Table 1: Characteristics of Included Studies (n=21)

Author, year (country)	Design	Age: mean (SD)	Sex, n	Level	Intervention frequency, duration and difficulty level progression	Outcome	Down's & Black score
Akbari et al, 2018 (Iran)[26]	Pre-post RCT	16.79 (1.18)	M, 12	Elite U19	3x/week for 8 weeks Undisclosed difficulty	SGJ	16
Zarei et al, 2018 (Iran)[25]	Pre-post clustered RCT	15.6 (0.5)	M, 34	U16 premier	2-3x/week for 30 weeks Undisclosed difficulty	9.1m, 36.6m sprint, Illinois agility test, BCMJ, SGJ	21
Ayala et al, 2017 (Spain)[15]	Pre-post RCT, double baseline	16.8 (0.7)	M, 10	Amateur	3x/week for 4 weeks Level 2	Illinois agility test, DJ, YBT 10m, 20m sprint	25
Harøy, 2017 (Norway)[21]	Pre-post RCT	16.9 (1.0)	M, 16	Regional Elite U19	3x/week for 8 weeks Undisclosed difficulty	HEcc corrected for bodyweight, AddEcc, 10m, 20m sprint	25
Dunsky et al, 2017 (Israel)[28]	Within-group pre-post design	12.91 (0.26)	M, 10	Amateur	3x/week for 6 weeks Bi-weekly difficulty increase	BESS, YBT Target accuracy test	13
Ghareeb et al, 2017 (USA)[24]	Within-group pre-post design	16.52 (1.08)	M,17	Varsity high school	3x/week for 3 weeks Subject-matched difficulty	QConPT 60, 180, 300°•s-1 HConPT 60, 180, 300°•s-1 Biodex balance system Stability test protocol	15
Rolstad-Martinez, 2017 (Norway) [UT]	Pre-post RCT	16.9 (0.9)	M, 14	Regional elite	3x/week for 8 weeks Undisclosed difficulty	10m, 20m sprint	22
Robles-Palazón et al, 2016 (Spain)[11]	Pre-post RCT	16.4 (1.3)	M, 10	Amateur	3x/week for 4 weeks Level 2	DJ, YBT, 10m, 20m sprint	19
Sharma and Sayyad, 2016 (India)[23]	Within-group pre-post design	18-25 (NA)	M, 15	Professional	6x/week for 9 weeks Subject-matched difficulty	Illinois agility test, SJ, 20m sprint Wall-volley test	16
Silva et al, 2015 (Brazil)[22]	Within-group pre-post design	18.3 (1.6)	M, 9	Professional	3x/week for 9 weeks Level increase every 3 weeks	SJ CMJ	19
Cloak et al, 2014 (UK)[8]	Within-group pre-post design	20 (1.2)	M, 24	Collegiate	Single session Undisclosed difficulty	RSI, 505 agility test, DJ	16
Bizzini et al, 2013 (Italy)[7]	Within-group pre-post design, double baseline	25.5 (5.1)	M, 20	Amateur	Single session Level 3	MVC, RFD, Agility T-test, SJ CMJ, SEBT, 20m sprint	14
Daneshjoo et al, 2013 (Malaysia)[18]	Within-group pre-post design	18.9 (1.4)	M, 12	Professional	3x/week for 8 weeks Subject-matched difficulty	QConPT 60, 180, 300°•s-1 HConPT 60, 180, 300°•s-1 QEccPT 120°•s-1 HEccPT 120°•s-1	21
Daneshjoo et al, 2013 (Malaysia)[20]	Within-group pre-post design	18.9 (1.4)	M, 12	Professional	3x/week for 8 weeks Subject-matched difficulty	QIsoNetPT30°, 60°, 90° HIsoNetPT30°, 60°, 90°	21

