

Response to the Letter to the Editor

Int J Sports Med 2012; 33(05): 416

DOI: 10.1055/s-0032-1309038

Letter to the Editor

© Georg Thieme Verlag KG Stuttgart · New York

J. Pinot, F. Grappe

- [Abstract](#)
- [Full Text](#)

[Buy Article Permissions and Reprints](#)

Letter to the Editor

Dear Editors,

Prof Grappe and I read with interest the correspondence from Dr McGregor.

First, we would like to reiterate the context of our study. It should be recalled that the relationship between power output and time has been studied since the second part of the XXth century (between 1954 and 1965) by Drs. Monod and Scherrer who were the pioneers in this field. Thus, the power profile is derived from these early studies with the power output measurement from power-meters. The methodology used in our manuscript takes into account the concept of *power output - time* associated with the follow-up of the power output measured in different cyclists during training and competition. We track the evolution of 13 record PO from each training and competition of cyclists to plot a *Record Power Profile* (RPP, between 1 s to 4 h) whereas Dr. Coggan assesses the level of the cyclists with only 4 measures from specific field tests between 5 s to a theoretical point (functional threshold power). His methodology is very different from ours. We have in common the assessment of the physical potential of a cyclist, but there are many methods in existence to do this.

With regard to the terminology "*Power profile*", before our paper was published, Quod et al. [2] also used the term "*Power profile*" in a recent study (referenced in our paper). Dr. Coggan is not listed amongst the references of this paper. Thus, our title

and use of the term in question is in keeping with this previous paper, but we emphasise our specific methodology for the assessment as the “*Record Power Profile*” of the cyclist. Moreover, it should be remembered that the term “*power profile*” is used routinely to describe any appraisal of power measurements over time or distance, e. g. in Wingate testing and pacing strategy research, and the term has been used in these contexts certainly before 2000. Like us, Quod et al. [2] referenced the sort of software which Dr. McGregor eludes to in his letter.

Dr. Coggan's book [1] contains no scientific references that could justify its presence in the bibliography of a scientific publication. Thus, it was not possible to refer to Dr. Coggan in the redaction of our scientific article knowing that in the first revised version of our paper, the reviewers did not accept this kind of reference. Also, to the best of our knowledge, the studies conducted by Dr. Coggan about this topic are inexistent in the scientific literature. His works do not feature in any of the bibliographies of the articles associated with our manuscript. In France, we have no trace of Congress acts or other posts (only the article on the website TrainingPeaks.com). From there, it was difficult for us to reference his work in our paper.

An innovative character of our study is that, from our RPP we can determine 5 exercise intensity zones for the cyclist training process. In terms of the use of the word “new” in our paper, like all other researchers, we attempt to undertake novel and original studies, and this is a fundamental aspect of all articles which are peer-reviewed for all decent journals. Contribution to new knowledge is crucial in research and we maintain that our research work does contribute to new knowledge in a novel way. We are proud of this aspect.

From these explanations, we ask for your understanding.

Sincerely,

Julien Pinot and Frederic Grappe

Coaches of the FDJ - Bigmat Pro Cycling Team