#### SYSTEMATIC REVIEW



# Pax7<sup>+</sup> Satellite Cells in Human Skeletal Muscle After Exercise: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Luthfia Dewi<sup>1,7</sup> · Yin-Chou Lin<sup>2,8</sup> · Andrew Nicholls<sup>1</sup> · Giancarlo Condello<sup>3</sup> · Chih-Yang Huang<sup>4,5,6</sup> · Chia-Hua Kuo<sup>1</sup>

Accepted: 8 September 2022 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2022

# Abstract

**Background** Skeletal muscle has extraordinary regenerative capabilities against challenge, mainly owing to its resident muscle stem cells, commonly identified by Pax7<sup>+</sup>, which expediently donate nuclei to the regenerating multinucleated myofibers. This local reserve of stem cells in damaged muscle tissues is replenished by undifferentiated bone marrow stem cells (CD34<sup>+</sup>) permeating into the surrounding vascular system.

**Objective** The purpose of the study was to provide a quantitative estimate for the changes in  $Pax7^+$  muscle stem cells (satellite cells) in humans following an acute bout of exercise until 96 h, in temporal relation to circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow stem cells. A subgroup analysis of age was also performed.

**Methods** Four databases (Web of Science, PubMed, Scopus, and BASE) were used for the literature search until February 2022. Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in human skeletal muscle were the primary outcome. Circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells were the secondary outcome. The standardized mean difference (SMD) was calculated using a random-effects meta-analysis. Subgroup analyses were conducted to examine the influence of age, training status, type of exercise, and follow-up time after exercise.

**Results** The final search identified 20 studies for  $Pax7^+$  cells comprising a total of 370 participants between the average age of 21 and 74 years and 26 studies for circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow stem cells comprising 494 participants between the average age of 21 and 67 years. Only one study assessed  $Pax7^+$  cells immediately after aerobic exercise and showed a 32% reduction in exercising muscle followed by a fast repletion to pre-exercise level within 3 h. A large effect on increasing  $Pax7^+$  cell content in skeletal muscles was observed 24 h after resistance exercise (SMD=0.89, p < 0.001). Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells increased to ~50% above pre-exercise level 24–72 h after resistance exercise. For a subgroup analysis of age, a large effect (SMD=0.81, p < 0.001) was observed on increasing Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in exercised muscle among adults aged > 50 years, whereas adults at younger age presented a medium effect (SMD=0.64, p < 0.001). Both resistance exercise and aerobic exercise showed a medium overall effect in increasing circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells (SMD=0.53, p < 0.001), which declined quickly to the pre-exercise baseline level after exercise within 6 h.

**Conclusions** An immediate depletion of  $Pax7^+$  cells in exercising skeletal muscle concurrent with a transient release of CD34<sup>+</sup> cells suggest a replenishment of the local stem cell reserve from bone marrow. A protracted  $Pax7^+$  cell expansion in the muscle can be observed during 24–72 h after resistance exercise. This result provides a scientific basis for exercise recommendations on weekly cycles allowing for adequate recovery time. Exercise-induced  $Pax7^+$  cell expansion in muscle remains significant at higher age, despite a lower stem cell reserve after age 50 years. More studies are required to confirm whether  $Pax7^+$  cell increment can occur after aerobic exercise.

**Clinical Trial Registration** Registered at the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) [identification code CRD42021265457].

Luthfia Dewi and Yin-Chou Lin contributed equally to this work.

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

# **Key Points**

Pax7<sup>+</sup> satellite cells donate nuclei to regenerating myofibers in response to acute damage.

Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in human muscle transiently depleted during aerobic exercise followed by a quick replenishment within 3 h.

Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell number in human muscle increases (~50%) during 24–72 h after resistance exercise.

Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion occurs after a transient increase in circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow stem cells following exercise.

Exercise-induced Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion in muscle remains normal after age 50 years.

# 1 Introduction

Satellite cells are myogenic stem cells located surrounding myofibers between the sarcolemma and basal lamina [1–4], which contribute to muscle growth and repair by a quick fusion of their nuclei into the cytoplasm of myofibers [1, 2, 5]. Lower satellite cell availability prevents muscle hypertrophy against weight loading in mice [6], suggesting its role in muscle plasticity against exercise challenges [4, 7, 8]. Paired box transcription factor 7 (Pax7) is a commonly used biomarker to identify satellite cells in muscle tissues in animal and human models [9–11]. While several studies have demonstrated increases in Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell content in exercised human skeletal muscle [12–15], the effect size and time required for a significant response after an acute bout of exercise from the pooled data of human studies have not been quantitatively examined.

One systematic review has first reported Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion after a single bout of exercise [16]. Based on four original studies listed in the systematic review, satellite cells in human skeletal muscle increased incrementally and peaked at 72 h post-exercise [16]. More studies are required to delineate the magnitude of changes and time required for a significant increase during post-exercise recovery. It is generally observed that the degree of muscle hypertrophy induced by exercise attenuates with age [17]. This has been thought to be associated with reduced satellite cell reserves in muscle tissues [4, 18]. A quantitative analysis is required to confirm the effect size of post-exercise  $Pax7^+$  cell expansion at a higher age. Furthermore, the results of  $Pax7^+$  cell expansion after an acute bout of exercise between trained and untrained individuals remains inconclusive [7, 8, 19]. Differing exercise regimens may also influence  $Pax7^+$  cell numbers of challenged human skeletal muscle [4].  $Pax7^+$ cells do not appear to increase in human muscle following a 6-week high-intensity aerobic training [20]. Subgroup analyses are needed to confirm the effects of age, post-exercise time, training status, and exercise regimen on changes of  $Pax7^+$  cells in human skeletal muscle following an acute bout of exercise.

Bone marrow-derived multipotent stem cells help to maintain adequate stem cell reserves in muscle tissue for myofiber regeneration following damage [21-23]. Transplantation of CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow stem cells into damaged muscle tissues has been shown to increase satellite cells in murine muscles [23–25]. CD34 protein is a commonly used biomarker to identify multipotent bone marrow stem cells in circulation [26], and has been detected in some Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells of muscle tissues [27-32]. An acute bout of exercise increases CD34<sup>+</sup> cells surrounding myofibers in human skeletal muscles within 24 h [33, 34]. The purpose of this meta-analysis is to provide quantitative measures regarding the effect of a single-bout exercise on Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in human skeletal muscle and to delineate the time course of exercise response in temporal relation with circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells during a 96-h recovery period. Subgroup analyses were also performed to confirm the effects of age, training status, and exercise regimen.

# 2 Methods

#### 2.1 Study Protocol and Registration

The present work has been registered to the International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO, registration number: CRD42021265457).

#### 2.2 Search Strategy

The literature search was performed for relevant studies (including a range of publications through to February 2022) across four databases: Web of Science, PubMed, Scopus, and BASE, according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guideline [35]. The keywords included: "exercise," "Pax7," "CD34," "human skeletal muscle," "satellite cells," "endothelial progenitor cells," and "progenitor cells".

# 2.3 Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

Studies were selected based on the PICOS model [36] (Table 1). Intervention studies conducting a single bout of aerobic and/or resistance exercise were included. The primary outcome of the present meta-analysis was  $Pax7^+$  cells in human skeletal muscle.  $CD34^+$  cells in circulation were a secondary outcome. Studies were excluded if they had: (1) undefined follow-up time after exercise; (2) mixed intervention (i.e., blood flow restriction combined with exercise); (3) unavailable total  $Pax7^+$  cell counts; (4) the unavailable baseline data; and (5) no dispersion of dataset.

### 2.4 Data Extraction

The initial review records from all databases and the eligibility of studies were conducted by the primary investigator, then those results were confirmed by at least two separate investigators. The records were imported into Endnote (version 20.1; Clarivate Analytic, Philadelphia, PA, USA) and were automated and manually screened. Once the included studies were finalized, the data were categorized by the characteristics of participants (sample size, age, and sex), and the exercise modality. The outcome data were expressed as standardized mean difference (SMD). If the full-text article only presented in a figure format, WebPlotDigitizer (Web-PlotDigitizer, Version 4.2, 2019; Ankit Rohatgi, TX, USA) was used to extract the data from the studies.

#### 2.5 Data Analysis

Initially, a time analysis was conducted to distinguish the outcomes based on post-exercise skeletal muscle biopsy timepoints for < 24 h and  $\ge 24$  h and discovered a varying effect size with recovery time. Therefore, a subgroup analysis was further adapted by distinguishing multiple time categories. The exercise regimen included aerobic exercise and

resistance exercise for comparison. Aerobic exercise predominated by concentric contraction was included [37]. We excluded a downhill running study from the meta-analysis assessing the effect of aerobic exercise due to a potentially greater muscle damage induced by eccentric muscle contraction [38]. For aerobic exercise, we categorized the intensity into moderate and high. High intensity was defined by either the running speed/cycling work rate as  $\geq$  77% of heart rate  $(HR)_{max/peak}$  or 60–90% of heart rate reserve or  $\geq 80\%$  of maximum oxygen consumption (VO<sub>2max</sub>) or  $\geq$  anaerobic threshold. Moderate intensity of aerobic exercise was determined as 64-76% of heart rate maximum/peak or 40-59% of heart rate reserve or 46-79% of VO2<sub>max</sub>. The studies using peak work rate were converted into %HR for which 59.5% of peak work rate corresponds to approximately 77% heart rate maximum [39]. Intensity of resistance exercise was classified into low (< 50% 1RM), moderate (50-69% 1RM), and high ( $\geq$ 70% 1RM) [40, 41]. We classified the training status into untrained and trained individuals based on the terminology used in previous work [42]. Untrained individuals were defined as subjects who participated in physical activity less than 3 h/week, while the trained subjects were defined as having habitual physical activity approximately 2 h/day for at least 3 days/week.

#### 2.6 Quality Assessment

The quality assessment of the included studies comprised five domains according to the revised Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for exercise intervention trials: (1) randomization process; (2) deviations from intended interventions; (3) missing outcome data; (4) measurement of the outcome; and (5) selection of the reported result. The overall risk of bias was defined as "low risk" if all domains were at low risk of bias, "some concerns" if containing at least one domain at some concerns status, but not at high risk of bias for any domain,

Parameter	Inclusion criteria
Population	Healthy individuals (BMI: 18–25 kg/m <sup>2</sup> )
Intervention	1. Aerobic exercise (acute bout of cycling or treadmill) with intensity $\ge 60\% VO_{2max}$ 2. Resistance exercise (acute bout) included all muscle contraction involved
Comparators	Pre-exercise baseline measurements
Outcomes	1. Primary outcome: Pax7 <sup>+</sup> cells in biopsied muscle measured by an immunohisto- chemical analysis
	<ol> <li>Secondary outcome: circulating CD34+ cells including total CD34<sup>+</sup> cells, CD34<sup>+</sup>/CD45dim, CD34<sup>+</sup>/CD45<sup>+</sup>, CD34<sup>+</sup>/Cd45<sup>dim</sup>/VEGRF2<sup>+</sup>, in the circulation measured by a flow-cytometric analysis</li> </ol>
Study design	Randomized and non-randomized trial

*BMI* body mass index, *CD34* cluster of differentiation 34 (commonly used to assess hematopoietic stem cells in blood), *PAX7* paired box transcription factor 7 (commonly used to assess muscle stem cells in tissues),  $VO_{2max}$  maximum oxygen consumption

Table 1PICOS model used toperform the meta-analysis

and "high risk" if at least one study was judged in some concerns for multiple domains [43].

