

Reviewer comments

I think in general it is a very well written manuscript and interesting meta-analysis. It is a relevant topic and, as demonstrated by the systematic search, several new studies have been published since the latest review. I have one major adjustment and some minor comments/suggestions/adjustments (see below).

Needs to be addressed:

In the analysis (raw data sheet) I noticed that the n for the control group (HL) in Lixandrao et al. 2015 were reported as 9 when compared to the different intervention groups. The 9 participants should have been divided by the number of intervention groups used as comparator as you otherwise quadruple the number of participants in the control group. See Cochrane Handbook chapter 16.5.4. How to include multiple groups from one study

Maybe, this would also apply for fx. Jessee et al. and Yasuda et al., albeit it being different muscles, you may also “double-count” the number of participants in the control and intervention group. This should be investigated by the authors if this is the case.

Thus, the analysis of should be performed again as it may impact the CI.

Minor corrections and considerations:

A consideration for the authors but this is not needed: It could be interesting to discuss these findings with the findings of “Schoenfeld et al. Strength and hypertrophy adaptations between low- vs. high-load resistance training: a systematic review and meta-analysis” and the mechanisms/clinical implication of LL-RT, LL-RT with BFR and HL-RT

The search terms used in the Cocrahe Central is deviating from the ones used in e.g. Embase and PubMed. I appreciate that there are inherent differences between databases but it seems that similar terms could have been used in Cochrane Library as well in both title/abstract and MeSH descriptor?

In figure 2. Jessee et al 2018 is missing an e

Line 322: Authors should remain consistent with abbreviation ” *While the mechanisms underpinning the hypertrophic effects of low loads with BFR are still not fully elucidated,...*” Should be LL-RT with BFR to remain consistent with the rest of the manuscript – please check throughout the manuscript.

Line 597 and line 602: References – the references are not reported homogeneous as e.g. some are presented with DOI and others are not. Should be checked throughout the manuscript.