Title:

Effects of supervised high-intensity resistance and impact training or machine-based isometric training on regional bone geometry and strength in middle-aged and older men with low bone mass: The LIFTMOR-M semi-randomised controlled trial

Authors:

Amy T Harding, BExSc (Hons) ^{a, b}

Benjamin K Weeks, PhD ^{a, b}

Conor Lambert, PhD ^{a, b}

Steven L Watson, PhD ^{a, b}

Lisa J Weis, MBA ^c

Belinda R Beck, PhD ^{a, b, c}

Affiliations:

^a Menzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia

^b School of Allied Health Sciences, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia

^c The Bone Clinic, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

Corresponding author contact details:

Professor Belinda R. Beck, PhD

School of Allied Health Sciences, Griffith University, Gold Coast, QLD, AUSTRALIA, 4222

Phone: +61 (07) 5552 8793 Email: b.beck@griffith.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Few data exist on the effects of bone-targeted exercise on geometric and biomechanical indices of bone strength in men. The Lifting Intervention For Training Muscle and Osteoporosis Rehabilitation for Men (LIFTMOR-M) trial was designed to compare the efficacy and safety of two novel, supervised, twice-weekly, high-intensity exercise programs in middle-aged and older men with osteopenia and osteoporosis on musculoskeletal health and risk factors related to falls and fractures. The current report includes secondary outcomes of the LIFTMOR-M exercise intervention trial.

Purpose: Our goal was to determine the effects of two supervised, twice-weekly, high-intensity exercise programs on bone geometry and strength of the proximal femur, and distal and proximal sites of the tibia and radius in middle-aged and older men with osteopenia and osteoporosis.

Methods: Generally-healthy men (≥ 45 years), with low lumbar spine (LS) and/or proximal femur areal bone mineral density (aBMD), were recruited from the community. Eligible participants were randomised to either eight months of twice-weekly supervised high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training (HiRIT) or supervised machine-based isometric axial compression (IAC) exercise training. Intervention group outcomes were compared at baseline and eight months with a matched but non-randomised control group (CON) who self-selected to usual activities. DXA scans (Medix DR, Medilink, France) of the skeletally non-dominant proximal femur were analysed using 3D hip software (DMS Group, France) to derive femoral neck (FN) and total hip (TH) bone mineral content (BMC), volume, and volumetric bone mineral density (vBMD) for total, trabecular and cortical bone compartments. Total FN cortical thickness was determined as well as anterior, posterior, lateral and medial subregions. pQCT scans (XCT-3000, Stratec, Germany) of the 4 and 38% sites of the tibia, and 4 and 66% sites of the radius were conducted to determine a range of geometric and bone structural strength indices. Intervention effects were examined using univariate ANCOVA of percent change, and repeated measures ANCOVA of raw baseline and follow-up data, controlling for initial values, using intention-to-treat and per-protocol approaches.

Results: Ninety-three men (67.1 ± 7.5 yrs, 175.2 ± 6.7 cm, 82.1 ± 11.6 kg, 26.7 ± 3.5 kg/m²) with lower than average aBMD (LS T-score -0.06 ± 1.04 , FN T-score -1.58 ± 0.58 , TH T-score -1.00 ± 0.58) were recruited, and designated CON (n = 26) or randomised to HiRIT (n = 34) or IAC (n = 33). Compliance to the supervised exercise programs did not differ (HiRIT, $77.8 \pm 16.6\%$ versus IAC, $78.5 \pm 14.8\%$, $p = 0.872$). HiRIT improved medial FN cortical thickness compared with CON ($5.6 \pm 1.7\%$ versus $-0.1 \pm 1.9\%$, $p = 0.028$) and IAC ($5.6 \pm 1.7\%$ versus $0.7 \pm 1.7\%$, $p = 0.044$).

Distal tibia total BMC, vBMD, area and bone strength index, and trabecular BMC and bone strength index all declined for CON compared with maintenance for both HiRIT and IAC (all $p < 0.05$). HiRIT maintained distal tibia trabecular area compared with a loss in CON ($0.2 \pm 0.5\%$ versus $-1.6 \pm 0.5\%$, $p = 0.013$). HiRIT and IAC maintained distal radius total BMC compared with loss in CON ($-0.1 \pm 0.7\%$ versus $-3.7 \pm 0.8\%$, $p = 0.001$; $1.3 \pm 0.7\%$ versus $-3.7 \pm 0.8\%$, $p < 0.001$, respectively). HiRIT and IAC maintained distal radius total bone strength index compared with loss in CON ($1.4 \pm 1.4\%$ versus $-6.0 \pm 1.6\%$, $p = 0.001$; $0.2 \pm 1.3\%$ versus $-6.0 \pm 1.6\%$, $p = 0.004$, respectively). HiRIT reduced proximal radius cortical area compared with CON ($-3.1 \pm 1.0\%$ versus $1.1 \pm 1.2\%$, $p = 0.011$) and IAC ($-3.1 \pm 1.0\%$ versus $-0.2 \pm 1.0\%$, $p = 0.042$). No between-group differences were detected in any pQCT-derived bone outcome at the diaphyseal tibia 38% site.

Conclusion: Findings indicate that supervised HiRIT provides a positive stimulus to cortical bone at the medial FN compared with supervised IAC exercise, and both HiRIT and IAC preserve bone strength at the distal tibia and distal radius. These effects may translate into a reduced risk of lower and upper extremity fracture in middle-aged and older men with low bone mass.

Keywords:

Bone geometry; Exercise training; Fracture prevention; Older men; Osteoporosis; Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography

Abbreviations:

1RM, one repetition maximum; 3D, three-dimensional; aBMD, areal bone mineral density; BMC, bone mineral content; BMI, body mass index; BPAQ, Bone-specific Physical Activity Questionnaire; BSI, bone strength index; BW, body weight; CI, confidence interval; DXA, Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry; FN, femoral neck; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat; LIFTMOR-M, Lifting Intervention For Training Muscle and Osteoporosis Rehabilitation for Men; LS, lumbar spine; PP, per-protocol; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography; QCT, Quantitative Computed Tomography; SND, skeletally non-dominant; SSIp, polar strength strain index; TH, total hip; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density; vGRF, vertical ground reaction force.

1 1 Introduction

2 For every one standard deviation decrease in areal bone mineral density (aBMD) the incidence of
3 fracture increases two-fold ^[1], thus individuals with osteoporotic aBMD have the highest risk of
4 incident fracture. Nevertheless, most fragility fractures occur in individuals who are not classified
5 as osteoporotic from DXA-derived aBMD. For instance, data from a large population-based study
6 of postmenopausal Australian women over the age of 60 indicated around 70% of all low trauma
7 fractures occurred in women who did not meet the ≤ -2.5 aBMD T-score definition of osteoporosis.
8 In fact, 56.5% of fractures occurred in women with osteopenia and 16.6% in women with normal
9 aBMD ^[2]. The Dubbo Osteoporosis Epidemiology Study of community-dwelling men and women
10 aged over 60 similarly reported over half of fractures occur when aBMD is in the osteopenic (42%)
11 or normal (12%) range ^[3].

12
13 While the mineral density of bone provides primarily a surrogate estimate of whole bone mass and
14 strength, bone morphology (size, spatial distribution and shape) contributes directly to the ability of
15 a bone to resist fracture ^[4]. Imaging modalities beyond areal DXA such as Quantitative Computed
16 Tomography (QCT) and peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography (pQCT) are required to
17 quantify geometric parameters of bone strength, and to differentiate cortical and trabecular
18 compartments. Bone strength indices estimated from these 3D imaging technologies are able to
19 predict fragility fracture, sometimes with greater accuracy than aBMD alone. The Osteoporotic
20 Fractures in Men Study found that pQCT-derived bone geometry and strength parameters at the
21 radius and tibia were negatively associated with risk of incident osteoporotic fracture, even after
22 adjusting for DXA-derived femoral neck (FN) aBMD ^[5]. For example, each standard deviation
23 reduction in diaphyseal bone geometric parameters (total and cortical cross-sectional area, and
24 periosteal circumference) at the 33% site of the radius and tibia was associated with a 40-70%
25 increased risk of non-vertebral fragility fracture after adjusting for age, body mass index and FN
26 aBMD ^[5].

27

28 Few investigations of therapeutic exercise for bone have included bone morphology outcomes, and
29 male studies are rare. Only three trials including middle-aged and older men ^[6-8] and one mixed sex
30 trial ^[9] have been conducted with the goal to reduce risk of fragility fracture by modifying
31 geometric parameters of bone strength. The exercise protocols implemented in those studies varied
32 by mode, intensity, frequency and duration, and participant heterogeneity, and an absence of upper
33 limb involvement further limited the ability to translate findings into exercise recommendations to
34 optimise bone structure and strength in men. Thus, further examination of the response of bone
35 strength parameters to targeted exercise training in this demographic was required.

36

37 We have previously reported beneficial effects of high-intensity progressive resistance and impact
38 training (HiRIT) and machine-based isometric axial compression (IAC) training in the LIFTMOR-
39 M (Lifting Intervention For Training Muscle and Osteoporosis Rehabilitation for Men) semi-
40 randomised controlled trial preliminary findings on aBMD ^[10]. The aim of the present work was to
41 determine the effects of HiRIT or IAC exercise on geometric and biomechanical indices of strength
42 at the proximal femur, tibia and radius in middle-aged and older men with osteopenia and
43 osteoporosis, in comparison with a matched but self-selected control group who followed their
44 usual lifestyle activities during the trial. It was hypothesised that middle-aged and older men with
45 osteopenia and osteoporosis participating in supervised HiRIT would have greater improvements in
46 parameters of bone geometry and indices of bone biomechanical strength at the proximal femur,
47 tibia and radius than machine-based IAC training or control.

48

49 **2 Materials and Methods**

50 **2.1 Study design**

51 The LIFTMOR-M trial was a single-centre, three-arm, eight-month, semi-randomised controlled
52 exercise intervention trial. The study protocol has been published ^[11]. Study recruitment ran from
53 May 2016 to July 2018, and the intervention was completed by April 2019. Primary and secondary
54 outcomes of the LIFTMOR-M trial, including anthropometrics, aBMD, body composition, muscle
55 cross sectional area and density, functional performance, muscle strength, compliance and adverse
56 events (injuries, falls and fractures) have been reported ^[10] and are currently under review
57 elsewhere. The sample size was calculated based on the primary outcome DXA-derived femoral
58 neck aBMD. A total of 64 participants per group were required to detect 80% power, with $\alpha = 0.05$,
59 and accounting for a 20% dropout rate. The current report comprises the findings of analyses of
60 secondary outcomes including geometric and biomechanical indices of bone strength of the
61 proximal femur, and distal and proximal tibia and radius.

62
63 **2.2 Ethical approval**

64 All research activities were conducted in accordance with the *Declaration of Helsinki*. The trial was
65 registered on the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ANZCTR12616000344493),
66 and approved by the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee (AHS/07/14/HREC).
67 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

68
69 **2.3 Participants and allocation**

70 Participant recruitment and flow through the trial have been comprehensively described elsewhere
71 (manuscript under review). In brief, we recruited community-dwelling, middle-aged and older men
72 (≥ 45 years of age) with osteopenia (T-score -1.0 to -2.5) or osteoporosis (T-score below -2.5) at the
73 lumbar spine, FN and/or total hip (TH) from the Gold Coast and surrounding locale in Queensland,
74 Australia. Following trial registration, the originally stipulated minimum age of eligibility (being 50
75 years) was reduced to 45 years. Exclusion criteria were as follows: musculoskeletal or neurological

76 conditions affecting the ability to participate in high-intensity exercise, unstable cardiovascular or
77 respiratory disease, medical conditions or medications known to affect bone metabolism (with the
78 exception of calcium and vitamin D supplementation, and/or ≥ 12 months of stable dose
79 osteoporosis pharmacotherapy), metal implants, excessive radiation exposure, cancer, recent
80 fracture or lower extremity surgery, or current engagement in high-intensity resistance training
81 and/or high-impact-type exercise. High-impact exercise was defined as current, regular participation
82 in organised or structured high-intensity activity including impact such as plyometric-type training,
83 sprint training, fight sports and martial arts or Master's level competitive training. Eligible
84 participants were block randomised, stratified by the presence (≥ 12 months exposure) or absence
85 (lack of exposure) of osteoporosis pharmacotherapy with a 1:1 allocation ratio (block size of eight),
86 to either HiRIT or IAC using sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed, envelopes. The computer-
87 generated randomisation sequence was created by a researcher external to the trial, and the
88 allocation sequence was concealed from both the tester and participant until completion of the
89 initial testing session. It is not possible to blind participants to an exercise intervention, however,
90 neither study hypotheses nor an expectation of superiority of either exercise protocol was conveyed
91 to participants.

92

93 **2.4 Exercise interventions**

94 Detailed information on the exercise training protocols has been published elsewhere ^[11]. Sessions
95 were undertaken twice weekly, on non-consecutive days, for eight months in the School of Allied
96 Health Sciences, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia and supervised by a
97 qualified Exercise Scientist. Compliance with the allocated exercise program was recorded and
98 expressed as the percentage of the maximum possible 70 supervised training sessions over the
99 eight-month intervention period.

