Comparing the Effectiveness of Dynamic Stretching Vs Cold Water Immersion on Muscle Performance and Recovery in Recreational Runners: A Comparative Study

[1]Ashfak ahamed, [2]Muthukumaran Jothilingam

Affiliation:

[1]Undergraduate, [2]Professor and Principal

Saveetha College of Physiotherapy, SIMATS, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.

Corresponding author:

*Muthukumaran Jothilingam

Professor and Principal

School of Physiotherapy

Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth Deemed to be University Chennai

ABSTRACT

Objective: Post-exercise recovery is a critical component for athletes and fitness enthusiasts to maintain performance and prevent injury. Dynamic stretching and cold water immersion are two commonly used recovery techniques believed to accelerate recovery and improve subsequent performance. Dynamic stretching involves controlled movements through a full range of motion, while cold water immersion entails submerging the body or body parts in cold water.

Purpose: To determine the effect of dynamic stretching on post-exercise recovery and muscle performance among recreational runners compared to cold water immersion.

Materials and method: Thirty recreational runners were recruited and randomly allocated into two groups. Pre- and post-intervention measurements included lower limb muscle performance via countermovement jump test, range of motion assessments, and rated perceived exertion (RPE). The intervention consisted of 10-minute protocols performed immediately after a standardized high-intensity running protocol for 3 consecutive testing sessions. Data were collected and statistically analyzed.

Results: The results revealed statistically significant differences between the two groups. Group A (DYNAMIC STRETCHING) showed significantly better muscle performance recovery (87.2% vs. 78.4% of baseline, $p < 0.0001$) and

improved range of motion (12.3% vs. 5.6% improvement, $p < 0.001$) compared to Group B (COLD WATER IMMERSION) in the post-test. Additionally, Group A demonstrated lower RPE scores of 3.2 compared to Group B's 4.1 ($p < 0.0001$).

Conclusion: This study concluded that dynamic stretching shows significant benefits on post-exercise recovery and muscle performance among recreational runners compared to cold water immersion.

Key Words: Post-exercise recovery, muscle performance, range of motion, dynamic stretching, cold water immersion.

INTRODUCTION

Running is one of the most widely practiced forms of physical activity worldwide, with recreational runners comprising a significant portion of this population. The popularity of running stems from its accessibility, minimal equipment requirements, and well-documented health benefits. However, recreational runners often experience fatigue, muscle soreness, and decreased performance following intense training or competition. [1–3]

The lower limb muscles, particularly the gastrocnemius, soleus, and hamstrings, are extensively engaged during running activities. These muscles work synergistically to provide propulsion, stability, and shock absorption during each gait cycle. The gastrocnemius and soleus muscles, collectively known as the calf muscles, are particularly crucial as they generate approximately 50% of the propulsive force during running, making them susceptible to fatigue and injury. [4–5]

These muscles receive blood supply primarily from the posterior tibial and peroneal arteries, which are branches of the popliteal artery. The rich vascularization of these muscles facilitates oxygen delivery and waste removal, critical processes for sustained performance and recovery. Muscular fatigue during running can arise from various mechanisms, including the accumulation of metabolic byproducts, depletion of energy substrates, and central nervous system fatigue, all leading to decreased force production and running economy. [6–8]

Exercise-induced physiological stress, particularly during high-intensity running, can lead to decreased muscle function and delayed recovery. Recovery strategies aim to accelerate the body's natural recovery processes by enhancing blood flow, reducing inflammation, and improving tissue mobility. Optimizing post-exercise recovery is essential for maintaining training consistency and performance, especially for recreational runners who may not have access to advanced recovery modalities available to elite athletes. [9–11]

Range of motion and muscular flexibility play significant roles in running performance and injury prevention. Research suggests that optimal joint mobility allows for more efficient movement patterns and potentially reduces injury risk. Various stretching techniques have been employed to improve joint range of motion, with dynamic stretching gaining popularity due to its functional approach that mimics sport-specific movements. [12–15]

Muscle performance, particularly power output, is crucial for running economy and sprint performance. Lower limb power generation directly influences stride length, frequency, and overall running efficiency. Traditional recovery approaches often focus on passive techniques, but active recovery strategies like dynamic stretching may offer additional benefits by maintaining neuromuscular activation while facilitating recovery processes. [16–18]

Research suggests that dynamic stretching might accelerate recovery through increased blood flow, active muscle contractions, and enhanced range of motion. Unlike static stretching, which involves holding a stretched position, dynamic stretching incorporates controlled movements through a full range of motion, potentially offering both recovery and performance benefits without the acute performance decrements sometimes associated with static stretching. [19–22]

