

1 **Exercise prescription and strategies to promote the cross-education of strength: a scoping review**

2 <sup>1</sup>Caleb C. Voskuil, <sup>2</sup>Justin W. Andrushko, <sup>3</sup>Boglarka S. Huddleston, <sup>4</sup>Jonathan P. Farthing, <sup>1,5</sup>Joshua C.  
3 Carr

4 <sup>1</sup>Texas Christian University, Department of Kinesiology, Fort Worth, TX, USA.

5 <sup>2</sup>The University of British Columbia, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Physical Therapy, Vancouver,  
6 B.C., Canada.

7 <sup>3</sup>Texas Christian University, Health Sciences Librarian, Mary C. Burnett Library, Fort Worth, TX, USA.

8 <sup>4</sup>University of Saskatchewan, College of Kinesiology, Saskatoon, SK, Canada.

9 <sup>5</sup>Texas Christian University School of Medicine, Department of Medical Education, Fort Worth, TX,  
10 USA.

11  
12 <sup>1</sup>Caleb C. Voskuil

13 Email: [caleb.voskuil@tcu.edu](mailto:caleb.voskuil@tcu.edu)  
14 ORCID iD: 0000-0003-3101-9030

15 <sup>2</sup>Justin W. Andrushko

16 Email: [justin.andrushko@ubc.ca](mailto:justin.andrushko@ubc.ca)  
17 ORCID iD: 0000-0003-2258-1689

18 <sup>3</sup>Boglarka S. Huddleston

19 Email: [b.huddleston@tcu.edu](mailto:b.huddleston@tcu.edu)  
20 ORCID iD: 0000-0002-7843-5632

21 <sup>4</sup>Jonathan P. Farthing

22 Email: [jon.farthing@usask.ca](mailto:jon.farthing@usask.ca)  
23 ORCID iD: 0000-0002-2549-1227

24 **Word count:** 4114

25 **Tables:** 3

26 **Figures:** 1

27 **Supplementary files:** 2

28 **Corresponding author**

29 Joshua C. Carr, Ph.D., CSCS

30 Assistant Professor

31 Texas Christian University

32 3005 Stadium Drive

33 Fort Worth, Texas 76129

34 Email: [joshua.carr@tcu.edu](mailto:joshua.carr@tcu.edu)

35 ORCID iD: 0000-0003-0874-0110

36 **Abstract**

37 **Objective:** To perform a scoping review of the literature on the experimental studies examining  
38 the role of resistance training frequency, intensity, the type of training, training volume, and  
39 adjuvant therapies on the cross-education of strength.

40 **Study Design:** Scoping Review.

41 **Literature Search:** The review was preregistered and performed with the search methodology  
42 described by the PRISMA extension for scoping reviews. CINAHL, MEDLINE, APA PsycInfo,  
43 SPORTDiscus, and Web of Science were systematically searched with grey literature searches  
44 and pearling of references thereafter.

45 **Study Selection Criteria:** Experiments were included in the review if they performed a  
46 unilateral resistance training intervention that directly compared the dose of a training variable  
47 on the cross-education response in healthy or clinical populations following a minimum of two  
48 weeks of training. Experiments must have reported maximal strength outcomes for the untrained  
49 limb.

50 **Data Synthesis:** For each experiment, the study population, intervention methods, the dosage of  
51 the training variable being studied, and the outcomes for the untrained, contralateral limb were  
52 identified and collectively synthesized.

53 **Results:** The search returned a total of 911 articles, 56 of which qualified for inclusion. The  
54 results show that experimental trials have been conducted on resistance training frequency (n =  
55 4), intensity (n = 7), the type of training (n = 25), training volume (n = 3), and adjuvant therapies  
56 (n = 17) on the cross-education of strength.

57 **Conclusions:** This review synthesizes the available evidence regarding exercise design and  
58 prescription strategies to promote the cross-education of strength. It appears that traditional  
59 resistance training frequencies (ie., 2-3d/wk) at high intensities are effective at promoting cross-  
60 education. Eccentric muscle actions show additive benefits. There is experimental evidence that  
61 neuromodulatory techniques can augment cross-education when layered with unilateral  
62 resistance training versus training alone.

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70 **Introduction**

71 Cross-education has been known since the seminal work of Scripture et al<sup>67</sup>, but only recently  
72 has its clinical significance been given meaningful attention. The defining feature of cross-  
73 education is the transfer of muscle strength to the opposite (untrained) homologous limb  
74 following unilateral strength training. This adaptation has little relevance for individuals with  
75 well-functioning limbs. However, in a scenario where one limb is debilitated, unilateral training  
76 is a viable intervention to preserve neuromuscular function following orthopedic injury<sup>31,45,56</sup> or  
77 neurotrauma.<sup>17,51</sup> Despite evidence showing the therapeutic efficacy of cross-education,  
78 unilateral training is still poorly prescribed.<sup>12</sup> This may be due, in part, to the lack of information  
79 available to clinicians to guide evidence-based decisions regarding the exercise prescription for  
80 cross-education.

81  
82 The potential benefits of cross-education in rehabilitation settings cannot be understated. A  
83 common concern is that resistance training with only one limb will heighten the asymmetry  
84 between limbs in clinical contexts. However, the benefit of preserving muscle size and function  
85 likely outweighs the temporary asymmetry that could manifest with cross-education and can be  
86 corrected post-disuse or injury by shifting the focus of training to the opposite limb.<sup>24</sup> In these  
87 scenarios, cross-education training provides a low-risk strategy that, at minimum, helps to  
88 prevent global deconditioning during periods of inactivity. The emerging evidence showing  
89 cross-education interventions preserve muscle strength and size during orthopedic limb  
90 immobilization<sup>2,23,46,63,76</sup> offers more confidence that unilateral training has broad clinical  
91 applications. There are very little data from randomized clinical trials that have employed a  
92 cross-education intervention in patients. Of those that have, there is evidence<sup>45,56,60</sup> showing

93 cross-education provides superior adaptations compared to standard care, whereas others<sup>83,84</sup>  
94 show similar outcomes with or without unilateral training. Differences in exercise design and  
95 prescription likely account for some of the disparity in these clinical trials.<sup>56,60,83,84</sup>  
96  
97 The transfer of strength to the opposite, untrained limb is mediated by neural adaptations. With  
98 that, exercise interventions that facilitate neural drive of descending motor commands may serve  
99 as promising strategies for enhancing the effect. Several reviews discuss the mechanisms and  
100 sites supporting cross-education.<sup>1,14,25,32,50</sup> Given its neural basis, there is interest towards  
101 identifying optimal training prescriptions that maximize contralateral adaptations. A meta-  
102 analysis by Manca et al<sup>48</sup> revealed that the type of muscle action used during unilateral training  
103 influences the magnitude of transfer, and Frazer et al<sup>49</sup> outline adjuvant interventions showing  
104 promise for augmenting the transfer effect. A recent expert consensus statement<sup>49</sup> provides  
105 direction for mechanistic inquiries into the cross-education effect as well as consensus-based  
106 recommendations for the design of unilateral training interventions aiming to promote strength  
107 transfer. Despite these advances, a thorough synthesis of the evidence regarding exercise design  
108 and prescription to optimize the cross-education of strength remains absent.  
109  
110 This scoping review addresses this gap by outlining the experiments that have examined the role  
111 of resistance training frequency, intensity, the type(s) of training, and training volume on the  
112 magnitude of cross-education. Emerging adjuvant therapies that may augment cross-education  
113 are also examined. Importantly, we focus on the cross-education of strength as it reflects the  
114 upper boundary of motor performance and is an accessible target across different clinics,  
115 conditions, and rehabilitation timelines.<sup>30,42</sup> Our intention is to provide clinicians with evidence-

