

Helland, C., Hole, E., Iversen, E., Olsson, M. C., Seynnes, O., Solberg, P. A., & Paulsen, G. (2017). Training strategies to improve muscle power: Is Olympic-style weightlifting relevant? *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 49, 736-745.

Dette er siste tekst-versjon av artikkelen, og den kan inneholde små forskjeller fra forlagets pdf-versjon. Forlagets pdf-versjon finner du på insights.ovid.com: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000001145>

This is the final text version of the article, and it may contain minor differences from the journal's pdf version. The original publication is available at insights.ovid.com: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000001145>

1 **TITLE**

2 Training strategies to improve muscle power: Is Olympic-style weightlifting relevant?

3

4 **AUTHORS**

5 Christian Helland¹, Eirik Hole¹, Erik Iversen¹, Monica Charlotte Olsson², Olivier Seynnes³,

6 Paul Andre Solberg⁴, Gøran Paulsen^{1,3}

7

8 **SHORT TITLE**

9 Olympic-style weightlifting and muscle power

10

11 **AFFILIATIONS**

12 1. The Norwegian Olympic and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of Sports,

13 Oslo, Norway

14 2. Biological and Environmental Systems Laboratory, Halmstad University, Halmstad,

15 Sweden

16 3. Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Oslo, Norway

17 4. Defense Institute, Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Oslo, Norway

18

19 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

20 Gøran Paulsen

21 The Norwegian Olympic and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of Sport

22 Pb 4004 Ullevål stadion, 0806 Oslo

23 goran.paulsen@olympiatoppen.no

24 +47 93429420

25

26 **KEYWORDS**

27 Athletes; power training; strength training; jump performance; sprint running; muscle
28 architecture

29

30 **ABSTRACT**

31 **Introduction**

32 This efficacy study investigated the effects of (1) Olympic-style weightlifting (OWL), (2)
33 motorized strength and power training (MSPT), and (3) free weight strength and power
34 training (FSPT) on muscle power.

35

36 **Methods**

37 Thirty-nine young athletes (20 ± 3 yr.; ice hockey, volleyball and badminton) were randomized
38 into the three training groups. All groups participated in 2-3 sessions/week for 8 weeks. The
39 MSPT and FSPT groups trained using squats (two legs and single leg) with high force and
40 high power, while the OWL group trained using clean and snatch exercises. MSPT was
41 conducted as slow-speed isokinetic strength training and isotonic power training with
42 augmented eccentric load, controlled by a computerized robotic engine system. FSPT used
43 free weights. The training volume (sum of repetitions x kg) was similar between all three
44 groups. Vertical jumping capabilities were assessed by countermovement jump (CMJ), squat
45 jump (SJ), drop jump (DJ), and loaded CMJs (10-80 kg). Sprinting capacity was assessed in a
46 30 m sprint. Secondary variables were squat 1-repetition-maximum, body composition and
47 quadriceps thickness and architecture.

48

49 **Results**

50 OWL resulted in trivial improvements, and inferior gains compared to FSPT and MSPT for
51 CMJ, SJ, and DJ. MSPT demonstrated small, but robust effects on SJ, DJ and loaded CMJs

52 (3-12%). MSPT was superior to FSPT in improving 30 m sprint performance. FSPT and
53 MSPT, but not OWL, demonstrated increased thickness in the vastus lateralis and rectus
54 femoris (4-7%).

55

56 **Conclusion**

57 MSPT was time-efficient and equally or more effective than FSPT training in improving
58 vertical jumping and sprinting performance. OWL was generally ineffective and inferior to
59 the two other interventions.

60

61

62 INTRODUCTION

63 Olympic-style weightlifting (OWL) includes the snatch and the clean and jerk. In both lifting
64 techniques, high performance necessitates not only great strength, but also high power (work
65 per unit time [W]). Indeed, high power outputs and rate of force development have been
66 reported during these lifts (13,25,27). Moreover, high-level weightlifters exhibit impressive
67 generic power abilities in the lower extremities, e.g., countermovement jump (CMJ) heights
68 are higher than those for power lifters and equivalent to high-level track and field sprinters
69 (8,29). Consequently, OWL and similar strength exercises (“weightlifting derivatives”) are
70 often advocated for a range of athletes to improve lower body muscle power (14,41).
71 However, although cross-sectional studies have documented a positive association between
72 OWL performance and lower body muscle power, there have been few experimental training
73 studies conducted to establish cause and effect (15).

74

75 Hoffman et al. (18) compared OWL with heavy, slow velocity powerlifting in college
76 American football players. No statistical significant improvements in vertical jump and sprint
77 performance were found during the training period with either training protocol (4 sessions
78 per week; 15 weeks). However, there was a group difference in the changes in vertical jump
79 height, favoring the OWL group. Tricoli et al. (42) reported clear improvements in vertical
80 jump performance in physically active college students who trained using OWL for 8 weeks
81 (3 sessions per week). In Tricoli et al.’s study, OWL was more effective than plyometrics in
82 improving squat jump (SJ) and CMJ heights, but not sprint performance. Channell and
83 Barfield (9) found no statistical difference in vertical jump improvements between adolescent
84 males (~16 years of age) training with either OWL or traditional strength training (i.e., squats
85 and deadlifts; 3 sessions per week for 8 weeks). However, based on the effect sizes, Channell
86 and Barfield (9) claimed that OWL might provide a modest advantage over traditional
87 strength training. In a study by Arabatzi and Kellis (4), OWL resulted in robust increases in

88 vertical jumping abilities after 8 weeks of training in recreationally trained students. OWL
89 was found superior to traditional strength training (leg extension, half-squats and leg press).
90 Finally, Chaouachi et al. (10) recruited boys aged 10 to 12 years and reported that two sessions
91 per week of OWL over 12 weeks was superior to traditional strength training (squats and
92 lunges) in improving isolated knee-extensor power ($300^\circ \cdot s^{-1}$) and balance, but not for
93 improving jumping and sprinting capabilities.

94

95 In summary, few studies have investigated the training effects of OWL (and derivative
96 exercises) for improving jumping and sprinting properties, and the results of these studies are
97 ambiguous. Only one study involved athletes (18), and only two of the studies controlled for
98 training volume (4,10). Thus, in contrast to what has been advocated in reviews primarily
99 based on cross-sectional studies and power measurements during lifting (14,41), limited
100 longitudinal experimental evidence supports OWL as being superior to other strength and
101 power training exercises for improving lower body muscle power in athletes.

102

103 **Isokinetic squat exercises**

104 In essence, strength training is about challenging the ability to generate maximal force (or
105 joint torque). Unlike traditional isotonic resistance exercises (free weights), isokinetic
106 resistance exercises have the advantage that maximal force can be exerted throughout the
107 range of motion (ROM; (34)). Numerous investigators have examined isokinetic exercises
108 and training, but longitudinal experiments typically involved only single joint movements
109 (33). Isolated, single joint exercises may, however, have very limited performance value for
110 athletes. Isokinetic multi-joint exercises should have much greater potential to transfer to
111 sport performance, but only a few studies have investigated this hypothesis (45). Four decades
112 ago Pipes and Wilmore (34) investigated isokinetic leg press and bench press devices that

113 allowed maximal force-generation in full ROM. Compared to traditional, isotonic strength
114 training, the isokinetic training induced superior improvements in sprint, jumping and
115 throwing performance in adult men (non-athletes). Intriguingly, the isokinetic training was
116 purely concentric (no eccentric phase). More recently, isokinetic strength training (concentric
117 and eccentric) was investigated and reportedly improved performance in functional tests,
118 although no comparisons were made against traditional strength training (only a non-
119 exercising control group; (32,35,38)).

