ISSN: 2798-7345 (online)
ISSN: 2830-2648 (print)

Vol (7) No (2)
doi: 10.31942/jess.v7i2.9184

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND SPORT SCIENCE (JESS)
http://publikasiilmiah.unwahas.ac.id/index.php/JESS

Exercise Physiology As A Foundation For Optimizing Athletic Performance: A Narrative Review

Praska Rivqi Nugraha[1]*

*Corresponding Author: Praska Rivqi Nugraha, e-mail: praskarivqi2000@gmail.com
[1]Department of Physical Education, Health and Recreation, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Wahid Hasyim, Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract

Objectives: This narrative review examines how exercise physiology supports athletic performance by explaining the interaction among cardiorespiratory, metabolic, neuromuscular, and recovery adaptations and by translating these mechanisms into evidence-informed training decisions.

Materials and Methods: A focused narrative search of PubMed and publisher databases was conducted for peer-reviewed reviews, meta-analyses, and consensus statements addressing physiological adaptation, training specificity, load monitoring, fatigue, recovery, and athletic performance. Fifteen publications with verified DOI records were purposively selected for conceptual relevance and methodological authority. Evidence was organized through thematic synthesis rather than statistical pooling.

Results: Five interdependent domains were identified: cardiorespiratory remodeling; metabolic and mitochondrial adaptation; neuromuscular force and power development; specificity and dose-response in training prescription; and the regulation of fatigue through load monitoring, recovery, and tapering. Performance improvement emerges when overload is sufficiently specific to the sport, internal and external responses are monitored together, and recovery preserves adaptation while limiting nonfunctional overreaching.

Conclusions: Exercise physiology is most valuable when it connects measurable athlete responses with individualized programming. Coaches should integrate sport-specific testing, progressive loading, multimodal monitoring, and planned recovery instead of relying on a single physiological marker. This approach can improve performance readiness while protecting athlete health.

Keywords: athletic performance; exercise adaptation; training load; recovery; sport physiology

Introduction

Athletic performance is the observable outcome of multiple biological systems functioning under the technical and tactical constraints of a sport. Exercise physiology provides the explanatory bridge between a training stimulus and the athlete's subsequent response. It describes acute changes during exercise, such as increased heart rate, ventilation, oxygen consumption, substrate turnover, and motor-unit recruitment, as well as chronic adaptations that emerge after repeated exposure. These adaptations include cardiac remodeling, increased mitochondrial content, improved metabolic regulation, greater neural drive, muscle hypertrophy, and enhanced fatigue resistance (Hawley et al., 2014; Martinez et al., 2021).

The practical value of this knowledge lies in dose selection. Training is not beneficial merely because it is strenuous; it is beneficial when the mode, intensity, duration, frequency, and recovery interval provide an appropriate stimulus for the individual athlete. Sport-specific assessment is therefore essential because laboratory precision alone does not guarantee ecological validity. Reilly et al. (2009) emphasized that physiological assessment should match the determinants and movement demands of the target sport, while Seiler (2010) showed that successful endurance preparation depends on the deliberate distribution of intensity and duration.

Earlier explanations of exercise physiology often listed changes in the heart, lungs, blood vessels, muscles, and bones separately. Although useful for basic instruction, such descriptions can obscure how adaptation is integrated and how coaches should make decisions when responses conflict. For example, an athlete may complete a high external workload but show an unusually elevated internal response, persistent fatigue, or declining performance. Conversely, a reduced training volume before competition can improve performance by dissipating fatigue without eliminating previously acquired fitness (Bosquet et al., 2007; Vachon et al., 2021).

A contemporary synthesis must therefore link mechanisms, measurement, prescription, and recovery. The purpose of this narrative review is to explain the principal physiological pathways through which systematic training supports athletic performance; identify the role of specificity, progressive overload, monitoring, and tapering; and formulate practical implications for coaches and sport-science practitioners. The review focuses on performance-oriented training in healthy athletic populations rather than exercise therapy for clinical disease.

