

MUSCLE HYPERTROPHY: A NARRATIVE REVIEW ON TRAINING

PRINCIPLES FOR INCREASING MUSCLE MASS

Louis P Howe, MSc., BSc, Dr Paul Read, Dr Mark Waldron

ABSTRACT

Developing muscle cross sectional area has the potential to enhance performance for many athletes. As emerging evidence challenges traditional beliefs regarding the prescription of hypertrophy focused training programs, this review provides an overview of the current literature relating, specifically, to programming variables. Evidence-based recommendations are provided for the design of effective resistance training programs, with the goal of increasing an athlete's skeletal muscle mass.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Within a strength and conditioning coach's practice, the development of physical
3 qualities that result in improvements in athletic performance are arguably at the heart
4 of the role. One such physical quality is maximal force development as it relates to
5 the constraints of each specific sport skill (86). Although neurological factors
6 primarily contribute to the development of force, structural adaptations following
7 long-term strength training may also influence force generation capacity (19), though
8 the role of muscle hypertrophy is likely to be exaggerated for increasing maximal
9 strength (50). Nonetheless, increases in muscle mass are typically desirable in
10 instances where athletes are required to produce large forces against their external
11 environment. Indeed, cross-sectional area of the limbs has been associated with both
12 horizontal and vertical power production in elite athletes (94). This concept provides
13 the rationale for developing the skeletal muscular system, prior to neural factors, as
14 part of a 'phase potentiation periodisation model' (86). Therefore, increases in muscle
15 mass can, in many circumstances, support athletic development to a point.

16
17 Alongside performance considerations, increasing muscle mass may also be required
18 following injury occurrence. During the rehabilitation process, muscle atrophy is a
19 key concern, secondary to unloading (40). In cases where muscle atrophy is
20 heightened due to immobilisation, the rehabilitation time has been suggested to be
21 extended (8). Therefore, recovery of lean muscle tissue may be a significant objective
22 that should be achieved in order to restore the athlete to full function following injury.

23
24 Three proposed primary mechanisms are responsible for training adaptations,
25 including: mechanical tension, metabolic stress and muscle damage (66). Mechanical

1 tension refers to the loading of muscle and is proposed to disrupt skeletal muscle
2 structures, compromising the integrity of individual muscle fibres and leading to
3 cellular responses via stimulation of the mTOR pathway (38). Local metabolic stress
4 involves the accumulation of metabolic by-products, such as blood lactate (B[La])
5 and hydrogen ions ($[H^+]$), caused by a cumulative demand on fast glycolysis (32, 90).
6 It is thought that this metabolic perturbation has the potential to stimulate anabolism
7 through mechanisms associated with increased local release of myokines, greater
8 reactive oxygen species production, cell swelling and acute hormonal responses (67).
9 Lastly, muscle damage is theorised to lead to hypertrophic responses (37), whereby
10 the inflammatory response and upregulation of muscle protein synthesis to exercise
11 induced muscle damage results in greater muscle size. For the interested reader
12 seeking further understanding of each mechanism and the underlying physiological
13 adaptations, please refer to Schoenfeld (66).

14
15 Traditional beliefs of the most effective strategies for the development of lean muscle
16 tissue have recently been challenged (17). This article reviews the current body of
17 literature related to training considerations for increasing muscle hypertrophy in
18 young healthy adults. Where appropriate, this review will indicate the training status
19 of the subjects used for each investigation. As such, this will allow coaches to
20 adequately interpret the discussion in order to suitably apply the findings in their own
21 strength and conditioning practice.

22 In particular, this article discusses the following foundational factors that should
23 influence a coach's decision-making when designing resistance training programs for
24 increasing muscle size:

- 25 • Training volume

- 1 • Load
- 2 • Training frequency
- 3 • Training to momentary muscular failure
- 4 • Exercise variation
- 5 • Contraction type
- 6 • Exercise order
- 7 • Repetition tempo
- 8 • Inter-set recovery

9 Evidence-based recommendations will be provided for the design of effective
10 resistance training programs, with the goal of increasing an athlete's skeletal muscle
11 mass.

12

13 This article does not describe, with any detail, the physiological mechanisms for
14 increasing in muscle mass, nor does it examine the evidence relating to specific
15 training techniques aimed at increasing muscle hypertrophy. Likewise, while a variety
16 of nutritional and lifestyle factors can be manipulated to augment the effects of
17 hypertrophy training (63), these will not be discussed herein.

19 **TRAINING VOLUME**

20 Resistance training volume, described as the amount of work completed for any given
21 unit of time, is a key variable for consideration in the pursuit of muscle hypertrophy.
22 Much like increases in maximal strength (44), muscle hypertrophy is enhanced
23 following high-volume longitudinal programs, particularly when multiple sets of
24 exercise are utilised, rather than single set routines (45). This evidence has been used
25 to support the current American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM)

1 recommendations, which suggest prescribing multiple sets for advanced lifters in
2 order to increase muscle hypertrophy (4). Acutely, significant increases in muscle
3 protein synthesis have been observed following high volume training in comparison
4 to low volume sessions (14), thus reinforcing this recommendation.

5
6 Although acute responses are not linearly accompanied by long-term increases in lean
7 muscle mass (53), numerous longitudinal studies have demonstrated that high volume
8 training facilitates muscle hypertrophy (20, 58, 59, 62). Using ultrasound to measure
9 elbow flexor and extensor muscle thickness, Radaelli et al. (59) showed that five sets
10 of exercises per training session resulted in significantly greater upper arm
11 development when compared to one and three set routines, across a six-month
12 training period. This increase in muscle mass was accompanied by significantly
13 superior gains in five repetition maximum (RM) loads for the bench press and lat pull
14 down following the high volume intervention (59).

15
16 While findings of higher volumes leading to superior gains in muscle growth are not
17 consistent throughout the literature (11, 51), a recent meta-analysis identified a dose-
18 response relationship between training volume and muscle hypertrophy (73). For
19 example, high weekly volumes (>10 total sets per body part, per week) were
20 associated with greater increases in muscle mass than lower volumes (< 5 sets, per
21 body part, per week), with an effect size of 0.241 (73). Schoenfeld et al. (73)
22 concluded that higher volume training produces greater gains in muscle mass than
23 lower volume training.

1 The mechanisms underlying the relationship between high training volume and
2 increased muscle mass are potentially linked to the prolonged metabolic stress (34). A
3 greater number of total sets per body part increases the total duration placed on the
4 relevant energy systems and variety of muscle fibres during training. However, if
5 prolonged metabolic stress is responsible for increases in muscle hypertrophy
6 following high volume routines, then coaches should carefully manage the types of
7 exercises that comprise their program, particularly if high-load exercises are included.
8 For example, utilisation of drop sets has the potential to heighten the accumulation of
9 metabolic by-products by placing greater demand on the fast glycolytic energy
10 systems (33). If a high number of sets of this type of training were to be prescribed
11 across sessions in order to increase volume, then an athlete may be taken beyond their
12 recovery threshold, resulting in a blunting of the hypertrophy response (28).