# 2.7 Statistical Analysis

This meta-analysis was performed using Review Manager (RevMan Version 5.4.1; The Cochrane Centre, Oxford, UK). We collected the baseline and post-exercise data of mean, standard error (SE), and sample size of individuals from exercise intervention studies. Forest plot was produced to display SMD, SE, and overall effect of Z score. If publications reported standard deviation (SD) only, SE was calculated using the following formula, where *n* represented the number of participants:

$$SE = \frac{SD}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

A random-effect model was used assuming an existence of inherent heterogeneity of the data among studies. To perform the SMD, we used the formula according to Cochrane [44]:

$$SMD = \frac{mean_{post} - mean_{baseline}}{\frac{SD_{paired}}{\sqrt{2x(1-r)}}}$$

The effect size was categorized into: (1) small (SMD = 0.20-0.50); (2) medium (SMD = 0.51-0.80); and (3) large (SMD > 0.8) [45–47]. Standard deviation values were calculated by:

$$SDp = \sqrt{(SD_{baseline})^2 + (SD_{post})^2 - 2 \times r \times SD_{baseline} \times SD_{post}},$$

where *r* represents the correlation coefficient. The 95% confidence interval including "0" referred to non-statistically significant [48]. A positive effect of exercise into Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells and CD34<sup>+</sup> cells were pointed out by a positive SMD. A negative SMD showed the negative effect of exercise towards Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells and CD34<sup>+</sup> cells. The overall effect size using the *Z*-score was considered as significant at p < 0.05.

To assess the heterogeneity, tau-squared ( $\tau^2$ ), Chi-square Cochran's  $Q(\chi^2)$  test, and  $I^2$  statistic were performed. The value of  $\tau^2 > 1$  indicated variability between studies. The Q test measured the variation around a weighted mean, in which a p value < 0.10 was considered as significant heterogeneity [49]. The  $I^2$  statistic was used to assess the effect consistency across the studies, with the interpretation of  $I^2$  as follows: (1)  $I^2 = 0-30\%$  showing no important heterogeneity; (2)  $I^2 = 30-49\%$  showing moderate heterogeneity; (3)  $I^2 = 50-74\%$  showing substantial heterogeneity; and (4)  $I^2 = 75-100\%$  showing considerable heterogeneity [44, 50].

#### **3 Results**

#### 3.1 Literature Search

#### 3.1.1 Selection Process

The number of identified articles from four databases and selection process are shown in Fig. 1. A total of 1719 intervention studies were retrieved from the database search, and 568 duplicated and ineligible articles were excluded. The screening phase in this work, including title and abstract screening, left 51 articles. The authors excluded five articles from the meta-analysis because of: (1) one mixed intervention study with whole-body vibration [51]; (2) two studies without a mean or SD [52, 53]; (3) one study presenting a  $Pax7^{+}/MyoD^{+}$  sub-fraction with no total  $Pax7^{+}$  data [4]; and (4) one study using aerobic running in the eccentric contraction mode [38]. These studies were included in the systemic review. This screening resulted in 46 eligible articles that were used for the current quantitative analysis, including 20 studies (n = 370) comprising Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell assessments in human skeletal muscle and 26 studies (n = 494) of circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cell assessments in response to an acute bout of exercise.

#### 3.1.2 Quality Assessment in Individual Studies

Among the included studies, no study scored in the highrisk bias, 12 studies scored in the moderate-risk bias [4, 12, 13, 15, 54–61], and 34 studies scored in the low-risk bias [7, 14, 16, 59, 62–89]. Results of the quality assessment are shown in Table S1 of the Electronic Supplementary Material (ESM).

# 3.2 Acute Response in Muscle Pax7<sup>+</sup> Cell Content After Exercise

#### 3.2.1 Age and Training Status

Table 2 summarizes the sample size, age, exercise type, follow-up time, and Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell change from the preexercise baseline (%) in human skeletal muscle. The total number of participants were 370 (male/female = 360/10) with an age range of 21–74 years. The subgroup analysis presents the acute exercise response of muscle Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell content compared with the pre-exercise baseline for two age levels:  $\leq$  50 years and > 50 years (Fig. S1 of the ESM). A total of eight studies consisting of 105 participants aged > 50 years reported changes of muscle Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell content from the pre-exercise baseline [7, 8, 19, 64, 73, 76, 90, 91]. For the subgroup analysis, a large effect in the adults age > 50 years (SMD = 0.81, 95% CI 0.48–1.14,  $I^2$  = 60%, Fig. 1 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram outlining the electronic search and selection process



overall effect: Z=4.83, p<0.001) and a medium effect in the younger adults of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell increases (SMD=0.64, 95% CI 0.43–0.84,  $l^2=66\%$ , overall effect: Z=6.15, p<0.001) were observed. Figure S2 of the ESM shows the influence of training status of the participants for the acute exercise response in muscle Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell content. There were 12 studies recruiting untrained participants [7, 8, 14, 64–67, 73, 76, 90, 91] and eight studies recruiting trained participants [12, 13, 15, 19, 57, 63, 77, 90]. A large effect of exerciseinduced Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion was observed in the untrained subgroup regardless of age (SMD 0.81, 95% CI 0.61–1.02,  $l^2 = 68\%$ , overall effect: Z=7.79, p<0.001), whereas the trained subgroup showed a small effect (SMD 0.32, 95% CI 0.02–0.62,  $l^2 = 52\%$ , overall effect: Z=2.10, p<0.05).

#### 3.2.2 Exercise Regimen

Most eligible studies assessing acute response in the Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell number of human muscle tissues used resistance exercise [7, 8, 12–15, 19, 57, 64–67, 73, 76, 77, 90–92]. Only one study reported acute response during and after concentric-based aerobic exercise [63]. The post-exercise follow-up

time was limited to 96 h. Because of variations in exercise protocols (isokinetic eccentric contraction or weightlifting) used among the 18 resistance exercise studies, the effect of exercise intensity could not be accurately classified.

When all eligible studies of aerobic exercise and resistance exercise were included, data from 68 biopsied muscle samples (Fig. S3 of the ESM) showed a medium overall effect of post-exercise Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell increases in skeletal muscle (SMD = 0.68, 95% CI 0.51–0.86,  $I^2$  = 66%, overall effect: Z = 7.74, p < 0.001). The subgroup analysis showed no effect in Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell content to an acute bout of aerobic exercise (SMD = -1.03, 95% CI -2.76 to 0.70,  $I^2 = 86\%$ , overall effect: Z = 1.17, p = 0.24) (Fig. S3 of the ESM). A time analysis further showed an acute Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell depletion in muscle immediately after aerobic exercise followed by a quick return to baseline 3 h post-exercise (Fig. 2). No study assessing biopsied muscle immediately after resistance exercise was reported. When post-exercise recovery time was not considered, a medium effect of resistance exercise on Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell increases in skeletal muscles was observed  $(SMD = 0.73, 95\% CI 0.56 - 0.89, I^2 = 61\%, overall effect:$ Z=8.63, p < 0.001)(Fig. 3a). For the time analysis, the

Study, year	Biomarker	Sample size/age	Training status	Type (intensity)	Follow-up time post- exercise	Marker change from pre-exercise baseline
(a) Resistance exercise	2					
Bellamy et al., 2014 [12]	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=23)$ , aged 24 y	Trained	Resistance exercise (acute, 80% of 1RM, 4 sets, 8 reps)	24 h 72 h	+ 34% + 50%
Cermak et al., 2012 [77]	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=9)$ , aged 23 y	Trained	15 sets, 20 reps at a speed 0.52 rad/s	24 h	+19.8%
Dreyer et al., 2006 [7]	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 10)$ , aged 21–35 y	Untrained	Resistance exercise (acute, 6 sets; 12–16	24 h	+157%
	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male ( <i>n</i> =9), aged 60 y		reps at 60°/s)	24 h	+43%
Farup et al., 2014 [13]	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male (n=24), aged 24 y	Trained	Resistance exercise (acute, 15 sets, 10 reps with range of motion were set at 70° and contraction velocity at $20^{\circ}(a)$	24 h 48 h	+ 19% 0%
Hyldahl et al., 2014 [14]	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male ( <i>n</i> =7), aged 22 y	Untrained	Resistance exercise dominated by eccen- tric contraction (acute, achieved up to 40 kJ)	24 h	+ 28%
	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male ( <i>n</i> =7), aged 23 y		Resistance exercise dominated by con- centric contraction (acute, achieved up to 40 kJ)		+3%
McKay et al., 2010 [100]	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 12)$ , aged 21 y	Untrained	30 sets of 10 maximal muscle lengthening contractions at 3.14 rads/s	24 h	+ 37.9%
McKay et al., 2012	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 9)$ ,	9), Untrained 9),	Resistance exercise (acute, 75% of 1-RM, 4 sets, 10 reps)	24 h	+ 32%
[76]		aged 21 y			48 h	+44%
		Male $(n=9)$ ,			24 h	+21%
		aged 70 y			48 h	+ 5%
McKay et al., 2013	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=9)$ ,	Untrained	Resistance exercise	3 h	+6%
[73]		aged 21.3 y		(acute, 75% of 1 RM, 4 sets, 10 reps)	24 h	+22%
					48 h	+34%
		Male $(n=9)$ ,			3 h	-1%
		aged 69.6 y			24 h	+15%
					48 h	+29%
Mackey et al., 2016	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 14)$ ,	Untrained	Resistance exercise	2.5 h	-2%
[66]		aged 21 y		(acute, 5 sets, 20 reps with range of motion from 90 to 10°)	48 h	-13%
Nederveen et al., 2015	Pax7 <sup>+</sup> MyoD <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=7)$ ,	Untrained	Resistance exercise	24 h	+269%
[4]	2	aged 67 y		(acute, 95% of 10-RM,	48 h	+5%
	Pax7 <sup>+</sup> MvoD <sup>-</sup>	<i>. .</i>		4 sets, 10 reps for	24 h	- 19%
				reps for leg pross)	48 h	-18%
Nederveen et al. 2016	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n-23)$	Trained	Resistance evercise	24 h	+ 25%
[15]		aged 24 y	Tranca	(acute, 80% of 1 RM, 4 sets, 8 reps)	72 h	+31%

Table 2	Characteristics of the str	tudies included in this	s review of Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	cells in skeletal r	muscle studies w	vith single-bout	resistance exer	cise (a)
and aero	bic exercise ( <b>b</b> )							