Materials and Methods

Study Design

This study used a focused narrative review design. The design was selected because the source manuscript was conceptual and sought to integrate mechanisms and applied training principles across different sport contexts. The review was interpretive rather than systematic: it did not attempt exhaustive retrieval, formal risk-of-bias scoring, or meta-analysis. Its purpose was to construct a coherent account of how physiological evidence informs performance preparation.

Search Strategy and Source Selection

Literature searches were conducted in PubMed and on official journal or publisher pages using combinations of the terms "exercise physiology," "physiological adaptation," "athletic performance," "training intensity," "interval training," "strength training," "training load," "recovery," "overtraining," and "tapering." Citation chaining from major reviews and consensus statements was used to identify foundational publications. Sources were eligible when they were peer-reviewed, directly relevant to healthy athletes or performance-oriented exercise, and had an active DOI that matched the article metadata. Clinical rehabilitation studies, non-peer-reviewed commentary, and publications without sufficiently relevant physiological or performance content were excluded.

Evidence Organization and Analysis

Fifteen publications were retained. Priority was given to systematic reviews, meta-analyses, consensus statements, and authoritative mechanistic reviews because these sources synthesize broader bodies of evidence. Each publication was read for its focal physiological system, training variable, principal conclusion, and applied implication. Findings were coded and consolidated into five themes: cardiorespiratory adaptation; metabolic and mitochondrial adaptation; neuromuscular adaptation; training specificity and dose-response; and load, fatigue, recovery, and tapering. Apparent disagreements were interpreted in relation to population, sport demands, intervention mode, outcome selection, and timing of measurement.

Results

The synthesis identified five connected domains through which exercise physiology contributes to performance. Table 1 summarizes the evidence pattern and its practical meaning. These domains are not independent: the magnitude and timing of improvement depend on the athlete's baseline status, the specificity of the stimulus, and whether recovery permits the induced molecular and functional responses to consolidate.

Table 1. Thematic synthesis of physiological contributions to athletic performance

Domain	Main evidence pattern	Performance implication
Cardiorespiratory	Repeated endurance loading increases central and peripheral oxygen-delivery capacity; structural cardiac changes must be interpreted in the context of training history and athlete health.	Supports sustained power or velocity and delays fatigue in endurance-dominant tasks.
Metabolic and mitochondrial	Exercise intensity and accumulated work activate signaling pathways that increase mitochondrial proteins, oxidative capacity, and substrate regulation.	Improves aerobic energy provision, repeated-effort tolerance, and metabolic efficiency.
Neuromuscular	Strength, explosive, and plyometric stimuli improve neural activation, force production, rate of force development, and movement economy.	Benefits acceleration, sprinting, jumping, change of direction, and endurance economy.
Specificity and dose-response	Adaptation depends on the match among exercise mode, intensity, volume, frequency, and sport-specific performance determinants.	Testing and prescription should reflect the competitive task and individual response.
Load, fatigue, and recovery	External work and internal response must be monitored together; excessive load with inadequate recovery can produce maladaptation, whereas tapering can reveal fitness.	Promotes readiness, reduces nonfunctional overreaching risk, and supports peaking.

Cardiorespiratory Adaptation

Endurance training elicits coordinated changes in cardiac structure and function, blood volume, peripheral circulation, and skeletal-muscle oxygen extraction. These adaptations raise the capacity to transport and use oxygen and reduce the relative physiological cost of a given workload. Martinez et al. (2021) described exercise-induced cardiac remodeling as a continuum influenced by training dose, sport type, age, sex, and individual characteristics. The evidence therefore supports repeated and progressive aerobic exposure, while also requiring practitioners to distinguish expected athletic remodeling from potential cardiovascular pathology.

