‘Pushing’ versus ‘holding’ isometric muscle actions; what we know and where to go: A scoping and systematic review with meta-analyses

Running head: Pushing vs holding isometrics

Dustin J Oranchuk[1], André R Nelson[2], Danny Lum[3,4], Alex O Natera[5], Frank N Bittmann[6], Laura V Schaefer[6,7,8]*

1. Muscle Morphology, Mechanics, and Performance Laboratory, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, School of Medicine, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO, United States
2. Institute for Health and Sport, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia
3. Sport Science and Sport Medicine, High Performance Sport Institute, Singapore
4. Sport and Exercise Science, School of Allied Health, Human Services and Sport, La Trobe University, Victoria, Australia
5. Sport Science, New South Wales Institute of Sport, Sydney Olympic Park, NSW, Australia
6. Regulative Physiology and Prevention, Department of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany
7. Center of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, University Hospital Brandenburg, Brandenburg Medical School Theodor Fontane, Brandenburg an der Havel, Germany
8. Faculty of Health Sciences, Joint faculty of University of Potsdam, Brandenburg Medical School Theodor Fontane and Brandenburg Technical University Cottbus-Senftenberg, Brandenburg, Germany

ORCIDs:

DJO: 0000-0003-4489-9022

ARN: 0000-0002-8162-7483

DL: 0000-0002-8908-3791

AON: 0000-0003-0442-6589

FNB: 0000-0003-4514-8060

LVS: 0000-0002-6289-6987

***Corresponding authors:** Laura V Schaefer. Brandenburg a.d. Havel, Brandenburg, Germany. dr.laura.schaefer@mhb-fontane.de

Word count: 10695

Tables: 1

Figures: 10

Supplementary Tables: 3

Supplementary Figures: 1

DECLARATIONS

Funding: The publication was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project no. 491466077.

Conflict of interest: Two authors run for-profit sports performance workshops, often focusing on isometric resistance training. All other authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Data availability: Data used in the meta-analyses are available upon request.

Ethics approval: not applicable.

Consent to participate/for publication: not applicable.

Author contributions: DJO conceptualized the review topic and formed the research team. DJO and ARN fine-tuned the research question and review methods. DJO and ARN performed the literature search and initial screenings. DJO, LVS, DL, AON and ARN assessed inclusion and quality/bias studies. DJO and LVS extracted data, while ARN and FNB checked the extracted data for accuracy. DJO, LVS and ARN performed the statistical analyses and created the figures. DJO wrote the first draft of the title, abstract, introduction and methods. DJO and LVS wrote the first draft of the results. All authors contributed to the discussion's first draft and approved the manuscript's final version

List of abbreviations:

AF: Adaptive force

EEG: Electroencephalography

EMG: Electromyography

aEMG: Electromyographic amplitude
sEMG: Surface electromyography
HIMA: Holding isometric muscle actions
HR: Heart rate
MAP: Mean arterial pressure
MMG: Mechanomyography
MTG: Mechanotendography
MVIC: Maximal voluntary isometric contraction
PIMA: Pushing/pulling isometric muscle actions
PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
RMS: Root-mean-squared
RPE: Ratings of perceived exertion
TMS: Transcranial magnetic stimulation
TTF: Time to task failure

ABSTRACT

Background: Pushing/pulling isometric muscle actions (PIMA) are commonly used to assess strength, fatigability, and neuromechanical function, whereas holding isometric muscle actions (HIMA), applied in rehabilitation and performance settings, remain less clearly defined and comparatively understudied. Evidence suggests that PIMA and HIMA may elicit distinct neural and cardiovascular responses, yet inconsistent operational definitions complicate interpretation and application. This review synthesized research directly comparing PIMA and HIMA to clarify their physiological profiles, identify research gaps and explore practical relevance. **Methods:** The protocol was pre-registered with PROSPERO (CRD42024530386). Databases were searched for peer-reviewed studies comparing PIMA and HIMA. Study quality and risk-of-bias were evaluated, and meta-analyses and meta-regressions were performed on time-to-task-failure (TTF), ratings of perceived exertion (RPE), heart rate (HR), and mean arterial pressure (MAP). **Results:** Fifty-four studies (publication year 2012.9±6.9; 1995-2024) were identified (N=919 participants; ~29.8±10.7 years). Thirty-five studies reported performance measures, 45 examined neural outputs, and 14 assessed cardiovascular or metabolic responses. Meta-analysis revealed longer TTF for PIMA vs. HIMA at the same absolute intensity (n=407; g=−0.74, p<0.001), except for two studies on axial muscles (g=1.78–3.59, p<0.001). Individual-study patterns suggest diminishing TTF differences at higher intensities; however, since two other studies found clear differences, this may reflect methodological heterogeneity rather than a true intensity effect. No significant differences were identified for HR, MAP, or RPE at relative time points, except for higher RPE at 50%TTF during PIMA. Qualitatively, PIMA was associated with higher peak torques and discharge rates, whereas HIMA was associated with higher burst rates, glucose uptake, and force fluctuation increases. **Conclusions:** These mechanistic distinctions may hold practical relevance as PIMA may be beneficial for prolonged activation and agonist neuromuscular adaptations. In contrast, HIMA could provide diagnostic value, injury-prevention potential, and time-efficient muscular, neural, and cardiovascular adaptations in rehabilitation. Methods varied widely across studies, making additional meta-analyses impossible. Randomized controlled trials are required to confirm the use of PIMA vs HIMA in clinical or performance contexts.

Keywords: concentric, eccentric, fatigue, force task, neuromuscular, physiology, position task, strength

Key Points

- Pushing/pulling and holding isometric actions produce distinct neuromuscular and physiological responses and should not be considered equivalent.
- Pushing/pulling actions generally support longer force maintenance, with task- and muscle-specific exceptions.
- Neural, mechanical, and metabolic characteristics differ, with pushing/pulling emphasizing antagonist force output while holding is more neuromuscular complex and metabolically taxing.
- These differences suggest divergent applications, with pushing/pulling suited to performance goals and holding suited to rehabilitation and specific diagnostic contexts.

1 INTRODUCTION

Different muscle action types (i.e., concentric, isometric, eccentric) are commonly used in research to examine acute physiological responses. They are also essential in clinical and sports performance settings to elicit specific morphological, neuromuscular, and performance adaptations through tailored movements and workloads [1, 2]. While concentric and eccentric actions are often highlighted for their distinct metabolic costs and adaptation profiles, including neuromuscular cross-education, muscle fascicle length, and region-specific hypertrophy [2], the importance of differentiating between two distinct types of isometric muscle actions has been underemphasized. Foundational studies have long demonstrated that different types of isometric tasks exhibit distinct neurophysiological [3-6] and metabolic [7, 8] characteristics. More recent investigations further highlight the need to recognize and distinguish the two types of isometric muscle actions, as they exhibit unique acute responses across multiple neurological and neuromuscular parameters [9-12], potentially influencing outcomes and application [1, 13].

Research examining muscle action types has existed since at least 1895, with Adolph Fick examining cardiac muscle under isometric conditions [14]. However, isometrics are commonly thought of as a single category of muscle action. There has been a recent surge in studies comparing 'two modes' of isometric muscle actions [9, 10] and hybrid muscle actions such as 'quasi-isometrics' [15-19] and 'Adaptive Force' [20-28]. The two distinctive forms are known by several names, including pushing/pulling (PIMA) and holding (HIMA) isometric muscle actions [9], force and position tasks [3], and overcoming and yielding isometrics [29]. Regardless of the semantics, PIMA involves exerting force against an immovable object (e.g., a strain-gauge, a wall, or a power rack). Conversely, HIMA is defined as maintaining a set position while resisting an external force (e.g., gravity, inertially loaded weight, cable stack, training partner, examiner) (**Figure 1**).



Figure 1. Examples of single-joint pushing/pulling and holding isometric muscle actions. (images adapted from Rudroff et al. [7] and Pasco et al. [30]).

While PIMAs are far more common in sports medicine and physiological research [1], typically as a means to assess maximal force production capacity [31], several recent studies have utilized HIMA in rehabilitative and performance contexts [32-36]. In parallel with this expanding use, practitioners have shown increasing interest in whether these two forms of isometric muscle action carry distinct practical implications [37-41]. Despite early work demonstrating that force- and position-based tasks differ in neuromechanical control and patterns of fatigue, notable gaps and inconsistencies remain in the literature. Specifically, although multiple studies have reported differences in mechanical [4, 42], neural [9, 11], perceptual [43, 44] and cardiometabolic variables [7, 45, 46], there is still no clear or consistently applied differentiation between PIMA and HIMA, and the physiological, mechanistic and contextual bases for these task-dependent differences

remain poorly characterized. Therefore, the primary purpose of this review was to systematically gather and evaluate research directly comparing PIMA and HIMA to determine whether objective measures support their distinction. A secondary aim was to use the available evidence to inform recommendations for researchers and practitioners.

2 METHODS

The protocol for the present review was prospectively registered at the National Institute of Health Research PROSPERO (CRD42024530386). This systematic review conformed to the "Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses" (PRISMA) guidelines [47]. Therefore, no Institutional Review Board approval was necessary.

2.1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

All included studies met the inclusion criteria: 1) published in English; 2) peer-reviewed journal publications or doctoral dissertations; 3) human participants; and 4) evaluated the mechanical, neurological, perceptual, or physiological effects of PIMA and HIMA. Studies were excluded if they: 1) were conference proceedings (papers, posters, presentations); and 2) did not include both PIMA and HIMA.

2.2 Literature search strategy

The initial search utilized CINAHL, Embase, MEDLINE, PubMed and Web of Science databases from inception to January 2023. Terms were searched for within the article title, abstract, and keywords using conjunctions 'OR' and 'AND' with truncation '*'. Boolean phrases comprising the search terms were: (isometric* OR static*) AND (contraction* OR action* OR task*) AND (holding OR position) AND (pushing OR force). No limiters or filters were applied. Secondary searches included: a) screening the reference lists of included studies; b) forward citation tracking; c) search alerts to monitor new search results; and d) contacting the most common authors of included outputs. Database searching was re-run regularly; with the final search in August 2025.

2.3 Study selection

Database results were uploaded to the EndNote reference manager (vX9.0.3; Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, PA) and utilized to remove 3080 duplicates, while 22 duplicates were manually identified and removed. The remaining publications were uploaded to the Rayyan

systematic review software, where titles and abstracts were independently screened for eligibility by two authors blinded to each other's decisions. Three authors then independently screened the full texts to finalize eligibility for inclusion. All disagreements were resolved through discussion, with the lead author making the final decision.

Because terminology surrounding PIMA and HIMA is inconsistent, all studies were evaluated against the operational definitions established for this review. Specifically, we examined whether the task involved force generation against an external resistance (PIMA) or position maintenance against an externally applied load (HIMA), regardless of the terminology used by the original authors (e.g., “pushing”, “force task”, “holding”, “position task”).

2.4 Data extraction

A spreadsheet was used to record extracted data, including: 1) publication details; 2) participant information; 3) key equipment; 4) condition details; 5) means, standard deviation and, where available, raw data; and 6) reported statistical outputs. Corresponding authors were contacted via email if insufficient data were reported. Three authors independently completed data extraction, with the other three cross-checking the spreadsheet. Any differences were resolved via discussion, with the lead author finalizing each decision.

WebPlotDigitizer (v4.1; https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/) was used to extract data from figures when raw values were unavailable. Images were exported from PDFs as high-resolution files. Means were estimated from the midpoint of error bars; when bars were asymmetric (e.g., triangles), the midpoint of the symmetrical error bars (SD or SE) was used instead. Upper error bars were digitized unless obscured by overlapping symbols, in which case lower bars were used. When error bars were embedded within the mean symbol, the largest plausible error was estimated by manually overlaying the bar width, which could overestimate the error for data points with minimal variability. When not otherwise stated, we assumed no missing samples and calculated standard deviations from reported standard errors using the study’s sample size.

2.5 Risk-of-bias and study quality

Studies that met the inclusion criteria were assessed to determine their risk-of-bias and methodological and statistical reporting quality based on established scales. Although several risk-of-bias tools are available, most tools are designed to evaluate intervention studies. Therefore, these assessments include criteria (e.g., control group, participant allocation, participants lost

before follow-up) that are irrelevant to observational and acute studies. Thus, we created unique risk-of-bias and quality assessments by combining the most relevant criteria from standard tools while adding other qualities deemed valuable by the present authorship.

The classification of the research study design was based on that presented by Manjali and Gupta [48] and used questions adapted from the Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine [49]. Degree of internal validity was assessed by incorporating the Joanna Briggs Institute checklist for quasi-experimental studies [50], with the 2024 revision of the critical appraisal tool. Additional publication reporting-quality questions were posed based on statistical guidelines [51], participant characteristics (e.g., demographics, evaluated characteristics) and training status stratification [52].

Hence, the six risk-of-bias domains were 'Clear cause-and-effect relationships', 'Thorough study population and participant details' (e.g., age, sex, training and health status, maximal voluntary isometric contraction (MVIC)), 'Reliable exposure', 'Reliable outcome measures', 'Selective reporting', and 'Overall'. The methodological and reporting quality domains were 'Repeated condition and outcome measurements', 'Appropriate statistical analysis', 'Exact *p*-values', 'Effect sizes', 'Confidence intervals', and 'Overall'.

