

## **Resistance training in postmenopausal women with and without hormone therapy**

*Pedro J. Teixeira<sup>1,2</sup>, Scott B. Going<sup>1</sup>, Linda B. Houtkooper<sup>1</sup>, Lauve L. Metcalfe<sup>1</sup>, Robert M. Blew<sup>1</sup>, Hilary G. Flint-Wagner<sup>1</sup>, Ellen C. Cussler<sup>1</sup>, Luís B. Sardinha<sup>2</sup>, and Timothy G. Lohman<sup>1</sup>*

**Running Title:** Resistance training in postmenopausal women

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physiology, University of Arizona, 101, Ina Gittings Building, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

<sup>2</sup>Exercise and Health Laboratory, Faculty of Human Movement, Technical University of Lisbon, Estrada da Costa, Cruz-Quebrada, 1499 Lisbon, Portugal.

Address all correspondence to:  
Timothy G. Lohman, Ph.D.  
Department of Physiology  
101, Ina Gittings Building  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ 85721  
Phone: 520-621-2004  
Fax: 520-621-8170  
Email: Lohman@u.arizona.edu

## ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** The main purpose of this study was to analyze the impact of a 1-year resistance training program on body composition and muscle strength in postmenopausal women, and to describe the impact of hormone replacement therapy (HRT) on body composition changes, with and without exercise. Secondly, we wanted to study dose-response relationships between measures of program compliance and changes in primary outcomes.

**Methods:** Subjects were postmenopausal women (40-66 yr) randomly assigned to an exercise (EX) group ( $N = 117$ ) and a non-exercise group ( $N = 116$ ). The EX group participated in a 1 yr trainer-supervised resistance training program, 60-75 min·day<sup>-1</sup>, 3 d·wk<sup>-1</sup>. Lean soft tissue (LST) and fat tissue (FT) changes were measured by DXA and strength by 1RM testing.

**Results:** Significant ( $P < 0.001$ ) gains in LST were observed for women who exercised, regardless of HRT status, while women who did not exercise lost LST ( $P < 0.05$ ) if they were not taking HRT, and gained LST ( $P = 0.08$ ) if they were on HRT. The only significant FT losses were observed for women who exercised while on HRT ( $P < 0.05$ ). Strength increases were observed at all sites ( $P < 0.001$ ). Total weight lifted by subjects in their training sessions was a significant predictor of changes in LST ( $P < 0.001$ ) and strength ( $P < 0.01$ ).

**Conclusions:** Resistance and weight/bearing exercise significantly changed total and regional body composition in postmenopausal women by increasing LST in all women

and decreasing FT in women on HRT. Hormone therapy showed no independent effects on body composition but it protected non-exercising women from losses in LST. The lean and muscle strength changes observed were partially dependent on the volume of training, as expressed by attendance and total weight lifted in one year of training.

**Key Words:** STRENGTH TRAINING; BODY COMPOSITION; VOLUME; FREQUENCY; WEIGHT LIFTED; ATTENDANCE; DOSE-RESPONSE

## **INTRODUCTION**

Paragraph Number 1 Strength training is recommended by the American College of Sports Medicine as a key component of an overall fitness program (3). For older adults, this is particularly important given the loss of muscle mass and strength that occurs from middle to old age. Sarcopenia, or the loss of lean tissue, especially muscle, has been shown to predict self-reported physical disability, independent of age, morbidity, obesity, ethnicity, income, and health behaviors among older men and women (6). In addition to increasing muscle mass and improving function (11), strength training has been shown to increase resting and total energy expenditure (15) and lipid oxidation (31), and to induce decreases in total and abdominal fat (7, 23, 30). In women, important changes in body composition occur around the time of menopause, including increases in total body fat mass, marked increases in abdominal fat, and a progressive reduction in lean tissue (18, 26, 29) that may be countered with exercise. The tendency for a shift in fat distribution towards an increased central/upper body fat pattern, together with overall weight gain, contributes for the higher risk of heart disease and metabolic disorders suffered by postmenopausal women.

Paragraph Number 2 Hormone replacement therapy (HRT) seems to counteract the trend for an accumulation of total fat, abdominal fat, and the loss of lean tissue that occurs after menopause though controversy remains whether HRT alone can induce significant changes in total body composition over time (7, 10, 13, 14, 16). A recent review suggests that HRT protects against strength losses with age and could potentially be used in the future as a strategy to facilitate maintenance of muscle strength in postmenopausal

women (20). When used together with weight-bearing aerobic exercise, HRT was beneficial for reducing adiposity and increasing fat-free mass in older women (16). Earlier results from the same research group had shown that gains in fat-free mass and strength with weight-bearing exercise and HRT were not additive compared to the effects of exercise alone (7). The impact of resistance (i.e. with added weights) plus weight-bearing exercise on body composition and strength has not been compared for postmenopausal women who are either using or not using HRT in a randomized clinical trial.