116 based recommendations that optimize contralateral adaptations for individuals with asymmetrical  
117 limb function (i.e., orthopedic injury) who are unable to exercise both limbs.  
118

119 **Methods**

120 This scoping review adhered to the recommendations for the PRISMA extension for Scoping  
121 Reviews.<sup>73</sup> The review topic was preregistered on Open Science Framework ([osf.io/9sh5b](https://osf.io/9sh5b))  
122 before study selection and data extraction. All literature searches were performed by an  
123 information scientist.

124 **Data Sources and Searches**

125 A literature search protocol was developed through the identification of relevant health science  
126 databases available through the Texas Christian University Library and the construction of a  
127 Boolean search string. The following databases were systematically searched on December 20,  
128 2021: CINAHL Complete, MEDLINE Complete, APA PsycInfo, SPORTDiscus with Full Text,  
129 and Web of Science. The following Boolean search string was utilized: ((cross education OR  
130 cross exercise OR cross transfer) OR (cross training NOT crossfit) OR (interlimb transfer OR  
131 “strength transfer”) OR bilateral transfer)) AND ((unilateral training OR unilateral exercise) OR  
132 (contralateral training OR contralateral exercise)). An expander was applied for equivalent  
133 subject terms. Results were limited to journal articles published after 1980 up to present time,  
134 and articles published in English. Three additional databases were searched for grey literature  
135 (ClinicalTrials.gov, HSRProj, and NIH RePORTER) and did not produce any additional results.  
136 Supplementary File Table 1 shows the search protocol executed in SPORTDiscus, including  
137 expanders, limiters, and number of items found.

138 **Study Selection**

139 The initial search across the five databases yielded 2809 articles. Six additional articles that were  
140 known to the authors but did not show up in the database searches were added. A screen for  
141 duplicates removed 1904 articles and a set of 911 potential articles remained. The inclusion

142 criteria utilized for this scoping review was designed to capture as many experiments as possible  
143 that have examined the role of resistance training frequency, training intensity, the type of  
144 training, training volume, and adjuvant interventions on the magnitude of cross-education. The  
145 following inclusion criteria was used for screening:

- 146 1. Participants: Investigations must have been performed on human participants; all ages,  
147 sexes, and abilities were included in the review.
- 148 2. Training comparisons: Studies must have included a direct comparison of a training  
149 variable and its influence on the magnitude of cross-education. The operational  
150 definitions of the training variables and their criteria for inclusion are composed of the  
151 following:
  - 152 a. Training Frequency: experiments must have compared the number of unilateral  
153 resistance training sessions within a defined period.
  - 154 b. Training Intensity: experiments must have compared the load and/or resistance  
155 relative to maximal strength levels for a unilateral resistance exercise.
  - 156 c. Type of Training: experiments must have compared the type of muscle action,  
157 joint action, or the limb involved within the unilateral resistance training  
158 intervention.
  - 159 d. Volume of Training: experiments must have compared the amount or structure of  
160 the sets and/or repetitions of unilateral resistance training within the intervention.
  - 161 e. Adjuvant Intervention: experiments must have compared the effects of a treatment  
162 intervention with unilateral training compared to unilateral training alone on the  
163 magnitude of cross-education.

164 3. Since this review focuses on the dose-response properties of resistance training variable  
165 prescription on the magnitude of cross-education, a minimum of two weeks of training  
166 must have been performed.

167 4. Outcome measures: Studies must have reported measurements of maximal strength to  
168 quantify the magnitude of cross-education.


169 5. Additional considerations: Review articles and conference abstracts were not included in  
170 this review.

171



172 **Results**

173 715 studies were excluded based on title, keywords, and abstract screening, and 156 were  
174 excluded based on full-text screening. A reference check was conducted on the remaining 40  
175 articles, which added 16 new articles. A total of 56 articles met inclusion criteria and were  
176 retained for inclusion in this scoping review. Figure 1 provides an overview of the study  
177 selection process.



Adapted from: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018; 169(7): 467–473. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>

178  
179 **Figure 1.** PRISMA Flowchart of Article Search and Selection  
180

181 **Study characteristics**

182 Of the articles included in the review, the total sample size across all 56 articles was N = 1801  
183 with a median of n = 31 per experiment. The median number of groups per experiment was n =  
184 3. There was considerable range in the sample size per experiment (n = 9-115). A total of six  
185 studies compared exercise prescription variables in clinical populations and one during  
186 orthopedic immobilization. Most studies (n=49) were performed in younger adults (median age:  
187 23 years), while four articles were performed in adolescents (median age: 11.5 years) and three  
188 performed with older adults (median age: 62 years). There were three studies that did not report  
189 the sex of the sample; of those that did, 66% were male and 34% were female.

190

191 There were three articles comparing more than one exercise prescription variable.<sup>13,52,58</sup> Of these,  
192 the primary aim of the respective experiment was used for categorization within the review, with  
193 secondary aims incorporated when necessary. Four articles met inclusion criteria but were not  
194 designed to examine cross-education, but as a control measure during a unilateral intervention.

195

196 **Discussion**

197 The American College of Sports Medicine provides general recommendations for resistance  
198 training design and prescription for the major resistance training variables: Frequency, Intensity,  
199 Type, and Volume.<sup>43</sup> These variables are manipulated within a resistance training session to  
200 provoke specific adaptations (i.e., strength, hypertrophy, endurance), yet there are no  
201 standardized recommendations for unilateral training to promote the cross-education of strength.  
202 By synthesizing the available data comparing the exercise design and prescription variables for  
203 unilateral training in this scoping review, we map the current knowledge on this topic and outline  
204 a general direction for design strategies to support the cross-education of strength. We

205 summarize the findings for each training variable below and outline general recommendations in  
206 Table 3.