Two authors independently completed the risk-of-bias and quality assessments, with a third author settling any discrepancies. Two authors who have published widely on PIMA vs HIMA were not involved in the risk-of-bias or quality assessments. The results were uploaded to the Robvis RoB 2.0 visualization tool [53], producing the 'traffic-light' and 'summary' plots. Paint-3D (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA) was used to edit and combine plots for clarity.

2.6 Statistical analysis

2.6.1 Calculation of effect sizes

Raw data, effect sizes, and *p*-values were extracted to a spreadsheet. Extracted raw data were used to calculate standardized mean differences (Cohen's effect size [*d*]) between PIMA and HIMA conditions. Standardized mean differences were interpreted as: trivial<0.20, small=0.20-0.49, moderate=0.50-0.79, and large>0.80 [54]. Studies already reporting effect sizes were double-checked where possible. Results were distilled to statistically significant ($p<0.05$), or 'non-trivial' ($d\geq0.20$) between-condition differences. Standardized mean differences were calculated for all possible time points and variables using the following equation:

$$\text{Cohen's } d=(\text{MeanPIMA}-\text{MeanHIMA})/(\text{pooledSD})$$

Percentage differences between PIMA and HIMA conditions were also calculated and reported where appropriate using the following equation:

$$\%\Delta=((\text{HIMA}-\text{PIMA})/\text{PIMA})\times 100$$

2.6.2 Meta-analytic synthesis

Meta-analytical procedures were performed using SPSS (Version 29.0, IBM Corp; Armonk, NY). Upon careful examination of the extracted data, the authors agreed that time-to-task-failure (TTF), ratings of perceived exertion (RPE), heart rate (HR), and mean arterial pressure (MAP) data were collected and reported with sufficient detail and consistency to warrant meta-analysis. For example, while several studies examined myoelectrical variables, some reported percent change, while others provided standardized effect sizes; thus, meta-analysis was contraindicated. Other variables, such as silent periods (N=3, interspike intervals (N=2), burst-rates (N=4), mechanomyography (MMG) (N=3), oxygen concentrations (N=1), kinematics (N=1), and glucose uptake (N=1), were not reported in enough studies to warrant meta-analysis.

Each study examining TTF provided mean and standard deviation data required to calculate standardized mean differences between PIMA and HIMA. RPE, HR, and MAP data were often reported in figures and extracted (see data extraction). Data were uploaded directly into statistical software to avoid potential human error. However, standardized mean differences were confirmed by manual calculation. Including multiple effects from a single study violates the assumption of independence, as effects from the same study are likely to be more similar than those from other studies and would influence statistical power. However, when only a small proportion of studies report multiple outcomes, dependence might be ignored in a sensitivity analysis [55, 56]. For TTF, four of 23 studies reported multiple outcomes with overlapping participants at different intensities [8, 57], forearm positions [58], or muscle groups [59]. Sensitivity analysis revealed only minor differences in meta-analysis results with single and combined outcomes. Therefore, the forest plots illustrate single outcomes, while statistical results are provided for single and combined outcomes. For combined analysis, the effect sizes from a single study utilizing multiple loading intensities, age groups, or forearm orientations were averaged as a single comparison. Hedges' *g* effect size with adjusted standard error was selected to correct for studies with small sample sizes. A random-effects model with restricted maximum likelihood was chosen because of substantial inter-study variability in age, sex, muscle groups, and loading intensities. Interpretation of the pooled effect size with 95% confidence intervals

(95%CI) was based on the thresholds: trivial<0.20, small=0.20–0.49, medium=0.50–0.79, and large≥0.80 [54]. Were appropriate, bubble plots and subgroup analyses were employed to examine the effect of loading intensity, muscle group, or time relative to TTF. Muscle groups were ordered by typical muscle mass and coded: 1-finger abductors, 2-wrist extensors, 3-ankle dorsi-flexors, 4-elbow flexors, 5-elbow extensors, 6-knee extensors, and 7-trunk extensors [60, 61].

2.6.3 Statistical heterogeneity

The I^2 statistic was used to evaluate study heterogeneity, representing the percentage of total variation in estimated effects across studies due to heterogeneity rather than chance. The I^2 statistic was interpreted as low<25%, moderate=25-50%, and high>50% heterogeneity [62]. Funnel plots were visually examined for excessive asymmetry or multiple studies outside the funnel, suggesting the potential for publication bias [63].

3 RESULTS

The systematic literature search (**Figure 2**) yielded 54 studies fulfilling the inclusion criteria [3-12, 20-25, 30, 42-46, 57-59, 64-92]. Forty-two studies were found through database searching [5, 6, 8-12, 20-25, 30, 43-46, 57, 59, 65, 66, 68-84, 88, 90, 91], while 12 publications were included following reference searches [3, 4, 7, 42, 58, 64, 67, 85-87, 89, 92]. Nine studies not found via database search were from the same laboratory group [7, 42, 58, 64, 67, 85-87, 89]. Thus, the primary investigator of the relevant laboratory was contacted, resulting in an additional study [4].



Figure 2. PRISMA diagram summarizing the literature search strategies.

3.1 Study characteristics

The 54 studies included 919 participants (~619 male, ~263 female, [mean±standard deviation] ~29.8±10.7 years) [3-12, 20-25, 30, 42-46, 57-59, 64-92] with publication years ranging from 1995 [91] to 2024 [20], and mean publication year of 2012.9±6.9. Demographic data are approximate because sex [54, 75, 91] and age [54, 91] were missing or only partially reported in several studies [3, 8, 11, 12, 42, 77, 89]. Ten studies were exclusively male [5-7, 12, 20-22, 25, 58, 82], 41 were mixed sex [3, 4, 8-11, 23, 24, 30, 42-46, 57, 59, 65-79, 81, 83-90, 92], with three not reporting sex [64, 80, 91]. Forty-six studies examined young adults (mean: 21-33.5 years) [3-6, 8-12, 21-25, 42-46, 57-59, 65, 67-71, 74-90, 92], two included older participants (mean: 64-72 years) [20, 73], four young and old sub-groups (mean: 47-52 years) [7, 30, 66, 72], with two not reporting age [64, 91]. Single studies concentrated on specific samples, such as strength and endurance athletes [21], soccer players [23], patients with knee osteoarthritis [20], or participants undergoing experimental joint pain [43, 44].

All 54 studies utilized single-joint actions at the same absolute load [3-12, 20-25, 30, 42-46, 57-59, 64-92]. The most common agonist muscle group was the elbow flexors (n=25) [3, 4, 6, 8, 21-24, 30, 46, 57-59, 67, 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 78, 82, 85, 87, 90, 91], followed by the knee

extensors (n=8) [7, 12, 43, 44, 68, 83, 84, 86]. Finger abductors (n=6) [5, 11, 65, 77, 80, 89], wrist extensors (n=3) [42, 64, 66] and flexors (n=2) [45, 64], ankle dorsi- (n=3) [72, 74, 81] and plantar-flexors (n=3) [69, 79, 92], elbow extensors (n=4) [9, 10, 25, 91], hip/trunk extensors (n=2) [59, 88], knee flexors (n=1) [20], and hip flexors (n=1) [23] were also agonist muscle groups investigated. Bittmann et al. [23] (elbow/hip flexion) and Thomas et al. [59] (trunk extension/elbow flexion) compared PIMA and HIMA across multiple agonist groups. One study included different forearm postures during elbow flexions [85], while another examined elbow flexion with supinated and neutral forearms [58]. Muscle action intensities differed widely, ranging from 3.8-100% (mean: ~34.6±27.8%) of pushing or pulling MVIC. Most studies (n=40) investigated intensities ≤30% MVIC [3-8, 11, 30, 42-44, 57-59, 64-74, 77-80, 82-92], while 14 studies investigated intensities of 40-90% MVIC [5, 8-10, 12, 25, 45, 46, 57, 65, 69, 75, 76, 81], and five studies used adaptive muscle action of >100% MVIC (gradual increase in applied force from submaximal to supramaximal intensities in one trial) [20-24]. Twelve included multiple intensities [3, 5, 8, 10, 30, 57, 65, 66, 69, 75, 79, 91]. Isometric tasks were taken to failure in 30 studies [4, 5, 7-10, 20-25, 42, 46, 57-59, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 76, 78, 84, 86-88, 90].

3.2 Risk-of-bias and study quality

Overall risk-of-bias was minimal (**Figure 3**), with 44 studies assessed as 'low' [5-12, 20-25, 30, 42-46, 58, 59, 65-68, 70, 72, 74-85, 87-90], ten as having 'some concerns' [3, 4, 57, 64, 69, 71, 73, 86, 91, 92], and zero studies flagged for 'high' overall risk-of-bias. Five studies lacked detail regarding study participant [3, 64, 69, 91, 92], and were substantially older (2005.2±8.1, 1995-2015) than the average publication date (2012.9±6.9), suggesting improved reporting and peer-review standards. Neither Buchanan and Lloyd [91] nor Baudry and Enoka [64] reported sex, age, height, mass, or any other demographic information or baseline characteristics. Inclusion and exclusion criteria, physical activity level, and baseline characteristics (e.g., strength, power) were not reported by Garner et al. [69]. Finally, neither Magalhães [92] nor Mathis et al. [3] reported height, mass, inclusion/exclusion criteria, or any baseline characteristics. While no other studies or categories received a 'high' risk-of-bias classification, the most common concern was the lack of in-house or intra-study reliability statistics for most outcome measures [3-8, 11, 30, 42-45, 57-59, 64-75, 79-92]. Like the participant details category, studies reporting reliabilities [9, 10, 12,

20-25, 46, 76-78] have substantially more recent publication dates (2020±4.6) than those that did not (2010.7±6) [3-8, 11, 30, 42-45, 57-59, 64-75, 79-92].



Figure 3. Risk-of-bias assessment illustrations of individual studies (**a**), and all 54 studies pooled (**b**).

Overall quality scores were mostly 'medium' [3-8, 11, 30, 42-45, 57-59, 64-76, 78-90], with 12 studies receiving 'high' scores [9, 10, 12, 20-25, 46, 77, 92] (**Figure 4**). The oldest study [91] was deemed 'low' quality. While all studies were considered to have utilized appropriate statistical analyses (e.g., parametric vs non-parametric tests, use of post-hoc corrections), several

only sometimes [7, 20, 21, 43, 57, 58, 76, 79, 84, 86, 90] or never [4, 59, 68, 73, 75, 87, 91] reported exact *p*-values. Fifteen studies provided effect sizes for all critical conditions and outcome measures [9, 10, 12, 20-25, 46, 59, 76, 77, 90, 92], while confidence interval reporting was only fully present in four studies [20, 21, 25, 92]. Interestingly, only two studies achieving 'high' quality were over eight years old [77, 92], with a mean publication year of 2020.6±3.4 [9, 10, 12, 20-25, 46, 77, 92], highlighting the relative improvement in methodological and statistical reporting quality in recent years.



Figure 4. Methodological and reporting quality of individual studies (**a**), and all 54 studies pooled (**b**).

3.3 Summary of isometric muscle action differences

An overview of the primary non-meta-analytic outcomes, including the total number and types of comparisons (e.g., TTF, RPE increases, discharge rates) and the frequency of statistically significant or potentially meaningful differences, is presented in **Table 1**. All comparisons were at the same absolute load, with quasi-identical joint angles/positions. 360 comparisons were identified, with all comparisons performed at the same absolute load. Fifty-two comparisons were significantly higher for PIMA ($p<0.05$). In contrast, 93 comparisons were significantly higher for HIMA. 201 comparisons were statistically similar between conditions. Notably, an opposite trend emerged when examining standardized effect sizes without considering p-values, with 72 comparisons favoring PIMA, 50 favoring HIMA, and 45 trivial effects (d or $g<0.20$); partially caused by missing effect sizes when significantly higher values were reported for HIMA.

Table 1. Overview of outcomes, including the number of outcomes, direction of statistical significance ($p<0.05$) and standardized effect size.