Paragraph Number 3 A dose-response effect of exercise on body composition changes has not been established. To our knowledge, no study has examined the association between measures of compliance with the training routine (volume, frequency) and body composition changes in exercising postmenopausal women. This controlled study was designed to analyze the impact of a vigorous 1-year strength training and weight-bearing exercise program on whole-body and regional lean and fat tissue in postmenopausal women, and to describe the impact of hormone replacement therapy (HRT) on body composition changes, with and without exercise. In addition, the relationships among changes in soft tissue mass, changes in strength, attendance to the program, and weight lifted, were investigated to better understand the influence of dose on the desired response.

## **METHODS**

### *Subjects*

Paragraph Number 4 Subjects were 233 healthy, sedentary postmenopausal women participating in a study investigating the effects of progressive resistance and weight-bearing exercise training on bone mineral density. The study was approved by the University of Arizona's Human Subjects Institutional Review Board and all participants gave written informed consent prior to participation in the study. The women were on average 5.8 yr postmenopausal, nonsmokers, and were either using HRT for longer than 1 yr but no more than 6 yr or were not using HRT and had not done so in the year prior to the study. Women who used HRT followed regimens prescribed by their primary care providers. Consequently, a variety of regimens were used, although most women took oral estrogen (32%) or estrogen and progesterone (48%). Another 14% received estrogen and/or progesterone by patch. Subjects did not take any other medications known to affect body composition, and had not used exercise or energy reduction diets for 1 yr prior to entering study. All participants received 800 mg per day of calcium citrate (Citracal®, Mission Pharmacal, San Antonio, TX). Subjects were instructed to take 2 tablets (200 mg elemental calcium/tablet), twice a day, without food, with a minimum of 4 hours between doses. Within categories of HRT status, subjects were randomly assigned to one year of weight-lifting and weight-bearing exercise or to a group with no exercise. Participants were instructed to maintain their usual diets and to avoid weight changes for the duration of the study. Furthermore, controls were instructed to maintain the same level of physical activity, or inactivity, as the case may be, that it was upon entering the study. If subjects gained or lost weight they were not excluded from the study nor was there any intervention employed to return them to their stable weight.

Paragraph Number 5. For controls, a medical history questionnaire was administered every 6 months addressing any adverse events or medication changes that may have occurred in the preceding 6 months. Exercisers completed this same questionnaire but were also instructed to inform their personal trainers of any such events and this information was then noted in the subject file. There were no adverse events reported. Among exercisers, only subjects who completed at least the first 10 months of the program were included for analysis purposes. A baseline comparison of completers with the 25 exercisers who did not complete at least 10 months showed no significant differences.

#### *Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry*

Paragraph Number 6 Lean soft tissue, fat tissue, and body fat percentage (%BF) were measured by dual energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA) using a total-body scanner (model DPX-L; Lunar Radiation Corp, Madison, WI). The scanner was calibrated daily against a standard calibration block supplied by the manufacturer. Subject position for the total body scan was standardized and identical to that described by Mazess and colleagues (19). All total body scans were completed in medium scan mode to ensure appropriate image resolution. To decrease measurement error, subjects were scanned twice within approximately two weeks, at all assessment periods. DXA technicians were blind to the participants' group assignments. Coefficients of variation from duplicate measurements for all subjects were 1.21% for total lean soft tissue mass and 1.72% for total fat tissue. The mean of the two scans was used in all statistical analyses. Initial scan analysis, including the placement of baselines distinguishing bone and soft tissue, edge detection, and regional demarcations, was done by standard computer algorithms (version 1.3y,

Lunar Corporation). Subsequently, one certified technician visually inspected all scans and adjustments were made as necessary.

### *Anthropometry*

Paragraph Number 7 Standing height (HT) and weight (WT) were measured with subjects wearing lightweight clothing without shoes. HT was measured to the nearest 0.1cm during a maximal inhalation using a Schorr measuring board. WT (kg) was measured on a calibrated digital scale (SECA, model 770; Hamburg, Germany) accurate to 0.1 kg. The average of two measurements for both HT and WT were used as the criterion measurement. Body mass index in kilograms per squared meter was calculated from WT (kg) and HT (m<sup>2</sup>).

### *Strength Assessment*

Paragraph Number 8 Muscle strength in exercising subjects was estimated from assessments of a 1 repetition maximum (1RM), measured in exercise facilities every 6-8 weeks to set training loads. The 1RM was defined as the maximal weight that could be lifted with proper body alignment and correct lifting technique. Exercises used were the leg press, hack squats or smith squats, lat pulldowns, lateral rows, back extensions, right and left arm dumbbell presses, and rotary torso. The 1RMs were measured in the same exercise facility using the same equipment for every subject at all assessment time points.

