POLITECNICO DI TORINO Repository ISTITUZIONALE

Longing for a Longitudinal Proxy_ Acutely Measured Surface EMG Amplitude is not a Validated Predictor of Muscle Hypertrophy

Original

Longing for a Longitudinal Proxy_ Acutely Measured Surface EMG Amplitude is not a Validated Predictor of Muscle Hypertrophy / Vigotsky, A. D.; Halperin, I.; Trajano, G. S.; Vieira, T. M. - In: SPORTS MEDICINE. - ISSN 0112-1642. -STAMPA. - 52:2(2022), pp. 193-199. [10.1007/s40279-021-01619-2]

Availability: This version is available at: 11583/2957257 since: 2022-03-03T14:40:46Z

Publisher: Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH

Published DOI:10.1007/s40279-021-01619-2

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright Springer postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

This version of the article has been accepted for publication, after peer review (when applicable) and is subject to Springer Nature's AM terms of use, but is not the Version of Record and does not reflect post-acceptance improvements, or any corrections. The Version of Record is available online at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40279-021-01619-2

(Article begins on next page)

Longing for a longitudinal proxy: Acutely measured surface EMG amplitude is not a validated predictor of muscle hypertrophy

Andrew D. Vigotsky^{*1}, Israel Halperin^{2,3}, Gabriel S. Trajano⁴, and Taian M. Vieira⁵

¹Departments of Biomedical Engineering and Statistics, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

²School of Public Health, Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv-Yafo, Israel

³Sylvan Adams Sports Institute, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv-Yafo, Israel

⁴Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

⁵Laboratory for Engineering of the Neuromuscular System, Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy

August 27, 2021

11

8

c

10

1

2

Abstract

Surface electromyography amplitudes are commonly measured in acute sports and exercise science studies to 12 make inferences about muscular strength, performance, and hypertrophic adaptations that may result from different 13 exercises or exercise-related variables. Here, we discuss the presumptive logic and assumptions underlying these 14 inferences, focusing on hypertrophic adaptations for simplicity's sake. In doing so, we present counter-evidence for 15 each of its premises and discuss evidence both for and against the logical conclusion. In view of the limited evidence 16 validating the amplitude of surface electromyograms as a predictor of longitudinal hypertrophic adaptations, coupled 17 with its weak mechanistic foundation, we suggest that acute comparative studies that wish to assess stimulus potency 18 be met with scrutiny. 19

In view of the growing popularity of surface electromyography (sEMG) studies in sports science, we voiced our concerns 20 in our 2018 review paper on sEMG's use and misuse [1]. Since its publication 3.5 years ago, the paper has garnered 21 well over 150 citations, indicating that it has attracted much attention and the field may indeed be receptive to our 22 concerns. However, over time we learned that many of these citation treated our concerns as minor, inconsequential 23 limitations of sEMG amplitudes rather than serious flaws that undermine their conclusions. In retrospect, this may not 24 be overly surprising as, admittedly, parts of the review were technically dense and required background knowledge of 25 neurophysiology. Given these mis-citations and the continued, pervasive extrapolations of sEMG amplitudes,¹ we wish 26 to clarify and simplify our primary concerns regarding the interpretation of sEMG amplitudes in applied sports science 27 studies, which are complementary to previous critical reviews on sEMG's use and misuse. 28

To achieve this goal, in this commentary, we solely focus on one study design which is especially popular and problematic in sports science: using sEMG amplitudes from acute studies to make inferences about

^{*}Corresponding Author: Andrew Vigotsky (avigotsky@gmail.com)

¹By sEMG amplitudes, we refer to statistics summarizing the average degree of variation of the amplitude of the raw sEMG over a given period into a single value, with the most popular estimate being the root mean square amplitude.

longitudinal adaptations, primarily concerning hypertrophy. Studies of this type are ubiquitous and easy to 31 identify. They commonly involve placing surface electrodes on muscles of interest and comparing the sEMG amplitudes 32 that result from two or more exercise variations, loading schemes, or some other exercise-related variable (e.g., exercise 33 order) performed within a single or over a few sessions (i.e., without performing a longitudinal study). For example, 34 researchers may place electrodes on the biceps brachii and have participants perform dumbbell preacher curls and 35 dumbbell incline curls during a single session. Authors then make exercise recommendations based on their findings, 36 indeliberately attributing predictive power to the acutely observed differences in sEMG amplitude; for instance, higher 37 sEMG amplitudes observed during one of the exercises implies that the exercise will elicit greater hypertrophy in the 38 long term. We note that other uses of sEMG, such as to investigate coordination and timing of muscle excitation, 39 are unrelated to our discussion and thus will not be covered, nor will we discuss what information is contained in the 40 sEMG signal. For information regarding the latter, we direct readers to reviews and texts on the topic (see Table 2 in 41 [1]). Instead, our goal with this article is to break down the assertion that sEMG amplitudes can predict hypertrophic 42 adaptations into three premises and a conclusion. Importantly, all three premises that we will cover are necessary for the 43 conclusion that sEMG is a valid predictor of hypertrophy. Yet, only one is dependent on sEMG amplitudes. We argue 44 that all three premises are weak, rendering the conclusion that sEMG amplitudes can be used to predict hypertrophic 45

