



Short Communication

Postural sway following cryotherapy in healthy adults

Claudiane A. Fukuchi^{a,b}, Marcos Duarte^b, Darren J. Stefanyshyn^{a,*}^a Human Performance Laboratory, Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Calgary, Canada^b Neuroscience Graduate Program and Biomedical Engineering, Federal University of ABC, São Bernardo do Campo, Brazil

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 23 May 2013

Received in revised form 5 February 2014

Accepted 10 February 2014

Keywords:

Cryotherapy

Pre-cooling

Center of pressure

Postural sway

Balance

ABSTRACT

In light of the wide use of cryotherapy and its potential negative effects on postural stability, little is known about how postural sway is affected, particularly when the whole lower limb is immersed. The purpose of this study was to analyze the influence of cryotherapy on postural sway in healthy males. Twenty-six subjects were randomly assigned into two intervention groups: control (tepid water at ~26 °C) or ice (cold water at ~11 °C). Postural sway was measured through the center of pressure (COP) position while they stood on a force plate during bipedal (70 s) and unipedal (40 s) conditions before and after the subjects were immersed in a water tub up to the umbilical level for 20 min. COP standard deviation (SD) and COP velocity were analyzed in the anterior–posterior (AP) and medial–lateral (ML) directions. Statistical analysis showed that in the bipedal condition cryotherapy increased the COP SD and COP velocity in the ML direction. During the unipedal condition, a higher COP velocity in the AP and ML directions was also reported. Our findings indicate that cryotherapy by immersing the whole lower limb should be used with caution before engaging in challenging postural control activities.

© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Cryotherapy is one of the most common and inexpensive forms of treatment for both acute and chronic athletic injuries [1,2]. Analgesia and enhanced endurance activities are some of the many benefits that can be experienced with cryotherapy prior to sports participation [1,3]. In contrast, cryotherapy can lead to a loss of sensation by the mechanoreceptors, which may contribute to altered postural stability [4].

There has been conflicting evidence in the literature on whether cryotherapy affects postural stability with some studies observing impaired postural control [4,5], while others reporting no effect [6–8]. This conflicting literature may be attributed to the lack of a control group in studies that investigated the effects of cryotherapy intervention [4–6,8]. Without a control group, attributing the effects to the water temperature or to others factors is difficult.

Another potential difference in the effects of cryotherapy on postural control is that the different studies have investigated only bipedal standing [4,6] or only unipedal standing [5,7,8]. Bipedal standing might be considered a trivial task and a minor effect of

cryotherapy may not be evident. In contrast, unipedal standing is more challenging and changes in postural control due to cryotherapy would potentially be more noticeable. Hence, the investigation of both bipedal and unipedal standing conditions enhances the understanding of the effects of cryotherapy on postural control.

Cold lower body immersion prior to sport participation has increased in popularity despite the fact that its use could potentially impair postural control, which may increase the risk of injury as a result of impaired stability [9]. Hence, a need for greater understanding of the immediate cryotherapy effects on postural control in a controlled study is identified. The aim of this study was to determine the effects of cryotherapy (whole lower body immersion) on postural sway during bipedal and unipedal quiet standing conditions in healthy males. We hypothesized that cryotherapy would increase postural sway in both standing conditions.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Twenty-six healthy males were recruited and randomly assigned to either a control or ice group. Detailed demographic information is provided in Table 1. All subjects were recreationally active and were free of any lower extremity injury within the six months prior to the

* Corresponding author at: Human Performance Laboratory, Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive NW, Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4. Tel.: +1 403 220 8637.

E-mail address: stefanyshyn@ucalgary.ca (D.J. Stefanyshyn).

Table 1

Mean and ± 1 SD characteristics of the subjects in each group and the t -value and p -value for a between-group statistical comparison.

	Control	Ice	t -Value	p -Value
Age (years)	22.9 \pm 3.1	26.8 \pm 3.9	-2.805	0.007*
Height (cm)	176.9 \pm 6.1	177.2 \pm 10.2	-0.701	0.944
Body mass (kg)	72.1 \pm 7.2	75.6 \pm 8.1	-1.159	0.253
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.0 \pm 1.7	24.1 \pm 2.3	-4.369	0.163

* Statistically significant difference at an alpha of 0.05.

study. Subjects that presented a history of any circulatory, vestibular or contraindication to cryotherapy including Raynaud's disease were excluded from the study. Prior to the test, all subjects read and signed a consent form approved by the Conjoint Health Research Ethics Board by the University of Calgary (E-24788).