Daneshjoo et al, 2013 (Malaysia)[19]	Within-group pre-post design	17-20 (NA)	M, 12	Professional	3x/week for 8 weeks Subject-matched difficulty	Illinois agility test, SJ, 10m cone sprint w ball, 10m cone sprint w/o ball, 20m sprint, Wall-volley test	23
Impellizzeri et al, 2013 (Italy)[2]	Pre-post RCT	23.7 (3.7)	M, 42	Amateur	3x/week for 9 weeks Level increase every 3 weeks	QConPT 60, 180°•s-1 HConPT 60, 180°•s-1 QEccPT 60°•s-1 HEccPT 60°•s-1 Agility T-test, CMJ, SEBT, 20m sprint	23
Steffen et al, 2013 (Canada)[9]	Within-group pre-post design	13-18 (NA)	F, reg 68 comp 78	U16/U18	Reg 1.5x/week for 4.5 months Comp 2.2x/ week for 4.5 months Undisclosed difficulty	SEBT, SL-EC-AP	26
Daneshjoo et al, 2012 (Malaysia)[17]	Within-group pre-post design	17-20 (NA)	M, 12	Professional	3x/week for 8 weeks Undisclosed difficulty	HCon/QCon 60, 180, 300°•s-1 QNetPT 300º•s-1/QNetPT 60º•s-1 HNetPT 300º•s-1/HNetPT 60º•s-1 HEcc120°•s-1/QCon120°•s-1	22
Daneshjoo et al, 2012 (Malaysia)[27]	Within-group pre-post design	17-20 (NA)	M, 12	Professional	3x/week for 8 weeks Subject-matched difficulty	SEBT, ST-EO, ST-EC	22
Brito et al, 2010 (Portugal)[16]	Within-group pre-post design	22.3 (4.2)	M, 18	Sub-elite	3x/week for 10 weeks Undisclosed difficulty	QConPT 60, 180°•s-1 HConPT 60, 180°•s-1 QEccPT 30°•s-1 HEccPT 30°•s-1 HCon/QCon 60, 180°•s-1 HEcc/QEcc 30°•s-1 HEcc 30°•s-1/Q Con 30°•s-1	17

UT = Unpublished thesis; QConPT = quadriceps concentric peak torque; HConPT = hamstring concentric peak torque; QEccPT = quadriceps eccentric peak torque; HEccPT = hamstring eccentric peak torque; HCon:QCon = conventional strength ratio; HEcc:QCon = dynamic control ratio; F/S = fast/slow; HIsoNetPT = hamstring isometric net peak torque; QIsoNetPT = quadriceps isometric net peak torque; AddEcc = adductor eccentric strength; RSI = reactive strength index; MVC = maximal voluntary contraction; RFD = rate of force of development; DJ = drop jump; CMJ = countermovement jump; SJ = squat jump; SGJ = Sargent jump; BCMJ = Bosco Counter Movement Jump; YBT = Y-balance test; BESS = balance error scoring system; ST-EO = stork test eyes open; ST-EC = stork test eyes closed; SEBT = star excursion balance test; SL-EC-AP = single leg eyes closed on Airex pad; reg. = regular group; comp. = comprehensive group

Table 2: Quadriceps Concentric Strength (n=4)

Author, year	Degrees/Leg	% Mean change (95%CI where available)	% Mean change as calculated through data provided in original manuscript	Statistically Significant Improvement
Brito et al, 2010	60°•s-1;D	6.9(0.6, 13.1)	4.6	Y•[1]
	60°•s-1;ND	1.2(-4.5, 7.0)	1.7	N[1]
	180°•s-1; D	8.3(0.8, 15.8)	6.5	Y•[1]
	180°•s-1; ND	3.2(-3.5, 9.9)	3.5	N[1]
Daneshjoo et al, 2013	60°•s-1; D	22.6(-5.2, 50.4)	10.4	N[2]
	60°•s-1; ND	6(-17.9, 29.9)	2.6	N[2]
	180°•s-1;D	20.6(-4.1, 45.3)	14.2	N[2]
	180°•s-1; ND	17.3(-4.9, 39.6)	11.9	N[2]
	300°•s-1;D	27.7(3.6, 51.8)	28.6	Y•[2]
	300°•s-1;ND	22(-2.2, 46.2)	21.8	N[2]
Ghareeb et al, 2017	60°•s-1;D	Not Reported	-1.5	N[1]
	60°•s-1;ND	Not Reported	-3.0	N[1]
	180°•s-1	Not Reported	Not Enough Data	Y•••[1]
	300°•s-1	Not Reported	Not Enough Data	Y••[1]
Impellizzeri et al, 2013	60°•s-1	3.7(1.8, 6.0*)	3.4	N[3]
	180°•s-1	6.2(3.6, 8.4*)	6.5	N[3]

* = 90%CI; • = p≤0.05; •• = p≤0.01; ••• = p≤0.001; •••• = p≤0.0001; [1] = determined by t-test; [2] = determined by ANOVA; [3] = determined by linear mixed-effects model.

