

The Effectiveness of Two Methods of Prescribing Load on Maximal Strength Development: A Systematic Review

THOMPSON, Steve <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7674-3685>>, ROGERSON, David <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4799-9865>>, RUDDOCK, Alan <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7001-9845>> and BARNES, Andrew <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8262-5132>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/25548/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

THOMPSON, Steve, ROGERSON, David, RUDDOCK, Alan and BARNES, Andrew (2019). The Effectiveness of Two Methods of Prescribing Load on Maximal Strength Development: A Systematic Review. *Sports Medicine*, 50 (5), 919-938.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

The effectiveness of three common methods of prescribing intensity on maximal strength development: a systematic review.

Steve W. Thompson¹, David Rogerson¹, Alan Ruddock¹, Andrew Barnes¹

¹Academy for Sport and Physical Activity, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author:

Steve W. Thompson

s.w.thompson@shu.ac.uk

+447801997099

ORCID I.D:

SW Thompson - 0000-0001-7674-3685

D Rogerson - 0000-0002-4799-9865

A Ruddock - 0000-0002-7001-9845

A Barnes - 0000-0001-8262-5132

Electronic Supplementary material

Modified Downs and Black methodological assessment checklist [31]

Reporting	Score
1. Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described?	0 – 1
2. Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the Introduction or Methods section?	0 – 1
3. Are the characteristics of the participants included in the study clearly described?	0 – 1
4. Are the interventions of interest clearly described?	0 – 1
5. Are the distributions of principal confounders in each group of participants to be compared clearly described?	0 – 1
6. Are the main findings of the study clearly described?	0 – 1
7. Does the study provide estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes?	0 – 1
8. Have all important adverse events that may be a consequence of the intervention been reported?	0 – 1
9. Have the characteristics of participants lost to follow-up been described?	0 – 1
10. Have actual probability values been reported (e.g. 0.035 rather than <0.05) for the main outcomes except where the probability value is less than 0.001?	0 – 1
External validity	
11. Were the subjects asked to participate in the study representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?	0 – 1
12. Were those subjects who were prepared to participate representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?	0 – 1
13. Were the staff, places, and facilities where the participants were treated, representative of the treatment the majority of participants receive?	0 – 1
Internal validity - bias	
14. Was an attempt made to blind study participants to the intervention they have received?	0 – 1
15. Was an attempt made to blind those measuring the main outcomes of the intervention?	0 – 1
16. If any of the results of the study were based on “data dredging”, was this made clear?	0 – 1
17. In trials and cohort studies, do the analyses adjust for different lengths of follow-up of participants, or in case-control studies, is the time period between the intervention and outcome the same for cases and controls?	0 – 1
18. Were the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate?	0 – 1
19. Was compliance with the intervention/s reliable?	0 – 1
20. Were the main outcome measures used accurate (valid and reliable)?	0 – 1
Internal validity – confounding (selection bias)	
21. Were the participants in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited from the same population?	0 – 1
22. Were study participants in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited over the same period of time?	0 – 1
23. Were study participants randomised to intervention groups?	0 – 1
24. Was the randomised intervention assignment concealed from both participants and health care staff until recruitment was complete and irrevocable?	0 – 1
25. Was there adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses from which the main findings were drawn?	0 – 1
26. Were losses of participants to follow-up taken into account?	0 – 1
27. Did the study have sufficient power to detect a clinically important effect where the probability value for a difference being due to change is less than 5%?	0 – 1
28. Were exercise sessions supervised?	0 – 1
29. Was exercise adhered to?	0 – 1