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ABSTRACT

Professionals are seeking to find ways to prevent exertional heat illness (EHI) in populations working in hot environments as well as populations that are physically active. The purpose of the present study was to evaluate individuals’ ability to accurately perceive core temperature ranges associated with homeothermic and EHI temperatures during exercise. Ten physically active males exercised on a treadmill at a self-selected rate until core temperature reached 39°C. Participants rated perceived core and skin temperature on 100 mm scales each time core temperature increased 0.25°C (37.5-39.0°C), along with thermal comfort and sweating sensation. During exercise core temperature was overestimated by 0.46 ±0.11°C. Following exercise, participants consistently underestimated core temperature by a mean perceived rating of 0.71 ±0.05°C. Skin temperature was overestimated by 1.45 ±1.21°C. Correlations were found between core temperature and perceived core temperature (r =0.54), perceived skin temperature (r =0.55), thermal comfort (r =0.41), and sweating sensation (r =0.42). No correlation was found between core and skin temperature (r =0.02). These data suggest that although people are able to recognize increases in core temperature to the point of overestimation during exercise, they may return to exercise or work too quickly following breaks to cool themselves.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Safety in respect to body temperature, especially high temperatures, is a prevalent area of concern among workers, athletes, and physically active individuals competing and working in hot environments. Homeostatic temperature ranges between 36.5 and 38.5˚ C. When temperatures vary outside this range for an extended period of time, physiological functions may be inhibited and even death may occur (Moran & Mendal, 2002). As endotherms, humans regulate temperature through internal heat generation via heat production, absorption, and loss (Lim et al., 2008). Professionals are continually seeking to better monitor body core temperature changes in hot environments to reduce incidents of exertional heat illness (EHI). EHI causes dysfunction in essentially all systems within the body and is characterized by high body temperature levels, induced by strenuous physical activity and/or high environmental temperature (O’Connor et al., 2010). During physical activity, more than 70% of heat production must be moved to the skin to be dissipated (i.e., loss). When metabolic heat production increases beyond the body’s ability to dissipate it, an increase in body temperature occurs (Lim et al., 2008). If this increase in body temperature is not reduced, then EHI becomes a possibility.
To date, the most applicable techniques of core temperature ($T_c$) and EHI assessment recommended are rectal and gastrointestinal temperature readings (Ganio et al., 2009). Rectal temperature ($T_{re}$) measurements are typically performed in controlled laboratory settings as the equipment needed to perform such measurements generally limits application. Gastrointestinal temperature ($T_g$) measurements have been validated using $T_{re}$, as one of the only other applicable measures of $T_c$ (Casa et al., 2007). The monetary cost of $T_g$ technology poses limitations to the practical application of this technology. Previous research has shown that skin temperature ($T_{sk}$) is an inaccurate method of evaluating $T_c$, even in the commonly utilized axillary locations (Ganio et al., 2009; Jensen et al., 2000). Due to the limitations of these assessment techniques, it has become increasingly important to find another accurate and reliable method of EHI assessment, especially to be used in field settings.

The inherent dangers of EHI and limitations of $T_c$ and $T_{sk}$ temperature monitoring elucidate the importance of evaluation of the human body’s own perception of $T_c$. As the human race has survived in a variety of environmentally challenging conditions, it appears that most humans do an adequate job in recognizing elevated $T_c$ and making efforts to decrease it without the use of a monitoring device. Previous research has shown that perceived thermal intensity of an external stimulus is not influenced by changes in $T_c$; however, perceived thermal pleasantness is affected by changes in $T_c$ (Mower, 1976), making it of
interest to determine whether thermal perceptions could be a strong enough internal alert system to cause individuals to make efforts to cool themselves when in hyperthermic states. Previous research has also shown that humans’ perception of body water loss during physical activity is consistently underestimated (O’Neal et al., 2012; Passe et al., 2007). Taking a similar approach to this idea of physical state perception, the evaluation of perceived core temperature ($T_{pc}$) could be beneficial as well. A recent study showed that rating of perceived exertion is higher during exercise in environmentally hot conditions compared to cool conditions (Crewe et al., 2008), and credited this to the model of a subconscious central governor system that regulates the body to prevent humans from reaching dangerous exertional levels (St. Clair Gibson & Noakes, 2004). It is possible that this same central governor could work similarly with rating $T_{pc}$ levels.

