ABSTRACT

This study focuses on a carbohydrate-containing beverage with water, 1.5% skim milk powder and lucuma fruit powder (Pouteria Lucuma). The aim is to analyze the influence of the beverage on the sports performance of young men with different levels of motor activity. The analysis of the results was based on the changes in some biometric parameters and the level of motor activity of 8 young men (experimental group; EG) consuming the beverage half an hour before fitness exercises – bodybuilding workouts – within a three-month period of time. The results obtained from the tests were compared to the results shown by the 13 men in the control group (CG) for the same period of time without consuming the beverage. On the basis of the profiles of the respondents from both groups (EG and CG), we analyzed the changes in body composition and motor activity at the beginning and at the end of the three-month period. The results obtained from the comparative analysis revealed that both groups manifested positive changes concerning the level of motor activity as a result of the training program. These positive changes turned out to be more significant in the EG with respect to maximum oxygen intake and plank endurance. We also analyzed the modifications in the correlational dependencies as regards EG parameters, as a result of which we established more significant dependencies at the end of the test period.

The results of the present study show that the consumption of the lucuma-based carbohydrate beverage by the experimental group has a positive effect on the analyzed parameters.
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INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed an increasing interest in healthy lifestyle. In order to get all the essential nutrients, people are advised to take in food supplements (FS). A great number of professional and amateur athletes consume food supplements to benefit to a considerable extent from their physical training (Burke, 2015; Maughan, et al., 2011; Sanches-Oliver, et al., 2018). They usually consume vitamins, minerals, antioxidants, energy drinks, proteins, protein bars, shakes rich in carbohydrates, and sometimes amino acids and other ergogenic substances (Maughan, et al., 2007; Braun, et al., 2009). D. Dimitrova subdivides food supplements into FS with guaranteed safety and efficiency, FS with potential efficiency proven theoretically by preliminary research, and FS whose efficiency has been proven theoretically but not in practice (Dimitrova, 2014).

The advantages of consuming food supplements in the course of physical training have been described and studied by many
scientists. Angelova, et al., (2010) discovered that, during their three-month training, aerobic gymnastics competitors who took in FS (amino acids, micronutrients and L-carnitine) manifested a decrease in fat and water and an increase in muscle mass with no discernible changes in the breathing capacity. A detailed study showed that the consumption of Carboenergy, a product high in carbohydrates, 30 minutes before training resulted in the reduction of body fat and the improvement of the aerobic capacity of the participants in the experiment (Angelova, et al., 2011; Angelova, et al. 2012). Ivy, et al., (2009) talked about the improvement of bikers’ performance after the intake of carbohydrate beverages whereas Rica et al., (2019) did not report any improvement in the abilities of amateur runners following energy drink intake.

A greater number of contemporary studies focus on regionally atypical plant species which are high in nutrients and can be incorporated into high-quality food products to fulfill the needs of the human organism (Ghouila, et al., 2017). The literature review attracted our interest to the nourishing natural product called lucuma (Pouteria Lucuma) which is a subtropical fruit known as “the gold of the Incas” grown in the mountains of Peru, Chile and Ecuador (Villanueva, 2002; Aguilar, 2015; Caballero, Aguilar, 2017).

Lucuma powder is widely used in the food industry in the preparation of ice cream, sweets, confectionery, juice, yogurt and cream. Because of its sweet taste and the presence of dietary fiber, this powdery product satisfies the appetite for carbohydrates without harming the human organism (Banasik, 2003; Dini, 2011; Rojo, et al., 2010). Erazo, et al., (1999); Verbeke, (2006); Fuentenalba, et al., (2016) pointed out that lucuma powder was rich in phenols, flavonoids and beta-carotene recognized as powerful antioxidants.

Due to its high concentration of biologically active substances, minerals, antioxidants and other nutrients, lucuma is referred to as a superfood because it boosts the immune system and supplies the organism with energy (Mukta, 2017, DGA, 2015-2020).

Scientific research proves the positive effects of taking in food supplements while practicing sports when the food supplements are widely used and recognized by consumers. No data have been discovered concerning research on carbohydrate-containing beverages with lucuma powder in order to ascertain the influence of such beverages on sports skills.