207  
208 **Frequency**  
209

210 The role of training frequency on the magnitude of cross-education has been examined with  
211 handgrip training<sup>3,9</sup> and knee extension training following anterior cruciate ligament  
212 reconstruction (ACLR).<sup>60,61</sup> The grip training experiments compare a traditional frequency of  
213 training (ie., 3×/wk) with a high frequency of training at the same intensity (i.e., 7×/wk or  
214 10×/wk respectively). The data shows that when handgrip training is volume-matched, high-  
215 frequency training does not further the magnitude of cross-education compared to a traditional  
216 training frequency.<sup>3,9</sup> However, with a unique study design, Barss et al<sup>3</sup> show that high-  
217 frequency training (daily) increases the rate at which cross-education manifests. Specifically,  
218 cross-education was observed in the daily training group following the 15<sup>th</sup> session (~2 weeks) of  
219 the training intervention, while cross-education was shown for the traditional training group after  
220 completion of the 12<sup>th</sup> session (~ 1 month). Similar findings are shown in experiments examining  
221 the role of training frequency during the early phase of rehabilitation following ACLR.<sup>60,61</sup> By  
222 comparing different frequencies (3d/wk versus 5d/wk) of unilateral knee extension training to  
223 standard care, the authors show that strength outcomes are improved in the reconstructed knee of  
224 the training groups more than standard care control group following 8 weeks of eccentric-based  
225 unilateral training (5 sets × 6 reps; 80% eccentric 1RM). However, there were no significant  
226 differences in the outcomes for the reconstructed knee between the two experimental groups.  
227 More specifically, the recovery of isometric knee extension strength to pre-operative levels was  
228 lowest in the standard treatment group with ~57% recovery versus ~80% and ~77% strength  
229 recovery for the 3×/wk and 5×/wk groups, respectively. The available data shows that increasing

230 training frequency does not further the magnitude of cross-education.<sup>3,9,60,61</sup> However, high  
231 frequency isometric training increases the rate at which cross-education manifests, showing  
232 similar strength improvements in ~half the time.<sup>3</sup> Overall, these findings indicate that increasing  
233 the training frequency influences the rate of cross-education but not the magnitude.

## 234 **Intensity**

235 The intensity of resistance training is arguably the most important variable in the exercise  
236 prescription and is a key moderator of the neural adaptations that manifest from training.<sup>27</sup> The  
237 role of training intensity on cross-education has been examined through submaximal handgrip  
238 training,<sup>70,79</sup> elbow flexion,<sup>57,64</sup> unilateral leg press in adolescents,<sup>5,10</sup> and knee extension.<sup>13</sup> The  
239 comparison of training loads (50%, 33%, and 30%, of maximal strength) prescribed to  
240 submaximal handgrip endurance training (2 sets to failure; 5-6×/wk for 6 wks) demonstrates that  
241 higher intensity loads exhibit greater cross-education than lower intensities. This positive  
242 relationship between the training intensity and the magnitude of cross-education is supported  
243 during both volume-matched and non-volume-matched elbow flexion training.<sup>57,64</sup> During higher  
244 intensity training ( $\geq 80\%$  1RM) a greater magnitude of cross-education is observed when  
245 compared to lower intensity loads ( $\leq 40\%$ ).<sup>57,64</sup> Additionally, training at higher intensities may  
246 increase the rate of cross-education, showing intensity-dependent outcomes following a single  
247 week of training.<sup>64</sup> Training intensity comparisons during lower-body training show similar  
248 results.<sup>5,10,13</sup> In adolescents performing volume-matched high intensity (5RM) or low intensity  
249 (20RM) unilateral leg press training, high-intensity training demonstrates ~25% and 20% greater  
250 contralateral strength increases in knee extension and flexion, respectively, compared to low-  
251 intensity.<sup>5,10</sup> Similar findings are observed during knee extension in non-clinical adults.<sup>13</sup> When  
252 training is performed at 75% 1RM for a defined volume (6 sets  $\times$  5 reps) or until failure, the

253 magnitude of cross-education is greater than training at 25% 1RM to failure.<sup>13</sup> The available data  
254 consistently demonstrates superior cross-education effects when unilateral training is performed  
255 at higher versus lower intensities.<sup>5,10,13,57,64,70,79</sup>

## 256 **Type**

### 257 *Muscle action*

258 Several experiments have examined how the type of muscle action used during unilateral  
259 training affects the magnitude of cross-education. Specifically, concentric versus eccentric  
260 training has been compared during isokinetic knee extensions,<sup>31,35,36,68,69</sup> isotonic knee  
261 extensions,<sup>77,78</sup> elbow flexion,<sup>34,65,74,76</sup> and isokinetic wrist flexion.<sup>40</sup> Most experiments show  
262 eccentric training results in superior cross-education versus concentric training and provides  
263 more robust transfer effects to other muscle actions.<sup>34,35,36,40,68,69,76</sup> Even in the experiments  
264 showing similar magnitudes of cross-education, it seems that cross-education is better preserved  
265 during detraining following eccentric versus concentric training.<sup>65,77,78</sup> The unique influence of  
266 unilateral eccentric training has been examined in clinically relevant scenarios.<sup>31,76</sup> Compared to  
267 traditional isotonic training with both muscle actions (ie., concentric-eccentric), eccentric  
268 training shows greater strength preservation effects following four weeks of arm immobilization  
269 for the immobilized arm.<sup>76</sup> Eccentric versus concentric training of the non-affected knee  
270 extensors in ACLR patients shows that both types of unilateral training resulted in greater  
271 strength recovery of the reconstructed knee compared to standard care, but superior effect sizes  
272 were shown for the eccentric versus concentric training group at 12- and 24-weeks post-  
273 surgery.<sup>31</sup> The experiments captured by our search show that unilateral eccentric training  
274 promotes more robust cross-education effects than concentric training in non-clinical and clinical  
275 populations.

276 *Joint action*

277 Experiments have examined how the type of joint action (i.e., isometric, isokinetic, isotonic)  
278 used during unilateral training influences the cross-education response<sup>16,47,62</sup> and some also  
279 compare the training velocities (i.e., slower versus faster) during single-joint<sup>21,58</sup> and multi-joint  
280 exercise.<sup>52,53</sup> Interestingly, available evidence utilizing single leg squats,<sup>53</sup> isotonic<sup>58</sup> and  
281 isokinetic elbow flexion<sup>21</sup> suggest training velocity influences cross-education. Unilateral multi-  
282 joint training at lower training velocities (duration of eccentric phase: 6-sec versus 3-sec) shows  
283 a greater magnitude of cross-education.<sup>53</sup> Conversely, when training velocity is low during  
284 isokinetic or isotonic training of the elbow flexors, there is less transfer to the contralateral limb  
285 compared to training at higher velocities. However, when training velocity, volume, and intensity  
286 of training are ~matched, there is no difference between isokinetic versus isotonic resistance  
287 training on the magnitude of cross-education.<sup>16</sup> Additional comparisons of joint action type on  
288 cross-education are challenging due to differences in training intensities. Specifically, maximal  
289 isometric knee extensions promote cross-education following three months of unilateral training  
290 whereas no cross-education was shown following low-intensity (6.4 kg) isotonic knee extensions  
291 in Antarctic explorers.<sup>62</sup> Similar findings are shown in patients with osteoarthritis who were  
292 separated into isometric, isokinetic, and isotonic training groups and performed unilateral  
293 training 5x/wk for 3wks.<sup>47</sup> Although the repetition volume was matched for each training session  
294 between groups, the isometric training was maximal, the isotonic training was low-intensity and  
295 fixed (1.5 kg), and the isokinetic training was concentric-only.<sup>47</sup> After the intervention, only the  
296 isometric group showed significant improvements in contralateral strength.<sup>47</sup> These results<sup>47,62</sup>  
297 emphasize the importance of unilateral training intensity to promote the cross-education of  
298 strength. When the intensity of isotonic training is matched, however, it seems that training at an

299 extended ( $0^\circ$  -  $50^\circ$ ) versus flexed ( $80^\circ$  -  $130^\circ$ ) joint angle and range of motion promotes greater  
300 cross-education.<sup>66</sup> These studies<sup>16,21,47,52,53,62,66</sup> collectively show that isometric, isokinetic, and  
301 isotonic joint actions will promote the cross-education of strength following unilateral training of  
302 sufficient intensity. The implications being that regardless of the equipment availability within a  
303 clinic, favorable contralateral adaptations may be achieved.