Previous research shows that both $T_c$ and $T_{sk}$ have an impact on thermal comfort (Frank et al., 1999), making it of interest to evaluate core temperature perceptions during a thermal stimulus. It is well known that $T_c$ increases in response to exercise (Shapiro & Seidman, 1990); therefore making it an externally valid stimulus for this evaluation. While $T_{sk}$ is an inaccurate method of evaluating $T_c$ (Ganio et al., 2009; Jensen et al., 2000), due to the presence of non-linear relationships between $T_{sk}$ and the currently recommended $T_c$ evaluation methods, perceptions of $T_{sk}$ as it applies to perceived dangerous $T_c$
levels could still be of value within EHI prevention efforts. $T_{sk}$ could be a vital aspect in temperature perception due to the afferent signals sent by thermoreceptors at the skin, which impact perception and behavioral responses (Green, 2004).

If it is determined that a majority of humans can accurately and reliably perceive $T_c$, especially during hyperthermia, this information could possibly improve self-regulatory behaviors of both perceptual responders and non-responders. This could be used to move the field of thermoregulation in a new direction in regards to EHI prevention efforts. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to evaluate individuals’ ability to accurately perceive $T_c$ and $T_{sk}$ temperature ranges associated with homeothermic and EHI temperatures during exercise.
CHAPTER 2

Methods

Subjects participating in the present study consisted of well-trained college-aged males. In order to minimize physiological strain to the current study’s protocol, well trained was defined as engaging in some combination of cardiovascular and strength training activities a minimum of 3 days per week for 12 weeks prior to participation. Written consent was obtained from all participants prior to testing.

Subjects were familiarized and instructed about procedures of the present research prior to testing. Subjects were asked to document food and fluid consumption for the day prior to testing, and consume 500 ml of water at 2100 hours to help ensure euhydration the following day. Subjects were also asked to abstain from strenuous exercise on the day prior to as well as the day of testing. Urine color, specific gravity, and urine volume were measured prior to each trial to confirm hydration levels.

Each subject participated in one trial. Upon entering the lab, to determine pre-trial weight, subjects emptied their bladder, and were then weighed (Detecto Scale, Brooklyn NY). During the trial, increases in body core temperature were induced by moderate physical activity consisting of a walk/run protocol on a
(Trackmaster treadmill, Newton KS) at a self-selected pace and incline until \( T_c \) reached 39°C or the subject requested to stop. Trials were conducted in a climate-controlled chamber at a mean temperature of 35°C and a mean relative humidity of 29% (Isothermex, Columbus Inst., Columbus OH). \( T_c \) was monitored using \( T_{re} \). \( T_{re} \) and \( T_{sk} \) were monitored throughout the trials using a rectal thermocouple, and skin thermocouples at the chest, forearm, and calf (Physitemp Inst., Clifton NJ). \( T_c > 39^\circ C \) was set as criterion for removal of subjects from the climate controlled environment to ensure safety. Subjects were not provided fluids during trials.

Participants were also asked to rate their perceptual estimations using 100 mm scales, including thermal comfort, sweating sensation, perceived core (\( T_{pc} \)) perceived skin temperature (\( T_{ps} \)). Each scale was presented separately in an effort to avoid cross scale contamination. Visual analog scales have been found to be efficacious in perceptual rating (Bishop & Herron, 2015). These measures were taken each time core temperature increased by 0.25°C until \( T_c \) reached \( >39^\circ C \) or the participant chose to stop. Once high \( T_c \) levels were reached participants stopped exercise, but remained in the climate chamber and passive cooling was used to reduce \( T_c \). Perceptual measures continued to be recorded as temperatures returned to resting levels (<38°C).
CHAPTER 3

Results

Participant demographics can be found in Table 1. Present data revealed that during exercise participants consistently overestimated $T_c$ levels with a mean perceived rating of $0.46 \pm 0.11 \degree C$ higher than $T_c$ (Table 2 and Fig. 1). To reach $39 \degree C$, participants exercised at mean $46.58 \pm 12.00$ minutes, and following exercise took $23.03 \pm 7.31$ minutes to return to $38 \degree C$ at rest. Following exercise, participants consistently underestimated $T_c$ levels with a mean perceived rating of $0.71 \pm 0.05 \degree C$ lower than $T_c$ (Fig. 1). Statistical significance was shown between $T_{pc}$ and $T_c$ in the majority of data points (Table 2) as readings were recorded at each $0.25 \degree C$ change in $T_c$ (11 data collection points) from $37.5 \degree C$ to $39 \degree C$ and during return to $38 \degree C$.