The aim of this study is grounded on the worldwide tendency to substitute natural fruit sources for chemically based food supplements: analysis of the nutritional value of a lucuma-powder beverage and determination of its influence on the sports performance of students practicing fitness and bodybuilding.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

We used commercial lucuma powder, which was produced in Peru, purchased in Bulgaria by “Internet café-BG” Ltd, packaged by “Zoya bg Organic Shop” and certified by ABG GmbH BG-BIO-16. Skim milk powder (1.5%) was also used. It was produced in the European Union and packaged by Bioset OOD, BG1618041EO.

The approximate average physicochemical composition of the new mixture was determined according to the analytical methods of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC), 2005: AOAC (2005) Determination of Moisture, Ash, Protein and Fat. Official Method of Analysis of the Association of Analytical Chemists, 18th Edition, AOAC, Washington DC.
Carbohydrate content in percentages was calculated as the difference between 100% total mass and the percentage of fat, protein, ash, and moisture content (Ferris, et al., 1995).

In order to produce the lucuma-powder beverage, a number of laboratory tests were conducted to determine the optimal amounts of its components. One of the main objectives was to free the beverage of impurities and other components as far as possible. The homogenization of a mixture of water and lucuma powder made the beverage somewhat unpleasant and insipid. Therefore, its flavor was improved with the addition of skim cow milk powder with fat content of 1.5 %. The recipe for the beverage obtained is the following: 15 g of lucuma powder, 15 g of skim cow milk powder with fat content of 1.5 %, and 200 ml of water. The water used was purified with a filtration system. The substances were measured with “Joycare” electronic scales and mixed in shakers used individually by every student.

The present study was conducted with the voluntary participation of first-year students practicing fitness and bodybuilding for 90 minutes three times a week. The basic training was conducted in a mixed and in an anaerobic regime of energy supply since its parameters were determined with respect to students’ individual abilities.

All participants followed an unrestricted diet and no calorie intake was taken into account.

Two test groups were formed:
- an experimental group (EG) consisting of 8 students and
- a control group (CG) with 13 students.

For three months, the students from the EG consumed the lucuma-based carbohydrate beverage 2-3 times a week, 30 minutes before their classes. The aim was to boost their energy resources, improve their sports performance, and enhance positive structural and functional changes in their bodies. During the same period of time, the students from the CG participated in the training without taking in a carbohydrate beverage.

With the help of the “Tanita – RD 953” body composition monitor, which applies cutting-edge technologies for bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA), we obtained data on the respondents’ body composition. On the basis of the age, sex, height, and weight of the participants in the experiment, the monitor provides information on the following parameters:
- Weight (kg);
- BMI - body mass index (kg/m2);
- Body fat (%);
- Muscle mass (kg);
- Muscle quality (%);
- Physique rating (0-10);
- Visceral fat (%);
- Metabolic age (years);
- Body water (%).

To determine the level of motor activity at the beginning and at the end of the test period, the participants were subjected to:
- Beep test – It evaluates the level of maximum oxygen consumption, a significant functional parameter for physical endurance.
- Plank test – It evaluates strength endurance. During the test, all muscle groups are subjected to isometric exercise for the longest period of time possible.
- Barbell bench press – It assesses maximum power via a single lift of maximum weight.

The following parameters were analyzed:
- VO2max – maximum oxygen intake, (aerobic endurance) (ml/kg/min);
- Endurance plank – strength endurance - plank (seconds);
- Max power – maximum power (kg).
The frequency of lucuma intake was established on the basis of these two parameters:
- N of trainings – number of trainings per week;
- Lucuma intake – number of intakes of the beverage.

The statistical processing of the data was conducted with the IBM SPSS16 program.

The statistical analysis resorted to the following statistical methods: variation, comparative, correlation analyses.