	Number of outcomes						
	Total	**Significant *p*-value**			**Effect size**		
Parameter		PIMA > HIMA	HIMA > PIMA	n.s.	PIMA > HIMA	HIMA > PIMA	Irrelevant effect
TTF	30	16	2	12	24	3	3
Fluctuations	8	6	1	1	6	1	-
Increase fluctuations	18	4	10	4	6	11	1
Peak torque	3	3	0	-	3	0	-
MVIC decline*	29	0	4	25	7	8	9
RPE 50% TTF	14	-	-	-	8	3	3
RPE 100% TTF	16	0	0	16	3	2	11
RPE increase	16	0	9	6	-	-	-
aEMG agonists	48	5	8	35	-	-	-
aEMG synergists	15	2	2	11	-	-	-
aEMG antagonists	17	1	0	17	-	-	-
Increase aEMG agonists	17	0	8	9	-	-	-
Increase aEMG synergist	10	0	5	5	-	-	-
Increase aEMG antagonists	9	0	4	5	-	-	-
Coactivation	13	0	3	10	-	-	-
EMG burst rate	4	0	2	2	0	2	2
Burst rate increase	3	0	3	0	0	2	0
Discharge rate	12	8	0	4	7	0	0
CV of ISI	7	1	5	1	-	-	-
D1 inhibition	7	5	1	1	5	1	-
Heteronymous reflex	11	1	9	1	-	7	-
HR at end	15	0	0	15	3	4	8
HR increase	12	0	8	4	-	-	-
MAP at end	14	0	1	13	0	6	8
MAP increase	12	0	8	4	-	-	-
TOTAL	**360**	**52**	**93**	**201**	**72**	**50**	**45**

Effect size: Cohen's d or Hedges' $g>0.20$
*Irrespective of epoch of TTF (90% or 100% TTF)

In case the sum of results is not equal to the total number of outcomes the information was not available.
Abbreviations (alphabetical): aEMG=EMG amplitude, CV=coefficient of variation, EMG=electromyography, HIMA=holding isometric muscle action, HR=heart rate, ISI=interspike interval, MAP=mean arterial pressure, MVIC=maximal voluntary isometric contraction, n.s.=non-significant, PIMA=pushing isometric muscle action, RPE=rating of perceived exertion (scale 0-10), TTF=time to task failure

3.4 Performance and mechanical parameters

The 35 studies examining performance and biomechanical differences between PIMA and HIMA are detailed in **Supplementary Table 1** [4-10, 12, 20-24, 42, 44, 46, 57-59, 67, 68, 70-74, 76, 78, 82, 84-88, 90]. Twenty-three studies compared TTF [4, 5, 7-9, 42, 46, 57-59, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 76, 78, 84, 86-88, 90], while two studies investigated the failure rate during paired personal interactions [10, 25]. Twenty-two studies quantified force or position fluctuations or variability throughout each condition [4-6, 8, 12, 42, 44, 57, 58, 67, 68, 70-74, 82, 84-88], 20 studies measured MVIC reductions [5-8, 21, 42, 57, 67, 68, 70-74, 78, 82, 85, 86, 88, 90], five compared the maximal muscle action force capacity [20-24] and 13 compared RPE [4, 5, 57, 58, 68, 70-74, 82, 86, 90].

3.4.1 Time-to-task-failure

Twenty-three studies investigating TTF (n=407) showed almost exclusively longer TTFs for PIMA (718±252 s) vs. HIMA (588±202 s), with a mean percentage difference of −22.4±30.2% (range: −56.2 to 61.5%) [4, 5, 7-9, 42, 46, 57-59, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 76, 78, 84, 86-88, 90]. Although single outcomes were based on partially overlapping or similar participants, the methods (high/low intensities, different forearm positions, different muscles) and results differed vastly. Thus, a combination of outcomes would result in considerable information loss, including levelling of single outcomes. According to Becker [56], and Park and Beretvas [55] dependence can be ignored if only a few studies report multiple outcomes. Sensitivity analysis showed only small differences in Hedges' g of meta-analyses of single vs combined outcomes (g=−0.74 vs −0.70). To avoid loss of information, the forest plot (**Figure 5a**) illustrates the 30 single outcomes across 23 studies. TTF was significantly longer during PIMA with a moderate to large effect (g=−0.74, 95%CI: −1.18 to −0.30, p<0.001, n=407). This significant effect is highlighted by all but two appendicular-focused outputs (both elbow flexors) falling to the right of the neutral (grey) line [57, 90]. Combining outcomes provided a similar result (g=−0.70, 95%CI: −1.13 to −0.27, p<0.001, n=358).



Figure 5. Meta-analysis forest plot (**a**) comparing time to task failure (TTF) between PIMA and HIMA at matched absolute target forces with funnel plot (**b**) and bubble chart regressions for loading intensity (**c**) and appendicular muscle subgroups (**d**).

Twenty-six of 30 outcomes demonstrated shorter TTF for HIMA with percentage differences from –56.2% to –1.3% (g=−3.38 to −0.02). Twenty-four outcomes showed non-trivial effect sizes (g≥0.20) [4, 5, 7-9, 42, 46, 57-59, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 76, 78, 84, 86, 87], while two were negligible (g<0.20) [5, 58]. The latter occurred for the first dorsal interosseous with intensities of 60% MVIC [5] and elbow flexors with vertical forearm position at 20% MVIC [58]. The remaining four outcomes showed the opposite (longer TTF for HIMA) with percentage differences of 1-61% (g=0.07-3.59) [57, 59, 88, 90]. Two of these studies examined axial muscles (trunk extensors) and showed longer TTF for HIMA with large effects (n=34; g=2.63, 95%CI: 0.86-4.40, p<0.001) [59, 88].

For appendicular muscles, 26 of 28 outcomes showed higher TTF for PIMA, with only Williams et al. [90] reporting the opposite (54%, g=0.75, 15% MVIC, elbow flexors). Rudroff et al. [57] found similar between-muscle action TTFs at 60% MVIC (%Δ=1%, g=0.07, elbow flexors). Meta-analysis of TTF with only appendicular muscles, including all outcomes, demonstrated a large effect favoring PIMA (n=373; g=−0.90, 95%CI: −1.18 to −0.62, p<0.001). However, in the three studies that tested multiple intensities, the PIMA–HIMA difference in TTF progressively narrowed as absolute load increased [5, 8, 57]. Across the three studies assessing multiple intensities, non-weighted Hedges' g values were large and negative at 20% MVIC (−3.38, −1.35, −0.70) but contracted markedly at 60% MVIC (0.07, −0.18, −0.54), indicating attenuation of the PIMA–HIMA difference with increasing load (**Figure 5a**). However, these trends are contradicted by Schaefer et al. [9], who utilized high intensities (80% MVIC), and reported significantly longer TTF with PIMA vs HIMA (g=−1.16).

The above meta-analyses were highly heterogeneous (I^2=66% [appendicular], 84% [axial], 85% [combined], 88% [all outcomes]), as confirmed via funnel plot (**Figure 5b**), supporting the use of the random-effects model. Subgroup analysis and meta-regression bubble plots determined negligible effects of loading intensity (**Figure 5c**) and appendicular muscle size (**Figure 5d**). It must be noted that 23 of 30 investigations used intensities ≤30% MVIC [4, 5, 7, 8, 42, 57-59, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 78, 84, 86-88, 90]. Five of the remaining seven performed at higher intensities (45-80% MVIC) showed moderate to high effect sizes (g=−1.37 to −0.35) [8, 9, 46, 57, 76], while the other two were negligible [5, 57].

Related to TTF, Schaefer and Bittmann examined the 'failure rate' during personal interaction of the elbow extensors at 90% MVIC (one partner performed PIMA and the other performed HIMA, in randomized order) [10]. In most trials (85%, $p<0.001$), the partner performing HIMA left the isometric position first, indicating that the pushing partner could maintain the set position longer, supporting the above results for higher intensities.

3.4.2 Fluctuations of force and position

Twenty-two studies (25 outcomes) investigated fluctuations of force or position [4-6, 8, 12, 42, 44, 57, 58, 67, 68, 70-74, 82, 84-88]. Sixteen studies (18 outcomes) compared fluctuation increases between muscle actions [4, 6, 42, 58, 67, 68, 70-74, 82, 85-88]. Of these, ten outcomes showed significantly higher increases for HIMA (d=0.62-1.96) [4, 6, 58, 67, 70, 73, 74, 82, 85, 87], four showed lower increases for HIMA (d=−5.19 to −0.63) [42, 68, 71, 86], while four outcomes were non-significant [72, 85, 88]. The other six studies (eight outcomes) examined fluctuations over the entire trial period [5, 8, 12, 44, 57, 84]. Of these, six showed significantly lower fluctuations in HIMA (d=−3.16 to −0.53) [46, 47, 76, 80], one showed significantly higher fluctuations in HIMA (d=4.05) [59], and one was non-significant (20%MVIC) [84]. While difficult to quantify without meta-analysis, no clear pattern emerged regarding absolute intensity when comparing PIMA and HIMA differences in force or position fluctuations, suggesting that relative intensity may not significantly influence these observations.

3.4.3 Maximal torques and strength declines

Only one research group compared the maximal torques of HIMA ($HIMA_{max}$) and PIMA ($PIMA_{max}$=MVIC) [20-24]. Three studies showed significantly lower $HIMA_{max}$ in healthy participants for elbow extensors (d=−0.74) [24], elbow flexors (d=−2.37) [21], and knee flexors (d=−2.62) [20].

Nineteen studies investigated MVIC declines pre-post HIMA or PIMA tasks to failure [5-8, 42, 57, 67, 68, 70-74, 78, 82, 85, 86, 88, 90]. All 25 outcomes were non-significant, though wide-ranging (d=−0.73-1.57, −40.2-31.3%). Three outcomes (two studies) reported significance following 90%TTF tasks with larger MVIC declines following HIMA ($p\leq0.02$, d=1.48-2.60, 33.2-50%) [7, 67]. Considering the values of relative decline irrespective of the significance and TTF epoch, 15 outcomes showed higher magnitudes of decline for HIMA (d=0.01-1.57, 13±10%) [5, 7, 8, 42, 57, 67, 68, 71, 78, 85, 88, 90], where 13 revealed lower declines following HIMA (d=0.06-0.73, −17±12%) [6, 8, 57, 67, 70, 72-74, 82, 85, 86], One study considered the decline in $PIMA_{max}$

and $HIMA_{max}$ after 30 repeated adaptive supramaximal HIMA trials, with HIMA leading to a 133% greater decline than PIMA [21].

3.4.4 Ratings of perceived exertion

Eleven studies investigated RPE during TTF trials [4, 5, 57, 58, 68, 70, 72-74, 86, 90] with two reporting RPE throughout a trial not taken to failure [71, 82] RPE data was extracted from the figures of several studies [4, 5, 57, 58, 68, 70, 72-74, 86, 90]. Meta-analysis revealed that RPE did not differ significantly at the start or end of TTF (relative time point of total duration) (n=194, g=−0.02 to 0.07, p=0.43-0.84) (**Figure 6a**) [4, 5, 57, 58, 68, 70, 72-74, 86, 90]. However, RPE was significantly higher for PIMA at 50% TTF (n=164, g=−0.31, 95%CI: −0.55 to −0.07, p=0.01) (**Figure 6a**) [4, 5, 57, 58, 68, 72-74, 86]. Bubble plots indicate a positive effect of intensity (**Figure 6b**) and a negative effect of appendicular muscle size (**Figure 6c**), with reverse effects at task initiation (clear) and task failure (low). Considering the significantly shorter TTF for HIMA, the RPE increase rate was higher for HIMA for most studies (**Figure 7**), further supported by two studies reporting faster RPE increases for HIMA over a set time [71, 82]. Apart from two outcomes (both 50%TTF) [58, 72], no apparent intramuscular differences were found with all other confidence limits crossing the overall effects. Furthermore, unlike TTF, there was no apparent effect of intensity within the studies with multiple loads [5, 57].



Figure 6. Meta-analysis forest plot (**a**) comparing ratings of perceived exhaustion (RPE) between PIMA and HIMA with bubble chart regressions for loading intensity (**b**) and appendicular muscle subgroups (**c**).



Figure 7. The relative difference in the rate of increase of ratings of perceived exertion (RPE) between HIMA and PIMA. The rate of increase was calculated from the start, end and TTF values for PIMA and HIMA, respectively. Relative differences=(HIMA-PIMA)/PIMA.

3.5 Neural and neuromuscular parameters

The 45 studies examining neural or neuromuscular differences between PIMA and HIMA are detailed in **Supplementary Table 2** [3-11, 25, 30, 42-45, 57, 58, 64-67, 69-92]. Unlike the mechanical (above) and metabolic (below) variables, more than minimal pooling of findings via meta-analyses or otherwise was impossible due to the exceptional variety of collection methods and data processing. Nearly all studies (n=41) employed surface electromyography (sEMG) [3-5, 7, 8, 11, 30, 42-45, 57, 58, 64-67, 69-92], while five included needle EMG [6, 30, 82, 85, 89], 12 employed intramuscular EMG [4, 5, 43, 58, 65, 70, 71, 73, 80, 82, 87, 91], and three used MMG and mechanotendography (MTG), which mirror oscillatory central activity [9, 10, 25]. Three studies assessed neural function via electroencephalography (EEG) [25, 44, 83]. Twelve studies included peripheral nerve stimulation (electrical, mechanical or magnetic) [3, 11, 42, 45, 64-66, 77, 78, 80, 90, 92], while four studies employed transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) [3, 77, 78, 90]. The diverse data processing methods and outcomes included EMG or MMG amplitudes [4, 7-10, 42, 44, 57, 58, 64-67, 69-71, 73, 78, 82, 85-87, 91], root-mean-square (RMS) [5, 43, 45, 72, 74-76, 83, 84, 88, 90], frequency/power [6, 9, 10, 25, 45, 57, 76, 84, 86, 88], burst rates [4, 72-74], burst durations [4, 73], discharge rates [6, 30, 43, 67, 71, 82, 85, 89], interspike interval CV [30, 67, 71, 85], recruitment rates and thresholds [30, 67, 75, 82], H-reflex [78], heteronymous

539 facilitation [42, 64-66, 77, 80, 92], D1-inhibition [42, 64, 66, 92], D2-inhibition [92], T-reflex
540 amplitude [65], silent period [3, 77, 78, 90], and coactivation ratios [7, 8, 42, 57, 66, 70, 72, 74,
541 81, 85, 86]. Three studies investigated the coherence of muscle and brain activity [25, 44, 83].
542 Thirty-one studies examined antagonist muscle groups [3, 5, 7, 8, 30, 42-44, 57, 58, 65-67, 70-76,
543 78, 80-87, 91, 92], while 34 assessed synergists [3-5, 7-10, 25, 42-44, 57, 58, 64-67, 70-74, 77,
544 80, 82-88, 90-92]. Four studies had specific focuses, including injection-induced experimental
545 joint pain [43, 44], residual force enhancement [81], and skin and core temperature manipulation
546 [45].