#### 304 *Limb*

305 In addition to the type of muscle and joint action, the magnitude of cross-education between the  
306 upper versus lower limb<sup>7,29</sup> as well as the direction of transfer between dominant and non-  
307 dominant limbs<sup>6,15,22,75</sup> have been examined. The magnitude of cross-education is similar  
308 between the upper and lower body<sup>7,29</sup> and presents in both the dominant and non-dominant  
309 limbs.<sup>6,15,22,75</sup> As the chance of sustaining an injury is similar across limbs, these findings offer  
310 support for the broad implementation of unilateral training when indicated.

#### 311 **Volume**

312 The volume of resistance training<sup>13,58</sup> and set configuration<sup>19</sup> have been examined for their  
313 effects on cross-education. When comparing training volumes during unilateral knee  
314 extension<sup>13,59</sup> and elbow flexion,<sup>19,58</sup> a dose-response relationship emerges between unilateral  
315 training volume and the magnitude of cross-education. However, it appears there is a threshold  
316 as well as diminishing returns for this relationship. For instance, no contralateral improvements  
317 are shown following unilateral knee extension training 1×wk every other week<sup>59</sup> or following 30  
318 discrete repetitions of elbow flexion 1×wk for 5 weeks.<sup>19</sup> Cross-education is observed for the  
319 elbow flexors following a single set and three sets at a 6-8 RM load 3×/wk for 6 weeks, but  
320 greater transfer occurs when the volume of training increases from a single set to three sets.<sup>58</sup>  
321 There is no additional contralateral benefit, however, when high-intensity (75% 1RM) training is

322 performed to failure (6 sets × failure) versus a defined volume (6 sets × 5 reps).<sup>13</sup> These studies  
323 suggest traditional strength training volume configurations (i.e., multiple sets of < 8 repetitions)  
324 at high intensities produces the most robust cross-education effect.<sup>13,19,58,59</sup>

### 325 **Adjuvant interventions**

326 There has been considerable interest in augmenting the magnitude of cross-education with  
327 various adjuvant interventions. This likely reflects the broad clinical interest in understanding  
328 and applying cross-education as a neurorehabilitation technique. The brief sections below are  
329 organized in the domains of *Stimulation, Mirror Training & Mental Imagery, Blood Flow*  
330 *Restriction*, and a collection of unique approaches.

#### 331 *Stimulation*

332 The use of muscle,<sup>8,37,39</sup> nerve,<sup>4</sup> and brain<sup>33</sup> stimulation techniques in conjunction with unilateral  
333 training versus training alone show unique and somewhat conflicting results for the untrained  
334 limb. The studies investigating muscle stimulation have all done so for the knee extensors and  
335 show favorable<sup>8,37</sup> or similar<sup>39,81</sup> results on the magnitude of cross-education versus training  
336 alone. Those showing additive benefits of unilateral training with muscle stimulation used high  
337 training intensities<sup>8</sup> and eccentric contractions,<sup>37</sup> while the interventions showing similar  
338 outcomes used lower intensities of isometric training.<sup>39,81</sup> One study<sup>33</sup> shows that applying  
339 anodal transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) over the ipsilateral motor cortex (the  
340 ‘untrained’ M1) during unilateral training promotes a slightly greater magnitude of cross-  
341 education (~12.5% versus 9.4%) and retention (13% versus 7.6%) following a brief period of  
342 detraining versus resistance training alone for the elbow flexors. In contrast, applying  
343 transcutaneous nerve stimulation to the radial nerve of the trained limb concurrently with  
344 training impairs the magnitude of cross-education compared to training alone for the wrist



345 extensors.<sup>4</sup> These studies collectively show that stimulation techniques can modify the  
346 magnitude of cross-education following unilateral training versus training alone. The use of  
347 neuromuscular electrical stimulation (NMES), tDCS, and other stimulation techniques<sup>81</sup> seem to  
348 be promising adjuvant interventions to layer within unilateral training prescription, though the  
349 exact prescription for these techniques requires more investigation (see Zhou et al<sup>82</sup> for more on  
350 this topic).

### 351 *Mirror Training & Mental Imagery*

352 Illusionary mirror training as well as mental imagery training are believed to activate the mirror  
353 neuron system<sup>38,85</sup> and both forms of training provide an accessible avenue for patient-driven  
354 rehabilitation. The mirror training hypothesis<sup>38</sup> has been investigated in neurologically intact  
355 individuals<sup>86</sup> and in individuals living with stroke.<sup>18,71</sup> These three studies compare the  
356 magnitude of cross-education while performing unilateral resistance training with and without  
357 illusionary mirror visual feedback during wrist flexion,<sup>86</sup> elbow extension,<sup>18</sup> and dorsiflexion.<sup>71</sup>  
358 The data from neurologically intact individuals show ~27% greater magnitude of cross-education  
359 in the mirror training group compared to the group that did not receive mirror visual feedback  
360 during unilateral training.<sup>86</sup> The data from individuals living with stroke shows that when  
361 training the less affected limb with or without a mirror illusion, the mirror group displays cross-  
362 education of elbow extensor strength (~15%), but no cross-education was observed following  
363 training without a mirror (-0.2%). Using the same training intervention as Ehrensberger et al,<sup>18</sup>  
364 dorsiflexion training<sup>71</sup> of the less affected limb with a mirror illusion shows a moderate, non-  
365 significant improvement in the contralateral dorsiflexors strength (~6%, ES = 0.40,  $p = 0.160$ )  
366 but less of an effect when training is performed without a mirror (-0.1%, ES < 0.00,  $p = 0.956$ ). It  
367 is important to note the large, non-significant between-group effect for the elbow extensors ( $p =$

368 0.056, ES = 0.70) and negligible between-group effect for the dorsiflexors ( $p = 0.956$ , ES = 0.10)  
369 in the experiments studying individuals living with stroke. The two studies comparing mental  
370 imagery training versus unilateral training alone on the magnitude of cross-education report  
371 contrasting findings.<sup>20,80</sup> Cross-education was similar between mental imagery versus the  
372 unilateral training group for the small muscles of the hand,<sup>80</sup> whereas only the unilateral training  
373 group demonstrated cross-education for a novel grip task.<sup>20</sup> The evidence shows that mirror  
374 training seems to be a promising adjuvant for cross-education in neurologically intact  
375 populations and individuals living with stroke for tasks involving the upper limb, but it may be  
376 that isotonic versus isometric tasks provide a greater training stimulus. The evidence does not  
377 support the notion that mental imagery provides additive benefits over unilateral training alone,  
378 however, the limited comparisons open the door for novel experimental designs to examine this  
379 question further.