⁴⁶ adaptations tenuous.

Operational Definitions

In this commentary, we simplify our language so as not to overburden the reader with terms with which they may not be familiar. Although some of these terms require knowledge of muscle physiology, a deep understanding of them is not required to grasp the key message of this article.

• Neuromuscular excitation – the electrical signal that causes calcium to be released into the sarcoplasm to enable contraction. This includes the depolarization of the α -motoneuron (neural excitation) and subsequent depolarization of the sarcolemma (muscle excitation). Neural excitation is influenced by motor unit recruitment and rate coding while muscle excitation is affected by changes in the peripheral muscle environment (e.g., $[Ca^{2+}]$ changes).

- Muscle activation relative binding of calcium to troponin to facilitate cross-bridge attachment.
- Cross-bridge attachment myosin binding to actin to produce active muscle force.
- Muscle state changes muscle activation and subsequent cross-bridge attachment.

We lump 'neural excitation' and 'muscle excitation' into 'neuromuscular excitation', which is the electrical phase. Similarly, we sometimes lump 'muscle activation' and 'cross-bridge attachment' into 'muscle state changes', which is the chemomechanical phase. This lumping is justified because the former in each is commonly—though not always—the rate-limiting step [2], and thus, the relationships are close to one-to-one for the purposes of this commentary.

⁴⁸ 1 The logic of sEMG as a predictor of hypertrophic adaptations

⁴⁹ Similar to our 2018 review paper [1], here, we will briefly cover both mechanistic and applied interpretations of sEMG ⁵⁰ amplitudes. Although seemingly unrelated, these interpretations are closely linked—the latter follows directly from the ⁵¹ former. That is, inferences that greater sEMG amplitudes are associated with more favorable hypertrophic adaptations ⁵² stem from various mechanistic assumptions. The full, often implicit, logical argument is presented below and in Figure ⁵³ 1.

- ⁵⁴ 1. sEMG amplitudes are indicative of neuromuscular excitation of the target muscle(s).
- ⁵⁵ 2. Neuromuscular excitation is directly related to the state of the muscle.
- ⁵⁶ 3. Changes in muscle state drive hypertrophic adaptations.
- ⁵⁷ .: Therefore, sEMG is predictive of hypertrophic adaptations.



Figure 1: Mechanistic logic for using surface electromyography (sEMG) as a predictor of hypertrophic adaptations. sEMG serves as a proxy for neuromuscular excitation. Neuromuscular excitation induces muscle state changes, which are said to drive hypertrophic adaptations. The implication of this logic is that acutely measured differences in sEMG amplitudes can be used to predict hypertrophic adaptations. For this logical conclusion to be true, either (a) all premises must strongly hold; (b) biases or poor relationships in one premise must be "cancelled out" by the other premises; and/or (c) there is some other pathway. *Prima facie*, we consider (b) and (c) to be highly unlikely, so we focus on (a).

⁵⁸ 1.1 Premise 1: sEMG amplitudes are indicative of neuromuscular excitation of the ⁵⁹ target muscle(s).

A common assumption among sport and exercise scientists is that sEMG amplitudes are solely a combination of neu-60 romuscular excitation. However, a growing number of human, animal, and modeling studies have shown that sEMG 61 amplitudes and neuromuscular excitation can be uncoupled. For instance, by simply plantar flexing the ankle, Vieira 62 et al. [3] observed a marked decrease in tibialis anterior sEMG amplitude induced by nerve stimulation (M-wave).² 63 This indicates that changing a muscle's shape or architecture (i.e., length and pennation angle) will drastically affect the sEMG signal, even when neuromuscular excitation is identical. The biophysical origins of this effect are fairly well 65 understood. In particular, the muscle architecture-dependence of the sEMG signal is a consequence of how the action potentials travel through the muscle relative to the positions of the electrodes [12]. Similarly, electrode configurations, 67 subcutaneous thickness, muscle lengths, and contraction modes will bias the surface electromyogram, resulting in an 68 under- or over-representation of the electrical signal from the target muscle(s) that may vary throughout the range of 60 motion [13-19]. 70

