Effect of Fast and Slow Pranayama Practice on Cognitive Functions in Healthy Volunteers
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ABSTRACT

Objectives: To compare the cumulative effect of commonly practised slow and fast pranayama on cognitive functions in healthy volunteers.

Settings and Design: 84 participants who were in self-reported good health, who were in the age group of 18-25 years, who were randomized to fast pranayama, slow pranayama and control group with 28 participants in each group.

Material and Methods: Fast pranayama included kapalabhati, bhastrika and kukkuriya. Slow pranayama included nadishodhana, Pranav and Savitri. Respective pranayama training was given for 35 minutes, three times per week, for a duration of 12 weeks under the supervision of a certified yoga trainer. Parameters were recorded before and after 12 weeks of intervention: Perceived stress scale (PSS), BMI, waist to hip ratio and cognitive parameters-letter cancellation test, trail making tests A and B, forward and reverse digit spans and auditory and visual reaction times for red light and green light.

Statistical Analysis: Inter-group comparison was done by one way ANOVA and intra group comparison was done by paired t-test.

Results and Conclusion: Executive functions, PSS and reaction time improved significantly in both fast and slow pranayama groups, except reverse digit span, which showed an improvement only in fast pranayama group. In addition, percentage reduction in reaction time was significantly more in the fast pranayama group as compared to that in slow pranayama group. Both types of pranayamas are beneficial for cognitive functions, but fast pranayama has additional effects on executive function of manipulation in auditory working memory, central neural processing and sensory-motor performance.
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INTRODUCTION

Anxiety, stress and mental tensions have become almost inevitable companions of human life at all cross sections of populations [1]. Studies have reported higher perceived stress among students in healthcare courses, including dental, medical and nursing courses [2-5], as compared to students from other fields. Yoga and pranayama are ancient sciences which originated in India, which can be practised to combat stress [6]. Pranayama involves manipulation of the breath and it consists of three phases: “puraka” (inhalation); “kumbhaka’ (retention) and “rechaka” (exhalation) [7,8]. Pranayama can be practised as either fast or slow pranayamas. Both fast and slow pranayamas are beneficial [9-11], but their physiological responses are different in healthy participants [12]. Executive functions refer to cognitive processes that regulate, control, and manage other cognitive processes [13]. Executive functions include working memory, concentration span, scanning and retrieval of stored information and mental flexibility, i.e. the ability to shift from one criterion to another in sorting or matching tasks [14,15]. Perceived stress has a negative impact on executive functions [16,17]. There is a paucity of data on evaluation of the cumulative effect of commonly practised slow and fast pranayamas on cognitive parameters such as attention span, executive functions, perceived stress and reaction time. Therefore, the current study aimed to compare the effects of twelve weeks of fast and slow pranayama training on these parameters in young healthcare students.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study was conducted in the Department of Physiology, JIPMER, Pondicherry India, during May 2011 to December 2011. Yoga training was given at the Advanced Centre for Yoga Therapy Education and Research (ACYTER), JIPMER, Pondicherry. The study was commenced after obtaining approval from the institute’s scientific advisory committee and human ethics committee.

Participants

We considered volunteers who were in the age group of [18-25] years, who were in self-reported good health, who were undergoing various healthcare courses (medical, nursing and allied medical sciences). We excluded volunteers who had practised yoga in the past one year and those with current or previous mental or neurological diseases. We explained the study design to the volunteers and made them aware that their participation would remain anonymous and that they had the freedom to withdraw from the study at any time. We included only those who gave their written informed consents to participate in the study (n=84).

Parameters Measured

1. Height
2. Weight
3. Cognitive Functions Test Battery [19]
   - Letter Cancellation Test (LCT)
   - Trail Making Test A (TTA)
   - Trail Making Test B (TTB)
   - Forward digit span (FDS)
   - Reverse digit span (RDS)
4. Reaction time (RT)

Reaction time for the detection of auditory (ART) and visual signals (red and green lights) (VRT R and VRT – G respectively) was recorded on apparatus supplied by Ananda agencies (Pune, India). RT is an indirect index of the processing capacity of the central nervous system, and it is a simple and inexpensive method...
of determining sensorimotor performance [20].