13

14 It is important to emphasise that the relationship between volume and muscle growth
15 is unlikely to be linear. That is; continual increases in training volume would
16 inevitably lead to a plateau in the development of muscle mass. This concept is
17 supported by the recent findings of Amirthalingham et al (3). In their investigation, no
18 significant difference in muscle hypertrophy was found between subjects who
19 performed either 5 sets of 10 repetitions or 10 sets of 10 repetitions over a six-week
20 period (3). Coaches should appreciate each individual athlete's recovery capacity
21 when prescribing training programs, with excessive volumes leading to extended
22 overreaching or, perhaps overtraining syndrome (83). The net effect of this would be
23 a reduction in the capacity for anabolic processes due to a heightened catabolic status
24 and increased protein metabolism (46). In this sense, the relationship between volume
25 and hypertrophy training is suggested to follow an inverted-U curve (71). As each

1 individual possesses their own capacity to recover from a given amount of work,
2 strength and conditioning coaches should use appropriate testing and monitoring tools
3 to identify thresholds which maximize increases in muscle mass, while maintaining
4 the athlete's health.

5

6 **LOAD**

7 The manipulation of load during resistance training, which is typically presented as
8 the percentage of maximal load that can be used for any given movement, has been
9 proposed as a vital factor in maximising muscle hypertrophy (66). This is likely to
10 relate directly to the mechanism of 'mechanical tension', as increased load results in
11 an intensification of tension on the musculotendinous unit. However, loads exceeding
12 85 % 1RM, while maximising mechanical tension, fail to provide adequate stress to
13 the fast glycolytic system due to reduced time under tension (60). Therefore, as a
14 compromise in emphasising both mechanical tension and metabolic stress
15 simultaneously, moderate loads (70-85 % 1RM) are traditionally recommended (4).

16

17 It has been suggested that high-load training (>65 % 1RM) leads to superior gains in
18 muscle mass due to the recruitment and fatigue of higher threshold motor units (43,
19 57). This outcome might be desirable among athletes, as hypertrophy of fast-twitch
20 fibres is known to be much greater than slow-twitch muscle fibres (1, 89) and fast-
21 twitch fibres demonstrate higher velocity contractions (97). Fry (29) showed that
22 programs incorporating loads above 50 % 1RM led to greater fast-twitch fibre
23 hypertrophy compared to slow-twitch fibres. Furthermore, during short duration
24 isometric contractions with low-load (30-45 % 1RM), glycogen depletion is non-
25 existent in type IIX fibres but rises significantly with increased resistance (91).

1

2 Although these findings suggest that type II fibres are stimulated to a greater degree
3 when exposed to heavy loading, it has been suggested that low-load training also
4 recruits fast-twitch muscle fibres, providing that the working set is continued close to
5 volitional fatigue (15). When high-load training has been directly compared to low-
6 load, Mitchell et al. (52) found no significant difference in fibre-type specific
7 hypertrophy. However, this study has been suggested to be underpowered (57),
8 consequently lacking the sensitivity required to establish a difference in fibre type
9 hypertrophy between loading strategies. As this investigation did establish a non-
10 significant difference in type I hypertrophy between high- and low-load training (17
11 vs. 30%, respectively) (52), it may be that the lack of statistical power prevented the
12 identification of differences. Mitchell et al. (52) used a sample size of 12 participants
13 per group, which would achieve a poor statistical power of 0.17, based on our own
14 *post-hoc* analysis, assuming an alpha level of 0.05 and an effect size 0.3 (*d*). It is
15 important for coaches to note that this investigation demonstrated very little
16 difference between high- and low-load training for type II fibre hypertrophy (16 vs.
17 18%, respectively) (52). Further evidence is required to establish whether load
18 determines fibre-type hypertrophy. Of course, coaches shouldn't underestimate the
19 importance of recruiting a wide range of motor units through the prescription of high
20 and low loads. Indeed, in the development of muscle cross sectional area, which is
21 determined by the increase in myofibrillar proteins and thus muscle fibre diameter, a
22 reliance upon the hypertrophy of type I fibres also exists. Exercises that activate a
23 greater proportion of type I fibres would, therefore, be of equal use in maximising
24 hypertrophic adaptation.

25

1 When considering whole muscle hypertrophy, a meta-analysis by Schoenfeld et al.
2 (76) showed high-load training ($> 65\%$ 1RM) to be no more effective than low-load
3 training ($<60\%$ 1RM) for increasing skeletal muscle mass. However, there was a
4 non-significant trend in favour of high-load training ($p = 0.076$), which might be due
5 to the low number of studies investigating the effects of training load on muscle
6 hypertrophy. The use of low-load training strategies is supported by reports that
7 training at 30% 1RM resulted in greater acute muscle protein synthesis relative to
8 high-load training (90% 1RM), providing low load training is continued to failure
9 (15). Additionally, Mitchell et al. (52) showed that a low-load training (30% 1RM)
10 regime resulted in similar increases in whole muscle cross-sectional area when
11 compared to high-load training (80% 1RM) over a 10-week period. Furthermore,
12 using a moderate loading scheme (8-12RM) or a variety of training loads (2-4RM, 8-
13 12 RM and 20-30RM) across a training week has been shown to result in similar
14 increases in muscle mass following an eight-week intervention (72).

15
16 Therefore, when coaches are prescribing a training stimulus for muscle hypertrophy,
17 high- or low-loads may be selected. Traditionally, loads $> 65\%$ 1RM have been
18 prescribed for hypertrophy programs, which might not be necessary. This information
19 might also be useful for injury rehabilitation, where low-load training can be an
20 effective method to increase muscle mass without the augmented forces associated
21 with high-load training, leading to reduced joint loads.

22
23 While low-load training might be equally as effective for muscle hypertrophy,
24 coaches should not overlook the superior strength adaptations that high-load training
25 provides in comparison to low-load training (10, 65, 55, 68). These differences are

1 explained by the principle of training specificity, whereby the all-out efforts required
2 during high-load training produces maximal force, whereas low-load training requires
3 only low-to-moderate forces in a fatigued state (18). As such, high-load training that
4 results in the accumulation of considerable training volume may allow for increased
5 muscle strength alongside substantial increases in muscle mass. Such adaptations
6 have been defined as *functional hypertrophy*, where increases in muscle mass and
7 maximal strength occur simultaneously (64).

9 **TRAINING FREQUENCY**

10 Training frequency is defined as the number of training sessions per unit of time.
11 From the perspective of increasing an athlete's muscle mass, training frequency
12 relates directly to training volume. During a single training session, the capacity to
13 recover from the work performed is limited. Therefore, for high levels of training
14 volume to be achieved, multiple sessions are likely to be required. As training volume
15 is a key factor in muscle growth (73), optimising training frequency will allow for
16 volume to be maximized without excessive fatigue being incurred.