### 380 *Blood Flow Restriction*

381 There have been three experiments comparing the effect of unilateral training with versus  
382 without blood flow restriction (BFR) to the training limb. The data from the elbow flexors shows  
383 that following 20 training sessions of 3 sets  $\times$  10 repetitions at 50% 1RM, there was either no  
384 cross-education<sup>44</sup> or a significant level of strength improvement for the untrained arm that was  
385 not enhanced by BFR.<sup>54</sup> Similar findings are shown when comparing the influence of high-  
386 intensity (75% 1RM) resistance training versus low-intensity (20% 1RM) BFR training of the  
387 plantar flexors. Following 20 training sessions, no cross-education of strength and no benefit of  
388 BFR was observed.<sup>55</sup> The available data indicates that adding BFR to a unilateral training  
389 intervention provides no benefit for the contralateral, untrained limb.

390

391 *Whole Body Vibration, Protein Supplementation, and Hypoxia*

392 The use of unilateral resistance training with whole body vibration,<sup>28</sup> protein supplementation,<sup>11</sup>  
393 and training under hypoxic conditions<sup>41</sup> have been examined. Performing high-intensity  
394 unilateral split squats with or without the rear leg on a vibrating platform drastically increases  
395 split squat 1RM for the contralateral leg,<sup>28</sup> but vibration (+52%, ES = 0.98) does not provide  
396 significantly greater benefits versus training without vibration (+35%, ES = 0.99). Interestingly,  
397 in the protein supplement study, participants who consumed 20 g of whey protein and 6.2 g of  
398 leucine before and after high-intensity training of the knee extensors for 8 weeks showed  
399 significantly greater magnitudes of cross-education (~15%) compared to the placebo (2.8%) and  
400 control (4.6%) groups.<sup>11</sup> Lastly, training under hypoxic conditions, which elevated growth  
401 hormone while resistance training, offered no significant benefit towards the magnitude of cross-  
402 education (40%) compared to normoxic conditions (24%).<sup>41</sup>

403 **Limitations**

404 Our focus on the cross-education of strength neglects the cross-education of skill that is well  
405 known and clinically relevant. The quality of the included studies varied considerably as some  
406 studies use a parallel group design with, and others without, a non-interventional control group.  
407 The participants who underwent training were mostly free of injury or disease, which may limit  
408 the generalizability of these findings for the intended patient populations. The relevance of  
409 adhering to reporting standards for exercise interventions is obvious<sup>72</sup> and needed for the  
410 replication, development, and clinical translation of unilateral resistance training paradigms. This  
411 is a critical point for cross-education interventions as principles of motor learning (i.e.,  
412 instruction, feedback, attentional focus) influence skill acquisition.

413

## 414 **Clinical Implications**

415 Unilateral resistance training provides a low-cost, accessible rehabilitation strategy for  
416 individuals unable to exercise one limb due to injury or neurotrauma. Clinicians can use this  
417 review as a road map for developing unilateral rehabilitation interventions that promote  
418 favorable outcomes for the affected limb in patients with asymmetrical limb function. These  
419 practices can be integrated within multiple levels of athlete-patient care.

## 420 **Conclusions**

421 This review maps the available evidence regarding the dose-response properties of unilateral  
422 resistance training frequency, intensity, the type(s) of training, and training volume on the cross-  
423 education of strength and outlines adjuvant interventions that may augment the transfer effects.  
424 The evidence shows that exercise design and prescription moderate the cross-education of  
425 strength following short-term training interventions in clinical and non-clinical populations. The  
426 key findings indicate that training 2-3×wk at relatively high intensities of effort are optimal for  
427 training. Whether training is single-joint or multi-joint, emphasizing eccentric muscle actions  
428 appears beneficial. As training progresses, so should the volume of unilateral exercise. Clinicians  
429 may consider using these recommendations as a starting point for implementing cross-education  
430 as a rehabilitation strategy. These recommendations are accessible, low-risk, and provide the  
431 patient with autonomy regarding their rehabilitation.

## 432 **Key points:**

433 **Findings:** The cross-education of strength is moderated by exercise design and prescription in  
434 clinical and non-clinical populations.

435 **Implications:** This review synthesizes the available evidence regarding exercise design  
436 strategies for unilateral resistance training and provides evidence-based recommendations for the  
437 prescription of unilateral training to maximize the cross-education of strength.

438 **Caution:** Unilateral training is another tool in a clinician’s toolbox, not a panacea, the training  
439 should align with the needs of the patient and the objectives of the rehabilitative phase.

440

441 **Table 3.** General recommendations for unilateral resistance training to promote the cross-  
442 education of strength.

443

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
<b>Frequency</b>	Unilateral exercise should be performed 2-3 days per week.  Increasing the training frequency may increase rate of cross-education.	3, 9, 60, 61
<b>Intensity</b>	To promote cross-education, unilateral exercise should be performed at relatively high intensities of effort.	5, 10, 13, 57, 64
<b>Type</b>	Multi-joint and single joint exercise can promote cross-education  Cross-education manifests for the upper, lower, dominant, and non-dominant limbs.  Isokinetic, isotonic, and isometric exercise all promote cross-education.  Eccentric muscle actions should be incorporated and at times emphasized during unilateral exercise.	6, 7, 15, 16, 21, 22, 29, 31, 34-36, 40, 47, 52, 53, 62, 65, 66, 68, 69, 74, 76-78
<b>Volume</b>	Multiple sets with progressive increases in volume are recommended to promote cross-education.	13,19,58

444

445

446 **References**

- 447 1. Andrushko JW, Gould LA, Farthing JP. Contralateral effects of unilateral training:  
448 sparing of muscle strength and size after immobilization. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab.*  
449 2018;43(11):1131-1139. <https://doi.org/10.1139/apnm-2018-0073>
- 450 2. Andrushko JW, Lanovaz JL, Bjorkman KM, Kontulainen SA, Farthing JP. Unilateral  
451 strength training leads to muscle-specific sparing effects during opposite homologous limb  
452 immobilization. *J Appl Physiol.* 2018;124(4):866-876.  
453 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00971.2017>
- 454 3. Barss TS, Klarner T, Pearcey GEP, Sun Y, Zehr EP. Time course of interlimb strength  
455 transfer after unilateral handgrip training. *J Appl Physiol.* 2018;125(5):1594-1608.  
456 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00390.2017>
- 457 4. Barss TS, Klarner T, Sun Y, Inouye K, Zehr EP. Effects of enhanced cutaneous sensory  
458 input on interlimb strength transfer of the wrist extensors. *Physiol Rep.* 2020;8(6):e14406.  
459 <https://doi.org/10.14814/phy2.14406>
- 460 5. Ben Othman A, Behm DG, Chaouachi A. Evidence of homologous and heterologous  
461 effects after unilateral leg training in youth. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab.* 2018;43(3):282-291.  
462 <https://doi.org/10.1139/apnm-2017-0338>
- 463 6. Ben Othman A, Chaouachi A, Chaouachi M, et al. Dominant and nondominant leg press  
464 training induce similar contralateral and ipsilateral limb training adaptations with children. *Appl*  
465 *Physiol Nutr Metab.* 2019;44(9):973-984. <https://doi.org/10.1139/apnm-2018-0766>
- 466 7. Ben Othman A, Chaouachi M, Makhlof I, et al. Unilateral elbow flexion and leg press  
467 training induce cross-education but not global training gains in children. *Pediatr Exerc Sci.*  
468 2020;32(1):36-47. <https://doi.org/10.1123/pes.2019-0079>