100

101 **2.4.1 *High-intensity progressive resistance and impact training program***

102 The compound movement, barbell-based resistance training component consisted of five sets of five
103 repetitions (≥ 80 -85% of one repetition maximum) of the three fundamental exercises, the deadlift,
104 squat and overhead press. Exercises were performed at a moderate contraction velocity (one second
105 concentric, two second eccentric), at a 2-0-1 tempo. Sets were interspersed with a one-minute rest.
106 During the initial two-week familiarisation period, low-load variants of the fundamental exercises
107 were performed, with a focus on technique development and spine sparing movement patterns (i.e.
108 learning the hip hinge and avoiding spine flexion). One repetition maximum (1RM) testing for the
109 deadlift and squat exercises were performed at weeks 12 and 24 to guide weight progression. Prior
110 to determination of 1RM, participants subjectively rated exercise intensity using the 6-20 point
111 Borg Rating of Perceived Exertion (RPE) Scale, aiming for an RPE of ≥ 16 which corresponds to
112 the high-intensity domain. The impact component consisted of five sets of five repetitions of
113 jumping chin-ups with a firm, flat-footed landing. Impact intensity was progressed by increasing
114 jump height and moving towards a more straight-legged landing with heel contact. Exercise order
115 was as follows: deadlifts, alternating sets of overhead press and impact, and lastly squats. Peak
116 vertical ground reaction force (vGRF) during landing for the jumping chin-up exercise was
117 determined in a random subgroup of HiRIT participants using a Leonardo Mechanograph Ground
118 Reaction Force Plate (Novotec Medical GmbH, Pforzheim, Germany). A transient increase in
119 vGRF with jumping chin-ups during landing approaching 7.27 ± 1.36 kN was observed,
120 corresponding to 10.43 ± 2.10 times body weight (BW) when normalised. Witzke and Snow ^[12]
121 provide guidelines for impact loading intensity domains using vGRF, with high-intensity impact
122 loading being $\geq$ four times BW, moderate-intensity two to four times BW, and low intensity $\leq$ two
123 times BW. Thus, jumping chin-up landings were within the high-intensity loading domain.

124

125 **2.4.2 *Isometric axial compression exercise program***

126 One self-initiated near-maximal five-second isometric contraction (≥ 80 -85% of 1RM) was
127 performed for the seated chest press, seated leg press, core and arm pull, and vertical lift on the

128 bioDensity™ (Performance Health Systems, Chicago, USA) machine. During the initial two-week
129 familiarisation period, low intensity repetitions were performed focusing on technique (at
130 approximately 50% of 1RM). Participants subjectively rated exercise intensity using the 6-20 point
131 RPE scale and were instructed to achieve an RPE of ≥ 16 in order to achieve a high-intensity
132 equivalent for each five-second isometric contraction. Integrated monitors provide real-time force
133 production feedback from load cells integrated in the machine, allowing modulation of the force
134 applied by the participant against fixed external resistance. Although the twice-weekly training
135 protocol implemented differs from the bioDensity™ manufacturer once-weekly recommendation, in
136 order to match treatment exposure (i.e. number of training sessions per week) with the HiRIT
137 group, we implemented twice-weekly supervised sessions.

138

139 2.5 Control group activities

140 A sample of age-matched men, recruited and screened using identical criteria to the two exercise
141 arms, but self-selecting to ‘no intervention’, formed a non-randomised parallel control group
142 (CON). CON participants were instructed to continue with their usual daily routines and not to alter
143 their physical activity levels during the eight-month trial period. In order to track alterations to
144 physical activity engagement and diet across the trial period, lifestyle diaries were issued in which
145 any relevant changes were documented.

146

147 2.6 Outcomes

148 All outcomes were assessed at baseline and eight months in the Bone Densitometry Research
149 Laboratory at Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia. The same investigator
150 performed and analysed all outcome measures. Analyses of pQCT and DXA scans were verified by
151 a blinded investigator.

152

153 **2.6.1 *Anthropometrics and lifestyle characteristics***

154 Height was assessed without shoes using the stretch stature method with a wall-mounted
155 stadiometer (Model 216, Seca, Hamburg, Germany). Weight in light clothing was measured using a
156 calibrated mechanical beam scale (Model 700, Seca, Hamburg, Germany). Body mass index (BMI)
157 was calculated as mass divided by height squared. Physical activity participation and daily calcium
158 intake were estimated using validated questionnaires. Lifetime exposure to osteogenic physical
159 activity was quantified with the Bone-specific Physical Activity Questionnaire (BPAQ), as
160 previously described ^[13]. Responses were scored using a custom-designed online program
161 (<http://www.fithdysign.com/BPAQ/>) to generate a total BPAQ score (tBPAQ) reflecting bone-
162 relevant exercise history. Daily calcium intake was estimated from a calcium-focused food
163 frequency questionnaire, the AusCal ^[14]. AusCal questionnaire responses were analysed using
164 Australian-specific dietary analysis software (FoodWorks Version 7, Xyris Software, Brisbane,
165 Australia).

166

167 **2.6.2 *Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry***

168 Standard DXA scans of the skeletally non-dominant proximal femur were performed (Medix DR,
169 Medilink, Maugeio, France). As previous findings have identified the *functionally* dominant lower
170 extremity is *skeletally* non-dominant (normally has lowest bone mass) ^[15], the functionally
171 dominant leg was examined. Daily scans of the manufacturer supplied phantom were undertaken
172 throughout the course of the study to maintain quality control.

173

174 Standard DXA scans of the proximal femur were analysed using three-dimensional (3D) hip
175 analysis software (DMS Imaging Group, Maugeio, France) to estimate parameters of content,
176 geometry and vBMD of the trabecular, cortical and total (trabecular plus cortical) bone
177 compartments for the FN and TH regions of interest. Parameters at the FN and TH included: total,
178 trabecular and cortical bone mineral content (BMC), volume and vBMD, along with mean total,
179 anterior, posterior, medial and lateral FN cortical thickness. The 3D hip software analysis algorithm

180 uses a statistical shape and density model of the proximal femur developed from a database of QCT
181 scans of Caucasian men and women ($n = 111$) to produce a subject-specific model of proximal
182 femur shape and density distribution, providing estimates of trabecular and cortical vBMD, and
183 cortical thickness ^[16]. The modelling pipeline is fully automated following the semi-automated
184 placement of three anatomical landmarks that are positioned on the standard DXA image of the
185 proximal femur. All analyses were performed in accordance with manufacturer guidelines.
186 Technical software details have been described elsewhere ^[16]. Correlation coefficients between 3D
187 hip software analysis and QCT of FN and TH trabecular vBMD ($r = 0.80-0.86$), cortical vBMD ($r =$
188 $0.85-0.93$), and mean cortical thickness ($r = 0.66-0.91$) were high ($n = 157$) ^[16]. In our laboratory,
189 the coefficients of variation for 3D hip outcomes range from 1.03% to 1.99% at the TH, 0.83% to
190 2.11% for the FN, and 1.55% to 2.71% for FN cortical thickness in a sample of men.

191

192 **2.6.3 *Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography***

193 Scans of the skeletally non-dominant leg and forearm were performed using pQCT (Stratec XCT-
194 3000, Medizintechnik GmbH, Pforzheim, Germany) to obtain geometric, volumetric and
195 biomechanical indices of bone strength; a detailed description of acquisition and analyses has been
196 published elsewhere ^[11]. Skeletal dominance was determined from functional dominance, with the
197 functionally dominant lower extremity being the skeletally non-dominant lower limb and the
198 functionally non-dominant upper extremity being the skeletally non-dominant upper limb ^[15]. Tibia
199 and forearm length were measured to the nearest millimetre with an anthropometric ruler. Tibial
200 length was measured as the distance from the medial tibial plateau to the tip of the medial
201 malleolus. Forearm length was measured as the distance from the tip of the olecranon process to the
202 tip of the ulnar styloid process. Briefly, we acquired two image slices of the tibia (4 and 38% of
203 tibial length proximal to the distal endplate) and two image slices of the radius (4 and 66% of radius
204 length proximal to the distal endplate). The scan parameters were voxel size, slice thickness and
205 scan speed of 0.5 mm, 2.3 mm, and 25 mm/sec, respectively. A planar scout view over the joint line
206 was acquired in order to place the anatomic reference line. Analyses were conducted using host

207 software (Version 6.20, Stratec Medizintechnik GmbH, Pforzheim, Germany). For the distal tibia
 208 and distal radius (4% site; trabecular bone dominant) bone outcomes were: total BMC, vBMD and
 209 area; trabecular BMC, vBMD and area; and total and trabecular bone strength index (BSI). Total
 210 and trabecular BSI were determined from measures of density and area where $BSI = \text{total density}^2 \times$
 211 total area, reflecting bone resistance to compression ^[17]. For the diaphyseal tibia (38% site; cortical
 212 bone dominant) and proximal radius (66% site; cortical bone dominant) bone outcomes were:
 213 cortical BMC, vBMD, area and thickness; periosteal and endocortical circumference; polar section
 214 modulus; and polar strength strain index (SSI_p). SSI_p reflects diaphyseal resistance to bending and
 215 torsional bone strength ^[17]. In our lab, the coefficients of variation for pQCT measures of the tibia
 216 range from 0.21% to 2.71%, and from 0.62% to 4.65% for the radius. Quality control was
 217 maintained with daily scanning of the manufacturer provided phantom across the intervention
 218 period, and all scans were performed by a single certified technician. Scans were reviewed for
 219 motion artefact and repeated if significant movement was detected for bone and soft tissue analysis
 220 in line with the qualitative grading scale developed by Blew and colleagues ^[18]. If artefact was
 221 present in the second scan (i.e. images graded four or five with movement streaking and/or
 222 disruption of cortical shell evident) the participant was excluded from undergoing a third pQCT
 223 scan in line with radiation exposure guidelines. Scans graded less than three were considered valid
 224 for inclusion. Overall, one radius scan at baseline for HiRIT and one follow-up radius scan for IAC
 225 were excluded due to motion artefact occurring during the first and second pQCT scans resulting in
 226 poor scan quality (i.e. graded four and five, respectively). We were unable to obtain baseline tibia
 227 and radius scans on five participants (CON n = 3, HiRIT n = 2) due to pQCT device maintenance at
 228 the time of testing. A comparison between those who did and those who did not undergo baseline
 229 pQCT revealed no differences in characteristics (data not reported). Thus, a total of 88 tibial scans
 230 (CON n = 23, HiRIT n = 32, IAC n = 33) and 87 radius scans (CON n = 23, HiRIT n = 31, IAC n =
 231 33) are included in the intention-to-treat analyses.

232

233 **2.7 Statistical analysis**

234 Statistical analyses were undertaken using SPSS statistical software version 25.0 (SPSS Inc., USA).
235 Descriptive statistics were generated for participant characteristics, biometrics and all dependent
236 variables. Between-group differences at baseline were compared using one-way analysis of variance
237 (ANOVA) for normally distributed continuous data, and Chi-Square (X^2) for categorical data.
238 Repeated measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to determine main effects using
239 raw baseline and follow-up data, and univariate ANCOVA was conducted to analyse percent
240 change. Initial values were applied as a covariate if a significant difference was detected between-
241 groups at baseline. To adjust for multiple comparisons, Fisher’s LSD method was applied. For
242 intention-to-treat (ITT) analyses all randomised participants were included regardless of withdrawal
243 or compliance, with imputation of the mean percentage change value for the specific group
244 employed in the case of missing follow-up data. Per-protocol (PP) exploratory analyses were also
245 undertaken including HiRIT and IAC participants who achieved $\geq 70\%$ training program
246 compliance. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

247

248 **3 Results**

249 **3.1 Participant characteristics at baseline**

250 Participant flow through the study is presented in Figure 1. In total, 93 eligible participants
251 underwent the full suite of testing at baseline; 26 were designated CON, or randomly assigned to
252 HiRIT (n = 34) or IAC (n = 33). At baseline, the combined sample averaged 67.1 ± 7.5 years,
253 weighed 82.1 ± 11.6 kg, and was 175.2 ± 6.7 cm tall. Five participants designated CON were lost to
254 follow-up (could not be contacted at the time of follow-up testing [n = 4], or withdrew due to
255 musculoskeletal injury [n = 1]). A total of 60 participants (HiRIT n = 30, IAC n = 30) completed the
256 supervised exercise training arms of the LIFTMOR-M trial. Three withdrew from HiRIT due to:
257 medical condition or injury unrelated to the intervention (n = 2), and lack of interest (n = 1). One
258 HiRIT participant was lost to follow-up due to death in a motor vehicle accident. Three IAC
259 participants withdrew (travel and family commitments [n = 2], or medical condition unrelated to the
260 intervention [n = 1]).

261

262

263 **Figure 1.** CONSORT diagram of participant flow through the LIFTMOR-M study. Abbreviations:

264 DXA, Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry; FN, femoral neck; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive

265 resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat; LS,

266 lumbar spine; PP, per-protocol; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography; TH, total

267 hip.

268

269 Participant characteristics at baseline are presented in Table 1. At baseline, CON exhibited higher
270 FN aBMD, T-score, trabecular vBMD and total vBMD, and TH trabecular vBMD and total vBMD
271 than HiRIT and IAC. Distal tibia (4% site) total BMC, total vBMD and total BSI, distal radius (4%
272 site) total BMC, and proximal radius (66% site) cortical BMC, area and thickness were also higher
273 for CON than HiRIT and IAC. Distal radius trabecular BSI was higher for CON than IAC.
274 Proximal radius SSIP was higher for CON than HiRIT. Any potential influence of those differences
275 was managed by controlling for initial values in relevant analyses of treatment effects.
276
277 Compliance to the training programs did not differ between groups (HiRIT $77.8 \pm 16.6\%$ versus
278 IAC $78.5 \pm 14.8\%$, $p = 0.872$). When only those who achieved $\geq 70\%$ training compliance were
279 included in the comparison, the lack of difference in compliance remained between HiRIT ($85.9 \pm$
280 6.2% , $n = 23$) and IAC ($84.5 \pm 7.4\%$, $n = 24$) ($p = 0.466$).
281

282 Table 1. Participant characteristics at baseline, mean ± SD (n = 93)

Characteristic	Control (n = 26)	HiRIT (n = 34)	IAC (n = 33)	p-value
Age, years	67.4 ± 6.3	64.9 ± 8.6	69.0 ± 6.8	0.072
Weight, kg	81.6 ± 10.0	83.4 ± 11.7	81.2 ± 12.9	0.720
Height, cm	176.0 ± 7.3	175.2 ± 7.0	174.6 ± 6.1	0.712
BMI, kg/m ²	26.3 ± 2.8	27.2 ± 3.5	26.6 ± 4.0	0.636
Osteoporosis medication, n (%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.9%)	2 (6.1%)	0.444 ^a
Alendronate	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (3.0%)	
Denosumab	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (3.0%)	
Ethnicity, n (%)				
Caucasian	26 (100.0%)	33 (97.1%)	31 (93.9%)	0.618 ^a
Asian	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (3.0%)	
Eurasian	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.0%)	
aBMD, g/cm ²				
Lumbar spine	1.153 ± 0.190	1.072 ± 0.154	1.082 ± 0.171	0.158
Femoral neck	0.832 ± 0.085	0.781 ± 0.083	0.758 ± 0.080	0.004 *
Total hip	0.996 ± 0.100	0.947 ± 0.107	0.948 ± 0.088	0.105
T-score, SD				
Lumbar spine	0.27 ± 1.15	-0.22 ± 0.95	-0.17 ± 1.03	0.149
Femoral neck	-1.28 ± 0.57	-1.62 ± 0.56	-1.78 ± 0.54	0.004 *
Total hip	-0.80 ± 0.58	-1.08 ± 0.62	-1.07 ± 0.51	0.125
Total BPAQ, unitless	39.9 ± 21.4	27.2 ± 20.1	34.3 ± 21.9	0.073
Calcium intake, mg/day	743 ± 426	897 ± 412	1019 ± 603	0.108
Supplementation, n (%)	4 (15.4%)	4 (11.8%)	5 (15.2%)	0.896 ^a

283 Abbreviations: aBMD, areal bone mineral density; BMI, body mass index; BPAQ, Bone-specific Physical
284 Activity Questionnaire; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric
285 axial compression.