### *Exercise Intervention*

Paragraph Number 9 Subjects in the exercise group trained three days per week on nonconsecutive days in community facilities with constant supervision by study trainers.



Each session lasted 60-75 minutes and included a warm-up (stretching, balance, and weight-bearing activity), weightlifting period, a weight-bearing circuit of moderate impact activities (e.g., walk/jog, skipping, hopping), and stair-climbing/step boxes with weighted vests. Exercise class attendance, weightlifting loads, sets and repetitions, steps with weighted vests, and minutes in aerobic activity were all monitored with logs that were checked regularly by study trainers.

Paragraph Number 10 The weightlifting component of the exercise session was done using free weights and machines. Core exercises were selected to target major muscle groups and included leg press, hack squats or smith squats, lat pulldowns, lateral rows, back extensions, right and left arm dumbbell presses, and rotary torso. Each session included two sets of 6-8 repetitions done at 70% (2 day/week) and 80% (1 day/week) of the 1-repetition maximum (1RM). Strength (1RM) was measured every 6-8 weeks and the load increased to maintain loads at 70-80% 1RM.

Paragraph Number 11 Weight-bearing activity was done for approximately 10 minutes during warm-up prior to weightlifting (walking on a treadmill or track), and for another 20-25 minutes during the circuit and stair climbing/step boxes. The weight-bearing circuit progressed from walking to increasing time spent in jogging, skipping, hopping and similar activities with greater ground reaction forces than walking. Intensity was maintained at approximately 60% of maximal heart rate. Stair-climbing/steps boxes (8 inches) began with 120 stairs/steps per session and increased progressively to 300 stairs/steps while wearing vests weighing 10-30 lbs. Loads during stairs/steps were increased incrementally by 1-3 lbs, as the participants were able to tolerate greater loads.

### *Statistical Analysis*

Paragraph Number 12 Statistical analyses were completed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 10.0.5). Measures of central tendency and distribution were examined to describe the sample, to test for normality and homoscedasticity, and to describe outcomes. The baseline physical characteristics of women who completed the study were compared with women who stopped the exercise program before completing 10 months using independent t-tests. Possible baseline mean differences in body composition and other characteristics between women randomized to exercise and no exercise groups were tested using independent t-tests within HRT and no HRT groups. Paired t-tests were used to test for significant changes in body composition within groups (exercise and HRT status) from baseline to follow-up. Independent t-tests were used to compare 1-year changes between exercisers and non-exercisers. The General Linear Model (analysis of covariance) was used to study the effects of exercise, HRT, and interaction (exercise x HRT) in body composition outcomes, using age and baseline body composition as covariates.

Paragraph Number 13 For exercisers only, attendance was calculated as the ratio of sessions attended to the total possible sessions that each subject could have attended, given start and end dates. The average maximum number of sessions subjects could have attended was  $148 \pm 4$  and varied between 12 and 232 with a mean attendance of  $105 \pm 4$ . The weight lifted in one-year for a specific exercise was calculated by adding weight lifted for all sets across all sessions (n) as follows:

$$\text{Exercise Dose (kg)} = \sum_{\text{session}=1}^n ([\text{Reps} * \text{Weight}]_{(\text{set1})} + [\text{Reps} * \text{Weight}]_{(\text{set2})})$$

Paragraph Number 14 Total weight lifted was calculated from the sum of all weights lifted from eight individual exercises. For weight lifted, legs value was equal to the weight lifted performing leg press exercises, arms value was calculated as the sum of weight lifted in military press, lat pulldown, and row exercises, and trunk value was calculated as sum of weight lifted in lat pulldown, row, and back extension exercises. The average of 1RM percent change for the same combination of exercises was used to calculate the corresponding strength value (legs, arms, and trunk strength). For all calculations using total weight lifted and strength changes, all analyses were adjusted by cohort number and facility. Not all subjects used the same facility for their training, and facility was found to have a significant effect on weight lifted and strength changes values.

Paragraph Number 15 Analysis of covariance was used to assess the impact of HRT on strength changes among exercisers, controlling for age, baseline body composition, cohort and facility. To examine changes in LST and strength across quartiles of total weight lifted and quartiles of attendance, these variables (weight lifted and attendance) were adjusted for cohort and facility (plus age, HRT status, and baseline body composition) using regression residuals. Two regression models were developed with these variables as independent variables and compliance measures (total weight lifted and attendance) as dependent variables. Residuals from these regression models (added to mean value) were then used to build the adjusted quartiles. Analysis of variance

(ANOVA) was used to study changes in LST and strength across adjusted quartiles of compliance measures. Finally, multiple linear regression was used to study the relationship between outcomes measures (LST and strength used as dependent and independent variables) and compliance measures (weight lifted and attendance used as independent variables). Type 1 error was set at  $\alpha = 0.05$  (two-tailed) for all tests.

