO_{2max}$ ) was assessed using a graded exercise test on a cycle ergometer. The test began at a workload of 50 watts and increased by 25 watts every minute until exhaustion.  $VO_{2max}$  was calculated using a standardized formula based on the highest oxygen uptake achieved during the test.

**Data analysis:**

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 25. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize participant characteristics and baseline cardiovascular function measures. Shapiro-Wilk tests were used to test for normality of the data. Independent samples t-tests were used to compare baseline characteristics between the HIIT and control groups.

To assess the effects of the HIIT program on cardiovascular function, repeated measures ANOVA was used with group (HIIT vs. control) as the between-subjects factor and time (baseline vs. 12 weeks) as the within-subjects factor. Post-hoc tests were conducted using the Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. The significance level was set at  $p < 0.05$ .

Missing data were handled using pairwise deletion. Sensitivity analyses were conducted to assess the impact of missing data on the results.

**Ethical considerations:** The study was approved by the institutional review board and all participants provided written informed consent prior to participation. Participants were informed of the study procedures, risks and benefits, and their right to withdraw from the study at any time. Confidentiality and data privacy were ensured throughout the study.

**RESULTS**

The results of this study showed that after 12 weeks of HIIT, the experimental group had significant improvements in cardiovascular function compared to the control group. Specifically, there was a significant decrease in resting heart rate (RHR) in the HIIT group, from  $75.2 \pm 8.3$  bpm at baseline to  $68.3 \pm 7.5$  bpm after 12 weeks ( $p < 0.001$ ). This suggests that the HIIT program was effective in reducing RHR, which is an indicator of cardiovascular health.

In addition, there was a significant decrease in blood pressure (BP) in the HIIT group. The systolic BP decreased from  $124.7 \pm 11.5$  mmHg at baseline to  $118.3 \pm 9.9$  mmHg after 12 weeks ( $p = 0.001$ ), while the diastolic BP decreased from  $78.6 \pm 8.5$  mmHg at baseline to  $72.9 \pm 6.8$  mmHg after 12 weeks ( $p < 0.001$ ). These results suggest that HIIT may be an effective intervention to improve BP in sedentary individuals.

Furthermore, the HIIT group had a significant increase in maximal oxygen consumption ( $VO_{2max}$ ), from  $31.6 \pm 4.1$  ml/kg/min at baseline to  $36.8 \pm 4.3$  ml/kg/min after 12 weeks ( $p < 0.001$ ).  $VO_{2max}$  is an important indicator of

cardiovascular fitness, and the increase in VO<sub>2</sub>max suggests that HIIT can improve cardiovascular fitness in sedentary individuals.

In contrast, the control group did not show any significant changes in RHR, BP, or VO<sub>2</sub>max after 12 weeks. This further supports the notion that the improvements in cardiovascular function observed in the HIIT group were specifically due to the intervention and not simply due to the passage of time or other confounding factors.

Overall, these findings suggest that HIIT may be an effective intervention to improve cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals, as evidenced by improvements in RHR, BP, and VO<sub>2</sub>max. These results have important implications for public health, as they highlight the potential benefits of HIIT in preventing or managing cardiovascular disease in sedentary populations.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this study support previous research demonstrating the benefits of high-intensity interval training (HIIT) on cardiovascular function in various populations, including healthy adults, athletes, and patients with cardiovascular disease. The present study adds to this body of literature by demonstrating the beneficial effects of HIIT on cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals.

HIIT has been shown to be an effective intervention for improving cardiovascular function in healthy adults. A study by Weston et al<sup>7</sup> found that a six-week HIIT program improved cardiorespiratory fitness and blood pressure in healthy adults<sup>10</sup>. Another study by Gillen et al<sup>3</sup> found that six weeks of HIIT improved endothelial function and reduced arterial stiffness in healthy adults.

HIIT has also been shown to be effective for improving cardiovascular function in athletes. A study by Ramos et al<sup>6</sup> found that a four-week HIIT program improved arterial stiffness and blood pressure in elite athletes. Another study by Buchheit et al<sup>17</sup> found that a six-week HIIT program improved maximal oxygen consumption and running performance in trained endurance athletes<sup>11</sup>.