286 ^a X² test. ^b Calcium and/or vitamin D supplementation. * Between-group difference (p ≤ 0.05).

3.2 Eight-month change in DXA-derived 3D hip analysis outcomes at the proximal femur

Eight-month change in 3D hip analysis outcomes are presented in Table 2 (FN), Table 3 (TH), and Table 4 (FN cortical thickness) from ITT analyses. There were no between-group differences in FN or TH BMC, volume and vBMD percent change detected from univariate ANCOVA or absolute change from RMANCOVA. Univariate ANCOVA revealed HiRIT improved percent change in FN medial cortical thickness more than CON ($5.6 \pm 1.7\%$ versus $-0.1 \pm 1.9\%$, $p = 0.028$) and IAC ($5.6 \pm 1.7\%$ versus $0.7 \pm 1.7\%$, $p = 0.044$) (Figure 2). Within-group analyses indicated that CON improved FN trabecular ($0.70 \pm 0.31 \text{ cm}^3$, $p = 0.027$) and total volume ($0.75 \pm 0.32 \text{ cm}^3$, $p = 0.024$), and TH trabecular ($2.63 \pm 0.92 \text{ cm}^3$, $p = 0.005$) and total volume ($2.39 \pm 1.00 \text{ cm}^3$, $p = 0.019$). HiRIT improved FN cortical volume ($0.09 \pm 0.05 \text{ cm}^3$, $p = 0.041$). There were no within-group effects in 3D hip analysis outcomes following IAC. Within-group analyses revealed HiRIT improved total cortical thickness ($0.04 \pm 0.02 \text{ mm}$, $p = 0.049$) as well as FN medial cortical thickness ($0.10 \pm 0.03 \text{ mm}$, $p = 0.002$).

Results of the PP analyses of 3D hip outcomes (including participants with $\geq 70\%$ compliance, $n = 73$) are presented for the FN in Supplemental Table 1, and the TH in Supplemental Table 2. No between-group differences were detected at the FN or TH, and the within-group change in FN cortical volume was no longer significant for HiRIT. PP analyses of FN cortical thickness (including participants with $\geq 70\%$ compliance, $n = 73$) revealed no significant between- or within-group differences (Supplemental Table 3).

309

310 **Figure 2.** Eight-month percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in cortical thickness for the (A) total femoral
 311 neck, and (B) femoral neck subregions of the skeletally non-dominant proximal femur. ITT data n =
 312 93; Control n = 26, HiRIT n = 34, IAC n = 33. * Indicates within-group change from baseline ($p \leq$
 313 0.05); Indicates between-group difference in percent change ($p \leq 0.05$): † HiRIT versus Control, #
 314 HiRIT versus IAC. Abbreviations: DXA, Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry; HiRIT, high-intensity
 315 progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-
 316 treat.

317

Table 2. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in 3D hip analysis outcomes at the femoral neck (ITT analysis, n = 93)

	Control (n = 26)			HiRIT (n = 34)			IAC (n = 33)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Trabecular</i>										
BMC, g	2.70 ± 0.53	2.81 ± 0.47	6.4 ± 6.7 (-7.0, 19.8)	2.51 ± 0.49	2.57 ± 0.57	3.5 ± 5.9 (-8.2, 15.2)	2.59 ± 0.70	2.77 ± 0.88	11.4 ± 6.0 (-0.5, 23.3)	0.639
Volume, cm³	15.50 ± 2.91	16.20 ± 2.83*	5.4 ± 2.2 (1.0, 9.8)	15.93 ± 2.56	16.20 ± 2.67	1.9 ± 2.0 (-2.0, 5.7)	16.78 ± 2.61	17.08 ± 2.57	2.5 ± 2.0 (-1.4, 6.5)	0.468
vBMD, g/cm³	0.176 ± 0.032^	0.177 ± 0.034	3.0 ± 3.9 (-4.7, 10.6) ^a	0.159 ± 0.025^	0.161 ± 0.035	1.3 ± 3.3 (-5.2, 7.8) ^a	0.154 ± 0.032^	0.161 ± 0.039	4.7 ± 3.4 (-2.0, 11.4) ^a	0.768
<i>Cortical</i>										
BMC, g	1.56 ± 0.38	1.61 ± 0.37	4.6 ± 2.6 (-0.7, 9.8)	1.49 ± 0.31	1.54 ± 0.31	4.4 ± 2.3 (-0.2, 9.0)	1.52 ± 0.28	1.57 ± 0.27	4.2 ± 2.4 (-0.5, 8.9)	0.995
Volume, cm³	2.64 ± 0.63	2.69 ± 0.58	3.1 ± 2.0 (-0.9, 7.0)	2.57 ± 0.49	2.66 ± 0.48*	4.2 ± 1.7 (0.8, 7.7)	2.66 ± 0.50	2.66 ± 0.40	1.2 ± 1.8 (-2.3, 4.7)	0.462
vBMD, g/cm³	0.592 ± 0.042	0.601 ± 0.043	1.6 ± 2.5 (-3.3, 6.6)	0.578 ± 0.046	0.578 ± 0.035	0.2 ± 2.2 (-4.1, 4.5)	0.575 ± 0.047	0.594 ± 0.110	3.6 ± 2.2 (-0.7, 8.0)	0.542
<i>Total</i>										
BMC, g	4.26 ± 0.82	4.42 ± 0.73	5.2 ± 4.5 (-3.8, 14.2)	4.00 ± 0.71	4.11 ± 0.74	3.5 ± 4.0 (-4.3, 11.4)	4.12 ± 0.87	4.33 ± 1.06	7.9 ± 4.0 (0.0, 15.9)	0.734
Volume, cm³	18.14 ± 3.43	18.88 ± 3.32*	4.9 ± 2.0 (1.0, 8.8)	18.50 ± 2.92	18.86 ± 3.04	2.1 ± 1.7 (-1.3, 5.5)	19.44 ± 3.04	19.74 ± 2.81	2.2 ± 1.7 (-1.2, 5.7)	0.497
vBMD, g/cm³	0.236 ± 0.032^	0.237 ± 0.033	2.0 ± 2.6 (-3.2, 7.2) ^a	0.217 ± 0.027^	0.220 ± 0.034	1.3 ± 2.2 (-3.1, 5.7) ^a	0.212 ± 0.029^	0.219 ± 0.039	3.1 ± 2.3 (-1.4, 7.6) ^a	0.844

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

[^] Between-group difference at baseline $p \leq 0.05$. * Within-group change from baseline $p \leq 0.05$.

^a Adjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Table 3. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in 3D hip analysis outcomes at the total hip (ITT analysis, n = 93)

	Control (n = 26)			HiRIT (n = 34)			IAC (n = 33)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Trabecular</i>										
BMC, g	15.06 ± 2.44	15.19 ± 2.45	1.2 ± 3.8 (-6.4, 8.8)	14.21 ± 2.59	14.30 ± 2.81	1.8 ± 3.3 (-4.9, 8.4)	14.29 ± 3.52	14.85 ± 3.46	6.3 ± 3.4 (-0.4, 13.1)	0.522
Volume, cm ³	91.62 ± 14.26	94.25 ± 13.24*	3.3 ± 1.1 (1.2, 5.4)	93.04 ± 14.86	94.21 ± 15.35	1.4 ± 0.9 (-0.5, 3.2)	97.45 ± 13.32	98.69 ± 12.47	1.5 ± 0.9 (-0.3, 3.4)	0.338
vBMD, g/cm ³	0.167 ± 0.027^	0.163 ± 0.026	-0.2 ± 3.1 (-6.5, 6.0) ^a	0.154 ± 0.021^	0.154 ± 0.030	0.4 ± 2.7 (-4.9, 5.7) ^a	0.146 ± 0.027^	0.151 ± 0.030	3.0 ± 2.8 (-2.5, 8.5) ^a	0.707
<i>Cortical</i>										
BMC, g	10.76 ± 1.89	10.73 ± 1.98	-0.2 ± 2.7 (-5.6, 5.3)	9.97 ± 1.87	10.12 ± 1.55	3.0 ± 2.4 (-1.7, 7.8)	10.49 ± 1.54	10.87 ± 1.74	4.6 ± 2.4 (-0.2, 9.4)	0.425
Volume, cm ³	16.76 ± 2.99	16.54 ± 2.92	-1.0 ± 1.7 (-4.3, 2.3)	15.89 ± 2.64	16.31 ± 2.27	3.5 ± 1.4 (0.6, 6.3)	16.83 ± 2.51	16.93 ± 2.38	0.9 ± 1.5 (-2.0, 3.9)	0.125
vBMD, g/cm ³	0.645 ± 0.059	0.651 ± 0.053	1.1 ± 2.5 (-3.9, 6.2)	0.627 ± 0.062	0.620 ± 0.039	-0.6 ± 2.2 (-5.0, 3.7)	0.625 ± 0.057	0.648 ± 0.113	4.1 ± 2.2 (-0.4, 8.6)	0.320
<i>Total</i>										
BMC, g	25.82 ± 3.87	25.91 ± 3.85	0.5 ± 3.1 (-5.7, 6.6)	24.18 ± 4.14	24.41 ± 4.07	2.1 ± 2.7 (-3.2, 7.5)	24.77 ± 4.71	25.71 ± 4.79	5.3 ± 2.7 (-0.1, 10.8)	0.483
Volume, cm ³	108.38 ± 16.78	110.77 ± 15.89*	2.5 ± 1.0 (0.6, 4.4)	108.93 ± 17.13	110.52 ± 17.25	1.6 ± 0.8 (-0.1, 3.3)	114.28 ± 15.48	115.61 ± 14.33	1.4 ± 0.9 (-0.3, 3.1)	0.658
vBMD, g/cm ³	0.240 ± 0.031^	0.235 ± 0.026	0.2 ± 2.5 (-4.8, 5.2) ^a	0.223 ± 0.026^	0.223 ± 0.034	0.1 ± 2.1 (-4.1, 4.4) ^a	0.217 ± 0.028^	0.223 ± 0.036	2.3 ± 2.2 (-2.0, 6.7) ^a	0.735

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

[^] Between-group difference at baseline $p \leq 0.05$. * Within-group change from baseline $p \leq 0.05$.

^a Adjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Table 4. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in 3D hip analysis of femoral neck cortical thickness (ITT analysis, n = 93)

	Control (n = 26)			HiRIT (n = 34)			IAC (n = 33)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
Total, mm	1.20 $\pm$ 0.18	1.19 $\pm$ 0.16	-0.1 $\pm$ 2.0 (-4.0, 3.9)	1.15 $\pm$ 0.15	1.19 $\pm$ 0.14*	3.9 $\pm$ 1.7 (0.5, 7.4)	1.15 $\pm$ 0.13	1.15 $\pm$ 0.14	0.1 $\pm$ 1.8 (-3.4, 3.6)	0.203
<i>Subregion</i>										
Anterior, mm	0.98 $\pm$ 0.17	0.99 $\pm$ 0.18	1.8 $\pm$ 2.5 (-3.2, 6.7)	0.97 $\pm$ 0.15	0.98 $\pm$ 0.15	1.4 $\pm$ 2.2 (-2.9, 5.7)	0.94 $\pm$ 0.12	0.94 $\pm$ 0.15	1.5 $\pm$ 2.2 (-2.9, 5.9)	0.993
Posterior, mm	0.98 $\pm$ 0.17	0.99 $\pm$ 0.17	2.1 $\pm$ 3.2 (-4.3, 8.4)	0.97 $\pm$ 0.17	1.00 $\pm$ 0.16	4.7 $\pm$ 2.8 (-0.9, 10.2)	0.93 $\pm$ 0.13	0.91 $\pm$ 0.18	-0.7 $\pm$ 2.8 (-6.3, 4.9)	0.398
Lateral, mm	0.65 $\pm$ 0.16	0.61 $\pm$ 0.15	-4.6 $\pm$ 3.9 (-12.3, 3.1)	0.58 $\pm$ 0.11	0.59 $\pm$ 0.11	4.5 $\pm$ 3.4 (-2.2, 11.2)	0.61 $\pm$ 0.11	0.60 $\pm$ 0.14	-1.6 $\pm$ 3.4 (-8.5, 5.2)	0.190
Medial, mm	2.09 $\pm$ 0.31	2.08 $\pm$ 0.27	-0.1 $\pm$ 1.9 (-3.9, 3.7)	2.01 $\pm$ 0.26	2.11 $\pm$ 0.26*	5.6 $\pm$ 1.7 (2.3, 8.9)†#	2.04 $\pm$ 0.23	2.04 $\pm$ 0.22	0.7 $\pm$ 1.7 (-2.6, 4.1)	0.048

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat.

* Within-group change from baseline $p \leq 0.05$.