#### Table 2 (continued) Training status Type (intensity) Study, year Biomarker Sample size/age Follow-up Marker change from time postpre-exercise baseline exercise Nederveen et al., 2017 Pax7<sup>+</sup> Male (n = 14), Trained Resistance exercise 24 h +4% [57] aged 25 y (acute, 70-85% of 1 72 h +32% RM, 4 sets, 8 reps) Nederveen et al., 2018 Pax7<sup>+</sup> Male (n = 20), Untrained Resistance exercise +486 h (acute, 30 sets, 10 **[67]** aged 21 y 24 h +74%reps at 180°/s, high 72 +57%CFPE) +4% 96 +38% Resistance exercise 6 h (acute, 30 sets, 10 24 h +62% reps at 180°/s, low 72 +47% CFPE) 96 +32% Nederveen et al., 2020 Pax7<sup>+</sup> Male (n=24), Untrained Resistance exercise 24 h +61% [64] Aged 73 y (acute, 65% of 1 RM, 48 h +30% 4 sets, 10 reps) Reidy et al., 2017 [91] Pax7<sup>+</sup> Male (n = 19), Untrained Resistance exercise -14% 1 h aged 70 y (acute, 60-70% of 1RM, 8 sets, 10 reps) Trained Roberts et al., 2015 Pax7<sup>+</sup> Male (n = 10), Resistance exercise +3% 2 h [53] aged 22.1 y (acute, 8-12 RM) with 24 h +20% ACT 48 h +48% Resistance exercise 2 h+1%(acute, 8-12 RM) with 24 h +12% CWI 48 h +16%Snijders et al., 2014a Pax7<sup>+</sup> Male (n = 20), Untrained Resistance exercise +6% 12 h [92] aged 21 y (acute, 75% of 1 RM, 24 h +17%6 sets, 10 reps) with 48 +45% LPD 72 +57% Resistance exercise 12 h +2% (acute, 75% of 1 RM, 24 h +16%6 sets, 10 reps) with 48 +33% NPD 72 +42%Snijders et al., 2014b Pax7<sup>+</sup> Male (n = 10), aged Untrained Resistance exercise 12 h +6% [8] 22 y (acute, 75% of 1 RM, 24 h +26% 6 sets, 10 reps) +43% 48 h 72 h +53% Male (n=10), aged 12 h +2% 73 y 24 h +14%48 h +22% 72 h +31%Snijders et al., 2019 Resistance exercise +30% Pax7<sup>+</sup> Male (n = 14), Untrained 24 h aged 74 y (acute, 65% of 1-RM, [19] 48 h +5% 4 sets, 10 reps) Toth et al., 2011 [65] Untrained Resistance exercise +12%Pax7<sup>+</sup> Male (n=12)1 h (acute, 300 unilateral +17%3 h isokinetic eccentric 24 h +60%contractions in 180°/s over a 55° range of motion)

Study, year	Biomarker	Sample size/age	Training status	Type (intensity)	Follow-up time post- exercise	Marker change from pre-exercise baseline
Walker et al., 2012	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=5)$ ,	Trained	Resistance exercise	6 h	+18%
[19]		aged 27 y		(acute, 70% of 1-RM, 8 sets 10 reps)	24 h	+138%
		Female $(n=5)$ , aged		0 0000, 10 1000)	6 h	+16%
		27 у			24 h	+ 50%
		Male $(n=6)$ , aged			6 h	+1%
		70 y			24 h	+48%
		Female $(n=5)$ , aged			6 h	+102%
		70 y			24 h	+140%
(b) Aerobic exercise						
Nederveen et al., 2015 [4]	Pax7 <sup>+</sup> MyoD <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=7)$ , aged 67 y	Untrained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 60% VO <sub>2</sub> peak)	24 h	106%
					48 h	70%
		Male $(n=8)$ , aged 67 y		Aerobic exercise (acute, 90–95% VO <sub>2</sub> peak)	24 h	355%
					48 h	51%
	Pax7 <sup>+</sup> /MyoD <sup>-</sup>	Male ( <i>n</i> =7), aged 67 y		Aerobic exercise (acute, 60% VO <sub>2</sub> peak)	24 h	- 6%
					48 h	-33%
		Male ( <i>n</i> =8), aged 67 y		Aerobic exercise (acute, 90–95% VO <sub>2</sub> peak)	24 h	- 39%
					48 h	-12%
van De Vyver and Myburgh, 2012 [38]	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male ( <i>n</i> =6), aged 22 y	Untrained	Aerobic exercise Resistance exercise (acute, 85% VO <sub>2max</sub> downhill running)	24 h	+41%
				_	48 h	+6%
Wu et al., 2019 [63]	Pax7 <sup>+</sup>	Male ( <i>n</i> =12), aged 21 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 70% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	0 h	- 32%
					3 h	-3%

ACT active recovery, CWI cold water immersion, h hours, LPD low-protein diet, NPD normal protein diet, RM repetition maximum, s seconds, y years, min minutes, VO<sub>2max</sub> maximum oxygen consumption maximum

effect size of resistance exercise peaked at 24 h and gradually returned to baseline in 96 h (Fig. 3b). The subgroup analysis showed a minimal effect within 12 h following resistance exercise (SMD=0.22, 95% CI 0.01–0.42,  $I^2=0\%$ , overall effect: Z=2.09, p<0.05). A large effect of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell increases after resistance exercise was contributed mostly by the muscle data assessed 24 h post-exercise or later (SMD=0.89, 95% CI 0.64–1.14,  $I^2=55\%$ , overall effect: Z=6.95, p<0.001).

Table 2 (continued)

# 3.3 Acute Response in Circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> Bone Marrow Stem Cells After Exercise

 $CD34^+$  bone marrow-derived stem cells from circulation contributes to local Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell reserve and myogenesis in skeletal muscle [27–32]. In this study, we also assessed the temporal relationship between circulating blood  $CD34^+$  cells and Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion in skeletal muscle in response to an acute bout of exercise.





#### 3.3.1 Age and Training Status

Table 3 summarizes sample size, age, exercise type, followup time, and marker change from the pre-exercise baseline (%) for CD34<sup>+</sup> cells in blood. The age range of participants was 10–65 years (n = 494) [54–56, 58–62, 68, 70–72, 75, 78-89, 93]. No significant effect for circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells was found after a single bout of exercise from 24 participants aged 50-65 years (SMD = 0.30, 95% CI - 0.31 to  $0.91, I^2 = 62\%$ , overall effect: Z = 0.97, p = 0.33). A medium effect was found for the remaining 470 young participants  $(SMD = 0.53, 95\% CI 0.40 - 0.66, I^2 = 69\%, overall effect:$ Z=7.83, p < 0.001) (Fig. S4 of the ESM). The effect of training status is shown in Fig. S5 of the ESM, which included (male/female = 378/116) categorized as untrained participants in eight studies [59-62, 79, 82, 85, 88] and trained participants in 19 studies [54-56, 58, 62, 68-70, 72, 75, 78, 80, 81, 83, 84, 86-89]. The subgroup analysis showed a medium effect for untrained (SMD = 0.57, 95%CI 0.38–0.77,  $I^2 = 53\%$ , overall effect: Z = 5.82, p < 0.001) and a small effect for trained participants (SMD = 0.49, 95%CI 0.32–0.67,  $I^2 = 74\%$ , overall effect: Z = 5.58, p < 0.001) compared with pre-exercise circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells.

#### 3.3.2 Exercise Regimen

A total of 22 eligible studies for aerobic exercise [54–56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 68, 69, 71, 72, 75, 78–83, 85, 87–89] and five eligible studies for resistance exercise [60, 70, 82, 84, 86] assessing circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cell counts were included in the quantitative analysis. The follow-up time after aerobic and resistance exercise was no more than 96 h. Without

considering time after exercise, the overall effect of a single bout of aerobic exercise and resistance exercise based on 125 measurements (Fig. S6 of the ESM) showed a small and medium effect of exercise on increasing circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells, respectively (aerobic exercise: SMD=0.47, 95% CI 0.32–0.63,  $I^2 = 71\%$ , overall effect: Z = 6.17, p < 0.001; resistance exercise: SMD=0.67, 95% CI 0.42–0.92,  $I^2 = 60\%$ , overall effect: Z = 5.19, p < 0.001).

When post-exercise time was not considered, a small effect of aerobic exercise (SMD = 0.47, 95% CI 0.32-0.63,  $I^2 = 71\%$ , overall effect: Z = 6.17, p < 0.001) and a medium effect of resistance exercise for increasing circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells (SMD = 0.67, 95% CI 0.42–0.92,  $I^2 = 60\%$ , overall effect: Z = 5.19, p < 0.001) were observed. The time analysis has further shown immediate increases of circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells above baseline after aerobic exercise followed by a quick decline within 2 h post-exercise (Fig. 4a). A medium effect in circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cell increases within 2 h after aerobic exercise was observed (SMD = 0.60, 95%CI 0.41–0.79,  $I^2 = 73\%$ , overall effect: Z = 6.28, p < 0.001) (Fig. 4b), whereas no significant effect was observed  $\geq 2$  h post-exercise (SMD = 0.18, 95% CI – 0.04 to 0.40,  $I^2 = 52\%$ , overall effect: Z = 1.60, p = 0.11). Both moderate-intensity aerobic exercise (46–79%  $VO_{2max}$  with average duration range of 10-240 min) [SMD = 0.48, 95% CI 0.24-0.72,  $I^2 = 74\%$ , overall effect: Z = 3.90, p < 0.001] and high-intensity aerobic exercise ( $\geq 80\%$  VO<sub>2max</sub> with average duration range of 6-207 min) [SMD=0.47, 95% CI 0.28-0.67,  $I^2 = 68\%$ , overall effect: Z = 4.74, p < 0.001 showed a small effect on post-exercise increases in circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells (Fig. 4b).

