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Correction to: Sports Medicine
https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-019-01178-7

Page 5, column 1, section 3.2, paragraph 1, sentence 1: The following sentence, which previously read:

“Consistency between the studies assessed for both hamstring strength measures and muscle architecture was moderate to high, with $I^2$ values of 62.49% and 88.03%, respectively.”

Should read:

“Consistency between the studies assessed for both hamstring strength measures and muscle architecture was moderate to high, with $I^2$ values of 58.58% and 88.03%, respectively.”

Page 5, columns 1–2, section 3.2, paragraph 1, sentence 3: The following sentence, which previously read:

“Two risk of bias assessments were also performed, the first (Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool) showing a low risk of bias overall within the randomized controlled studies included in this review (Fig. 2), the second identifying the results of this meta-analysis are not subject to publication bias ($p < 0.001$) with 250 and 663 “filed-away” studies needed to prove null effects of NHE interventions on strength and architecture, respectively.”

Should read:

“Two risk of bias assessments were also performed, the first (Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool) showing a low risk of bias overall within the randomized controlled studies included in this review (Fig. 2), the second identifying the results of this meta-analysis are not subject to publication bias ($p < 0.001$) with 178 and 663 “filed-away” studies needed to prove null effects of NHE interventions on strength and architecture, respectively.”

Pages 5–6, columns 2 (page 5) and 1 (page 6), section 3.3, paragraph 1, sentence 6: The following sentence, which previously read:

“The pooled summary of variance from the random-effects model was 0.374 ($p = 0.009$, 95% CI 0.94–0.655) for strength and 0.793 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI 0.338–1.248) for muscle architecture.”

Should read:

“The pooled summary of variance from the random-effects model was 0.439 ($p = 0.001$, 95% CI 0.160–0.709) for strength and 0.793 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI 0.338–1.248) for muscle architecture.”

Page 11, Table 1, Alt et al. [58] row: The cell entry in column 1, which previously read:

risk of bias overall within the randomized controlled studies included in this review (Fig. 2), the second identifying the results of this meta-analysis are not subject to publication bias ($p < 0.001$) with 250 and 663 “filed-away” studies needed to prove null effects of NHE interventions on strength and architecture, respectively.”

Should read:

“Two risk of bias assessments were also performed, the first (Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool) showing a low risk of bias overall within the randomized controlled studies included in this review (Fig. 2), the second identifying the results of this meta-analysis are not subject to publication bias ($p < 0.001$) with 178 and 663 “filed-away” studies needed to prove null effects of NHE interventions on strength and architecture, respectively.”
“Alt et al. [58]”

Should read:

“Alt et al. [48]”
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