$T_{ps}$ was also overestimated with a mean perceived rating of $1.45 \pm 1.21 \degree C$ higher than $T_{sk}$ (Table 3 and Fig. 2). Following exercise, $T_{ps}$ did not track with core perceptions above, and participants continued to overestimate $T_{sk}$ as $T_c$ returned to $38 \degree C$. Statistical significance was shown between $T_{ps}$ and $T_{sk}$ in the majority of data points as well (Table 3), as readings were taken at each $0.25 \degree C$ change in core temperature.
Correlations were calculated to determine relationships between $T_c$ and $T_{pc}$, $T_{sk}$ and $T_{ps}$, thermal comfort, and sweating sensation. A positive correlation was found between $T_c$ and $T_{pc}$ ($r=0.54$). No correlation was found between $T_c$ and $T_{sk}$ ($r=0.02$); however, a positive correlation was shown between $T_c$ and $T_{ps}$ ($r=0.55$). Both thermal comfort and sweating sensation exhibited a positive correlation with $T_c$ of $r=0.41$ and $r=0.42$, respectively.
CHAPTER 4
Discussion

This study evaluated individuals’ ability to accurately perceive $T_c$ ranges associated with homeothermic and EHI temperatures during exercise. Healthy college age males completed one trial of exercise in a climate-controlled chamber at a mean temperature of 35˚C on a treadmill at a self-selected pace and incline until $T_c$ reached >39˚C. Participants rated $T_{pc}$ on 100 mm scales each time $T_c$ increased 0.25˚C, along with $T_{ps}$, thermal comfort, and sweating sensation.

Results showed that during exercise participants consistently overestimated $T_c$ levels with a mean perceived rating of 0.46 ±0.11˚C higher than $T_c$. Following exercise participants consistently underestimated $T_c$ levels with a mean perceived rating of 0.71 ±0.05˚C lower than $T_c$. $T_{ps}$ was overestimated with a mean perceived rating of 1.45 ±1.21˚C higher than $T_{sk}$. Unlike the underestimation of $T_{pc}$ following exercise, the overestimation of $T_{ps}$ and correlation of $T_{ps}$ to $T_c$ ($r=0.55$), suggests that $T_{ps}$ might be a possible EHI prevention tool as it was able to recognize elevated temperature levels after exercise. Correlations were also found between core and $T_{pc}$ ($r=0.54$), thermal comfort ($r=0.41$), and sweating sensation ($r=0.42$). No correlation was found between core temperature and $T_{sk}$ ($r=0.02$). According to the correlations found,
clinicians may want to consider utilizing actual temperature ratings for EHI prevention versus the more typically used thermal perception ratings. This could be achieved using temperature education as an intervention method for EHI prevention.

In reference to EHI, these data suggest that humans are able to recognize elevation in $T_c$ levels from the beginning and throughout sustained exercise. The highest health risk appears to be immediately following exercise. It is possible that although people are able recognize increases in $T_c$, and even overestimate them, they may return to exercise/work too soon following a break when increasing $T_c$ is recognized. This is supported by the findings that participants underestimated $T_c$ immediately following exercise and continued to underestimate until 38˚C was reached. Much like this $T_c$ underestimation following exercise, previous research also found that humans’ perception of body water loss during physical activity is consistently underestimated (O’Neal et al., 2012; Passe et al., 2007). Together, these findings suggest that humans may not adequately recover following physical activity, which could lead to increased health risk.

The fact that participants were able to recognize elevated levels during exercise, though overestimating them, compares well with previous research that found that thermal sensation increases with exercise workload in the same environment (Goto et al., 2000). Instead of quantifying temperature, thermal
sensation is rated through temperature related words (i.e. very cold, cold, cool, slightly cool, neutral, slightly warm, warm, hot, very hot). However, this study found that after 15 minutes of exercise, thermal sensation exhibited a steady state response, unlike the increasing linear fashion of $T_c$ shown in the present study. This seems to indicate that thermal and sweat sensation may not be a suitable method for evaluating risk of EHI. This is unlike previous research, which credits both thermal comfort (Frank et al., 1999) and sweating sensation (Nielsen & Endrusick 1990) in being serviceable perceptual ratings in relation to $T_c$.