Fig. 3 Forest plot of standardized mean difference for Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell number in human skeletal muscle at follow-up measurement < 24 h, 24 h, 48 h, 72 h, and 96 h after resistance exercise (a), time course analysis for the change of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in skeletal muscle after an acute bout of resistance exercise (**b**). *CI* confidence interval, *df* degree of freedom,  $I^2$  inconsistency between studies, SE standard error

а	Phudu an	Cubaraux.	Rtd Hass Difference CE	Weinht	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
	< 24 h	Subgroup	Std. Mean Difference SE	weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Kalidon, 55% Cl
	Mackey e	t al. 2016 (2.5 h)	0 0.5345	1.3%	0.00 [-1.05, 1.05]	<u> </u>
	McKay et McKay et	al. 2013 (3 h, old) al. 2013 (3 h, vound)	0.2166 0.4732	1.5%	0.22 [-0.71, 1.14]	_ <b>_</b>
	Nedervee	n et al. 2018 (6 h, high CFPE)	0.9636 0.336	1.9%	0.96 [0.31, 1.62]	
	Nedervee	n et al. 2018 (6 h, low CFPE)	-0.0176 0.3162	1.9%	-0.02 [-0.64, 0.60]	<u> </u>
	Sniiders e	al. 2017 (1 h) et al. 2014a (12 h. LPD)	-0.1563 0.325 0.2192 0.3173	1.9%	-0.16 [-0.79, 0.48] 0.22 [-0.40, 0.84]	
	Snijders e	t al. 2014a (12 h, NPD)	0.2192 0.3173	1.9%	0.22 [-0.40, 0.84]	+-
	Snijders e	t al. 2014b (12 h, old)	-0.2375 0.4492	1.5%	-0.24 [-1.12, 0.64]	<u> </u>
	Toth et al	t al. 2014b (12 h, young) 2011 (1 h)	0.7429 0.466	1.5%	0.74 [-0.17, 1.66]	
	Toth et al	2011 (3 h)	0.3472 0.4119	1.6%	0.35 [-0.46, 1.15]	+
	Walker et	al. 2012 (6 h, female, old)	0.7664 0.6697	1.0%	0.77 [-0.55, 2.08]	
	Walker et Walker et	al. 2012 (6 h, female, young) al. 2012 (6 h, male, old)	0.4039 0.643	1.0%	0.40 [-0.86, 1.66]	
	Walker et	al. 2012 (6 h, male, young)	-0.4039 0.643	1.0%	-0.40 [-1.66, 0.86]	<u> </u>
	Subtotal	(95% CI)	# - 45 (D - 0 74); I2 - 00	24.3%	0.22 [0.01, 0.42]	
	Test for o	verall effect: Z = 2.09 (P = 0.04)	n = 15 (P = 0.71), 1 = 0.8			
	24 h					
	Bellamy e	tal 2014 (24 h)	0.3911 0.298	2.0%	0.39 (-0.19, 0.98)	
	Cermak e	t al. 2013 (24 h)	0.3527 0.4761	1.4%	0.35 [-0.58, 1.29]	
	Dreyer et	al. 2006 (24 h, old)	1.4286 0.543	1.3%	1.43 [0.36, 2.49]	
	Farup et a	al. 2006 (24 h, young) al. 2014 (24 h)	0.1846 0.4093	1.6%	0.18 [-0.62, 0.99]	-
	Hyldahl e	t al. 2014 (24 h-CON)	0.36 0.54	1.3%	0.36 [-0.70, 1.42]	- <del>-</del>
	Hyldahl e MeKay et	t al. 2014 (24 h-ECC)	0.58 0.5	1.4%	0.58 [-0.40, 1.56]	T
	McKay et	al. 2012 (24 h, old)	2.1035 0.6161	1.1%	2.10 [0.90, 3.31]	
	McKay et	al. 2012 (24 h, young)	2.1006 0.6157	1.1%	2.10 [0.89, 3.31]	
	McKay et	al. 2013 (24 h, old)	0.5171 0.4814	1.4%	0.52 [-0.43, 1.46]	<b>—</b>
	Nedervee	n et al. 2016 (24 h)	0.517 0.3002	2.0%	0.52 [-0.07, 1.11]	-
	Nedervee	n et al. 2017 (24 h)	0.1226 0.3784	1.7%	0.12 [-0.62, 0.86]	+
	Nedervee	n et al. 2018 (24 h, high CFPE) n et al. 2018 (24 h. low CFPE)	0.9797 0.3366	1.9%	0.98 [0.32, 1.64]	+
	Nedervee	n et al. 2020 (24 h)	1.7214 0.342	1.9%	1.72 [1.05, 2.39]	
	Snijders e	t al. 2014a (24 h, LPD)	0.4383 0.3204	1.9%	0.44 [-0.19, 1.07]	<u>t</u>
	Snijders e	a. 2014a (24 h, NPD) at al. 2014b (24 h, old)	0.9958 0.4805	1.9%	0.44 [-0.19, 1.07] 1.00 [0.05, 1.94]	<u> </u>
	Snijders e	t al. 2014b (24 h, young)	2.1933 0.5914	1.1%	2.19 [1.03, 3.35]	
	Snijders e	t al. 2019 (24 h) 2011 (24 h)	0.7716 0.3001	2.0%	0.77 [0.18, 1.36]	
	Walker et	al. 2012 (24 h, female, old)	0.8079 0.6737	1.0%	0.81 [-0.51, 2.13]	+
	Walker et	al. 2012 (24 h, female, young)	1.2118 0.7219	0.9%	1.21 [-0.20, 2.63]	
	Walker et	al. 2012 (24 h, male, old)	0.7537 0.6071	1.1%	0.75 [-0.44, 1.94]	
	Subtotal	(95% CI)	3.0354 1.2200	39.2%	0.89 [0.64, 1.14]	•
	Heteroge	neity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.22; Chl <sup>2</sup> = 57.53,	if = 26 (P = 0.0004); I <sup>2</sup> = 55%			
	Test for o	verall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.000	)1)			
	48 h					
	Farup et a	al. 2014 (48 h)	0 0.4082	1.6%	0.00 [-0.80, 0.80]	
	Mackey e McKay et	tal. 2016 (48 h) al. 2012 (48 h old)	-0.6497 0.5533	1.2%	-0.65 [-1.73, 0.43] 1 90 [0 74, 3 07]	
	McKay et	al. 2012 (48 h, young)	2.9347 0.727	0.9%	2.93 [1.51, 4.36]	
	McKay et	al. 2013 (48 h, old)	0.9692 0.5056	1.4%	0.97 [-0.02, 1.96]	
	Nedervee	al. 2013 (46 h, young) n et al. 2020 (48 h)	0.9242 0.305	2.0%	0.92 [0.33, 1.52]	
	Snijders e	t al. 2014a (48 h, LPD)	1.0958 0.3415	1.9%	1.10 [0.43, 1.77]	
	Snijders e	t al. 2014a (48 h, NPD)	0.8767 0.3327	1.9%	0.88 [0.22, 1.53]	
	Snijders e	t al. 2014b (48 h, young)	2.8788 0.6768	1.0%	2.88 [1.55, 4.21]	
	Snijders e	t al. 2019 (48 h)	0 0.378	1.7%	0.00 [-0.74, 0.74]	· · · · ·
	Heteroge	(95 % Cl) neity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.48; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 38.20. (	if = 11 (P < 0.0001);   <sup>2</sup> = 71%	17.476	0.55 [0.51, 1.40]	•
	Test for o	verall effect: Z = 4.06 (P < 0.000	I)			
	72 h					
	Bellamy e	t al. 2014 (72 h)	0.6263 0.3027	2.0%	0.63 [0.03, 1.22]	
	Nedervee	n et al. 2016 (72 h)	0.6148 0.3024	2.0%	0.61 [0.02, 1.21]	<u> </u>
	Nedervee	n etal. 2017 (72 h) n etal. 2018 (72 h. hinh CEPE)	0.7752 0.3941	1.7%	0.78 [0.00, 1.55]	
	Nedervee	n et al. 2018 (72 h, low CFPE)	0.5513 0.3228	1.9%	0.55 [-0.08, 1.18]	
	Snijders e	t al. 2014a (72 h, LPD)	1.315 0.3521	1.8%	1.31 [0.62, 2.01]	
	Snijders e Snijders e	t al. 2014a (72 h, NPD) t al. 2014b (72 h, old)	1.9184 0.5609	1.9%	1.92 [0.82, 3.02]	
	Snijders e	et al. 2014b (72 h, young)	3.2009 0.7204	0.9%	3.20 [1.79, 4.61]	
	Subtotal	(95% CI) solity: Touris = 0.17; Chill = 19.14	# = 9 /D = 0.02); IZ = 569/	15.2%	1.03 [0.66, 1.40]	•
	Test for o	verall effect: Z = 5.47 (P < 0.000	)1)			
	96 h					
	Nedervee	n et al. 2018 (96 h, high CFPE)	0.0645 0.3163	1.9%	0.06 [-0.56, 0.68]	+
	Nedervee	n et al. 2018 (96 h, low CFPE)	-0.3499 0.3189	1.9%	-0.35 [-0.97, 0.28]	1
	Heterope	neity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.85 dt	= 1 (P = 0.36); I <sup>2</sup> = 0%	3.8%	-0.14 [-0.58, 0.30]	T
	Test for o	verall effect: Z = 0.63 (P = 0.53)				
	Total (95	% CI)		100.0%	0.73 [0.56. 0.89]	•
	Heteroge	neity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.26; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 166.95,	df = 65 (P < 0.00001); I <sup>2</sup> = 61%			4 2 0 2 4
	Test for o	verall effect: Z = 8.63 (P < 0.000	)1)			
	Test for e	ubaroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 36 35	df =4 (P < 0.00001) 12 = 89 0%			
		op anterender om - 30.20				
հ						
IJ	1.6.5					
	190					
	170					
			•			
	150		•			
	100		•			
	120		•			
ne	130					
ili						
ıse	110					
þ		•				
Ę	90					
ro	90					
еf	70		•			
ğ	70		-			
lar			•			•
cF	50	•	•		•	
%		•	1			●
Ű	30	-			1	•
	20				I	-

48

Time (h)

54 60 66 72 78 84 90 96

10

-10

-30

-50

Baseline

12 18 24 30 36 42

6

**Table 3** Summary and characteristics of the studies included in this review of circulating  $CD34^+$  cells studies with single-bout resistance exercise (a) and aerobic exercise (b)

Study, year	Biomarker	Sample size	Training status	Type (intensity)	Follow-up time post- exercise	Marker change from baseline
(a) Resistance exercis	se					
Krüger et al., 2015 [82]	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD45 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 12)$ , aged 25–26 y	Untrained	Resistance exercise (acute, 75% 1RM)	0 h 3 h	+70% +81%
					24 h	+51%
	CD24+CD45-VDB+				48 fi	- 8%
	CD34 CD43 KDK				011	100%
					3 II 24 h	190%
					24 II 48 h	394 <i>/</i> 0 25%
Loo at al. 2015 [70]	CD24 <sup>+</sup>	$M_{olo}(n-6)$	Trainad	Pasistanaa avaraisa	40 II 0 b	33% 20%
Lee et al., 2015 [70]	CD34	aged 28 v	Trained	(acute, 10 sets: 6	011	- 3 %
		ugeu 20 y		reps MVC)	2 fi 24 h	-4%
	CD24 <sup>+</sup>				24 h	+ 19%
	CD34 <sup>+</sup>				48 h	+ 10%
					72 h	+14%
NG				<b>D</b> 1.	96 h	+ /%
Montgomery et al.,	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD45 <sub>dim</sub>	Male $(n=9)$ ,	Trained	Resistance exercise	0 h	-4%
2019 [00]		ageu 21 y		followed by 3 sets	0.5 h	-6%
	CD34 'VEGRF2'			of 15 reps 20%	0 h	116%
				1RM)	0.5 h	112%
	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD45 <sub>dim</sub> VEGRF2				0 h	96%
				(0)(( 1))) ( 0)	0.5 h	140%
Ribeiro et al., 2017	CD45 <sub>dim</sub> /VEGFR2 <sup>+</sup> /CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Female $(n = 13)$ , aged 20.7 y Female $(n = 12)$ , aged 21 y	Untrained	60% 1-RM, 3 sets,	0 h	58%
[00]				12 1005	6 h	31%
					24 h	16%
				70% 1-RM, 3 sets, 12 reps	0 h	133%
					6 h	69%
					24 h	-35%
		Female $(n = 13)$ , aged 20.9 y		80% 1-RM, 3 sets, 12 reps	0 h	135%
					6 h	222%
					24 h	10%
Ross et al., 2013	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 13)$ ,	Trained	Resistance exercise	0 h	+85%
[84]		aged 22 y		of six exercises-leg press, seated chest press, leg curl, lat pulldown, knee extension, and triceps pushdown)	2 h 24 h	+65% -2%
(b) Aerobic exercise						
Agha et al., 2018 [78]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male/female ( $n = 8/7$ ), aged = 28 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (ventilatory thresh- old + 15%)	0 h	+76%
					1 h	-8%
					2 h	+8%
					3 h	+24%
				Aerobic exercise (ventilatory thresh- old – 5%)	0 h	+12%
					1 h	0%