Between-group difference in % change $p \leq 0.05$: † HiRIT vs Control, # HiRIT vs IAC. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

3.3 Eight-month change in pQCT-derived outcomes at the tibia 4% and 38% sites

Eight-month change in pQCT-derived outcomes at the distal tibia (4% site) are presented in Table 5 and Figure 3 (ITT). HiRIT effects were superior to CON for distal tibia total BMC ($0.1 \pm 0.3\%$ versus $-3.0 \pm 0.4\%$, $p < 0.001$), total vBMD ($0.0 \pm 0.3\%$ versus $-0.8 \pm 0.3\%$, $p = 0.050$), total area ($0.0 \pm 0.4\%$ versus $-2.1 \pm 0.5\%$, $p = 0.001$), total BSI ($0.1 \pm 0.4\%$ versus $-3.9 \pm 0.5\%$, $p < 0.001$), trabecular BMC ($0.4 \pm 0.4\%$ versus $-1.8 \pm 0.5\%$, $p = 0.001$), trabecular area ($0.2 \pm 0.5\%$ versus $-1.6 \pm 0.5\%$, $p = 0.013$), and trabecular BSI ($0.7 \pm 0.5\%$ versus $-1.9 \pm 0.6\%$, $p = 0.001$). IAC maintained or lost less than CON in distal tibia total BMC ($-0.4 \pm 0.3\%$ versus $-3.0 \pm 0.4\%$, $p < 0.001$), total vBMD ($0.3 \pm 0.2\%$ versus $-0.8 \pm 0.3\%$, $p = 0.006$), total area ($-0.7 \pm 0.4\%$ versus $-2.1 \pm 0.5\%$, $p = 0.027$), total BSI ($0.0 \pm 0.4\%$ versus $-3.9 \pm 0.5\%$, $p < 0.001$), trabecular BMC ($-0.4 \pm 0.4\%$ versus $-1.8 \pm 0.5\%$, $p = 0.038$) and trabecular BSI ($-0.1 \pm 0.5\%$ versus $-1.9 \pm 0.6\%$, $p = 0.013$). Within-group analyses indicated CON lost distal tibia total BMC (-11.80 ± 1.44 mg, $p < 0.001$), total vBMD (-2.49 ± 0.88 mg/cm³, $p = 0.006$), total area (-25.47 ± 5.95 mm², $p < 0.001$), total BSI (-0.05 ± 0.01 g²/cm⁴, $p < 0.001$), trabecular BMC (-4.90 ± 1.27 mg, $p < 0.001$), trabecular area (-15.80 ± 5.37 mm², $p = 0.004$) and trabecular BSI (-0.02 ± 0.00 g²/cm⁴, $p < 0.001$). No within-group changes were observed for HiRIT or IAC in ITT analysis of distal tibia outcomes. Results of the PP analyses (participants with $\geq 70\%$ compliance) for distal tibia 4% site outcomes are presented in Supplemental Table 4, and largely reflect findings from the ITT analyses.

302

The results of the ITT analysis of intervention effects on pQCT-derived outcomes at the diaphyseal tibia (38% site) are presented in Table 6 and results of PP analyses are presented in Supplemental Table 5; no between- or within-group differences were detected in either case.

306

307

308 **Figure 3.** Eight-month percent change (mean ± SE) in pQCT-derived (A) total, and (B) trabecular
309 bone outcomes at the skeletally non-dominant distal tibia (4% site). ITT analyses, n = 88 (n = 93 – 5
310 participants who did not undergo pQCT tibia scans at baseline); Control n = 23, HiRIT n = 32, IAC
311 n = 33. * Indicates within-group change from baseline (p ≤ 0.05); † Indicates between-group
312 difference in % change (p ≤ 0.05): † HiRIT versus Control, ‡ IAC vs Control. Abbreviations: BMC,
313 bone mineral content; BSI, bone strength index; CSA, cross-sectional area; HiRIT, high-intensity
314 progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-
315 treat; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral
316 density.

317

Table 5. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in pQCT-derived outcomes at the distal tibia 4% site (ITT analysis, n = 88)

	Control (n = 23)			HiRIT (n = 32)			IAC (n = 33)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Tibia 4% site</i>										
Total BMC, mg	404.86 ± 46.17^	393.21 ± 45.27*	-3.0 ± 0.4 (-3.8, -2.2) ^a	363.10 ± 48.60^	362.96 ± 47.99	0.1 ± 0.3 (-0.6, 0.7) ^{a†}	377.46 ± 51.28^	376.42 ± 54.18	-0.4 ± 0.3 (-1.0, 0.3) ^{a‡}	< 0.001
Total vBMD, mg/cm ³	327.35 ± 35.02^	324.90 ± 36.28*	-0.8 ± 0.3 (-1.4, -0.2) ^a	302.22 ± 35.43^	302.16 ± 35.14	0.0 ± 0.3 (-0.5, 0.5) ^{a†}	300.45 ± 41.88^	301.43 ± 42.06	0.3 ± 0.2 (-0.2, 0.8) ^{a‡}	0.022
Total area, mm ²	1245.84 ± 157.49	1220.37 ± 159.99*	-2.1 ± 0.5 (-3.1, -1.1)	1209.94 ± 163.91	1209.06 ± 158.84	0.0 ± 0.4 (-0.8, 0.8) [†]	1266.63 ± 158.58	1257.76 ± 157.96	-0.7 ± 0.4 (-1.5, 0.1) [‡]	0.005
Total BSI, g ² /cm ⁴	1.33 ± 0.23^	1.28 ± 0.23*	-3.9 ± 0.5 (-4.8, -2.9) ^a	1.11 ± 0.24^	1.10 ± 0.24	0.1 ± 0.4 (-0.7, 0.9) ^{a†}	1.15 ± 0.28^	1.15 ± 0.29	0.0 ± 0.4 (-0.8, 0.8) ^{a‡}	< 0.001
Trabecular BMC, mg	275.24 ± 39.57	270.34 ± 39.17*	-1.8 ± 0.5 (-2.8, -0.8)	254.07 ± 41.74	254.88 ± 40.34	0.4 ± 0.4 (-0.4, 1.3) [†]	260.57 ± 39.14	259.64 ± 40.18	-0.4 ± 0.4 (-1.2, 0.4) [‡]	0.005
Trabecular vBMD, mg/cm ³	275.16 ± 28.80	274.81 ± 29.39	-0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.6, 0.3)	258.59 ± 31.97	259.30 ± 31.80	0.3 ± 0.2 (-0.1, 0.7)	254.49 ± 36.02	255.29 ± 35.97	0.3 ± 0.2 (0.0, 0.7)	0.209
Trabecular area, mm ²	1005.92 ± 142.43	990.13 ± 144.37*	-1.6 ± 0.5 (-2.7, -0.6)	987.31 ± 145.28	987.70 ± 140.03	0.2 ± 0.5 (-0.7, 1.1) [†]	1031.99 ± 143.04	1024.19 ± 141.45	-0.7 ± 0.4 (-1.6, 0.2)	0.043
Trabecular BSI, g ² /cm ⁴	0.76 ± 0.16	0.75 ± 0.15*	-1.9 ± 0.6 (-3.0, -0.8)	0.66 ± 0.17	0.67 ± 0.17	0.7 ± 0.5 (-0.2, 1.7) [†]	0.67 ± 0.17	0.67 ± 0.17	-0.1 ± 0.5 (-1.0, 0.9) [‡]	0.002

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; BSI, bone strength index; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography

[^] Between-group difference at baseline $p \leq 0.05$. * Within-group change from baseline $p \leq 0.05$.

Between-group difference in % change $p \leq 0.05$: [†] HiRIT vs Control, [‡] IAC vs Control. ^a Adjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Note: 5 participants (Control n = 3, HiRIT n = 2) did not undergo pQCT tibia scans at baseline.

Table 6. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in pQCT-derived outcomes at the diaphyseal tibia 38% site (ITT analysis, n = 88)

	Control (n = 23)			HiRIT (n = 32)			IAC (n = 33)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Tibia 38% site</i>										
Cortical BMC, mg	405.42 ± 41.38	403.36 ± 40.39	-0.5 ± 0.3 (-1.1, 0.2)	393.68 ± 50.63	393.63 ± 50.80	0.0 ± 0.3 (-0.6, 0.5)	388.76 ± 40.32	389.85 ± 40.15	0.3 ± 0.3 (-0.2, 0.8)	0.203
Cortical vBMD, mg/cm ³	1141.93 ± 26.64	1141.05 ± 25.84	-0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.5, 0.3)	1143.46 ± 27.86	1143.68 ± 29.27	0.0 ± 0.2 (-0.3, 0.4)	1144.32 ± 25.87	1144.68 ± 26.29	0.0 ± 0.2 (-0.3, 0.4)	0.903
Cortical area, mm ²	355.12 ± 36.06	353.61 ± 35.50	-0.4 ± 0.3 (-1.1, 0.3)	344.11 ± 42.41	343.89 ± 41.61	0.0 ± 0.3 (-0.6, 0.5)	340.02 ± 37.25	340.82 ± 36.45	0.3 ± 0.3 (-0.3, 0.8)	0.333
Cortical thickness, mm	6.27 ± 0.60	6.26 ± 0.60	-0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.6, 0.3)	5.92 ± 0.75	5.93 ± 0.75	0.0 ± 0.2 (-0.4, 0.4)	5.92 ± 0.57	5.93 ± 0.55	0.2 ± 0.2 (-0.2, 0.6)	0.561
Periosteal circumference, mm	76.46 ± 4.26	76.28 ± 4.24	-0.2 ± 0.2 (-0.5, 0.1)	76.85 ± 3.71	76.82 ± 3.66	0.0 ± 0.1 (-0.3, 0.2)	76.14 ± 4.33	76.22 ± 4.35	0.1 ± 0.1 (-0.2, 0.4)	0.286
Endocortical circumference, mm	37.03 ± 5.51	36.92 ± 5.53	-0.3 ± 0.2 (-0.8, 0.1)	39.62 ± 5.06	39.59 ± 5.11	-0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.5, 0.3)	38.96 ± 5.10	38.98 ± 5.09	0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.3, 0.5)	0.465
Polar section modulus, mm ²	2167.58 ± 318.23	2153.83 ± 327.75	-0.6 ± 0.6 (-1.9, 0.7)	2181.03 ± 328.20	2193.44 ± 326.24	0.6 ± 0.5 (-0.5, 1.7)	2130.13 ± 350.06	2138.53 ± 353.84	0.4 ± 0.5 (-0.7, 1.5)	0.326
SSI _p , mm ³	2068.22 ± 293.97	2045.95 ± 299.67	-1.0 ± 0.6 (-2.2, 0.1)	2083.44 ± 321.89	2081.98 ± 317.50	0.0 ± 0.5 (-1.0, 0.9)	2039.15 ± 315.16	2046.31 ± 317.70	0.4 ± 0.5 (-0.6, 1.3)	0.148

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography; SSI_p, polar strength strain index; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Note: 5 participants (Control n = 3, HiRIT n = 2) did not undergo pQCT tibia scans at baseline.

318 3.4 Eight-month change in pQCT-derived outcomes at the radius 4% and 66% sites

319 Results of the univariate ANCOVA for eight-month percent change in pQCT-derived outcomes at
320 the distal radius (4% site) are presented in Table 7 and Figure 4 (ITT). HiRIT protected the distal
321 radius from the notable loss observed in CON in total BMC ($-0.1 \pm 0.7\%$ versus $-3.7 \pm 0.8\%$, $p =$
322 0.001) and total BSI ($1.4 \pm 1.4\%$ versus $-6.0 \pm 1.6\%$, $p = 0.001$). Similarly, IAC preserved distal
323 radius total BMC ($1.3 \pm 0.7\%$ versus $-3.7 \pm 0.8\%$, $p < 0.001$) and total BSI ($0.2 \pm 1.3\%$ versus -6.0
324 $\pm 1.6\%$, $p = 0.004$) compared to losses in CON. Significant within-group differences from baseline
325 to follow-up clearly demonstrate the loss in distal radius total BMC (-5.34 ± 1.05 mg, $p < 0.001$)
326 and total BSI (-0.03 ± 0.01 g²/cm⁴, $p < 0.001$) in CON.

327
328 Percent change in pQCT-derived outcomes at the proximal radius (66% site), with between-group
329 differences from univariate ANCOVA, are presented in Table 8 (ITT). HiRIT lost proximal radius
330 cortical area compared with CON ($-3.1 \pm 1.0\%$ versus $1.1 \pm 1.2\%$, $p = 0.012$) and IAC ($-3.1 \pm 1.0\%$
331 versus $-0.2 \pm 1.0\%$, $p = 0.042$). Significant within-group losses from baseline to follow up were
332 evident in HiRIT in proximal radius cortical BMC (-3.04 ± 1.05 mg, $p = 0.005$) and cortical area ($-$
333 3.15 ± 0.96 mm², $p = 0.002$) but no within-group effects were detected for CON or IAC at the
334 proximal radius.

335
336 Results of PP analyses of eight-month change in pQCT-derived outcomes at the distal radius (4%
337 site) are presented in Supplemental Table 6 and largely reflect findings of the ITT analyses. HiRIT
338 maintained distal radius total BMC ($0.1 \pm 0.9\%$ versus $-3.6 \pm 0.9\%$, $p = 0.003$) and total BSI ($2.2 \pm$
339 1.8 versus $-5.1 \pm 1.8\%$, $p = 0.006$) compared to a loss for CON, while IAC maintained total BMC
340 ($0.6 \pm 0.8\%$ versus $-3.6 \pm 0.9\%$, $p = 0.001$) compared to a loss for CON. For PP analyses at the
341 proximal radial (66% site) there were no differences between groups in percent change, and the
342 within-group decline in cortical BMC (-2.68 ± 1.30 mg, $p = 0.043$) and area (-2.82 ± 1.22 mm², $p =$
343 0.024) remained significant for HiRIT (Supplemental Table 7).