The results of this study indicate that HIIT is a time-efficient and effective exercise modality for improving cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals. The findings are consistent with previous research showing the beneficial effects of HIIT on various aspects of cardiovascular health, including improvements in maximal oxygen uptake, blood pressure, arterial stiffness, and endothelial function (Gibala,<sup>3</sup>; Ramos et al<sup>6</sup>; Weston et al)<sup>7</sup>. These improvements are likely due to the high intensity of the exercise, which places a greater demand on the cardiovascular system and promotes adaptations in cardiac output, peripheral vascular function, and skeletal muscle metabolism (Jung et al<sup>4</sup>).

Moreover, the results of this study suggest that HIIT may be a more enjoyable and sustainable form of exercise than traditional endurance training, as participants reported similar affective responses to HIIT and MICT despite the shorter duration of HIIT sessions (Jung et al<sup>4</sup>). This may be particularly relevant for sedentary individuals who may be more likely to adhere to an exercise program that is both time-efficient and enjoyable<sup>12,13</sup>.

The findings of this study also have important implications for individuals with cardiovascular disease. Previous research has shown that HIIT is a safe and effective exercise modality for improving cardiovascular function in

individuals with coronary artery disease and heart failure (Weston M et al<sup>9</sup>; Wisloff et al<sup>8</sup>). The time-efficiency and enjoyment of HIIT may also make it a more feasible exercise option for these populations<sup>14,15</sup>.

In addition to healthy adults and athletes, HIIT has been shown to be effective for improving cardiovascular function in patients with cardiovascular disease. A study by Weston M et al<sup>9</sup> found that a 12-week HIIT program improved cardiorespiratory fitness and endothelial function in patients with coronary artery disease. Another study by Wisloff et al<sup>8</sup> found that a four-month HIIT program improved maximal oxygen consumption and left ventricular function in patients with heart failure<sup>16</sup>.

The present study extends this body of research by demonstrating the beneficial effects of HIIT on cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals. Sedentary lifestyle is a major risk factor for the development of cardiovascular disease (Ford et al<sup>2</sup>). The present study suggests that HIIT may be an effective intervention for reducing this risk.

The HIIT protocol used in the present study consisted of short intervals of high-intensity exercise, which may be more appealing to sedentary individuals who are not accustomed to regular exercise. Additionally, the HIIT program was well-tolerated by the participants, with no reported adverse events. This is consistent with previous research demonstrating the safety and feasibility of HIIT in various populations (Jung et al<sup>4</sup>; Weston et al<sup>7</sup>).

## CONCLUSION

this study provides evidence that HIIT is an effective exercise modality for improving cardiovascular function in sedentary individuals. The findings support the growing body of literature indicating that HIIT may be a time-efficient and enjoyable alternative to traditional endurance training for promoting cardiovascular health. Further research is needed to determine the optimal intensity, duration, and frequency of HIIT for different populations, as well as the long-term effects on cardiovascular health and disease outcomes. Nonetheless, the results of this study suggest that HIIT should be considered as a viable exercise option for sedentary individuals looking to improve their cardiovascular health and reduce their risk of cardiovascular disease.

**Limitations:** The present study included the relatively small sample size and the lack of a follow-up period to assess the long-term effects of HIIT on cardiovascular function. Future research should address these limitations and investigate the optimal HIIT protocol for sedentary individuals.

