

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Kidgell, Dawson, Bonanno, Daniel, Frazer, Ashlyn, Howatson, Glyn and Pearce, Alan (2017) Corticospinal responses following strength training: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 46 (11). pp. 2648-2661. ISSN 1460-9568

Published by: Wiley-Blackwell

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ejn.13710> <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ejn.13710>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/31703/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



**Northumbria
University**
NEWCASTLE



UniversityLibrary

Table 2: Overall study outlines and Downs and Black checklist [44].

Study	Country	Design [46]	Evidence Level [46]	Training*	Sample Size	Participant characteristics	Age Mean \pm SD (Yr)	Age Range (Yr)	Sampling	Key DV	Key Measure(s)	Results	Score [44]
et al	Germany/ USA	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	12 stability training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	27	Healthy young	28.1 \pm 2.1	n/a	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Stability performance	Stability MEP threshold and amplitude, paired-pulse ratio	\uparrow stability; \uparrow MEP amplitude 20.9%; \uparrow SICI 6% and ICF 7%.	17
ll et al	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	16	Healthy young	n/a	22-36	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP amplitude,	\uparrow strength 33%; \downarrow MEP amplitude 1.7%.	17
ll et al	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	17	Healthy young	n/a	19-35	Sub-group of larger study. Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP threshold and amplitude	\uparrow strength 8%; \uparrow MEP amplitude 0.7%.	15
tie and n	USA	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	6 training; 2 wks - 3x/wk	30	Healthy young	21.9 \pm 3.1	n/a	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP amplitude, cSP duration	\uparrow strength 8%; \downarrow MEP amplitude 1.4%; \downarrow cSP duration 15 ms.	18
ubs et]	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	9 training; 3 wks - 3x/wk	23	Healthy young	n/a	18-36	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP amplitude, cSP duration paired-pulse ratio	\uparrow strength 20% (mean both trained limbs); No change MEP amplitude; \downarrow cSP duration ~15 ms No change SICI	19
r et al	USA/ Taiwan	Single group; Pretest/posttest	III-3	6 training over 1 wk	12	Healthy young	27.7	23-40	Not-stated	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP amplitude, cSP duration	\uparrow MEP amplitude 41.2%; \uparrow cSP duration 22.1 ms.	12
will et]	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	9 training; 3 wks - 3x/wk	14	Healthy young	21.0 \pm 1.1	18-35	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP threshold and amplitude, paired-pulse ratio	\uparrow strength 40.7%; \uparrow MEP amplitude 16.8%; \downarrow SICI 9.8%.	16
n and elli	USA/ Canada	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-2	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	20	Healthy young	n/a	18-32	Not-stated	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP threshold and amplitude	\uparrow strength 18.1%; \uparrow MEP amplitude 16.3%;	17
y and ill	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-2	9 training; 3 wks - 3x/wk	30	Healthy young	25.7 \pm 3.1	n/a	Pseudo-random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP threshold and amplitude, cSP duration, paired-pulse ratio	\uparrow strength 11.6%; \uparrow MEP amplitude 4.5%; \downarrow cSP duration 9.9 ms; \downarrow SICI 7.8%.	18

Sn et al	Denmark	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	24	Healthy young	25.0 ±5.0	n/a	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP amplitude	↑ strength 12.5%; ↓ MEP amplitude 2.7%.	17
Hill and Lee	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	16	Healthy young	24.1 ±5.2	n/a	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP amplitude, cSP duration,	↑ strength 33.8%; ↑ MEP amplitude 9.7%; ↓ cSP duration 25 ms.	18
Hill et al	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	26	Healthy young	26.8 ±7.3	n/a	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP threshold and amplitude	↑ strength 19.2%; ↑ MEP amplitude 33.1%.	18
Hill et al	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	23	Healthy young	26.8 ±7.3	n/a	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP threshold and amplitude, cSP duration	↑ strength 19%; ↑ MEP amplitude 33%; ↓ cSP duration 3 ms.	18
Ma et al	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-2	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	18	Healthy young	n/a	18-35	Matched for age, gender, pre-train strength	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP amplitude, and cSP duration	↑ strength 29%; ↓ MEP amplitude 0.3%; ↓ cSP duration 17.7 ms.	16
Hill et al	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	23	Healthy young	n/a	18.51	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, and MEP amplitude	↑ strength 29%; No change MEP amplitude	18
Ng et al	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	9 training; 3 wks - 3x/wk	18	Healthy young	24.6 ±1.1	18-35	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP threshold and amplitude	↑ strength 39%; ↑ MEP amplitude 25.5%.	17
Ma et al	Italy/Israel/ UK	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	34	Healthy young	25.5 ±6.0	n/a	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Strength, MEP amplitude; paired-pulse ratio	No change handgrip strength No change MEP amplitude No change paired-pulse measures	23
Lee et al	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-2	9 training; 3 wks - 3x/wk	28	Healthy young	25.2 ±7.4	n/a	Matched for age, gender, pre-train strength	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance/maintenance	Strength, MEP threshold and amplitude	↑ strength 13.8%; ↑ MEP amplitude 5.5%.	19
Lee et al	Germany/ USA	Concurrent control Pretest-posttest	III-1	16 training; 4 wks - 4x/wk	23	Healthy young	25.0 ±3.0	n/a	Random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength performance	Stability MEP amplitude	↑ stability; ↓ MEP amplitude 31%.	19
Hill et al	Australia	Concurrent control Pretest-	III-2	12 training; 4 wks - 3x/wk	12	Healthy young	n/a	18-27	Pseudo-random	Corticospinal excitability; Strength	Strength, MEP threshold and amplitude,	↑ strength 86.9%; ↑ MEP amplitude 116.2%; ↓ SICI 35.4%.	16

posttest

performance

paired-pulse ratio

n/a = not applicable

Table 3: Risk of bias as assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool [45].

Study	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other potential bias
Beck et al [29]	-	+	+	+	-	-	
Carroll et al [1]	-	+	+	+	?	+	Study completed from same laboratory group as Carroll et al [1]
Carroll et al [55]	-	+	+	+	?	+	Study completed from same laboratory group as Carroll et al [1]
Christie and Kamen [38]	-	+	+	+	?	+	
Coombs et al [31]	-	+	+	+	?	-	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et al [10]
Fisher et al [51]	+	+	+	+	?	+	
Goodwill et al	+	+	+	+	?	-	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et

[52]							al [10]
Griffen and Cafarelli	-	+	+	+	?	+	
[9]							
Hendy and Kidgell	-	+	+	+	?	-	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et al [10]
[39]							
Jensen et al	+	+	+	+	?	+	
[32]							
Kidgell and Pearce	+	+	+	+	-	+	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et al [10]
[10]							
Kidgell et al	-	+	+	+	-	-	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et al [10]
[33]							
Kidgell et al	+	+	+	+	-	+	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et al [10]
[34]							
Latella et al	-	+	+	+	?	+	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et al [10]
[40]							
Lee et al	-	+	+	+	?	+	Study completed from same laboratory group as Carroll et al [1]
[30]							

Leung et al [37]	-	+	+	+	?	+	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et al [10]
Manca et al [53]	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Pearce et al [35]	-	+	+	+	?	+	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et al [10]
Taube et al [62]	+	+	+	+	?	+	
Weier et al [36]	-	+	+	+	-	-	Study completed from same laboratory group as Kidgell et al [10]

+, high risk of bias; -, low risk of bias; ?, unclear risk of bias. Criteria established from the Cochran Collaboration tool for assessing risk of bias [45]