Note: Positive values for % mean change denotes favorable improvements in quadriceps concentric strength

Table 3: Hamstrings Concentric Strength (n=4)

Author, year	Degrees/Leg	% Mean change (95%CI where available)	% Mean change as calculated through data provided in original manuscript	Statistically Significant Improvement
Brito et al, 2010	60°•s-1;D	20.4(1.5, 39.3)	14.0	Y•[1]
	60°•s-1;ND	14.6(3.8, 25.3)	9.8	Y•[1]
	180°•s-1; D	6.5(-3.3, 16.2)	4.9	N[1]
	180°•s-1; ND	15(0.8, 29.2)	9.0	Y•[1]
Daneshjoo et al, 2013	60°•s-1; D	22(9.5, 34.5)	19.5	Y•[2]
	60°•s-1; ND	22.3(10.5, 34.1)	20.3	Y•[2]
	180°•s-1;D	21.4(4.4, 38.5)	27.5	Y•[2]
	180°•s-1; ND	15.7(6.2, 25.2)	19.5	Y•[2]
	300°•s-1;D	22.1(5, 39.2)	32.7	Y•[2]
	300°•s-1;ND	15.2(-3.3, 33.8)	20.4	N[2]
Ghareeb et al, 2017	60°•s-1;D	Not Reported	9.8	Y•[1]
	60°•s-1;ND	Not Reported	7.8	Y•[1]
	180°•s-1	Not Reported	Not Enough Data	Y•••[1]
	300°•s-1	Not Reported	Not Enough Data	Y••[1]
Impellizzeri et al, 2013	60°•s-1	5.9(3.7, 8.0*)	6.2	Y[3]
	180°•s-1	7.1(4.7, 11.1*)	7.3	Y•[3]

* = 90%CI; • = p≤0.05; •• = p≤0.01; ••• = p≤0.001; •••• = p≤0.0001; [1] = determined by t-test; [2] = determined by ANOVA; [3] = determined by linear mixed-effects model

Note: Positive values for % mean change denotes favorable improvements in hamstrings concentric strength

Table 4: Other Strength (n=9)