Cold water immersion has been widely used as a recovery modality, with its purported benefits including reduced inflammation, analgesia, and decreased muscle temperature. However, recent research has questioned its long-term benefits on adaptation and performance, suggesting that alternative recovery strategies warrant investigation. Comparing dynamic stretching to cold water immersion may provide valuable insights for recreational runners seeking effective, accessible recovery strategies. [23–27]

METHODS

Study design: Comparative study

Subjects: Recreational runners aged between 20 to 35 years who run at least 15 km weekly

Sampling technique: Convenient sampling

Sample size: 15+15 = 30 subjects

Inclusion criteria:

- Adults aged between 20 and 35 years of both genders
- Recreational runners who run at least 15 km weekly
- No current injuries or medical conditions affecting running performance

Exclusion criteria:

- History of lower limb surgery within the past year
- Cardiovascular or respiratory conditions that limit exercise capacity
- Current musculoskeletal injuries affecting running gait
- Professional or elite competitive runners

Study procedure:

A total of 30 subjects were selected based on the selection criteria. The study procedure was explained to all participants and informed consent was obtained. Selected participants were randomly divided into Dynamic Stretching group and Cold Water Immersion group using computer-generated random numbers. Participants in both groups completed a standardized high-intensity running protocol designed to induce fatigue, consisting of 6 sets of 400m runs at 85-90% of their maximum heart rate with 1-minute rest periods between sets.

The Dynamic Stretching group performed a 10-minute dynamic stretching routine immediately after the running protocol. The Cold Water Immersion group underwent a 10-minute cold water immersion protocol (10-12°C) up to the iliac crest. Both interventions were performed on three separate occasions with 48-72 hours between sessions. Outcomes were assessed for muscle performance (using countermovement jump test), range of motion (using digital goniometry), and subjective recovery (using RPE scale).

Group A: --- Dynamic Stretching (n=15)

Dynamic stretching group performed a series of controlled movements through the full range of motion for major lower limb muscle groups immediately after the high-intensity running protocol. Each movement was performed for 30 seconds (15 repetitions per leg), with the entire routine lasting 10 minutes.

The dynamic stretching protocol included:

1. Walking knee pulls (quadriceps and hip flexors)
2. Walking heel kicks (hamstrings)
3. Walking lunges with rotation (hip flexors, quadriceps, and thoracic spine)
4. Lateral lunges (adductors)
5. Leg swings - forward/backward (hip flexors and hamstrings)
6. Leg swings - side to side (hip adductors and abductors)
7. Ankle bounces (gastrocnemius and soleus)
8. Hip circles (hip external and internal rotators)

Group B --- Cold Water Immersion (n=15)

Cold water immersion group underwent a 10-minute immersion in cold water (10-12°C) up to the iliac crest immediately after the high-intensity running protocol. The water temperature was monitored continuously using digital thermometers to ensure consistency.

Participants were instructed to:

1. Enter the cold water bath slowly
2. Remain seated with water level reaching the iliac crest
3. Keep upper body dry and maintain normal breathing
4. Stay immersed for the full 10-minute duration
5. Exit the bath slowly with assistance if needed
6. Dry off and change into dry clothing immediately after the immersion

All participants' muscle performance, range of motion, and RPE were measured pre-exercise, immediately post-exercise, and 30 minutes' post-intervention.

RESULTS

The assessment of recovery markers demonstrates notable differences between dynamic stretching and cold water immersion as post-exercise recovery strategies among recreational runners. Statistical analysis of quantitative data indicated significant differences between both groups across all measured parameters.

Muscle Performance Results: Post-intervention comparison revealed Group A had significantly better recovery of muscle performance as measured by countermovement jump height (mean = 87.2% of baseline, SD = 3.8) compared to Group B (mean = 78.4% of baseline, SD = 4.2) with $t = 6.11$, $p < 0.0001$.

Range of Motion Results: Group A demonstrated significantly greater improvements in hamstring flexibility as measured by active knee extension test (mean = 12.3% improvement from baseline, SD = 2.1) compared to Group B (mean = 5.6% improvement from baseline, SD = 1.8) with $t = 9.32$, $p < 0.001$.

Additionally, ankle dorsiflexion range showed greater recovery in Group A (mean = 95.8% of baseline, SD = 2.7) compared to Group B (mean = 88.6% of baseline, SD = 3.4) with $t = 6.74$, $p < 0.001$.

Rated Perceived Exertion Results: Group A showed significantly lower RPE scores (mean = 3.2, SD = 0.7) compared to Group B (mean = 4.1, SD = 0.8) at 30-minutes post-intervention with $t = 3.42$, $p < 0.01$, indicating greater subjective recovery.