## RESULTS

Paragraph Number 16 Baseline descriptive statistics for subjects who completed baseline and follow-up measurements, are shown in **Table 1**, by HRT status. Women taking HRT were approximately 1.5 yr younger and had been postmenopausal for approximately 1.5 yr less, compared to women not taking HRT ( $P < 0.05$ ). There were no other significant differences observed between women taking HRT or not taking HRT at baseline. There were no baseline significant differences between women assigned to exercise ( $N = 117$ ) or no exercise ( $N = 116$ ) groups.

### (Table 1)

Paragraph Number 17 **Figure 1** shows one-year changes in LST and FT for women taking HRT (exercise and no exercise) and not taking HRT (exercise and no exercise). Significant gains in LST were observed for women who exercised, both taking and not taking HRT. Women who did not exercise significantly lost LST if they were not taking HRT and showed a trend towards LST gains ( $P = 0.08$ ) if they were on hormone therapy. The only significant FT losses were observed for women who exercised while on HRT.

### (Figure 1)

Paragraph Number 18 One-year changes for exercisers and controls, within HRT category, are shown in **Table 2**. Among subjects on HRT, exercise had a significant impact on weight, BMI, %BF, LST (except trunk LST), and FT (except trunk FT). Among women not on HRT, changes in %BF and LST in exercisers were different than in non-exercising controls. The overall impact of exercise was significant for LST, FT, and %BF, although effects were much stronger for LST (and %BF) than for FT. The effects of HRT were generally not significant, although there was a weak, significant interaction effect between HRT and exercise in augmenting/preserving LST. Given the small impact of HRT, results are henceforth reported without discriminating HRT status.

**(Table 2)**

Paragraph Number 19 Among exercisers, changes in whole-body LST ( $P < 0.001$ ) and FT ( $P = 0.029$ ) were both significantly different than changes in controls ( $P < 0.05$  for inter-group comparison). Total lean and fat changes among controls were non-significant ( $P > 0.36$ ). Despite significant average changes in total and regional body composition among exercisers, the inter-subject variability was very high. For total LST, the range for individual changes was 6.7 kg (min = -3.0 kg; max = +3.7 kg), while for FT changes the range was 14.2 kg (min = -8.3 kg; max = 5.9 kg). Positive changes in 1RM were significant for all exercises ( $P < 0.001$ ) and ranged from +28% (seated row) to +77% (leg press). Analysis of covariance showed that HRT did not significantly affect total and regional strength gains ( $P > 0.161$ ). Muscle strength by 1RM was not measured in controls.

Paragraph Number 20 Individual changes in LST and strength among women in the training group may be related to the volume (total weight lifted) and frequency (number of sessions attended) of training. Total weight lifted during one year of training was

measured for six primary exercises and ranged between 563,314 kg and 2,619,290 kg; mean was 1,312,770 kg (sum of six exercises). Mean attendance to the exercise sessions was 77% and ranged from 26% and 100%. Attendance was strongly correlated with weight lifted. Partial correlation coefficient (adjusting for age, HRT status, baseline body composition, cohort, and facility) between percent attendance and sum of weight lifted for all exercises was 0.67 ( $P < 0.001$ ).

Paragraph Number 21 To better assess the relationship between changes in outcomes (LST and strength) and measures of compliance (weight lifted and attendance), we divided one-year changes in outcomes into quartiles. **Figure 2** shows LST and strength changes by adjusted quartiles of weight lifted and attendance. Analysis of variance showed a significant dose-response for LST and strength changes across categories of weight lifted. For attendance, a similar, albeit non-significant, dose-response trend was observed, particularly for strength. For changes in LST, a more linear association was observed towards the right side of the distribution (3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quartiles) in total weight lifted, whereas for strength changes the association seemed linear across the four weight lifted quartiles.

**(Figure 2)**

**DISCUSSION**

Paragraph Number 22 This randomized controlled trial investigated the impact of one year of resistance and weight-bearing exercise on whole-body and regional body composition in postmenopausal women who were either using HRT or not using HRT. Previous studies with postmenopausal women which analyzed the effects of resistance and/or weight-bearing training on body composition used either small samples sizes (15,

22, 28), relatively short training periods (30, 31), training protocols without added weights (7, 16, 17), and/or did not analyze the relative impact of HRT with resistance training (21, 23). Furthermore, few studies have used controlled designs. Although the present study did not randomize subjects by HRT, it is, to our knowledge, the only study that has investigated the interaction of strength training and HRT effects in post-menopausal women. Recently we have submitted for publication the bone density results on this cohort of women (8) as well as body composition changes in a subsample (12).