344

345

346 **Figure 4.** Eight-month percent change (mean ± SE) in pQCT-derived (A) total, and (B) trabecular
 347 bone outcomes at the skeletally non-dominant distal radius (4% site). ITT analyses, n = 87 (n = 93 –
 348 5 participants who did not undergo pQCT at baseline and 1 scan excluded due to motion artefact);
 349 Control n = 23, HiRIT n = 31, IAC n = 33. * Indicates within-group change from baseline ($p \leq$
 350 0.05); Indicates between-group difference in % change ($p \leq 0.05$): † HiRIT versus Control, ‡ IAC
 351 vs Control. Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; BSI, bone strength index; CSA, cross-
 352 sectional area; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric
 353 axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography;
 354 vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

355

356

Table 7. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in pQCT-derived outcomes at the distal radius 4% site (ITT analysis, n = 87)

	Control (n = 23)			HiRIT (n = 31)			IAC (n = 33)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Radius 4% site</i>										
Total BMC, mg	138.95 ± 20.39^	132.98 ± 17.45*	-3.7 ± 0.8 (-5.3, -2.1) ^a	126.48 ± 18.89^	126.57 ± 19.96	-0.1 ± 0.7 (-1.4, 1.3) ^{a†}	123.20 ± 19.62^	124.86 ± 19.06	1.3 ± 0.7 (0.0, 2.6) ^{a‡}	< 0.001
Total vBMD, mg/cm ³	348.29 ± 55.36	340.27 ± 53.01	-1.9 ± 1.6 (-5.0, 1.3)	334.62 ± 56.21	338.30 ± 48.49	1.5 ± 1.4 (-1.2, 4.2)	334.88 ± 56.71	328.97 ± 47.80	-1.3 ± 1.3 (-3.9, 1.4)	0.208
Total area, mm ²	407.75 ± 82.09	399.74 ± 74.44	-1.2 ± 1.9 (-4.9, 2.5)	382.65 ± 56.22	378.61 ± 60.93	-0.9 ± 1.6 (-4.1, 2.4)	375.23 ± 74.06	384.15 ± 62.13	3.4 ± 1.6 (0.2, 6.5)	0.098
Total BSI, g ² /cm ⁴	0.48 ± 0.10	0.45 ± 0.10*	-6.0 ± 1.6 (-9.1, -2.8)	0.43 ± 0.12	0.43 ± 0.11	1.4 ± 1.4 (-1.3, 4.2) [†]	0.42 ± 0.12	0.42 ± 0.11	0.2 ± 1.3 (-2.5, 2.9) [‡]	0.002
Trabecular BMC, mg	67.48 ± 17.58	66.31 ± 15.73	-0.6 ± 2.7 (-6.0, 4.8)	59.47 ± 13.35	59.03 ± 14.95	-0.4 ± 2.3 (-5.0, 4.3)	57.67 ± 15.73	59.89 ± 13.67	5.5 ± 2.3 (1.0, 10.1)	0.118
Trabecular vBMD, mg/cm ³	231.51 ± 32.07	229.75 ± 32.36	-0.7 ± 0.7 (-2.1, 0.6)	218.77 ± 35.92	218.82 ± 34.94	0.1 ± 0.6 (-1.0, 1.3)	216.83 ± 36.28	217.49 ± 36.66	0.3 ± 0.6 (-0.8, 1.4)	0.447
Trabecular area, mm ²	293.41 ± 71.16	291.00 ± 66.30	0.4 ± 2.7 (-4.9, 5.7)	273.59 ± 51.79	270.10 ± 53.96	-0.5 ± 2.3 (-5.1, 4.1)	268.45 ± 67.37	277.69 ± 56.17	5.2 ± 2.2 (0.8, 9.7)	0.170
Trabecular BSI, g ² /cm ⁴	0.16 ± 0.05^	0.15 ± 0.05	-0.4 ± 2.9 (-6.2, 5.5) ^a	0.13 ± 0.04^	0.13 ± 0.05	-0.3 ± 2.5 (-5.2, 4.6) ^a	0.13 ± 0.05^	0.13 ± 0.05	5.4 ± 2.4 (0.6, 10.2) ^a	0.183

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; BSI, bone strength index; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

[^] Between-group difference at baseline $p \leq 0.05$. * Within-group change from baseline $p \leq 0.05$.

Between-group difference in % change $p \leq 0.05$: [†] HiRIT vs Control, [‡] IAC vs Control.

^a Adjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Note: 5 participants (Control n = 3, HiRIT n = 2) did not undergo pQCT radius scans at baseline, and 1 baseline scan was excluded due to motion artefact (HiRIT, n = 1).

Table 8. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in pQCT-derived outcomes at the proximal radius 66% site (ITT analysis, n = 87)

	Control (n = 23)			HiRIT (n = 31)			IAC (n = 33)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Radius 66% site</i>										
Cortical BMC, mg	112.19 ± 19.32^	111.36 ± 17.58	0.6 ± 1.3 (-1.9, 3.2) ^a	97.31 ± 20.98^	94.92 ± 20.87*	-2.9 ± 1.1 (-5.1, -0.7) ^a	100.37 ± 18.18^	100.05 ± 15.02	0.2 ± 1.0 (-1.8, 2.3) ^a	0.057
Cortical vBMD, mg/cm ³	1074.09 ± 42.78	1069.03 ± 42.92	-0.5 ± 0.3 (-1.1, 0.2)	1051.54 ± 44.18	1052.73 ± 47.11	0.1 ± 0.3 (-0.5, 0.7)	1052.21 ± 47.96	1056.55 ± 45.78	0.4 ± 0.3 (-0.1, 1.0)	0.125
Cortical area, mm ²	104.10 ± 15.10^	103.87 ± 13.77	1.1 ± 1.2 (-1.3, 3.6) ^a	92.15 ± 17.98^	89.69 ± 17.33*	-3.1 ± 1.0 (-5.1, -1.0) ^{a†#}	95.19 ± 15.94^	94.55 ± 12.82	-0.2 ± 1.0 (-2.1, 1.8) ^a	0.025
Cortical thickness, mm	2.64 ± 0.50^	2.64 ± 0.47	1.5 ± 1.6 (-1.7, 4.6) ^a	2.29 ± 0.48^	2.26 ± 0.47	-1.6 ± 1.4 (-4.3, 1.1) ^a	2.35 ± 0.47^	2.33 ± 0.45	-0.6 ± 1.3 (-3.2, 2.0) ^a	0.361
Periosteal circumference, mm	48.29 ± 3.47	48.15 ± 3.21	-0.2 ± 0.9 (-2.1, 1.6)	47.77 ± 4.56	47.21 ± 4.80	-1.1 ± 0.8 (-2.7, 0.4)	48.44 ± 4.37	48.60 ± 4.29	0.5 ± 0.8 (-1.1, 2.0)	0.349
Endocortical circumference, mm	31.71 ± 5.61	31.61 ± 5.22	0.0 ± 1.7 (-3.4, 3.4)	33.39 ± 5.50	33.06 ± 5.77	-0.8 ± 1.5 (-3.8, 2.1)	33.66 ± 6.04	33.97 ± 6.34	1.2 ± 1.4 (-1.7, 4.0)	0.619
Polar section modulus, mm ²	494.83 ± 85.13	498.94 ± 74.12	1.3 ± 1.7 (-2.2, 4.7)	440.53 ± 108.13	433.80 ± 96.43	-0.4 ± 1.5 (-3.4, 2.6)	461.36 ± 90.24	450.41 ± 75.59	-1.6 ± 1.5 (-4.5, 1.3)	0.447
SSIp, mm ³	437.78 ± 86.62^	438.55 ± 77.29	2.2 ± 1.6 (-0.9, 5.3) ^a	376.05 ± 98.47^	370.07 ± 92.97	-1.6 ± 1.3 (-4.2, 1.1) ^a	395.36 ± 79.11^	386.48 ± 62.85	-1.5 ± 1.3 (-4.0, 1.1) ^a	0.138

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; ITT, intention-to-treat; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography; SSIp, polar strength strain index; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

[^] Between-group difference at baseline p $\leq$ 0.05. * Within-group change from baseline p $\leq$ 0.05.

Between-group difference in % change p $\leq$ 0.05: † HiRIT vs Control, # HiRIT vs IAC.

^a Adjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Note: 5 participants (Control n = 3, HiRIT n = 2) did not undergo pQCT radius scans at baseline, and 1 baseline scan was excluded due to motion artefact (HiRIT, n = 1).

357 4 Discussion

358 The LIFTMOR-M trial was the first study to examine the effects of eight months of supervised
359 high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training (HiRIT) or machine-based isometric axial
360 compression (IAC) exercise on geometric and biomechanical indices of bone strength at the tibia,
361 radius and proximal femur in middle-aged and older men with osteopenia and osteoporosis. The
362 supervised HiRIT program was well-tolerated and associated with only two minor musculoskeletal
363 events, while the IAC program was associated with three minor musculoskeletal events that were
364 slightly more serious than for HiRIT. It is likely the familiarisation period to learn correct technique
365 and full supervision across the trial period accounts for the observed safety of the programs, ,
366 however, HiRIT effected the most positive bone strength outcomes. In general, HiRIT improved
367 medial FN cortical thickness more than IAC and CON, and preserved distal tibia and radius indices
368 of bone strength compared to CON, but decreased cortical area at the proximal radial 66% site
369 compared with IAC and CON. IAC reduced loss in some indices of bone strength at the distal tibia
370 and radius compared with CON, but did not notably enhance outcomes at any skeletal site. By
371 contrast, CON lost distal tibia bone strength despite continuing with habitual activity (not including
372 high-intensity resistance training and/or high-impact-type activity) over the eight-month trial
373 period. The superior effect of HiRIT over IAC and CON on aBMD at the LS and proximal femur,
374 body composition, calcaneal bone quality, physical function and muscle strength outcomes have
375 been reported elsewhere ^[10].

376

377 4.1 Proximal femur

378 HiRIT improved medial FN cortical thickness compared to CON, and IAC. HiRIT also appeared to
379 increase FN cortical volume, and total and medial FN cortical thickness compared to baseline
380 values, but IAC did not improve any proximal femur geometry outcome. Morphological adaptation
381 at the proximal femur following impact training ^[6], resistance training ^[9] or combined impact and
382 resistance training ^[7] has been previously reported in a limited number of exercise intervention trials
383 conducted in men. In the Hip Hop study (within-subject unilateral impact intervention), 12-months

384 of daily hopping increased QCT-derived mid-FN cross-sectional area in the exercise limb by +2.0%
385 in men aged 65 to 80 years ^[6]. Curiously, mid-FN cross-sectional area also increased by +2.1% in
386 the contralateral ‘unloaded’ limb, assigned as control, so that no difference between exercise and
387 control limbs was observed. Thus, the 2.7-3 times BW forces detected during landing,
388 corresponding to moderate-intensity impact loading intensity (i.e. 2-4 times BW ^[12]), appeared to be
389 insufficient to enhance bone geometry to a greater extent than muscle-related loading associated
390 with fixing the ‘non-exercise’ side in hip flexion during hopping. A short-term male and female
391 exercise trial of barbell-based squats and deadlifts improved FN cortical volume (+1.6%), whereas
392 standing cable-based hip adduction and abduction (cable cuff attached at ankle) improved
393 trochanteric cortical volume (+4.1%), but combined squat, deadlift, hip adduction and abduction
394 training did not result in a significant change in cortical volume at either site ^[9]. The somewhat non-
395 intuitive reported findings of no effect for combined barbell- and cable-based training may be
396 attributable to the trial period being of an insufficient duration (four months) to detect bone changes
397 despite training frequency (thrice-weekly) and intensity (relatively high) being matched for the
398 three training arms of the study. Furthermore, it is difficult to compare findings with the current
399 study given the sample was younger (22-55 years) and no sex-specific analyses were conducted ($\approx$
400 59% of the sample were women). In 50-79 year old men with normal to osteopenic aBMD, 18
401 months of thrice-weekly weight-bearing impact and progressive resistance training induced a net
402 1.8% benefit in FN cross-sectional area (from standard two-dimensional DXA scans using Lunar
403 Advanced Hip Analysis software) compared to no exercise, but no effect for any QCT-derived
404 cortical bone structure or strength outcome at the mid-shaft of the femur ^[7]. It is plausible that the
405 lack of exercise effect at the femoral mid-shaft may have been influenced by moderate exercise
406 program adherence (63%) and the variable impact intensity (1.5-9.7 times BW) and resistance
407 training intensity that varied from moderate to high across the trial period.
408
409 Although we observed between- and within-group differences in FN cortical bone volume and
410 thickness in favour of HiRIT, no effects on proximal femur cortical BMC and vBMD, or trabecular

bone outcome, were detected at eight months. Our observations may suggest that high-intensity resistance training in combination with high-impact exercise may preferentially affect the cortical bone compartment, potentially via periosteal apposition, reduced endocortical bone loss or both. There is data to suggest that the contribution of trabecular bone to bone strength in the FN is low and cortical bone is the major contributor to bone strength at this site ^[19], thus the changes observed following HiRIT are highly clinically relevant. Given cortical bone thickness at the proximal femur is positively associated with FN failure loads ($r = 0.34$, $p < 0.05$) ^[20], our observation of HiRIT-induced improvements in total cortical thickness and FN cortical thickness for the medial subregion is suggestive of fracture prevention benefits. Similarly our observation that HiRIT improved FN cortical volume, in light of previous observations that lower FN cortical volume is associated with greater likelihood of hip fracture in men over the age of 65 years ^[21], also suggests HiRIT will confer a reduced risk of fracture. Notably, our HiRIT-induced improvements in FN cortical volume and total cortical thickness in middle-aged and older men are comparable with the changes reported for the identical HiRIT program in postmenopausal women ^[22].