The results obtained have statistical significance, with a probability of $P = 95\%$ and error of $\alpha = 5\%$.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Table 1 shows the results from the physicochemical analysis of the beverage mixture. The mixture is rich in carbohydrates, i.e. 65.5%. Carbohydrates are a major energy source because they provide between 55 and 60% of the daily energy requirements (Gachev, Djarova, 2003; Balch, Balch, 2005; Dimitrova, 2014). Since it is high in carbohydrates, the product could fulfill the greater energy needs of the human organism in the course of physical training, thus sparing the glycogen stored in muscles and liver.

Table 1. Approximate average physicochemical composition of the ready-made beverage mixture, 100 g.

| Sample                      | Proteins, % | Carbohydrates, % | Moisture, % | Fat, % | Ash, % |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|--------|--------|
| Ready-made beverage mixture | 21.5        | 65.5             | 8.3         | 1.5    | 3.2    |
| Lucuma powder               | 4           | 82.2             | 10.7        | 1.1    | 2      |
| Dry milk                    | 32          | 55               | 6.1         | 1.5    | 5.4    |

**EG and CG respondents’ profile at the beginning and at the end of the test period**

The average age of the students (male) in the EG was 19.44 years, for a standard deviation of 0.55 years, whereas that of the students in the CG was 19.55 years, for a standard deviation of 1.19 years.

Table 2 presents the modifications of the parameters related to the body composition and motor activity of EG students at the beginning and at the end of the test period. We established changes in the values of the biometric parameters at the end of the period attributable to the combined effect of the beverage intake and the physical training.

The respondents’ weight rose by 1.900 kg together with an increase in muscle mass by 1.1375 kg. Body fat was increased by 0.775%, and visceral fat – by 0.538%. This may be due to the time period when the experiments were conducted (October – January) when the higher values of these parameters are acceptable. At the end of the analyzed period, the muscle quality value was also higher (59.25 MQ) for the EG, the increase corresponding to the average value of standard scores. The body water value was decreased by 0.837%, the value remaining in the healthy body range.

More significant changes were identified with respect to the parameters determining the motor activity level following the lucuma-based beverage intake. During the beep test, we discovered an increase in the maximum oxygen intake by +8.800 ml/kg/min. The most significant was the increase during the plank endurance test, by 52.625 seconds. During the barbell bench press exercise, maximum power rose by 4.375 kg.
Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the EG parameters at the beginning and at the end of the test period (n = 8)

| Parameters       | Start / Finish | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Mean Difference |
|------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Metabolic Age    | Start          | 12.88  | 1.642          | .581            | 2.125          |
|                  | Finish         | 15.00  | 3.207          | 1.134           |                |
| Weight           | Start          | 75.375 | 8.825          | 3.120           | +1.900         |
|                  | Finish         | 77.275 | 10.001         | 3.536           |                |
| BMI              | Start          | 24.113 | 3.586          | 1.268           | +.550          |
|                  | Finish         | 24.663 | 3.846          | 1.360           |                |
| Body fat         | Start          | 13.812 | 4.137          | 1.463           | +.775          |
|                  | Finish         | 14.588 | 4.162          | 1.472           |                |
| Musc mass        | Start          | 61.450 | 6.145          | 2.173           | +1.1375        |
|                  | Finish         | 62.588 | 7.077          | 2.502           |                |
| Musc quality     | Start          | 57.13  | 11.307         | 3.997           | +2.125         |
|                  | Finish         | 59.25  | 10.361         | 3.663           |                |
| Visceral fat     | Start          | 1.88   | 1.246          | .441            | +.538          |
|                  | Finish         | 2.41   | 1.167          | .413            |                |
| Body water       | Start          | 61.31  | 2.779          | .983            | -.837          |
|                  | Finish         | 60.48  | 2.244          | .793            |                |
| N of trainings   | Start          | 3.13   | 1.246          | .441            | .000           |
|                  | Finish         | 3.13   | 1.246          | .441            |                |
| Lucuma intake    | Start          | 2.38   | .518           | .183            | .000           |
|                  | Finish         | 2.38   | .518           | .183            |                |
| VO₂ max          | Start          | 29.838 | 3.777          | 1.336           | +8.800         |
|                  | Finish         | 38.638 | 4.025          | 1.423           |                |
| Endurance plank  | Start          | 147.50 | 40.242         | 14.228          | +52.625        |
|                  | Finish         | 200.13 | 54.520         | 19.276          |                |
| Max power        | Start          | 75.38  | 19.078         | 6.745           | +4.375         |
|                  | Finish         | 79.75  | 20.748         | 7.336           |                |

The modifications in the body composition and motor activity parameters of CG students at the beginning and at the end of the test period are presented in Table 3.