120

121 The squat exercise – commonly considered more functional than the leg press – is the
122 cornerstone of the strength training regimes of many athletes. Isokinetic squat devices have
123 been developed and described (28,45), but to the best of our knowledge, no previous studies
124 have investigated the effects of isokinetic squat resistance training on strength and power in
125 athletes. Therefore, a goal of the present study was to investigate the effects of isokinetic
126 squat exercise training in comparison to OWL and free weight strength and power training
127 (FSPT).

128

129 **Eccentric exercise training**

130 Muscle force may be higher during eccentric than concentric contractions (3). High-force
131 eccentric contractions therefore have a larger potential for stimulating muscle cells via
132 mechano-sensitive pathways (23,26). In line with this, researchers have concluded that
133 eccentric exercise is superior to concentric exercise regimes in promoting muscle growth and
134 strength (11,21,37,43,44). Notably, eccentric training will primarily induce augmented
135 eccentric strength, and the transfer to concentric strength seems more variable (37).
136 Furthermore, few studies have investigated the effects of eccentric training in athletes. Vikne
137 et al. (43) recruited a mix of recreationally trained individuals and elite athletes engaged in

138 power-sports, such as track and field and powerlifting. They demonstrated more hypertrophy
139 in the exercised m. biceps brachii muscle after eccentric training compared to concentric
140 training over a 12-week study, but 1 repetition maximum (1RM) and maximal concentric
141 velocity at submaximal loads increased equally in both groups. In power-sports athletes (e.g.,
142 track and field), Friedmann-Bette et al. (12) compared eccentric overload training, i.e.,
143 maximal eccentric and concentric loads, with traditional isotonic training in a one-legged
144 knee-extension exercise. The results were equivocal, but type IIX fiber hypertrophy and
145 improved vertical jump performance were observed in the eccentric overload group only.
146 These results are intriguing, but isolated knee-extension is an open-chain exercise that may
147 have limited transfer to multi-joint jumping and sprinting abilities. In a recent study,
148 Papadopoulos et al. (32) used an isokinetic, eccentric bilateral leg press exercise and reported
149 robust effects on drop jump performance. However, this study was conducted on untrained
150 students with no active control groups, which raises questions about the effectiveness of this
151 intervention in athletes when compared to other forms of resistance exercise training. To the
152 best of our knowledge, no previous study has investigated the effects of squat-jump training
153 with computer-controlled augmented eccentric loading in athletes.

154

155 **Purpose**

156 The purpose of the present study was to examine training strategies for improving lower body
157 muscle power in the form of vertical jumping and horizontal sprinting abilities. We designed
158 and tested three intervention strategies in well-trained young athletes: (1) Olympic-style
159 weightlifting (OWL), (2) motorized strength and power training (MSPT), i.e., isokinetic
160 resistance exercise combined with augmented eccentric load power training, and (3) free
161 weight strength and power training (FSPT).

162

163 **METHODS**

164 **Recruitment and inclusion**

165 Badminton, volleyball and hockey players were recruited from a Norwegian High School for
166 elite sports. In addition, we recruited volleyball players (< 30 years of age) from teams
167 competing at the two highest levels in Norway. All participants confirmed that they had
168 regularly performed strength and power training during the last 2 years (≥ 1 session per
169 week), and all had some experience with OWL. Typically, the athletes based their strength
170 and power training on exercises such as squats, jump squats, deadlifts, Bulgarian split squats,
171 step-ups, lunges, power cleans and hang cleans. None of the athletes had experience with
172 isokinetic exercise training or augmented eccentric load exercises.

173

174 Fifty-two athletes provided written informed consent to participate in this randomized
175 controlled study. The National Regional Committee for Research Ethics approved the project.
176 Before the intervention period started, six participants declined to participate due to
177 scheduling problems. During the intervention period, seven participants dropped out: two due
178 to injury during the intervention period (lower back pain and partial rupture of the m. rectus
179 femoris muscle), two had difficulties attending at the scheduled times, two moved, and
180 finally, one refused to participate because he was randomized into an unsatisfactory group.
181 Thus, 39 participants (10 women and 29 men) completed the intervention (20 ± 3 years;
182 182 ± 10 cm; 78 ± 12 kg).

183

184 **Experimental procedure**

185 The participants were familiar with maximal vertical jumping, strength and sprint testing prior
186 to commencing the study. All performance tests were conducted twice before and once after
187 the intervention period. Two pre-tests were conducted to allow for familiarization to the tests.

188 Before the tests, participants rested for a minimum of 24 hours. All tests were performed after
189 a standardized warm-up of 5 minutes submaximal cycling (100-150 W), followed by 3-5 sub-
190 maximal CMJ. Two to three submaximal 40 m runs were conducted before the 30 m sprint
191 test. Body composition, muscle thickness and muscle architecture were assessed in the fasted
192 state between 7-10 a.m. on test days.

193

194 After the pre-tests, the participants were randomly allocated into three groups: Olympic-style
195 weightlifting (OWL; n=13, 4 women and 9 men), motorized strength and power training
196 (MSPT; n=13, 3 women and 10 men), and free weight strength and power training (FSPT;
197 n=13, 3 women and 10 men). The athletes continued their regular off-season training, but
198 were instructed not to conduct any strength and power training apart from the intervention
199 programs. Due to the complexity of the athletes' training programs, we did not quantify their
200 total training loads. In order to counteract possible group allocation bias, the group
201 randomization process was stratified by sex, sport and CMJ (jump height).

202

203 Prior to the first training session, all participants took part in two separate lifting-technique
204 courses (of 1-2 hours each). The intention was primarily to ensure that the participants had
205 proper and similar lifting-technique skills. Secondly, we aimed to identify individual flaws
206 and weaknesses in the participants' lifting techniques and provide feedback on how to
207 improve. The coaches who supervised the familiarization training continued to provide
208 technique supervision and correction during the intervention period.

209

210 **Intervention programs**

211 The participants underwent an 8-week, progressive training program, involving 21 sessions
212 (Table 1). During the first three weeks, participants completed two similar strength and power

213 training sessions per week. Thereafter the training frequency increased to three sessions per
214 week, including two combined strength and power training sessions, and one power training
215 session.

216

217 The training programs were designed to ensure equal training volumes between groups: sum
218 of repetitions x load on bar (kg). To achieve an equal training volume the OWL group was
219 assigned to perform the highest number of repetitions per session, while the MSPT group did
220 the least (due to the higher force per repetition in this technique). Inter-set and inter-exercise
221 rest periods were always 3 minutes. For the training sessions that combined strength and
222 power training (Table 1), the mean durations were approximately 25, 35 and 45 minutes for
223 the MSPT, FSPT and OWL sessions, respectively. The loads in the MSPT group were
224 calculated from the mean concentric force generated in each repetition, which were recorded
225 and digitally stored (1080 Quantum synchro, 1080 Motion AB, Stockholm, Sweden).

226

227 Generally, the training programs combined heavy lifts (strength) with lighter load power
228 training (Table 1). All training exercises were conducted with the intention to move as fast as
229 possible in the concentric phase, irrespective of load. The OWL group applied the heaviest
230 loads possible without compromising adequate lifting techniques (repetition maximum,
231 [RM]). The FSPT group applied RM loads during the heavy strength training. The MSPT
232 group conducted isokinetic squats with maximal effort in each repetition. For the MSPT and
233 FSPT groups, the power-training loads were reduced from 60% to 40% to 20% of squat 1RM
234 during the training period (20%, 15% and 10% for the single leg exercises; Table 1).