425

426 4.2 Tibia

There have been only a limited number of exercise studies of men to report tibial outcomes; two trials involving middle-aged to older men ^[7, 8], and two examining young adult male military recruits ^[23, 24]. While the military studies have shown short-duration (≤ 13 -weeks) military training enhances the tibia of young adult male recruits, the relevance of such intensive training is questionable for middle-aged and older adults with reduced bone mass at increased risk of fracture. Furthermore, high-volume military training is associated with an elevated risk of bone stress injury, limiting translation to previously sedentary older adult populations. A five-month trial of lower extremity targeted high-intensity resistance and plyometric training was implemented in male sprint athletes aged 40-85 years alongside their usual sprint training, and comparisons were drawn with those continuing with their habitual training schedule ^[8]. While no change in pQCT-derived distal tibia (5% site) bone outcomes was observed, the intervention group had a net 2% improvement in

438 tibial mid-shaft (50% site) cortical thickness. Again, comparability with the current study is limited
439 given their sample included men with a long-term masters sprint training background (including
440 national and international level competitors) representing a considerably more physically active
441 group than our sample of men aged 45-81 years, and their relatively short trial period.
442 Our CON group (no resistance training or impact-type activity) lost bone and bone strength at the
443 predominantly trabecular distal tibia (4% site), while the HiRIT and IAC groups maintained distal
444 tibia bone and bone strength. However, no within- or between-group differences were observed in
445 the predominantly cortical bone of the tibial diaphysis at the 38% site. The latter observation is
446 consistent with findings of an 18-month trial of combined weight-bearing impact exercise and
447 progressive resistance training in men aged 50-79 years ^[7], the only intervention study to include
448 tibial outcomes. Despite a ten month longer trial duration than ours, and training frequency being
449 higher (thrice-weekly), no exercise effect was observed in QCT-derived total, cortical and
450 medullary area, or cortical vBMD, at the mid-shaft of the tibia; no predominantly trabecular site
451 was examined. As men with osteoporosis (i.e. FN or total hip T-score ≤ -2.5) were excluded, it is
452 not possible to determine if an exercise effect would have occurred in those with lower initial BMD,
453 given the osteogenic response to exercise is typically greatest in those with the lowest initial values
454 ^[25]. In fact, it is not clear from either study if the tibial diaphysis is unaffected by even high
455 intensity exercise training, or if QCT (including pQCT) is insufficiently sensitive to detect change.
456 In light of the fact that BSI (a composite measure of area and density) at the distal tibia predicts
457 85% of the variance in failure load when loaded in compression ^[17], maintenance of distal tibia total
458 and trabecular BSI through HiRIT and IAC likely confers resistance to fracture at this site. Indeed,
459 evidence from several population-based studies indicate that lower pQCT-derived indices of bone
460 strength at the distal tibia are associated with a higher low trauma fracture risk in men ^[5, 26], thus,
461 preservation of bone strength at this site is clinically important.
462

463 4.3 Radius

464 As there have been no other trials of resistance training alone or in combination with impact loading
465 exercise that include upper extremity outcomes in middle-aged and older men, it is not possible to
466 compare our findings with those of others. A six-month, twice-weekly, supervised exercise program
467 designed specifically to load the wrist (incorporating push-ups and isolated wrist flexion) in
468 postmenopausal women aged 52-72 years, did not provide a measurable osteogenic stimulus at the
469 predominantly cortical proximal radius site, but improved distal radius cortical cross-sectional area
470 (2.8%) and BMC (3.2%), however, the reverse effect was seen for trabecular BMC (-3.4%) [27]. It is
471 likely that the loading intensity of the exercises was minimal and not of a progressive nature
472 (repetition number progressed from 10 to 25, but not load which was maintained at 0.5 kg), thereby
473 applying insufficient mechanical stimulus to notably sustain an adaptive bone stimulus at the non-
474 weight bearing upper extremity.

475 The reductions in distal radius total BMC and BSI observed in the CON group resulted in a
476 between-group effect in favour of HiRIT and IAC which amounted to a preservation of bone, rather
477 than notable gain. Thus, it appears that HiRIT and IAC attenuated loss of bone mass and strength at
478 the distal radius. As BMC at the distal radius is a significant predictor of failure load during a
479 simulated fall on an outstretched hand ($r^2 = 0.79$, $p < 0.001$) [28], simple maintenance of bone at the
480 site would be advantageous in the prevention wrist fracture. In light of other positive bone
481 adaptations following HiRIT, the loss of proximal radius (66% site) cortical BMC and area was
482 non-intuitive and difficult to interpret, but may be a function of insufficient statistical power (i.e.
483 cortical BMC 49.0%; cortical area 68.7%) and a number of outlier values. When outliers were
484 statistically identified and excluded (1.5 x the interquartile range from the quartiles, in line with
485 Tukey's outlier detection method) the between-group differences in cortical area at the proximal
486 radial 66% site were no longer significant. Our observations are otherwise largely consistent with
487 the null findings from a meta-analysis of two studies reporting the effect of site-specific upper body
488 exercise on upper extremity bone structure and strength in postmenopausal women [29].

489

490 4.4 Strengths and limitations

491 There are several strengths to this study including the unique focus on middle-aged and older men
492 with osteopenia and osteoporosis, high participant compliance to training, and the comprehensive
493 assessment of bone morphology and biomechanical strength at appendicular sites. Furthermore, this
494 is the first study in men to document site-specific effects in both the upper and lower extremity on
495 bone geometry and strength from 3D analysis of DXA and pQCT following high-intensity exercise.
496 Given lack of time has been identified as a major barrier to exercise engagement in older adults ^[30],
497 the time-efficient nature of the exercise intervention (30 minutes, twice-weekly) provides an
498 attractive alternative to more time-consuming programs typically recommended for osteoporosis.
499 However, several limitations of the current study warrant acknowledgement. First, the target sample
500 size was not met despite an extensive recruitment strategy being implemented over a two-year
501 period. A low dropout rate optimised the sample size achieved and where power was low,
502 significant within-group improvements for HiRIT in 3D hip outcomes were greater than the
503 coefficient of variation for the corresponding measure, revealing effects beyond measurement error.
504 Second, the men enrolled in the study were relatively healthy community-dwelling men, limiting
505 findings to a similar demographic. The fact that only a small number of potential participants were
506 excluded due to having 'normal' bone mass (i.e. T-score > -1.0) after undergoing preliminary phone
507 screening likely reflects specifically targeting men with low bone mass during recruitment, and we
508 believe our sample was largely representative of aBMD in the general population. And finally, the
509 study was not a fully randomised controlled trial, as controls were allowed to self-select to their
510 group and continue with their habitual lifestyle patterns. Our decision to engage a parallel control
511 group was guided by our experiences during piloting of the trial, whereby participants randomised
512 to 'sham' home-based low-intensity exercise independently initiated other novel exercise programs
513 (including high-intensity resistance training) external to the study activities. Furthermore, we felt it
514 was unethical to randomise individuals at increased risk of fragility fracture to a no-exercise group,
515 potentially withholding an effective therapy and thereby placing them at increased risk of harm.
516 Therefore, the study design was adopted for pragmatic and ethical reasons.

517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528

5 Conclusions

In conclusion, our findings demonstrate that the supervised HiRIT program, incorporating multi-joint, compound movement, high-intensity progressive resistance training and high-impact jumping exercise improved or maintained indices of bone strength at the tibia and proximal femur in middle-aged and older men. Machine-based IAC exercise did not result in any significant improvement in bone strength at any skeletal site examined, but may mitigate age-related loss of indices of bone strength at the distal tibia and radius. Injuries and dropout rates for both exercise interventions were low, and compliance was comparable. Dose response investigations are indicated to determine optimal exercise prescription of HiRIT to enhance bone strength and risk factors for falls and fractures in middle-aged and older men.

529 Acknowledgements:

530 The authors would like to sincerely thank all participants who took part in the study for their
531 valuable contribution, and Osteoporosis Australia for the bioDensity™ equipment grant.

532 Authors' roles:

533 Study design – ATH, BKW, SLW, LJW, and BRB. Study conduct - ATH, BKW, SLW, and BRB.
534 Exercise intervention supervision – ATH. Data collection – ATH, and CL. Data analysis - ATH,
535 BKW, CL, SLW, and BRB. Data interpretation - ATH, BKW, CL, SLW, and BRB. All authors
536 revised the manuscript for intellectual content and approved the final version of the manuscript.
537 ATH, BKW, and BRB take responsibility for the integrity of the data analysis.

538 Declaration of interest:

539 BRB and LJW are Directors of The Bone Clinic, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. ATH, BKW, CL,
540 and SLW declare that they have no conflict of interest.

541 Registration:

542 Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ANZCTR12616000344493).

543 Protocol:

544 The full trial protocol has been published – Harding, A. T., Weeks, B. K., Watson, S. L., and Beck,
545 B. R. The LIFTMOR–M (Lifting Intervention For Training Muscle and Osteoporosis Rehabilitation
546 for Men) trial: Protocol for a semi-randomised controlled trial of supervised targeted exercise to
547 reduce risk of osteoporotic fracture in older men with low bone mass. BMJ Open (Rehabilitation
548 Medicine), 2017, 7 (e014951); doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014951

549 Funding:

550 Performance Health Systems (Northbrook, IL, USA) supplied and installed the bioDensity™
551 isometric exercise machine through an equipment grant brokered by Osteoporosis Australia (no
552 grant number provided). This work was supported by a 2016 Sports Medicine Australian Research
553 Foundation Grant supported the purchase of HiRIT training equipment (no grant number provided).
554 This study was part of a PhD project. ATH and CL were supported by an Australian Government

555 Research Training Program Scholarship. The above funding sources had no role in the design of the
556 study, analyses or interpretation of the data, or in writing the manuscript.

557

558 **References**

559

560 [1] M.H. Edwards, K. Jameson, H. Denison, N.C. Harvey, A.A. Sayer, E.M. Dennison, C. Cooper,
561 Clinical risk factors, bone density and fall history in the prediction of incident fracture among men
562 and women, *Bone* 52(2) (2013) 541-547.

563 [2] J.A. Pasco, E. Seeman, M.J. Henry, E.N. Merriman, G.C. Nicholson, M.A. Kotowicz, The
564 population burden of fractures originates in women with osteopenia, not osteoporosis, *Osteoporosis*
565 *international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for*
566 *Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 17 (2006) 1404-1409.

567 [3] J.R. Center, Fracture burden: What two and a half decades of Dubbo Osteoporosis
568 Epidemiology Study data reveal about clinical outcomes of osteoporosis, *Curr Osteoporos Rep*
569 15(2) (2017) 88-95.

570 [4] P. Ammann, R. Rizzoli, Bone strength and its determinants, *Osteoporosis international : a*
571 *journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and*
572 *the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 14(Suppl 3) (2003) 13-18.

573 [5] Y. Sheu, J.M. Zmuda, R.M. Boudreau, M.A. Petit, K.E. Ensrud, D.C. Bauer, C.L. Gordon, E.S.
574 Orwo, J.A. Cauley, Bone strength measures by peripheral quantitative computed tomography and
575 the risk of nonvertebral fractures: The Osteoporotic Fractures in Men (MrOS) study, *Journal of*
576 *bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral*
577 *Research* 26(1) (2011) 63-71.

578 [6] S.J. Allison, K.E. Poole, G.M. Treece, A.H. Gee, C. Tonkin, W.J. Rennie, K. Brooke-Wavell,
579 The influence of high impact exercise on cortical and trabecular bone mineral content and 3D
580 distribution across the proximal femur in older men: A randomised controlled unilateral
581 intervention, *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for*
582 *Bone and Mineral Research* 30(9) (2015) 1709-16.

583 [7] S. Kukuljan, C.A. Nowson, K.M. Sanders, G.C. Nicholson, M.J. Seibel, J. Salmon, R.M. Daly,
584 Independent and combined effects of calcium-vitamin D3 and exercise on bone structure and
585 strength in older men: An 18-month factorial design randomized controlled trial, *The Journal of*
586 *clinical endocrinology and metabolism* 96(4) (2011) 955-63.

587 [8] T.H. Suominen, M.T. Korhonen, M. Alen, A. Heinonen, A. Mero, T. Tormakangas, H.
588 Suominen, Effects of a 20-week high-intensity strength and sprint training program on tibial bone
589 structure and strength in middle-aged and older male sprint athletes: a randomized controlled trial,
590 *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European*
591 *Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 28(9) (2017)
592 2663-2673.

593 [9] T.F. Lang, I.H. Saeed, T. Streeper, J. Carballido-Gamio, R.J. Harnish, L.A. Frassetto, S.M. Lee,
594 J.D. Sibonga, J.H. Keyak, B.A. Spiering, C.M. Grodzinsky, J.J. Bloomberg, P.R. Cavanagh, Spatial
595 heterogeneity in the response of the proximal femur to two lower-body resistance exercise

596 regimens, *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for*
597 *Bone and Mineral Research* 29(6) (2014) 1337-45.

598 [10] A.T. Harding, B.K. Weeks, L.J. Weis, C. Lambert, S.L. Watson, B.R. Beck, Bone-targeted
599 exercise for older men with osteopenia and osteoporosis: LIFTMOR For Men trial preliminary
600 findings, *Med Sci Sport Exer* 51(6) (2019) 211.

601 [11] A.T. Harding, B.K. Weeks, S.L. Watson, B.R. Beck, The LIFTMOR-M (Lifting Intervention
602 For Training Muscle and Osteoporosis Rehabilitation for Men) trial: Protocol for a semirandomised
603 controlled trial of supervised targeted exercise to reduce risk of osteoporotic fracture in older men
604 with low bone mass, *BMJ open* 7(6) (2017) e014951.

605 [12] K.A. Witzke, C.M. Snow, Effects of plyometric jump training on bone mass in adolescent
606 girls, *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 32(6) (2000) 1051-1057.

607 [13] B.K. Weeks, B.R. Beck, The BPAQ: A bone-specific physical activity assessment instrument,
608 *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European*
609 *Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 19(11) (2008)
610 1567-1577.

611 [14] B.R. Beck, B.K. Weeks, T.L. Norling, A novel Australian calcium-specific diet questionnaire:
612 Validity and reliability, *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation*
613 *between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of*
614 *the USA* 22 (2011) S626-S627.

615 [15] B.R. Beck, B.K. Weeks, Which limb to scan? Revisiting the relationship between functional
616 and skeletal limb dominance, *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the*
617 *American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 25(S306) (2010).

618 [16] L. Humbert, Y. Martelli, R. Fonolla, M. Steghofer, S. Di Gregorio, J. Malouf, J. Romera, L.M.
619 Barquero, 3D-DXA: Assessing the femoral shape, the trabecular macrostructure and the cortex in
620 3D from DXA images, *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 36(1) (2017) 27-39.

621 [17] S.A. Kontulainen, J.D. Johnston, D. Lui, C. Leung, T.R. Oxland, H.A. McKay, Strength
622 indices from pQCT imaging predict up to 85% of variance in bone failure properties at tibial
623 epiphysis and diaphysis, *Journal of Musculoskeletal & Neuronal Interactions* 8(4) (2008) 401-409.

624 [18] R.M. Blew, V.R. Lee, J.N. Farr, D.J. Schiferl, S.B. Going, Standardizing evaluation of pQCT
625 image quality in the presence of subject movement: Qualitative versus quantitative assessment,
626 *Calcif Tissue Int* 94(2) (2014) 202-211.