18 In establishing the optimal training frequency for muscle hypertrophy, Wernborn et
19 al. (95) showed that two-to-three training sessions per week was optimal. This is
20 supported by a recent meta-analysis, identifying that two weekly training sessions for
21 the same muscle group led to significantly greater increases in muscle mass compared
22 to one or three sessions per week (74). These findings are in contrast to the traditional
23 practices of some bodybuilders, who are reported to train a single muscle group once
24 per week (36). However, it should be noted that both Schoenfeld et al. (74) and

1 Wernborn et al. (95) included both untrained and trained subjects in their analysis,
2 potentially impacting the application for athletic populations.

3

4 For the majority of resistance-trained athletes, it is inevitable that the training volume
5 per session and training frequency are inversely related, such that an increase in
6 training frequency leads to a reduction in volume per session. In the case of a high
7 frequency training program, where a muscle group is trained on multiple occasions,
8 the training volume for each session should be lower in order to prevent excessive
9 weekly training volumes. High training frequency should be periodized strategically
10 so that adequate recovery is provided between sessions. Indeed, training the same
11 muscle group before protein synthesis has returned to homeostasis may impair the
12 muscle hypertrophy process (49); thus, 48 to 72 hours' rest between training sessions
13 for the same muscle group may be required in order to optimise the training response
14 (74).

15

16 Although this general recommendation is likely to be appropriate for many athletes, it
17 has been recently suggested that higher training frequencies may be more beneficial
18 for trained individuals in stimulating greater muscle hypertrophy (23). As trained
19 individuals adapt to resistance training in the long-term by reducing the muscle
20 protein synthesis response (22), distributing training volume across a higher
21 frequency has the potential to increase the total time spent in a positive protein
22 balance by an athlete (23). Such approach would require a large reduction in training
23 volume per session in order to avoid the accumulation of excessive fatigue. Dankel et
24 al. (23) suggests strategies of high training frequency may be less than optimal for
25 untrained individuals, as the subsequent bouts of resistance training would likely

interfere with the increase protein synthesis response for the preceding training session. While this hypothesis is supported mechanistically, at present little evidence exists to confirm this theoretical model and future investigations are required.

TRAINING TO MOMENTARY MUSCULAR FAILURE

Training to momentary muscular failure results in the inability to produce the necessary force to lift a load through the concentric phase (66). When training to failure, it is hypothesised that maximal motor unit recruitment is achieved resulting in the fatigue of a greater number of muscle fibres (16, 98), in turn leading to a greater hypertrophic response. Performing repeated muscle contractions of a fixed load (i.e. a set) to failure is associated with progressive increases in both the perception of effort (5) and muscle activation levels (obtained from surface EMG) (87). These findings infer an increase in the recruitment of high-threshold motor units (87). In support of this, Burd et al. (14) reported no differences in muscle adaptation in low- or high-load training strategies, providing that each set was completed to failure. However, it is difficult to come to such conclusions where training volume is not equated.

Goto et al. (34) investigated the effects of training to failure on muscle hypertrophy in a twelve-week study, where participants were volume-matched and assigned to either a group that trained to failure or a group that incorporated an intra-set rest preventing failure from occurring. With volume equated, the “no-rest” group using repetition maximums achieved significantly greater muscle hypertrophy in the quadriceps, along with higher levels of maximal strength (34). This is similar to the findings of Schott (78), who also identified training to failure induced superior hypertrophy adaptations compared to finishing a set prior to failure.

1

2 Although these findings indicate the positive effects of training to failure, caution
3 should be taken with routinely prescribing this approach. Sundstrup et al. (87)
4 reported that complete concentric failure was not required in order to achieve full
5 muscle activation using EMG analysis, with a plateau occurring during the final 3-5
6 repetitions with a 15 RM load. This is an important consideration, as routinely
7 performing resistance training to failure may produce symptoms of overtraining, and
8 subsequent threats to the anabolic status of athletes (39). As many of the studies
9 evaluating the benefits of training to failure are of relatively short duration, the long-
10 term implications are yet to be elucidated. Such findings have been identified in
11 training programs for maximal strength (25). Therefore, it is recommended that
12 practitioners strategically expose their athletes to training that induces failure to
13 prevent the occurrence of overtraining.

14

15 **EXERCISE VARIATION**

16 Traditionally, bodybuilders tend to subscribe to the notion that broad exercise
17 variation is required in order to maximize muscle hypertrophy (36). A proposed
18 rationale is that muscles such as the pectoralis major (47) and trapezius (7) perform
19 different movements of the same joint segment via the functional subdivisions of each
20 muscle (6). As such, manipulating exercises has the potential to target large sections
21 of the muscle. For example, in the case of the pectoralis major, utilising a 15° decline
22 during the bench press results in greater EMG activity of the sternal fibres relative to
23 the clavicular fibres (47). Therefore, in order to overload specific portions of different
24 muscles, a wider variety of exercises is essential to recruit and fatigue all muscle
25 subdivisions.

1

2 The above concept may be extended to muscles that possess numerous fibres
3 orientated at a variety of angles between the origin and insertion. For example, both
4 the long head and short head of the biceps brachii musculature are architecturally
5 classified as fusiform (31); the biceps brachii is not functionally compartmentalised
6 like the pectoralis major muscle. By manipulating shoulder and elbow positioning, the
7 biceps brachii demonstrates a region-specific muscle activation strategy during
8 supination (12). Furthermore, during elbow flexion, the biceps brachii does not
9 uniformly shorten, suggesting that separate muscle fascicles contract concentrically at
10 varying rates thus manipulating the range in the work produced for each muscle fibre
11 (31).

12

13 Non-uniform muscle fibre recruitment has also been shown to occur in the hamstrings
14 musculature, with EMG activity varying between the lower and upper fibres,
15 depending on whether the hamstrings were required to flex the knee or extend the hip
16 against resistance (69). This finding was supported by the work of Mendez-
17 Villanueva et al. (54), who used functional magnetic resonance imaging to
18 demonstrate regional differences in muscle activation of each head of the hamstrings
19 during a variety of posterior chain exercises. Likewise, during resisted elbow
20 extensions, multi-joint and single joint exercises have been shown to elicit regional
21 differences in muscle activation. For example, single-joint elbow extension exercise
22 has been shown to increase activation of the distal portion of the triceps brachii (92).
23 Chronic adaptations to these exercises led to greater increases in cross-sectional area
24 in the distal region of the muscle after a 12-week overloaded intervention program
25 (92). Similarly, Wakahara et al. (93) showed that a multi-joint elbow extension

1 exercise (dumbbell bench press) increased muscle activation levels of the middle and
2 proximal region of the triceps brachii, leading to greater growth in these areas. This
3 suggests that in order to maximize hypertrophic adaptation, it is necessary to stress
4 the muscle across its different portions (proximal-distal) using a variety of exercises.