547 *3.5.1 Neuromuscular activity*

548 EMG amplitude differences (aEMG or RMS) were mostly non-significant for agonist
549 muscles. For example, only five of 48 relevant outcomes [4, 5, 7, 8, 42, 57, 58, 64-67, 69-76, 78,
550 83-88, 90, 91] resulted in greater agonist activation during PIMA (*d*=0.66-6.79, 25.5-38.1%) [4,
551 57, 58, 73, 78], whereas eight outcomes were greater during HIMA (*d*=0.22-0.72, 11.8-25%) [67,
552 72, 87, 91]. Eight of 17 outcomes [4, 5, 57, 67, 72-74, 76, 78, 85, 86, 90] showed a significantly
553 greater increase of EMG amplitude in agonists during HIMA (*d*=0.46-0.99, 0.1-3566%) [5, 57, 67,
554 72, 74, 86], with none favoring PIMA. Regarding synergist muscles, two of 15 outcomes [4, 8, 57,
555 65, 67, 70, 74, 88, 91] reported greater EMG amplitude during HIMA (*d*=0.42-0.72, 22.8-41.4%)
556 [57], with two favoring PIMA (*d*=0.46, −21.6%) [74, 91]. Five of 10 outcomes [4, 42, 57, 67, 72,
557 74] had greater synergist EMG amplitude increases in EMG amplitude during HIMA (*d*=0.43-
558 3.16, 0.5-81%) [4, 57, 72, 74], with the other five showing no significant differences. For
559 antagonist muscles, of 17 relevant outcomes [7, 8, 42, 64-67, 70, 71, 75, 76, 78, 83-87], only one
560 was significant, with greater EMG amplitude for PIMA [84]. In four of nine relevant outcomes [5,
561 67, 72-74, 76, 78] the increase in antagonist EMG was significantly higher during HIMA (*d*=0.40-
562 0.82, 63-600%) [72, 74, 76].

563 Agonist EMG burst rate was significantly greater during HIMA in five of seven outcomes
564 (*d*=0.20-0.69, 35.7-210.5%) [4, 72-74]. One study considered the antagonist burst rates, without
565 significant between-task differences [73]. Discharge rates were significantly lower for HIMA in
566 eight of 12 outcomes (*d*=0.52-4.56, −28 to −10.5%) [30, 67, 71, 82, 85] while the remaining four
567 were non-significant (e.g., in older participants or for neutral forearm position) [30, 82, 85, 89].
568 Discharge rates declined significantly more during HIMA in all outcomes [71, 82]. Interspike
569 interval CV was greater or increased faster during HIMA in five of seven outcomes (*d*=0.57-2.31,

23.9-625%) [30, 67, 71, 85], with a single outcome favoring PIMA with large target force differences in young participants (*d*=0.64, −20.3%) and a non-significant result in older participants [30].

The H-reflex amplitude significantly decreased more, and faster during HIMA (*d*=1.35, 72%).[78] Heteronymous facilitation was greater for HIMA in nine of 11 outcomes (*d*=0.21-1.32, 5.22-34.6%) [64-66, 77, 80, 92]. One outcome was significantly lower (p=0.049) for HIMA at task failure [42]; differences in older adults were non-significant [66]. D1-inhibition was lower for HIMA in five of seven outcomes ($p \leq 0.042$, *d*=−0.71 to −3.6, −14.3 to −34%) [42, 64, 66, 92]. One study revealed a significantly lower D1-inhibition during HIMA after 120s, with a reversed direction of effect at task termination (*d*=1.57, 33%) [42]. D1-inhibition did not differ significantly between tasks for old participants [66]. The coactivation ratio was non-significant between muscle actions in ten of 13 outcomes [7, 8, 42, 57, 66, 70, 74, 85, 86]. Significantly greater coactivation was found during HIMA wrist extensions for older participants [66] and ankle dorsiflexion [72].

Schaefer and Bittmann used MMG and MTG to examine the elbow extensors during 80% and 90% MVIC muscle actions in a single-person setting [9] or during inter-participant interaction [10]. PIMA led to significantly greater triceps MMG amplitude [9], while HIMA showed significantly greater power in the MTG of the triceps tendon across 8-29 Hz frequencies [9]. For the single-person setting, the amplitude of the oblique muscle varied significantly less between HIMA vs PIMA trials [9]. In the paired setting, the obliques amplitude variation within-trials was significantly higher for HIMA [10]. While HIMA led to a significantly lower power of obliques' MMG (*d*=0.28-0.39, −33 to −50%), PIMA showed a significantly higher power-frequency ratio (*d*=0.36-0.66, 24.7-57.4%) and frequency variation between trials [10].

3.5.2 Brain activity

Three studies included measures of brain activity via EEG [25, 44, 83]. Poortvliet et al. [44, 83] investigated the knee extensors (10% MVIC, 30s) and reported non-significant differences between tasks for corticomuscular coherence (only central areas of EEG were used that approximated the motor cortex of the left hemisphere), but significantly lower cortico-cortical coherence for HIMA (four of five outcomes; $p<0.001$, *d*=0.09-0.27, −5 to −14.5%) and significantly higher beta-band EEG power of the left hemisphere ($p<0.05$, *d*=0.11, 0.68%) [83]. Schaefer and Bittmann [25] examined the coherence between EEGs (central, left and right areas), MMGs (triceps brachii and ipsilateral abdominal external oblique muscles; statistics did not

consider muscles separately) and force-signal during interpersonal actions of elbow extensors (70% MVIC of the weaker partner, fatiguing, n=2). Significantly higher values were revealed for HIMA regarding EEG coherence (central and left areas) to the partner's MMG (inter-brain-muscle coherence), force-EEG-coherence (central and right area) and the frequency of inter-brain-synchrony (central vs left and central vs right) and inter-brain-muscle-coherence (EEG right vs MMG), respectively ($p \leq 0.047$, d=0.36-2.67, 5.1-67.6%) [25].

3.5.3 Special factors

Coletta et al. [45] reported greater RMS of the EMG signal for HIMA at modest heating and cooling conditions (±0.5°C) during 3s muscle actions. However, non-significant muscle action differences were found during 60s muscle actions at the higher heating (1°C) condition [45]. It must be noted that the RMS was significantly higher for HIMA at baseline. Marion and Power [81] compared PIMA and HIMA following active lengthening of the dorsi-flexors to examine residual force enhancement, with no significant differences between isometric tasks for any outcome (activation reduction, neuromuscular economy, coactivation).

Experiments led by Poortvliet investigated the effects of hypertonic saline injections into the infrapatellar fat pad to temporarily generate knee pain during low-intensity (~10%) knee extensor muscle actions [43, 44]. The first study considered 35 single-motor-units (n=5), which were assessed across all conditions (no pain, pain, HIMA, PIMA) in a single session [43]. Additionally, 189 single-motor-units (n=11) were assessed over two sessions. For the 35 single-motor-units, the no-pain state showed similar RMS and discharge rates between HIMA and PIMA, where the discharge rate variability tended to be higher for PIMA (p=0.05). Under pain, the decline in discharge rate was greater for PIMA. Furthermore, discharge rate variability between no-pain and pain states only changed significantly for PIMA. Considering all 189 single-motor-units, discharge rate was significantly higher for HIMA. However, discharge rate decreased under pain for both tasks, with a trend towards lower discharge rates for PIMA. Moreover, the number of single-motor-unit discharge rates which changed (>10% increase or decrease) from no-pain to pain-state states was twice as high for PIMA (44.9%) than HIMA (22.2%) [43]. The second study by Poortvliet et al. found no significant muscle action differences for corticomuscular coherence [44]. However, only PIMA resulted in significant changes between no-pain and pain states, with lower corticomuscular coherence under pain. Additionally, beta band power decreased while gamma band increased between no-pain and pain during PIMA. Thus, Poortvliet et al. suggested

632 that brain activity is less affected by pain during HIMA [44].

633 **3.6 Cardiovascular and metabolic parameters**

634 Fourteen studies examining cardiovascular or metabolic differences between PIMA and
635 HIMA are detailed in **Supplementary Table 3** [4, 5, 7, 8, 46, 57, 58, 70, 72-74, 82, 86, 87]. Eleven
636 studies assessed HR and MAP [4, 5, 57, 58, 70, 72-74, 82, 86, 87], allowing for meta-analysis.
637 Seven utilized the elbow flexors [4, 57, 58, 70, 73, 82, 87], while others employed the dorsi-flexors
638 [72, 74], knee extensors [86], or first dorsal interossei [5]. Two studies compared parameters of
639 muscle oxygenation using near-infrared spectroscopy on biceps and triceps brachii during elbow
640 flexions at 20% or 60% MVIC [8], or an O2C® spectrophotometer on biceps brachii during elbow
641 flexions at 60% MVIC [46], with both studies reporting non-significant between-task differences.
642 Another study employed computed tomography with venous glucose injection to assess
643 standardized glucose uptake of the agonist (knee extensors), antagonist, and synergist muscles at
644 25% MVIC [7]. While all differences were non-significant in the older population (d=0.13 to 0.26,
645 −7.7 to −4.3%), HIMA resulted in greater glucose uptake into agonist (d=0.68, 32.6%), antagonist
646 (d=0.47, 15.4%), and hip (d=0.19, 9.7%) muscles of the young group [7].

647 HR and MAP data were extracted from the figures of nine studies [4, 5, 57, 58, 70, 72-74,
648 86]. Meta-analyses of 11-15 outcomes (7-9 studies; 29.2±15.7% MVIC, range: 15-60%) found
649 trivial differences in HR (n=136-170, g=−0.11 to 0.15, p=0.12-0.96) and MAP (n=136-170,
650 g=0.04-0.18, p=0.07-0.45) at initiation, 50% TTF and at task failure (**Figure 8a, 9a**) [4, 5, 57, 58,
651 70, 72-74, 86]. While not reaching statistical significance, MAP at task failure was slightly greater
652 during HIMA (n=170, g=0.18, 95%CI: −0.01 to 0.37, p=0.07). Examining bubble plots is
653 complicated by relatively few studies. However, HR tended to be higher for PIMA for larger
654 appendicular muscles at task failure, with the reverse for smaller muscle groups (**Figure 8c**). The
655 opposite appears true when examining MAP during the initial phases (0% and 50% of TTF): the
656 larger the muscle group, the more HIMA seems to elevate MAP when compared to PIMA (**Figure**
657 **9c**). Minimal differences between muscle groups were observed for either HR or MAP, with only
658 a single output's confidence interval falling outside the overall effect (**Figure 9a**) [72]. Similarly,
659 potential within-study intensity effects cannot be reliably inferred from the degree of confidence-
660 interval overlap [5, 57]. Finally, HR and MAP meta-analyses were almost completely
661 homogeneous (all I^2<0.001).



Figure 8. Meta-analysis forest plot (**a**) comparing heart rate (HR) between PIMA and HIMA with bubble chart regressions for loading intensity (**b**) and appendicular muscle subgroups (**c**).



Figure 9. Meta-analysis forest plot (**a**) comparing mean arterial pressure (MAP) between PIMA and HIMA with bubble chart regressions for loading intensity (**b**) and appendicular muscle subgroups (**c**).

669 The rate of HR and MAP increase was higher during HIMA for most studies (**Figure 10**)
670 [4, 5, 57, 58, 70, 72-74, 86]. These data suggest metabolic conditions or consequences contributed
671 to the mostly briefer TTF for HIMA.



672
673 **Figure 10.** The relative difference between HIMA and PIMA regarding the rate of increase in
674 heart rate (HR; dark blue) and mean arterial pressure (MAP; light blue). Note: The rate of increase
675 was calculated from the start, end and TTF values for PIMA and HIMA, respectively. Relative
676 differences=(HIMA-PIMA)/PIMA.