Table 3 (continued)						
Study, year	Biomarker	Sample size	Training status	Type (intensity)	Follow-up time post- exercise	Marker change from baseline
					2 h	-20%
					3 h	-8%
		Male/female (n = 10/2), aged = 30 y		Aerobic exercise (lactate thresh- old + 10%)	0 h	+91%
					1 h	+3%
Baker et al., 2017 [54]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 11)$ , aged 23.5 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 70% WR <sub>peak</sub> )	0 min	+97%
					10 min	+1%
					30 min	+23%
					60 min	+9%
Bonsignore et al., 2002 [56]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 16)$ , aged 41.8 y	Trained	Half-marathon (acute)	0 h	-25%
					<24 h	-58%
				Marathon (acute)	0 h	+20%
					<24 h	-49%
Bonsignore et al., 2010 [55]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 17)$ , aged 43.6 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 101% HR <sub>max</sub> )	0 h	+90%
				Aerobic exercise (acute, marathon)	0 h	-37%
					18 h	-17%
					24 h	+265%
Chang et al., 2015 [61]	VEGFR2 <sup>+</sup> /CD11b <sup>-</sup> / CD34 <sup>+</sup> /AC133 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=5)$ , aged 29.8 y	Untrained	Aerobic exercise (acute, HR > 140 bpm)	0 h	10%
					24 h	265%
Craenenbroeck et al., 2008 [71]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male/female $(n=6/5)$ , aged 23.9 y	Not reported	Aerobic exercise (acute, 116% VO2 <sub>max</sub> )	0 h	+39%
		Male/female (n=9/6), aged 36.2 y		Aerobic exercise (acute, 119% VO2 <sub>max</sub> )	0 h	+10%
Harris et al., 2017 [79]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Female $(n = 15)$ , aged 63 y	Untrained	Aerobic exercise (acute, moderate continues, 80% of lactate threshold)	0.5 h	- 19%
		Female ( <i>n</i> = 15), aged 63 y		Aerobic exercise (acute, moderate interval, 90% of $VO_{2max}$ with 10:20 s)	0.5 h	- 4%
		Female $(n = 15)$ , aged 63 y		Aerobic exercise (acute, heavy inter- val, 90% of $VO_{2max}$ with 30:60 s)	0.5 h	-15%
Kroepfl et al., 2012 [81]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male ( <i>n</i> = 10) aged 25.3 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 40-W starting load, increasing 20 W/min) until exhaustion)	10 min	+ 87%
					30 min	+8%
					60 min	+1%

Study, year	Biomarker	Sample size	Training status	Type (intensity)	Follow-up time post- exercise	Marker change from baseline
					120 min	-10%
Krüger et al., 2014 [82]	CD34 <sup>+</sup> /CD45 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 12)$ , aged 25–26 y	Untrained	Aerobic exercise (acute, CET, 80% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	0 h	+96%
					3 h	+53%
					24 h	+34%
		Male ( <i>n</i> = 12), aged 25–26 y		Aerobic exercise (acute, ECC,80% $VO_{2max}$ with the run down 12%)	0 h	+77%
					3 h	+33%
					24 h	+60%
					48 h	+5%
	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD45 <sup>-</sup> KDR <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 12)$ , aged 25–26 y		Aerobic exercise (acute, CET, 80% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	0 h	72%
					3 h	16%
					24 h	-42%
		Male ( <i>n</i> = 12), aged 25–26 y		Aerobic exercise (acute, ECC, 80% VO <sub>2max</sub> with the run down 12%)	0 h	164%
					3 h	-14%
					24 h	5%
					48 h	-14%
Kröpfl et al., 2020 [89]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=21)$ , aged 29–30 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 85% of speed/power)	0 h	+17%
aufs et al., 2005 [83]	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD133 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 25)$ , aged 24.8 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 82% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	0 h	+54%
				Aerobic exercise (acute, 68% VO <sub>2max</sub> , 30 min)	0 h	+43%
				Aerobic exercise (acute, 68% VO <sub>2max</sub> , 10 min)	0 h	+6%
	CD34 <sup>+</sup> VEGRF2 <sup>+</sup>			Aerobic exercise (acute, 82% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	0 h	120%
				Aerobic exercise (acute, 68% VO <sub>2max</sub> , 30 min)	0 h	163%
				Aerobic exercise (acute, 68% VO <sub>2max</sub> , 10 min)	0 h	6%
	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD117 <sup>+</sup>			Aerobic exercise (acute, 82% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	0 h	34%
				Aerobic exercise (acute, 68% VO <sub>2max</sub> , 30 min)	0 h	20%
				Aerobic exercise (acute, 68% VO <sub>2max</sub> , 10 min)	0 h	5%

Table 3 (continued)						
Study, year	Biomarker	Sample size	Training status	Type (intensity)	Follow-up time post- exercise	Marker change from baseline
Möbius-Winkler et al., 2009 [75]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 18)$ , aged 32.4 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 70% indi- vidual anabolic threshold)	0 min	+178%
					30 min	+99%
					1 h	+72%
					2 h	+94%
					24 h	+3%
Morici et al., 2005 [80]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male/ female (n=13/7) aged 16–18 y	Trained	Rowing with average workload 322 W	0 min	+114%
Niemiro et al., 2017 [59]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=7)$ , aged 25.3 y	Untrained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 70% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	15 min	+58%
[37]					1 h	+5%
					2 h	+23%
O'Carroll et al., 2019 [58]	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD45d <sub>im</sub> VEGRF2 <sup>+</sup>	Male/female $(n=8/4)$ , aged 29 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 70% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	0 h	+35%
					2 h	-19%
					24 h	-6%
	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD45 <sub>dim</sub>				0 h	16%
					2 h	-191%
					24 h	3%
Ross et al., 2018 [93]	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD45 <sub>dim</sub>	Male $(n=8)$ , aged 23 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 70% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	0 h	+55%
		Male $(n=9)$ , aged 65 y			0 h	-2%
	CD34 <sup>+</sup> CD45 <sub>dim</sub> VEGRF2 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=8)$ , aged 23 y			0 h	104%
		Male $(n=9)$ , aged 65 y			0 h	62%
Shill et al., 2018 [68]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male/female (n = 10/10), aged 23.6 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, $65\%$ VO <sub>2max</sub> )	0 min	+4%
					30 min	-18%
					1 h	-14%
					1.5 h	-23%
					2 h	-25%
				Aerobic exercise (acute, 90–100% VO <sub>2mon</sub> )	0 min	0%
				2max/	30 min	-1%
					1 h	+7%
					1.5 h	+12%
					2 h	-1%
Stelzer et al., 2014 [131]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male/female $(n=3/4)$ , aged 39.6 y	Trained	Ultra-endurance cycling race	0 min	-11%
Thijssen et al., 2006 [62]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n=8)$ , aged 19–28 y	Untrained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 65% HRR)	0 h	+100%
		Male $(n=8)$ , aged 19–28 y	Trained	/		+ 32%

Table 3	(continued)
---------	-------------

Study, year	Biomarker	Sample size	Training status	Type (intensity)	Follow-up time post- exercise	Marker change from baseline
		Male ( <i>n</i> =4), aged 67–76 y	Untrained			+71%
		Male $(n = 4)$ , aged 67–76 y	Trained			+48%
Wardyn et al., 2008 [88]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male/female (n = 10/8), aged 19–35 y	Untrained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 90–112% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	30 min	0%
		Male/female (n=9/10), aged 19-35 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 114–148% VO <sub>2max</sub> )	30 min	-3%
Yang et al., 2007 [85]	CD34 <sup>+</sup> /KDR <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 16)$ , Aged 25.1 y	Untrained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 5.5 km/h, 14% grade, 10.2 METS)	30 min	74%
Zaldivar et al., 2007 [72]	CD34 <sup>+</sup>	Male $(n = 14)$ , aged 10.3 y	Trained	Aerobic exercise (acute, 50% WR)	0 h	+63%
		Male $(n = 13)$ , aged 16.6 y			0 h	+141%

min minutes, MVC maximal voluntary contraction, CET concentric endurance test, ECC eccentric endurance test, h hour,  $HR_{max}$  heart rate maximum, HRR heart rate reserve, s seconds,  $VO_{2max}$  maximal oxygen consumption, WR peak work rate peak, y years

Resistance exercise showed immediate increases in circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells and returned to baseline levels after 6 h (Fig. 5a). A large effect of CD34<sup>+</sup> cell increases was observed within 6 h after resistance exercise (SMD=0.93, 95% CI 0.60–1.27,  $I^2 = 60\%$ , overall effect: Z = 5.45, p < 0.001), whereas no significant effect was observed beyond 6 h (SMD=0.29, 95% CI – 0.01 to 0.59,  $I^2 = 33\%$ , overall effect: Z = 1.87, p = 0.06) (Fig. 5b).

# **4** Discussion

To our knowledge, the present study provides the first quantitative meta-analysis to confirm the effect of an acute single-bout exercise on Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in human skeletal muscles. Time required for significant changes in Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells during and after exercise is also delineated with circulating levels of CD34<sup>+</sup> cells [32, 94, 95]. Here, we summarized the findings as follows: (1) Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell replenishment and further expansion occur following a transient Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell depletion in human skeletal muscle during exercise; (2) Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion in exercised human skeletal muscles peaks at 24 h and remains somewhat elevated up to 72 h after resistance exercise; (3) post-exercise Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion occurs slowly after a transient increase in circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow stem cells during exercise; and (4) Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion induced by exercise remains normal for adults aged 50–74 years, despite a lower Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell reserve in muscle compared with younger adults.