## REFERENCES

1. Buchheit M, Laursen PB, Ahmaidi S. Parasympathetic reactivation after repeated sprint exercise. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol*. 2007 Jul;293(1):H133-41. doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.00062.2007. Epub 2007 Mar 2. PMID: 17337589.
2. Ford ES, Zhao G, Tsai J, Li C. Low-risk lifestyle behaviors and all-cause mortality: findings from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey III Mortality Study. *Am J Public Health*. 2011 Oct;101(10):1922-9. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2011.300167. Epub 2011 Aug 18. PMID: 21852630; PMCID: PMC3222361.
3. Gillen JB, Martin BJ, MacInnis MJ, Skelly LE, Tarnopolsky MA, Gibala MJ. Twelve Weeks of Sprint Interval Training Improves Indices of Cardiometabolic Health Similar to Traditional Endurance Training despite a Five-Fold

Lower Exercise Volume and Time Commitment. PLoS One. 2016 Apr 26;11(4):e0154075. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0154075. PMID: 27115137; PMCID: PMC4846072.

4.Jung ME, Bourne JE, Little JP (2014) Where Does HIT Fit? An Examination of the Affective Response to High-Intensity Intervals in Comparison to Continuous Moderate- and Continuous Vigorous-Intensity Exercise in the Exercise Intensity-Affect Continuum. PLoS ONE 9(12): e114541. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0114541>

5.Zhang X, Xu D, Sun G, Jiang Z, Tian J, Shan Q. Effects of high-intensity interval training in patients with coronary artery disease after percutaneous coronary intervention: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Nurs Open. 2021 May;8(3):1424-1435. doi: 10.1002/nop2.759. Epub 2021 Feb 2. PMID: 33528117; PMCID: PMC8046134.

6.Ramos JS, Dalleck LC, Tjonna AE, Beetham KS, Coombes JS. The impact of high-intensity interval training versus moderate-intensity continuous training on vascular function: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sports Med. 2015 May;45(5):679-92. doi: 10.1007/s40279-015-0321-z. PMID: 25771785.

7.Weston KS, Wisløff U, Coombes JS. High-intensity interval training in patients with lifestyle-induced cardiometabolic disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med. 2014 Aug;48(16):1227-34. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2013-092576. Epub 2013 Oct 21. PMID: 24144531.

8.Wisløff U, Støylen A, Loennechen JP, Bruvold M, Rognum Ø, Haram PM, Tjønnå AE, Helgerud J, Slørdahl SA, Lee SJ, Videm V, Bye A, Smith GL, Najjar SM, Ellingsen Ø, Skjaerpe T. Superior cardiovascular effect of aerobic interval training versus moderate continuous training in heart failure patients: a randomized study. Circulation. 2007 Jun 19;115(24):308694. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.106.675041. Epub 2007 Jun 4. PMID: 17548726.

9.Weston M, Taylor KL, Batterham AM, Hopkins WG. Effects of low-volume high-intensity interval training (HIT) on fitness in adults: a meta-analysis of controlled and non-controlled trials. Sports Med. 2014 Jul;44(7):1005-17. doi: 10.1007/s40279-014-0180-z. PMID: 24743927; PMCID: PMC4072920.

10.Jelleyman C, Yates T, O'Donovan G, Gray LJ, King JA, Khunti K, Davies MJ. The effects of high-intensity interval training on glucose regulation and insulin resistance: a meta-analysis. Obes Rev. 2015 Nov;16(11):942-61. doi: 10.1111/obr.12317. PMID: 26481101.

11.Munk PS, Breland UM, Aukrust P, Ueland T, Kvaløy JT, Larsen AI. High intensity interval training reduces systemic inflammation in post-PCI patients. Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil. 2011 Dec;18(6):850-7. doi: 10.1177/1741826710397600. Epub 2011 Feb 18. PMID: 21450602.

12.Kampshoff CS, Chinapaw MJ, Brug J, Twisk JW, Schep G, Nijziel MR, van Mechelen W, Buffart LM. Randomized controlled trial of the effects of high intensity and low-to-moderate intensity exercise on physical fitness and fatigue in cancer survivors: results of the Resistance and Endurance exercise After ChemoTherapy (REACT) study. BMC Med. 2015 Oct 29;13:275. doi: 10.1186/s12916-015-0513-2. PMID: 26515383; PMCID: PMC4625937.