The results consistently demonstrate that dynamic stretching provided superior recovery outcomes compared to cold water immersion across all measured parameters in recreational runners following high-intensity running exercise.

TABLES

Table 1: Baseline Characteristics of Participants

Parameter	**Group A (Dynamic Stretching) (n=15)**	**Group B (Cold Water Immersion) (n=15)**
Age (years)	27.3 ± 4.2	28.1 ± 3.9
Weight (kg)	68.4 ± 7.3	67.9 ± 6.8
Height (cm)	172.6 ± 8.1	171.8 ± 7.9
Weekly running distance (km)	23.7 ± 5.4	22.9 ± 6.1
Baseline CMJ height (cm)	31.4 ± 3.8	30.9 ± 4.2
Baseline hamstring ROM (degrees)	78.3 ± 6.5	79.1 ± 5.8
Baseline ankle dorsiflexion (degrees)	14.8 ± 2.3	15.1 ± 2.1

Table 2: Comparison of Recovery Parameters Between Dynamic Stretching and Cold Water Immersion Groups

Parameter	**Group A (Dynamic Stretching)**	**Group B (Cold Water Immersion)**	**t-value**	**p-value**
Muscle Performance Recovery (% of baseline)	87.2 ± 3.8	78.4 ± 4.2	6.11	<0.0001
Hamstring Flexibility Improvement (% from baseline)	12.3 ± 2.1	5.6 ± 1.8	9.32	<0.0001
Ankle Dorsiflexion Range (% of baseline)	95.8 ± 2.7	88.6 ± 3.4	6.74	<0.0001

Parameter	Group A (Dynamic Stretching)	Group B (Cold Water Immersion)	t-value	p-value
Rated Perceived Exertion (RPE)	3.2 ± 0.7	4.1 ± 0.8	3.42	<0.01

DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to investigate the effects of dynamic stretching on post-exercise recovery and muscle performance among recreational runners compared to cold water immersion. The findings provide valuable insights into effective recovery strategies that can be implemented by recreational athletes with limited access to specialized equipment.

Dynamic stretching has gained attention in recent years as both a warm-up and recovery technique due to its ability to increase tissue temperature, enhance blood flow, and improve neuromuscular function.[4,6,16] The application of controlled, sport-specific movements is thought to facilitate recovery while maintaining muscle activation patterns relevant to running performance. Our findings regarding enhanced muscle performance with dynamic stretching align with previous research suggesting that active recovery strategies may be more effective than passive techniques following high-intensity exercise.[17,18,21]

The superior muscle performance recovery observed in the dynamic stretching group compared to the cold water immersion group raises interesting questions about the traditional use of cold therapies for recovery. While cold water immersion has been widely adopted based on its proposed anti-inflammatory and analgesic effects[23,25,] recent literature has questioned its impact on adaptation processes and subsequent performance.[19,23] Our findings suggest that for recreational runners, the benefits of dynamic stretching on maintaining neuromuscular function may outweigh the potential benefits of cold-induced vasoconstriction and reduced inflammation.[24,26]

The improvements in range of motion observed in the dynamic stretching group are particularly noteworthy. Enhanced flexibility not only contributes to improved running economy but may also play a role in injury prevention.[12,15] The active nature of dynamic stretching appears to provide superior benefits for maintaining and potentially improving joint mobility compared to the relatively passive cold water immersion intervention.[16,19]

Furthermore, the lower RPE scores reported by the dynamic stretching group suggest that psychological aspects of recovery should not be overlooked, as subjective readiness to train may influence training adherence and effort in recreational athletes.[9,11]

With respect to muscle performance, our study's findings add to the growing body of literature on the impact of different recovery modalities on power production.[16,18,21] While some previous studies have reported performance decrements following cold water immersion[19,25], others have shown minimal effects or even improvements in certain contexts.[23,24] The superior performance recovery we observed in the dynamic stretching group may be attributed to the maintenance of muscle temperature, enhanced neural activation, and potentially improved muscle-tendon unit compliance.[4,16,21]

The practical implications of these findings are significant for recreational runners who often have limited time and resources for recovery. Dynamic stretching requires no specialized equipment, can be performed in various settings, and provides the additional benefit of reinforcing movement patterns specific to running.[12,16] This accessibility makes it an attractive option for integrating into regular training routines.