These inconsistencies challenge the premise that sEMG amplitudes collected across different exercises truly reflect differences in neuromuscular excitation. Although normalizing signals to a single maximal value (e.g., maximum voluntary contraction, M-wave) is unlikely to attenuate this effect, the benefits of position-specific normalization remain to be investigated. Indeed, the excitatory origins of sEMG amplitude changes are clearer in well-controlled conditions but can impose an inferential barrier whenever changes in muscle architecture, length, or force are likely to take place [17].

²Similar findings have been reported in other studies and muscles [4–11].

⁷⁶ 1.2 Premise 2: Neuromuscular excitation is directly related to the state of the muscle.

Neuromuscular excitation is the electrical signal that causes calcium to be released into the sarcoplasm to enable contraction. Following this release, the state of the muscle is altered by calcium binding to troponin (activation) to enable cross-bridging (attachment), which together determine the muscle's state [20]. The distinction between neuromuscular excitation and a muscle's state is subtle but meaningful, as the two can be instantaneously decoupled by exploiting their dynamics.³ This challenges the premise that neuromuscular excitation provides clear insight into a muscle's state. However, Premise 2 can hold in study designs that include non-fatiguing, isotonic, isometric contractions, as one can assume a linear and stable relationship between neuromuscular excitation and a muscle's state.

⁸⁴ 1.3 Premise 3: Muscle state changes drive hypertrophic adaptations.

The logic that a muscle's state begets its hypertrophy is predicated on the assumptions that (a) changes in muscle state induce muscle protein synthesis (MPS), and (b) MPS triggers a hypertrophic response. It is certainly the case that resistance exercise triggers robust MPS and hypertrophic responses relative to rest [22]. Unfortunately, comparisons to rest tell us little about the muscle state-hypertrophy dose-response relationship.

The relationship between muscle state changes and MPS remains unclear, and the best available evidence suggests it is weak. Morton et al. [23] found that glycogen depletion following exercise, a marker of activation, was only weakly associated with anabolic markers (i.e., mTOR, p70 S6k, etc.; not MPS).⁴ Although the investigators did not study MPS directly, the weak relationship observed between muscle state changes and anabolic markers indicates that the muscle state-MPS relationship may indeed be tenuous.

In contrast to the muscle state-MPS relationship, the link between MPS and hypertrophy is mixed and remains to be fully elucidated. Early work suggests little-to-no correlation between MPS and hypertrophy [25], but more recent work that accounts for some methodological shortcomings suggests much stronger correlations (r > 0.9) [26]. Although debates are ongoing [22], in some contexts, the jump from MPS to hypertrophy may indeed be a reasonable one.

More broadly, the relationship between muscle state changes and growth—spanning both muscle state to MPS and MPS to growth, which are detailed separately above—is inconsistent across the literature. For example, changes in the muscle state are not necessary for muscle growth, as indicated by studies that have observed growth following stretch protocols in which changes in muscle state did not occur [27]. Evidently, the activation-hypertrophy relationship is not straightforward. The dearth of a clear-cut relationship between muscle state changes and muscle growth undermines Premise 3.

Finally, even if the above premises held, the predictive value of sEMG would still need to be directly validated.

¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁵

 $^{^{3}}$ Changing a muscle's state over time (e.g., dynamic contractions or changes in force) will complicate the otherwise straightforward neuromuscular excitation-muscle state relationship [2, 21]. Although this process can be modeled, it is typically not in applied sEMG studies in sports science.

⁴Morton et al. [23] also demonstrate that sEMG amplitudes can be decoupled from (a) muscle state changes, as measured via muscle glycogen depletion, which spans Premises 1 and 2, and (b) anabolic signaling, which spans Premises 1–3. However, the authors employed between- rather than within-subject correlations. Here, we think the more relevant question is the within-subject relationship (see [24]), which may be a fruitful avenue for future research.

¹⁰⁶ 1.4 Logical Conclusion: sEMG is predictive of hypertrophic adaptations.