Author, year	Degrees/Leg	% Mean change (95%CI where available)	% Mean change as calculated through data provided in original manuscript	Statistically Significant Improvement
Brito et al, 2010	QEcc PT 30°•s-1;D	6.4(-7.2, 20.1)	2.2	N[1]
	QEcc PT 30°•s-1;ND	7.7(-3.6, 18.9)	5.4	N[1]
	HEcc PT 30°•s-1;D	-3.3(-12.6, 6)	-3.6	N[1]
	HEcc.PT 30°•s-1;ND	14.3(3.7, 24.7)	13.3	Y•[1]
	H/Q Con 60°•s-1;D	10.8(-5.4, 27)	5.8	N[1]
	H/Q Con 60°•s-1;ND	14.8(1.7, 27.9)	9.8	Y•[1]
	H/Q Con 180°•s-1;D	-0.9(-10.6, 8.8)	-3.2	N[1]
	H/Q Con 180°•s-1;ND	-0.9(-10.6, 8.7)	10.5	N[1]
	H/Q Ecc 30°•s-1;D	-5.9(-16.5, 4.7)	-5.5	N[1]
	H/Q Ecc 30°•s-1;ND	7.9(-0.8, 16.6)	9.8	N[1]
	HEcc 30°•s-1/QCon 30°•s-1;D	-8.4(-18.7, 1.9)	-11.8	N[1]
	HEcc 30°•s-1/QCon 30°•s-1;ND	13.8(1.5, 26)	11.1	Y•[1]
Daneshjoo et al, 2012	H/Q Con 60°•s-1;D	0.04(-0.1, 0.2)	7.6	N[1]
	H/Q Con 60°•s-1;ND	-0.08(-0.13, 0.02)	14	Y••[1]
	H/Q Con 180°•s-1;D	0.7(-0.001, 0.13)	13	N[1]
	H/Q Con 180°•s-1;ND	-0.04(-0.1, 0.02)	7.1	N[1]
	H/Q Con 300°•s-1;D	0.005(-0.13, 0.14)	1.4	N[1]
	H/Q Con 300°•s-1;ND	0.01(-0.12, 0.14)	-1.3	N[1]
	QNetPT 300º•s-1/QNetPT 60º•s-1;D	-1.08(-0.16,0.004)	17.8	N[1]
	QNetPT 300º•s-1/QNetPT 60º•s-1;ND	-0.08(-0.16,-0.01)	20	Y•[1]
	HNetPT 300º•s-1/HNetPT 60º•s-1;D	-0.07(-0.18, 0.3)	11.7	N[1]
	HNetPT 300º•s-1/HNetPT 60º•s-1;ND	-0.01(-0.17,0.15)	-1.5	N[1]
	HEcc 120°•s-1/QCon 120°•s-1;D	-0.4(0.1, 0.7)	-45.4	Y•[1]
	HEcc 120°•s-1/QCon 120°•s-1;ND	-0.3(0.1, 0.5)	-41.5	Y••[1]
Daneshjoo et al, 2013	HEccPT 120°•s-1; D	-7.5(-16.7, 1.7)	4.7	N[2]
	HEccPT 120°•s-1; ND	-10.1(-23.9, 3.9)	-6.3	N[2]
	QEccPT 120°•s-1; D	7.2(-8.0, 22.3)	4.7	N[2]
	QEccPT 120°•s-1; ND	13.1(2.3, 24.0)	9	N[2]
Daneshjoo et al, 2013	QIsoPT30°; D	0.4(-12.5, 13.3)	0.5	N[2]
	QIsoPT30°; ND	16.0(1.8, 30.3)	19.3	Y•[2]
	QIsoPT60°; D	19.1(1.7, 36.4)	10.6	Y•[2]
	QIsoPT60°; ND	35.3(13.9, 56.7)	20.8	Y•[2]
	QIsoPT90°; D	47.8(21.3, 74.3)	17.8	Y•[2]
	QIsoPT90°; ND	78.1(44.4, 111.9)	31.5	Y•[2]
	HIsoPT30°; D	24.8(7.1, 42.6)	17.5	Y•[2]
	HIsoPT30°; ND	28.7(13.0, 44.3)	23.7	Y•[2]
	HIsoPT60°; D	19.8(7.4, 32.3)	17.4	Y•[2]
	HIsoPT60°; ND	13.7(4.9, 22.4)	13.5	Y•[2]
	HIsoPT90°; D	10.2(-0.7, 21.1)	11.3	N[2]
	HIsoPT90°; ND	4.5(-2.4, 11.5)	5.4	N[2]
Impellizzeri et al, 2013	H EccPT 60°•s-1	5.9(3.7, 7.6*)	6.0	Y•[3]
	Q EccPT 60°•s-1	2.4(0.2, 4.0*)	2.3	N[3]

Bizzini et al, 2013+	RFD	-10(-26, 6)	-7.5	N[1]
	MVC	-1.3(-4.7, 2.8)	-0.8	N[1]
Cloak et al, 2014+	RSI	0	0	N[2]
Harøy et al, 2017	HEcc corrected for bodyweight; D	7.5	7.5	Y•[1]
	HEcc corrected for bodyweight; ND	7.9	7.9	Y••[1]
	AddEcc; D	0	0	
	AddEcc; ND	-1.8	-1.9	
Zarei et al, 2018	Bosco Counter Movement Jump (N)	Not Reported*	0.9	N[3]
	Bosco Counter Movement Jump (W/kg)	Not Reported*	13.1	Y•••[3]

QEccPT = quadriceps eccentric peak torque; HEccPT = hamstring eccentric peak torque; H/QCon = conventional strength ratio; HEcc/QCon = dynamic control ratio; HIsoPT = hamstring isometric net peak torque; QIsoPT = quadriceps isometric net peak torque; AddEcc = adductor eccentric strength; RSI = reactive strength index; MVC = maximal voluntary contraction; RFD = rate of force of development; * = 90%CI; + = single session; NED = Not Enough Data; • = $p \leq 0.05$; •• = $p \leq 0.01$; ••• = $p \leq 0.001$; •••• = $p \leq 0.0001$; [1] = determined by t-test; [2] = determined by ANOVA; [3] = determined by linear mixed-effects model; # = reported as significant but p-value was greater than 0.05

Note: Positive values for % mean change denotes favorable improvements across all strength measures provided.