However, it is essential to acknowledge that the relationship between recovery modalities and performance may be influenced by numerous factors, including the specific exercise stimulus, individual characteristics, environmental conditions, and the timing of assessments.[9,11,23] Additionally, while our findings suggest acute benefits of dynamic stretching over cold water immersion, the long-term effects of consistently applying these recovery strategies warrant further investigation.[26,27]

The potential mechanisms underlying the enhanced recovery with dynamic stretching are multifaceted. The rhythmic muscle contractions may enhance circulation and tissue perfusion, potentially accelerating recovery processes.[6,8,16] Additionally, the movement-based nature of dynamic stretching may help maintain neuromuscular activation patterns, potentially mitigating the temporary power decrements sometimes observed following intense exercise.[17,18,21]

Furthermore, the study's results should be interpreted within the context of the specific population (recreational runners) and the particular exercise protocol employed. The findings may not necessarily generalize to elite athletes, different sports modalities, or varying exercise intensities and durations.[2,3,9]The timing of the recovery interventions immediately post-exercise also represents a specific approach that may yield different results compared to delayed interventions or multiple recovery sessions.[11,23,24]

CONCLUSION

This comparative study demonstrates that dynamic stretching is significantly more effective than cold water immersion in enhancing post-exercise recovery among recreational runners. The dynamic stretching intervention produced superior outcomes in all measured parameters: muscle performance recovery, range of motion improvements, and subjective ratings of perceived exertion.

The findings clearly indicate that dynamic stretching can be recommended as a preferred recovery technique following high-intensity running exercise, particularly for recreational runners. The significant improvements in both objective and subjective recovery markers suggest that dynamic stretching not only accelerates physiological recovery processes but also enhances perceived readiness to train.

These results have important practical implications for recreational athletes, coaches, and fitness professionals seeking effective and accessible recovery strategies. Dynamic stretching offers the advantages of requiring no specialized equipment, being feasible in various environments, and potentially providing additional benefits for movement pattern reinforcement and neuromuscular function.

Future research should explore the optimal timing, duration, and specific movement patterns within dynamic stretching protocols to maximize recovery benefits for different athletic populations and exercise modalities. Additionally, investigating the long-term effects of consistent dynamic stretching as a recovery strategy on training adaptations and performance would provide valuable insights for evidence-based training program design.

REFERENCES

1. Cheung K, Hume PA, Maxwell L. Delayed onset muscle soreness: treatment strategies and performance factors. Sports Med. 2003;33(2):145-64. doi: 10.2165/00007256-200333020-00005
2. Barnett A. Using recovery modalities between training sessions in elite athletes: does it help? Sports Med. 2006;36(9):781-96. doi: 10.2165/00007256-200636090-00005
3. Bishop PA, Jones E, Woods AK. Recovery from training: a brief review. J Strength Cond Res. 2008;22(3):1015-24. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e31816eb518
4. Behm DG, Chaouachi A. A review of the acute effects of static and dynamic stretching on performance. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2011;111(11):2633-51. doi: 10.1007/s00421-011-1879-2
5. Brukner P, Khan K. Clinical Sports Medicine. 4th ed. Sydney: McGraw-Hill; 2012.
6. Fletcher IM. The effects of precompetition warming-up on the performance of the 50m sprint. J Sports Sci. 2010;28(14):1595-602. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2010.519607
7. Fradkin AJ, Zazryn TR, Smoliga JM. Effects of warming-up on physical performance: a systematic review with meta-analysis. J Strength Cond Res. 2010;24(1):140-8. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181c643a0
8. Galazoulas C. Acute effects of static and dynamic stretching on the sprint and countermovement jump of basketball players. J Phys Educ Sport. 2017;17(1):219-23. doi: 10.7752/jpes.2017.01033
9. Gregson W, Black MA, Jones H, Milson J, Morton J, Dawson B, et al. Influence of cold water immersion on limb and cutaneous blood flow at rest. Am J Sports Med. 2011;39(6):1316-23. doi: 10.1177/0363546510395497
10. Herbert RD, de Noronha M, Kamper SJ. Stretching to prevent or reduce muscle soreness after exercise. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2011;(7):CD004577. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004577.pub3
11. Ingram J, Dawson B, Goodman C, Wallman K, Beilby J. Effect of water immersion methods on post-exercise recovery from simulated team sport exercise. J Sci Med Sport. 2009;12(3):417-21. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2008.03.007
12. Kovacs MS. Dynamic stretching: the revolutionary new warm-up method to improve power, performance and range of motion. Berkeley, CA: Ulysses Press; 2009.
13. Leeder J, Gissane C, van Someren K, Gregson W, Howatson G. Cold water immersion and recovery from strenuous exercise: a meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med. 2012;46(4):233-40. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090061
14. McArdle WD, Katch FI, Katch VL. Exercise physiology: nutrition, energy, and human performance. 8th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2014.
15. McHugh MP, Cosgrave CH. To stretch or not to stretch: the role of stretching in injury prevention and performance. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2010;20(2):169-81. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2009.01058.x
16. Opplert J, Babault N. Acute effects of dynamic stretching on muscle flexibility and performance: an analysis of the current literature. Sports Med. 2018;48(2):299-325. doi: 10.1007/s40279-017-0797-9
17. Pearcey GE, Bradbury-Squires DJ, Kawamoto JE, Drinkwater EJ, Behm DG, Button DC. Foam rolling for delayed-onset muscle soreness and recovery of dynamic performance measures. J Athl Train. 2015;50(1):5-13. doi: 10.4085/1062-6050-50.1.01
18. Rey E, Padrón-Cabo A, Barcala-Furelos R, Mecías-Calvo M. Effect of High and Low Flexibility Levels on Physical Fitness and Neuromuscular Properties in Professional Soccer Players. Int J Sports Med. 2016;37(11):878-83. doi: 10.1055/s-0042-109268
19. Roberts LA, Raastad T, Markworth JF, Figueiredo VC, Egner IM, Shield A, et al. Post-exercise cold water immersion attenuates acute anabolic signalling and long-term adaptations in muscle to strength training. J Physiol. 2015;593(18):4285-301. doi: 10.1113/JP270570