2.2. Procedures

Each participant was tested through: (1) standing on both legs for 70 s (bipedal quiet standing) and (2) standing on the force plate on their right leg for 40 s (unipedal quiet standing). During the bipedal condition, the feet were placed with an angle of 30° with the heels positioned 3 cm apart. For the unipedal condition, the right foot of each subject was placed in the middle of the force plate. Ground reaction forces (GRF) were collected with a force plate (Z4852/c, Kistler Instrument AG, Winterhur) at 60 Hz and the signal was amplified with a gain of 2000. In both conditions, subjects were required to stand as still as possible with their arms at their sides in a comfortable position while looking at a cross-marker positioned on the wall 4 meters straight ahead at the subject's eyelevel. After the baseline data collection, they were asked to remain sitting in a water tub for 20 min, immersed up to the umbilical level. The water temperature was constantly monitored and it was set at 26 °C (tepid water) for the control group and at 11 °C (cold water) for the ice group. Following the water immersion, the data collection procedures were repeated to determine the effect of the water intervention.

2.3. Data analysis

The data were filtered with a fourth order low-pass Butterworth filter with a 10 Hz cut-off frequency [10]. From the GRF data we computed the center of pressure (COP) displacement in the

anterior–posterior (AP) and medial–lateral (ML) directions. The specific variables analyzed in both bipedal and unipedal quiet standing conditions were

COP standard deviation (SD) and COP velocity in the AP and ML directions [11]. All variables were computed using custom algorithms written in Matlab 7.14 (Mathworks Inc., Natick, USA).

2.4. Statistical analysis

Median across trials for each aforementioned variable was obtained for each subject and used in the statistical analysis. A 2 \times 2 mixed factorial ANOVA was carried out, with Intervention (Ice and Control) as a between group factor and time (pre and post) as a within group factor. If a significant interaction between factors was found, a t -test with Bonferroni adjustment was undertaken in the post hoc analysis. A significant level of 0.05 was adopted for all statistical tests. In addition, effect size estimates were computed using eta-squared, η^2 , or partial eta-squared, η_p^2 . All statistical analyses were performed in R2.15.1 (R Foundation, Vienna, Austria).

3. Results

Mean and standard deviation of the COP data during bipedal and unipedal standing for groups and conditions are shown in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively.

3.1. Bipedal standing

For the COP SD ML variable, there was a main effect of time ($F(1, 24) = 7.491$, $p = 0.011$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.24$) and an interaction effect between Intervention and time ($F(1, 24) = 10.780$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.31$). The post hoc analysis indicated larger values of the COP SD ML post intervention for the ice group ($p = 0.017$, $\eta^2 = 0.53$). For the COP velocity ML variable, there was a main effect of time ($F(1, 24) = 6.459$, $p = 0.018$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.21$) and an interaction effect between Intervention and time ($F(1, 24) = 10.122$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.30$), whereas the post hoc analysis revealed a larger COP velocity ML post intervention in the ice group ($p < 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.41$).

3.2. Unipedal standing

For the COP SD ML variable, there was a main effect of time ($F(1, 24) = 4.845$, $p = 0.038$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.17$, respectively) and no




Fig. 1. Mean and standard deviation of the variables COP SD and COP velocity in the anterior–posterior (AP) and medial–lateral (ML) directions for control and ice group during the bipedal stance. * $p < 0.05$.




Fig. 2. Mean and standard deviation of the variables COP SD and COP velocity in the anterior–posterior (AP) and medial–lateral (ML) directions for control and ice group during the unipedal stance. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$.

interaction indicating that COP SD ML increased similarly in both groups post intervention. Concerning the COP velocity AP variable, there was a main effect of time ($F(1, 24) = 14.07$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.37$) and an interaction effect between Intervention and time ($F(1, 24) = 13.73$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.36$), where the post hoc analysis showed a larger COP velocity AP post intervention in the ice group ($p < 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.62$). For the COP velocity ML variable, there was an interaction effect between intervention and time ($F(1, 24) = 11.32$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.32$), whereas the post hoc analysis indicated a larger COP velocity ML post intervention in the ice group ($p = 0.02$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.39$).

4. Discussion

COP SD and COP velocity increased in the ML direction for the bipedal condition and COP velocity in the AP and ML directions also increased for the unipedal condition, in the ice group compared to the control group following intervention.

An increase in postural sway during bipedal condition after cryotherapy in relation to the control group was observed only in the ML direction. These findings are similar to Magnusson et al. [4] but not to Dewhurst et al. [6]. During bipedal quiet standing, balance in the frontal plane is maintained primarily by the hip and ankle muscles with little participation of the knee joint muscles [12], thus highlighting a predominance of the hip strategy. Since the whole lower body was cooled, one could expect that this hip strategy was negatively influenced and, therefore, ML stability was compromised.