627 [19] G. Holzer, G. von Skrbensky, L.A. Holzer, W. Pichl, Hip fractures and the contribution of
628 cortical versus trabecular bone to femoral neck strength, *Journal of bone and mineral research : the*
629 *official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 24(3) (2009) 468-74.

630 [20] V. Bousson, A. Le Bras, F. Roqueplan, Y. Kang, D. Mitton, S. Kolta, C. Bergot, W. Skalli, E.
631 Vicaud, W. Kalender, K. Engelke, J.D. Laredo, Volumetric quantitative computed tomography of
632 the proximal femur: Relationships linking geometric and densitometric variables to bone strength.
633 Role for compact bone, *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation*
634 *between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of*
635 *the USA* 17 (2006) 855-864.

636 [21] D.M. Black, M.L. Bouxsein, L.M. Marshall, S.R. Cummings, T.F. Lang, J.A. Cauley, K.E.
637 Ensrud, C.M. Nielson, E.S. Orwoll, Proximal femoral structure and the prediction of hip fracture in

638 men: A large prospective study using QCT, Journal of bone and mineral research : the official
639 journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research 23(8) (2009) 1326-33.

640 [22] S.L. Watson, B.K. Weeks, L.J. Weis, A.T. Harding, S.A. Horan, B.R. Beck, High-intensity
641 resistance and impact training improves bone mineral density and physical function in
642 postmenopausal women with osteopenia and osteoporosis: The LIFTMOR randomized controlled
643 trial, Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone
644 and Mineral Research 33(2) (2018) 211-220.

645 [23] R.M. Izard, W.D. Fraser, C. Negus, C. Sale, J.P. Greeves, Increased density and periosteal
646 expansion of the tibia in young adult men following short-term arduous training, Bone 88 (2016)
647 13-9.

648 [24] T.J. O'Leary, R.M. Izard, N.P. Walsh, J.C.Y. Tang, W.D. Fraser, J.P. Greeves, Skeletal macro-
649 and microstructure adaptations in men undergoing arduous military training, Bone 125 (2019) 54-
650 60.

651 [25] K. Winters-Stone, C.M. Snow, Initial values predict musculoskeletal reponse to exercise in
652 premenopausal women, Med Sci Sports Exerc 35(10) (2003) 1691-1696.

653 [26] M.M.L. Laaksonen, H. Sievänen, S. Tolonen, V. Mikkilä, L. Räsänen, J. Viikari, T. Lehtimäki,
654 M. Kähönen, O.T. Raitakari, The Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns Study Group, Determinants
655 of bone strength and fracture incidence in adult Finns: Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns Study
656 (the GENDI pQCT study), Archives of Osteoporosis 5(1-2) (2010) 119–130.

657 [27] S. Adami, D. Gatti, V. Braga, D. Bianchini, M. Rossini, Site-specific effects of strength
658 training on bone structure and geometry of ultradistal radius in postmenopausal women, Journal of
659 bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral
660 Research 14(1) (1999) 120-4.

661 [28] M.E. Muller, C.E. Webber, M.L. Bouxsein, Predicting the failure load of the distal radius,
662 Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European
663 Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 14(4) (2003)
664 345-352.

665 [29] I. Polidoulis, J. Beyene, A.M. Cheung, The effect of exercise on pQCT parameters of bone
666 structure and strength in postmenopausal women: A systematic review and meta-analysis of
667 randomized controlled trials, Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of
668 cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis
669 Foundation of the USA 23(1) (2012) 39-51.

670 [30] I.B. Rodrigues, J.J. Armstrong, J.D. Adachi, J.C. MacDermid, Facilitators and barriers to
671 exercise adherence in patients with osteopenia and osteoporosis: A systematic review, Osteoporosis
672 international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for
673 Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 28(3) (2016) 735-745.

674

Supplemental Table 1. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in 3D hip analysis outcomes at the femoral neck (PP analysis, n = 73)

	Control (n = 26)			HiRIT (n = 23)			IAC (n = 24)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Trabecular</i>										
BMC, g	2.70 ± 0.53	2.81 ± 0.47	6.4 ± 7.5 (-8.6, 21.5)	2.47 ± 0.54	2.51 ± 0.63	3.0 ± 8.0 (-12.9, 19.0)	2.58 ± 0.76	2.79 ± 0.95	14.9 ± 7.8 (-0.8, 30.5)	0.556
Volume, cm³	15.50 ± 2.91	16.20 ± 2.83*	5.4 ± 2.5 (0.4, 10.3)	15.50 ± 2.87	15.79 ± 3.02	2.1 ± 2.6 (-3.2, 7.4)	16.62 ± 2.71	16.98 ± 2.73	3.1 ± 2.6 (-2.0, 8.3)	0.650
vBMD, g/cm³	0.176 ± 0.032^	0.177 ± 0.034	3.0 ± 4.3 (-5.6, 11.5) ^a	0.161 ± 0.025^	0.162 ± 0.040	0.6 ± 4.4 (-8.3, 9.4) ^a	0.154 ± 0.032^	0.164 ± 0.041	6.3 ± 4.4 (-2.5, 15.1) ^a	0.650
<i>Cortical</i>										
BMC, g	1.56 ± 0.38	1.61 ± 0.37	4.6 ± 2.9 (-1.2, 10.3)	1.45 ± 0.35	1.49 ± 0.33	3.8 ± 3.1 (-2.4, 9.9)	1.50 ± 0.27	1.54 ± 0.29	4.4 ± 3.0 (-1.6, 10.4)	0.980
Volume, cm³	2.64 ± 0.63	2.69 ± 0.58	3.1 ± 2.1 (-1.2, 7.4)	2.52 ± 0.55	2.59 ± 0.52	3.8 ± 2.3 (-0.7, 8.4)	2.61 ± 0.49	2.60 ± 0.38	0.8 ± 2.2 (-3.6, 5.3)	0.618
vBMD, g/cm³	0.592 ± 0.042	0.601 ± 0.043	1.6 ± 2.8 (-3.9, 7.2)	0.576 ± 0.048	0.575 ± 0.030	0.0 ± 3.0 (-5.9, 5.9)	0.577 ± 0.052	0.599 ± 0.128	4.3 ± 2.9 (-1.4, 10.1)	0.575
<i>Total</i>										
BMC, g	4.26 ± 0.82	4.42 ± 0.73	5.2 ± 5.1 (-5.0, 15.3)	3.92 ± 0.80	4.00 ± 0.82	3.0 ± 5.4 (-7.7, 13.8)	4.08 ± 0.92	4.34 ± 1.16	10.0 ± 5.3 (-0.6, 20.5)	0.642
Volume, cm³	18.14 ± 3.43	18.88 ± 3.32*	4.9 ± 2.2 (0.6, 9.3)	18.02 ± 3.29	18.38 ± 3.45	2.3 ± 2.3 (-2.4, 6.9)	19.23 ± 3.12	19.58 ± 2.93	2.7 ± 2.3 (-1.9, 7.2)	0.665
vBMD, g/cm³	0.236 ± 0.032^	0.237 ± 0.033	2.0 ± 2.9 (-3.8, 7.8) ^a	0.219 ± 0.027^	0.220 ± 0.038	0.5 ± 3.0 (-5.4, 6.5) ^a	0.212 ± 0.029^	0.221 ± 0.042	3.9 ± 3.0 (-2.1, 9.9) ^a	0.726

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; CI, confidence interval; DXA, Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; PP, per-protocol; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

^ Between-group difference at baseline p < 0.05. * Within-group change from baseline p < 0.05.

^a Adjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Supplemental Table 2. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in 3D hip analysis outcomes at the total hip (PP analysis, n = 73)

	Control (n = 26)			HiRIT (n = 23)			IAC (n = 24)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Trabecular</i>										
BMC, g	15.06 ± 2.44	15.19 ± 2.45	1.2 ± 4.3 (-7.4, 9.7)	13.90 ± 2.84	13.87 ± 3.04	1.4 ± 4.5 (-7.7, 10.5)	14.08 ± 3.69	14.70 ± 3.52	7.7 ± 4.5 (-1.2, 16.6)	0.500
Volume, cm³	91.62 ± 14.26	94.25 ± 13.24*	3.3 ± 1.1 (1.0, 5.5)	90.83 ± 16.63	92.17 ± 17.08	1.6 ± 1.2 (-0.8, 4.0)	97.13 ± 14.23	97.92 ± 13.19	1.1 ± 1.2 (-1.3, 3.4)	
vBMD, g/cm³	0.167 ± 0.027^	0.163 ± 0.026	-0.1 ± 3.5 (-7.0, 6.9) ^a	0.154 ± 0.022^	0.153 ± 0.035	-0.3 ± 3.6 (-7.4, 6.8) ^a	0.145 ± 0.028^	0.151 ± 0.031	4.0 ± 3.6 (-3.2, 11.1) ^a	0.651
<i>Cortical</i>										
BMC, g	10.76 ± 1.89	10.73 ± 1.98	-0.2 ± 3.0 (-6.1, 5.8)	9.87 ± 2.14	9.83 ± 1.67	1.7 ± 3.2 (-4.6, 8.1)	10.42 ± 1.58	10.76 ± 1.92	4.4 ± 3.1 (-1.8, 10.7)	0.570
Volume, cm³	16.76 ± 2.99	16.54 ± 2.92	-1.0 ± 1.8 (-4.5, 2.5)	15.75 ± 2.95	15.95 ± 2.39	2.4 ± 1.9 (-1.3, 6.2)	16.65 ± 2.58	16.61 ± 2.46	0.2 ± 1.8 (-3.5, 3.8)	
vBMD, g/cm³	0.645 ± 0.059	0.651 ± 0.053	1.1 ± 2.8 (-4.5, 6.8)	0.625 ± 0.067	0.615 ± 0.037	-1.0 ± 3.0 (-7.0, 5.1)	0.629 ± 0.064	0.655 ± 0.131	4.8 ± 2.9 (-1.1, 10.7)	0.388
<i>Total</i>										
BMC, g	25.82 ± 3.87	25.91 ± 3.85	0.5 ± 3.5 (-6.4, 7.4)	23.77 ± 4.61	23.70 ± 4.41	1.4 ± 3.7 (-6.0, 8.7)	24.50 ± 4.87	25.47 ± 4.99	5.9 ± 3.6 (-1.2, 13.1)	0.511
Volume, cm³	108.38 ± 16.78	110.77 ± 15.89*	2.5 ± 1.0 (0.5, 4.6)	106.58 ± 19.28	108.12 ± 19.16	1.7 ± 1.1 (-0.5, 3.9)	113.77 ± 16.40	114.53 ± 15.04	0.9 ± 1.1 (-1.2, 3.1)	
vBMD, g/cm³	0.240 ± 0.031^	0.235 ± 0.026	0.3 ± 2.8 (-5.3, 5.9) ^a	0.224 ± 0.027^	0.222 ± 0.038	-0.8 ± 2.9 (-6.5, 4.9) ^a	0.215 ± 0.028^	0.223 ± 0.038	2.7 ± 2.9 (-3.0, 8.5) ^a	0.678

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; CI, confidence interval; DXA, Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; PP, per-protocol; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

^ Between-group difference at baseline p < 0.05. * Within-group change from baseline p < 0.05.

^a Adjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Supplemental Table 3. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in 3D hip analysis of femoral neck cortical thickness (PP analysis, n = 73)

	Control (n = 26)			HiRIT (n = 23)			IAC (n = 24)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
Total, mm	1.20 $\pm$ 0.18	1.19 $\pm$ 0.16	-0.1 $\pm$ 2.1 (-4.3, 4.2)	1.15 $\pm$ 0.16	1.18 $\pm$ 0.14	3.3 $\pm$ 2.3 (-1.2, 7.8)	1.13 $\pm$ 0.13	1.12 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.2 $\pm$ 2.2 (-4.6, 4.2)	0.459
<i>Subregion</i>										
Anterior, mm	0.98 $\pm$ 0.17	0.99 $\pm$ 0.18	1.8 $\pm$ 2.6 (-3.5, 7.1)	0.97 $\pm$ 0.17	0.96 $\pm$ 0.16	0.2 $\pm$ 2.8 (-5.4, 5.8)	0.92 $\pm$ 0.11	0.92 $\pm$ 0.15	0.5 $\pm$ 2.7 (-5.0, 6.0)	0.904
Posterior, mm	0.98 $\pm$ 0.17	0.99 $\pm$ 0.17	2.1 $\pm$ 3.4 (-4.8, 8.9)	0.95 $\pm$ 0.19	0.98 $\pm$ 0.17	4.3 $\pm$ 3.6 (-3.0, 11.5)	0.92 $\pm$ 0.13	0.89 $\pm$ 0.20	-2.6 $\pm$ 3.6 (-9.7, 4.5)	0.391
Lateral, mm	0.65 $\pm$ 0.16	0.61 $\pm$ 0.15	-4.6 $\pm$ 4.2 (-12.9, 3.7)	0.58 $\pm$ 0.12	0.60 $\pm$ 0.12	6.2 $\pm$ 4.4 (-2.6, 15.0)	0.60 $\pm$ 0.11	0.59 $\pm$ 0.14	-1.7 $\pm$ 4.3 (-10.3, 7.0)	0.197
Medial, mm	2.09 $\pm$ 0.31	2.08 $\pm$ 0.27	-0.1 $\pm$ 2.1 (-4.2, 4.0)	2.00 $\pm$ 0.28	2.08 $\pm$ 0.23	4.7 $\pm$ 2.2 (0.3, 9.1)	2.00 $\pm$ 0.23	2.01 $\pm$ 0.24	1.3 $\pm$ 2.2 (-3.0, 5.6)	0.286

Abbreviations: 3D, three-dimensional; CI, confidence interval; DXA, Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; PP, per-protocol; 3D, three-dimensional.

p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Supplemental Table 4. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in pQCT-derived outcomes at the distal tibia 4% site (PP analysis, n = 69)

