

Table II - Methods and outcomes of the studies included in this review

Study	EMG result (% - ±) Pre- vs. post- intervention		Intervention profile (days)	Muscles analyzed	p-value	Test used	Training loads (kg)
Clark <i>et al.</i> [12]	RA = 21.1 ± 14.7 LS = 16.2 ± 18.4 EO = 26.1 ± 26.3 ULES = 20.7 ± 19.3 VL = 10.4 ± 8.0	↑90.3 ± 65.0 ↑66.7 ± 48.41 ↑54.5 ± 15.3 ↑108.6 ± 10.4 ↑54.8 ± 39.0	3	RA LS OE ULES VL	p<0.001 p<0.00 p<0.001 p<0.001 P<0.001	1RM	393.4 ± 28.20
Fletcher & Bagley [13]	ES= 107.8 ± 38.1 ES= 119.5 ± 39.5	↑113.5 ± 37.1 ↑134.1 ± 55.4	7	ES, GM, ST, BF	p<0.05 p<0.001	1RM	397.5 ± 7.94
Gomes <i>et al.</i> [14]	GM= 12% VL= 34.4	↑19,7% ↑45,6%	5	GM VL	p<0.001 p<0.001	1RM	107 ± 30
Mina <i>et al.</i> [15]	ST= 77.4 ± 9.7 QF = 95.9 ± 3.5	↑137.6 ± 26.8 ↑100.8 ± 4.6	2	RF, VM, ST VL, QR	p<0.05 p<0.05	1RM	282.7 ± 7.42
Mina <i>et al.</i> [16]	ST= 76.0 ± 11.2 QF= 78.6 ± 3.5	↑75.7 ± 18.0 ↓70.5 ± 6.3	3	VM, VL, RF, ST	p<0.05	1RM	280.6 ± 5.94
Silva <i>et al.</i> [17]	GM= 1.0 BF = 0.22 SL = 0.27	↑29.37% ↑11.78% ↑10.85%	2	GM BF SL	p=0.004 p=0.009 p=0.031	10RM	163.4 ± 15.27
Silva <i>et al.</i> [18]	VM = 103.37 VL = 84.7 RF = 85.58 BF = 92.19	↑110.3% ↑102.14% ↑102.54 % ↑120.93%	4	VM VL RF BF	p<0.05 p<0.05 p<0.05 p<0.05	8–12RM	297.35 ± 12.40
Yavuz <i>et al.</i> [19]	VM= 72 ± 57.6 GM= 30 ± 17.9	↑76.4 ± 61.8 ↑50.2 ± 30.8	2	RF, VL, VM, ES, GM, BF, ST	p<0.05 p<0.05	1RM	270.4 ± 21.50

EMG = electromyography; RM= repetition maximum; RA = rectus abdominis; EO = external oblique; ULES = upper lumbar erector spinae; LS = lumbar sacral; ES = erector spinae; VM= vastus medialis; VL= vastus lateralis; RF= rectus femoris; ST= semitendinosus; BF= biceps femoris; SL = soleus; GM= gluteus maximus; LS = Lumbar Spine; ↑ increase, ↓ decrease