Table 5: Agility (n=7)

Author, year	Test	% Mean change (95%CI where available)	% Mean change as calculated through data provided in original manuscript	Statistically Significant Improvement
Ayala et al, 2017	Illinois Agility	-2.4	-2.4	N[1]
Bizzini et al, 2013+	Agility T-test	-1(-1.5,-0.5)	-2	Y•••[1]
Cloak et al, 2014+	505 Agility	Not Reported	3.6	N[2]
Daneshjoo et al, 2013	Illinois Agility	-1.7(-2.6, -0.8)	-11.1	Y••[2]
Impellizzeri et al, 2013	Agility T-test	-3.1(-4.2, -1.9*)	-2.8	N[3]
Sharma and Sayyad, 2016	Illinois Agility	-19.7	-19.7	Y•••[1]
Zarei et al, 2018	Illinois Agility	Not Reported*	-4.2	Y••[3]

* = 90%CI; + = single session; • = p≤0.05; •• = p≤0.01; ••• = p≤0.001; •••• = p≤0.0001; [1] = determined by t-test; [2] = determined by ANOVA; [3] = determined by linear mixed-effects model

Note: Negative values for % mean change denotes favorable decreases in agility test time

Table 6: Vertical Jump (n=10)

Author, year	Test	% Mean change (95%CI where available)	% Mean change as calculated through data provided in original manuscript	Statistically Significant Improvement
Akbari et al, 2018	Sargent Jump	Not reported	12.5	Y•••[2]
Ayala et al, 2017	Drop Jump	-0.4	-0.4	Y •[1]
Bizzini et al, 2013+	Counter Movement Jump	5.5(3.2, 7.8)	-5.2	Y•••[1]
	Squat Jump	6.2(3.6, 8.7)	6.6	Y•••[1]
Cloak et al, 2014+	Drop Jump	Not reported	-0.8	N[2]
Da Costa Silva et al, 2015	Squat Jump	12.92	12.9	Y•[2]
	Counter Movement Jump	11.39	11.3	Y•[2]
Daneshjoo et al, 2013	Squat Jump	3.7(1.2, 6.3)	7.9	Y••[2]
Impellizzeri et al, 2013	Counter Movement Jump	1.4(-0.2, 2.6*)	1.5	N[3]
Robles-Palazón et al, 2016	Drop Jump	Not Reported	-1.1	N[2]
Sharma and Sayyad, 2016	Squat Jump	9.06	8.9	Y•••[1]
Zarei et al, 2018	Sargent Jump	Not Reported*	9.5	Y•••[3]

* = 90%CI; + = single session; • = $p \leq 0.05$; •• = $p \leq 0.01$; ••• = $p \leq 0.001$; •••• = $p \leq 0.0001$; [1] = determined by t-test; [2] = determined by ANOVA; [3] = determined by linear mixed-effects model

Note: Positive values for % mean change denotes favorable improvements in jump height

Table 7: Balance (n=8)

Author, year	Test	Leg	% Mean change (95%CI where available)	% Mean change as calculated through data provided in original manuscript	Statistically Significant Improvement
Ayala et al, 2017	YBT - Anterior	NA	-0.3	-0.3	Y•[1]
	YBT - Postmed	NA	2.1	2.1	Y•[1]
	YBT - Postlat	NA	0.3	0.3	N[1]
	YBT - Composite	NA	1	1	N[1]
Bizzini et al, 2013+	SEBT	NA	2.9(1.9, 3.9)	2.9	Y••••[1]
Daneshjoo et al, 2012	SB-EO	NA	10.9	25.8	Y•[2]
	SB-EC	NA	12.4	69.3	Y[2]
	SEBT	NA	6.7	6.9	Y••[2]
Dunsky et al, 2017	BESS	NA	Not Reported	4.8	N[2]
	YBT	R	Not Reported	5.1	N[2]
	YBT	L	Not Reported	6.1	Y•[2]
Ghareeb et al, 2017	Biodex Overall Stability Index	D	Not Reported	-13.1	N[1]
	Biodex Overall Stability Index	ND	Not Reported	0	N[1]
	Biodex AP Index	D	Not Reported	-15.0	N[1]
	Biodex AP Index	ND	Not Reported	-15.4	N[1]
	Biodex ML Index	D	Not Reported	-13.8	N[1]
	Biodex ML Index	ND	Not Reported	6.8	N[1]
Impellizzeri et al, 2013	SEBT	NA	1.9(0.8, 2.8*)	1.9	N[3]
Robles-Palazón et al, 2016	YBT - Anterior	NA	Not Reported	-0.4	N[2]
	YBT - Postmed	NA	Not Reported	1.4	N[2]
	YBT - Postlat	NA	Not Reported	-0.4	N[2]
	YBT - Composite	NA	Not Reported	0.2	N[2]
Steffen et al, 2013	SEBT - Ant (Reg)	L	Not Reported	7.5	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Ant (Comp)	L	Not Reported	9.2	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Postlat (Reg)	L	Not Reported	2.6	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Postlat (Comp)	L	Not Reported	7.5	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Postmed (Reg)	L	Not Reported	8.5	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Postmed (Comp)	L	Not Reported	7.3	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Ant (Reg)	R	Not Reported	6.5	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Ant (Comp)	R	Not Reported	10.2	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Postlat (Reg)	R	Not Reported	3.8	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Postlat (Comp)	R	Not Reported	7.4	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Postmed (Reg)	R	Not Reported	10.1	Y•[4]
	SEBT - Postmed (Comp)	R	Not Reported	7.2	Y•[4]
	SL-EC-AP (Reg)	L	Not Reported	-14.5	N[4]
	SL-EC-AP (Comp)	L	Not Reported	8.3	Y•[4]