We identified an insignificant increase in metabolic age, by 0.154 years, an increase in weight by 1.115 kg, and a decrease in muscle mass by 0.0846 kg. In the CG, body fat rose by 0.9846%, whereas the increase in visceral fat was insignificant, by 0.115%. Muscle quality rose by 0.3846 MQ. Body water decreased by 1.0231%, the value remaining in the healthy body range. The beep test showed an increase in maximum oxygen intake by +3.2692 ml/kg/min. The plank test manifested a greater increase, by 38.0769 seconds at the end of the exercise as compared to the beginning. During the barbell bench press exercise, maximum power rose by 5.000 kg.

**Analysis of the modifications of the parameters of the EG and the CG at the beginning and at the end of the test period**

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the CG parameters at the beginning and at the end of the test period (n = 13)

| Parameters       | Start / Finish | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Mean Difference |
|------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Metabolic Age    | Start          | 20.08  | 10.782         | 2.990           | -.154          |
|                  | Finish         | 19.92  | 10.610         | 2.943           |                |
In order to determine whether the differences in the parameter values for EG students at the end of the test period had a statistical significance, we applied the Paired-Samples T-test in SPSS16. The results obtained are presented in Table 4. The results of the Paired-Samples T-test showed that the differences in the mean values at the end of the period, as compared to the beginning of the period, had statistical significance for the following parameters: Metabolic Age, Weight, BMI, VO\textsubscript{2}max, Plank endurance and Maximum power.

The difference between Metabolic Age\textsubscript{2} - Metabolic Age\textsubscript{1} = 2.124. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 2.429$ is Sig. $t$ (2-tailed) = .046 < $\alpha$ = .05.

The difference between Weight\textsubscript{2} - Weight\textsubscript{1} = 1.90. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 3.170$ is Sig. $t$ (2-tailed) = .016 < $\alpha$ = .05.

The difference between BMI\textsubscript{2} - BMI\textsubscript{1} = .55. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 3.317$ is Sig. $t$ (2-tailed) = .013 < $\alpha$ = .05.

The difference between VO\textsubscript{2}max\textsubscript{2} - VO\textsubscript{2}max\textsubscript{1} = 8.80. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 5.259$ is Sig. $t$ (2-tailed) = .001 < $\alpha$ = .05.

The difference between Endurance plank\textsubscript{2} - Endurance plank\textsubscript{1} = 52.625. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 4.418$ is Sig. $t$ (2-tailed) = .003 < $\alpha$ = .05.

The difference between Max power\textsubscript{2} - Max power\textsubscript{1} = 4.375. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 3.123$ is Sig. $t$ (2-tailed) = .017 < $\alpha$ = .05.

As regards the other parameters, the differences in their mean values at the end of the test period, as compared to the beginning of the test period, did not have statistical significance since for each of these parameters the level of significance is Sig. $t$ (2-tailed) > $\alpha$ = .05.

| Parameter          | Start | Finish | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------|-------|--------|------------|--------------|
| 2 Weight           | 78.046| 14.634 | 4.0590     | +1.1154      |
| 3 BMI              | 24.446| 3.7451 | 1.0384     | +1.1154      |
| 4 Body Fat         | 14.562| 7.8048 | 2.5176     | +.9846       |
| 5 Muscle Mass      | 62.823| 7.6715 | 2.1277     | -.0846       |
| 6 Muscle quality   | 61.62 | 8.026  | 2.222      | +.3846       |
| 7 Visceral Fat     | 2.85  | 2.528  | .701       | +.1154       |
| 8 Body water       | 59.92 | 5.255  | 1.457      | -1.0231      |
| 9 N of trainings   | 3.54  | 1.127  | .312       | .000         |
| 10 Lucuma intake   | 30.192| 5.7487 | 1.5944     | +3.2692      |
| 11 VO\textsubscript{2}max | 33.462| 6.8561 | 1.9015     | +38.0769     |
| 12 Endurance plank | 218.77| 118.344| 32.823     | +5.000       |
| 13 Max power       | 87.31 | 21.565 | 5.981      | +5.000       |
### Table 4. Comparative analysis of the parameter modifications for the EG at the beginning and at the end of the test period