5

6 Fonseca et al. (26) showed that changing exercises within a 12-week period was more
7 effective for increasing muscle strength and hypertrophy compared to solely
8 manipulations in training load. Within this investigation, hypertrophy of the vastus
9 medialis and rectus femoris was more for subjects who varied exercises over three-
10 week cycles, compared to subjects who used the same exercise throughout (26). This
11 evidence supports the concept of utilising numerous exercises in order to fully exploit
12 adaptations of muscle hypertrophy.

13

14 One potential mechanism for the regional differences in hypertrophy may be the
15 compartmentalisation of skeletal muscle (6). Within the neuromuscular system,
16 sections of the muscle are innervated by specific motor units that are responsible for
17 orchestrating the contraction of their respective fibres (6). Indeed, even fusiform
18 muscle fibres terminate intrafascicularly (31, 96), meaning that there is potential for
19 various neuromuscular compartments to exist within a given muscle. As fibre-type
20 distribution inside muscles is also region specific (47, 84), intramuscular differences
21 are likely to exist relative to function. Therefore, resistance training targeting
22 preferential hypertrophy of fast-twitch fibres with strategies such as eccentric-only
23 training, may also lead to non-uniform hypertrophy (discussed in the following
24 section). It is likely that each muscle contains multiple neuromuscular compartments
25 that can be selectively overloaded through varying exercise selection.

1

2 **CONTRACTION TYPE**

3 Eccentric muscle contractions increase the amount of mechanical stress on the
4 musculotendinous units (7). While EMG amplitude is lower during eccentric
5 contractions, fast-twitch fibres are preferentially recruited over their slow-twitch
6 counterparts, leading to greater tension per muscle fibre and a bias toward type II
7 fibre damage (79). The greater muscle damage incurred promotes an adaptive
8 response in the fast-twitch fibres, which possess greater potential for growth (1).

9

10 Traditional methods to determine loads during a program typically use the concentric
11 strength of the athlete (i.e. percentage of 1 RM). However, because eccentric strength
12 can be as much as 45 % greater than concentric strength (41), it is likely that eccentric
13 training is rarely exploited to its full potential. Since, submaximal eccentric training
14 does not acutely raise muscle protein synthesis when compared to concentric training,
15 the downstream effects on muscle hypertrophy are likely to be limited if traditional
16 approaches to quantify load are used (21). However, when eccentric training is
17 performed with maximal resistance, muscle protein synthesis is significantly greater
18 than load-matched concentric training (56). When eccentric training is applied over a
19 number of weeks, muscle hypertrophy adaptations are shown to be superior to that of
20 concentric training (61). Therefore, supra-maximal eccentric training is likely to
21 induce greater hypertrophic adaptations, assuming that the necessary recovery is
22 provided. However, this is not consistent within the literature, with some studies
23 identifying no difference between modes of contraction (28). This is potentially due to
24 difficulties in matching volume-load between conditions, with eccentric training
25 requiring higher loads.

1

2 In a recent meta-analysis, Schoenfeld et al. (77) identified a non-significant trend that
3 eccentric-only training induced greater hypertrophic adaptations than concentric-only
4 concentric training for inducing hypertrophic gains ($p=0.076$). Mean effect sizes for
5 muscle growth following eccentric-only and concentric-only training were 1.02 and
6 0.77 respectively, with an effect size difference of 0.27. The authors propose that due
7 to many of the studies included for analysis matching the total repetitions performed
8 and not total work, the higher amount of work completed was likely to be a major
9 influence on these findings (77).

10

11 A further consideration with eccentric training is the identification of region-specific
12 hypertrophy. Franchi et al. (27) showed that although muscle hypertrophy of the
13 vastus lateralis was equal between concentric and eccentric training, mid portion
14 hypertrophy was higher in the concentric group, whereas the eccentric group
15 experienced greater growth in the distal division. This may be due to the change in
16 muscle architecture, secondary to the activation of altered molecular responses,
17 following a concentric or eccentric-only training intervention (27). Eccentric-only
18 resistance training leads to increases in fascicle length, while concentric-only training
19 promotes greater pennation angles, indicating a higher number of sarcomere's in
20 parallel (27). This has the potential to alter the force-velocity relationship of any
21 given muscle, with an increased fascicle length (sarcomere's in series) resulting in
22 superior shortening velocities (19). Conversely, a muscle with a larger pennation
23 angles has the capacity to create higher levels of force due to an increased number of
24 sarcomeres in parallel (19).

25

1 **EXERCISE ORDER**

2 It is generally recommended that multi-joint exercises, relying on work being
3 produced by large muscle groups, should be performed in the initial stages of a
4 training session (2). As more repetitions can be completed with any given load earlier
5 in the training session (82), greater long-term accumulation of training volumes will
6 occur in response to exercises that are performed during these periods (81). While this
7 is dependent upon the design of the training session, it is, therefore, possible that
8 using multi-joint exercises at the start of a training session will result greater
9 hypertrophic adaptations in larger muscle groups.

10

11 Although this provides one reason to include multi-joint exercises earlier in the
12 training session, little evidence exists to support this hypothesis. This is mostly due to
13 limited amount of studies investigating the relationship between chronic structural
14 adaptations and exercise order (81). Of the research that does exist, Simão et al. (80)
15 and Spinetti et al. (85) both showed that ordering training sessions such that single-
16 joint elbow extension and flexion exercises were performed before the bench press
17 and lat pull-down, resulted in increased triceps muscle volume when compared to the
18 reverse order (effect size = 2.07 and 1.08 vs. 0.75 and 0.40). It should be noted that no
19 difference was seen for the biceps musculature between conditions in either
20 investigation (80, 85). However, neither study attempted to establish whether
21 structural changes occurred in the pectoralis major and latissimus dorsi muscles,
22 limiting the scope of their conclusions. It is likely that muscles trained and fatigued in
23 the early stages of a training session will accumulate higher training volumes and
24 therefore, adapt to a greater extent. As such, practitioners should prioritize exercises

for completion in the initial stages of the training session, based on the individual needs of the athlete (81).

One issue with performing single-joint exercises prior to multi-joint exercises is that the pre-fatigued muscle may alter the muscle activation patterns during the multi-joint exercise. In both the lower extremity (9) and upper extremity (30), pre-fatiguing a muscle with a single-joint exercise has been shown to decrease the recruitment of the muscle during a multi-joint exercise. This occurs alongside an increased recruitment of the synergistic muscles during the compound movement (30). However, activating a muscle with a single-joint exercise but not to the point of fatigue may increase its activation in the subsequent multi-joint exercise (42). Therefore, coaches may order exercises to strategically manipulate the recruitment patterns of prime movers during exercises in order to alter muscle activation patterns.

REPETITION TEMPO

Explosive strength training demonstrates a clear advantage over slow concentric training for strength development (13). This is likely to be due to the higher forces that are required to increase acceleration during the concentric phase of an appropriately loaded lift. However, when attempting to develop muscle mass, this relationship is not evident (70). This potentially occurs due to the reduced lifting speed requiring less force, prolonging the duration of the set leading to increased metabolic stress. When loads are lifted with the intention of achieving a high velocity, the forces will be higher, increasing the tension of the muscle. In such instances where the repetition duration increases, loading must be reduced due to the time component placing increased demands on the involved energy systems (88).