235

236 In the first 3 weeks, the heavy load strength training exercises were followed by power
237 training exercises in the MSPT and FSPT groups, while in weeks 4-8 the sessions started with

238 power training exercise (jump squats; Table 1). After the initial 3 weeks, a low volume power
239 session was added and conducted on every third training day (Table 1). For the OWL group
240 we chose power cleans, hang cleans and hang snatches, because these exercises are conducted
241 with relatively low loads and high velocity movements (Table 1). In contrast to the other
242 groups, the OWL group participants were motivated to increase the loads in these “power
243 sessions” during the training intervention (applying the heaviest loads possible in all
244 sessions). The rationale for this was based on the observations of McBride et al. (27) that
245 reported the highest power in the jump squat at low loads (only body weight), while the
246 opposite was the case for power cleans; the highest power was reached at the heaviest load
247 (90% of 1RM).

248

249 Olympic-style weightlifting

250 OWL included full cleans with front squat, hang cleans, power jerk behind the neck, full
251 snatches and hang snatches (Table 1). The exercises and combinations were based on best
252 practice at the Norwegian Olympic Training Center (Oslo, Norway). The idea was to combine
253 exercises with a focus on different ranges of motions (ROM). For example, the clean with
254 front squat ensures large knee and hip ROM and allows for quite heavy weights, while the
255 power jerk behind the neck, in contrast, involves a small ROM and a very rapid movement.
256 The snatch, hang snatch and hang clean were considered to be exercises that lay in between
257 the previously-mentioned exercises in terms of ROMs and loads.

258

259 Motorized strength and power training

260 A computerized robotic engine system (1080 Quantum synchro, 1080 Motion AB,
261 Stockholm, Sweden) controlled the load for the MSPT group. The robotic engine was
262 attached to a custom-made Smith machine.

263

264 The strength training was conducted as isokinetic squat training. The concentric velocity was
265 set to 0.2-0.4 m/s, starting with 0.4 m/s and progressing to 0.3 m/s and, finally, 0.2 m/s during
266 the intervention period (Table 1). The participants were instructed to switch from eccentric to
267 concentric phases with maximal effort and keep on pushing maximally until they reached the
268 upright position. The eccentric phase was always isotonic, with a velocity of less than 1.0 m/s.
269 The participants were instructed to lower the bar in a slow, controlled manner (~0.4-0.5 m/s).
270 The eccentric load was individually adjusted to match the concentric force generated; i.e., if
271 the mean concentric force for the full ROM was 1000 N, the constant eccentric load was set to
272 1000 N. The participants received feedback on their performance after each set via graphs
273 displaying the mean concentric force (N) for each repetition and the whole set.

274

275 Power training was conducted as CMJ with external loads (countermovement to half squat
276 depth). The loads were isotonic and set to 20-60% of the participant's squat 1RM (10-20% for
277 single leg CMJ; see Table 1). The eccentric load was 20-40% higher than the concentric load
278 (increasing from 20% to 30% and finally 40%; see Table 1). The robotic engine system
279 seamlessly switched on the eccentric overload when the eccentric velocity reached <0.2 m/s.
280 This allowed for continuous jumping in the five repetitions per set. The participants received
281 feedback on their performance after each set via graphs displaying the mean concentric power
282 (W) for each repetition and the whole set.

283

284 Free weight strength and power training

285 The FSPT was designed to be as simple as possible, and was identical to the MSPT group,
286 except for the use of free weights (isotonic) instead of a Smith machine (Table 1). We chose
287 free weights because most high-level athletes generally favor this over the Smith machine.

288

289 **Tests**

290 Jump performance

291 Participants performed SJ, CMJ, and DJ on a force platform with arms akimbo (sampling rate
292 2000 Hz, AMTI OR6-5-1, AMTI, Watertown, MA, USA). For SJ, participants were
293 instructed to squat until their knee joint angle reached 80-90° (verified by a goniometer during
294 warm-ups). The hips were flexed to 70-80° (180° in upright position). Approximately one
295 second after reaching this position, the investigator gave the signal to perform a maximal
296 vertical jump. SJ attempts flawed by an initial counter movement (more than 5% below body
297 weight) were discarded. CMJs were performed from an upright position to a self-determined
298 depth, followed by an immediate maximal vertical jump. DJs were performed from a 40 cm
299 high box, with the same instructions as for CMJ. In each case, the mean of the two highest
300 jumps out of 3 to 6 attempts was used for further analysis.

301

302 Sprint performance

303 We assessed sprint performance on an indoor rubberized track (Mondo, Conshohocken, PA,
304 USA) with an electronic timing system (Biomekanikk, Oslo, Norway). As a timing trigger, a
305 single-beamed timing gate was placed 0.6 m after the start line (0.5 m above ground level).
306 Dual-beamed timing gates were placed every 5m along the 30-m sprint distance. A stand-still
307 start was used, one foot in front of the other; and the participants accelerated as fast as
308 possible. Haugen et al. (16,17) have previously reported coefficients of variation (CV) in the
309 range 0.9-1.6% with this system setup and procedure.

310

311 Vertical jump power

312 A linear encoder was used to assess vertical power during loaded CMJs (Musclelab Linear
313 Encoder, Ergotest Innovation, Porsgrunn, Norway). The encoder's string was mounted to the
314 bar, and the device measured the vertical displacement (d) and velocity (v) during the
315 concentric phase of the jump (200 Hz sampling rate; 0.019 mm resolution). The power output
316 (P) was estimated on the system mass (m), i.e., 90% of body mass and the external mass ($v =$
317 d/t ; acceleration [a] = v/t , force [F] = $m \cdot g + m \cdot a$; $P = F \cdot v$). A concentric force-velocity
318 relationship was established and peak power could be estimated (best fit polynomial; software
319 from Ergotest Innovation). With the instruction to jump as high as possible, the participants
320 completed three CMJs at each load with ~5 seconds between each jump and 2 min between
321 sets. Participants performed the first set without external load (body weight and a plastic stick
322 [~ 300 g]), and then the female and male participants increased the load by 10 and 20 kg,
323 respectively. The women progressed to 60 kg and the men to 80 kg, or until the lifting
324 technique was judged inadequate by the test leader. The attempt with highest peak power
325 from each load was used for further analysis.

326

327 Squat

328 For measurements of 1RM in parallel squat, we used a Smith machine (Multipower,
329 Technogym, Cecena FC, Italy). The first 1RM attempt was conducted after two warm-up lifts
330 at ~85% and one repetition at ~92.5 % of expected 1RM. Warm-up sets and attempts were
331 separated by 3 minutes of rest. If the 1RM attempt was successful, the load was increased by
332 2.5-5% until the test leader predicted failure on the next attempt. To ensure the same squat
333 depth from pre to post testing, we measured the distance from the floor to the bar. The
334 distance was marked with a pen, providing visual feedback for the test leader.

335

336 Lean mass measurements and ultrasound measurements

337 Body composition was assessed using a narrow angle fan beam Lunar iDXA scan (DXA; GE-
338 Helthcare, Madison, WI, USA). The iDXA was calibrated daily according to the
339 manufacture's guidelines. The iDXA machine automatically chose scanning mode, with all
340 athletes scanned in the standard mode. The images were analyzed with enCORE software
341 (version 14.10.022, GE-Helthcare). The software automatically defined the different body
342 segments: arms, trunk and legs. However, all scans were manually controlled and adjusted to
343 ensure optimal pre- and post-training comparisons.

344

345 Muscle thickness and architecture of m. vastus lateralis and muscle thickness of m. rectus
346 femoris in the dominant leg were assessed using B-mode ultrasonography (probe size of 4.5
347 cm and 8-17 MHz scanning frequency; GE Logiq 9, GE Healthcare, Little Chalfont, UK). The
348 scans were obtained at 50% of the femur length (1). Two to three images were captured at
349 each position. The position of the probe was marked on the skin (hydrophobic pen) and
350 subsequently marked on a soft transparent plastic sheet superimposed on the thigh.

