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## 1. Introduction

With the invention of power measurement systems for cyclists by SRM, founded by Ulrich Schoberer in 1986, the training of riders and their equipment has been put to another level. Over time, more and more parameters for the assessment of physiological processes and biomechanical analysis have been established1), 2), 3). Biomechanical factors play a more important role in defining new indicators to search for the smallest detail and advantage4), 5), 6). The aim of this single case study is to show the improved power measurement and significant research benefit that will come up in the future using a new development of SRM. It will be demonstrated by evaluating a ride on an SRM Indoortrainer with an oval and round chainring and two rides of different training targets. The amount of the highly resolved recorded data has improved with the new SRM Powermeter what may also lead to many exciting discussions and approaches to introduce or rethink parameters.

## 2. Materials and Methods

The 22-year-old, 1.87 m tall and 72.1 kg male participant in the present study has years of experience in competitive cycling and triathlon. Using a prototype of the new SRM invention this research is designed as a single case study. Shown will be a ride on an SRM Indoortrainer with oval and round 56 teeth chainrings to proof the improved power calculation. For that, the rider executed a onehour ride divided into two 30-minute parts at $250 \pm 4 \mathrm{~W}$ and $73.5 \pm 1 \mathrm{rpm}$ cadence, changing between the round and oval chainring every five minutes. The difference between the 30minute parts was the recording of the data using the IMU mode, where 200 Hz angular velocity and torque are recorded, and the rotation-based mode, where the average torque and angular velocity are used to determine the power after one complete crank revolution. In order to neglect the acceleration of the flywheel mass the last four the last four minutes of each interval were recorded. To get further usable data for this work the participant had to execute two outdoor bike rides on a BMC Teammachine SLR01. These two rides had a total length of
$84.86 \pm 0.82$ minutes. One ride was completed as continuous riding at 218 W and an average cadence of 84 rpm . In the second ride the participant completed five six-minute intervals at $369 \pm 2.59 \mathrm{~W}$ with a cadence of $89.07 \pm 0.93 \mathrm{rpm}$ and 3 minutes rest at $227 \pm$ 6.9 W and a ten-minute effort of 322 W and 89 rpm with eight minutes rest at 203 W to the last six-minute effort. For the intervals the rider was supposed to find a flat road with as little turns as possible in order to keep a constant power output. Second by second power output and cadence have been displayed on a Powercontrol 8 from SRM to execute the given tasks. The power output has been measured by an SRM Spiderpowermeter prototype. Additionally, torque and angular velocity have been measured and recorded with associated angle every five milliseconds and have been stored in a mass storage device. SRM internal beta software was used to decode the recorded data into graphs and export them to Excel spreadsheets for further statistical analysis. With exporting the files to Excel to get the recorded data as well as the calculated respective current power, called "On Time Power" shown as their values, there have been several statistical analysis methods used to analyse the rides. For every file the mean, median and standard deviation have been calculated for every parameter. Because of the higher power, the intervals were looked at in more detail and highlighted in the analysis using the same statistical analysis methods.

## 3. Results

The most important finding of this paper is the more accurate power measurement as well as amount of collected datapoints. Collected datapoints being 1,010,479 for each timestamp, torque, angular velocity and
angle in the interval method and 1,029,519 for the continuous method.

Table 1
(a)

| No | Chain <br> ring | Power <br> /W | Cadence <br> /rpm | Kin Energy <br> Flywheel /J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Round | 249 | 75 | 2024 |
| 2 | Oval | 247 | 75 | 2024 |
| 3 | Round | 251 | 74 | 1971 |
| 4 | Oval | 250 | 73 | 1918 |
| 5 | Round | 243 | 73 | 1918 |
| 6 | Oval | 243 | 72 | 1866 |

(b)

| No | Chain <br> ring | Power <br> /W | Cadence <br> /rpm | Kin Energy <br> Flywheel /J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Round | 246 | 72 | 1866 |
| 2 | Oval | 248 | 71 | 1814 |
| 3 | Round | 250 | 74 | 1971 |
| 4 | Oval | 259 | 74 | 1971 |
| 5 | Round | 250 | 74 | 1971 |
| 6 | Oval | 260 | 74 | 1971 |

Table 1 shows the measured power and cadence as well as the kinetic energy in the system of the Indoortrainer ride in the (table 1 a) IMU mode and (table 1 b ) rotation-based mode. Noticeable is, that the measured power in the IMU mode does not vary greatly with either the round or the oval chainring, each with $248 \pm 3 \mathrm{~W}$ for the round and 247 $\pm 3 \mathrm{~W}$ for the oval chainring. In table 2 b is striking that the power output with the oval chainring is always higher than with the round one although cadence and kinetic energy are nearly the same for every part. In numbers it is $256 \pm 5 \mathrm{~W}$ with the oval one whereby it is $249 \pm 2 \mathrm{~W}$ with the round
chainring. Cadence does not distinguish a lot in both modes being $74 \pm 1 \mathrm{rpm}$ in IMU mode or $73 \pm 1 \mathrm{rpm}$ in the rotation-based mode.