677 **4 DISCUSSION**

678 In sports science and medicine, it is uncommon to differentiate the two isometric muscle
679 action types. PIMA (the most common isometric muscle action) is usually assessed to quantify
680 muscle strength. However, focus is increasingly shifting towards HIMA, which is being utilized
681 more frequently by sports medicine and performance practitioners aiming to improve
682 musculotendinous morphology and neuromuscular function [37-41]. Despite a wealth of studies
683 comparing PIMA and HIMA, it is difficult for researchers and practitioners to understand their
684 potential applications due to the wide range of methods and data reporting. Therefore, we identified
685 and presented all studies directly comparing the isometric muscle action types. The first question
686 was whether two types of isometric muscle action exist. Based on this review, the answer is *yes*:
687 HIMA and PIMA can be differentiated by objective measures. When examining the 54 studies

comparing both isometric types, our findings can be separated into those supported by meta-analysis and those derived from qualitative synthesis. First, meta-analytic results indicated that (1) PIMA leads to longer TTF at the same relative intensity (except for postural axial muscles), although this difference may narrow at higher intensities; and that (2) no consistent differences were evident for RPE, HR, or MAP at matched relative time points. Second, qualitative evidence from the broader literature suggested several additional patterns. PIMA was generally associated with larger force fluctuations, higher discharge rates, greater D1-inhibition, and higher peak torques. HIMA tended to show higher heteronymous facilitation, greater EMG burst rates, higher interspike interval CV, greater glucose uptake in young participants, and faster increases in force or position fluctuations, EMG amplitude, RPE, HR, and MAP. HIMA may also lead to greater declines in MVIC and higher coactivation. Non-significant or unclear differences were observed for absolute EMG amplitude and frequency, MEPs, and oxygenation. Finally, several studies reported differences between HIMA and PIMA in cortico-cortical and corticomuscular coherence, as well as differential responses to experimentally induced joint pain. These qualitative findings should be interpreted cautiously, as most variables beyond TTF, RPE, HR, and MAP were not amenable to meta-analysis and often relied on single-study comparisons or heterogeneous methodologies.

4.1 Distinguishing holding and pushing isometric muscle actions

4.1.1 Muscle fatigability

TTF at the same intensity was the most frequently investigated parameter, resulting in the clearest findings. TTF was significantly longer in appendicular muscles for PIMA, with a large meta-analytic effect (g=0.90). These findings suggest several factors must contribute to reduced endurance with HIMA. However, 12 of 30 outcomes were non-significant, with a trend suggesting that the phenomenon was more evident at low intensities (≤30% MVIC), thus, the difference may be attenuated with increasing intensity [5, 8, 57]. Only six studies investigated TTF with intensities ≥50% MVIC [5, 8, 9, 46, 57, 76] with non-significant differences between the isometric types for five outcomes. Schaefer et al. [9], who found significantly shorter TTF for HIMA at 80% MVIC, used a pneumatic device to exert an external force during the holding task against the participant without permitted position corrections. In contrast, other studies employed inertial loads, with four explicitly allowing position correction [5, 8, 57, 76]. It is suggested that minor muscle shortenings

during these position corrections might alter neuromuscular control processes in favor of PIMA. Dech et al. [46] supports this, as dumbbell-loaded HIMA were examined without and with brief, subtle muscle twitches at 60% MVIC. TTF during HIMA with twitches was larger than without and did not differ from PIMA [46]. However, some studies investigating low intensities also allowed position corrections during HIMA, finding significant differences. Consequently, intensity could play a role in whether minor muscle shortenings can alter neuromuscular control. Differences between the isometric types, even at high intensities, are further supported by the investigation during paired measurements (90% MVIC) [10]. In most cases (85%), the partner performing HIMA failed first. As the settings for HIMA and PIMA were identical (load compliance, i.e., position stability and correction possibilities), the differences must have resulted from the assigned tasks.

Axial muscle TTF was significantly longer during HIMA [59, 88], with minimal between-muscle differences (all subgroup confidence intervals crossing the overall effect), likely reflecting different habitual neuromuscular functions compared with appendicular muscle groups. Axial muscles are routinely engaged in stabilizing and "holding" the torso during standing, walking, and upright sitting, and therefore habitually perform tasks analogous to HIMA. In contrast, appendicular muscles more commonly execute voluntary movements resembling PIMA. In addition, during axial muscle testing, participants must support not only the external load, but also a substantial portion of their body mass, which may have caused the actual intensity experienced to exceed the nominal target. Although the available results are limited to two studies, these patterns suggest that axial and appendicular muscles may need to be considered separately in both assessment and treatment contexts.

The significant TTF differences between HIMA and PIMA suggest that, at least for appendicular muscles, HIMA is more challenging to maintain than PIMA. Hence, factors contributing to this phenomenon must be present. One factor might be the relative proportion of peak force achieved via each muscle action. The intensity in nearly all studies was based on $PIMA_{max}$ (MVIC). $HIMA_{max}$ has been estimated to be ~77% of $PIMA_{max}$ [20, 21, 24]. Thus, the absolute loads were identical, but the relative loading presumably was not. Fluctuations in force and/or position tended to increase more rapidly during HIMA compared to PIMA, whereas absolute fluctuations were generally greater during PIMA. Similar findings for TTF and force decrements revealed no substantial intermuscular differences, suggesting minimal influence of

749 total muscle mass or body region. However, the relatively small number of studies and outcome
750 measures limits the ability to draw definitive conclusions about between-muscle differences.
751 Overall, the question remains about why lower peak forces and shorter TTF occur during HIMA.

752 *4.1.2 Neurophysiological, metabolic, and cardiovascular considerations*

753 In line with shorter TTF, several parameters increased faster during HIMA (e.g.,
754 fluctuations, RPE, MAP, HR, EMG amplitude, burst rate), indicating that HIMA is more strenuous
755 than PIMA. Since the perceived effort and MAP are mediated by central processes [72, 93], HIMA
756 is assumed to require greater central processing. This is further underpinned by the absence of
757 differences in muscle oxygenation as a possible reason for task differences [8, 46]. Studies have
758 shown that HIMA involves greater supraspinal and spinal activation compared to PIMA, as
759 evidenced by, for example, spinal processing reflected in earlier and greater changes in motor-unit
760 recruitment and rate coding during HIMA [4, 5, 57, 67, 74, 75, 82, 86]. Moreover, the lower D1-
761 inhibition and higher heteronymous facilitation during HIMA indicate reduced presynaptic
762 inhibition and enhanced reliance on proprioceptive input [42, 64-66, 77, 80, 92]. Presynaptic
763 inhibition is primarily controlled by supraspinal centers and sensory feedback [94], reinforcing the
764 relevance of supraspinal pathways when distinguishing between isometric tasks. Accordingly, a
765 strategy for HIMA was suggested "in which supraspinal centers choose to enhance the contribution
766 of muscle afferents to the synaptic input that converges onto spinal motor neurons" [66, 95],
767 aligning with findings that HIMA requires greater proprioceptive information [11, 77, 82]. These
768 patterns indicate that HIMA engages more complex central modulation and sensorimotor
769 integration than PIMA as suggested by several researchers [3, 5, 11, 12, 25, 30, 57, 58, 64, 70, 73,
770 75, 82, 87]. The given justification is the higher instability compared to the PIMA setting, requiring
771 higher reflex responsiveness [64]. Indeed, 45 of 53 studies used inertial loading, or similar
772 methods, to realize HIMA, allowing movement across muscle shortening and lengthening. In
773 contrast, four studies employed a pneumatic device that impedes muscle shortening [4, 18, 20, 23],
774 while another four utilized personal interaction [10, 22, 23, 25]. In those studies, the 'stability' or
775 'freedom-to-move' was similar between tasks. Nevertheless, HIMA and PIMA still showed
776 different outcomes, suggesting that, at least for those studies, the differences between the isometric
777 types could not be explained by stability or degrees of freedom. Thus, other factors must contribute
778 to the muscle action differences.

While load compliance (i.e., force vs position control) plays a major role in shaping neuromuscular demands, it is important to clarify that HIMA and PIMA are not synonymous with closed- and open-chain kinetic exercises. Both HIMA and PIMA can be performed under either chain condition, depending on joint fixation, limb support, or load configuration. The key distinction lies in whether the individual is actively generating force against an immovable object (PIMA) or reactively stabilizing against an imposed force (HIMA), regardless of limb constraint. Equating these with closed- or open-chain exercises risks oversimplifying their neural and sensorimotor distinctions, which are central to this review. Overall, our findings support the argument that intrinsic differences in neural control, rather than task mechanics alone, underpin the distinct responses observed between PIMA and HIMA.

4.1.3 Neural mechanisms during HIMA and PIMA

The meta-analytic finding of shorter TTF during HIMA raises the question of underlying neural mechanisms. Available evidence suggests differences at both supraspinal and spinal levels. At the supraspinal level, Poortvliet et al. [44, 83] reported lower cortico-cortical coherence but higher beta band power during HIMA, which they interpreted as reflecting greater subcortical involvement. Schaefer and Bittmann [25] found higher inter-brain-muscle coherence for HIMA. Despite large methodological differences between these studies, both suggest that HIMA and PIMA engage qualitatively different neural processing.

These supraspinal differences may be linked to distinct roles of afferent input. A potential paradox arises from Poortvliet et al.'s [44, 83] finding that experimental pain produced greater motor modifications during PIMA than HIMA—seemingly inconsistent with HIMA involving heightened sensory processing [4, 5, 43, 58, 74, 84]. Yunoki et al. [11] proposed that sensory input unrelated to movement is suppressed during PIMA (especially cutaneous information), while HIMA maintains greater openness to proprioceptive feedback. Under this framework, HIMA would be selectively more responsive to proprioceptive input than PIMA. Supporting this interpretation, Kirimoto et al. [77] and Mottram et al. [6, 82] demonstrated increased sensorimotor modulation and interspike interval variability during HIMA, indicating enhanced feedback-dependent regulation.

Collectively, these findings suggest that HIMA relies on continuous proprioceptive updating integrated across supraspinal and spinal levels, consistent with models of optimal feedback control [95, 96]. The persistence of TTF differences even in paired settings with identical

mechanical conditions and high target force [10] reinforces that these reflect genuine differences in control strategy rather than task artifacts. Accordingly, classification, diagnostics, and training interventions should not treat isometric actions as a monolith, but rather tailor strategies based on whether the muscle action is more 'holding' or 'pushing' in nature. In particular, HIMA may serve as a more sensitive probe of sensorimotor integration capacity. Confirmation through further research with standardized protocols is needed.

4.1.4 HIMA and PIMA as 'stopped' or 'restricted' lengthening or shortening actions

Classically, isometric muscle action is considered a single category, defined by constant muscle length. However, our findings demonstrate that HIMA and PIMA differ systematically across multiple parameters, challenging the notion of a uniform isometric muscle action. Moreover, even during isometric tasks, fascicles shorten slightly while tendons elongate [97, 98], and mechanical oscillations reflect that muscles continuously alternate between shortening and lengthening [9, 10, 99], which are similar to those during concentric and eccentric actions [99]. These observations have led to the proposal of the 'stopped action hypothesis': HIMA and PIMA may represent restricted eccentric and concentric actions, respectively [9, 10]. During PIMA, the participant pushes against immovable resistance—a concentric action that is mechanically prevented from producing movement. During HIMA, the participant resists an external load that would cause lengthening if force were insufficient—also known as eccentric quasi-isometric muscle action [15-19]—resembling a restricted eccentric action. This framework has explanatory value because lengthening muscle actions are known to require more complex neural control strategies than shortening ones [100]. If HIMA indeed resembles a restricted eccentric action, this could account for the proposed differences in motor control strategies between HIMA and PIMA [9-12, 21-23, 25-28, 58]. However, direct comparison between isometric and anisometric actions is complicated by the fact that the latter involves macro changes in muscle length and joint movement.

Despite this limitation, some similarities exist between the isometric types and their suggested anisometric counterparts. Discharge rates are systematically lower during lengthening than shortening actions [100]; similarly, discharge rates were lower during HIMA than PIMA in eight of 12 outcomes [30, 67, 71, 82, 85]. The faster RPE increase during HIMA [4, 5, 57, 58, 68, 70-74, 82, 86] parallels the force overestimation reported for eccentric vs. concentric actions [93]. Modulations of neural activation during lengthening actions are assumed to involve supraspinal

and spinal mechanisms, predominantly mediated by spinal pre- and postsynaptic inhibitory mechanisms [100]. Similar mechanisms have been suggested for HIMA [4, 5, 42, 57, 58, 64-67, 71, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 82, 86, 92]. Higher central activity (EEG) accompanies reduced EMG activity during lengthening versus shortening actions [101]; similarly, higher beta band power was found for HIMA [83], though data remain limited. Finally, voluntary activation is lower during maximal lengthening than shortening actions, limiting the realization of the muscle's intrinsic force capacity [100]. A similar mechanism may explain the lower peak torque for HIMA compared to PIMA [20, 21, 24]. H-reflex data are insufficient for comparison, with only one study reporting decreased values during HIMA vs. PIMA [78], which, despite limited evidence, aligns with the typically depressed H-reflex during active and passive lengthening actions [93, 100].