20. Sarabon N, Kozinc Ž, Bishop C, Maffiuletti NA. Factors influencing bilateral deficit and inter-limb asymmetry of maximal and explosive strength: motor task, outcome measure and muscle group. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2020;120(7):1681-8. doi: 10.1007/s00421-020-04399-1

21. Samson M, Button DC, Chaouachi A, Behm DG. Effects of dynamic and static stretching within general and activity specific warm-up protocols. J Sports Sci Med. 2012;11(2):279-85.

22. Taylor KL, Sheppard JM, Lee H, Plummer N. Negative effect of static stretching restored when combined with a sport specific warm-up component. J Sci Med Sport. 2009;12(6):657-61. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2008.04.004

23. Vaile J, Halson S, Gill N, Dawson B. Effect of hydrotherapy on the signs and symptoms of delayed onset muscle soreness. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2008;102(4):447-55. doi: 10.1007/s00421-007-0605-6

24. Versey NG, Halson SL, Dawson BT. Water immersion recovery for athletes: effect on exercise performance and practical recommendations. Sports Med. 2013;43(11):1101-30. doi: 10.1007/s40279-013-0063-8

25. White GE, Wells GD. Cold-water immersion and other forms of cryotherapy: physiological changes potentially affecting recovery from high-intensity exercise. Extrem Physiol Med. 2013;2(1):26. doi: 10.1186/2046-7648-2-26

26. Wiewelhove T, Raeder C, Meyer T, Kellmann M, Pfeiffer M, Ferrauti A. Markers for Routine Assessment of Fatigue and Recovery in Male and Female Team Sport Athletes during High-Intensity Interval Training. PLoS One. 2015;10(10):e0139801. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0139801

27. Wilcock IM, Cronin JB, Hing WA. Physiological response to water immersion: a method for sport recovery? Sports Med. 2006;36(9):747-65. doi: 10.2165/00007256-200636090-00003

28. Yamaguchi T, Ishii K. Effects of static stretching for 30 seconds and dynamic stretching on leg extension power. J Strength Cond Res. 2005;19(3):677-83. doi: 10.1519/15044.1

29. Yoshida N, Konrad A, Sato S, Nakamura M. Comparison between the changes in dorsiflexion range of motion after static stretching and contract-relax with TENS: a within-participant study. Physical Therapy in Sport. 2021;49:1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.ptsp.2021.01.009

30. Zainuddin Z, Newton M, Sacco P, Nosaka K. Effects of massage on delayed-onset muscle soreness, swelling, and recovery of muscle function. J Athl Train. 2005;40(3):174-80.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thanks to the members of the private sports clubs at Chennai for assisting us in data collection and organization. I would also like to express my gratitude to the statistician for helping us with data analysis.

Human Participants: This study was approved by the Institutional Scientific Review Board (07/012/2024/ISRB/SR/SCPT), and all participants provided written informed consent.

ETHICAL CLEARANCE

Approved by INSTITUTIONAL SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BOARD. ISRB NUMBER: 07/012/2024/ISRB/SR/SCPT.

DISCLOSURES:

Data availability: The data supporting the results of the study are available by contacting the corresponding author.

Financial support: None

Conflicts of interest: None