- 469 8. Bezerra P, Zhou S, Crowley Z, Brooks L, Hooper A. Effects of unilateral  
470 electromyostimulation superimposed on voluntary training on strength and cross-sectional area.  
471 *Muscle Nerve*. 2009;40(3):430-437. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mus.21329>
- 472 9. Boyes NG, Yee P, Lanovaz JL, Farthing JP. Cross-education after high-frequency versus  
473 low-frequency volume-matched handgrip training. *Muscle Nerve*. 2017;56(4):689-695.  
474 <https://doi.org/10.1002/mus.25637>
- 475 10. Chaouachi A, Ben Othman A, Makhlof I, Young JD, Granacher U, Behm DG. Global  
476 training effects of trained and untrained muscles with youth can be maintained during 4 weeks of  
477 detraining. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2019;33(10):2788-2800.  
478 <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002606>
- 479 11. Coburn JW, Housh DJ, Housh TJ, et al. Effects of leucine and whey protein  
480 supplementation during eight weeks of unilateral resistance training. *J Strength Cond Res*.  
481 2006;20(2):284-291. <https://doi.org/10.1519/r-17925.1>
- 482 12. Collins BW, Lockyer EJ, Button DC. Prescribing cross-education of strength: is it time?  
483 *Muscle Nerve*. 2017;56(4):684-685. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mus.25665>
- 484 13. Colomer-Poveda D, Romero-Arenas S, Farinas J, Iglesias-Soler E, Hortobagyi T,  
485 Marquez G. Training load but not fatigue affects cross-education of maximal voluntary force.  
486 *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2021;31(2):313-324. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13844>
- 487 14. Colomer-Poveda D, Romero-Arenas S, Keller M, Hortobagyi T, Marquez G. Effects of  
488 acute and chronic unilateral resistance training variables on ipsilateral motor cortical excitability  
489 and cross-education: a systematic review. *Phys Ther Sport*. 2019;40:143-152.  
490 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ptsp.2019.09.006>
- 491 15. Coombs TA, Frazer AK, Horvath DM, Pearce AJ, Howatson G, Kidgell DJ. Cross-

- 492 education of wrist extensor strength is not influenced by non-dominant training in right-handers.  
493 *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2016;116(9):1757-1769. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-016-3436-5>
- 494 16. Coratella G, Milanese C, Schena F. Cross-education effect after unilateral eccentric-only  
495 isokinetic vs dynamic constant external resistance training. *Sport Sci Health.* 2015;11(3):329-  
496 335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11332-015-0244-y>
- 497 17. Dragert K, Zehr EP. High-intensity unilateral dorsiflexor resistance training results in  
498 bilateral neuromuscular plasticity after stroke. *Exp Brain Res.* 2013;225(1):93-104.  
499 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-012-3351-x>
- 500 18. Ehrensberger M, Simpson D, Broderick P, et al. Unilateral strength training and mirror  
501 therapy in patients with chronic stroke: a pilot randomized trial. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.*  
502 2019;98(8):657-665. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PHM.0000000000001162>
- 503 19. Fariñas J, Mayo X, Giraldez-Garcia MA, et al. Set configuration in strength training  
504 programs modulates the cross education phenomenon. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2021;35(9):2414-  
505 2420. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000003189>
- 506 20. Farthing JP, Borowsky R, Chilibeck PD, Binsted G, Sarty GE. Neuro-physiological  
507 adaptations associated with cross-education of strength. *Brain Topogr.* 2007;20(2):77-88.  
508 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-007-0033-2>
- 509 21. Farthing JP, Chilibeck PD. The effect of eccentric training at different velocities on  
510 cross-education. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2003;89(6):570-577. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-003-0841-3>
- 511 0841-3
- 512 22. Farthing JP, Chilibeck PD, Binsted G. Cross-education of arm muscular strength is  
513 unidirectional in right-handed individuals. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2005;37(9):1594-1600.  
514 <https://doi.org/10.1249/01.mss.0000177588.74448.75>



- 515 23. Farthing JP, Krentz JR, Magnus CR. Strength training the free limb attenuates strength  
516 loss during unilateral immobilization. *J Appl Physiol*. 2009;106(3):830-836.  
517 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.91331.2008>
- 518 24. Farthing JP, Zehr EP. Restoring symmetry: clinical applications of cross-education.  
519 *Exerc Sport Sci Rev*. 2014;42(2):70-75. <https://doi.org/10.1249/JES.0000000000000009>
- 520 25. Frazer AK, Pearce AJ, Howatson G, Thomas K, Goodall S, Kidgell DJ. Determining the  
521 potential sites of neural adaptation to cross-education: implications for the cross-education of  
522 muscle strength. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2018;118(9):1751-1772. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-018-3937-5)  
523 [018-3937-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-018-3937-5)
- 524 26. Frazer AK, Williams J, Spittle M, Kidgell DJ. Cross-education of muscular strength is  
525 facilitated by homeostatic plasticity. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2017;117(4):665-677.  
526 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-017-3538-8>
- 527 27. Gabriel DA, Kamen G, Frost G. Neural adaptations to resistive exercise: mechanisms and  
528 recommendations for training practices. *Sports Med*. 2006;36(2):133-149.  
529 <https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-200636020-00004>
- 530 28. Goodwill AM, Kidgell DJ. The effects of whole-body vibration on the cross-transfer of  
531 strength. *Scientific World Journal*. 2012;2012:1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1100/2012/504837>
- 532 29. Green LA, Gabriel DA. The cross education of strength and skill following unilateral  
533 strength training in the upper and lower limbs. *J Neurophysiol*. 2018;120(2):468-479.  
534 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00116.2018>
- 535 30. Grindem H, Snyder-Mackler L, Moksnes H, Engebretsen L, Risberg MA. Simple  
536 decision rules can reduce reinjury risk by 84% after ACL reconstruction: the Delaware-Oslo  
537 ACL cohort study. *Br J Sports Med*. 2016;50(13):804-808. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports->

538 2016-096031

539 31. Harput G, Ulusoy B, Yildiz TI, et al. Cross-education improves quadriceps strength  
540 recovery after ACL reconstruction: a randomized controlled trial. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol*  
541 *Arthrosc.* 2019;27(1):68-75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-018-5040-1>

