

# Validation of the firefighter WFI treadmill protocol for predicting $\text{VO}_2$ max

B. A. Dolezal<sup>1</sup>, D. Barr<sup>2</sup>, D. M. Boland<sup>1</sup>, D. L. Smith<sup>2</sup> and C. B. Cooper<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Medicine and Physiology, Exercise Physiology Research Laboratory, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA, <sup>2</sup>Department of Health and Exercise Sciences, First Responder Health and Safety Laboratory, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866, USA.

Correspondence to: B. A. Dolezal, Department of Medicine and Physiology, Exercise Physiology Research Laboratory, David Geffen School of Medicine, 10833 Le Conte Avenue, CHS 37–131, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA. Tel: +1 310 741 8954; fax: +1 310 206 8211; e-mail: [drbducla@gmail.com](mailto:drbducla@gmail.com)

<b>Background</b>	The Wellness-Fitness Initiative submaximal treadmill exercise test (WFI-TM) is recommended by the US National Fire Protection Agency to assess aerobic capacity ( $\text{VO}_2$ max) in firefighters. However, predicting $\text{VO}_2$ max from submaximal tests can result in errors leading to erroneous conclusions about fitness.
<b>Aims</b>	To investigate the level of agreement between $\text{VO}_2$ max predicted from the WFI-TM against its direct measurement using exhaled gas analysis.
<b>Methods</b>	The WFI-TM was performed to volitional fatigue. Differences between estimated $\text{VO}_2$ max (derived from the WFI-TM equation) and direct measurement (exhaled gas analysis) were compared by paired <i>t</i> -test and agreement was determined using Pearson Product-Moment correlation and Bland–Altman analysis. Statistical significance was set at $P < 0.05$ .
<b>Results</b>	Fifty-nine men performed the WFI-TM. Mean (standard deviation) values for estimated and measured $\text{VO}_2$ max were 44.6 (3.4) and 43.6 (7.9) ml/kg/min, respectively ( $P < 0.01$ ). The mean bias by which WFI-TM overestimated $\text{VO}_2$ max was 0.9 ml/kg/min with a 95% prediction interval of $\pm 13.1$ . Prediction errors for 22% of subjects were within $\pm 5\%$ ; 36% had errors greater than or equal to $\pm 15\%$ and 7% had greater than $\pm 30\%$ errors. The correlation between predicted and measured $\text{VO}_2$ max was $r = 0.55$ (standard error of the estimate = 2.8 ml/kg/min).
<b>Conclusions</b>	WFI-TM predicts $\text{VO}_2$ max with 11% error. There is a tendency to overestimate aerobic capacity in less fit individuals and to underestimate it in more fit individuals leading to a clustering of values around 42 ml/kg/min, a criterion used by some fire departments to assess fitness for duty.
<b>Key words</b>	Firefighters; fitness tests; physical fitness.