1 Therefore, manipulating repetition tempo is just another example of the inverse-
2 relationship between volume and load.

3

4 The available evidence shows equivocal differences between short and long repetition
5 tempos for muscle hypertrophy development. Tanimoto and Ishii (88) determined that
6 as long as subjects trained to failure, there was no significant difference in quadriceps
7 hypertrophy following high-load normal tempo training (1-second concentric: 1-
8 second eccentric: 1-second relaxation) when compared to a low-load, slow training
9 group (3-seconds concentric: 3-seconds eccentric: 1-second relaxation). Furthermore,
10 a recent meta-analysis showed no significant difference in muscle growth when
11 comparing regimes consisting of 0.5-seconds to 8-seconds for completion of the
12 concentric phase of a lift (70). Thus, manipulating repetition tempo between blocks of
13 training provides coaches with another strategy that may provide a novel form of
14 overload through increasing training volume (via long repetition duration) or load (via
15 short repetition durations).

16

17 **INTER-SET RECOVERY**

18 Much like repetition duration, coaches may also change inter-set recovery periods to
19 alter the balance of the training volume-load relationship. With short duration
20 recovery periods (< 30-seconds), training volume may be increased as training density
21 rises. However, if insufficient recovery is provided to fully replenish the anaerobic
22 energy stores (34), the load must be reduced. Likewise, with higher inter-set recovery
23 periods, greater loads may be used for each set at the expense of maintaining high
24 training density, coupled with additional rest time (24).

25

Research investigating inter-set recovery periods suggests that short rest intervals (\leq 60-seconds) potentially compromises volume load due to drastic reductions in the load used, when compared to longer recoveries (3-minutes) (75). This is supported by Buresh et al. (17), who showed greater increases in quadriceps cross-sectional area when utilising longer (2.5 minutes), compared to shorter (60 seconds) inter-set recoveries. However, caution should be applied when interpreting these results, as in each of these studies volume was equated. Such control may remove the benefits of utilising short recoveries, as training density cannot be increased. Whether shorter rest periods permit tolerable increases in training volume has not yet been studied. Therefore, further evidence is required in order to make clearer recommendations regarding the manipulation of inter-set rest periods for increasing muscle hypertrophy (35).

CONCLUSION

Certain aspects of traditional hypertrophy training have been recently challenged. A more detailed understanding of key programming variables is therefore required to maximize training effectiveness. Using the training principles outlined in this review, coaches can design and deliver evidence-based hypertrophy training that has the potential to increase athletic performance or expedite recovery from injury.

The current body of evidence suggests that there is no ideal load prescription to maximize muscle hypertrophy. In fact, from a loading perspective, there appears to be very few constraints, providing that the intensity of effort is high. However, an important variable that must be considered is training volume. High training volumes are necessary for maximising muscle growth. This may be accomplished through a

variety of approaches; one being increased training frequency. The current literature indicates between 2-3 training sessions per muscle group per week are most effective, although there may be potential for superior gains in muscle hypertrophy with the prescription of higher frequencies (>3) in trained individuals.

Exercise variation is also important to access all ‘functional compartments’ of individual muscles. This may be accomplished by including variations of basic exercises that place stress on specific muscle divisions. By incorporating a variety of exercises for a single muscle in the training program of an athlete, the hypertrophic response has the potential to be enhanced. Such adaptations may also be obtained with varying the type of contraction, as concentric-only and eccentric-only loading strategies have been shown to provide hypertrophic adaptations in different sections of a muscle. Furthermore, it seems that eccentric-only training has the potential to increase muscle mass beyond that of concentric-only training through the increase in total work performed.

Finally, exercise order, repetition tempo and inter-set recovery periods may all be manipulated at the program level in order to present the athlete with a novel stimulus. These variables should be considered in relation to the individual athlete goals and the desired outcome.

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Adams G and Bamman MM. Characterization and regulation of mechanical
3 loading-induced compensatory muscle hypertrophy. *Compr Physiol* 2:2829 -
4 2970, 2012.
- 5 2. American College of Sports Medicine. American College of Sports Medicine
6 position stand. Progression models in resistance training for healthy adults.
7 *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 41:687 - 708, 2009.
- 8 3. Amirthalingam T, Mavros Y, Wilson GC, Clarke JL, Mitchell L and Hackett
9 DA. Effects of a modified German Volume Training program on muscular
10 hypertrophy and strength. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2016. [Epub ahead of print].
- 11 4. An HJ, Choi WS, Choi JH, Kim JN and Min KO. Effects of muscle activity
12 and number of resistance exercise repetitions on perceived exertion in tonic
13 and phasic muscle of young Korean adults. *J Phys Ther Sci* 27:3455 - 3459,
14 2015
- 15 5. Antonio J. Nonuniform response of skeletal muscle to heavy resistance
16 training: can bodybuilders induce regional muscle hypertrophy? *J Strength*
17 *Cond Res* 14:102 – 113, 2000.
- 18 6. Armstrong RB, Warren GL and Warren JA. Mechanisms of exercise-induced
19 muscle fibre injury. *Sports Med* 12:184 - 207, 1991.
- 20 7. Arlotta M, Lovasco G and McLean L. Selective recruitment of the lower
21 fibers of the trapezius muscle. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 21: 403 - 410, 2011.
- 22 8. Arthur RC, Liotta FJ, Klootwyk TE, Porter DA and Mieling P. Potential risk
23 of rerupture in primary Achilles tendon repair in athletes younger than 30
24 years of age. *Am J Sports Med* 33:119 – 123, 2005.
- 25 9. Augustsson J, Thomeé R, Hörnstedt P, Lindblom J, Karlsson J, and Grimby G.

- 1 Effect of pre-exhaustion exercise on lower-extremity muscle activation during
2 a leg press exercise. *J Strength Cond Res* 17: 411 – 416, 2003.
- 3 10. Berger R.A. Effect of varied weight training programs on strength. *Research*
4 *Quarterly* 33:169 – 181, 1962.
- 5 11. Bottaro M, Veloso J, Wagner D and Gentil P. Resistance training for strength
6 and muscle thickness: Effect of number of sets and muscle group trained. *Sci*
7 *Sports* 26:259 - 264, 2011.
- 8 12. Brown JM, Solomon C and Paton M. Further evidence of functional
9 differentiation within biceps brachii. *Electromyogr Clin Neurophysiol* 33:301 -
10 309, 1993.
- 11 13. Bruce-Low S and Smith D. Explosive exercise in sports training: a critical
12 review. *J Exerc Physiol* 10:21 - 33, 2007.
- 13 14. Burd NA, Holwerda AM, Selby KC, West DW, Staples AW, Cain NE,
14 Cashaback JGA, Potvin JR, Baker SK and Phillips SM. Resistance exercise
15 volume affects myofibrillar protein synthesis and anabolic signalling molecule
16 phosphorylation in young men. *J Physiol*, 588:3119 – 3130, 2010.
- 17 15. Burd NA, West DW, Staples AW, Atherton PJ, Baker JM, Moore DR,
18 Holwerda AM, Parise G, Rennie MJ, Baker SK and Phillips SM. Low-load
19 high volume resistance exercise stimulates muscle protein synthesis more than
20 high-load low volume resistance exercise in young men. *PLoS One* 5:e12033,
21 2010.
- 22 16. Burd NA, Mitchell CJ, Churchward-Venne TA and Phillips SM. Bigger
23 weights may not beget bigger muscles: Evidence from acute muscle protein
24 synthetic responses after resistance exercise. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 37:551
25 – 554, 2012.