| Paired Samples Test | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | t   | df  | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----------------|
| Paired Differences  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Lower | Upper |               |
| Pair 1              | Metabolic Age2 - Metabolic Age1          | 2.125 | 2.475 | .875           | .056 | 4.194 | .046          |
| Pair 2              | Weight2 - Weight1                        | 1.900 | 1.6954 | .5994        | .4826 | 3.3174 | .016          |
| Pair 3              | BMI2 - BMI1                              | .5500 | .4690 | .1658         | .1579 | .9421 | .013          |
| Pair 4              | Bodyfat2 - Bodyfat1                      | .7750 | 2.4703 | .8734        | -1.2902 | 2.8402 | .404          |
| Pair 5              | Muscle mass2 - Muscle mass1              | 1.1375 | 2.3330 | .8248        | - .8129 | 3.0879 | .210          |
| Pair 6              | Muscle quality2 - Muscle quality1        | 2.1250 | 7.7540 | 2.7415       | -4.3575 | 8.6075 | .464          |
| Pair 7              | Physique Rating2 - Physique Rating1      | .1250 | .3536 | .1250         | -1.706 | .4206 | .351          |
| Pair 8              | Visceral Fat2 - Visceral Fat1            | .5375 | 1.0941 | .3868        | -3.772 | 1.4522 | .207          |
| Pair 9              | Body Water2 - Body Water1               | -.8375 | 1.6106 | .5694        | -2.1840 | .5090 | .185          |
| Pair 10             | VO\textsubscript{max}2 - VO\textsubscript{max}1 | 8.8000 | 4.7329 | 1.6733       | 4.8432 | 12.7568 | .001          |
| Pair 11             | Endurance plank2 - Endurance plank1      | 52.6250 | 33.6874 | 11.9103     | 24.4616 | 80.7884 | .003          |
| Pair 12             | Max power2 - Max power1                  | 4.3750 | 3.9619 | 1.4007       | 1.0628 | 7.6872 | .017          |

In order to test the hypotheses concerning the statistical significance of the differences in the mean values of the parameters for the CG at the end of the test period, as compared to the beginning of the test period, we used the Paired-Samples T-test (Table 5).

The results of the Paired-Samples T-test showed that the differences in the mean values at the end of the period, as compared to the beginning of the period, had statistical significance for the following parameters: Weight, Body fat, Body Water, VO\textsubscript{2}\textsubscript{max}, Plank endurance and Maximum power.

The difference between Weight2 - Weight1 = 1.1154. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 3.468$ is Sig. t (2-tailed) = .005 $< \alpha = .05$.

The difference between Body fat2 - Body fat1 = .9846. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 2.602$ is Sig. t (2-tailed) = .023 $< \alpha = .05$.

The difference between Body Water2 - Body Water1 = -1.0231. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 3.035$ is Sig. t (2-tailed) = .010 $< \alpha = .05$.

The difference between VO\textsubscript{2}\textsubscript{max}2 - VO\textsubscript{2}\textsubscript{max}1 = 3.2692. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for $t = 2.639$ is Sig. t (2-tailed) = .022 $< \alpha = .05$.

The difference between Endurance plank2 -
Endurance plank1 = 38.0769. It has a statistical significance since the level of significance for \( t = 2.475 \) is Sig. \( t \) (2-tailed) = .029 < \( \alpha = .05 \).

The difference between Max power2 - Max power1 = 5.00. The statistical significance, for a level of significance for \( t = 3.950 \) is Sig. \( t \) (2-tailed) = .002 < \( \alpha = .05 \).

As regards the other parameters, the differences in their mean values at the end of the test period, as compared to the beginning of the test period, did not have statistical significance since for each of these parameters the level of significance is Sig. \( t \) (2-tailed) > \( \alpha = .05 \).