Figure 1

(b)


Figure 1 represents torque in yellow, angular velocity in light blue and power in green from both rides with (figure 1 a) being the continuous method and (figure 1 b ) being the interval ride. One relevant aspect to address is the wide distribution of torque in every ride, whereby the angular velocity distribution takes place in a smaller range to get the nearly same power for a given time period.

Noticeable in figure 1a is that torque and angular velocity do not really change over duration except little peaks that occur from time to time. The distribution of torque seems to be the same throughout the ride, while the angular velocity is kept quite steady, so that the rider is able to deliver the required performance.
A closer look at figure 1 b shows that the angular velocity remains at the same level for the whole ride, although the power output increases considerably in the completed intervals. Comparing the first five intervals with a length of six minutes with the last interval of ten minutes, it becomes clear that
the torque level rises but appears to be at the same level in the longer effort.

Table 2

|  | Torque [Nm] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Continuous <br> method | Interval <br> method |
| Mean | 24.907 | 31.394 |
| Median | 24.813 | 29.5 |
| Deviation Mean <br> to Median [\%] | 0.38 | 6.03 |
| Standard <br> Deviation | 11.56 | 15.43 |

Table 2 represents the mean, median, deviation of mean to median and standard deviation for torque of both rides. The mean and median value of torque show a deviation of $0.38 \%$ in the continuous ride however differ notably in the interval session by 6.03 $\%$. As a result, the standard deviation for torque increases from 11.56 Nm in the continuous ride to 15.43 Nm for the interval ride what can also be seen from the previously shown diagrams, as the torque level fluctuates.

Table 3

|  | Angular Velocity [rad/s] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Continuous <br> method | Interval <br> method |
| Mean | 8.781 | 9.048 |
| Median | 8.938 | 9.196 |
| Deviation <br> Mean to <br> Median [\%] | -1.79 | -1.64 |
| Standard <br> Deviation | 0.95 | 1.02 |

Analysing the angular velocity, presented in table 3 reveals that the mean and median values in both rides have almost the same deviation with $-1.79 \%$ and $-1.64 \%$, although the effort expended was very different. Their absolute mean values are practically the same with $8.781 \pm 0.95 \mathrm{rad} / \mathrm{s}$ in the continuous ride and $9.048 \pm 1.02 \mathrm{rad} / \mathrm{s}$ in the interval ride.

Table 4

|  | On Time Power [W] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Continuous <br> method | Interval <br> method |
| Mean | 218 | 286 |
| Median | 221 | 269 |
| Deviation <br> Mean to <br> Median [\%] | -1.38 | 5.94 |
| Standard <br> Deviation | 96 | 140 |

Taking a closer look at the calculated On Time Power output figures it is noticeable that the deviation of the mean and median value in the interval ride is nearly the same with $5.94 \%$ than as it is in the torque values. The mean value $286 \pm 140 \mathrm{~W}$ is considerably higher in the interval ride than in the continuous effort with a mean of $218 \pm 96 \mathrm{~W}$. Yet, the median On Time Power of the continuous method is 3 W higher than its mean whereby in the interval ride the median is 17 W lower than the mean value.

## Table 5

(a)

| No | Length[s] | Mean |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Torque <br> $[\mathrm{Nm}]$ | Angular <br> Velocity <br> [rad/s] | On Time <br> Power <br> $[\mathrm{W}]$ |
| 1 | 360.29 | 38.750 | 9.47 | 368 |
| 2 | 361.10 | 40.309 | 9.17 | 368 |
| 3 | 360.92 | 39.470 | 9.35 | 369 |
| 4 | 359.09 | 39.560 | 9.34 | 368 |
| 5 | 360.33 | 40.356 | 9.31 | 374 |
| 6 | 600.38 | 34.746 | 9.31 | 322 |