17. Buresh R, Berg K and French J. The effect of resistive exercise rest interval on hormonal response, strength, and hypertrophy with training. *J Strength Cond Res* 23:62 - 71, 2009.
18. Campos GE, Luecke TJ, Wendeln HK, Toma K, Hagerman FC, Murray TF, Ragg KE, Ratamess NA, Kraemer WJ and Staron RS. Muscular adaptations in response to three different resistance-training regimens: specificity of repetition maximum training zones. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 88:50 – 60, 2002.
19. Cormie P, McGuigan MR and Newton RU. Developing maximal neuromuscular power: part 1 – biological basis of maximal power production. *Sports Med* 41:17 – 38, 2011.
20. Correa CS, Teixeira BC, Cobos RC, Macedo RC, Kruger RL, Carteri RB, Radaelli R, Gross JS, Pinto RS and Reischak-Oliveira Á. High-volume resistance training reduces postprandial lipaemia in postmenopausal women. *J Sports Sci* 33:1890 – 1901, 2015.
21. Cuthbertson DJ, Babraj J, Smith K, Wilkes E, Fedele MJ, Esser K and Rennie M. Anabolic signalling and protein synthesis in human skeletal muscle after dynamic shortening and lengthening exercise. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab* 290:731 – 738, 2006.
22. Damas F, Phillips S, Vechin FC, and Ugrinowitsch C. A review of resistance training-induced changes in skeletal muscle protein synthesis and their contribution to hypertrophy. *Sports Med* 45: 801 – 807, 2015.
23. Dankel SJ, Mattocks KT, Jessee MB, Buckner SL, Mouser JG, Counts BR, Laurentino GC, and Loenneke JP. Frequency: the overlooked resistance training variable for inducing muscle hypertrophy? *Sports Med* 47: 799 – 805, 2017.

24. de Salles BF, Simão R, Miranda F, Novaes Jda S, Lemos A and Willardson JM. Rest interval between sets in strength training. *Sports Med* 39:765 – 777, 2009.
25. Folland JP, Irish CS, Roberts JC, Tarr JE and Jones DA. Fatigue is not a necessary stimulus for strength gains during resistance training. *Br J Sports Med* 36:370 – 373, 2002.
26. Fonseca RM, Roschel H, Tricoli V, de Souza EO, Wilson JM, Laurentino GC, Aihara AY, de Souza Leão AR and Ugrinowitsch C. Changes in exercises are more effective than in loading schemes to improve muscle strength. *J Strength Cond Res* 28:3085 – 3092, 2014.
27. Franchi MV, Atherton PJ, Reeves ND, Flück M, Williams J, Mitchell WK, Selby A, Beltran Valls RM and Narici MV. Architectural, functional and molecular responses to concentric and eccentric loading in human skeletal muscle. *Acta Physiologica* 210:642 – 654, 2014.
28. Fry AC and Kraemer WJ. Resistance exercise overtraining and overreaching: Neuroendocrine responses. *Sports Med* 23:106–129, 1997.
29. Fry AC. The role of resistance exercise intensity on muscle fibre adaptations. *Sports Med* 34:663 – 679, 2004.
30. Gentil P, Oliveira E, de Araújo Rocha Júnior V, do Carmo J, and Bottaro M. Effects of exercise order on upper-body muscle activation and exercise performance. *J Strength Cond Res* 21: 1082 – 1086, 2007.
31. George PP, Asakawa DS, Delp SL, Zajac FE and Drace JE. Nonuniform shortening in the biceps brachii during elbow flexion. *J Appl Physiol* 92:2381 – 2389, 2002.

- 1 32. Godfrey RJ, Madgwick Z and Whyte GP. The exercise-induced growth
2 hormone response in athletes. *Sports Med* 33:599 – 613, 2003.
- 3 33. Goto K, Sato K and Takamatsu K. A single set of low intensity resistance
4 exercise immediately following high intensity resistance exercise stimulates
5 growth hormone secretion in men. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness* 43:243 – 249,
6 2003.
- 7 34. Goto K, Ishii N, Kizuka T and Takamatsu K. The impact of metabolic stress
8 on hormonal responses and muscular adaptations. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*
9 37:955 – 963, 2005.
- 10 35. Grgic J, Lazinica B, Mikulic P, Krieger JW and Schoenfeld BJ. The effects of
11 short versus long inter-set rest intervals in resistance training on measures of
12 muscle hypertrophy: A systematic review. *Eur J Sport Sci* 22:1 – 11, 2017.
- 13 36. Hackett DA, Johnson NA and Chow CM. Training practices and ergogenic
14 aids used by male bodybuilders. *J Strength Cond Res* 27: 1609 – 1617, 2013.
- 15 37. Hill, M and Goldspink, G. Expression and splicing of the insulin- like growth
16 factor gene in rodent muscle is associated with muscle satellite (stem) cell
17 activation following local tissue damage. *J Physiol* 549:409 – 418, 2003.
- 18 38. Hornberger TA, Chu WK, Mak YW, Hsiung JW, Huang SA and Chien S. The
19 role of phospholipase D and phosphatidic acid in the mechanical activation of
20 mTOR signalling in skeletal muscle. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 103: 4741 –
21 4746, 2006.
- 22 39. Izquierdo M, Ibañez J, González-Badillo JJ, Häkkinen K, Ratamess NA,
23 Kraemer WJ, French DN, Eslava J, Altadill A, Asiain X and Gorostiaga EM.
24 Differential effects of strength training leading to failure versus not to failure