The mechanistic rationale for sEMG being a predictor of hypertrophy is attractive, but as we briefly discussed in the 107 previous sections, there are theoretical concerns that may yield the relationship to be tenuous. In fact, the assertion 108 that sEMG has predictive validity is an example of a slippery slope argument, the strength of which depends on two 100 factors. As eloquently stated by philosopher David Kelley, "The first is the strength of each link in the causal chain; 110 the argument cannot be stronger than its weakest link. The second is the number of links; the more links there are, 111 the more likely it is that other factors could alter the consequences" (p. 123, [28]). Given both the number of links 112 (premises) and their unstable mechanistic foundations, predictive validity arguments for sEMG amplitude are poor. It 113 cannot simply be assumed that a clear relationship between sEMG and longitudinal outcomes exists. 114

Indirect evidence indicates inconsistent relationships between sEMG amplitudes and growth. On one hand, evidence 115 in favor of the sEMG-hypertrophy relationship is that sEMG amplitudes tend to correspond with growth in the rectus 116 femoris [29–32] and hamstrings [33–36]. For example, multi-joint movements yield low sEMG amplitudes and little 117 growth in the rectus femoris, whereas single-joint movements yield high sEMG amplitudes and marked growth [29–32]. 118 However, one could argue that these results are expected based on biomechanics, meaning there was no clinical equipoise 119 and the sEMG results did not provide novel insight. On the other hand, sEMG amplitudes were not clearly indicative 120 of growth when comparing different contraction modes [15, 37], fatiguing conditions [23, 38–44], and muscle lengths [4, 121 45–56. For example, maximum isometric voluntary contractions across a range of knee joint angles produces discordant 122 quadriceps sEMG amplitudes [4,45–52]. However, greater hypertrophy is commonly observed when the quadriceps are 123 trained isometrically at longer compared to shorter muscle lengths [53–56]. Perhaps the largest discrepancy between 124 sEMG amplitudes and hypertrophy is in the high-versus low-load resistance training literature. When sets are performed 125 to momentary failure, high- and low-loads produce similar growth [38–40] despite high-loads eliciting greater sEMG 126 amplitudes throughout the entire duration of a set [23, 41-44, 57]. 127

As evident from these examples, indirect evidence is mixed regarding the link between sEMG amplitude and hypertrophic responses. Yet, no study has directly investigated and quantified the association between sEMG amplitude and longitudinal outcomes.⁵ In quantifying this relationship, several ancillary questions will be answered, including the sensitivity of sEMG as a predictor of hypertrophy. For example, when comparing two exercises, how much greater of a hypertrophic response can we expect from a 10% greater sEMG amplitude? Moderators of this relationship would also be of interest, including the effects of fatigue, contraction mode, and muscle being studied. However, predictive validity does not begin and end with associations.

Establishing predictive validity is a grueling process. To do so, investigators must explicitly demonstrate that any observed relationship is predictive and generalizable to other populations and environments [62]. For sEMG to be validated and accepted as a predictor of longitudinal adaptations, it would need to be *both* associated with *and*

⁵We also acknowledge the T_2 -weighted magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and regional hypertrophy work by Wakahara et al. [58–60] in the triceps brachii and quadriceps and Illera-Dominguez et al. [61] in the hamstrings, quadriceps, and adductors. Although their findings are mixed, there are two caveats to note. Principally, this work used MRI rather than sEMG; to our knowledge, MRI has not been validated against sEMG for intramuscular heterogeneity. Secondly, these studies did not model within-subject relationships directly.

¹³⁸ predictive of the outcomes of interest (hypertrophy). Without such work, it is unacceptable to treat sEMG as a
 ¹³⁹ validated predictor of longitudinal adaptations.

¹⁴⁰ 2 Take-Home Points

In light of the aforementioned limitations, the production of acute studies and reviews of comparative studies on 141 acute sEMG amplitudes, with the implicit or explicit purpose of inferring longitudinal adaptations, should be greatly 142 attenuated. The sheer number of these acute comparative sEMG amplitude studies are increasing at what seems to 143 be an exponential rate, without complementary longitudinal studies. This is problematic: If one exercise leads to 144 greater sEMG amplitude than another, the longitudinal implications of such findings are assumed, not evidenced. In 145 the case of hypertrophy, these assumptions are largely unsupported, and similar scrutiny can also be applied to other 146 longitudinal adaptations such as strength. These acute sEMG amplitude studies intended to inform exercise selection 147 without measuring longitudinal adaptations use precious resources, including the time of the researchers, participants, 148 peer-reviewers, editors, and readers, in addition to the costs involved in conducting research. 149

- 150 To be clear,
- At present, acute studies that compare sEMG amplitudes between, for example, two different exercise protocols cannot be used as evidence for longitudinal adaptations (e.g., hypertrophy);
- Acute sEMG amplitude studies *may* be indicative of longitudinal adaptations, but evidence supporting this assertion is lacking. Arguments that contend otherwise are based on tenuous assumptions and are appeals to ignorance;
- Instead of acute comparative sEMG amplitude studies, investigators should focus on longitudinal outcomes of interest (e.g., measures of hypertrophy);
- Despite these limitations, sEMG is a useful tool for specific research questions, such as those related to coordination
 (e.g., timing of muscle excitation).