542 32. Hendy AM, Lamon S. The cross-education phenomenon: brain and beyond. *Front*  
543 *Physiol.* 2017;8:1-9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2017.00297>

544 33. Hendy AM, Teo WP, Kidgell DJ. Anodal transcranial direct current stimulation prolongs  
545 the cross-education of strength and corticomotor plasticity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*  
546 2015;47(9):1788-1797. <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000000600>

547 34. Hill EC. Eccentric, but not concentric blood flow restriction resistance training increases  
548 muscle strength in the untrained limb. *Phys Ther Sport.* 2020;43:1-7.  
549 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ptsp.2020.01.013>

550 35. Hortobagyi T, Barrier J, Beard D, et al. Greater initial adaptations to submaximal muscle  
551 lengthening than maximal shortening. *J Appl Physiol.* 1996;81(4):1677-1682.  
552 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1996.81.4.1677>

553 36. Hortobagyi T, Lambert NJ, Hill JP. Greater cross education following training with  
554 muscle lengthening than shortening. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1997;29(1):107-112.  
555 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005768-199701000-00015>

556 37. Hortobagyi T, Scott K, Lambert J, Hamilton G, Tracy J. Cross-education of muscle  
557 strength is greater with stimulated than voluntary contractions. *Motor Control.* 1999;3(2):205-  
558 219. <https://doi.org/10.1123/mcj.3.2.205>

559 38. Howatson G, Zult T, Farthing JP, Zijdwind I, Hortobagyi T. Mirror training to augment  
560 cross-education during resistance training: a hypothesis. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2013;7:396.

561 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00396>

562 39. Kadri MA, Noe F, Nouar MB, Paillard T. Effects of training programs based on  
563 ipsilateral voluntary and stimulated contractions on muscle strength and monopedal postural  
564 control of the contralateral limb. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2017;117(9):1799-1806.

565 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-017-3676-z>

566 40. Kidgell DJ, Frazer AK, Daly RM, et al. Increased cross-education of muscle strength and  
567 reduced corticospinal inhibition following eccentric strength training. *Neuroscience.*

568 2015;300:566-575. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2015.05.057>

569 41. Kurobe K, Huang Z, Nishiwaki M, Yamamoto M, Kanehisa H, Ogita F. Effects of  
570 resistance training under hypoxic conditions on muscle hypertrophy and strength. *Clin Physiol*  
571 *Funct Imaging.* 2015;35(3):197-202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cpf.12147>

572 42. Kyritsis P, Bahr R, Landreau P, Miladi R, Witvrouw E. Likelihood of ACL graft rupture:  
573 not meeting six clinical discharge criteria before return to sport is associated with a four times  
574 greater risk of rupture. *Br J Sports Med.* 2016;50(15):946-51. [https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-](https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-095908)  
575 [2015-095908](https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-095908)

576 43. Liguori G, American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM). *ACSM's Guidelines for*  
577 *Exercise Testing and Prescription.* 11th ed. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins;  
578 2020.

579 44. Madarame H, Neya M, Ochi E, Nakazato K, Sato Y, Ishii N. Cross-transfer effects of  
580 resistance training with blood flow restriction. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2008;40(2):258-263.

581 <https://doi.org/10.1249/mss.0b013e31815c6d7e>

582 45. Magnus CR, Arnold CM, Johnston G, et al. Cross-education for improving strength and  
583 mobility after distal radius fractures: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*

- 584 2013;94(7):1247-1255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2013.03.005>
- 585 46. Magnus CR, Barss TS, Lanovaz JL, Farthing JP. Effects of cross-education on the muscle  
586 after a period of unilateral limb immobilization using a shoulder sling and swathe. *J Appl*  
587 *Physiol.* 2010;109(6):1887-1894. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00597.2010>
- 588 47. Malas FU, Ozcakar L, Kaymak B, et al. Effects of different strength training on muscle  
589 architecture: clinical and ultrasonographic evaluation in knee osteoarthritis. *PM R.*  
590 2013;5(8):655-662. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmrj.2013.03.005>
- 591 48. Manca A, Dragone D, Dvir Z, Deriu F. Cross-education of muscular strength following  
592 unilateral resistance training: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2017;117(11):2335-2354.  
593 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-017-3720-z>
- 594 49. Manca A, Hortobagyi T, Carroll TJ, et al. Contralateral effects of unilateral strength and  
595 skill training: modified Delphi consensus to establish key aspects of cross-education. *Sports*  
596 *Med.* 2021;51(1):11-20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-020-01377-7>
- 597 50. Manca A, Hortobagyi T, Rothwell J, Deriu F. Neurophysiological adaptations in the  
598 untrained side in conjunction with cross-education of muscle strength: a systematic review and  
599 meta-analysis. *J Appl Physiol.* 2018;124(6):1502-1518.  
600 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.01016.2017>
- 601 51. Manca A, Peruzzi A, Aiello E, et al. Gait changes following direct versus contralateral  
602 strength training: a randomized controlled pilot study in individuals with multiple sclerosis. *Gait*  
603 *Posture.* 2020;78:13-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2020.02.017>
- 604 52. Maroto-Izquierdo S, Nosaka K, Blazeovich AJ, Gonzalez-Gallego J, de Paz JA. Cross-  
605 education effects of unilateral accentuated eccentric isoinertial resistance training on lean mass  
606 and function. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2022;32(4):672-684. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.14108>

- 607 53. Martinez F, Abian P, Jimenez F, Abian-Vicen J. Effects of cross-education after 6 weeks  
608 of eccentric single-leg decline squats performed with different execution times: a randomized  
609 controlled trial. *Sports Health*. 2021;13(6):594-605. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19417381211016353>
- 610 54. May AK, Russell AP, Warmington SA. Lower body blood flow restriction training may  
611 induce remote muscle strength adaptations in an active unrestricted arm. *Eur J Appl Physiol*.  
612 2018;118(3):617-627. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-018-3806-2>
- 613 55. Mendonca GV, Vila-Cha C, Teodosio C, et al. Contralateral training effects of low-  
614 intensity blood-flow restricted and high-intensity unilateral resistance training. *Eur J Appl*  
615 *Physiol*. 2021;121(8):2305-2321. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-021-04708-2>
- 616 56. Minshull C, Gallacher P, Roberts S, Barnett A, Kuiper JH, Bailey A. Contralateral  
617 strength training attenuates muscle performance loss following anterior cruciate ligament (ACL)  
618 reconstruction: a randomised-controlled trial. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2021;121(12):3551-3559.  
619 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-021-04812-3>
- 620 57. Moss BM, Refsnes PE, Abildgaard A, Nicolaysen K, Jensen J. Effects of maximal effort  
621 strength training with different loads on dynamic strength, cross-sectional area, load-power and  
622 load-velocity relationships. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol*. 1997;75(3):193-199.  
623 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004210050147>
- 624 58. Munn J, Herbert RD, Hancock MJ, Gandevia SC. Training with unilateral resistance  
625 exercise increases contralateral strength. *J Appl Physiol*. 2005;99(5):1880-1884.  
626 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00559.2005>
- 627 59. Ohmori H, Kume T, Sasaki K, Ohyamabyun K, Takahashi H, Kubota T. Low-frequency  
628 isometric training, 1-day of training every 2 weeks, increases muscle strength in untrained  
629 subjects. *Adv Exer Sports Physiol*. 2010;16(1):1-5.