- 1 on hormonal responses, strength, and muscle power gains. *J Appl Physiol* 100:
2 1647 – 1656, 2006.
- 3 40. Järvinen TA, Järvinen TL, Kääriäinen M, Aärimaa V, Vaittinen S Kalimo H
4 and Järvinen M. Muscle injuries: optimising recovery. *Best Pract Res Clin*
5 *Rheumatol* 21: 317-331, 2007.
- 6 41. Jones DA and Rutherford OM. Human muscle strength training: the effects of
7 three different regimens and the nature of the resultant changes. *J Physiol*
8 391:1 – 11, 1987.
- 9 42. Júnior VAR, Bottaro M, Pereira MCC, Andrade MM, Júnior PRWP, and
10 Carmo JC. Electromyography analyses of muscle pre-activation induced by
11 single joint exercise. *Rev Bras Fisioter* 14: 158 – 165, 2010.
- 12 43. Kraemer WJ and Ratamess NA. Fundamentals of resistance training:
13 Progression and exercise prescription. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 36: 674–688,
14 2004.
- 15 44. Krieger JW. Single Versus Multiple Sets of Resistance Exercise: A Meta-
16 Regression. *J Strength Condit Res* 23:1890 – 1901, 2009.
- 17 45. Krieger JW. Single vs. multiple sets of resistance exercise for muscle
18 hypertrophy: a meta-analysis. *J Strength Condit Res* 24:1150 – 1159, 2010.
- 19 46. Kreher JB and Schwartz JB. Overtraining Syndrome: A Practical Guide.
20 *Sports Health* 4:128 – 138, 2012.
- 21 47. Lauver JD, Cayot TE and Scheuermann BW. Influence of bench angle on
22 upper extremity muscular activation during bench press exercise. *Eur J Sport*
23 *Sci* 16:309 – 316, 2016.

- 1 48. Lexell J, Henriksson-Larsén K and Sjöström M. Distribution of different fiber
2 types in human skeletal muscles. 2. A study of cross-sections of whole m.
3 vastus lateralis. *Acta Physiol Scand* 117:115 – 122, 1983.
- 4 49. MacDougall JD, Gibala MJ, Tarnopolsky MA, MacDonald JR, Interisano SA
5 and Yarasheski KE. The time course for elevated muscle protein synthesis
6 following heavy resistance exercise. *Can J Appl Physiol* 20:480 – 486, 1995.
- 7 50. Mattocks, KT, Buckner, SL, Jessee, MB, Dankel, SJ, Mouser, JG, and
8 Loenneke, JP. Practicing the test produces strength equivalent to higher
9 volume training. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. Epub ahead of print. 2017.
- 10 51. McBride JM, Blaak JB and Triplett-McBride T. Effect of resistance exercise
11 volume and complexity on EMG, strength, and regional body composition.
12 *Eur J Appl Physiol* 90:626 – 632, 2003.
- 13 52. Mitchell CJ, Churchward-Venne TA, West DW, Burd NA, Breen L, Baker SK
14 and Phillips SM. Resistance exercise load does not determine training-
15 mediated hypertrophic gains in young men. *J Appl Physiol* 113:71 – 77, 2012.
- 16 53. Mitchell CJ, Churchward-Venne TA, Parise G, Bellamy L, Baker SK, Smith
17 K, Atherton PJ and Phillips SM. Acute post-exercise myofibrillar protein
18 synthesis is not correlated with resistance training-induced muscle
19 hypertrophy in young men. *PLoS One* 24: e89431, 2014.
- 20 54. Mendez-Villanueva A, Suarez-Arrones L, Rodas G, Fernandez-Gonzalo R,
21 Tesch P, Linnehan R, Kreider R and, Di Salvo V. MRI-Based Regional
22 Muscle Use during Hamstring Strengthening Exercises in Elite Soccer
23 Players. *PLoS One* 11: e0161356, 2016.
- 24 55. Moss BM, Refsnes PE, Abildgaard A, Nicolaysen K and Jensen J. The effects
25 of maximal effort strength training with different loads on dynamic strength,

- 1 cross-sectional area, load-power and load-velocity relationships. *Eur J Appl*
2 *Physiol* 75:193 – 199, 1997.
- 3 56. Moore DR, Phillips SM, Babraj JA, Smith K and Rennie MJ. Myofibrillar and
4 collagen protein synthesis in human skeletal muscle in young men after
5 maximal shortening and lengthening contractions. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol*
6 *Metab* 288: 1153 – 1159, 2005.
- 7 57. Ogborn D and Schoenfeld BJ. The role of fiber types in muscle hypertrophy:
8 Implications for loading strategies. *Strength Cond J* 35:20 – 25, 2014.
- 9 58. Radaelli R, Botton CE, Wilhelm EN, Bottaro M, Lacerda F, Gaya A, Moraes
10 K, Peruzzolo A, Brown LE and Pinto RS. Low- and high-volume strength
11 training induces similar neuromuscular improvements in muscle quality in
12 elderly women. *Exp Gerontol* 48:710 – 716, 2013.
- 13 59. Radaelli R, Fleck SJ, Leite T, Leite RD, Pinto RS, Fernandes L and Simao R.
14 Dose response of 1, 3 and 5 sets of resistance exercise on strength, local
15 muscular endurance and hypertrophy. *J Strength Cond Res* 29:1349 – 1358,
16 2015.
- 17 60. Robbins DW, Goodale TL, Docherty D, Behm DG and Tran QT. The effects
18 of load and training pattern on acute neuromuscular responses in the upper
19 body. *J Strength Cond Res* 24:23 – 29, 2009.
- 20 61. Roig M, O'Brien K, Kirk G, Murray R, McKinnon P, Shadgan B and Reid
21 WD. The effects of eccentric versus concentric resistance training on muscle
22 strength and mass in healthy adults: a systematic review with meta-analysis.
23 *Br J Sports Med* 43:556 - 68, 2009.
- 24 62. Rønnestad BR, Egeland W, Kvamme NH, Refsnes PE, Kadi F and Raastad T.
25 Dissimilar effects of one- and three-set strength training on strength and

- 1 muscle mass gains in upper and lower body in untrained subjects. *J Strength*
2 *Condit Res* 21:157 – 163, 2007.
- 3 63. Phillips SM. A Brief Review of Critical Processes in Exercise-Induced
4 Muscular Hypertrophy. *Sports Med* 44:71 – 77, 2014.
- 5 64. Poliquin C. *The Poliquin International Certification Program: Theory Manual*
6 *I*. East Greenwich, RI: Poliquin Performance Center, 2009.
- 7 65. Schmidtleicher D and Haralambie G. Changes in contractile properties of
8 muscle after strength training in man. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 46:221 – 228, 1981.
- 9 66. Schoenfeld BJ. The mechanisms of muscle hypertrophy and their application
10 to resistance training. *J Strength Cond Res* 24:2857 – 2872, 2010.
- 11 67. Schoenfeld BJ. Potential mechanisms for a role of metabolic stress in
12 hypertrophic adaptations to resistance training. *Sports Med* 43:179 – 94, 2013.
- 13 68. Schoenfeld BJ, Ratamess NA, Peterson MD, Contreras B, Sonmez GT and
14 Alvar BA. Effects of different volume-equated resistance training loading
15 strategies on muscular adaptations in well-trained men. *J Strength Cond Res*
16 28:2909 - 2918, 2014.
- 17 69. Schoenfeld BJ, Contreas B, Tiriyaki-Sonmez G, Wilson JM, Kolber MJ and
18 Peterson MD. Regional differences in muscle activation during hamstrings
19 exercise. *J Strength Cond Res* 29:159 – 164, 2015.
- 20 70. Schoenfeld BJ, Ogborn DI and Krieger JW. Effect of repetition duration
21 during resistance training on muscle hypertrophy: a systematic review and
22 meta-analysis. *Sports Med* 45:577 – 585, 2015.
- 23 71. Schoenfeld BJ. *Science and Development of Muscle Hypertrophy*. Champaign,
24 IL: Human Kinetics, 51-56, 2016.