# 4.1 Pax7<sup>+</sup> Cells in Human Skeletal Muscle Increases After Exercise in Higher Age Adults and Training Status

Lower Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell reserves in aging skeletal muscle are generally considered as a cause of age-dependent declines in muscle repair and regenerative capacity [96–98]. However, the current meta-analysis showed a slightly greater effect size of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell increases after exercise in adults aged 50–74 years compared with younger adults (SMD=0.81; p < 0.001 vs SMD = 0.64; p < 0.001). This unexpected result appears to be contributed in part by moderately lower baseline values of  $Pax7^+$  cells in older than younger adults [18, 99]. The mean baseline value for older adults was  $6.3 \text{ Pax7}^+$ cells/100 myofibers [4, 7, 19, 64, 73, 76, 90, 92] compared with an average of 9.9 Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells/100 myofibers in sedentary young adults [7, 8, 14, 15, 19, 57, 63, 66, 67, 73, 76, 77, 92, 100]. The larger effect size in older adults is mainly contributed by three studies [4, 64, 90]. Despite significant increases in Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell content after exercise for adults aged 50-74 years, the time required for this exercise response seems to be longer in those with a higher age according to four studies [7, 8, 19, 73]. The primary difference between these four studies and the other studies was from a delayed response in participants aged > 70 years. Anabolic hormones such as insulin and sex hormones are known to decline during late life [101-107], which may be responsible for this observation. Both sex hormones [108] and insulin [109] are essential for stem cell reproduction and tissue repair.

**Fig. 4** Time course analysis of circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells following aerobic exercise (**a**), forest plot of standardized mean difference for CD34<sup>+</sup> cells in circulation at follow-up measurement < 2 h and  $\ge$  2 h after an acute bout of aerobic exercise (**b**). *CI* confidence interval, *df* degree of freedom, *I*<sup>2</sup> inconsistency between studies, *SE* standard error





