

#### BACKGROUND

- Resistance training (RT) is typically prescribed however, force production during eccentric muse max strength. The eccentric phase of RT may be
- Overloading (EO) or accentuating (AEL) the ecc explosiveness acutely and enhances explosivenes
- Eccentric-focused methods remain unpopular de
- The physiological mechanisms behind acute perf
- The examination of neuromuscular behavior at v concentric counterpart may lead to better unders

### PURPOSE

To compare muscle excitation over a range of inten back squats relative to action type max strength.

### METHODS

- Thirty-one college-aged students [23 males (height 1RM:143.3±37.0kg; Ecc1RM:172.7±42.8kg) and mass:68.0±10.3kg; 1RM:86.2±12.7kg; Ecc1RM:
- Day 1: Subject's 1RM for concentric and eccentr were performed at a consistent rate of descent, to seconds or more until the barbell was set on the
- <u>Days 2 & 3</u>: Subjects completed concentric (CO) (ECC).
- Surface electromyography sensors were placed (BF), and gluteus maximus (GM). Following a b performed a ramping repetition scheme at 60, 70
- Peak SEMG amplitudes were recorded at each in amplitude displayed during the study.
- A 2x2x5 (Sex x Action x Intensity) Repeated Me muscle.

# RESULTS

- Main effects of Action were observed for VL (Fi ECC (VL: CON 73.39+23.8%, ECC 60.8+22.3% 42.4±27.7%, *p*=.002).
- For GM (Figure 5.), an Action x Sex interaction difference between concentric and eccentric for (+15.64%).

# ELECTROMYOGRAPHIC COMPARISON OF INTENSITIES RELATIVE TO **ACTION TYPE MAX STRENGTH IN THE BACK SQUAT**

C. Munger<sup>1</sup>, R. Garner<sup>2</sup>, V. Wright<sup>2</sup>, K. Sorenson<sup>2</sup>, H. Mikel<sup>2</sup> University of Nebraska Kearney<sup>1</sup> College of Idaho<sup>2</sup>

relative to concentric max strength (1RM) cle actions can achieve 120-190% of concentric e underloaded as result. centric phase has shown to increase strength and ass in short-term training. espite acute performance and training benefits. formance and training are not well understood. warying intensities and comparing them to their standing of the adaptive underpinnings. stities between eccentric-only and concentric eght:178.9± 7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; d 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; l:103.2±11.8kg)] participated. ric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. DN) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris barbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects D, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. ntensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each	relative to concentric max strength (1RM) cle actions can achieve 120-190% of concentric e underloaded as result. centric phase has shown to increase strength and ess in short-term training. espite acute performance and training benefits. formance and training are not well understood. varying intensities and comparing them to their standing of the adaptive underpinnings. sities between eccentric-only and concentric ght:178.9± 7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; d 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; l:103.2±11.8kg)] participated. ric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. DN) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris barbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects 0, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. ntensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each igure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than %, $p$ =.008; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( $p$ = .048), whereby the mean males was greater (+34.23%) than females	
hsities between eccentric-only and concentric ght:178.9±7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; id 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; 1:103.2±11.8kg)] participated. ric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. PN) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris barbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects 0, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. ntensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each	nsities between eccentric-only and concentric ght:178.9± 7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; d 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; [:103.2±11.8kg)] participated. ric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. PN) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris barbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects 0, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. ntensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each igure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than %, $p$ =.008; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( $p$ = .048), whereby the mean males was greater (+34.23%) than females	relative to concentric max strength (1RM) cle actions can achieve 120-190% of concentric underloaded as result. centric phase has shown to increase strength and ess in short-term training. espite acute performance and training benefits. formance and training are not well understood. varying intensities and comparing them to their standing of the adaptive underpinnings.
hsities between eccentric-only and concentric ght:178.9±7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; id 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; 1:103.2±11.8kg)] participated. ric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. DN) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris barbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects 0, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. ntensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each	Insities between eccentric-only and concentric ght:178.9±7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; id 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; [:103.2±11.8kg)] participated. tric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. DN) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris parbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects D, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. Intensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each igure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than %, $p$ =.008; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( $p$ = .048), whereby the mean males was greater (+34.23%) than females	
ght:178.9± 7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; ad 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; 1:103.2±11.8kg)] participated. ric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. DN) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris barbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects 0, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. ntensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each	ght:178.9±7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; id 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; l:103.2±11.8kg)] participated. tric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. ON) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris barbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects 0, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. ntensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each igure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than %, <i>p</i> =.008; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( <i>p</i> = .048), whereby the mean males was greater (+34.23%) than females	sities between eccentric-only and concentric
ght:178.9± 7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; d 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; :103.2±11.8kg)] participated. ric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. ON) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris parbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects 0, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. ntensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each	ght:178.9± 7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; id 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; 103.2±11.8kg)] participated. ric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. DN) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris barbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects D, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. Intensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each igure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than %, $p$ =.008; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( $p$ = .048), whereby the mean males was greater (+34.23%) than females	
	igure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than $\%$ , <i>p</i> =.008; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( <i>p</i> = .048), whereby the mean males was greater (+34.23%) than females	ght:178.9±7.7cm; mass:87.3±14.4kg; d 8 females (height:165.2±7.2cm; ::103.2±11.8kg)] participated. ric-only 1RM (ecc1RM) were tested. Ecc1RMs o the cadence of a metronome, and over 3 safeties within the rack. ON) conditions or eccentric-only conditions on the vastus lateralis (VL), biceps femoris parbell-only warm-up of 10 repetitions, subjects 0, 80, 90, and 100% of max strength. ntensity and normalized to the individuals' max easures ANOVA was conducted for each
	Figure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than $\%$ , $p=.008$ ; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( $p = .048$ ), whereby the mean males was greater (+34.23%) than females	
	igure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than %, $p=.008$ ; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( $p = .048$ ), whereby the mean males was greater (+34.23%) than females	
igure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than %, $p=.008$ ; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( $p = .048$ ), whereby the mean	males was greater $(+34.23\%)$ than females	igure 1.) and BF, where CON was greater than %, $p=.008$ ; BF: CON 62.5±28.5%, ECC was observed ( $p = .048$ ), whereby the mean



# CONCLUSIONS

- Peak muscle excitation was lower for eccentric than concentric when normalizing loads to action type max strength.
- It seems that the additional forces, that can be produced eccentrically, are by means other than motor unit recruitment and increased rate coding. Possible explanations include:
- 1) Crossbridge behavior, where more myosin heads are connected and passive, but are mechanically uncoupled instead of chemically uncoupled.
- 2) Titin has been suggested to play more of an active role in producing tension within the sarcomere during lengthening.

# **PRACTICAL APPLICATION**

- Eccentric-focused training seems to have drawbacks and benefits. Drawbacks include 1) fatiguing effects associated with EO and AEL, 2) that eccentric actions do not yield neuromuscular excitation to levels of concentric. Therefore, concentric actions should remain paired with eccentric.
- Benefits of eccentric-focused training include its association to muscle growth, acute strength gain, acute explosiveness gain, and explosiveness from training. However, the body of literature supporting these notions is limited and should further be elucidated.