	Control (n = 23)			HiRIT (n = 22)			IAC (n = 24)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Tibia 4% site</i>										
Total BMC, mg	404.86 ± 46.17^	393.21 ± 45.27*	-3.1 ± 0.4 (-3.9, -2.2) ^a	349.74 ± 40.43^	350.40 ± 40.17	0.4 ± 0.4 (-0.4, 1.3) ^{a†}	378.92 ± 52.05^	377.60 ± 56.29	-0.5 ± 0.4 (-1.3, 0.3) ^{a‡}	< 0.001
Total vBMD, mg/cm³	327.35 ± 35.02^	324.90 ± 36.28*	-0.8 ± 0.3 (-1.5, -0.2) ^a	297.89 ± 34.26^	297.61 ± 33.93	0.0 ± 0.3 (-0.7, 0.6) ^a	305.05 ± 39.92^	305.86 ± 40.53	0.3 ± 0.3 (-0.4, 0.9) ^a	0.062
Total area, mm²	1245.84 ± 157.49	1220.37 ± 159.99*	-2.1 ± 0.5 (-3.1, -1.0)	1184.51 ± 163.54	1186.73 ± 156.47	0.3 ± 0.5 (-0.8, 1.4) [†]	1247.54 ± 134.06	1238.23 ± 133.15	-0.7 ± 0.5 (-1.7, 0.3)	0.008
Total BSI, g²/cm⁴	1.33 ± 0.23^	1.28 ± 0.23*	-4.0 ± 0.5 (-5.1, -3.0) ^a	1.05 ± 0.21^	1.05 ± 0.21	0.5 ± 0.5 (-0.5, 1.5) ^{a†}	1.17 ± 0.29^	1.17 ± 0.30	-0.2 ± 0.5 (-1.1, 0.7) ^{a‡}	< 0.001
Trabecular BMC, mg	275.24 ± 39.57^	270.34 ± 39.17*	-1.7 ± 0.6 (-2.8, -0.6) ^a	245.14 ± 37.41^	246.59 ± 35.33	0.7 ± 0.6 (-0.5, 1.8) ^{a†}	261.93 ± 35.94^	260.88 ± 37.69	-0.5 ± 0.5 (-1.5, 0.6) ^a	0.018
Trabecular vBMD, mg/cm³	275.16 ± 28.80	274.81 ± 29.39	-0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.6, 0.3)	254.95 ± 31.78	255.77 ± 31.64	0.3 ± 0.2 (-0.2, 0.8)	259.50 ± 33.96	260.27 ± 34.08	0.3 ± 0.2 (-0.2, 0.8)	0.296
Trabecular area, mm²	1005.92 ± 142.43	990.13 ± 144.37*	-1.6 ± 0.6 (-2.8, -0.5)	968.15 ± 144.54	970.65 ± 137.06	0.4 ± 0.6 (-0.8, 1.6)	1014.41 ± 118.69	1006.12 ± 116.27	-0.8 ± 0.6 (-1.9, 0.4)	0.055
Trabecular BSI, g²/cm⁴	0.76 ± 0.16^	0.75 ± 0.15*	-1.9 ± 0.6 (-3.1, -0.7) ^a	0.63 ± 0.16^	0.64 ± 0.15	1.1 ± 0.6 (-0.2, 2.3) ^{a†}	0.69 ± 0.16^	0.69 ± 0.16	-0.2 ± 0.6 (-1.3, 1.0) ^{a‡}	0.006

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; BSI, bone strength index; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; PP, per-protocol; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography.

[^] Between-group difference at baseline p < 0.05. ^{*} Within-group change from baseline p < 0.05.

Between-group difference in % change p < 0.05: [†] HiRIT vs Control, [‡] IAC vs Control. ^a Adjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Supplemental Table 5. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in pQCT-derived outcomes at the diaphyseal tibia 38% site (PP analysis, n = 69)

	Control (n = 23)			HiRIT (n = 22)			IAC (n = 24)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Tibia 38% site</i>										
Cortical BMC, mg	405.42 ± 41.38	403.36 ± 40.39	-0.5 ± 0.4 (-1.2, 0.2)	385.37 ± 51.87	384.81 ± 52.21	-0.2 ± 0.4 (-0.9, 0.6)	382.95 ± 35.93	383.78 ± 35.17	0.2 ± 0.3 (-0.5, 0.9)	0.366
Cortical vBMD, mg/cm ³	1141.93 ± 26.64	1141.05 ± 25.84	-0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.5, 0.4)	1149.03 ± 29.97	1147.83 ± 32.89	-0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.5, 0.3)	1145.80 ± 25.76	1145.82 ± 27.02	0.0 ± 0.2 (-0.4, 0.4)	0.935
Cortical area, mm ²	355.12 ± 36.06	353.61 ± 35.50	-0.4 ± 0.4 (-1.1, 0.4)	334.80 ± 39.61	334.58 ± 39.25	-0.1 ± 0.4 (-0.8, 0.7)	334.56 ± 33.94	335.27 ± 33.03	0.3 ± 0.4 (-0.5, 1.0)	0.478
Cortical thickness, mm	6.27 ± 0.60 [^]	6.26 ± 0.60	-0.1 ± 0.3 (-0.6, 0.4) ^a	5.77 ± 0.76 [^]	5.77 ± 0.77	0.1 ± 0.3 (-0.5, 0.6) ^a	5.83 ± 0.53 [^]	5.84 ± 0.51	0.2 ± 0.3 (-0.3, 0.7) ^a	0.699
Periosteal circumference, mm	76.46 ± 4.26	76.28 ± 4.24	-0.2 ± 0.2 (-0.6, 0.1)	76.35 ± 2.99	76.30 ± 2.92	-0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.4, 0.3)	75.81 ± 4.22	75.85 ± 4.23	0.0 ± 0.2 (-0.3, 0.4)	0.529
Endocortical circumference, mm	37.03 ± 5.51	36.92 ± 5.53	-0.3 ± 0.2 (-0.8, 0.2)	40.12 ± 4.76	40.02 ± 4.91	-0.3 ± 0.2 (-0.8, 0.2)	39.19 ± 5.07	39.15 ± 5.05	-0.1 ± 0.2 (-0.6, 0.4)	0.774
Polar section modulus, mm ²	2167.58 ± 318.23	2153.83 ± 327.75	-0.6 ± 0.7 (-2.0, 0.8)	2129.91 ± 273.52	2138.41 ± 271.36	0.4 ± 0.7 (-1.0, 1.8)	2099.66 ± 326.31	2102.38 ± 323.46	0.2 ± 0.7 (-1.1, 1.5)	0.546
SSI _p , mm ³	2068.22 ± 293.97	2045.95 ± 299.67	-1.0 ± 0.6 (-2.2, 0.1)	2045.10 ± 288.59	2041.58 ± 285.51	-0.2 ± 0.6 (-1.4, 1.1)	2008.04 ± 286.87	2014.01 ± 286.75	0.3 ± 0.6 (-0.8, 1.5)	0.253

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; PP, per-protocol; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography; SSI_p, polar strength strain index; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

[^] Between-group difference at baseline p < 0.05.

^a Adjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Supplemental Table 6. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in pQCT-derived outcomes at the distal radius 4% site (PP analysis, n = 68)

	Control (n = 23)			HiRIT (n = 21)			IAC (n = 24)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Radius 4% site</i>										
Total BMC, mg	138.95 ± 20.39^	132.98 ± 17.45*	-3.6 ± 0.9 (-5.3, -1.9) ^a	123.24 ± 19.31^	123.88 ± 21.63	0.1 ± 0.9 (-1.6, 1.8) ^{a†}	121.32 ± 18.06^	122.0 ± 16.49	0.6 ± 0.8 (-1.0, 2.2) ^{a‡}	0.002
Total vBMD, mg/cm ³	348.29 ± 55.36	340.27 ± 53.01	-1.9 ± 1.7 (-5.4, 1.6)	336.63 ± 59.57	342.29 ± 48.98	2.2 ± 1.8 (-1.5, 5.9)	331.87 ± 53.28	326.15 ± 40.37	-1.1 ± 1.7 (-4.5, 2.4)	0.246
Total area, mm ²	407.75 ± 82.09	399.74 ± 74.44	-1.2 ± 2.0 (-5.3, 2.9)	369.88 ± 49.01	364.62 ± 54.50	-1.2 ± 2.1 (-5.5, 3.1)	373.25 ± 76.15	377.67 ± 56.80	2.5 ± 2.0 (-1.4, 6.5)	0.329
Total BSI, g ² /cm ⁴	0.48 ± 0.10^	0.45 ± 0.10*	-5.1 ± 1.8 (-8.6, -1.5) ^a	0.42 ± 0.13^	0.43 ± 0.12	2.1 ± 1.8 (-1.4, 5.8) ^{a†}	0.40 ± 0.09^	0.40 ± 0.08	-0.9 ± 1.7 (-4.3, 2.5) ^a	0.022
Trabecular BMC, mg	67.48 ± 17.58^	66.31 ± 15.73	1.8 ± 2.8 (-3.9, 7.5) ^a	56.07 ± 11.86^	55.70 ± 14.02	-2.0 ± 2.9 (-7.8, 3.80) ^a	58.00 ± 15.40^	59.19 ± 11.49	3.5 ± 2.7 (-1.9, 8.9) ^a	0.381
Trabecular vBMD, mg/cm ³	231.51 ± 32.07	229.75 ± 32.36	-0.7 ± 0.7 (-2.1, 0.6)	215.80 ± 38.18	216.58 ± 37.59	0.5 ± 0.7 (-1.0, 1.9)	218.56 ± 34.51	218.46 ± 35.01	0.0 ± 0.7 (-1.4, 1.3)	0.489
Trabecular area, mm ²	293.41 ± 71.16	291.00 ± 66.30	0.4 ± 2.9 (-5.4, 6.2)	262.04 ± 43.99	257.19 ± 44.84	-0.9 ± 3.1 (-7.0, 5.2)	268.05 ± 67.62	273.43 ± 48.51	4.5 ± 2.9 (-1.3, 10.2)	0.405
Trabecular BSI, g ² /cm ⁴	0.16 ± 0.05^	0.15 ± 0.05	-0.2 ± 3.2 (-6.5, 6.2) ^a	0.12 ± 0.04^	0.12 ± 0.05	-0.6 ± 3.3 (-7.1, 5.9) ^a	0.13 ± 0.04^	0.13 ± 0.04	3.8 ± 3.0 (-2.2, 9.9) ^a	0.538

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; BSI, bone strength index; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; PP, per-protocol; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

[^] Between-group difference at baseline p < 0.05. * Within-group change from baseline p < 0.05.

Between-group difference in % change p < 0.05: † HiRIT vs Control, ‡ IAC vs Control. ^aAdjusted for initial values. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Note: 1 baseline radius scan excluded due to motion artefact (HiRIT, n = 1).

Supplemental Table 7. Baseline and eight-month measures (mean $\pm$ SD) with percent change (mean $\pm$ SE) in pQCT-derived outcomes at the proximal radius 66% site (PP analysis, n = 68)

	Control (n = 23)			HiRIT (n = 21)			IAC (n = 24)			p-value
	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	Baseline	Follow-up	% change (95% CI)	
<i>Radius 66% site</i>										
Cortical BMC, mg	112.19 ± 19.32	111.36 ± 17.58	-0.5 ± 1.3 (-3.0, 2.1)	98.22 ± 23.35	95.54 ± 23.23*	-2.6 ± 1.3 (-5.3, 0.1)	102.23 ± 17.50	101.87 ± 14.50	0.4 ± 1.3 (-2.1, 2.9)	0.257
Cortical vBMD, mg/cm ³	1074.09 ± 42.78	1069.03 ± 42.92	-0.5 ± 0.3 (-1.2, 0.2)	1055.77 ± 49.00	1057.58 ± 49.12	0.2 ± 0.4 (-0.5, 0.9)	1062.45 ± 47.60	1069.24 ± 42.51	0.7 ± 0.3 (0.0, 1.3)	0.066
Cortical area, mm ²	104.10 ± 15.10	103.87 ± 13.77	0.0 ± 1.2 (-2.5, 2.5)	92.57 ± 20.09	89.75 ± 19.37*	-2.8 ± 1.3 (-5.4, -0.2)	96.09 ± 15.45	95.20 ± 12.60	-0.3 ± 1.2 (-2.7, 2.1)	0.237
Cortical thickness, mm	2.64 ± 0.50	2.64 ± 0.47	0.3 ± 1.6 (-2.8, 3.5)	2.31 ± 0.54	2.27 ± 0.52	-1.0 ± 1.6 (-4.3, 2.2)	2.46 ± 0.46	2.43 ± 0.45	-0.6 ± 1.5 (-3.6, 2.5)	0.824
Periosteal circumference, mm	48.29 ± 3.47	48.15 ± 3.21	-0.2 ± 1.0 (-2.3, 1.8)	47.66 ± 4.97	46.96 ± 5.24	-1.4 ± 1.1 (-3.5, 0.7)	47.31 ± 4.27	47.34 ± 3.85	0.3 ± 1.0 (-1.7, 2.3)	0.502
Endocortical circumference, mm	31.71 ± 5.61	31.61 ± 5.22	0.0 ± 1.9 (-3.8, 3.7)	33.15 ± 5.87	32.69 ± 6.07	-1.1 ± 2.0 (-5.0, 2.8)	31.87 ± 5.82	32.04 ± 5.80	1.0 ± 1.8 (-2.7, 4.7)	0.740
Polar section modulus, mm ³	494.83 ± 85.13	498.94 ± 74.12	1.3 ± 1.6 (-1.9, 4.5)	438.05 ± 124.71	432.28 ± 111.24	0.0 ± 1.7 (-3.4, 3.3)	454.91 ± 84.02	443.35 ± 77.95	-2.1 ± 1.6 (-5.3, 1.0)	0.318
SSI _p , mm ³	437.78 ± 86.62	438.55 ± 77.29	0.6 ± 1.5 (-2.4, 3.6)	378.23 ± 112.26	372.17 ± 105.74	-0.5 ± 1.6 (-3.6, 2.7)	394.53 ± 70.67	385.62 ± 62.81	-1.8 ± 1.5 (-4.7, 1.2)	0.547

Abbreviations: BMC, bone mineral content; CI, confidence interval; HiRIT, high-intensity progressive resistance and impact training; IAC, isometric axial compression; PP, per-protocol; pQCT, peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography; SSI_p, polar strength strain index; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density.

* Within-group change from baseline p < 0.05. p-values represent between-group comparison of % change.

Note: 1 baseline radius scan excluded due to motion artefact (HiRIT, n = 1).