159 3 Conclusion

We contend that continued submissions and publications of acute comparative sEMG amplitude studies with inferences about longitudinal adaptations are flooding the literature. To help remedy this, we propose that journal editors keep the above points in mind before sending these papers out for review, and reviewers who receive such papers should be mindful of the limitations we mentioned. Unless authors communicate the value of their study independently of longitudinal outcomes and beyond that which would be expected from basic biomechanics or functional anatomy, their findings and implications should be appraised critically.

¹⁶⁶ 4 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank David Behm, Thiago Torres da Matta, Roger Enoka, Franco Impellizzeri, Greg Lehman, Robert
 Morton, Jeff Nippard, Greg Nuckols, Stu Phillips, Brad Schoenfeld, James Steele, Nicolas Place, and Jim Potvin for
 their thoughtful comments and feedback.

170 References

- [1] Andrew D Vigotsky, Israel Halperin, Gregory J Lehman, Gabriel S Trajano, and Taian M Vieira. Interpreting signal amplitudes in surface electromyography studies in sport and rehabilitation sciences. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 8:985, 2018.
- [2] Felix E Zajac. Muscle and tendon: properties, models, scaling, and application to biomechanics and motor control. *Critical reviews in biomedical engineering*, 17(4):359–411, 1989.
- [3] Taian M Vieira, Maria Cristina Bisi, Rita Stagni, and Alberto Botter. Changes in tibialis anterior architecture affect the amplitude of
 surface electromyograms. Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, 14(1):81, 2017.
- [4] Marcel B. Lanza, Thomas G. Balshaw, and Jonathan P. Folland. Do changes in neuromuscular activation contribute to the knee extensor
 angle-torque relationship? *Experimental Physiology*, 102(8):962–973, Aug 2017.
- [5] E. Marsh, D. Sale, A. J. McComas, and J. Quinlan. Influence of joint position on ankle dorsiflexion in humans. Journal of Applied
 Physiology: Respiratory, Environmental and Exercise Physiology, 51(1):160–167, Jul 1981.
- [6] Alain Frigon, Timothy J. Carroll, Kelvin E. Jones, E. Paul Zehr, and David F. Collins. Ankle position and voluntary contraction alter
 maximal M waves in soleus and tibialis anterior. *Muscle & Nerve*, 35(6):756–766, Jun 2007.
- [7] Brandon W. Collins and Duane C. Button. The effect of shoulder position on motor evoked and maximal muscle compound action
 potentials of the biceps brachii. *Neuroscience Letters*, 665:206–211, Feb 2018.
- [8] Brandon Wayne Collins, Edward W. J. Cadigan, Lucas Stefanelli, and Duane C. Button. Corticospinal excitability of the biceps brachii
 is shoulder position dependent. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 118(6):3242–3251, Dec 2017.
- [9] Jeremy P. M. Mogk, Lynn M. Rogers, Wendy M. Murray, Eric J. Perreault, and James W. Stinear. Corticomotor excitability of arm
 muscles modulates according to static position and orientation of the upper limb. *Clinical Neurophysiology : Official Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology*, 125(10):2046–2054, Oct 2014.
- [10] Siobhan C. Dongés, Janet L. Taylor, and James L. Nuzzo. Elbow angle modulates corticospinal excitability to the resting biceps brachii
 at both spinal and supraspinal levels. *Experimental Physiology*, 104(4):546–555, Apr 2019.
- [11] James L. Nuzzo, Gabriel S. Trajano, Benjamin K. Barry, Simon C. Gandevia, and Janet L. Taylor. Arm posture-dependent changes in
 corticospinal excitability are largely spinal in origin. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 115(4):2076–2082, Apr 2016.
- [12] Luca Mesin, Roberto Merletti, and Taian MM Vieira. Insights gained into the interpretation of surface electromyograms from the
 gastrocnemius muscles: a simulation study. *Journal of biomechanics*, 44(6):1096–1103, 2011.
- [13] Felipe D Mancebo, Hélio V Cabral, Leonardo ML de Souza, Liliam F de Oliveira, and Taian M Vieira. Innervation zone locations
 distribute medially within the pectoralis major muscle during bench press exercise. Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology,
 46:8–13, 2019.
- [14] Taian Martins Vieira. Interpretation of surface electromyograms: The spatial localisation of muscle activity. In International Conference
 on NeuroRehabilitation, pages 1148–1151. Springer, 2018.
- [15] JR Potvin. Effects of muscle kinematics on surface emg amplitude and frequency during fatiguing dynamic contractions. Journal of
 Applied Physiology, 82(1):144–151, 1997.