351 Landmarks such as moles and scars were also marked on the plastic sheets for relocation of
352 the scanned areas during post-training measurements. Both longitudinal and cross sectional
353 images were obtained from m. vastus lateralis, while only transverse images were obtained
354 from m. rectus femoris. Transverse images were used for assessing muscle thickness, whereas
355 longitudinal images were used for assessing pennation angle and fascicle length. ImageJ
356 software was used for image analyses (Wayne Rasband, National Institutes of Health,
357 Bethesda, MD, USA), where muscle thickness was measured at three different sites on the
358 transverse image and an average of these measurements was used for further calculations.

359 Pennation angle was measured three times at the same site on the longitudinal image and an
360 average was used for further calculations. Fascicle length was calculated from the following
361 equation: Fascicle length = thickness/sin(pennation angle). The thickness value was the

362 average of three measurements at three sites on the longitudinal image. For both transverse
363 and longitudinal images, the pre and post images were analyzed at the same time and great
364 care was taken to match the thickness and angle measurements sites on the pre and post
365 images. The assessor was blinded for the participants' group affiliations.

366

367 **Nutrition**

368 To ensure adequate energy and protein intake, a high-protein bar was ingested after each
369 training session (20 g protein, 31 g carbohydrates and 5 g fat; Yt, Tine, Oslo, Norway).

370

371

372 **Statistical analysis**

373 A priori power calculations with a standard deviation (SD) of 5% suggested 15 participants
374 were needed in each group in order to detect a difference of 5% with 80% power (GraphPad
375 StatMate version 2.00, GraphPad Software, Ca, USA). We ended up with 13 athletes in each
376 group, which gave us 80% power to detect a difference of 6% between groups with a standard
377 deviation of 5% (e.g., CMJ).

378

379 For all performance tests the means of the two pre-tests were used as baselines for further
380 calculations. Based on the two pre-tests, coefficient of variation (CV) and intraclass
381 correlation (ICC) were calculated for each test (19). The linear mixed model procedure in
382 SPSS Statistics (Version 21, IBM Corp. Armonk, NY, USA) was used to analyse the changes
383 and differences in the means, while adjusting for the effects of covariates in the three groups:
384 baseline level, bodyweight and training volume. A more detailed description of the
385 procedures used can be found elsewhere (40). Changes within groups are reported as $\% \pm \text{SD}$.
386 The magnitudes of within-group changes and between-group differences were assessed as
387 effect sizes (ES; mean change or difference divided by baseline SD of all subjects), and

388 evaluated with a modification of Cohen's scale that aligns with the effect sizes used for bi-
389 serial correlations: <0.2, trivial; 0.2-0.6, small; 0.6-1.2, moderate; >1.2, large (20). Inferences
390 were based on the assumption of the normality of sampling distribution of the differences. To
391 make inferences about true values of effects in the population studied, we used non-clinical
392 magnitude-based inference rather than null-hypothesis significance testing (20). Magnitudes
393 were evaluated mechanistically: if the confidence interval overlapped substantial positive and
394 negative values (0.2 and -0.2), the effect was deemed unclear. The effect is shown as the
395 difference or change with the greatest probability, and the probability is shown qualitatively
396 using the following scale: 25-75%, possibly (*); 75-95%, likely (**); 95-99.5%, very likely
397 (***); > 99.5%, most likely (20).

398

399 **RESULTS**

400 Adequate reliability was established for all performance tests. Loaded CMJs, DJ and SJ had
401 the highest CVs of 5-10%, and lowest ICCs of 0.92-0.96, while 1RM squat, CMJ, and 30 m
402 sprint had the lowest CVs: 1-5%, and highest ICCs: 0.96-0.98. Moreover, there were no
403 performance improvements from pre 1 to pre 2 for any tests (all participants pooled).

404

405 No group differences were detected before the intervention period (Table 2). The total
406 training volume (sum of repetitions x load [kg]) during the intervention period was similar
407 between the groups (Table 2).

408

409 Except for SJ with heavy loads (40 kg for women and 80 kg for men) 8 weeks of OWL did
410 not affect vertical jumping or sprinting performance (Table 3). Body composition was
411 unaltered, and no clear architectural changes were demonstrated in m. rectus femoris and m.
412 vastus lateralis.

413

414 MSPT demonstrated overall small but clear changes in both vertical jumping and sprinting
415 performance (Table 2). Total lean mass and bone mass increased significantly ($p < 0.05$), but
416 the changes in whole body composition were trivial after 8 weeks of MSPT. However, the
417 thickness of m. rectus femoris and m. vastus lateralis increased. A small increase in fascicle
418 angle in m. vastus lateralis was detected, although fascicle length was unaltered.

419

420 FSPT induced generally small but clear changes in 1RM squat and vertical jump performance.
421 Performance in the 30 m sprint, however, did not improve after 8 weeks' FSPT training
422 (Table 3). There were no clear changes in body composition, but muscle thickness of m.
423 vastus lateralis and m. rectus femoris increased slightly. Changes in m. vastus lateralis
424 architecture, fascicle angle and length were trivial (Table 3).

425

426 The group comparisons showed that the FSPT group had small, but clear improvements in
427 1RM strength ($ES = .32 \pm .22$), SJ height ($ES = .22 \pm .27$), CMJ height ($ES = .22 \pm .25$) and
428 loaded CMJ peak power ($ES = .23 \pm .35$) compared to the OWL group. The OWL group
429 showed improved 30 m sprint performance ($ES = .20 \pm .25$) compared with the FSPT group,
430 mainly due to a decrease in the FSPT group. The MSPT intervention was superior to OWL in
431 increasing 1RM strength ($ES = .40 \pm .22$), SJ height ($ES = .26 \pm .27$), loaded jump power
432 (40/80 kg; $ES = .28 \pm .31$), DJ height ($ES = .33 \pm .31$), 20-30 m flying sprint performance (ES
433 $= .30 \pm .25$), fascicle angle ($ES = .25 \pm .40$) and m. vastus lateralis thickness ($ES = .24 \pm .22$).
434 MSPT was also more effective than FSPT in increasing DJ height ($ES = .26 \pm .33$), 30 m
435 sprint performance ($ES = .34 \pm .24$), and fascicle angle ($ES = .26 \pm .41$).

436

437 **DISCUSSION**

438 In the present study, we observed that OWL was statistically inferior to FSPT in improving
439 CMJ height, peak power during loaded CMJ, and 1RM squat. In contrast, MSPT, i.e.,
440 isokinetic strength training combined with augmented eccentric load power training, induced
441 generally small but robust effects on CMJ and SJ height, DJ rebound height, and sprint
442 running, as well as loaded CMJ power and 1RM squat. MSPT was superior to FSPT in
443 improving DJ rebound height and 30 m sprint times.

444

445 Our participants were encouraged to have a fast, “explosive” concentric phase in each lift, and
446 all sessions included supervised training with technical feedback. Despite this, we observed
447 that OWL training resulted in smaller improvements in jumping and sprinting performances
448 than expected based on previous publications (9,10,14,18,41,42). We included several
449 derivatives of OWL exercises, and the training volume and frequency seemed appropriate (2-
450 3 sessions per week). The intervention period was short (8 weeks), but still relevant for
451 athletes with limited preparatory periods, and of similar duration to the study of Channell and
452 Barfield (9), in which OWL training did improve vertical jumping abilities. To illustrate the
453 specific effects of the OWL training, our athletes improved their 1RM hang clean by $29\pm 11\%$
454 ($p<0.001$; estimated from training loads (31)); in line with the observations of others (42).
455 This indicates that the problem may lie in the transfer from OWL techniques to jumping and
456 sprinting movements.