(b)

| No | Length <br> $[\mathrm{s}]$ | Median |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Torque <br> $[\mathrm{Nm}]$ | Angular <br> Velocity <br> [rad/s] | On Time <br> Power <br> $[W]$ |
| 1 | 360.29 | 39.329 | 9.56 | 375 |
| 2 | 361.10 | 40.719 | 9.23 | 374 |
| 3 | 360.92 | 39.688 | 9.45 | 373 |
| 4 | 359.09 | 40.000 | 9.37 | 374 |
| 5 | 360.33 | 40.188 | 9.33 | 375 |
| 6 | 600.38 | 35.031 | 9.32 | 327 |

(c)

| No | Length[s] | Standard Deviation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Torque <br> $[\mathrm{Nm}]$ | Angular <br> Velocity <br> [rad/s] | On <br> Time <br> Power <br> $[\mathrm{W}]$ |
| 1 | 360.29 | 14.552 | 0.78 | 135 |
| 2 | 361.10 | 15.383 | 0.59 | 135 |
| 3 | 360.92 | 14.889 | 0.69 | 137 |
| 4 | 359.09 | 15.450 | 0.42 | 140 |


| 5 | 360.33 | 15.533 | 0.45 | 141 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 600.38 | 13.212 | 0.49 | 120 |

Table 5 shows (table 5 a) mean, (table 5 b) median and (table 5 c ) standard deviation of all completed intervals. For all intervals mean torque ranges around $38.865 \pm 1.921$ Nm and median is very similar at 39.159 $\pm 1.895 \mathrm{Nm}$. The angular velocity numbers with $9.32 \pm 0.09 \mathrm{rad} / \mathrm{s}$ in mean and $9.38 \pm 0.11$ $\mathrm{rad} / \mathrm{s}$ in median are also very equal. Comparing the six-minute efforts with a higher power output of $369 \pm 2.59 \mathrm{~W}$ to the ten-minute effort with an average of 322 Watt the applied torque is only $4.943 \pm 0.596 \mathrm{Nm}$ higher despite a higher power output of 47 W. Every calculated On Time Power output is lower in its mean value than in median, irrespective of the interval duration. Interestingly the fifth six-minute intervals mean and median value of On Time power output is nearly the same. Standard deviation for every quantity is nearly the same being $15.161 \pm 0.379 \mathrm{Nm}, 0.59 \pm 0.14 \mathrm{rad} / \mathrm{s}$ and 138 $\pm 2 \mathrm{~W}$ in the first five intervals and 13.212 $\mathrm{Nm}, 0.49 \mathrm{rad} / \mathrm{s}$ and 120 W in the ten-minute effort.
Figure 2


Figure 2 shows two crank repetitions as an example for the high resolution of the recorded data. Taken out of the third interval with a power output of 369 Watt at an 88 rpm cadence, it gets visible that the torque graph follows a sin function but is not even over the
whole time. By definition, in the first $180^{\circ}$ of a crank repetition the right leg is dominant and in the second $180^{\circ}$ the left leg pushes the pedal down. The graph shows a higher unevenness for the left leg phase. Over the presented figure the angular velocity is varying minimal.

## 4. Discussion and practical applications

From the previously stated results a few new findings and practical applications can be found and can be considered helpful for future research. Most striking is the more accurate measurement of power with the IMU mode never mind if a round or oval chainring is used. The highly increased amount of acquired data can also be used for a more detailed training evaluation and might also lead to new parameters for cycling analysis. Furthermore, studies can not only be executed under laboratory conditions but also outside with the same required data. Mean and Median values of torque, angular velocity and On Time Power can be used to analyse a cyclists' biomechanical pedal pattern in more detail. Moreover, the high resolution of the recorded values shown in graphs can be used to optimise a riders' pedal pattern. The deviation of mean and median allow to analyse the evenness of a ride or interval. Peaks could play a role in sprints or other short intervals. Torque can be a very useful tool in track cycling as the starts are often out of a standstill and also can be implemented in or as new training tools. Another possible use of the Powermeter 9 could be found in the medical sector. At this a patient's muscle functionality or progress in rehab could be analysed by controlling the $\sin$ course of torque. Further, the data could be used to check, if the rider has certain damage in coordination after a crash. A negative point of the Powermeter 9 might be that it measures both applied torques at the
same time and so only the sum of both values can be displayed. Therefore, it cannot be differentiated if one leg is applying more force or whether the other one is counteracting more or less.

## 5. Conclusion

To summarise this single case study, this Powermeter calculates power more accurate and the collected data can be used to develop new parameters, indicators or even methods to improve the performance of a cyclist. Furthermore, it surely can find use in other sectors such as the medical. Future research needs to be done to find a scientific use of the values and to develop a user-friendly way to process and demonstrate all relevant data. Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
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