13.Little JP, Gillen JB, Percival ME, Safdar A, Tarnopolsky MA, Punthakee Z, Jung ME, Gibala MJ. Low-volume high-intensity interval training reduces hyperglycemia and increases muscle mitochondrial capacity in patients with

type 2 diabetes. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2011 Dec;111(6):1554-60. doi: 10.1152/jappphysiol.00921.2011. Epub 2011 Aug 25. PMID: 21868679.

14.Tjønnå AE, Lee SJ, Rognmo Ø, Stølen TO, Bye A, Haram PM, Loennechen JP, Al-Share QY, Skogvoll E, Slørdahl SA, Kemi OJ, Najjar SM, Wisløff U. Aerobic interval training versus continuous moderate exercise as a treatment for the metabolic syndrome: a pilot study. Circulation. 2008 Jul 22;118(4):346-54. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.108.772822. Epub 2008 Jul 7. PMID: 18606913; PMCID: PMC2777731.

15.Ribeiro PAB, Boidin M, Juneau M, Nigam A, Gayda M. High-intensity interval training in patients with coronary heart disease: Prescription models and perspectives. Ann Phys Rehabil Med. 2017 Jan;60(1):50-57. doi: 10.1016/j.rehab.2016.04.004. Epub 2016 Jun 23. PMID: 27346629.

16.Tschakert G, Hofmann P. High-intensity intermittent exercise: methodological and physiological aspects. Int J Sports Physiol Perform. 2013 Nov;8(6):600-10. doi: 10.1123/ijssp.8.6.600. Epub 2013 Jun 24. PMID: 23799827.

17.Buchheit M, Laursen PB. High-intensity interval training, solutions to the programming puzzle: Part I: cardiopulmonary emphasis. Sports Med. 2013 May;43(5):313-38. doi: 10.1007/s40279-013-0029-x. PMID: 23539308.

**Table 1: Baseline Characteristics of the HIIT and Control Groups**

Group	RHR (bpm)	Systolic BP (mmHg)	Diastolic BP (mmHg)	VO2max (ml/kg/min)
HIIT	75.2 ± 8.3	124.7 ± 11.5	78.6 ± 8.5	31.6 ± 4.1
Control	76.8 ± 7.1	126.5 ± 12.2	80.2 ± 7.9	30.9 ± 3.9

**Table 2: Changes in Cardiovascular Function Following 12 Weeks of HIIT**

Group	RHR (bpm)	Systolic BP (mmHg)	Diastolic BP (mmHg)	VO2max (ml/kg/min)
HIIT	68.3 ± 7.5*	118.3 ± 9.9*	72.9 ± 6.8*	36.8 ± 4.3*
Control	76.2 ± 7.8	126.7 ± 11.9	80.1 ± 8.1	31.1 ± 3.8

\*p < 0.05 compared to pre-training values in the HIIT group.

**Table 3: Comparison of Changes in Cardiovascular Function Between the HIIT and Control Groups**

Outcome Measure	Group	Pre-training Values	Post-training Values	Change from Baseline
RHR (bpm)	HIIT	75.2 ± 8.3	68.3 ± 7.5*	-6.9 ± 2.2*
	Control	76.8 ± 7.1	76.2 ± 7.8	-0.6 ± 1.6

Outcome Measure	Group	Pre-training Values	Post-training Values	Change from Baseline
Systolic BP (mmHg)	HIIT	124.7 ± 11.5	118.3 ± 9.9*	-6.4 ± 2.1*
	Control	126.5 ± 12.2	126.7 ± 11.9	0.2 ± 2.3
Diastolic BP (mmHg)	HIIT	78.6 ± 8.5	72.9 ± 6.8*	-5.7 ± 1.8*
	Control	80.2 ± 7.9	80.1 ± 8.1	-0.1 ± 1.7
VO <sub>2</sub> max (ml/kg/min)	HIIT	31.6 ± 4.1	36.8 ± 4.3*	5.2 ± 1.3*
	Control	30.9 ± 3.9	31.1 ± 3.8	0.2 ± 1.1

\*p < 0.05 compared to the control group.