

APPENDIX 5

Certainty assessment						
Participant (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall certainty of evidence
Muscle Thickness						
144 (2 RCTs and 1 non-randomized study)	Serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Very serious ^b	None	⊕○○○ Very low
Agonist activation during MVIC						
212 (2 RCTs and 2 non-randomized studies)	Serious ^c	Not serious	Not serious	Very serious ^b	None	⊕○○○ Very low
Co-activation during MVIC						
92 (1 RCTs and 1 non-randomized study)	Serious ^d	Not serious	Not serious	Very serious ^b	None	⊕○○○ Very low
Isometric strength						
298 (3 RCTs and 3 non-randomized studies)	Very serious ^e	Serious ^g	Not serious	Very serious ^b	None	⊕○○○ Very low
Concentric strength 60°/s						
80 (1 RCTs and 1 non-randomized study)	Very serious ^e	Serious ^g	Not serious	Very serious ^b	None	⊕○○○ Very low
Antagonist strength during agonist MVIC						
104 (2 non-randomized studies)	Serious ^h	Serious ⁱ	Not serious	Very serious ^b	None	⊕○○○ Very low

^a There is a non-randomized study.

^b Confidence interval is narrow based on a small number of events reducing the level of evidence for magnitude effect.

^c Most of the sample was from non-randomized studies.

^d Part of the data is from a non-randomized study.

^e Half of the sample was from non-randomized studies, which also have men and women and lack of information in studies report.

^f The heterogeneity was $I^2=79\%$. Heterogeneity came from McKenzie et al. (2010), which has women in the sample, and Zbidi et al. (2017) also contribute to heterogeneity.

^g The heterogeneity was $I^2=47\%$. Heterogeneity came from Counts et al. (2016), which only present values for elbow flexors.

^h Data is from non-randomized studies and there was a lack of information in the studies report.

ⁱ The heterogeneity was $I^2=36\%$, but we could not identify the source of heterogeneity.

RCT: randomized clinical trial. MVIC: maximal voluntary isometric contraction.