- 630 60. Papandreou M, Billis E, Papathanasiou G, Spyropoulos P, Papaioannou N. Cross-  
631 exercise on quadriceps deficit after ACL reconstruction. *J Knee Surg.* 2013;26(1):51-58.  
632 <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0032-1313744>
- 633 61. Papandreou MG, Papaioannou, N., Antonogiannakis, E., Zeeris, H. The effect of cross  
634 exercise on quadriceps strength in different knee angles after the anterior cruciate ligament  
635 reconstruction. *Brazilian Journal of Biomotricity.* 2007;1(4):123-138.
- 636 62. Parker RH. The effects of mild one-legged isometric or dynamic training. *Eur J Appl*  
637 *Physiol Occup Physiol.* 1985;54(3):262-268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00426143>
- 638 63. Pearce AJ, Hendy A, Bowen WA, Kidgell DJ. Corticospinal adaptations and strength  
639 maintenance in the immobilized arm following 3 weeks unilateral strength training. *Scand J Med*  
640 *Sci Sports.* 2013;23(6):740-748. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0838.2012.01453.x>
- 641 64. Pelet DCS, Orsatti FL. Effects of resistance training at different intensities of load on  
642 cross-education of muscle strength. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab.* 2021;46(10):1279-1289.  
643 <https://doi.org/10.1139/apnm-2021-0088>
- 644 65. Sato S, Yoshida R, Kiyono R, et al. Cross-education and detraining effects of eccentric  
645 vs. concentric resistance training of the elbow flexors. *BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil.*  
646 2021;13(1):105-117. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13102-021-00298-w>
- 647 66. Sato S, Yoshida R, Kiyono R, et al. Elbow joint angles in elbow flexor unilateral  
648 resistance exercise training determine its effects on muscle strength and thickness of trained and  
649 non-trained arms. *Front Physiol.* 2021;12:1-9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2021.734509>
- 650 67. Scripture E, Smith, TL, Brown, EM On the education of muscular control and power.  
651 *Studies from Yale Psychological Laboratory.* 1894;2(5).
- 652 68. Seger JY, Arvidsson B, Thorstensson A. Specific effects of eccentric and concentric

- 653 training on muscle strength and morphology in humans. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol.*  
654 1998;79(1):49-57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004210050472>
- 655 69. Seger JY, Thorstensson A. Effects of eccentric versus concentric training on thigh muscle  
656 strength and EMG. *Int J Sports Med.* 2005;26(1):45-52. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2004-817892>
- 657 70. Shields RK, Leo KC, Messaros AJ, Somers VK. Effects of repetitive handgrip training on  
658 endurance, specificity, and cross-education. *Phys Ther.* 1999;79(5):467-475.  
659 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/79.5.467>
- 660 71. Simpson D, Ehrensberger M, Horgan F, et al. Unilateral dorsiflexor strengthening with  
661 mirror therapy to improve motor function after stroke: a pilot randomized study. *Physiother Res*  
662 *Int.* 2019;24(4):e1792. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pri.1792>
- 663 72. Slade SC, Dionne CE, Underwood M, Buchbinder R. Consensus on Exercise Reporting  
664 Template (CERT): explanation and elaboration statement. *Br J Sports Med.* 2016;50(23):1428-  
665 1437. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2016-096651>
- 666 73. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA Extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-  
667 ScR): checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169(7):467-473.  
668 <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
- 669 74. Tseng WC, Nosaka K, Tseng KW, Chou TY, Chen TC. Contralateral effects by unilateral  
670 eccentric versus concentric resistance training. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2020;52(2):474-483.  
671 <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000002155>
- 672 75. Uh BS, Beynnon BD, Helie BV, Alosa DM, Renstrom PA. The benefit of a single-leg  
673 strength training program for the muscles around the untrained ankle. *Am J Sports Med.*  
674 2000;28(4):568-573. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03635465000280042101>
- 675 76. Valdes O, Ramirez C, Perez F, Garcia-Vicencio S, Nosaka K, Penailillo L. Contralateral



- 676 effects of eccentric resistance training on immobilized arm. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*.  
677 2021;31(1):76-90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13821>
- 678 77. Weir JP, Housh DJ, Housh TJ, Weir LL. The effect of unilateral eccentric weight training  
679 and detraining on joint angle specificity, cross-training, and the bilateral deficit. *J Orthop Sports  
680 Phys Ther*. 1995;22(5):207-215. <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.1995.22.5.207>
- 681 78. Weir JP, Housh DJ, Housh TJ, Weir LL. The effect of unilateral concentric weight  
682 training and detraining on joint angle specificity, cross-training, and the bilateral deficit. *J  
683 Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 1997;25(4):264-270. <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.1997.25.4.264>
- 684 79. Yasuda Y, Miyamura M. Cross transfer effects of muscular training on blood flow in the  
685 ipsilateral and contralateral forearms. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol*. 1983;51(3):321-329.  
686 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00429068>
- 687 80. Yue G, Cole KJ. Strength increases from the motor program: comparison of training with  
688 maximal voluntary and imagined muscle contractions. *J Neurophysiol*. 1992;67(5):1114-1123.  
689 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1992.67.5.1114>
- 690 81. Zhou S, Oakman A, Davie A. Effects of unilateral voluntary and electromyostimulation  
691 training on muscular strength of the contralateral limb. *Hong Kong Journal of Sports Medicine &  
692 Sports Science*. 2002;14:1-11.
- 693 82. Zhou S, Zhang SS, Crowley-McHattan ZJ. A scoping review of the contralateral effects  
694 of unilateral peripheral stimulation on neuromuscular function. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(2):e0263662.  
695 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0263662>
- 696 83. Zult T, Gokeler A, van Raay J, et al. Cross-education does not accelerate the  
697 rehabilitation of neuromuscular functions after ACL reconstruction: a randomized controlled  
698 clinical trial. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2018;118(8):1609-1623. [32](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-018-</a></p></div><div data-bbox=)



699 3892-1

700 84. Zult T, Gokeler A, van Raay J, et al. Cross-education does not improve early and late-  
701 phase rehabilitation outcomes after ACL reconstruction: a randomized controlled clinical trial.  
702 *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2019;27(2):478-490. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-018-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-018-5116-y)  
703 5116-y

704 85. Zult T, Goodall S, Thomas K, Hortobagyi T, Howatson G. Mirror illusion reduces motor  
705 cortical inhibition in the ipsilateral primary motor cortex during forceful unilateral muscle  
706 contractions. *J Neurophysiol.* 2015;113(7):2262-2270. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00686.2014>

707 86. Zult T, Goodall S, Thomas K, Solnik S, Hortobagyi T, Howatson G. Mirror training  
708 augments the cross-education of strength and affects inhibitory paths. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*  
709 2016;48(6):1001-1013. <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000000871>

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721