In the present study, we performed *post-hoc* analyses to study the dose-response effects of strength training on lean soft tissue (LST) changes and strength gains, using weight lifted during one year and attendance rates as independent variables. These variables were carefully monitored by the study's staff and recorded after each exercise session.

#### *Exercise effects on body composition*

Paragraph Number 23 We found resistance and weight-bearing training to have a significant and positive effect on LST changes (whole-body and regional areas of interest) and a significant negative effect on legs fat tissue (FT) changes in women who exercised. All measured changes in body composition variables within the exercise group, except for trunk FT changes, were significantly different than what was found for non-exercising controls, who showed a tendency for LST losses and FT gains after one year. Moreover, the main effects of HRT were found to have a non-significant impact on body composition changes.

Paragraph Number 24 One-year gains in LST among exercisers were close to 0.9 kg, a result that can be considered typical. Using a training protocol identical to ours, Taaffe et al. (27) observed a mean increase of 0.7 kg in DXA-measured LST, while Nelson et al. (21) observed a mean muscle mass gain of 1.2 kg (assessed by creatinine excretion) with a twice-a-week protocol, in both cases after 1 year of resistance training with postmenopausal women. These average changes are relatively modest and, if considered in isolation, may be interpreted as clinically insignificant. Nevertheless, our study and others (21) observed that subjects not participating in resistance training show a noticeable trend towards lean mass losses, reconfirming the fact that after menopause, women are at higher risk for sarcopenia (11). If continued for several years, strength training may override this trend, protecting women from progressive lean tissue losses and the accompanying decrease in function and quality of life (6).

Paragraph Number 25 The effects of resistance training on FT appear to be smaller in magnitude than those observed for LST. Collectively, previous studies have shown non-significant mean FT losses ranging from 0.2 and 0.7 kg in women after various resistance training programs, of 4 to 12 months in duration (15, 23, 28, 30, 31). This supports the common understanding that strength training *per se* will not typically cause enough energy expenditure to induce substantial changes in energy balance and adiposity (2). However, longer-term strength training studies may show cumulative beneficial effects on women's adiposity when compared to sedentary controls. It is also important to note that strength training has been shown to significantly impact intra-abdominal fat in postmenopausal women, even in the absence of whole-body weight, fat, and fat-free mass



changes (30), suggesting that important health benefits from strength training may go unnoticed when less precise measures of regional adiposity are used.

#### *HRT and exercise effects*

Paragraph Number 26 We found virtually no independent effects of HRT on body composition after 1 year. Previously, HRT has been shown to contribute to the preservation of fat-free mass (16) or to have no effects on lean tissue (1, 13). Results on fat and weight have also been variable (4, 13). The relative impact of hormone replacement therapy and exercise on the body composition and/or strength of exercising postmenopausal women has been studied both cross-sectionally (14) and longitudinally (7, 10, 16). Three studies using body weight-bearing aerobic exercises in older women (60 and 84 years old) have analyzed the independent and exercise-related effects of HRT on body composition and/or strength changes, showing that HRT has a positive and additive (in relation to exercise alone) effects on FT but that it does not significantly add to the impact of exercise on fat-free mass or strength (7, 10, 16).

Paragraph Number 27. Differences in sample age and size, and especially in the type of exercise training limit comparisons between these studies and ours. The presence of added weights in the exercise program we used may solicit a different response in LST than that which is caused by the impact forces induced by the weight of the body alone. In our study, HRT did not enhance the exercise effects on LST changes but instead it worked to prevent LST losses in the non-exercising controls. Unlike previously reported data [e.g. (10)], we did not notice an interaction between the effects of exercise and HRT on FT or fat distribution changes.

Paragraph Number 28 The established knowledge that muscle cells in other species have estrogen receptors (9, 24) may explain the potentially anabolic effects of HRT on LST in humans. Since estrogens promote fluid retention in postmenopausal women (25), it is hypothesized that estrogens improve LST at least partially by increasing the water content in muscle, an adaptation which is also induced by exercise. Because DXA does not discriminate between protein and water content in LST, this study cannot elucidate the mechanisms behind the relative effects of HRT on LST in sedentary controls. Also, the assessment of abdominal adiposity by DXA may be insufficiently precise to detect significant changes in that depot, particularly if they occurred preferentially in the abdominal region, where HRT and exercise may have a selective impact (16, 30).