During the unipedal condition, COP velocity increased in both AP and ML directions after cryotherapy. Surenkok et al. [13] and Kernozek et al. [5] reported similar findings, although one study observed contrasting results [7]. These inconsistent findings may be due to the differences in either the populations analyzed [5,7] or the methods to measure postural control [13] compared to the present study where healthy males were tested on a force plate embedded in the floor. Additionally, an increase in COP velocity but not in the spatial variability has been observed in conditions where postural control is believed to also be impaired but now due to muscle fatigue [14], which can lead to increased joint stiffness by muscle coactivation [15]. Since the nerve conduction velocity is likely impaired following cryotherapy [16], the response by the muscles to control our posture after a perturbation may also be affected.

Overall, after cryotherapy an increase in postural sway, measured by COP SD (used as a measure of spatial variability) and COP velocity was presented. The different results between both conditions can be partially explained by the larger base of support in the bipedal standing, making unipedal stance a more challenging task. Consequently, any perturbation to the postural control system would result in greater alterations in the unipedal condition than in the bipedal condition. A possible mechanism to explain such behavior in the unipedal condition to control the body sway is the increase in joint stiffness by muscle coactivation [15], enhancing the velocity in both directions. It is not clear however why during the bipedal standing we did not observe an increase in postural sway in the anterior–posterior direction, only in the medio-lateral direction. It is known that the hip strategy plays an important role in postural control in the medio-lateral direction during bipedal standing [12]. If the cold immersion compromised more the hip strategy than the postural control by other joints, this might explain the results we observed.

Based on our results, sports activities or rehabilitation programs that require standing postures on only one leg should be prescribed with prudence immediately following cryotherapy. Since cryotherapy to the lower body negatively affected postural control in healthy male adults, we suggest that its use should be applied with caution before engaging in challenging postural control activities.

Acknowledgments

The authors are thankful to Emmanuel Rocha for his assistance with data collection and the Sports Medicine Center for allowing the use of the water immersion facility.

Conflict of interest

There are no conflicts of interest. None of the authors have any financial or personal relationships that could inappropriately influence their work.

References

- [1] Knight KL. *Cryotherapy in sport injury management*. Human Kinetics; 1995.
- [2] Bleakley C, McDonough S, MacAuley D. The use of ice in the treatment of acute soft-tissue injury: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Sports Med* 2004;32:251–61.

- [3] Duffield R, Green R, Castle P, Maxwell N. Precooling can prevent the reduction of self-paced exercise intensity in the heat. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2010;42:577–84.
- [4] Magnusson M, Enbom H, Johansson R, Wiklund J. Significance of pressor input from the human feet in lateral postural control. The effect of hypothermia on galvanically induced body-sway. *Acta Otolaryngol* 1990;110:321–7.
- [5] Kernozek TW, Greany JF, Anderson DR, Van Heel D, Youngdahl RL, Benesh BG, et al. The effect of immersion cryotherapy on medial–lateral postural sway variability in individuals with a lateral ankle sprain. *Physiother Res Int* 2008;13:107–18.
- [6] Dewhurst S, Riches PE, De Vito G. Moderate alterations in lower limbs muscle temperature do not affect postural stability during quiet standing in both young and older women. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2007;17:292–8.
- [7] Saam F, Leidinger B, Tibesku CO. The influence of cryotherapy of the ankle on static balance. *Sportverletz Sportschaden* 2008;22:45–51.
- [8] Ingersoll CD, Knight KL, Merrick MA. Sensory perception of the foot and ankle following therapeutic applications of heat and cold. *J Athl Train* 1992;27:231–4.
- [9] Wang HK, Chen CH, Shiang TY, Jan MH, Lin KH. Risk-factor analysis of high school basketball-player ankle injuries: a prospective controlled cohort study evaluating postural sway, ankle strength, and flexibility. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2006;87:821–5.
- [10] Prado JM, Dinato MC, Duarte M. Age-related difference on weight transfer during unconstrained standing. *Gait Posture* 2011;33:93–7.
- [11] Duarte M, Freitas SMSF. Revision of posturography based on force plate for balance evaluation. *Rev Bras Fisiot* 2010;14:183–92.
- [12] Winter DA, Prince F, Frank JS, Powell C, Zabjek KF. Unified theory regarding A/P and M/L balance in quiet stance. *J Neurophysiol* 1996;75:2334–43.
- [13] Surenkok O, Aytar A, Tüzün EH, Akman MN. Cryotherapy impairs knee joint position sense and balance. *Isokinet Exerc Sci* 2008;16:69–73.
- [14] Marchetti PH, Orselli MI, Duarte M. The effects of uni- and bilateral fatigue on postural and power tasks. *J Appl Biomech* 2013;29:44–8.
- [15] Carpenter MG, Frank JS, Silcher CP, Peysar GW. The influence of postural threat on the control of upright stance. *Exp Brain Res* 2001;138:210–8.
- [16] Algafly AA, George KP. The effect of cryotherapy on nerve conduction velocity, pain threshold and pain tolerance. *Br J Sports Med* 2007;41:365–9.