Villalba, M. M., Fujita, R. A., Stoelben, K. J. V., Silva, N. R. S., & Gomes M. M. (2023). Effects of Co-Contraction Training on neuromuscular Outcomes of Elbow Flexors and Extensors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
International Journal of Strength and Conditioning
https://doi.org/10.47206/ijsc.v3i1.243

APPENDIX 4

Certainty assessment						
Participant (studies)	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Publication bias**	**Overall certainty of evidence**
Muscle Thickness						
78 (2 RCTs)	Serious[a]	Not serious[b]	Not serious	Very serious[c]	None	⊕○○○ Very low
Agonist activation during MVIC						
194 (2 RCTs and 2 non-randomized studies)	Serious[d]	Not serious[b]	Not serious	Very serious[c]	None	⊕○○○ Very low
Co-activation during MVIC						
86 (1 RCTs and 1 non-randomized study)	Serious[e]	Not serious[b]	Not serious	Very serious[c]	None	⊕○○○ Very low
Isometric strength						
198 (2 RCTs and 2 non-randomized studies)	Serious[f]	Serious[g]	Not serious	Very serious[c]	None	⊕○○○ Very low

[a] The studies were not blinded and can be considered a small sample.
[b] The heterogeneity was I^2=0%.
[c] Confidence interval is narrow based on a small number of events reducing the level of evidence for magnitude effect.
[d] There is men and women in the sample and one study considered the contralateral arm as control.
[e] The studies were not blinded and can be considered with a small sample. There is information missing in the studies report.
[f] Most of the sample was from non-randomized studies.
[g] The heterogeneity was I^2=17%. Heterogeneity came from Mckenzie et al. (2010), perhaps due is the only one including women in the sample.
RCT: randomized clinical trial. MVIC: maximal voluntary isometric contraction.