**Comparative analysis of the modifications of the parameters of the EG and the CG at the beginning and at the end of the test period**

Table 5. Comparative analysis of the parameter modifications for the CG at the beginning and at the end of the test period

| Paired Differences | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------------------|------|----------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------|---|----|----------------|
| Pair 1              | Metabolic Age2 - Metabolic Age1 | .154          | 1.068           | .296                                    | -.492 | .799 | .519 | 12 | .613 |
| Pair 2              | Weight2 - Weight1           | 1.1154        | 1.1596          | .3216                                    | .4146 | 1.8161 | 3.468 | 12 | .005 |
| Pair 3              | BMI2 - BMI1                | 1.1154        | 2.9311          | .8129                                    | -.6559 | 2.8866 | 1.372 | 12 | .195 |
| Pair 4              | Body fat2 - Body fat1      | .9846         | 1.3643          | .3784                                    | -.1602 | 1.8091 | 2.602 | 12 | .023 |
| Pair 5              | Muscle mass2 - Muscle mass1 | -.0846        | 1.4381          | .3989                                    | -.9536 | .7844 | -.212 | 12 | .836 |
| Pair 6              | Muscle quality2 - Muscle quality1 | .3846          | 6.4361          | 1.7850                                    | -3.5047 | 4.2739 | .215 | 12 | .833 |
| Pair 7              | Physique Rating2 - Physique Rating1 | -.462          | 1.391           | .386                                    | -1.302 | .379 | -1.196 | 12 | .255 |
| Pair 8              | Visceral Fat2 - Visceral Fat1 | .1154         | .2193           | .0608                                    | -.0171 | .2479 | 1.897 | 12 | .082 |
| Pair 9              | Body Water2 - Body Water1 | -1.0231       | 1.2153          | .3371                                    | -1.7575 | -.2887 | -3.035 | 12 | .010 |
| Pair 10             | VO\(_\text{max}\)_2 - VO\(_\text{max}\)_1 | 3.2692        | 4.4668          | 1.2389                                    | .5700 | 5.9685 | 2.639 | 12 | .022 |
| Pair 11             | Endurance plank2 - Endurance plank1 | 38.0769       | 55.4669         | 15.3837                                    | 4.5586 | 71.5952 | 2.475 | 12 | .029 |
| Pair 12             | Max power2 - Max power1    | 5.0000        | 4.5664          | 1.2659                                    | 2.2418 | 7.7582 | 3.950 | 12 | .002 |

For each separate group, we calculated the differences in the mean values of the parameters at the end of the test period, as compared to the beginning of the test period. They characterize the modifications in the parameters attributable to the effects of the lucuma-based carbohydrate beverage and the EG students’ training as well as the changes of the parameters for the CG students solely due to the physical training. For instance, concerning weight, the difference is determined as follows: \( Weight = Weight2 - Weight1 \), where:

- \( Weight1 \) is the average weight of the students in the group at the beginning of the
- **Weight2** is the average weight of the students in the group at the end of the test period;
- **Weight** – is the modification of the average weight of the students in the group.

In a similar fashion, we also calculated the differences in the mean values for all other parameters.

In order to compare the changes in the parameters for both groups, we applied the Independent Samples T-test. This test determines whether there are statistically significant differences in the modifications of the parameters for the two groups. The results are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. Comparative analysis of the modifications in the parameters in the EG and the CG**