- [16] Verne T Inman, HJ Ralston, JB de CM Saunders, MB Bertram Feinstein, and Elwood W Wright Jr. Relation of human electromyogram
 to muscular tension. *Electroencephalography and clinical neurophysiology*, 4(2):187–194, 1952.
- [17] Dario Farina. Interpretation of the surface electromyogram in dynamic contractions. *Exercise and sport sciences reviews*, 34(3):121–127,
 2006.
- [18] K. G. Keenan, D. Farina, K. S. Maluf, R. Merletti, and R. M. Enoka. Influence of amplitude cancellation on the simulated surface
 electromyogram. J Appl Physiol (1985), 98(1):120–131, Jan 2005.
- [19] A. Rainoldi, M. Nazzaro, R. Merletti, D. Farina, I. Caruso, and S. Gaudenti. Geometrical factors in surface EMG of the vastus medialis
 and lateralis muscles. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*, 10(5):327–336, Oct 2000.
- [20] Jack M Winters. Hill-based muscle models: a systems engineering perspective. In Multiple muscle systems, pages 69–93. Springer, 1990.
- [21] George I. Zahalak and Shi-Ping Ma. Muscle Activation and Contraction: Constitutive Relations Based Directly on Cross-Bridge Kinetics.
 Journal of Biomechanical Engineering, 112(1):52–62, Feb 1990.
- [22] Vandré Casagrande Figueiredo. Revisiting the roles of protein synthesis during skeletal muscle hypertrophy induced by exercise. American
 Journal of Physiology. Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology, 317(5):709–718, Nov 2019.
- [23] Robert W Morton, Michael W Sonne, Amanda Farias Zuniga, Ibrahim YZ Mohammad, Amanda Jones, Chris McGlory, Peter J Keir,
 Jim R Potvin, and Stuart M Phillips. Muscle fibre activation is unaffected by load and repetition duration when resistance exercise is
 performed to task failure. *The Journal of physiology*, 597(17):4601–4613, 2019.
- [24] Andrew D. Vigotsky, Brad J. Schoenfeld, Christian Than, and J. Mark Brown. Methods matter: the relationship between strength and
 hypertrophy depends on methods of measurement and analysis. *PeerJ*, 6:e5071., Jun 2018.
- [25] Cameron J Mitchell, Tyler A Churchward-Venne, Gianni Parise, Leeann Bellamy, Steven K Baker, Kenneth Smith, Philip J Atherton,
 and Stuart M Phillips. Acute post-exercise myofibrillar protein synthesis is not correlated with resistance training-induced muscle
 hypertrophy in young men. *PloS one*, 9(2):e89431, 2014.
- [26] Felipe Damas, Stuart M Phillips, Cleiton A Libardi, Felipe C Vechin, Manoel E Lixandrão, Paulo R Jannig, Luiz AR Costa, Aline V
 Bacurau, Tim Snijders, Gianni Parise, et al. Resistance training-induced changes in integrated myofibrillar protein synthesis are related
- to hypertrophy only after attenuation of muscle damage. The Journal of physiology, 594(18):5209–5222, 2016.
- [27] Alfred L Goldberg, Joseph D Etlinger, David F Goldspink, and Charles Jablecki. Mechanism of work-induced hypertrophy of skeletal
 muscle. *Medicine and science in sports*, 7(3):185–198, 1975.
- [28] David Kelley. The art of reasoning: An introduction to logic and critical thinking. WW Norton & Company, 2013.
- [29] Ryoichi Ema, Taku Wakahara, Naokazu Miyamoto, Hiroaki Kanehisa, and Yasuo Kawakami. Inhomogeneous architectural changes of
 the quadriceps femoris induced by resistance training. *European journal of applied physiology*, 113(11):2691–2703, 2013.
- [30] Ryoichi Ema, Masanori Sakaguchi, Ryota Akagi, and Yasuo Kawakami. Unique activation of the quadriceps femoris during single-and
 multi-joint exercises. European journal of applied physiology, 116(5):1031–1041, 2016.
- [31] N Yamashita. Emg activities in mono-and bi-articular thigh muscles in combined hip and knee extension. European journal of applied
 physiology and occupational physiology, 58(3):274–277, 1988.
- [32] Makoto Fujiwara and John V Basmajian. Electromyographic study of two-joint muscles. American Journal of Physical Medicine &
 Rehabilitation, 54(5):234–242, 1975.
- [33] William P Ebben, David H Leigh, and Randall L Jensen. The role of the back squat as a hamstring training stimulus. Strength &
 Conditioning Journal, 22(5):15, 2000.
- 240 [34] K1 Bloomquist, Henning Langberg, Stine Karlsen, S Madsgaard, M Boesen, and Truls Raastad. Effect of range of motion in heavy load
- squatting on muscle and tendon adaptations. European journal of applied physiology, 113(8):2133–2142, 2013.