457

458 Although studies have shown high lower body power outputs during OWL (13,25,27), there
459 are often large differences between skilled weightlifters and athletes engaged in other sports
460 that use OWL as part of their training. Inappropriate lifting techniques would probably reduce
461 or abolish the transfer to other abilities, such as jumping and sprinting. Intriguingly, the OWL

462 training induced larger gains of lean mass in the arms than the lower body (3.3% vs -0.4%,
463 $p < 0.05$; trivial effects). These results indicate that upper-body muscles were highly active
464 during the OWL training, thereby alleviating the load on the lower body muscles. Indeed, the
465 ability to transfer forces between joints via bi-articular muscles implies the possibility of
466 reducing the work of the lower limb muscles in OWL.

467

468 OWL is kinematically different from both vertical jumping (25) and sprinting (unilateral
469 movement). Thus, the transfer from OWL training to jump and sprint performance is not
470 obvious. Nevertheless, OWL might be more advantageous for improving hip extension
471 moments in joint positions more relevant for sprinting than vertical jumping. Interestingly, the
472 improvement in 30 m sprint was trivial for OWL, but still superior to free weight strength
473 training, due to a slight decrease in performance in the latter group.

474

475 Another possibility for limited improvements from OWL is low eccentric muscle force
476 production, since eccentric muscle actions are possibly more potent in increasing muscle mass
477 than concentric contractions (37). In OWL, the bar must be dropped to the hips or directly to
478 the floor, and the eccentric stimulus for the lower leg muscles is consequently negligible. In
479 addition to myofiber hypertrophy, eccentric-contraction-induced neural and tendon
480 adaptations could plausibly explain the group differences in jumping and sprinting
481 improvements.

482

483 In accordance with our results, Hoffman et al. (18) found no significant improvements in
484 either vertical jumping or sprinting after 15 weeks of OWL training. In contrast to other
485 previous studies (4,9,10,18,42), but similar to the present study, Hoffman et al. recruited well-
486 trained athletes. However, the authors concluded that OWL training was superior to

487 powerlifting training, mostly because the powerlifting group surprisingly showed reductions
488 in their vertical jump height. It seems fair to say that the efficacy of OWL training in athletes
489 warrants further research.

490

491 In the present study, we included OWL exercises only, similar to Chaouahi et al. (10). Other
492 previous investigations have included a mix of exercises, such as squats, lunges and leg press
493 exercises, in addition to the OWL exercises (4,9,18,42). The inclusion of other exercises
494 makes it impossible to conclude that OWL *per se* induced the observable training effects.

495

496 In accordance with the present study, some previous studies equalized or controlled for
497 training volume when comparing OWL with traditional strength and power training (4,10),
498 but not all did so (9,18). Without equal training volume, one cannot exclude the possibility of
499 a dose-response effect, and direct comparisons are not readily possible.

500

501 The motorized strength and power training, using a robotic engine training device, allowed for
502 maximal effort and force generation through the whole range of motion during the slow,
503 isokinetic squat exercises, and augmented eccentric loading during the power training
504 exercises. MSPT induced similar improvements in 1RM squat as did FSPT, but did lead to
505 larger progressions in drop jump performance (vertical rebound jump height) and sprint
506 running ability (and was clearly better than OWL). The muscle thickness of m. rectus femoris
507 and m. vastus lateralis consistently increased in both the MSPT and FSPT groups, but fascicle
508 angle increased only in the MSPT group. Previous studies have shown that various resistance
509 training modalities induce contrasting changes in fascicle angle (6,36). Training regimes
510 involving concentric contractions typically yield a higher angle of pennation with no
511 consistent change in fascicular length, while the opposite findings are observed with eccentric

512 contractions. With equal training volumes across groups, the higher concentric force
513 generation during isokinetic squats seems to have driven these adaptations.

514

515 In contrast to hypertrophic strength training (1,22), power training has been accompanied by
516 no change or a decrease in fascicle angle and an increase in fascicle length (2,7,24). The
517 participants in the present study conducted both heavy strength and power training. Since the
518 fascicle angle increased and fascicle length trivially decreased in the MSPT group, we suggest
519 that the concentric, high-force contractions were the dominating stimulus for the architectural
520 changes. Arguably, hypertrophy was achieved in this group via sarcomerogenesis in parallel,
521 rather than in series. However, fascicle length was calculated using simple trigonometric
522 extrapolation techniques in the present study. Advanced techniques enabling direct
523 measurements may have been more sensitive to changes in this parameter.

524

525 The MSPT group performed power training with an augmented eccentric load (120-140% of
526 the concentric load). The idea was that this would give a stronger stimulus to the
527 neuromuscular system (30). This was, apparently, not the case for the SJ or the CMJ abilities.
528 On the other hand, the MSPT group did experience superior improvements in the DJ test.
529 Intriguingly, a DJ will cause a high eccentric load, quite similar to the augmented eccentric
530 load during the loaded CMJ training. Consequently, the augmented eccentric load training
531 appears to have transferred effectively to drop jump performance. In support of our findings,
532 strategies (e.g., use of rubber bands) to augment eccentric loading during plyometrics are used
533 in practice by athletes (30,39).

534

535 This study has several potential limitations. First, one could argue that it is atypical to train
536 using purely OWL exercises, and their effects could be optimized when combined with

537 traditional strength and power training; similar studies have successfully added squats and leg
538 press exercises to an OWL program (5,9,10,42). However, we chose the present design in
539 order to isolate the effects of OWL. Second, the motorized training included slow velocity,
540 isokinetic squat training and augmented eccentric load jump squat training. The relative
541 contribution of these training modes in terms of performance enhancements cannot be
542 inferred from the present results. Future experiments should investigate these training modes
543 separately. Third, the motorized squat training was an unaccustomed exercise modality for all
544 participants, and we therefore cannot exclude the possibility that some of the performance
545 gains were due to this being a novel stimulus and/or the enhanced feedback on performance.
546 Finally, we calculated the total training volume simply by summarizing the products of the
547 load on the bar and the number of repetitions for each set. This approach may not be optimal
548 when comparing training programs with different exercises, including ballistic exercises (such
549 as OWL).

550

551 **PRACTICAL APPLICATION**

552 In the present study, we demonstrated that using computer-controlled robotic engines for
553 strength and power training was a time-efficient approach to increase vertical jumping and
554 sprinting performance in athletes. Traditional FSPT seemed also effective in improving
555 vertical jumping height, while OWL appeared less effective as a sole training mode. If
556 anything, OWL appeared more favorable in improving sprinting than vertical jumping
557 performance. OWL may work well for certain athletes, but adequate lifting technique is
558 probably an important prerequisite. Moreover, for athletes with already high maximal
559 strength, OWL might be more relevant for improving lower body muscle power and speed
560 than for weaker athletes. It could also be important to combine OWL exercises with exercises
561 focusing on eccentric muscle actions (i.e., drop jumps). For young “power-athletes”, such as
562 those recruited in the present study (ice hockey, volleyball and badminton players), we

563 recommend a base of simple heavy strength and power training exercises (e.g., squats) that
564 includes a controlled eccentric phase, to favor muscle growth and maximal force gains.

565

566 **CONCLUSION**

567 MSPT was more time-efficient while being equally as effective or superior to FSPT in
568 improving both vertical jumping and sprinting performance. Hence, isokinetic strength
569 training combined with eccentric augmented load power training emerges as an attractive
570 training approach for a wide range of athletes. In contrast, OWL appeared generally
571 ineffective and inferior to traditional FSPT in developing vertical jumping performance in
572 athletes.