Metabolic and Mitochondrial Adaptation

At the cellular level, muscular contraction disturbs energy homeostasis and activates signaling networks that regulate gene expression and protein synthesis. Hawley et al. (2014) showed that adaptation reflects communication among skeletal muscle, cardiovascular, metabolic, and neuroendocrine systems. Interval-training evidence further indicates that exercise intensity influences metabolic stress and mitochondrial signaling. MacInnis and Gibala (2017) and Atakan et al. (2021) reported that high-intensity interval training can improve maximal oxygen uptake, mitochondrial content, aerobic endurance, and anaerobic capacity, although the optimal format depends on training status and total work.

Neuromuscular Adaptation

Performance in explosive actions depends not only on maximal force but also on how rapidly force is produced. Maffiuletti et al. (2016) linked rate of force development to neural drive, muscle-tendon properties, maximal strength, and task-specific measurement conditions. Strength training can also improve endurance performance through better running economy and sprint capacity without necessarily changing maximal oxygen uptake. Blagrove et al. (2018) found that appropriately programmed heavy, explosive, and plyometric training generally improves running economy and selected performance outcomes in middle- and long-distance runners.

Training Specificity and Dose-Response

Across the evidence, no universal training dose was optimal for every performance outcome. Reilly et al. (2009) emphasized the need to identify sport-specific physiological determinants before selecting tests or interventions. Seiler (2010) similarly showed that intensity distribution matters in endurance preparation, where a large volume of lower-intensity work can coexist with smaller but purposeful amounts of high-intensity training. The practical result is that progressive overload should be individualized and directed toward the limiting determinant rather than applied as a generic increase in workload.

Load, Fatigue, Recovery, and Tapering

Training load is meaningful only when the external work performed and the athlete's internal response are interpreted together. Bourdon et al. (2017) recommended combining measures while considering their validity, reliability, feasibility, and sport context. Impellizzeri et al. (2019) clarified that external load is the physical work completed, whereas internal load is the psychophysiological response that mediates adaptation. When overload is excessive or recovery is insufficient, functional overreaching may progress toward nonfunctional overreaching or overtraining syndrome (Meeusen et al., 2013). Recovery monitoring and planned reductions in load are therefore components of adaptation rather than signs of inadequate training. Meta-analytic evidence indicates that tapering can improve performance by reducing accumulated fatigue while maintaining the adaptations needed for competition (Bosquet et al., 2007; Vachon et al., 2021).

Discussion

The principal finding of this review is that exercise physiology contributes to athletic performance through an integrated load-response-adaptation process. Training first disrupts homeostasis; the resulting cardiovascular, metabolic, and neuromuscular signals can subsequently produce adaptation if the stimulus is specific and recovery is adequate. This interpretation extends the traditional organ-by-organ account of physiology. It positions the athlete as a dynamic system in which central oxygen delivery, peripheral energy metabolism, neural activation, mechanical output, and fatigue regulation jointly determine performance.

The cardiorespiratory findings agree with Martinez et al. (2021), who demonstrated that chronic exercise produces structural and functional remodeling rather than merely a lower resting heart rate. Such remodeling can increase stroke volume and support high cardiac output during exercise, but its magnitude differs across sports and individuals. This variability explains why a single normative value should not be used to judge all athletes. A physiologically informed assessment combines training history, symptoms, resting and exercise responses, and the specific demands of competition.

The metabolic results also support earlier mechanistic research. Hawley et al. (2014) described exercise adaptation as an integrated biological process, while MacInnis and Gibala (2017) showed that intensity is a major—but not isolated—determinant of mitochondrial and whole-body adaptation. Atakan et al. (2021) similarly concluded that interval training can provide substantial improvements despite lower time commitment. Taken together, these studies do not imply that every session should be maximal. Rather, high-intensity work should be placed within a broader program that supplies sufficient volume, technical quality, and recovery. This interpretation is consistent with Seiler's (2010) observation that successful endurance athletes distribute training intensity instead of accumulating most training near the threshold.