- [35] Matthew N Bourne, Morgan D Williams, David A Opar, Aiman Al Najjar, Graham K Kerr, and Anthony J Shield. Impact of exercise
 selection on hamstring muscle activation. *British journal of sports medicine*, 51(13):1021–1028, 2017.
- [36] Matthew N Bourne, Steven J Duhig, Ryan G Timmins, Morgan D Williams, David A Opar, Aiman Al Najjar, Graham K Kerr, and
 Anthony J Shield. Impact of the nordic hamstring and hip extension exercises on hamstring architecture and morphology: implications
 for injury prevention. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 51(5):469–477, 2017.
- [37] Brad J Schoenfeld, Dan I Ogborn, Andrew D Vigotsky, Martino V Franchi, and James W Krieger. Hypertrophic effects of concentric vs.
 eccentric muscle actions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*, 31(9):2599–2608,
 2017.
- [38] Cameron J. Mitchell, Tyler A. Churchward-Venne, Daniel W. D. West, Nicholas A. Burd, Leigh Breen, Steven K. Baker, and Stuart M.
 Phillips. Resistance exercise load does not determine training-mediated hypertrophic gains in young men. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 113(1):71, Jul 2012.
- [39] Robert W Morton, Sara Y Oikawa, Christopher G Wavell, Nicole Mazara, Chris McGlory, Joe Quadrilatero, Brittany L Baechler,
 Steven K Baker, and Stuart M Phillips. Neither load nor systemic hormones determine resistance training-mediated hypertrophy or
 strength gains in resistance-trained young men. *Journal of applied physiology*, 121(1):129–138, 2016.
- [40] Brad J. Schoenfeld, Jozo Grgic, Dan Ogborn, and James W. Krieger. Strength and Hypertrophy Adaptations Between Low- vs. High Load Resistance Training: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 31(12):3508–3523,
 Dec 2017.
- [41] Nathaniel D. M. Jenkins, Terry J. Housh, Haley C. Bergstrom, Kristen C. Cochrane, Ethan C. Hill, Cory M. Smith, Glen O. Johnson,
 Richard J. Schmidt, and Joel T. Cramer. Muscle activation during three sets to failure at 80 vs. 30 % 1RM resistance exercise. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 115(11):2335–2347, Nov 2015.
- [42] David P Looney, William J Kraemer, Michael F Joseph, Brett A Comstock, Craig R Denegar, Shawn D Flanagan, Robert U Newton,
 Tunde K Szivak, William H DuPont, David R Hooper, et al. Electromyographical and perceptual responses to different resistance
 intensities in a squat protocol: does performing sets to failure with light loads produce the same activity? The Journal of Strength &
 Conditioning Research, 30(3):792–799, 2016.
- [43] Brad J Schoenfeld, Bret Contreras, Jeffrey M Willardson, Fabio Fontana, and Gul Tiryaki-Sonmez. Muscle activation during low-versus
 high-load resistance training in well-trained men. *European journal of applied physiology*, 114(12):2491–2497, 2014.
- [44] Brad J Schoenfeld, Bret Contreras, Andrew D Vigotsky, Dan Ogborn, Fabio Fontana, and Gul Tiryaki-Sonmez. Upper body muscle
 activation during low-versus high-load resistance exercise in the bench press. *Isokinetics and Exercise Science*, 24(3):217–224, 2016.
- [45] Roland Becker and Friedemann Awiszus. Physiological alterations of maximal voluntary quadriceps activation by changes of knee joint
 angle. Muscle & Nerve, 24(5):667–672, May 2001.
- [46] Keitaro Kubo, Naoya Tsunoda, Hiroaki Kanehisa, and Tetsuo Fukunaga. Activation of agonist and antagonist muscles at different joint
 angles during maximal isometric efforts. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 91(2):349–352, Mar 2004.
- [47] Danny M. Pincivero, Yuliya Salfetnikov, Robert M. Campy, and Alan J. Coelho. Angle- and gender-specific quadriceps femoris muscle
 recruitment and knee extensor torque. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 37(11):1689–1697, Nov 2004.
- [48] E. M. Hasler, J. Denoth, A. Stacoff, and W. Herzog. Influence of hip and knee joint angles on excitation of knee extensor muscles.
 Electromyography and Clinical Neurophysiology, 34(6):355–361, Sep 1994.
- [49] Nicolas Babault, Michel Pousson, Anne Michaut, and Jacques Van Hoecke. Effect of quadriceps femoris muscle length on neural
 activation during isometric and concentric contractions. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, Mar 2003.
- [50] Roger M. Zabik and Mary L. Dawson. Comparison of Force and Peak EMG during a Maximal Voluntary Isometric Contraction at
- Selected Angles in the Range of Motion for Knee Extension. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 83(3):976–978, Dec 1996.