SL-EC-AP (Reg)	R	Not Reported	-7.6	N[4]
SL-EC-AP (Comp)	R	Not Reported	4.1	Y•[4]

YBT = Y-balance test; BESS = balance error scoring system; ST-EO = stork test eyes open; ST-EC = stork test eyes closed; SEBT = star excursion balance test; SL-EC-AP = single leg eyes closed on Airex pad; reg. = regular group; comp. = comprehensive group; * = 90%CI; + = single session; • = p≤0.05; •• = p≤0.01; ••• = p≤0.001; •••• = p≤0.0001; [1] = determined by t-test; [2] = determined by ANOVA; [3] = determined by linear mixed-effects model; [4] = determined by linear three-way mixed regression model

Note: Positive values for % mean change denotes favorable improvements in balance performance, with exception of positive Biodex and BESS scores which denotes decreased balance performance.

Table 8: Speed (n=9)

Author, year	**Test**	**% Mean change (95%CI where available)**	**% Mean change as calculated through data provided in original manuscript**	**Statistically Significant Improvement**
Ayala et al, 2017	10m	5.2	5.2	Y•[1]
	20m	-1.8	-1.8	Y•[1]
Bizzini et al, 2013+	20m	-2.2(-3.1,-1.3)	-2.1	Y•••[1]
Daneshjoo et al, 2013	10m with ball	-0.6(-1.2, 0.01)	-6.9	Y•[2]
	10m	-0.3(-0.7, 0.007)	-5.4	Y•[2]
	20m	-0.3(-0.64, 0.003)	-12.9	Y•[2]
Harøy et al, 2017	10m	0.5	0.6	N[1]
	20m	0.2	0	N[1]
Impellizzeri et al, 2013	20m	-2.8(-3.7,-2.0*)	-2.7	N•[3]
Robles- Palazón et al, 2016	10m	Not Reported	7.4	N[2]
	20m	Not Reported	-0.9	N[2]
Rolstad-Martinez, 2017	10m	0.6	0.6	N[1]
	20m	0	0	N[1]
Sharma and Sayyad, 2016	20m	-24.2	-24.3	Y•••[1]
Zarei et al, 2018	9.1m	Not Reported*	0	N[3]
	36.6m	Not Reported*	-1.8	Y•[3]

* = 90%CI; + = single session; • = p≤0.05; •• = p≤0.01; ••• = p≤0.001; •••• = p≤0.0001; [1] = determined by t-test; [2] = determined by ANOVA; [3] = determined by linear mixed-effects model

Note: Negative values for % mean change denotes favorable decreases in sprint time

Online Resource 9: Kicking Skill and Accuracy (n=3)

Author, year	**Test**	**% Mean change (95%CI where available)**	**% Mean change as calculated through data provided in original manuscript**	**Statistically Significant Improvement**
Daneshjoo et al, 2013	Wall-Volley Test	5.4(3.0, 7.8)	17.4	Y•••[2]
Dunsky et al, 2017	Target Accuracy Test	Not Reported	13.8	N[2]
Sharma & Sayyad, 2016	Wall-Volley Test	-2.24	-2.3	N[1]

• = $p \leq 0.05$; •• = $p \leq 0.01$; ••• = $p \leq 0.001$; •••• = $p \leq 0.0001$; [1] = determined by t-test; [2] = determined by ANOVA

Note: Positive values for % mean change denotes favorable improvements in kicking skill and accuracy