Neuromuscular evidence demonstrates why endurance capacity alone cannot explain performance in many sports. Rapid acceleration, jumping, sprinting, tackling, throwing, and directional changes require force to be expressed within short time windows. Maffiuletti et al. (2016) showed that rate of force development is sensitive to both physiological and methodological conditions. This matters for athlete testing: an isometric measure obtained in a laboratory may not fully represent force application during a sport-specific action. The evidence reviewed by Blagrove et al. (2018) nevertheless indicates that strength training can improve running economy and performance even when maximal oxygen uptake remains unchanged. Thus, performance may improve because an athlete uses less energy at a given speed or produces force more effectively, not only because aerobic capacity increases.

The synthesis also reinforces the specificity principle. Reilly et al. (2009) warned that a highly reliable test may have limited practical value if it poorly represents the target sport. Coaches should therefore begin with a needs analysis, identify the dominant energy-system and neuromuscular requirements, and choose measurements capable of detecting meaningful changes. Generic increases in volume or intensity can create fatigue without addressing the actual performance limitation. In this context, physiology supports decision-making by explaining why the same external session can impose different internal loads on different athletes.

Load monitoring provides the operational link between theory and daily practice. Bourdon et al. (2017) recommended a multidimensional approach rather than dependence on one metric. Impellizzeri et al. (2019) further distinguished the prescribed or completed external work from the internal response that stimulates adaptation. Heart rate, session rating of perceived exertion, wellness, sleep, biochemical markers, and performance tests each capture different aspects of the response. Their usefulness depends on consistent collection, known measurement error, and an explicit decision rule. More data do not automatically create better decisions when measures are poorly selected or interpreted outside context.

The relationship between load and performance is also nonlinear. The IOC consensus led by Soligard et al. (2016) cautioned that rapid or excessive changes in load can elevate injury risk when the athlete's capacity is insufficient. Meeusen et al. (2013) similarly distinguished short-term functional overreaching from prolonged maladaptation. These findings are consistent with the recovery consensus of Kellmann et al. (2018), which treats recovery as an individualized, systematic process. Sleep, nutrition, psychological detachment, hydration, and active or passive recovery should therefore be planned according to the cause and magnitude of fatigue rather than used as interchangeable rituals.

Tapering illustrates how physiological reasoning can convert accumulated training into competition performance. Bosquet et al. (2007) found that a substantial reduction in volume with intensity maintained was generally effective, while Vachon et al. (2021) reported improvements in maximal power, repeated-sprint ability, change-of-direction speed, and maximal oxygen uptake in team-sport athletes. These findings explain why last-minute increases in workload can be counterproductive: fitness may be present but obscured by fatigue. A taper should be individualized according to prior load, sport calendar, and the decay rate of relevant adaptations.

Several limitations should be considered. This was a focused narrative review rather than a registered systematic review; study selection was purposive, no formal quality appraisal was conducted, and heterogeneous sports and outcomes were integrated conceptually. The review therefore supports principles rather than a universal prescription. Future research should evaluate athlete-specific dose-response relationships using repeated measures, report both internal and external load, include women and developing athletes adequately, and determine which combinations of physiological indicators lead to better coaching decisions.

Conclusions

Exercise physiology supports athletic performance by explaining how training stimuli produce integrated cardiorespiratory, metabolic, and neuromuscular adaptations. The evidence indicates that optimal preparation requires more than hard training: the stimulus must be specific, progressively dosed, monitored through both external work and internal response, and balanced with adequate recovery. Planned tapering can reduce fatigue and allow established fitness to be expressed at competition. Coaches and sport-science practitioners should therefore use physiology as a decision framework—linking sport demands, individual assessment, training prescription, response monitoring, and recovery—rather than relying on isolated measurements or generic programs.

Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the Department of Physical Education, Health and Recreation, Universitas Wahid Hasyim, for academic support. No external funding was received for this review.