*Strength changes and dose-response effects*

Paragraph Number 29 The importance of preserving or even increasing LST in women after menopause and in later years is associated with the need to maintain an adequate level of muscular functioning, allowing independent and effective physical work in daily tasks. However, it is not clear if muscle mass is an ideal surrogate measure of muscular function. In fact, while some evidence has shown muscle mass to be correlated with physical performance (6, 32), muscle strength is a more consistent predictor of performance and physical ability (11) and has been shown to mediate the association between muscle mass and performance in daily tasks (32). Given the wide variability of responses for strength and LST changes, we investigated the source of this variation and hypothesized that the level of attendance to the exercise sessions and/or the amount of weight women lifted in those sessions throughout the year could account for some of the total variance in outcome measures. Weight lifted during the year-long program

significantly predicted changes in LST and, with the exception of legs, changes in strength, while percentage of sessions attended did not predict LST changes but it was correlated with some strength improvements. Importantly, a dose-response relationship was observed between the total weight that was lifted during one year and improvements in both lean mass and strength, adjusting for baseline body composition. Although total weight lifted values in this study are difficult to translate into practical recommendations given differences in equipment between ours and other training settings, the observation of a increasing improvement in LST and strength with increasing amount of weight lifted across a wide range of values suggests postmenopausal women will continue to benefit from protocols that ask for continuously higher training loads, within safe limits. This is the first study to report dose-response analysis for changes in body composition and strength in post-menopausal women, as a result of resistance training.

Paragraph Number 30 This study has limitations that should be acknowledged. First, subjects were not randomly assigned to HRT and no-HRT groups. Although a completely randomized design is preferable, many women are not willing or able to undergo HRT, and randomizing women to HRT requires extensive surveillance that was beyond the scope of this study. Also, the study was originally designed to study exercise effects on bone. Therefore, the training program was not conceived to specifically promote muscle and strength changes but to maximize external weights' and weight-bearing impact on the skeleton. Finally, the fact that subjects exercised on 4 different facilities with different equipment (though performing identical exercises in all facilities) may have influenced results beyond what we could statistically control. These limitations notwithstanding, this is the largest exercise randomized controlled trial (RCT) reporting the effects of

resistance training on postmenopausal women's body composition and strength and the only RCT to study the independent and interactive impact of HRT using added and weight-bearing resistance training, in this age group.

Paragraph Number 31 In conclusion, we found that resistance and weight-bearing exercise had a significant and positive impact on the total and regional body composition of postmenopausal women, independent of HRT. In the absence of exercise, HRT protected women from LST losses occurring in non-HRT treated controls. The overall positive impact of exercise on body composition in postmenopausal women was clearly superior to that of HRT. Frequent and vigorous resistance exercises were safely performed by a large number of postmenopausal participants, many of whom lifted a considerable amount of weight during the one-year training program. These are very encouraging results, particularly in light of recent reports which have cast a shadow of doubt on the health effects of the most popular form of hormone replacement treatment in healthy postmenopausal women (5).

This work was supported by the NIH grant #AR39559. The authors wish to acknowledge all the participants in the BEST study for their enthusiasm and dedication to the project.

Address for correspondence: Timothy G. Lohman, Ph.D., Department of Physiology, University of Arizona, 101, Ina Gittings Building, Tucson, AZ 85721, Email: Lohman@u.arizona.edu

## References

1. Aloia, J. F., A. Vaswani, L. Russo, et al. The influence of menopause and hormonal replacement therapy on body cell mass and body fat mass. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 172:896-900, 1995.
2. American College of Sports Medicine. Position stand on appropriate intervention strategies for weight loss and prevention of weight regain for adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 33:2145-2156, 2001.
3. American College of Sports Medicine. Position stand on the recommended quantity and quality of exercise for developing and maintaining cardiorespiratory and muscular fitness, and flexibility in healthy adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 30:975-991, 1998.
4. American Medical Association. Effects of estrogen or estrogen/progestin regimens on heart disease risk factors in postmenopausal women. The Postmenopausal Estrogen/Progestin Interventions (PEPI) Trial. The Writing Group for the PEPI Trial. *Jama.* 273:199-208, 1995.
5. American Medical Association. Risks and benefits of estrogen plus progestin in healthy postmenopausal women: principal results From the Women's Health Initiative randomized controlled trial. The Writing Group for the Women's Health Initiative Investigators. *Jama.* 288:321-333, 2002.
6. Baumgartner, R.N., K.M. Koehler, D. Gallagher, et al. Epidemiology of sarcopenia among the elderly in New Mexico. *Am J Epidemiol.* 147:755-763, 1998.

