



## Correction to: The Effectiveness of Resisted Sled Training (RST) for Sprint Performance: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Pedro E. Alcaraz<sup>1,2</sup> · Jorge Carlos-Vivas<sup>1</sup> · Bruno O. Oponjuru<sup>1</sup> · Alejandro Martínez-Rodríguez<sup>3</sup>

Published online: 9 July 2018  
© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2018

**Correction to: Sports Medicine**  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-0947-8>

**Page 1: Abstract, Conclusions, sentence 4. The following sentence, which read:**

Moreover, the intensity (load) is not a determinant of sprint performance improvement, but the recommended volume is > 160 m per session, and approximately 2680 m per week, with a training frequency of two to three times per week, for at least 6 weeks.

should read:

Moreover, the intensity (load) is not a determinant of sprint performance improvement, but the recommended volume is > 160 m per session, and approximately 2680 m per total training program, with a training frequency of two to three times per week, for at least 6 weeks.

**Page 6: Section 3.3, paragraph 3, sentence 2. The following sentence, which read:**

---

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-0947-8>.

---

✉ Pedro E. Alcaraz  
pedro.e.alcaraz@gmail.com

✉ Alejandro Martínez-Rodríguez  
amartinezrodriguez@ua.es

<sup>1</sup> UCAM Research Center for High Performance Sport, Catholic University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Sport Sciences, UCAM, Catholic University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain

<sup>3</sup> Department of Analytical Chemistry, Nutrition and Food Sciences, Faculty of Sciences, University of Alicante, Alicante, Spain

A large ES was obtained for a frequency over twice a week (ES 1.85) [55], and moderate ESs were found for lower loads (ES 0.61) [39, 55–57, 59–65], > 6-week training periods (ES 0.63) [39, 55, 56, 60, 63–66], session volume > 160 m (ES 0.92) [55, 56, 59, 60, 64], total weekly training volume > 2680 m (ES 0.83) [55, 59, 60, 64], and rigid surface (ES 0.69) [39, 56, 61, 64].

should read:

A large ES was obtained for a frequency over twice a week (ES 1.85) [55], and moderate ESs were found for lower loads (ES 0.61) [39, 55–57, 59–65], > 6-week training periods (ES 0.63) [39, 55, 56, 60, 63–66], session volume > 160 m (ES 0.92) [55, 56, 59, 60, 64], total training volume > 2680 m (ES 0.83) [55, 59, 60, 64], and rigid surface (ES 0.69) [39, 56, 61, 64].

**Page 6: Section 3.3, paragraph 3, sentence 3. The following sentence, which read:**

Small ESs were also found for a training frequency equal to or fewer than two trainings per week (ES 0.52) [39, 56, 57, 59–66], a total weekly training volume < 2680 m (ES 0.53) [39, 56, 57, 61–63, 65, 66], and grass surface (ES 0.47) [59, 60, 65, 66].

should read:

Small ESs were also found for a training frequency equal to or fewer than two trainings per week (ES 0.52) [39, 56, 57, 59–66], a total training volume < 2680 m (ES 0.53) [39, 56, 57, 61–63, 65, 66], and grass surface (ES 0.47) [59, 60, 65, 66].

**Page 19: Section 4.1, paragraph 7, sentence 1. The following sentence, which read:**

Another variable that should be considered when designing training programs with RST is volume, both for each session and for the microcycle.

should read:

Another variable that should be considered when designing training programs with RST is volume, both for each session and for the training cycle (i.e. mesocycle).

**Page 19: Section 4.1, paragraph 7, sentence 4. The following sentence, which read:**

Similarly, when weekly volumes were compared, higher volumes (> 2680 m) produced a moderate effect (ES 0.83) compared with volumes 720–2680 m (ES 0.53), although the effects were statistically significant for both volume per session and weekly volume.

should read:

Similarly, when total training volumes were compared, higher volumes (> 2680 m) produced a moderate effect (ES 0.83) compared with volumes 720–2680 m (ES 0.53), although the effects were statistically significant for both volume per session and total training volume.

**Page 20: Section 4.2, paragraph 2, final sentence. The following sentence, which read:**

With respect to the training characteristics, the effect was small in all cases and significant with loads < 20% BM (ES 0.35;  $p = 0.02$ ), weekly training frequencies of  $\leq 2$  days (ES

0.35;  $p = 0.02$ ), for duration > 6 weeks (ES 0.39;  $p = 0.01$ ), volumes per session > 160 m (ES 0.53;  $p = 0.03$ ), and weekly values > 2680 m (ES 0.53;  $p = 0.03$ ).

should read:

With respect to the training characteristics, the effect was small in all cases and significant with loads < 20% BM (ES 0.35;  $p = 0.02$ ), weekly training frequencies of  $\leq 2$  days (ES 0.35;  $p = 0.02$ ), for duration > 6 weeks (ES 0.39;  $p = 0.01$ ), volumes per session > 160 m (ES 0.53;  $p = 0.03$ ), and total training values > 2680 m (ES 0.53;  $p = 0.03$ ).

**Page 21: Section 5, paragraph 1, sentence 7. The following sentence, which read:**

Finally, with regards to the training characteristics, the intensity (load) is not a determinant of sprint performance improvement, but the recommended volume is > 160 m per session, and approximately 2680 m per week, with a training frequency of 2–3 times per week, for at least 6 weeks.

should read:

Finally, with regards to the training characteristics, the intensity (load) is not a determinant of sprint performance improvement, but the recommended volume is > 160 m per session, and approximately 2680 m per total training program, with a training frequency of 2–3 times per week, for at least 6 weeks.

The original article has been corrected.