| Parameter             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
|                       | F          | Sig. | t    | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Metabolic Age         | 14.039     | .001 | 2.542 | 19 | .020           | 1.97115         | .77535                  | .34832 | 3.59398 |
| Weight                | .907       | .353 | 1.264 | 19 | .222           | .78462          | .62074                  | -.51461 | 2.08384 |
| BMI                   | 1.635      | .216 | -.536 | 19 | .598           | -.56538         | 1.05453                 | -2.77254 | 1.64177 |
| Body fat              | 1.172      | .293 | -.252 | 19 | .804           | -.20962         | .83147                  | -1.94990 | 1.53067 |
| Muscle mass           | 1.946      | .179 | 1.495 | 19 | .151           | 1.22212         | .81770                  | -.48936 | 2.93359 |
| Muscle quality        | .418       | .526 | .557  | 19 | .584           | 1.74038         | 3.12339                 | -4.79694 | 8.27771 |
| Physique Rating       | 3.904      | .063 | 1.159 | 19 | .261           | .58654          | .50615                  | -.47284 | 1.64592 |
| Visceral Fat          | 10.414     | .004 | 1.368 | 19 | .187           | .42212          | .30851                  | -.22360 | 1.06783 |
| Body Water            | .059       | .811 | .301  | 19 | .767           | .18558          | .61752                  | -1.10691 | 1.47807 |
| VO2max                | .083       | .776 | 2.695 | 19 | .014           | 5.53077         | 2.05205                 | 1.23577 | 9.82577 |
| Endurance plank       | 1.554      | .228 | .666  | 19 | .513           | 14.54808        | 21.83531                | -31.15375 | 60.24991 |
| Max power             | .547       | .469 | -.320 | 19 | .753           | -.62500         | 1.95565                 | -.471823 | 3.46823 |

The results from the Independent Samples T-test showed that for both groups there was a statistically significant difference in the modification of the **VO2max** parameter. The level of significance of $t = 2.695$ is $\text{Sig. } t (2\text{-tailed}) = .014 < \alpha = .05$. As regards the other parameters, no statistically significant differences in their modifications were identified. For both groups (EG and CG), we established a statistically significant difference in the modification...
of the Metabolit_Age parameter. The level of significance of \( t = 2.542 \) is Sig. \( t \) (2-tailed) = .020 \( < \alpha = .05 \). In this case, the Levene’s test showed that the dispersions in the groups differed significantly, as a result of which it was necessary to test the hypothesis additionally with the help of the non-parametric Wilcoxon W test which confirmed the conclusion for Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) = .047 \( < \alpha = .05 \).

Determining correlational dependencies between the parameters at the beginning and at the end of the test period

To determine the statistically significant correlational dependencies between the parameters studied, with the help of the SPSS16 statistical package, we produced two correlation matrices for the EG concerning the beginning and the end of the test period. We identified strong correlational dependencies between the parameters characterizing the motor activity level and the other variables, both at the beginning (Table 7) and at the end (Table 8) of the test period.

Table 7. Correlation matrix for the EG concerning the beginning of the test period

|        | Weight1 | BMI1 | Body fat1 | Muscle mass1 | Muscle quality1 | Physique Raiting1 | Visceral Fat1 | Body Water1 | VO2 max1 | Endurance plank1 | Max power1 |
|--------|---------|------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------|------------|
| Weight1| R 1     | .926“ | .498      | .894“        | .512           | .275              | -.802         | .586        | -.206    | .692            | 1          |
| BMI1   | R .926“ | 1    | .683      | .722“        | .616           | .115              | .752“         | .937“       | .436     | .078            | .636       |
| Body fat1 | R .498      | .683 | 1         | .063         | .237           | -.449             | .764“         | -.834“      | -.147   | .356            | .128       |
| Muscle mass1 | R .894“      | .722“ | .063 | 1     | .461           | .508              | .406          | .495        | .789“   | -.383           | .742“      |
| Muscle quality1 | R .512       | .616  | .237      | .461        | 1              | .365              | .392          | -.673       | .168    | -.578           | .863“      |
| Physique Raiting1 | R .275     | .115  | -.449     | .508        | .365          | 1                 | .192         | .045        | .274    | -.811“          | .410       |
| Visceral Fat1 | R .722“     | .752“ | .764“     | .406        | .392          | .192              | 1             | -.814“      | .047    | -.168           | .375       |
| Body Water1 | R -.802“    | -.937“ | -.834“    | -.495       | -.673         | .045              | -.814“       | 1          | .169   | .065            | -.598      |
| VO2 max1 | R .586     | .436  | -.147     | .789“       | .168          | .274              | -.047         | -.169       | 1       | -.094           | .422       |
| Endurance plank1 | R -.206     | -.078 | .356      | -.383       | -.578         | -.811“            | .168          | .065        | -.094  | 1               | -.506      |
| Max power1 | R .692     | .636  | .128      | .724“       | .863“         | .410              | .375          | -.598       | -.422  | .506            | 1          |

