

Body composition results†

The descriptive values are presented in Table. Both groups increased significantly the appendicular lean soft tissue after nine weeks of resistance training (N-VAR = +3.5% vs. VAR = +3.1%), with no significant difference ($P = 0.52$) between groups. Similarly, both groups increased the skeletal muscle mass (N-VAR = +3.6% vs. VAR = +3.2%), with no significant differences between groups ($P = 0.53$).

Table. Changes in body composition observed in the N-VAR and VAR groups after nine weeks of RT.

| | N-VAR (n = 11) | VAR (n = 12) |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| ALST (kg) | | |
| Pre | 30.6 ± 3.6 | 27.6 ± 3.5 |
| Post | 31.6 ± 3.4* | 28.4 ± 3.2* |
| Δ (95% CI) | 1.05 (0.49–1.56) | 0.81 (0.32–1.34) |
| ES | 0.29 | 0.24 |
| SMM (kg) | | |
| Pre | 35.3 ± 4.2 | 31.7 ± 4.1 |
| Post | 36.5 ± 3.9* | 32.7 ± 3.8* |
| Δ (95% CI) | 1.24 (0.58–1.84) | 0.95 (0.37–1.58) |
| ES | 0.30 | 0.26 |

Note. N-VAR = non-varied exercise; VAR = varied exercise; ALST = appendicular lean soft tissue; SMM = skeletal muscle mass; ES = effect size. * = $P < 0.05$ pre versus post. Pre- and post-training data are presented as mean and standard deviation, whereas the mean difference (Δ) as mean and confidence interval.

†The comparisons of the group effects (N-VAR versus VAR) on body composition parameters were performed from analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) of the raw difference between preintervention and postintervention measures with baseline values as a covariate to eliminate possible influence of initial scores variances on outcomes. Interpretation of data was based on 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of the change score (ie., when CI 95% of the raw delta did not overlap the 0, there was a difference between the baseline score). The effect size (ES) was calculated as post-training mean minus pre-training mean, divided by pooled pre-training standard deviation.