



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

Pedro E. Alcaraz^{1,2} · Jorge Carlos-Vivas¹ · Bruno O. Oponjuru¹ · Alejandro Martínez-Rodríguez³

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

¹ UCAM Research Center for High Performance Sport, Catholic University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain

² Faculty of Sport Sciences, UCAM, Catholic University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain

³ 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 ≤ 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 ≤ 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.