References

Atakan, M. M., Li, Y., Koşar, Ş. N., Turnagöl, H. H., & Yan, X. (2021). Evidence-based effects of high-intensity interval training on exercise capacity and health: A review with historical perspective. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(13), 7201. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18137201

Blagrove, R. C., Howatson, G., & Hayes, P. R. (2018). Effects of strength training on the physiological determinants of middle- and long-distance running performance: A systematic review. Sports Medicine, 48, 1117–1149. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-017-0835-7

Bosquet, L., Montpetit, J., Arvisais, D., & Mujika, I. (2007). Effects of tapering on performance: A meta-analysis. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 39(8), 1358–1365. https://doi.org/10.1249/mss.0b013e31806010e0

Bourdon, P. C., Cardinale, M., Murray, A., Gastin, P., Kellmann, M., Varley, M. C., Gabbett, T. J., Coutts, A. J., Burgess, D. J., Gregson, W., & Cable, N. T. (2017). Monitoring athlete training loads: Consensus statement. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 12(Suppl 2), S2-161–S2-170. https://doi.org/10.1123/IJSPP.2017-0208

Hawley, J. A., Hargreaves, M., Joyner, M. J., & Zierath, J. R. (2014). Integrative biology of exercise. Cell, 159(4), 738–749. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.10.029

Impellizzeri, F. M., Marcora, S. M., & Coutts, A. J. (2019). Internal and external training load: 15 years on. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 14(2), 270–273. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2018-0935

Kellmann, M., Bertollo, M., Bosquet, L., Brink, M., Coutts, A. J., Duffield, R., Erlacher, D., Halson, S. L., Hecksteden, A., Heidari, J., Kallus, K. W., Meeusen, R., Mujika, I., Robazza, C., Skorski, S., Venter, R., & Beckmann, J. (2018). Recovery and performance in sport: Consensus statement. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 13(2), 240–245. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2017-0759

MacInnis, M. J., & Gibala, M. J. (2017). Physiological adaptations to interval training and the role of exercise intensity. The Journal of Physiology, 595(9), 2915–2930. https://doi.org/10.1113/JP273196

Maffiuletti, N. A., Aagaard, P., Blazevich, A. J., Folland, J., Tillin, N., & Duchateau, J. (2016). Rate of force development: Physiological and methodological considerations. European Journal of Applied Physiology, 116(6), 1091–1116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-016-3346-6

Martinez, M. W., Kim, J. H., Shah, A. B., Phelan, D., Emery, M. S., Wasfy, M. M., Fernandez, A. B., Bunch, T. J., Dean, P., Danielian, A., Krishnan, S., Baggish, A. L., Eijsvogels, T. M. H., Chung, E. H., & Levine, B. D. (2021). Exercise-induced cardiovascular adaptations and approach to exercise and cardiovascular disease: JACC state-of-the-art review. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 78(14), 1453–1470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2021.08.003

Meeusen, R., Duclos, M., Foster, C., Fry, A., Gleeson, M., Nieman, D., Raglin, J., Rietjens, G., Steinacker, J., & Urhausen, A. (2013). Prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the overtraining syndrome: Joint consensus statement of the ECSS and ACSM. European Journal of Sport Science, 13(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2012.730061

Reilly, T., Morris, T., & Whyte, G. (2009). The specificity of training prescription and physiological assessment: A review. Journal of Sports Sciences, 27(6), 575–589. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410902729741

Seiler, S. (2010). What is best practice for training intensity and duration distribution in endurance athletes? International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 5(3), 276–291. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.5.3.276

Soligard, T., Schwellnus, M., Alonso, J.-M., Bahr, R., Clarsen, B., Dijkstra, H. P., Gabbett, T., Gleeson, M., Hägglund, M., Hutchinson, M. R., Janse van Rensburg, C., Khan, K. M., Meeusen, R., Orchard, J. W., Pluim, B. M., Raftery, M., Budgett, R., & Engebretsen, L. (2016). How much is too much? (Part 1) International Olympic Committee consensus statement on load in sport and risk of injury. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 50(17), 1030–1041. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2016-096581

Vachon, A., Berryman, N., Mujika, I., Paquet, J.-B., Arvisais, D., & Bosquet, L. (2021). Effects of tapering on neuromuscular and metabolic fitness in team sports: A systematic review and meta-analysis. European Journal of Sport Science, 21(3), 300–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2020.1736183