#### b

a

Study or Subgroup         Std. Mean Difference         SE         Weight         IV, Random, 95% CI         IV, Random, 95% CI           Kruger et al. 2015 (0 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)         0.6647         0.4215         3.5%         0.66 (D-16, 1.49)           Kruger et al. 2015 (3 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)         1.3802         0.4613         3.3%         1.36 (0.48, 2.26)           Kruger et al. 2015 (3 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)         1.2766         0.656 (D-18, 72, 0.60)					Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
$ \leq 6 h \\ \text{Kruger et al. 2015 (0 h, RET, CD34+CCD45+KDR+)} 0.773 0.4215 3.5% 0.66 [-0.16, 1.49] \\ \text{Kruger et al. 2015 (3 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)} 1.2706 0.453 3.3% 1.26 [0.46, 2.26] \\ \text{Kruger et al. 2015 (3 h, RET, CD34+CD45+KDR+)} 1.2766 0.4553 3.3% 1.28 [0.38, 2.17] \\ \text{Lee et al. 2015 (3 h, RET, CD34+CD45+KDR+)} 1.2766 0.4553 3.3% 1.28 [0.38, 2.17] \\ \text{Lee et al. 2015 (2 h)} -0.1962 0.4729 3.2% -0.20 [-1.2 0.73] \\ \text{Monignormy et al. 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+CD45-KDR+2+)} 0.8968 0.5008 3.1% 0.92 [-0.07, 1.90] \\ \text{Monignormy et al. 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+CD45-KDR+2+)} 0.8968 0.5008 3.1% 0.92 [-0.07, 1.90] \\ \text{Monignormy et al. 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+CD45-KDR+2+)} 1.9903 0.5322 2.6% 1.91 [0.75, 3.07] \\ \text{Horing and 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+CD45-KDR+2+)} 1.9903 0.5322 2.6% 1.91 [0.75, 3.07] \\ \text{Horing and 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+CD45-KDR+2+)} 1.9903 0.5322 2.6% 1.94 [0.28, 1.28] \\ \text{Monignormy et al. 2017 (0 h, 50%-RM) \\ \text{Let ot al. 2017 (0 h, 50%-RM) } 2.445 0.4669 3.3% 1.44 [0.28, 2.25] \\ \text{Holer ot al. 2017 (6 h, 50%-RM) } 2.445 0.2659 0.3946 3.7% 0.29 [-0.48] 1.68] \\ \text{Horing trail 2.017 (6 h, 50%-RM) } 2.278 0.521 2.9% 2.28 [1.28, 3.30] \\ \text{Rose at al. 2013 (6 h) } 0.70%-RM ) & 2.476 0.251 2.9% 2.28 [1.28, 3.30] \\ \text{Rose at al. 2017 (6 h, 50%-RM) } 2.278 0.521 2.9% 2.28 [1.28, 3.30] \\ \text{Rose at al. 2017 (6 h, 50%-RM) } 2.278 0.521 2.9% 2.28 [1.28, 3.30] \\ \text{Rose at al. 2017 (6 h, 50%-RM) } 2.278 0.531 2.9% 2.28 [1.28, 3.30] \\ \text{Rose at al. 2017 (6 h, 50%-RM) } 2.278 0.531 2.9% 2.28 [1.28, 3.30] \\ \text{Rose at al. 2015 (2 h, RET, CD34+CD45+MCR+) } 1.2198 0.4514 3.3% 0.65 [-0.18, 1.47] \\ \text{Ruger at al. 2015 (2 h, RET, CD34+CD45+MCR+) } 2.238 0.4098 3.5% 0.65 [-0.18, 1.47] \\ \text{Ruger at al. 2015 (2 h, RET, CD34+CD45+MCR+) } 2.238 0.4098 3.5% 0.65 [-0.18, 1.47] \\ \text{Ruger at al. 2015 (2 h, RET, CD34+CD45+MCR+) } 2.238 0.4098 3.5\% 0.65 [-0.18, 1.47] \\ \text{Ruger at al. 2015 (2 h, RET, CD34+CD45+MCR+) } 2.238 0.4098 3.5\% 0.65 [-0.18, 1.48] \\ \text{Lee at al. 2015 (2 h, RET, CD34+CD45+MCR+) } 2.228 0.4098 3.5\% 0.65 [-0.18, 1.47] \\ Ruger at al. 2015 (2$	Study or Subgroup	Std. Mean Difference	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% CI	
$ \begin{aligned} & Fruger et al. 2015 (0 h, RET, CD34+CD45+OR+) \\ & Crear et al. 2015 (3 h, \mathsf{RET, CD34+CD45+) \\ & Crear et al. 2015 (3 h, \mathsf{RET, CD34+CD45+) \\ & Crear et al. 2015 (3 h, \mathsf{RET, CD34+CD45+OR+) \\ & L2766 \\ & L2772 \\ & L287 \\ & L287 \\ & L281 \\ & L281 \\ & L281 \\ & L2913 (0 h, \mathsf{LC7, CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2766 \\ & L2729 \\ & L287 \\ & L281 \\ & L281 \\ & L2913 (0 h, \mathsf{CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h) \\ & L2913 (0 h, \mathsf{CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h) \\ & L2913 (0 h, \mathsf{CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h, \mathsf{L234+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h, \mathsf{L234+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h, \mathsf{L234+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h, \mathsf{L234, L201 (2 h, \mathsf{CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h, \mathsf{L234, L201 (2 h, \mathsf{CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h, \mathsf{L234, L201 (2 h, \mathsf{CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h, \mathsf{L234, L201 (2 h, \mathsf{CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & L2915 (2 h, \mathsf{L234, L201 (2 h, \mathsf{CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+) \\ & \mathsf{L2915 (2 h, \mathsf{L234, L201 (2 h, \mathsf{D054, \mathsf{L204 (1 h, \mathsf{L235 (2 h, \mathsf{L235 (1 h, \mathsf{L235 (1 h, \mathsf{L235 (2 h, \mathsf{L235 (1 h, \mathsf{L235 (1 h, \mathsf{L235 (2 h, \mathsf{L235 (1 h, \mathsf{L235 (2 h, \mathsf{L235 (1 h, \mathsf{L235 (2 h, \mathsf{L235 (1 h$	≤ 6 h						
Kruger et al. 2015 (b h, RET, CD34+CD45+)       0.7703       0.426       3.5%       0.77 (b 0.6). fcl 1         Kruger et al. 2015 (a h, RET, CD34+CD45+WCR+)       1.266       0.4613       3.3%       1.28 [0.43, 2.17]         Lee et al. 2015 (b (h)       -0.334 (1.4765       3.2%       -0.33 [-1.27, 0.60]         Monigoremy et al. 2019 (b .5h, CD34+CD45-WCRF2+)       0.9157       0.502       3.1%       0.28 [-1.2, 0.73]         Monigoremy et al. 2019 (b .5h, CD34+CD45-WCRF2+)       0.9157       0.502       3.1%       0.20 [-1.12, 0.73]         Monigoremy et al. 2019 (0.5h, CD34+CD45-WCRF2+)       1.922       0.5519       2.8%       1.52 [0.44, 2.60]         Monigoremy et al. 2017 (b .60%+TRM)       0.4997       0.3994       3.7%       0.60 [-2.8, 1.28]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (b .60%+TRM)       2.445       0.5379       2.9%       2.44 [1.02, 2.26]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (b .60%+TRM)       2.287       2.28 [1.28, 3.00]	Kruger et al. 2015 (0 h,RET, CD34+CCD45-KDR+)	0.6647	0.4215	3.5%	0.66 [-0.16, 1.49]	+	
Kruger et al. 2015 (3 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)       1.3602       0.4613       3.3%       1.38 [0.36, 2.26]         Kruger et al. 2015 (3 h, RET, CD34+CD45-KDR+)       1.2766       0.4653       3.2%       -0.32 [1.12, 0.73]         Lae et al. 2015 (0 h)       0.3341       0.4756       3.2%       -0.32 [1.12, 0.73]         Monigoremy et al. 2019 (0.5h, CD34+CD45-VEGRF2+)       0.9167       0.502       3.1%       0.52 [1.07, 1.90]         Monigoremy et al. 2019 (0 min, CD34+VEGRF2+)       1.9868       0.50519       2.8%       1.95 [0.47, 3.07]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (0 h, 70%+IRM)       1.4354       0.4669       3.3%       1.44 [0.52, 2.35]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (0 h, 70%+IRM)       2.4454       0.3994       3.7%       0.50 [0.22, 1.28]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 70%+IRM)       2.2459       3.3%       1.44 [0.26, 2.01]	Kruger et al. 2015 (0 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)	0.7703	0.426	3.5%	0.77 [-0.06, 1.61]		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Kruger et al. 2015 (3 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)	1.3602	0.4613	3.3%	1.36 [0.46, 2.26]		
Lee et al. 2015 (b h)	Kruger et al. 2015 (3 h, RET, CD34+CD45-KDR+)	1.2766	0.4553	3.3%	1.28 [0.38, 2.17]		
Lee et al. 2015 (2 h)	Lee et al. 2015 (0 h)	-0.3341	0.4756	3.2%	-0.33 [-1.27, 0.60]		
Montgoremy et al. 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+CD45+VEGRF2+)       0.9157       0.502       3.1%       0.92 [-0.07, 1.90]         Montgoremy et al. 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+VEGRF2+)       1.522       0.5519       2.8%       1.52 [0.44, 2.60]         Montgoremy et al. 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+VEGRF2+)       1.592       0.5619       2.8%       1.52 [0.44, 2.60]         Montgoremy et al. 2017 (0. h, 70%-IRM)       0.4967       0.3994       3.7%       0.56 [-2.8, 1.28]         Riber et al. 2017 (0. h, 70%-IRM)       1.4354       0.4669       3.3%       1.44 [0.52, 2.35]         Riber et al. 2017 (6. h, 60%-IRM)       0.2451       0.289       0.2946       3.7%       0.26 [-0.48, 1.06]         Riber et al. 2017 (6. h, 60%-IRM)       0.2850       0.3946       3.7%       0.28 [-0.20]       0.31       0.346       3.7%       0.28 [-0.26, 1.06]         Ross et al. 2017 (6. h, 60%-IRM)       0.2791       0.521       2.28       1.26, 3.30]	Lee et al. 2015 (2 h)	-0.1962	0.4729	3.2%	-0.20 [-1.12, 0.73]		
Montgoremy et al. 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+VEGRF2+)       0.8968       0.5008       3.1%       0.90 (-0.08, 1.88)         Montgoremy et al. 2019 (0 min, CD34+VEGRF2+)       1.922       0.5519       2.6%       1.91 [0.75, 3.07]         Riberic et al. 2017 (0 h, 60%-IRM)       0.4997       0.3994       3.7%       0.50 [-0.28, 1.28]         Riberic et al. 2017 (0 h, 60%-IRM)       1.4354       0.4669       3.3%       1.44 (0.52, 2.55]         Riberic et al. 2017 (6 h, 60%-IRM)       0.2450       0.3946       3.7%       0.29 [-0.48, 1.08]         Riberic et al. 2017 (6 h, 70%-IRM)       1.137       0.446       3.4%       1.42 (0.26, 2.01]         Riberic et al. 2017 (6 h, 70%-IRM)       1.137       0.446       3.4%       0.33 [-0.44, 1.10]         Subtotal (85% CI)       0.33 (0.3954       3.7%       0.43 [-0.35, 1.21]	Montgoremy et al.2019(0.5h,CD34+CD45-VEGRF2+)	0.9157	0.502	3.1%	0.92 [-0.07, 1.90]		
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Montgoremy et al. 2019 (0.5 h, CD34+VEGRF2+)	0.8968	0.5008	3.1%	0.90 [-0.08, 1.88]		
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Montgoremy et al.2019(0min,CD34+CD45-VEGRF2+)	1.522	0.5519	2.8%	1.52 [0.44, 2.60]	· · · · ·	
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Montgoremy et al. 2019 (0 min, CD34+VEGRF2+)	1.9093	0.5932	2.6%	1.91 [0.75, 3.07]		
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Ribeiro et al. 2017 (0 h, 60%-1RM)	0.4997	0.3994	3.7%	0.50 [-0.28, 1.28]	+	
Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 60%-1RM)       2.445 0.5379 2.9%       2.44 [1.39, 3.50]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 60%-1RM)       0.2859 0.3946 3.7%       0.29 [-0.49, 1.06]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 60%-1RM)       2.2791 0.5211 2.9%       2.28 [1.26, 3.30]         Ross et al. 2013 (0 h)       0.4319 0.3976 3.7%       0.44 [-0.35, 1.21]         Ross et al. 2013 (2 h)       0.33 0.3954 3.7%       0.43 [-0.35, 1.21]         Subtotal (95% Cl)       0.33 0.3954 3.7%       0.33 [-0.44, 1.0]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.31; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 42.03, df = 17 (P = 0.0007); P = 60%       58.7%       0.33 [0.60, 1.27]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.31; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 42.03, df = 17 (P = 0.0007); P = 60%       58.7%       0.65 [-0.18, 1.47]         Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)       0.6463 0.4208 3.5%       0.66 [-0.29, 1.62]	Ribeiro et al. 2017 (0 h, 70%-1RM)	1.4354	0.4669	3.3%	1.44 [0.52, 2.35]		
Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 60%-1RM)       0.2859       0.3946       3.7%       0.29 [-0.49, 1.06]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 60%-1RM)       1.137       0.446       3.4%       1.14 [0.26, 2.01]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 60%-1RM)       2.2791       0.281 [2.63, 3.0]       0.3976       3.7%       0.43 [-0.35, 1.21]         Ross et al. 2013 (2 h)       0.33       0.3954       3.7%       0.33 [-0.44, 1.10]       0.33 [0.60, 1.27]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.31; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 42.03, df = 17 (P = 0.0007); P = 60%       Test for overall effect; Z = 5.45 (P < 0.00001)	Ribeiro et al. 2017 (0 h, 80%-1RM)	2.445	0.5379	2.9%	2.44 [1.39, 3.50]		
Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 70%-1RM)       1.137       0.446       3.4%       1.14 [0.26, 2.01]         Ribeiro et al. 2013 (0 h)       0.2791       0.5211       2.9%       2.28 [1.26, 3.30]         Ross et al. 2013 (0 h)       0.4319       0.3976       3.7%       0.33 [-0.44, 1.10]         Subtotal (95% Cl)       0.33       0.3976       3.7%       0.33 [-0.44, 1.10]         Subtotal (95% Cl)       0.33       0.3976       3.7%       0.33 [-0.44, 1.10]         Subtotal (95% Cl)       0.33       0.3976       3.7%       0.33 [-0.44, 1.10]         Yarger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)       0.6463       0.4208       3.5%       0.65 [-0.18, 1.47]         Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)       0.0904       0.4085       3.6%       -0.09 [-0.89, 0.71]         Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)       0.0904       0.4085       3.6%       -0.22 [-0.58, 1.03]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6826       0.4877       3.1%       0.69 [-0.28, 1.62]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6826       0.4877       3.1%       0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6826       0.4877       3.1%       0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6826       0.4877       3.1%	Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 60%-1RM)	0.2859	0.3946	3.7%	0.29 [-0.49, 1.06]		
Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 80%-1RM)       2.2791 0.5211 2.9%       2.28 [1.26, 3.30]         Ross et al. 2013 (2 h)       0.331 0.3954 3.7%       0.43 [-0.35, 1.21]         Score et al. 2013 (2 h)       0.33 0.3954 3.7%       0.93 [0.60, 1.27]         Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.31; Ch" = 42.03, df = 17 (P = 0.0007); I" = 60%       58.7%       0.93 [0.60, 1.27]         Test for overall effect: Z = 5.45 (P < 0.0001)	Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 70%-1RM)	1.137	0.446	3.4%	1.14 [0.26, 2.01]		
Ross et al. 2013 (0 h)       0.4319       0.3976       3.7%       0.43 [-0.35, 1.21]         Ross et al. 2013 (2 h)       0.33       0.3954       3.7%       0.33 [-0.44, 1.10]         Subtotal (95% CI)       58.7%       0.93 [0.60, 1.27]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.31; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 42.03, df = 17 (P = 0.0007); I <sup>2</sup> = 60%         Test for overall effect: Z = 5.45 (P < 0.00001)	Ribeiro et al. 2017 (6 h, 80%-1RM)	2.2791	0.5211	2.9%	2.28 [1.26, 3.30]		
Ross et al. 2013 (2 h)       0.33       0.3954       3.7%       0.33 [0.44, 1.10]         Subtotal (95% CI)       0.93 [0.60, 1.27]       58.7%       0.93 [0.60, 1.27]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.31; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 42.03, df = 17 (P = 0.0007); P = 60%       58.7%       0.65 [-0.18, 1.47]         Test for overall effect: Z = 5.45 (P < 0.00001)	Ross et al. 2013 (0 h)	0.4319	0.3976	3.7%	0.43 [-0.35, 1.21]	+	
Subtotal (95% Cl) 58.7% 0.93 [0.60, 1.27] Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.31; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 42.03, df = 17 (P = 0.0007); P = 60% Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.45 (P < 0.00001)$ > 6 h Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+) 0.6463 0.4208 3.5% 0.65 [-0.18, 1.47] Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+) 1.2198 0.4514 3.3% 1.22 [0.34, 2.10] Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+) 0.0904 0.4085 3.6% -0.09 [-0.89, 0.71] Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h) 0.0031 0.5011 3.1% 0.90 [-0.28, 1.62] Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) 0.0031 0.5011 3.1% 0.90 [-0.28, 1.62] Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) 0.0031 0.5011 3.1% 0.90 [-0.27, 1.65] Lee et al. 2015 (24 h, 6%-1RM) 0.1919 0.3933 3.7% 0.19 [-0.58, 0.96] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 6%-1RM) 0.1919 0.3923 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Ross et al. 2017 (24 h, 6%-1RM) 0.1919 0.3922 3.7% -0.01 [-0.78, 0.76] Subtotal (95% Cl) 41.3% 0.29 [-0.01, 0.59] Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); l <sup>2</sup> = 33% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60%	Ross et al. 2013 (2 h)	0.33	0.3954	3.7%	0.33 [-0.44, 1.10]		