Study design
The persons involved in the recording of the parameters and the analysis of data were blind to the experimental conditions (i.e., the group that the participants belonged to).

We familiarized the participants with the test batteries and gave them adequate practice on the reaction time apparatus on two separate occasions, to produce results that were more consistent. On the day of assessment, participants reported to the Department of Physiology, JIPMER, between 9 and 10 AM, at least two hours after eating a light breakfast. Then, the above-mentioned parameters were recorded. We administered these tests in the same order as are given here, to all the participants.

Then, the participants (n=84) were randomly assigned into three groups:

2. Slow pranayama group (n = 28): Nadishodhana, Pranava and Savitri.
3. Control group (n = 28): No pranayama intervention. All the parameters were recorded again after 12 weeks of intervention.

Intervention
We trained the participants in their respective pranayama technique for one week, before the start of the intervention period. Pranayama intervention was carried out for about thirty-five minutes a day, three times per week, for a duration of 12 weeks. A certified yoga trainer at ACYTER gave the Pranayama training and intervention. Participants practised the pranayama in a quiet room which was maintained at a comfortable temperature (25 ± 2ºC). We followed pranayama techniques followed in ACYTER, JIPMER 21. Typical sessions of fast and slow pranayamas were as follows:

Fast Pranayama: Each cycle (6 minutes) consisted of practising one minute of Kapalabhati, one minute of Bhastrika and one minute of Kukkriya pranayamas, interspersed with one minute of rest between each pranayama. Participants were asked to complete 4 cycles in each session (24 minutes).

Slow Pranayama: Each cycle (9 minutes) consisted of practising two minutes of Nadishodhana, two minutes of Pranava and two minutes of Savitri pranayamas which were interspersed with one minute of rest between each pranayama. While they were sitting in a comfortable posture (sukhasana), participants were asked to perform three rounds per session (27 minutes).

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
Power and sample size software, version 3.0 was used to calculate the adequate sample size (at assumed power of 90%) which was required for the study and to analyze the post-test power of the study. Analysis of the data was done by using IBM SPSS, version 19. The normality of the data was tested by Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. Intergroup comparison was done using one way ANOVA, followed by Tukey Kramer post-hoc test for pair wise comparisons. Intragroup comparisons were done by using paired t-test for parametric measures and Wilcoxon signed rank test was used for non-parametric measures. Chi-square test was used to compare intergroup gender distributions. The Mann Whitney U-test was used to compare the percentage change between groups. A p value less than 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

RESULTS
A post-test analysis, revealed that the lowest power of the study with a mean RDS difference of 0.36 (SD=1.13) between fast and slow pranayama groups was 85%, which showed that the sample size was adequate and that the strength of the study was good. There were no significant differences in age, height or weight between the three groups [Table/Fig-1]. There was no significant difference in gender distribution between the groups. The 3 groups were comparable in executive functions and attention span before the intervention [Table/Fig-2]. There was a significant decrease in LCT (time) (p<0.001), number of omissions in LCT (p<0.001), total time taken for TTA (p<0.001), total time taken for TTB (p<0.001), ART (p<0.001) and VRT (both green and red light) (p<0.005) in both the study groups but not in the control group after the study period (12 weeks). We have also observed that practice of fast and slow pranayama lead to significant decrease in Perceived stress scale scores [18]. In addition, a significant improvement was seen among participants of both fast pranayama group and slow pranayama group in FDS (p<0.001), whereas a change in RDS was seen only in fast pranayama group participants.