7. Brown, M., S.J. Birge, and W.M. Kohrt. Hormone replacement therapy does not augment gains in muscle strength or fat-free mass in response to weight-bearing exercise. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 52:B166-170, 1997.
8. Cussler, E.C., T.G. Lohman, S.B. Going, et al. Weight lifted in strength training predicts bone change in postmenopausal women. *Med Sci Sports Med (in press)*.
9. Dube, J.Y., R. Lesage, and R.R. Tremblay. Androgen and estrogen binding in rat skeletal and perineal muscles. *Can J Biochem*. 54:50-55, 1975.
10. Evans, E.M., R.E. Van Pelt, E.F. Binder, et al. Effects of HRT and exercise training on insulin action, glucose tolerance, and body composition in older women. *J Appl Physiol*. 90:2033-2040, 2001.
11. Evans, W. Functional and metabolic consequences of sarcopenia. *J Nutr*. 127:998S-1003S, 1997.
12. Figueroa, A., S.B. Going, L.A. Milliken, et al. Effects of exercise training and hormone replacement therapy on lean and fat mass in postmenopausal women. *Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci (in press)*.
13. Gambacciani, M., M. Ciaponi, B. Cappagli, et al. Body weight, body fat distribution, and hormonal replacement therapy in early postmenopausal women. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 82:414-417, 1997.
14. Hagberg, J.M., J.M. Zmuda, S.D. McCole, et al. Determinants of body composition in postmenopausal women. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 55:M607-612, 2000.

15. Hunter, G.R., C.J. Wetzstein, D.A. Fields, et al. Resistance training increases total energy expenditure and free-living physical activity in older adults. *J Appl Physiol.* 89:977-984, 2000.
16. Kohrt, W.M., A.A. Ehsani, and S.J. Birge, Jr. HRT preserves increases in bone mineral density and reductions in body fat after a supervised exercise program. *J Appl Physiol.* 84:1506-1512, 1998.
17. Kohrt, W.M., K.A. Obert, and J.O. Holloszy. Exercise training improves fat distribution patterns in 60- to 70-year old men and women. *J Gerontology.* 47:M99-M105, 1992.
18. Ley, C.J., B. Lees, and Stevenson. Sex- and menopause-associated changes in body-fat distribution. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 55:950-954, 1992.
19. Mazess, R.B., H. Barden, J. Bisek, et al. Dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry for total-body and regional bone-mineral and soft-tissue composition. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 51:1106-1112, 1990.
20. Meeuwsen, I.B., M.M. Samson, and H.J. Verhaar. Evaluation of the applicability of HRT as a preservative of muscle strength in women. *Maturitas.* 36:49-61, 2000.
21. Nelson, M., M. Fiatarone, C. Morganti, et al. Effects of high intensity strength training on multiple risk factors for osteoporotic fractures. *JAMA.* 272:1909-1914, 1994.
22. Pyka, G., E. Lindenberger, S. Charette, et al. Muscle strength and fiber adaptations to a year-long resistance training program in elderly men and women. *J Gerontol.* 49:M22-27, 1994.

23. Ryan, A.S., R.E. Pratley, D. Elahi, et al. Resistive training increases fat-free mass and maintains RMR despite weight loss in postmenopausal women. *J Appl Physiol.* 79:818-823, 1995.
24. Saartok, T. Steroid receptors in two types of rabbit skeletal muscle. *Int J Sports Med.* 5:130-136, 1984.
25. Stachenfeld, N.S., L. DiPietro, S.F. Palter, et al. Estrogen influences osmotic secretion of AVP and body water balance in postmenopausal women. *Am J Physiol.* 274:R187-195, 1998.
26. Svendsen, O.L., C. Hassager, and C. Christiansen. Age- and menopause-associated variations in body composition and fat distribution in healthy women as measured by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry. *Metabolism.* 44:369-373, 1995.
27. Taaffe, D.R., L. Pruitt, G. Pyka, et al. Comparative effects of high- and low-intensity resistance training on thigh muscle strength, fiber area, and tissue composition in elderly women. *Clin Physiol.* 16:381-392, 1996.
28. Taaffe, D.R., L. Pruitt, J. Reim, et al. Effect of sustained resistance training on basal metabolic rate in older women. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 43:465-471, 1995.
29. Tchernof, A. and E.T. Poehlman. Effects of the menopause transition on body fatness and body fat distribution. *Obes Res.* 6:246-254, 1998.
30. Treuth, M.S., G.R. Hunter, T. Kekes-Szabo, et al. Reduction in intra-abdominal adipose tissue after strength training in older women. *J Appl Physiol.* 78:1425-1431, 1995.



31. Treuth, M.S., G.R. Hunter, R.L. Weinsier, et al. Energy expenditure and substrate utilization in older women after strength training: 24-h calorimeter results. *J Appl Physiol.* 78:2140-2146, 1995.
32. Visser, M., A.B. Newman, M.C. Nevitt, et al. Reexamining the sarcopenia hypothesis. Muscle mass versus muscle strength. Health, Aging, and Body Composition Study Research Group. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 904:456-461, 2000.