However, some findings are inconsistent with the hypothesis above. MEP and post-TMS silent period are reduced and briefer during lengthening versus shortening actions [100], but HIMA versus PIMA results are mixed: MEP differences were non-significant [3, 77, 78], and silent periods were briefer [77], non-significant [78, 90], or longer [3]. In summary, several parallels support the 'stopped action hypothesis', though the limited evidence base calls for further research.

4.1.5 HIMA with variable external forces – A greater challenge for motor control

Research on Adaptive Force (AF) further supports the assumption of more complex control strategies during HIMA. AF refers to the neuromuscular capacity to adapt to increasing external loads and is assessed via HIMA with a non-stationary load that ramps to and beyond $HIMA_{max}$, requiring constant sensorimotor updating [102]. As previously mentioned, adaptive $HIMA_{max}$ (i.e., maximum isometric AF) was significantly lower than $PIMA_{max}$ [20, 21, 24]. Moreover, adaptive $HIMA_{max}$ is reduced significantly in healthy participants by stimuli such as negative imagery or odors [26-28], by muscle spindle slack induced through specific pre-conditioning [22, 23], and in patients with knee osteoarthritis [20]. Whether $PIMA_{max}$ would react similarly has not been directly tested, though findings from Bittmann et al. [23] suggest otherwise. In that study, adaptive $HIMA_{max}$ of the elbow flexors was assessed after two pre-conditioning protocols: (1) muscle action in a lengthened position with passive return to the testing (middle) position (provoking spindle slack), and (2) the same, but followed by a brief voluntary contraction (20% MVIC) in the testing position. Only protocol (1) reduced the adaptive $HIMA_{max}$ significantly (−47%); the brief voluntary contraction in protocol (2) restored full holding capacity. Critically, PIMA inherently begins with voluntary force production, preventing spindle slack from affecting

performance. This suggests that HIMA's reliance on reactive, feedback-dependent control renders it selectively vulnerable to proprioceptive perturbations—a vulnerability likely not shared by PIMA.

Taken together, these findings indicate that HIMA—particularly adaptive HIMA—involves heightened sensitivity to afferent input, which supports the suggested differences in sensorimotor modulation between the two isometric types. The higher sensitivity likely arises from the need to regulate length-tension control while adapting to external loads continuously. This process particularly requires the integration of proprioceptive afferents via feedback control mechanisms engaging subcortical structures (thalamus, cerebellum, basal ganglia). Since these structures also process nociceptive and emotional inputs, such stimuli may influence adaptive HIMA performance. While this sensitivity enables precise adaptation, it also increases vulnerability to interfering inputs (e.g., nociception, mental distress). Under such perturbations, the neuromuscular system may fail to maintain the required position under increasing load, resulting in yielding. This has potential diagnostic implications. Assessing adaptive $HIMA_{max}$, particularly under standardized stimulus conditions, could help identify impairments in sensorimotor integration that remain undetected by conventional strength testing (PIMA). Such impairments may be relevant to injury risk assessment, rehabilitation monitoring, or the detection of neuromuscular dysfunction. Since adaptive $HIMA_{max}$ also responds to supportive stimuli, its assessment could help identify effective and individualized therapy approaches. However, further research is needed to establish clinical utility and to clarify how different stimuli affect HIMA versus PIMA.

4.2 Practical applications

4.2.1 Injury prevention

The findings of this review may have implications for injury prevention, though these remain speculative. Most injuries occur without contact [103] during muscle lengthening, when a muscle must hold or decelerate an external force [104]. Injuries induced by muscle action typically do not result from pushing/pulling isometric or shortening actions [106]. Despite this, muscle strength is usually assessed via PIMA, neglecting the adaptive holding component which is closer to the nature of injury mechanisms. In a review, Ullmann et al. [105] claimed that the positive

effects of isometric exercise on injury prevention are assumed because of post-activation potentiation. However, potential distinctions between HIMA and PIMA were not considered.

This raises the question whether assessing HIMA—particularly adaptive HIMA—could help identify individuals at risk. Various stimuli, including negative emotions, proprioceptive disruption and nociception reduce adaptive HIMA [22, 23, 26-28]. If such reductions also occur in real-world settings, they might explain why non-contact injuries can occur suddenly during routine movements under normal load (e.g., running, direction changes, landing) that have been performed thousands of times without incident. However, no study has directly investigated whether reduced holding capacity (muscle instability) increases injury risk or whether full holding capacity (muscle stability) prevents injuries. The evidence for isometric exercise in injury prevention is limited. Two low-quality studies suggest reduced injury rates with added isometric training [106, 107], but the type of isometric exercise was not specified. Complex exercises involving reactive stabilization, such as the Nordic hamstring exercise, may be more relevant. Two reviews found significant reductions in hamstring injuries [108, 109], though another reported inconclusive evidence of a protective effect [110].

Thus, it is hypothesized that (1) adaptive HIMA could uncover functional impairments undetected by conventional strength testing and (2) such impairments may be relevant for injury risk. Notably, reductions in adaptive HIMA are likely due to interfering inputs (e.g., nociception, emotional stress) rather than insufficient muscle strength, so conventional exercise may not address the underlying causes. These hypotheses require empirical validation.

4.2.2 Rehabilitation

Clinical interest in isometric exercise for conditions like tendinopathy has increased [111], though studies do not distinguish between HIMA and PIMA [32, 35, 112-120]. One study compared isometric dorsiflexion—assumed to resemble HIMA—with other interventions for Achilles tendinopathy and found significantly greater improvement compared to isotonic exercise and rest [112]. However, no study has directly compared HIMA and PIMA exercise programs.

Based on the present findings, preliminary suggestions can be made. PIMA may be preferable when prolonged activation is required, given its longer TTF. HIMA may be more suitable when higher sensorimotor demands and stability control are desired, potentially relevant for neurological rehabilitation. As proposed by Bauer et al. [12], differentiating between the two isometric types according to patient needs appears warranted. Based on the findings regarding

932 maximal holding capacity and injury prevention considerations, rehabilitation should primarily
933 focus on muscle stability and adaptation to external loads rather than pure muscle strength.
934 However, direct comparative studies are needed before specific recommendations can be made.

935 *4.2.3 Sports performance*

936 Isometric training for sports performance has gained recent popularity as more evidence
937 on its ability to improve various sports performance indicators has become available [1, 33, 34,
938 121, 122]. However, most of these studies used PIMA [126, 127], with only a limited number
939 employing HIMA [33, 34]. Additionally, no study has compared the efficacy of PIMA and HIMA
940 for improving sports performance. Hence, it may be challenging for practitioners to determine
941 which method to use at various training cycle phases. Nevertheless, the current review may provide
942 some guidance on when to include HIMA or PIMA in athletic physical preparation. Firstly, HIMA
943 may be preferred during general preparation, where the training objective is often to increase the
944 overall strength required to endure the demands of subsequent phases, and to reduce the risk of
945 injury as training intensity increases. This recommendation is based on the greater synergistic
946 muscle activation during HIMA, which is vital in maintaining joint integrity during intensive
947 movements [21]. Furthermore, appendicular muscles can sustain PIMA longer than HIMA at a
948 given intensity, while the opposite finding was true for the trunk muscles. During the general
949 preparation phase, coaches plan for higher training volumes, meaning that muscle action duration
950 would be longer if isometric training is included. If PIMA were used during an exercise such as
951 the isometric squat, the adaptation of the lower limb may be limited by the duration for which the
952 trunk muscles could sustain a given force. However, if HIMA were to be used, the trunk muscles
953 would likely be able to maintain the given force for as long as, or longer than, the lower limb.
954 Hence, the adaptation to the lower limb would be less limited by the trunk. Secondly, during the
955 training phase, PIMA would likely be preferred, as it involves exerting force against an immovable
956 object, allowing an athlete to exert maximal force rapidly. Similarly, several studies demonstrated
957 that PIMA allows for greater maximal torques than HIMA [20, 21, 24]. Hence, high-intensity
958 PIMA would likely result in greater strength adaptations.

959 While there is rarely only one mode of muscle action in sports, brief or prolonged isometric
960 action is typical in many sports. Hence, the decision to use PIMA or HIMA in training may also
961 depend on the specific sporting action(s) to be prepared for. For example, sports actions under high
962 external loads with relatively static conditions, such as a rugby scrum or a grappling/wrestling

963 maneuver, may be best trained using PIMA. Likewise, actions that require holdings, such as the
964 static position held during a springboard dive or various gymnastic maneuvers, may be best
965 prepared for using HIMA. Finally, if improving rate of force development is paramount, both
966 PIMA and HIMA with rapid muscle actions can be utilized [123]. While it is relatively simple to
967 perform PIMA with rapid intent, practitioners may lack insight into how to conduct rapid HIMA,
968 including rapid landings or unconventional exercises (e.g., rapid decelerations, hamstring
969 'switches', oscillatory training), which are currently lacking in scientific literature. Furthermore,
970 while several examples of multi-joint HIMA exist [33, 34], no studies have compared PIMA and
971 HIMA via closed-chain movements, presenting an exciting research opportunity.

972 **4.3 Limitations and future research directions**

973 While the primary aims were accomplished, there are several limitations. First, we included
974 only studies that directly compared PIMA and HIMA. While it would have been exceptionally
975 time-consuming, all studies employing PIMA or HIMA could have been identified and
976 synthesized. While enough studies utilized TTF as a dependent variable for confident meta-
977 analyses, far fewer studies reported HR, MAP, or RPE. Therefore, readers should be aware of
978 potential limitations. Similarly, the between-study variability in neurological (e.g., EEG, CT) and
979 neuromuscular (e.g., sEMG) assessment methodology prevented us from performing further meta-
980 analyses. Moreover, the small number of studies focusing on the same objective (e.g., brain
981 activity, tendon oscillations, max torque) makes authoritative statements difficult. Other methods
982 may uncover further insights, including fMRI, fascicle dynamics, echo intensity, shear wave
983 elastography, tendon creep, and tensiomyography. The 'stability-of-position' factor was
984 impossible to include in the interpretation of data (i.e., HIMA is typically more unstable than
985 PIMA). Thus, aligning the position stability during both functions would be advisable. Readers
986 should also be aware that the experimental pain trials included in this review were conducted in
987 highly controlled laboratory settings, which may not be directly applicable to clinical settings.
988 While the risk-of-bias was modest for all studies, our quality scoring criteria are somewhat
989 subjective. As such, other researchers may have different means of assessing quality. Many
990 included studies did not provide effect size statistics, leaving us to calculate them based on text,
991 tables, or figure extractions, potentially (minimally) affecting some of the meta-analyses. The
992 mean intensity of the included studies was far lower than nearly all but the most conservative

rehabilitation or sports performance guidelines. While these low loads allowed for greater durations and, thus, more time intervals for comparison, future studies should examine more practically relevant intensities. An even more explicit limitation is the complete absence of studies comparing PIMA and HIMA during multi-joint movements (e.g., squat, leg press, pull-up, bench press). Researchers could also compare the two types of isometric muscle action over multiple days to examine the time course of fatigue and recovery. Moreover, investigations on how external and internal stimuli might influence HIMA and PIMA could be relevant for gathering further information on underlying control mechanisms and for diagnostics, injury mitigation and rehabilitation. Most importantly, longitudinal, randomized control trials are required to ascertain if PIMA or HIMA have any measurable advantage over the other for use in diagnostics or for inducing various rehabilitation or sports performance adaptations.

5 CONCLUSIONS

This systematic review and meta-analysis advances the understanding of isometric muscle actions by clearly delineating two distinct types—PIMA and HIMA—and synthesizing evidence that they differ in meaningful neural, biomechanical, and functional ways. Objective measures largely suggest that HIMA involves more complex neural and neuromuscular control strategies than PIMA, likely reflecting neuromuscular processing similar to muscle lengthening and shortening actions, respectively. This supports the hypothesis that HIMA and PIMA may represent "stopped" anisometric actions rather than a single, uniform isometric modality. HIMA demonstrates faster rises in neuromuscular and cardiovascular responses, and exhibits heightened sensorimotor modulation, suggesting particular utility in diagnostics, injury prevention, and rehabilitation—especially when increasing external loads are incorporated—though clinical evidence remains limited. When integrated with broader physiological, biomechanical, and psychological research, HIMA may offer a time-efficient means of inducing musculoskeletal, neural, and cardiovascular adaptations. In contrast, PIMA appears more effective for sustained activation and promoting agonist-specific neuromuscular adaptations due to its greater force capacity.

Collectively, the findings challenge the traditional view of isometric muscle actions as a unitary construct and highlight important implications for sports medicine and rehabilitation, where isometrics are widely used to enhance recovery, prevent injury, and improve performance.

Incorporating both HIMA and PIMA into assessment, training, and rehabilitation programs may enable practitioners to target complementary adaptations, individualize care, and develop goal-specific interventions. However, substantial methodological heterogeneity across studies precluded additional meta-analyses, underscoring the need for consistent protocols and improved reporting. Future randomized trials are warranted to translate these mechanistic insights into clinical and athletic outcomes, and it is recommended that knowledge of both isometric types be integrated into research, education, and clinical practice in sports and health sciences.

REFERENCES

1. Oranchuk DJ, Storey AG, Nelson AR, Cronin JB. Isometric training and long-term adaptations; effects of muscle length, intensity, and intent: A systematic review. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2019;29(4):484-503.