573

574 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

575 We would like to thank Magnus Midttun, Yngve Apneseth, Lene Puntervold, Charlotte
576 Krohn, Vebjørn Vingsand, Line Rønningen, Marte Mo Anderssen, Jon Aase, Sindre
577 Madsgaard and Annbjørg Engeseth for supervising the athletes during the training sessions,
578 and all the athletes for their hard work.

579

580 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

581 The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The results of the present study do not constitute
582 endorsement by the American College of Sports Medicine.

583 **REFERENCES**

- 584 (1) Aagaard P, Andersen JL, Dyhre-Poulsen P, Leffers AM, Wagner A, Magnusson SP,
585 Halkjaer-Kristensen J, Simonsen EB. A mechanism for increased contractile strength of
586 human pennate muscle in response to strength training: changes in muscle architecture.
587 *J Physiol.* 2001;534(Pt. 2):613-23.
- 588 (2) Alegre LM, Jimenez F, Gonzalo-Orden JM, Martin-Acero R, Aguado X. Effects of
589 dynamic resistance training on fascicle length and isometric strength. *J Sports Sci.*
590 2006;24(5):501-8.
- 591 (3) Amiridis IG, Martin A, Morlon B, Martin L, Cometti G, Pousson M, van HJ. Co-
592 activation and tension-regulating phenomena during isokinetic knee extension in
593 sedentary and highly skilled humans. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol.* 1996;73(1-
594 2):149-56.
- 595 (4) Arabatzi F, Kellis E. Olympic weightlifting training causes different knee muscle-
596 coactivation adaptations compared with traditional weight training. *J Strength Cond*
597 *Res.* 2012;26(8):2192-201.
- 598 (5) Arabatzi F, Kellis E, Saez-Saez D, V. Vertical jump biomechanics after plyometric,
599 weight lifting, and combined (weight lifting + plyometric) training. *J Strength Cond*
600 *Res.* 2010;24(9):2440-8.
- 601 (6) Blazeovich AJ, Cannavan D, Coleman DR, Horne S. Influence of concentric and
602 eccentric resistance training on architectural adaptation in human quadriceps muscles.
603 *J Appl Physiol.* 2007;103(5):1565-75.
- 604 (7) Blazeovich AJ, Gill ND, Bronks R, Newton RU. Training-specific muscle architecture
605 adaptation after 5-wk training in athletes. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2003;35(12):2013-22.
- 606 (8) Carlock JM, Smith SL, Hartman MJ, Morris RT, Ciroslan DA, Pierce KC, Newton RU,
607 Harman EA, Sands WA, Stone MH. The relationship between vertical jump power
608 estimates and weightlifting ability: a field-test approach. *J Strength Cond Res.*
609 2004;18(3):534-9.
- 610 (9) Channell BT, Barfield JP. Effect of Olympic and traditional resistance training on
611 vertical jump improvement in high school boys. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2008;22(5):1522-
612 7.
- 613 (10) Chaouachi A, Hammami R, Kaabi S, Chamari K, Drinkwater EJ, Behm DG. Olympic
614 weightlifting and plyometric training with children provides similar or greater
615 performance improvements than traditional resistance training. *J Strength Cond Res.*
616 2014;28(6):1483-96.
- 617 (11) English KL, Loehr JA, Lee SM, Smith SM. Early-phase musculoskeletal adaptations to
618 different levels of eccentric resistance after 8 weeks of lower body training. *Eur J Appl*
619 *Physiol.* 2014;114(11):2263-80.

- 620 (12) Friedmann-Bette B, Bauer T, Kinscherf R, Vorwald S, Klute K, Bischoff D, Muller H,
621 Weber MA, Metz J, Kauczor HU, Bartsch P, Billeter R. Effects of strength training with
622 eccentric overload on muscle adaptation in male athletes. *Eur J Appl Physiol.*
623 2010;108(4):821-36.
- 624 (13) Garhammer J. Power production by Olympic weightlifters. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*
625 1980;12(1):54-60.
- 626 (14) Garhammer J, Takano B. Training for weightlifting. In: Komi PV, editor. Strength and
627 power in sports. 2 ed. Blackwell Science Ltd; 2003. p. 502-15.
- 628 (15) Hackett D, Davies T, Soomro N, Halaki M. Olympic weightlifting training improves
629 vertical jump height in sportspeople: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Br J*
630 *Sports Med.* 2016;50(14):865-72.
- 631 (16) Haugen T, Tonnessen E, Seiler S. Correction Factors for Photocell Sprint Timing With
632 Flying Start. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2015;10(8):1055-7.
- 633 (17) Haugen TA, Tonnessen E, Svendsen IS, Seiler S. Sprint time differences between
634 single- and dual-beam timing systems. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2014;28(8):2376-9.
- 635 (18) Hoffman JR, Cooper J, Wendell M, Kang J. Comparison of Olympic vs. traditional
636 power lifting training programs in football players. *J Strength Cond Res.*
637 2004;18(1):129-35.
- 638 (19) Hopkins WG. Spreadsheets for analysis of validity and reliability. *Sport Science.*
639 2015;19:36-42.
- 640 (20) Hopkins WG, Marshall SW, Batterham AM, Hanin J. Progressive statistics for studies
641 in sports medicine and exercise science. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2009;41(1):3-13.
- 642 (21) Isner-Horobeti ME, Dufour SP, Vautravers P, Geny B, Coudeyre E, Richard R.
643 Eccentric exercise training: modalities, applications and perspectives. *Sports Med.*
644 2013;43(6):483-512.
- 645 (22) Kawakami Y, Abe T, Fukunaga T. Muscle-fiber pennation angles are greater in
646 hypertrophied than in normal muscles. *J Appl Physiol (1985).* 1993;74(6):2740-4.
- 647 (23) Lueders TN, Zou K, Huntsman HD, Meador B, Mahmassani Z, Abel M, Valero MC,
648 Huey KA, Boppart MD. The alpha7beta1-integrin accelerates fiber hypertrophy and
649 myogenesis following a single bout of eccentric exercise. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol.*
650 2011;301(4):C938-C946.
- 651 (24) Luteberget LS, Raastad T, Seynnes O, Spencer M. Effect of traditional and resisted
652 sprint training in highly trained female team handball players. *Int J Sports Physiol*
653 *Perform.* 2015;10(5):642-7.
- 654 (25) MacKenzie SJ, Lavers RJ, Wallace BB. A biomechanical comparison of the vertical
655 jump, power clean, and jump squat. *J Sports Sci.* 2014;32(16):1576-85.
- 656 (26) Martineau LC, Gardiner PF. Insight into skeletal muscle mechanotransduction: MAPK
657 activation is quantitatively related to tension. *J Appl Physiol.* 2001;91(2):693-702.