- [51] S. A. Newman, G. Jones, and D. J. Newham. Quadriceps voluntary activation at different joint angles measured by two stimulation
 techniques. European Journal of Applied Physiology, 89(5):496–499, Jun 2003.
- [52] R. D. Kooistra, C. J. de Ruiter, and A. de Haan. Conventionally assessed voluntary activation does not represent relative voluntary
 torque production. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 100(3):309–320, Jun 2007.
- [53] Dustin J. Oranchuk, Adam G. Storey, André R. Nelson, and John B. Cronin. Isometric training and long-term adaptations: Effects of
 muscle length, intensity, and intent: A systematic review. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 29(4):484–503, Apr
 2019.
- [54] Marika Noorkõiv, Kazunori Nosaka, and Anthony J. Blazevich. Neuromuscular adaptations associated with knee joint angle-specific
 force change. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 46(8):1525–1537, Aug 2014.
- [55] K. Kubo, K. Ohgo, R. Takeishi, K. Yoshinaga, N. Tsunoda, H. Kanehisa, and T. Fukunaga. Effects of isometric training at different
 knee angles on the muscle-tendon complex in vivo. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 16(3):159–167, Jun 2006.
- 293 [56] Luis M. Alegre, Asunción Ferri-Morales, Raúl Rodriguez-Casares, and Xavier Aguado. Effects of isometric training on the knee extensor
- moment-angle relationship and vastus lateralis muscle architecture. European Journal of Applied Physiology, 114(11):2437–2446, Nov
 2014.
- [57] Brenda Bigland-Ritchie. Emg/force relations and fatigue of human voluntary contractions. *Exercise and sport sciences reviews*, 9(1):75–
 118, 1981.
- [58] Taku Wakahara, Naokazu Miyamoto, Norihide Sugisaki, Koichiro Murata, Hiroaki Kanehisa, Yasuo Kawakami, Tetsuo Fukunaga, and
 Toshimasa Yanai. Association between regional differences in muscle activation in one session of resistance exercise and in muscle
 hypertrophy after resistance training. *European journal of applied physiology*, 112(4):1569–1576, 2012.
- [59] Taku Wakahara, Atsuki Fukutani, Yasuo Kawakami, and Toshimasa Yanai. Nonuniform muscle hypertrophy: its relation to muscle activation in training session. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 45(11):2158–2165, 2013.
- [60] Taku Wakahara, Ryoichi Ema, Naokazu Miyamoto, and Yasuo Kawakami. Inter-and intramuscular differences in training-induced
 hypertrophy of the quadriceps femoris: association with muscle activation during the first training session. *Clinical Physiology and Functional Imaging*, 37(4):405–412, 2017.
- [61] Víctor Illera-Domínguez, Sergi Nuell, Gerard Carmona, Josep M. Padullés, Xavier Padullés, Mario Lloret, Roser Cussó, Xavier Alomar,
 and Joan A. Cadefau. Early Functional and Morphological Muscle Adaptations During Short-Term Inertial-Squat Training. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 9, 2018.
- [62] Ewout W Steyerberg et al. Clinical prediction models. Springer, 2019.