- 1 72. Schoenfeld BJ, Contreras B, Ogborn D, Galpin A, Krieger J, and Sonmez GT.
2 Effects of varied versus constant loading zones on muscular adaptations in
3 trained men. *Int J Sports Med* 37: 442 – 7, 2016
- 4 73. Schoenfeld BJ, Ogborn D and Krieger JW. Dose-response relationship
5 between weekly resistance training volume and increases in muscle mass: a
6 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Sports Sci* 19: 1 – 10, 2016.
- 7 74. Schoenfeld BJ, Ogborn D and Krieger JW. Effects of resistance training
8 frequency on measures of muscle hypertrophy: a systematic review and meta-
9 analysis. *Sports Med* 46:1689 – 1697, 2016.
- 10 75. Schoenfeld BJ, Pope ZK, Benik FM, Hester GM, Sellers J, Nooner JL,
11 Schnaiter JA, Bond-Williams KE, Carter AS, Ross CL, Just BL, Henselmans
12 M and Krieger JW. Longer interset rest periods enhance muscle strength and
13 hypertrophy in resistance-trained men. *J Strength Cond Res* 30:1805 – 1812,
14 2016.
- 15 76. Schoenfeld BJ, Wilson JM, Lowery RP and Krieger JW: Muscular adaptations
16 in low- versus high-load resistance training: A meta-analysis, *Eur J Sport Sci*
17 16:1 – 10, 2016.
- 18 77. Schoenfeld BJ, Ogborn D, Vigotsky AD, Franchi M, and Krieger JW.
19 Hypertrophic effects of concentric versus eccentric muscle actions: A
20 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2017. [Epub ahead
21 of print].
- 22 78. Schott J, McCully K and Rutherford OM. The role of metabolites in strength
23 training. II. Short versus long isometric contractions. *Eur J App Physiol Occup*
24 *Physiol* 71: 337 – 341, 1995.

79. Shepstone TN, Tang JE, Dallaire S, Schuenke MD, Staron RS and Philips SM. Short-term high- vs. low-velocity isokinetic lengthening training results in greater hypertrophy of the elbow flexors in young men. *J Appl Physiol* 98:1768 – 1776, 2005.
80. Simão R, Spinetti J, de Salles BF, Oliveira LF, Matta T, Miranda F, Miranda H, and Costa PB. Influence of exercise order on maximum strength and muscle thickness in untrained men. *J Sports Sci Med* 9: 1 – 7, 2010.
81. Simão R, de Salles BF, Figueiredo T, Dias I, and Willardson JM. Exercise order in resistance training. *Sports Med* 42: 251 – 265, 2012.
82. Simão R, Figueiredo T, Leite RD, Jansen A, and Willardson JM. Influence of exercise order on repetition performance during low-intensity resistance exercise. *Res Sports Med* 20: 263 – 273, 2012.
83. Smith LL. Overtraining, excessive exercise, and altered immunity: is this a T Helper-1 versus T Helper-2 lymphocyte response? *Sports Med* 33:347 – 364, 2003.
84. Sola OM, Herring S, Zhang G, Huang X, Hayashida N, Haines LC, Thomas R, Kakulas BA and Sauvage LR. Significance of the biopsy site of the latissimus dorsi muscle for fiber typing. *J Hear Lung Transplant* 11: 315 – 319, 1992.
85. Spinetti J, de Salles BF, Rhea MR, Lavigne D, Matta T, Miranda F, Fernandes L, and Simão R. Influence of exercise order on maximum strength and muscle volume in nonlinear periodized resistance training. *J Strength Cond Res* 24: 2962 – 2969, 2010.
86. Stone MH, Stone ME and Sands WA. *Principles and practice of resistance training*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2007.

- 1 87. Sundstrup E, Jakobsen MD, Andersen CH, Zebis MK, Mortensen OS and
2 Andersen LL. Muscle activation strategies during strength training with heavy
3 loading vs. repetitions to failure. *J Strength Cond Res* 26:1897 – 1904, 2012.
- 4 88. Tanimoto M and Ishii N. Effects of low-intensity resistance exercise with slow
5 movement tonic force generation on muscular function in young men. *J Appl*
6 *Physiol* 100:1150 – 1157, 2006.
- 7 89. Tesch PA and Karlsson J. Muscle fiber types and size in trained and untrained
8 muscles of elite athletes. *J Appl Physiol* 59:1716 – 1720, 1985.
- 9 90. Tesch PA, Colliander EB and Kaiser P. Muscle metabolism during intense,
10 heavy-resistance exercise. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 55:362 – 366,
11 1986.
- 12 91. Tesch PA, Ploutz-Snyder LL, Yström L, Castro MJ and Dudley GA. Skeletal
13 muscle glycogen loss evoked by resistance exercise. *J Strength Cond Res*
14 12:67 – 73, 1998.
- 15 92. Wakahara T, Miyamoto N, Sugisaki N, Murata K, Kanehisa H, Kawakami Y,
16 Fukunaga T and Yanai T. Association between regional differences in muscle
17 activation in one session of resistance exercise and in muscle hypertrophy
18 after resistance training. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 112: 1569 – 1576, 2012.
- 19 93. Wakahara T, Fukutani A, Kawakami Y and Yanai T. Nonuniform muscle
20 hypertrophy: its relation to muscle activation in training session. *Med Sci*
21 *Sports Exerc* 45: 2158 – 2165, 2013.
- 22 94. Waldron M, Worsfold PR, Twist C and Lamb KL. Changes in anthropometry
23 and performance, and their inter-relationships, across three seasons in elite
24 youth rugby league players. *J Strength Cond Res* 28: 3128-3136, 2014.

- 1 95. Wernbom M, Augustsson J and Thomee R. The influence of frequency,
2 intensity, volume and mode of strength training on whole muscle cross-
3 sectional area in humans. *Sports Med* 37: 225 – 264, 2007.
- 4 96. Wickiewicz TL, Roy RR, Powell PL and Edgerton VR. Muscle architecture of
5 the human lower limb. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 179:275 – 283, 1983.
- 6 97. Widrick JJ, Stelzer JE, Shoepe TC and Garner DP. Functional properties of
7 human muscle fibers after short-term resistance exercise training. *Am J*
8 *Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol* 283: 408 – 416, 2002.
- 9 98. Willardson, JM, Norton L, Wilson G. Training to failure and beyond in
10 mainstream resistance exercise programs. *Strength Cond J* 32:21 – 29, 2010.
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17