There were no significant differences in the percentage of change from pre- to post-test between fast and slow pranayama groups in stress scores and in all of the executive function parameters. However, the fast pranayama group showed a significantly improved performance as compared to the slow pranayama group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Fast pranayama group (n=28)</th>
<th>Slow pranayama group (n=28)</th>
<th>Control group (n=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years) (Mean ± SD)</td>
<td>18.39 ± 1.133</td>
<td>19.28 ± 1.82</td>
<td>19.0 ± 1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm) (Mean ± SD)</td>
<td>158.46 ± 7.30</td>
<td>157.33 ± 9.42</td>
<td>157.25 ± 8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (Kg) (Mean ± SD)</td>
<td>49.63 ± 6.12</td>
<td>51.82 ± 11.65</td>
<td>50.21 ± 9.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Fast pranayama group (n=28)</th>
<th>Slow pranayama group (n=28)</th>
<th>Control group (n=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>114.03 ± 17.13</td>
<td>104.89 ± 19.20</td>
<td>111.36 ± 18.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>104.17 ± 114.15***</td>
<td>89.32 ± 19.37***</td>
<td>109.36 ± 24.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.64 ± 2.52</td>
<td>1.36 ± 1.54</td>
<td>0.98 ± 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.71 ± 1.08***</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.69**</td>
<td>0.70 ± 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>0.035 ± 0.18</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.18</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.071 ± 0.62</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.26</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>73.60 ± 23.4</td>
<td>65.12 ± 14.96</td>
<td>74.10 ± 11.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>58.67 ± 21.62***</td>
<td>51.89 ± 13.14***</td>
<td>72.10 ± 12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>104.57 ± 26.50</td>
<td>97.05 ± 24.36</td>
<td>106.73 ± 34.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>83.96 ± 19.49***</td>
<td>85.39 ± 25.47***</td>
<td>98.46 ± 33.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.00 ± 0.83</td>
<td>6.00 ± 0.94</td>
<td>5.93 ± 1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.75 ± 1.07***</td>
<td>6.42 ± 0.71**</td>
<td>5.73 ± 1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.14 ± 0.80</td>
<td>4.21 ± 0.95</td>
<td>3.83 ± 1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.50 ± 1.07**</td>
<td>4.57 ± 1.13</td>
<td>3.80 ± 1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>188.99 ± 30.36</td>
<td>186.61 ± 30.43</td>
<td>189.54 ± 28.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>154.89 ± 29.10***</td>
<td>167.58 ± 23.99***</td>
<td>189.76 ± 26.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>219.79 ± 35.21</td>
<td>208.11 ± 37.02</td>
<td>221.88 ± 34.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>177.85 ± 22.22***</td>
<td>189.32 ± 40.19**</td>
<td>222.0 ± 27.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>240.70 ± 39.44</td>
<td>226.53 ± 41.67</td>
<td>222.68 ± 31.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>186.31 ± 39.02***</td>
<td>186.32 ± 39.02***</td>
<td>223.21 ± 30.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>19.21 ± 4.33</td>
<td>19.21 ± 4.38</td>
<td>20.57 ± 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>14.42 ± 4.14***</td>
<td>13.89 ± 2.94***</td>
<td>19.82 ± 3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
neural representation within the CNS and improves bidirectional communication between the cerebral cortex and the limbic, autonomic, neuroendocrine, emotional, and behavioural activation [22]. Also, generalized alteration in information processing at thalamo-cortical level induces modification in neural mechanisms which regulate the respiratory system [28].

The shortening of auditory and visual RT in our pranayama groups represents greater arousal, better concentration and faster responsiveness [12]. The improvement was significantly greater in the fast pranayama group as compared to that in slow pranayama group. One previous study found insignificant decreases in ART and VRT, with a shorter (three weeks) training period of Savitri (slow breathing) and Bhastrika (fast breathing) pranayamas [12]. Our study, on the other hand, demonstrated that a prolonged practice (12 weeks) of pranayama could be beneficial in reducing RT.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There was a difference in training times between the fast and slow pranayama groups (24 vs. 27 minutes), since the participants in the fast pranayama group found it difficult to do more than four rounds in a session. Also, there was a difference in the number of male and female participants in the study. Nevertheless, the male and female participants were equally distributed between the groups, i.e. the gender ratio was almost similar. Since this study was conducted only on healthy participants, future studies should broaden the current research and include clinical populations such as patients with psychiatric disorders, whose cognitive functions are adversely compromised.

CONCLUSION

Slow and rapid types of pranayama are beneficial for stress reduction and for improving cognitive functions, but fast pranayama has additional effects on sensori-motor performance (i.e. faster auditory and visual RT).
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