N 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
### Table 8. Correlation matrix for the EG concerning the end of the test period

|                | Weight2 | BMI2 | Body fat2 | Muscle mass2 | Muscle quality2 | Physique Rating2 | Visceral Fat2 | Body Water2 | VO2max2 | Endurance plank2 | Max power2 |
|----------------|---------|------|-----------|--------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|---------|-----------------|------------|
| Weight2        | R 1     | .931** | .463      | .933**       | .216           | .266             | .772**        | -.759*      | -.039   | -.212          | .769*      |
| BMI2           | R .931**| 1    | .644      | .787*        | .193           | .125             | .877**        | -.894**     | -.080   | .019           | .747*      |
| Body fat2      | R .463  | .644  | 1         | .115         | -.501          | -.663            | .748*         | -.869**     | .304    | .079           |            |
| Muscle mass2   | R .933**| .787* | .115      | 1            | .455           | .567             | .557          | -.501       | -.174  | -.544          | .843**     |
| Muscle quality2| R .216  | .193  | -.501     | .455         | 1              | .845**           | 1             | .058        | .248    | -.472          | -.941**    | .558      |
| Physique Rating2| R .266 | .125  | -.663     | .567         | .845**         | 1                | -.058        | .248        | -.472  | -.941**        | .558       |
| Visceral Fat2  | R .772* | .877**| .748*     | .557         | -.050          | .501             | .455          | .248        | -.892**| .111           | .237       | .397      |
| Body Water2    | R -.759*| -.894**| .869**    | -.501        | .047           | .248             | -.892**       | 1           | .274    | -.403          | -.474      |
| VO2max2        | R -.039 | -.080 | .304      | -.174        | -.253          | -.472            | .111          | -.274       | 1       | .444           | -.329      |
| Endurance plank2| R -.212 | .019  | .757*     | -.544        | -.723**        | -.941**          | .237          | -.403       | .444    | 1              | -.496      |
| Max power2     | R .769* | .747* | .079      | .843**       | .675           | .558             | .397          | -.474       | -.329  | -.496          | 1          |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**  
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

**Figure 1. Statistically significant correlations accounting for the motor activity of the EG at the beginning of the test period**

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate very strong correlations accounting for the motor activity of the EG at the beginning and at the end of the test period. On the basis of the analysis concerning the end of the test period (Table 2), we identified a strong negative ($r = - .723, P = .043$ – Muscle quality2) and a very strong correlation ($r = -.941, P = .000$ – Physique Raiting2) affecting Endurance plank2. The increase in Muscle mass2, Weight2 and BMI2 strongly affect the increase in MaxPower2, as expressed by means of ($r = .843, P = .009$); ($r = .769, P = .026$) and ($r = .747, P = .033$).
CONCLUSIONS

We produced a new carbohydrate beverage containing lucuma powder and determined its approximate physio-chemical composition: 21.5% protein, 65.5% carbohydrate, 8.3% moisture, 1.5% fat and 3.2% ash. Since it is rich in carbohydrates, the lucuma-based beverage can be used in sports training in order to improve the energy resources of the organism, immediately prior to physical exercises.

The results from the analysis of the motor activity of the EG students at the end of the test period, obtained after the consumption of the beverage, manifest positive changes in the level of maximum oxygen intake (VO$_2$ max), plank test endurance and maximum power. The comparative analysis of the modifications in the EG and CG parameters shows that the modifications are more significant for the EG concerning maximum oxygen intake, muscle mass, muscle quality and plank endurance. The correlational dependencies for the EG at the beginning and at the end of the test period manifest that the effects of the carbohydrate beverage and the physical training are combined in order to bring about modifications in body composition leading to significant functional changes.

On the basis of the obtained results and the analyses carried out, we believe that the lucuma-based carbohydrate beverage can be applied in sports training in order to improve the energy resources of the organism, immediately prior to physical exercises.
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