- 658 (27) McBride JM, Haines TL, Kirby TJ. Effect of loading on peak power of the bar, body,
659 and system during power cleans, squats, and jump squats. *J Sports Sci.*
660 2011;29(11):1215-21.
- 661 (28) McBride JM, Skinner JW, Schafer PC, Haines TL, Kirby TJ. Comparison of kinetic
662 variables and muscle activity during a squat vs. a box squat. *J Strength Cond Res.*
663 2010;24(12):3195-9.
- 664 (29) McBride JM, Triplett-McBride T, Davie A, Newton RU. A comparison of strength and
665 power characteristics between power lifters, olympic lifters, and sprinters. *J Strength*
666 *Cond Res.* 1999;13(1):58-66.
- 667 (30) Moore CA, Schilling BK. Theory and application of augmented eccentric loading.
668 *Strength and Conditioning Journal.* 2006;27(5):20-7.
- 669 (31) Morales J, Sobonya S. Use of submaximal repetition tests for predicting 1-RM strength
670 in class athletes. *J Strength Cond Res.* 1996;10(3):186-9.
- 671 (32) Papadopoulos C, Theodosiou K, Bogdanis GC, Gkantiraga E, Gissis I, Sambanis M,
672 Souglis A, Sotiropoulos A. Multiarticular isokinetic high-load eccentric training induces
673 large increases in eccentric and concentric strength and jumping performance. *J*
674 *Strength Cond Res.* 2014;28(9):2680-8.
- 675 (33) Pereira MI, Gomes PS. Movement velocity in resistance training. *Sports Med.*
676 2003;33(6):427-38.
- 677 (34) Pipes TV, Wilmore JH. Isokinetic vs isotonic strength training in adult men. *Med Sci*
678 *Sports.* 1975;7(4):262-74.
- 679 (35) Ratamess NA, Beller NA, Gonzalez AM, Spatz GE, Hoffman JR, Ross RE, Faigenbaum
680 AD, Kang J. The Effects of Multiple-Joint Isokinetic Resistance Training on Maximal
681 Isokinetic and Dynamic Muscle Strength and Local Muscular Endurance. *J Sports Sci*
682 *Med.* 2016;15(1):34-40.
- 683 (36) Reeves ND, Maganaris CN, Longo S, Narici MV. Differential adaptations to eccentric
684 versus conventional resistance training in older humans. *Exp Physiol.* 2009;94(7):825-
685 33.
- 686 (37) Roig M, O'Brien K, Kirk G, Murray R, McKinnon P, Shadgan B, Reid DW. The effects
687 of eccentric versus concentric resistance training on muscle strength and mass in healthy
688 adults: a systematic review with meta-analyses. *Br J Sports Med.* 2008;43:556-68.
- 689 (38) Sharp RL, Troup JP, Costill DL. Relationship between power and sprint freestyle
690 swimming. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1982;14(1):53-6.
- 691 (39) Sheppard J, Hobson S, Barker M, Taylor K, Chapman D, McGuigan M, Newton R. The
692 effect of training with accentuated eccentric load counter-movement jumps on strength
693 and power characteristics of high-performance volleyball players. *Int J Sports Sci*
694 *Coach.* 2008;3(3):355-63.

- 695 (40) Solberg PA, Hopkins WG, Ommundsen Y, Halvari H. Effects of three training types on
696 vitality among older adults: A self-determination theory perspective. *Psychology of*
697 *Sport and Exercise*. 2012;13:407-17.
- 698 (41) Suchomel TJ, Comfort P, Stone MH. Weightlifting pulling derivatives: rationale for
699 implementation and application. *Sports Med*. 2015;45(6):823-39.
- 700 (42) Tricoli V, Lamas L, Carnevale R, Ugrinowitsch C. Short-term effects on lower-body
701 functional power development: weightlifting vs. vertical jump training programs. *J*
702 *Strength Cond Res*. 2005;19(2):433-7.
- 703 (43) Vikne H, Refsnes PE, Ekmark M, Medbo JJ, Gundersen V, Gundersen K. Muscular
704 performance after concentric and eccentric exercise in trained men. *Med Sci Sports*
705 *Exerc*. 2006;38(10):1770-81.
- 706 (44) Vogt M, Hoppeler HH. Eccentric exercise: mechanisms and effects when used as
707 training regime or training adjunct. *J Appl Physiol (1985)*. 2014;116(11):1446-54.
- 708 (45) Wilson GJ, Walshe AD, Fisher MR. The development of an isokinetic squat device:
709 reliability and relationship to functional performance. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup*
710 *Physiol*. 1997;75(5):455-61.

711

712

Table 1. Overview of the three training interventions: Olympic weightlifting (OWL), motorized strength and power training (MSPT), and free weight strength and power training (FSPT). The MSPT group trained isokinetic squats and the speed of the concentric phase is given in meter per sec (m/s). For the MSPT and FSPT groups, CMJ loads (including single leg squats) are given as percentage of 1RM in the bilateral squat. For the MSPT group, the CMJs were conducted with augmented eccentric loads given as percentage of the concentric loads (i.e., 120 % ecc could mean a 50 kg concentric load and a 60 kg eccentric load).

OWL		MSPT		FSPT	
Sessions 1-6		Sessions 1-6		Sessions 1-6	
Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5	Warm-up. (increasing effort during the set)	1x10	Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5
Clean with front squat	4x5RM	Squat 0.4 m/s	2x5	Squat	3x5RM
Hang clean	3x5RM	Single leg squat 0.4 m/s	2x2x5	Single leg squat	2x2x5RM
Snatch	2x5RM	CMJ 60% of 1RM + 120% ecc.	2x5	CMJ 60% of 1RM	2x5
Power jerk behind the neck	3x5RM	Single leg CMJ 20% of 1RM + 120% ecc.	2x2x5	Single leg CMJ 20% of 1RM	2x2x5
Sessions 7, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15		Sessions 7, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15		Sessions 7, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15	
Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5	Warm-up. (increasing effort during the set)	1x10	Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5
Snatch	4x4RM	CMJ 40% of 1RM + 130% ecc.	3x5	CMJ 40% of 1RM	3x5
Hang clean	4x4RM	Single leg CMJ 15% of 1RM + 130% ecc.	2x5	Single leg CMJ 15% of 1RM	2x2x5
Clean with front squat	4x5RM	Squat 0.3 m/s	3x5	Squat	5x4RM
Power jerk behind the neck	4x4RM	Single leg squat 0.3 m/s	2x5	Single leg squat	2x3x5RM
Sessions 8, 11 and 14 (power only)		Sessions 8, 11 and 14 (power only)		Sessions 8, 11 and 14 (power only)	
Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5	Warm-up. (increasing effort during the set)	1x10	Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5
Power clean	5x3RM	CMJ 40% of 1RM + 130% ecc.	3x5	CMJ 40% of 1RM	3x5
Hang clean	3x3RM	Single leg squat 15% of 1RM + 130% ecc.	2x3x5	Single leg CMJ 15% of 1RM	2x3x5
Hang snatch	3x3RM				
Sessions 16, 18 and 19		Sessions 16, 18 and 19		Sessions 16, 18 and 19	
Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5	Warm-up. (increasing effort during the set)	1x10	Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5
Snatch	5x3RM	CMJ 20% of 1RM + 140% ecc.	4x5	CMJ 20% of 1RM	4x5
Hang clean	5x3RM	Single leg CMJ 10% of 1RM + 140% ecc.	2x2x5	Single leg CMJ 10% of 1RM	2x2x5
Clean with front squat	4x5RM	Squat 0.2 m/s	4x5	Squat	6x3RM
Power jerk behind the neck	4x3RM	Single leg squat 0.2 m/s	2x2x5	Single leg squat	2x3x5RM
Session 17 (power only)		Session 17 (power only)		Session 17 (power only)	
Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5	Warm-up. (increasing effort during the set)	1x10	Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5
Power clean	5x3RM	CMJ 20% of 1RM + 140% ecc.	4x5	CMJ 20% of 1RM	4x5
Hang clean	3x3RM	Single leg CMJ 10% of 1RM + 140% ecc.	2x3x5	Single leg CMJ 10% of 1RM	2x3x5
Hang snatch	3x3RM				
Session 20 (power only)		Session 20 (power only)		Session 20 (power only)	
Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5	Warm-up. (increasing effort during the set)	1x10	Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5
Power clean	5x3RM	CMJ 20% of 1RM + 140% ecc.	2x5	CMJ 20% of 1RM	3x5
Hang clean	3x3RM	Single leg squat 10% of 1RM + 140% ecc.	2x1x5	Single leg CMJ at 10% of 1RM	2x2x5
Hang snatch	3x3RM				
Session 21		Session 21		Session 21	
Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5	Warm-up. (increasing effort during the set)	1x10	Warm-up. (40, 60, 80% of training load)	3x5
Snatch	3x3RM	CMJ 20% of 1RM + 140% ecc.	2x5	CMJ 20% of 1RM	2x5
Hang clean	3x3RM	Single leg CMJ 10% of 1RM + 140% ecc.	2x1x5	Single leg CMJ 10% of 1RM	2x2x5
Clean with front squat	3x5RM	Squat 0.2 m/s	2x5	Squat	3x3RM
Power jerk behind the neck	3x3RM	Single leg squat 0.2 m/s	2x1x5	Single leg squat	2x2x5RM

CMJ: Countermovement jump; RM: Repetition Maximum; Ecc: Eccentric load.