2. Douglas J, Pearson S, Ross A, McGuigan M. Chronic adaptations to eccentric training: A systematic review. Sports Med. 2017;47(5):917-41.

3. Mathis J, de Quervain D, Hess CW. Task-dependent effects on motor-evoked potentials and on the following silent period. J Clin Neurophysiol. 1999;16(6):556-65.

4. Hunter SK, Ryan DL, Ortega JD, Enoka RM. Task differences with the same load torque alter the endurance time of submaximal fatiguing contractions in humans. J Neurophysiol. 2002;88(6):3087-96.

5. Maluf KS, Shinohara M, Stephenson JL, Enoka RM. Muscle activation and time to task failure differ with load type and contraction intensity for a human hand muscle. Exp Brain Res. 2005;167(2):165-77.

6. Mottram CJ, Christou EA, Meyer FG, Enoka RM. Frequency modulation of motor unit discharge has task-dependent effects on fluctuations in motor output. J Neurophysiol. 2005;94(4):2878-87.

7. Rudroff T, Kalliokoski KK, Block DE, Gould JR, Klingensmith WC, Enoka RM. PET/CT imaging of age- and task-associated differences in muscle activity during fatiguing contractions. J Appl Physiol. 2013;114(9):1211-9.

8. Booghs C, Baudry S, Enoka RM, Duchateau J. Influence of neural adjustments and muscle oxygenation on task failure during sustained isometric contractions with elbow flexor muscles. Exp Physiol. 2012;97(8):918-29.

9. Schaefer LV, Bittmann FN. Are there two forms of isometric muscle action? Results of the experimental study support a distinction between a holding and a pushing isometric muscle function. BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil. 2017;9(11):1-13.

10. Schaefer LV, Bittmann FN. Paired personal interaction reveals objective differences between pushing and holding isometric muscle action. PLoS One. 2021;16(5):e0238331.

11. Yunoki K, Watanabe T, Matsumoto T, Kuwabara T, Horinouchi T, Ito K, et al. Cutaneous information processing differs with load type during isometric finger abduction. PLoS One. 2022;17(12):e0279477.

12. Bauer P, Gomes JS, Oliveira J, Santos P, Pezarat-Correia P, Vaz JR. Torque regulation is influenced by the nature of the isometric contraction. Sensors. 2023;23(2):726.

13. Sharifnezhad A, Marzilger R, Arampatzis A. Effects of load magnitude, muscle length and velocity during eccentric chronic loading on the longitudinal growth of the vastus lateralis muscle. J Exp Biol. 2014;217(Pt 15):2726-33.

14. Sterling W. Outlines of practical physiology. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: P. Blakiston, Son & Co; 1895.

15. Oranchuk DJ, Nelson AR, Storey AG, Cronin JB. Scientific basis of eccentric quasi-isometric resistance training: A narrative review. J Strength Cond Res. 2019;33(10):2846-59.

16. Oranchuk DJ, Nelson AR, Storey AG, Diewald SN, Cronin JB. Short-term neuromuscular, morphological, and architectural responses to eccentric quasi-isometric muscle actions. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2021;121(1):141-58.

17. Henderson ZJ, Wang S, Cornish SM, Scribbans TD. Exploring the acute muscle fatigue response in resistance trained individuals during eccentric quasi-isometric elbow flexions-A cross-sectional comparison of repetition and sex. Sports Biomech. 2023;24(5):1362-84.

18. Oranchuk DJ, Diewald SN, McGrath JW, Nelson AR, Storey AG, Cronin JB. Kinetic and kinematic profile of eccentric quasi-isometric loading. Sports Biomech. 2024;23(6):758-71.

19. Ličen U, Oranchuk DJ, Kozinc Z. Exploring the biomechanics and fatigue patterns of eccentric quasi-isometric muscle actions in the knee extensors and flexors. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2024;124(11):3409-19.

20. Schaefer LV, Dech S, Carnarius F, Ronnert F, Bittmann FN, Becker R. Adaptive force of hamstring muscles in reduced in patients with knee osteoarthritis compared to asymptomatic controls. BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders. 2024;25(34).

21. Schaefer LV, Carnarius F, Dech S, Bittmann FN. Repeated measurements of adaptive force: Maximal holding capacity differs from other maximal strength parameters and preliminary characteristics for non-professional strength vs. endurance athletes. Front Physiol. 2023;14(1020954):1-19.

22. Bittmann FN, Dech S, Schaefer LV. Another way to confuse motor control: Manual technique supposed to shorten muscle spindles reduces the muscular holding stability in the sense of adaptive force in male soccer players. Brain Sciences. 2023;13(7):1105.

1091 23. Bittmann FN, Dech S, Schaefer LV. How to confuse motor control: Passive muscle
1092 shortening after contraction in lengthened position reduces the muscular holding stability in the
1093 sense of adaptive force. Life. 2023;13(911):1-18.

1094 24. Dech S, Bittmann FN, Schaefer LV. Assessment of the adaptive force of elbow extensions
1095 in healthy subjects quantified by a novel pneumatically driven measurement system with
1096 considerations of its quality criteria. Diagnostics. 2021;11(923):1-23.

1097 25. Schaefer LV, Bittmann FN. Case study: Intra- and interpersonal coherence of muscle and
1098 brain activity of two coupled persons during pushing and holding isometric muscle actions. Brain
1099 Sciences. 2022;12(6):703.

1100 26. Schaefer LV, Dech S, Aehle M, Bittmann FN. Disgusting odours affect the characteristics
1101 of the Adaptive Force in contrast to neutral and pleasant odours. Sci Rep. 2021;11(16410).

1102 27. Schaefer LV, Dech S, Bittmann FN. Adaptive Force and emotionally related imaginations
1103 – preliminary results suggest a reduction of the maximal holding capacity as reaction to disgusting
1104 food imagination. Heliyon. 2021;7(8):e07827.

1105 28. Schaefer LV, Dech S, Wolff LL, Bittmann FN. Emotional imagery influences the Adaptive
1106 Force in young women: Unpleasant imagery reduces instantaneously the muscular holding
1107 capacity. Brain Sciences. 2022;12(10):1318.

1108 29. Verkhoshansky V, Verkhoshansky N. Special strength training manual for coaches. Rome,
1109 Italy: Verkhoshansky SSTM; 2011.

1110 30. Pascoe MA, Gould JR, Enoka RM. Motor unit activity when young and old adults perform
1111 steady contractions while supporting an inertial load. J Neurophysiol. 2013;109(4):1055-64.

1112 31. Oranchuk DJ, Gullett LK, Kicia M, Thome B, Game A. The relationship of anthropometric
1113 and physical performance characteristics on competitive success in amateur, elite, and professional
1114 rodeo athletes. J Strength Cond Res. 2023;37(7):1495-506.

1115 32. Bradford B, Rio E, Murphy M, Wells J, Khondoker M, Clarke C, et al. Immediate effects
1116 of two isometric calf muscle exercise on mid-portion achilles tendon pain. Int J Sports Med.
1117 2021;42(12):1122-7.

1118 33. Allegue H, Khmiri A, Oranchuk DJ, Chelly MS. The effect of combined isometric and
1119 plyometric- versus contrast strength training on athletic performance in male junior handball
1120 players. Applied Sciences. 2023;13(16):9069.

1121 34. Lee B, McGill S. The effect of core training on distal limb performance during ballistic
1122 strike manoeuvers. J Sports Sci. 2017;35(18):1768-80.

1123 35. Rio E, van Ark M, Docking S, Moseley GL, Kidgell D, Gaida JE, et al. Isometric
1124 contractions are more analgesic than isotonic contractions for patellar tendon pain: An in-season
1125 randomized clinical trial. Clin J Sport Med. 2017 May;27(3):253-9.

36. Le Flao E, Pichardo AW, Ganpatt S, Oranchuk DJ. An accessable, 16-week neck strength training program improves head kinematics following chest perturbation in young soccer athletes. J Sport Rehabil. 2021;30(8):1158-65.

37. CeJ. Hold on, it's Isometric Time. 2024 [cited; Available from: https://unionfitness.com/hold-on-its-isometric-time/

38. Natera A. Modern Speed Training: Q&A with Alex Natera on Isometrics for Running Performance. 2017 [cited; Available from: https://www.just-fly-sports.com/modern-speed-training-alex-natera/

39. Natera A. All isometric training is not the same: Differences in the execution, prescription and use of pushing and holding isometrics. 2021 [cited; Available from: https://www.sportsmith.co/articles/all-isometric-training-is-not-the-same-differences-in-the-execution-prescription-and-use-of-pushing-and-holding-isometrics/

40. Plaza JV. Isometric Training for Building Muscle. 2023 [cited; Available from: https://vitruve.fit/blog/isometric-training-for-building-muscle/

41. Simpson P. Two Types of Isometrics!? 2022 [cited; Available from: https://www.airspaceperth.com.au/blog/two-types-of-isometrics

42. Baudry S, Maerz AH, Gould JR, Enoka RM. Task- and time-dependent modulation of Ia presynaptic inhibition during fatiguing contractions performed by humans. J Neurophysiol. 2011;106(1):265-73.

43. Poortvliet PC, Tucker KJ, Hodges PW. Experimental pain has a greater effect on single motor unit discharge during force-control than position-control tasks. Clin Neurophysiol. 2015;126(7):1378-86.

44. Poortvliet PC, Tucker KJ, Finnigan S, Scott D, Hodges PW. Experimental pain decreases corticomuscular coherence in a force- but not a position-control task. J Pain. 2019;20(2):192-200.

45. Coletta NA, Mallette MM, Gabriel DA, Tyler CJ, Cheung SS. Core and skin temperature influences on the surface electromyographic responses to an isometric force and position task. PLoS One. 2018;13(3):e0195219.

46. Dech S, Bittmann FN, Schaefer LV. Muscle oxygenation and time to task failure of submaximal holding and pulling isometric muscle actions and influence of intermittent voluntary muscle twitches. BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil. 2022;14(55).

47. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372(n71).

48. Manjali JJ, Gupta T. Critical appraisal of a clinical research paper: What one needs to know. Cancer Research, Statistics, and Trends. 2020;3(3):545-51.

1161 49. Medicine CfE-B. Study designs. 2024 [cited; Available from:
1162 https://www.cebm.ox.ac.uk/resources/ebm-tools/study-designs

1163 50. Barker TH, Habibi N, Aromataris E, Stone JC, Leonardi-Bee J, Sears K, et al. The revised
1164 JBI critical appraisal tool for the assessment of risk of bias for quasi-experimental studies. JBI
1165 Evidence Synthesis. 2024;22(3):378-88.

1166 51. Hopkins WG, Marshall SW, Batterham AM, Hanin J. Progressive statistics for studies in
1167 sports medicine and exercise science. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2009;41(1):3-13.

1168 52. McKay AKA, Stellingwerff T, Smith ES, Martin DT, Mujika I, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, et al.
1169 Defining training and performance caliber: A participant classification framework. Int J Sports
1170 Physiol Perform. 2022;17(2):317-31.

1171 53. McGuinness LA, Higgins JPT. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and
1172 Shiny web app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. Research Synthesis Methods.
1173 2020;12(1):55-61.

1174 54. Cohen J. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence
1175 Erlbaum Associates; 1988.

1176 55. Park S, Beretvas SN. Synthesizing effects for multiple outcomes per study using robust
1177 variance estimation versus the three-level model. Behavior Research Methods. 2019;51(1):152-
1178 71.

1179 56. Becker BJ. Multivariate meta-analysis: Academic Press; 2000.

1180 57. Rudroff T, Justice JN, Holmes MR, Matthews SD, Enoka RM. Muscle activity and time to
1181 task failure differ with load compliance and target force for elbow flexor muscles. J Appl Physiol.
1182 2011;110(1):125-36.

1183 58. Rudroff T, Barry BK, Stone AL, Barry CJ, Enoka RM. Accessory muscle activity
1184 contributes to the variation in time to task failure for different arm postures and loads. J Appl
1185 Physiol. 2007;102(3):1000-6.

1186 59. Thomas JS, Ross AJ, Russ DW, Clark BC. Time to task failure of trunk extensor muscles
1187 differs with load type. J Motor Behav. 2010;43(1):27-9.

1188 60. Holzbaur KRS, Murry WM, Gold GE, Delp SL. Upper limb muscle volumes in adult
1189 subjects. J Biomech. 2007;40(4):742-9.

1190 61. Ito J, Moriyama H, Inokuchi S, Goto N. Human lower limb muscles: An evaluation of
1191 weight and fiber size. Okajimas Folia Anat Jpn. 2003;80(2-3):47-55.

1192 62. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-
1193 analyses. BMJ. 2003;327(7414):557-60.

1194 63. Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al. Recommendations
1195 for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled
1196 trials. BMJ. 2011;343(d4002).

1197 64. Baudry S, Enoka RM. Influence of load type on presynaptic modulation of Ia afferent input
1198 onto two synergist muscles. Exp Brain Res. 2009;199(1):83-8.