## Legends for Figures

Legend for Figure 1. \* $P < 0.05$ , \*\*\* $P < 0.001$  for paired t-test within group from baseline to one year

Legend for Figure 2. Tukey-HSD test for multiple comparisons (significant differences are indicated by different letters,  $P < 0.05$ ); To build quartiles, total weight lifted and attendance were adjusted for age, HRT status, baseline body composition, cohort, and facility; Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals; Adjusted means for quartiles of total weight lifted in one year were 826, 1194, 1412 and 1822 (kg/100) and for attendance were 57.9, 75.8, 83.6, and 89.6% (percentage of sessions attended), respectively for quartiles 1 through 4.

**Table 1. Baseline descriptive statistics by HRT status (n=233)**

	HRT (n=119) <b>Mean ± SD</b>	No HRT (n=114) <b>Mean ± SD</b>
Age (yr)	54.5 ± 4.4	56.0 ± 5.1 *
Years post-menopausal	5.0 ± 2.7	6.6 ± 3.1 ***
Weight (kg)	68.2 ± 11.9	66.9 ± 10.1
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	25.5 ± 4.1	25.1 ± 3.3
Waist (cm)	80.8 ± 9.9	80.2 ± 9.6
WHR	0.78 ± 0.05	0.78 ± 0.07
Body fat (%)	38.2 ± 6.9	38.2 ± 6.6
Total LST (kg)	38.6 ± 4.5	38.1 ± 4.1
Total FT (kg)	26.3 ± 8.7	25.7 ± 7.6


LST=lean soft tissue, FT=fat tissue; SD=standard deviation; WHR=waist-to-hip ratio;  
\* $P<0.05$ , \*\*\* $P<0.001$  for independent t-test comparing HRT and No HRT two groups.

**Table 2. One-year changes for fat and lean soft tissue for exercise and non-exercise groups within HRT status**

	HRT		No HRT		Exercise	HRT	Ex. x HRT
	Exercise (n=58)	No Exercise (n=61)	Exercise (n=59)	No Exercise (n=55)			
	mean ± SD	mean ±SD	mean ±SD	mean ±SD	<i>P</i> <sup>a</sup>	<i>P</i> <sup>a</sup>	<i>P</i> <sup>a</sup>
Weight (kg)	-0.2 ± 2.6	0.8 ± 2.7*	0.34 ± 2.5	-0.4 ± 3.3	0.439	0.671	0.024
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	-0.02 ± 1.03	0.38 ± 1.11*	0.17 ± 1.06	-0.03 ± 1.23	0.213	0.669	0.049
Waist (cm)	-0.45 ± 2.39	0.04 ± 3.44	-0.44 ± 2.80	-1.14 ± 3.02	0.898	0.269	0.173
WHR	0.001 ± 0.018	-0.004 ± 0.026	0.002 ± 0.021	-0.005 ± 0.033	0.105	0.552	0.552
Body fat (%)	-1.14 ± 2.74	0.23 ± 2.18**	-0.99 ± 2.63	0.11 ± 2.31*	<0.001	0.772	0.772
Total LST (kg)	0.9 ± 0.1	0.3 ± 1.1*	1.0 ± 0.9	-0.3 ± 1.1***	<0.001	0.244	0.008
Legs LST (kg)	0.1 ± 0.5	0.0 ± 0.5**	0.3 ± 0.5	-0.2 ± 0.5***	<0.001	0.353	0.030
Arms LST (kg)	0.1 ± 0.2	0.0 ± 0.2*	0.1 ± 0.2	0.0 ± 0.2***	<0.001	0.747	0.549
Trunk LST (kg)	0.5 ± 0.7	0.3 ± 0.8	0.5 ± 0.6	-0.1 ± 0.7***	<0.001	0.018	0.020
Total FT (kg)	-0.7 ± 2.5	0.5 ± 2.5*	-0.4 ± 2.6	-0.1 ± 2.7	0.015	0.949	0.236
Legs FT (kg)	-0.5 ± 0.9	0.0 ± 1.0*	-0.3 ± 1.0	-0.2 ± 1.2	0.021	0.834	0.156
Arms FT (kg)	-0.1 ± 0.7	0.1 ± 0.4*	0.0 ± 0.4	0.0 ± 0.4	0.030	0.634	0.117
Trunk FT (kg)	-0.1 ± 1.4	0.3 ± 1.3	-0.1 ± 1.4	0.1 ± 1.3	0.030	0.871	0.543

LST=lean soft tissue, FT=fat tissue, SD=standard deviation; \**P*<0.05, \*\**P*<0.01, \*\*\**P*<0.001 for independent t-test comparing exercise and no exercise groups within HRT status; <sup>a</sup>*P* values for analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with age, baseline LST and baseline FT as covariates.

**Figure 1. One-year changes in fat and lean soft tissues by HRT and exercise status**



**Figure 2. Changes in LST and strength by quartile of total weight lifted (sum of all exercises) and attendance changes (exercisers only, n=117)**