Table 2. Simple statistics for the main variables in each group at baseline.

	All (N=39) Mean ± SD	OWL (n=13) Mean ± SD	FSPT (n=13) Mean ± SD	MSPT (n=13) Mean ± SD
1 RM squat (kg)	112 ± 25	109 ± 28	116 ± 27	111 ± 23
Counter movement jump (cm)	37.4 ± 6.8	35.8 ± 8.8	39.3 ± 5.2	37.0 ± 6.1
Squat jump (cm)	35.0 ± 6.4	33.7 ± 8.2	36.6 ± 5.6	34.6 ± 5.1
Drop jump 40 (cm)	36.8 ± 6.9	35.4 ± 8.5	38.7 ± 5.9	36.4 ± 6.3
Peak power (W)	1847 ± 388	1786 ± 490	1946 ± 362	1809 ± 301
Power 40/80kg (W)	1618 ± 365	1571 ± 449	1736 ± 321	1547 ± 309
30 m sprint (s)	4.29 ± 0.26	4.38 ± 0.37	4.19 ± 0.17	4.32 ± 0.19
20-30 m flying (s)	1.27 ± 0.09	1.30 ± 0.13	1.24 ± 0.06	1.28 ± 0.06
Bodyweight (kg)	78 ± 12	76 ± 15	80 ± 12	78 ± 11
Lean body mass (kg)	60.3 ± 11.0	58.8 ± 14.0	62.1 ± 10.4	59.9 ± 8.5
Fat mass (kg)	13.4 ± 3.9	13.2 ± 3.8	13.4 ± 2.7	13.6 ± 5.1
m. vastus lateralis fascicle angle	21.3 ± 2.9	21.2 ± 3.1	21.5 ± 3.4	21.2 ± 2.4
m. vastus lateralis fascicle length	74.6 ± 10.0	73.9 ± 10.8	77.4 ± 9.5	72.8 ± 9.9
m. vastus lateralis thickness	26.8 ± 3.8	26.1 ± 4.5	28.0 ± 3.8	26.4 ± 3.0
m. rectus femoris thickness	16.6 ± 3.1	15.3 ± 3.8	17.3 ± 2.6	17.4 ± 2.6
Total training volume (kg)	58084 ± 13080	59876 ± 18595	55674 ± 9067	58700 ± 10178

^aMagnitude thresholds (for difference in means divided by baseline SD of the total sample): <0.20, trivial; 0.20-0.59, small; 0.60-1.19, moderate; >1.20, large.

Asterisks indicate effects clear at the 5% level and likelihood that the true effect is substantial, as follows: *possible, **likely, ***very likely, ****most likely.

OWL: Olympic-style weightlifting

FSPT: Free weight strength and power training

MSPT: Motorized strength and power training

Table 3. Percent changes across groups and magnitude-based inferences for the changes when adjusted to baseline mean, bodyweight and total training volume.

	OWL (n=13)		FSPT (n=13)		MSPT (n=13)	
	Mean change \pm SD	Inference	Mean change \pm SD	Inference	Mean change \pm SD	Inference
Performance tests						
1 RM squat	3.4 \pm 7.9	trivial \uparrow	11.4 \pm 4.0	small \uparrow *** ¹	13.4 \pm 4.3	sm/mod \uparrow *** ¹
Counter movement jump	0.8 \pm 6.2	trivial \uparrow	5.0 \pm 4.5	small \uparrow *** ¹	3.3 \pm 6.0	trivial \uparrow
Squat jump	1.2 \pm 7.7	trivial \uparrow	5.4 \pm 2.5	small \uparrow *** ¹	6.2 \pm 5.3	small \uparrow *** ¹
Drop jump 40	-0.4 \pm 6.7	trivial \downarrow	1.0 \pm 6.9	trivial \uparrow	6.1 \pm 7.7	small \uparrow *** ^{1,2}
Peak power	2.6 \pm 5.2	trivial \uparrow	8.1 \pm 10.9	small \uparrow *** ¹	6.1 \pm 2.8	small \uparrow **
Power 40/80kg	5.9 \pm 8.1	small \uparrow **	10.1 \pm 8.7	small \uparrow ***	12.6 \pm 9.4	sm/mod \uparrow *** ¹
30 m sprint	-0.5 \pm 1.8	trivial \uparrow ²	0.7 \pm 1.3	trivial \downarrow	-1.3 \pm 1.7	small** \uparrow ²
20-30 m flying	0.5 \pm 2.0	trivial \downarrow	-0.2 \pm 2.5	trivial \downarrow	-1.5 \pm 2.0	small \uparrow *** ¹
Body composition						
Bodyweight	0.3 \pm 2.2	trivial \uparrow	0.5 \pm 2.8	trivial \uparrow	0.5 \pm 2.2	trivial \uparrow
Lean mass (total)	0.7 \pm 2.2	trivial \uparrow	1.2 \pm 2.9	trivial \uparrow	2.0 \pm 3.5	trivial \uparrow
Lean mass legs	-0.4 \pm 2.7	trivial \uparrow	1.3 \pm 2.6	trivial \uparrow	2.2 \pm 3.2	trivial \uparrow
Lean mass arms	3.3 \pm 3.8	trivial \uparrow	0.1 \pm 4.3	trivial \uparrow	2.1 \pm 4.5	trivial \uparrow
Fat mass	-1.3 \pm 5.8	trivial \downarrow	-3.3 \pm 10.9	trivial \downarrow	-0.6 \pm 12.5	trivial \downarrow
Bone mass	0.3 \pm 1.1	trivial \uparrow	0.8 \pm 0.7	trivial \uparrow	0.8 \pm 0.9	trivial \uparrow
m. vastus lateralis fascicle angle	2.2 \pm 5.7	trivial \uparrow	2.0 \pm 5.6	trivial \uparrow	5.4 \pm 6.9	small \uparrow *** ^{1,2}
m. vastus lateralis fascicle length	0.2 \pm 7.1	trivial \uparrow	1.7 \pm 6.7	trivial \uparrow	-0.4 \pm 5.9	trivial \downarrow
m. vastus lateralis thickness	2.8 \pm 4.0	trivial \uparrow	3.8 \pm 4.8	small \uparrow **	6.1 \pm 3.3	small \uparrow *** ¹
m. rectus femoris thickness	2.8 \pm 9.1	trivial \uparrow	5.4 \pm 7.7	small \uparrow **	6.6 \pm 6.5	small \uparrow **

Magnitude thresholds (for mean change divided by baseline SD of the total sample): <0.20, trivial; 0.20-0.59, small; 0.60-1.19, moderate; >1.20, large.

Asterisks indicate effects clear at the 5% level and likelihood that the true effect is substantial or trivial, as follows: *possible, **likely, ***very likely, ****most likely. **is significant at p<.05. Differences between groups are marked with numbers:

¹ Different to Olympic-style weightlifting (OWL)¹ Different to Olympic strength training

² Different to Free weight strength and power training (FSPT)

³ Different to Motorized strength and power training (MSPT)