1199 65. Baudry S, Jordan K, Enoka RM. Heteronymous reflex responses in a hand muscle when
1200 maintaining constant finger force or position at different contraction intensities. Clin
1201 Neurophysiol. 2009;120(1):210-7.

1202 66. Baudry S, Maerz AH, Enoka RM. Presynaptic modulation of Ia afferents in young and old
1203 adults when performing force and position control. J Neurophysiol. 2010;103(2):623-31.

1204 67. Baudry S, Rudroff T, Pierpoint LA, Enoka RM. Load type influences motor unit
1205 recruitment in biceps brachii during a sustained contraction. J Neurophysiol. 2009;102(3):1725-
1206 35.

1207 68. Bojsen-Møller J, Schwartz S, Magnusson SP. Limited difference in time to failure between
1208 sustained force and position control contractions with the knee extensors. Scand J Med Sci Sports.
1209 2011;21(6):e48-55.

1210 69. Garner JC, Blackburn T, Wiemar W, Campbell B. Comparison of electromyographic
1211 activity during eccentrically versus concentrically loaded isometric contractions. J Electromyogr
1212 Kinesiol. 2008;18(3):466-71.

1213 70. Gordon NM, Rudroff T, Enoka JA, Enoka RM. Handedness but not dominance influences
1214 variability in endurance time for sustained, submaximal contractions. J Neurophysiol.
1215 2012;108(5):1501-10.

1216 71. Gould JR, Cleland BT, Mani D, Amiridis IG, Enoka RM. Motor unit activity in biceps
1217 brachii of left-handed humans during sustained contractions with two load types. J Neurophysiol.
1218 2016;116(3):1358-65.

1219 72. Griffith EE, Yoon T, Hunter SK. Age and load compliance alter time to task failure for a
1220 submaximal fatiguing contraction with the lower leg. J Appl Physiol. 2010;108(6):1510-9.

1221 73. Hunter SK, Rochette L, Critchlow A, Enoka RM. Time to task failure differs with load
1222 type when old adults perform a submaximal fatiguing contraction. Muscle Nerve. 2005;31(6):730-
1223 40.

1224 74. Hunter SK, Yoon T, Farinella J, Griffith EE, Ng AV. Time to task failure and muscle
1225 activation vary with load type for a submaximal fatiguing contraction with the lower leg. J Appl
1226 Physiol. 2008;105(2):463-72.

1227 75. Jeon S, Miller WM, Ye X. A comparison of motor unit control strategies between two
1228 different isometric tasks. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.
1229 2020;17(8):2799.

1230 76. Jeon S, Ye X, Miller WM. Sex comparisons of agonist and antagonist muscle
1231 electromyographic parameters during two different submaximal isometric fatiguing tasks. Physiol
1232 Rep. 2019;7(5):e14022.

1233 77. Kirimoto H, Tamaki H, Suzuki M, Matsumoto T, Sugawara K, Kojima S, et al.
1234 Sensorimotor modulation differs with load type during constant finger force or position. PLoS
1235 One. 2014;9(9):e108058.

1236 78. Klass M, Levenez M, Enoka RM, Duchateau J. Spinal mechanisms contribute to
1237 differences in the time to failure of submaximal fatiguing contractions performed with different
1238 loads. J Neurophysiol. 2008;99(3):1096-104.

1239 79. Kunugi S, Holobar A, Kodera T, Toyoda H, Watanabe K. Motor unit firing patterns on
1240 increasing force during force and position tasks. J Neurophysiol. 2021;126(5):1653-9.

1241 80. Maluf KS, Barry BK, Riley ZA, Enoka RM. Reflex responsiveness of a human hand
1242 muscle when controlling isometric force and joint position. Clin Neurophysiol. 2007;118(9):2063-
1243 71.

1244 81. Marion R, Power GA. Residual force enhancement due to active muscle lengthening allows
1245 similar reductions in neuromuscular activation during position and force control tasks. J Sport
1246 Health Sci. 2020;9(6):670-6.

1247 82. Mottram CJ, Jakobi JM, Semmler JG, Enoka RM. Motor-unit activity differs with load
1248 type during a fatiguing contraction. J Neurophysiol. 2005;93(3):1381-92.

1249 83. Poortvliet PC, Tucker KJ, Finnigan S, Scott D, Sowman P, Hodges PW. Cortical activity
1250 differs between position- and force-control knee extension tasks. Exp Brain Res.
1251 2015;233(12):3447-57.

1252 84. Poortvliet PC, Tucker KJ, Hodges PW. Changes in constraint of proximal segments effects
1253 time to task failure and activity of proximal muscles in knee position-control tasks. Clin
1254 Neurophysiol. 2013;124(4):732-9.

1255 85. Rudroff T, Jordan K, Enoka JA, Matthews SD, Baudry S, Enoka RM. Discharge of biceps
1256 brachii motor units is modulated by load compliance and forearm posture. Exp Brain Res.
1257 2010;202(1):111-20.

1258 86. Rudroff T, Justice JN, Matthews S, Zuo R, Enoka RM. Muscle activity differs with load
1259 compliance during fatiguing contractions with the knee extensor muscles. Exp Brain Res.
1260 2010;203(2):307-16.

1261 87. Rudroff T, Poston B, Shin I-S, Bojsen-Møller F, Enoka RM. Net excitation of the motor
1262 unit pool varies with load type during fatiguing contractions. Muscle Nerve. 2005;31(1):78-87.

1263 88. Russ DW, Ross AJ, Clark BC, Thomas JS. The effects of task type on time to task failure
1264 during fatigue: A modified Sørensen test. Journal of Motor Behavior. 2018;50(1):96-103.

1265 89. Semmler JG, Kornatz KW, Dinenno DV, Shi Z, Enoka RM. Motor unit synchronisation is
1266 enhanced during slow lengthening contractions of a hand muscle. The Journal of Physiology.
1267 2002;545(2):681-95.

1268 90. Williams PS, Hoffman RL, Clark BC. Cortical and spinal mechanisms of task failure of
1269 sustained submaximal fatiguing contractions. PLoS One. 2014;9(3):e93284.

1270 91. Buchanan TS, Lloyd DG. Muscle activity is different for humans performing static tasks
1271 which require force control and position control. Neurosci Lett. 1995;194(1-2):61-4.

1272 92. Magalhães FHE, L A, da Silva CR, de Lima FF, de Toledo DR, Kohn AF. D1 and D2
1273 inhibitions of the soleus H-reflex are differentially modulated during plantarflexion force and
1274 position tasks. PLoS One. 2015;10(11):e0143862.

1275 93. Carson RG, Riek S, Shahbazpour N. Central and peripheral mediation of human force
1276 sensation following eccentric or concentric contractions. J Physiol. 2002;539(Pt 3):913-25.

1277 94. Stein RB. Presynaptic inhibition in humans. Prog Neurobiol. 1995;47(6):533-44.

1278 95. Nielsen JB. Sensorimotor integration at spinal level as a basis for muscle coordination
1279 during voluntary movement in humans. J Appl Physiol. 2004;96(5):1961-7.

1280 96. Todorov E. Optimality principles in sensorimotor control. Nat Neurosci. 2004;7(9):907-
1281 15.

1282 97. Martinez-Valdes E, Negro F, Botter A, Pincheira PA, Cerone GL, Lichtwark GA, et al.
1283 Modulations in motor unit discharge are related to changes in fascicle length during isometric
1284 contractions. J Appl Physiol. 2022;133(4):1136-48.

1285 98. Pavlov I, Novinger R, Rassier DE. Sarcomere dynamics in skeletal muscle myofibrils
1286 during isometric contractions. J Biomech. 2009;42(16):2808-12.

1287 99. Beck TW, DeFreitas JM, Stock MS, Dillon MA. An examination of mechanomyographic
1288 signal stationarity during concentric isokinetic, eccentric isokinetic and isometric muscle actions.
1289 Physiol Meas. 2010;31(3):339-61.

1290 100. Duchateau J, Enoka RM. Neural control of lengthening contractions. J Exp Biol.
1291 2016;219(2):197-204.

1292 101. Perrey S. Brain activation associated with eccentric movement: A narrative review of the
1293 literature. Eur J Sport Sci. 2017;18(1):75-82.

1294 102. Bays PM, Wolpert DM. Computational principles of sensorimotor control that minimize
1295 uncertainty and variability. J Physiol. 2007;578(Pt 2):387-96.

1296 103. Della Villa F, Buckthorpe MG, A, Nabiuzzi A, Tosarelli F, Zaffagnini S, Della Villa S.
1297 Systematic video analysis of ACL injuries in professional male football (soccer): injury

mechanisms, situational patterns and biomechanics study on 134 consecutive cases. Br J Sports Med. 2020;54(23):1423-32.

104. Garrett WEJ. Muscle strain injuries: Clinical and basic aspects. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 1990;22(4):436-43.

105. Ullman ZJ, Fernandez MB, Klein M. Effects of isometric exercises versus static stretching in warm-up regimens for running sport athletes: A systematic review. International Journal of Exercise Science. 2021;14(6):1204-18.

106. Bolotin A, Bakayev V. Efficacy of using isometric exercises to prevent basketball injuries Journal of Physical Education and Sport. 2016;16(4):1177-85.

107. Brynzak S, Putrov S, Olena O, Kostenko M, Myroshnichenko V. Analysis of the use of isometric exercises to prevent injuries in beach soccer players. Journal of Physical Education and Sport. 2023;23(2):440-8.

108. van Dyk N, Behan FP, Whiteley R. Including the Nordic hamstring exercise in injury prevention programmes halves the rate of hamstring injuries: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 8459 athletes. Br J Sports Med. 2019;53(21):1362-70.

109. Al Attar WSA, Soomro N, Sinclair PJ, Pappas E, Sanders RH. Effect of injury prevention programs that include the Nordic hamstring exercise on hamstring injury rates in soccer players: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Sports Med. 2016;47(5):907-16.

110. Impellizzeri FM, McCall A, van Smeden M. Why methods matter in a meta-analysis: A reappraisal showed inconclusive injury preventive effect of Nordic hamstring exercise. J Clin Epidemiol. 2021;140:111-24.

111. Clifford C, Challoumas DC, Paul L, Syme G, Millar NL. Effectiveness of isometric exercise in the management of tendinopathy: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. BMJ Open Sport & Exercise Medicine. 2020;6(1):e000760.

112. van der Vlist AC, van Veldhoven PLJ, van Oosterom RF, Verhaar JAN, de Vos RJ. Isometric exercises do not provide immediate pain relief in Achilles tendinopathy: A quasi-randomized clinical trial. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2020;30(9):1712-21.

113. Gatz M, Betsch M, Dirrichs T, Schrading S, Tingart M, Michalik R, et al. Eccentric and isometric exercise in Achilles tendinopathy evaluated by the VISA-A score and shear wave elastography. Sports Health. 2020;12(4):373-81.

114. Holden S, Lyng K, Graven-Nielsen T, Riel H, Olesen JL, Larsen LH, et al. Isometric exercise and pain in patellar tendinopathy: A randomized crossover trial. J Sci Med Sport. 2020;23(3):208-14.

115. Parle PJ, Riddiford-Harland DL, Howitt CD, Lewis JS. Acute rotator cuff tendinopathy: does ice, low load isometric exercise, or a combination of the two produce an analgaesic effect? Br J Sports Med. 2017;51(3):208-9.

116. Rio E, Kidgell D, Purdam C, Gaida J, Moseley GL, Pearce AJ, et al. Isometric exercise induces analgesia and reduces inhibition in patellar tendinopathy. Br J Sports Med. 2015;49(19):1277-83.

117. van Ark M, Cook JL, Docking SI, Zwerver J, Gaida JE, van den Akker-Scheek I, et al. Do isometric and isotonic exercise programs reduce pain in athletes with patellar tendinopathy in-season? A randomised clinical trial. J Sci Med Sport. 2016;19(9):702-6.

118. Rio E, Purdam C, Girdwood M, Cook J. Isometric exercise to reduce pain in patellar tendinopathy in-season: Is it effective "on the road"? Clin J Sport Med. 2019;29(3):188-92.

119. Topp R, Woolley S, Hornyak J, Khuder S, Kahaleh B. The effect of dynamic versus isometric resistance training on pain and functioning among adults with osteoarthritis of the knee. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2002;83(9):1187-95.

120. Hagberg M, Harms-Ringdahl K, Nisell R, Hjelm EW. Rehabilitation of neck-shoulder pain in women industrial workers: A randomized trial comparing isometric shoulder endurance training with isometric shoulder strength training. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2000;81(8):1051-8.

121. Lum D, Comfort P, Barbosa TM, Balasekaran G. Comparing the effects of plyometric and isometric strength training on dynamic and isometric force-time characteristics. Biol Sport. 2022;39(1):189-97.

122. Lum D, Barbosa TM, Aziz AR, Balasekaran G. Effects of isometric strength and plyometric training on running performance: A randomized controlled study. Res Q Exerc Sport. 2023;94(1):263-71.

123. Tillin NA, Folland JP. Maximal and explosive strength training elicit distinct neuromuscular adaptations, specific to the training stimulus. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2014;14(2):365-74.