The evidence of a central governing system first proposed by St. Clair Gibson & Noakes (2004) that subconsciously works to prevent health risk was also of interest. Though many participants verbally expressed their ignorance of their current $T_c$ state, the fact that perceptions increased in such a linear fashion in a similar pattern to core temperature, though higher, suggests the possibility that this governor does indeed exist. In no way do these data prove its existence, but they do support the theory behind it. The overestimation of $T_c$ during exercise could work quite well in efforts of preventing the body from reaching dangerously high temperature levels. However, during cool down periods participants’ underestimation of $T_c$ levels are less promising. $T_{ps}$ did recognize elevated temperature levels as well as correlate with $T_c$. This is especially interesting due to the fact that previous research has shown perception of temperature to be independent of $T_c$ and more dependent on peripheral temperatures (Mower,
1976). Also, skin temperature itself has been proven to be a poor predictor of core temperature (Ganio et al., 2009; Jensen et al., 2000), and this was supported by no correlation found between $T_c$ and $T_{sk}$ in the present study ($r=0.02$). It is possible that since participants were unsure of core temperature and their ability to sense it, they were able to associate $T_{ps}$ with more of a sensory based ‘feeling.’ Due to the correlation between $T_{pc}$ and $T_c$, this ‘feeling’ may have been more related to $T_c$ than realized. Additionally, the overestimation of $T_{ps}$ following exercise could possibly be credited to how the body responds to $T_c$ and $T_{sk}$. Past literature reveals that the autonomic systems within body are more sensitive to changes in $T_c$ than $T_{sk}$ (Frank et al., 1999). The lack of sensitivity to $T_{sk}$ may impact our perceptions, causing the delay in the drop of $T_{ps}$ during recovery.

Future research is needed in the area of EHI prevention. Though the results in the present study provide some knowledge of how people may perceive $T_c$ variations during exercise, the small sample size limits its use. Though participants were able to recognize changes in $T_c$ and may lend support to aforementioned central governor theory, perceptual changes during recovery require further investigation as it relates to safe return to work/activity within hot environments. Due to the small variability of the surface area to mass ratio of the participants in this study, it is of interest to find if the same results would be found in populations with a higher level of variability. Future research is also needed to
bridge the gap between $T_{pc}$ and perceptions of health risk associated with that temperature. How individuals perceive $T_c$ changes in relation to their own health and safety are required to fully understand the relationship between $T_{pc}$ and EHI prevention.
### Table 1. Participant Demographics (N=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (yrs)</td>
<td>21.30 ± 2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Body Fat</td>
<td>17.37 ± 4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>27.56 ± 5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urine Specific Gravity</td>
<td>1.02 ± 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urine Color</td>
<td>3.60 ± 1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Perceptual Core Temperature Data (N=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Temp.</th>
<th>Perceived Core Temp. ± SD</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>37.88 ±0.61</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>38.10 ±0.81</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>38.63 ±0.69</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>38.83 ±0.58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>39.03 ±0.48</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>39.20 ±0.55</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>39.35 ±0.49</td>
<td>0.0498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>38.11 ±0.63</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>37.78 ±0.53</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>37.50 ±0.47</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>37.26 ±0.38</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Perceptual ratings were taken using 100mm scales.
Table 3. *Perceptual Skin Temperature Data* (N=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skin Temp ± SD</th>
<th>Perceived Skin Temp. ± SD</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.22 ±0.55</td>
<td>34.72 ±2.05</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.75 ±0.53</td>
<td>35.20 ±2.41</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.82 ±0.23</td>
<td>36.53 ±2.22</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.08 ±0.16</td>
<td>37.85 ±1.67</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.80 ±0.23</td>
<td>37.83 ±1.56</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.14 ±0.17</td>
<td>38.80 ±1.59</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.27 ±0.47</td>
<td>39.35 ±1.14</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.80 ±0.45</td>
<td>35.42 ±1.90</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.36 ±0.28</td>
<td>34.25 ±1.82</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.93 ±0.15</td>
<td>33.13 ±1.35</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.83 ±0.38</td>
<td>32.83 ±1.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Perceptual ratings were taken using 100mm scales

Table 4. *Thermal Comfort and Sweating Sensation* (N=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Temp.</th>
<th>Thermal Comfort ± SD</th>
<th>Sweating Sensation ± SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>36.63 ±22.91</td>
<td>37.36 ±35.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>46.60 ±29.61</td>
<td>52.60 ±33.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>54.50 ±27.88</td>
<td>73.80 ±26.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>64.50 ±28.96</td>
<td>84.10 ±18.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>68.60 ±12.16</td>
<td>86.40 ±14.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>78.30 ±12.92</td>
<td>88.30 ±12.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>85.80 ±10.16</td>
<td>93.90 ±7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>27.56 ±29.06</td>
<td>40.44 ±30.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>19.00 ±18.95</td>
<td>28.10 ±24.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>14.80 ±16.14</td>
<td>13.80 ±15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>8.90 ±13.74</td>
<td>7.80 ±8.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Perceptual ratings were taken using 100mm scales
Figure 1. Core VS Perceived Core Temperatures

Note. Vertical line at Data Collection Point 39 indicates stopping exercise

*Data collection points were recorded at core temperature changes of 0.25˚ Celsius
Figure 2. Skin VS Perceived Skin Temperatures

Note. Vertical line at Data Collection Point 39 indicates stopping exercise

*Data collection points were recorded at core temperature changes of 0.25°C
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