**(SDC4) Table S3.** Network univariate meta-regression models for muscle hypertrophy and muscle strength.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comparison** | **Covariates** | **Range** | **Overall** | |
|  |  |  | **Coef±SE** | **P-value** |
| **Muscle hypertrophy** |  |  |  |  |
| High vs. Low | Year of publication | 2002 to 2019 | 0.02 ± 0.02 | .438 |
| Experimental design | Between- vs. Within-group | 0.12 ± 0.19 | .519 |
| Sex | Women vs. Men | 0.11 ± 0.22 | .610 |
| Training status | Untrained vs. Recreationally trained | -0.08 ± 0.23 | .726 |
| Number of sessions | 12 to 48 | 0.00 ± 0.01 | .710 |
| Assessed limb | Lower- vs. Upper-body | 0.00 ± 0.23 | .986 |
| Prescription method | %1-RM vs. RM’s | -0.13 ± 0.19 | .490 |
| Moderate vs. Low | Year of publication | 2002 to 2019 | 0.02 ± 0.03 | .454 |
| Experimental design | Between vs. Within-group | 0.28 ± 0.26 | .278 |
| Sex | Women vs. Men | 0.15 ± 0.26 | .567 |
| Training status | Untrained vs. Recreationally trained | -0.11 ± 0.26 | .677 |
| Number of sessions | 16 to 24 | 0.02 ± 0.02 | .370 |
| Assessed limb | Lower- vs. Upper-body | 0.07 ± 0.27 | .791 |
| Prescription method | %1-RM vs. RM’s | -0.29 ± 0.26 | .265 |
| High vs. Moderate | Year of publication | 1996 to 2018 | 0.00 ± 0.02 | .970 |
| Experimental design† | Between vs. Within-group | 0.15 ± 0.28 | .585 |
| Sex | Women vs. Men | 0.04 ± 0.27 | .884 |
| Training status | Untrained vs. Recreationally trained | -0.02 ± 0.27 | .927 |
| Number of sessions | 16 to 33 | 0.02 ± 0.02 | .462 |
| Assessed limb | Lower- vs. Upper-body | 0.07 ± 0.26 | .798 |
| Prescription method | %1-RM vs. RM’s | -0.15 ± 0.28 | .579 |
| **Muscle strength** |  |  |  |  |
| High vs. Low | Year of publication | 1982 to 2019 | -0.05 ± 0.02 | **.021** |
| Experimental design | Between vs. Within-group | -0.13 ± 0.42 | .754 |
| Sex | Women vs. Men | 0.68 ± 0.41 | .097 |
| Training status | Untrained vs. Recreationally trained | -0.20 ± 0.42 | .644 |
| Number of sessions | 12 to 48 | 0.00 ± 0.02 | .827 |
| Assessed limb | Lower- vs. Upper-body | 0.30 ± 0.39 | .446 |
| Prescription method | %1-RM vs. RM’s | 0.08 ± 0.38 | .826 |
| Moderate vs. Low | Year of publication | 2002 to 2019 | -0.02 ± 0.04 | .538 |
| Experimental design | Between vs. Within-group | 0.42 ± 0.41 | .306 |
| Sex | Women vs. Men | 0.49 ± 0.48 | .315 |
| Training status | Untrained vs. Recreationally trained | -0.27 ± 0.39 | .492 |
| Number of sessions | 16 to 27 | 0.01 ± 0.03 | .906 |
| Assessed limb | Lower- vs. Upper-body | 0.01 ± 0.43 | .984 |
| Prescription method† | %1-RM vs. RM’s | -0.44 ± 0.39 | .267 |
| High vs. Moderate | Year of publication | 2002 to 2017 | 0.02 ± 0.04 | .525 |
| Experimental design | Between vs. Within-group | 0.55 ± 0.52 | .287 |
| Sex | Women vs. Men | -0.19 ± 0.36 | .593 |
| Training status | Untrained vs. Recreationally trained | -0.07 ± 0.31 | .811 |
| Number of sessions | 16 to 38 | -0.00 ± 0.03 | .965 |
| Assessed limb | Lower- vs. Upper-body | -0.29 ± 0.33 | .384 |
|  | Prescription method† | %1-RM vs. RM’s | -0.52 ± 0.49 | .288 |

%1-RM, Percentage of one repetition maximum; RM’s, Repetitions maximum.