$\begin{array}{c} Heterogeneity: Tau^2 = 0.31; Chi^2 = 42.03, df = 17 (P = 0.0007); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Test for overall effect: Z = 5.45 (P < 0.00001) \\ > 6 h \\ \mbox{Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+) & 0.6463 & 0.4208 & 3.5\% & 0.65 [-0.18, 1.47]\\ \mbox{Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+) & -0.0904 & 0.4085 & 3.6\% & -0.09 [-0.89, 0.71]\\ \mbox{Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+) & 0.2238 & 0.498 & 3.6\% & 0.02 [-0.58, 1.03]\\ \mbox{Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) & 0.6626 & 0.4877 & 3.1\% & 0.66 [-0.29, 1.62]\\ \mbox{Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) & 0.6898 & 0.489 & 3.1\% & 0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]\\ \mbox{Lee et al. 2015 (72 h) & 0.6898 & 0.489 & 3.1\% & 0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]\\ \mbox{Lee et al. 2015 (72 h) & 0.6898 & 0.489 & 3.1\% & 0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]\\ \mbox{Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60\%-1RM) & 0.1919 & 0.3933 & 3.7\% & 0.19 [-0.58, 0.66]\\ \mbox{Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60\%-1RM) & 0.3922 & 3.7\% & 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77]\\ \mbox{Rose et al. 2013 (24 h) & 0.005 & 0.3922 & 3.7\% & 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77]\\ \mbox{Rose et al. 2013 (24 h) & 0.09; Chi^2 = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); l^2 = 33\%\\ \mbox{Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Ribetror etal = 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all of 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all of 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all of 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all of 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are all 0.30; Chi^2 = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l^2 = 60\%\\ \mbox{Rise are al$	Subtotal (95% CI)			58.7%	0.93 [0.60, 1.27]	•	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.45$ (P < 0.00001) > 6 h Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+) 0.6463 0.4208 3.5% 0.65 [-0.18, 1.47] Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+) - 1.2198 0.4514 3.3% 1.22 [0.34, 2.10] Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+) 0.2238 0.4098 3.6% 0.22 [-0.58, 1.03] Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) 0.6626 0.4877 3.1% 0.66 [-0.29, 1.62] Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) 0.6626 0.4877 3.1% 0.66 [-0.27, 1.65] Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) 0.5011 3.1% 0.90 [-0.08, 1.62] Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) 0.5101 3.1% 0.90 [-0.08, 1.68] Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) 0.5101 3.1% 0.90 [-0.27, 1.65] Lee et al. 2015 (24 h, 0%-1RM) 0.1919 0.3933 3.7% 0.19 [-0.58, 0.96] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM) 0.1919 0.3932 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Ross et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM) 0.3922 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Ross et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM) 0.3922 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Ross et al. 2013 (24 h) 0.069 Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); I <sup>2</sup> = 33% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001); I <sup>2</sup> = 60% Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 0.67 [0.42, 0.92] Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); I <sup>2</sup> = 60% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001)	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.31; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 42.03, df = 17 (P = 0.0	1007); l² = 60%					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Test for overall effect: Z = 5.45 (P < 0.00001)						
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	> 6 h						
Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45-KDR+)       1.2198       0.4514       3.3%       1.22 [0.34, 2.10]         Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h), RET, CD34+CD45+)       -0.0904       0.4085       3.6%       -0.09 [-0.89, 0.71]         Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h), RET, CD34+CD45+)       0.0228       0.4098       3.6%       0.22 [-0.58, 1.03]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6626       0.4877       3.1%       0.66 [-0.29, 1.62]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6020       0.4732       3.2%       0.22 [-0.71, 1.15]         Lee et al. 2015 (72 h)       0.6898       0.489       3.1%       0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]         Lee et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM)       0.1919       0.3933       3.7%       0.19 [-0.58, 0.96]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 70%-1RM)       0.3922       3.7%       0.00 [-0.77, 0.77]         Ross et al. 2013 (24 h)       -0.0105       0.3922       3.7%       0.00 [-0.77, 0.77]         Subtotal (95% CI)       41.3%       0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]       41.3%       0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]         Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.30; Ch² = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); I² = 60%	Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)	0.6463	0.4208	3.5%	0.65 [-0.18, 1.47]	+	
Kruger et al. 2015 (48 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)       -0.0904       0.4098       3.6%       -0.09 [-0.89, 0.71]         Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.2238       0.4098       3.6%       -0.22 [-0.58, 1.03]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6626       0.4877       3.1%       0.66 [-0.29, 1.62]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.691       0.5011       3.1%       0.09 [-0.27, 1.62]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6988       0.489       3.1%       0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.4919       0.3933       3.7%       0.19 [-0.58, 0.96]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM)       0.1919       0.3923       3.7%       0.08 [-0.27, 1.65]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM)       -0.8155       0.4281       3.5%       -0.82 [-1.65, 0.02]         Ribeiro et al. 2013 (24 h)       0.03922       3.7%       -0.01 [-0.78, 0.76]       -0.0105         Subtotal (95% Cl)       41.3%       0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]       -0.413%       -0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); I <sup>2</sup> = 60%       -2       -1       0       1         -2       -1       0       1       2       -2       -1       0       1	Kruger et al. 2015 (24 h, RET,CD34+CD45-KDR+)	1.2198	0.4514	3.3%	1.22 [0.34, 2.10]		
Kruger et al. 2015 (48 h, RET, CD34+CD45-KDR+)       0.2238       0.4097       3.1%       0.22 [-0.58, 1.03]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6626       0.4877       3.1%       0.66 [-0.29, 1.62]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)       0.6808       0.4897       3.1%       0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]         Lee et al. 2015 (72 h)       0.6898       0.489       3.1%       0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]         Lee et al. 2015 (24 h, 60%-1RM)       0.2207       0.4732       3.2%       0.22 [-0.71, 1.15]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM)       0.1919       0.3933       3.7%       0.09 [-0.58, 0.56]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM)       0.03922       3.7%       -0.01 [-0.78, 0.76]         Subtotal (95% Cl)       41.3%       0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); I <sup>2</sup> = 33%       100.0%       0.67 [0.42, 0.92]         Total (95% Cl)       100.0%       0.67 [0.42, 0.92]       -2         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); I <sup>2</sup> = 60%       -2       -1       0         Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001)	Kruger et al. 2015 (48 h, RET, CD34+CD45+)	-0.0904	0.4085	3.6%	-0.09 [-0.89, 0.71]		
Lee et al. 2015 (24 h) 0.6626 0.487 3.1% 0.66 [-0.29, 1.62] Lee et al. 2015 (48 h) 0.901 0.5011 3.1% 0.90 [-0.08, 1.88] Lee et al. 2015 (72 h) 0.6898 0.489 3.1% 0.69 [-0.27, 1.65] Lee et al. 2015 (72 h) 0.2207 0.4732 3.2% 0.22 [-0.71, 1.15] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM) 0.1919 0.3933 3.7% 0.19 [-0.58, 0.96] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 70%-1RM) 0.03922 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Ross et al. 2013 (24 h, 70%-1RM) 0.03922 3.7% 0.00 [-0.78, 0.76] Subtotal (95% Cl) 41.3% 0.29 [-0.01); l <sup>2</sup> = 33% Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.19$ (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.19$ (P < 0.0001)	Kruger et al. 2015 (48 h,RET, CD34+CD45-KDR+)	0.2238	0.4098	3.6%	0.22 [-0.58, 1.03]		
Lee et al. 2015 (48 h) 0.901 0.5011 3.1% 0.90 [-0.08, 1.88] Lee et al. 2015 (72 h) 0.6898 0.489 3.1% 0.69 [-0.27, 1.65] Lee et al. 2015 (96 h) 0.2207 0.4732 3.2% 0.22 [-0.71, 1.15] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM) 0.1919 0.3933 3.7% 0.19 [-0.58, 0.96] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 70%-1RM) -0.8155 0.4281 3.5% -0.82 [-1.65, 0.02] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM) 0 0.3922 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Ross et al. 2013 (24 h) 0.0115 0.3922 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Subtotal (95% Cl) 41.3% 0.29 [-0.01, 0.59] Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); l <sup>2</sup> = 33% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001)	Lee et al. 2015 (24 h)	0.6626	0.4877	3.1%	0.66 [-0.29, 1.62]	+	
Lee et al. 2015 (72 h) 0.6898 0.489 3.1% 0.69 [-0.27, 1.65] Lee et al. 2015 (36 h) 0.2207 0.4732 3.2% 0.22 [-0.71, 1.15] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM) 0.1919 0.3933 3.7% 0.37% 0.01 [-0.58, 0.96] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM) 0.8155 0.4281 3.5% -0.82 [-1.65, 0.02] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM) 0.3922 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Ross et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM) 0.3922 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Subtotal (95% Cl) 41.3% 0.29 [-0.01, 0.59] Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); l <sup>2</sup> = 33% Tostal (95% Cl) 100.0% 0.67 [0.42, 0.92] Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001)	Lee et al. 2015 (48 h)	0.901	0.5011	3.1%	0.90 [-0.08, 1.88]		
Lee et al. 2015 (96 h) 0.2207 0.4732 3.2% 0.22 [-0.71, 1.15] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM) 0.1919 0.3933 3.7% 0.19 [-0.58, 0.96] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 70%-1RM) 0.3855 0.4281 3.5% 0.08 [-1.65, 0.02] Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM) 0.0.3922 3.7% 0.00 [-0.77, 0.77] Ross et al. 2013 (24 h) 0.005 0.3922 3.7% 0.001 [-0.78, 0.76] Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); l <sup>2</sup> = 33% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001)	Lee et al. 2015 (72 h)	0.6898	0.489	3.1%	0.69 [-0.27, 1.65]		
Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM)       0.1919       0.3933       3.7%       0.19 [-0.58, 0.96]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 70%-1RM)       -0.8155       0.4281       3.5%       -0.82 [-1.65, 0.02]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM)       0.03922       3.7%       0.00 [-0.77, 0.77]         Ross et al. 2013 (24 h)       -0.0105       0.3922       3.7%       -0.00 [-0.78, 0.76]         Subtotal (95% CI)       41.3%       0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]       +         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); i <sup>2</sup> = 33%       100.0%       0.67 [0.42, 0.92]         Total (95% CI)       100.0%       0.67 [0.42, 0.92]       +         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); i <sup>2</sup> = 60%       -2       -1       0       1	Lee et al. 2015 (96 h)	0.2207	0.4732	3.2%	0.22 [-0.71, 1.15]		
Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 70%-1RM)       -0.8155       0.4281       3.5%       -0.82 [-1.65, 0.02]         Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM)       0       0.3922       3.7%       0.00 [-0.77, 0.77]         Ross et al. 2013 (24 h)       -0.0105       0.3922       3.7%       -0.01 [-0.78, 0.76]         Subtotal (95% Cl)       41.3%       0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); i <sup>2</sup> = 33%         Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60%         Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.00001)	Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 60%-1RM)	0.1919	0.3933	3.7%	0.19 [-0.58, 0.96]	<del></del>	
Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM)       0       0.3922       3.7%       0.00 [-0.77, 0.77]         Ross et al. 2013 (24 h)       -0.0105       0.3922       3.7%       -0.01 [-0.78, 0.76]         Subtotal (95% Cl)       41.3%       0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]       •       •       •         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); l <sup>2</sup> = 33%       Test for overall effect: Z = 1.87 (P = 0.06)       •       •       •         Total (95% Cl)       100.0%       0.67 [0.42, 0.92]       •       •       •         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60%       100.0%       0.67 [0.42, 0.92]       •       •         Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.00001)	Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 70%-1RM)	-0.8155	0.4281	3.5%	-0.82 [-1.65, 0.02]		
Ross et al. 2013 (24 h)       -0.0105       0.3922       3.7%       -0.01 [-0.78, 0.76]         Subtotal (95% CI)       41.3%       0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); i <sup>2</sup> = 33%         Test for overall effect: Z = 1.87 (P = 0.06)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); i <sup>2</sup> = 60%         Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.00001)	Ribeiro et al. 2017 (24 h, 80%-1RM)	0	0.3922	3.7%	0.00 [-0.77, 0.77]		
Subtotal (95% CI)       41.3%       0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); l <sup>2</sup> = 33%         Test for overall effect: Z = 1.87 (P = 0.06)         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60%         Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.00001)	Ross et al. 2013 (24 h)	-0.0105	0.3922	3.7%	-0.01 [-0.78, 0.76]		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.13); l <sup>2</sup> = 33% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.87 (P = 0.06) Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.00001) -2 -1 0 1 2	Subtotal (95% CI)			41.3%	0.29 [-0.01, 0.59]	◆	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.87$ (P = 0.06)         Total (95% Cl)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60%         Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.19$ (P < 0.00001)	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.45, df = 11 (P = 0.1	3); I <sup>2</sup> = 33%					
Total (95% Cl)       100.0%       0.67 [0.42, 0.92]         Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.30; Chi² = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l² = 60%	Test for overall effect: Z = 1.87 (P = 0.06)						
Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 0.67 [0.42, 0.92] Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Test for overall effect; Z = 5.19 (P < 0.00001)							
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.30; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 71.74, df = 29 (P < 0.0001); l <sup>2</sup> = 60% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.00001) -2 -1 0 1 2	Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.67 [0.42, 0.92]		
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.19 (P < 0.00001)	Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.30$ ; $Chi^2 = 71.74$ , $df = 29$ (P < 0.0001); $l^2 = 60\%$ -2 - 1 0 1 2						
Test for subgroup differences: Chi2 = $7.02$ , df = 1 (P = 0.005), $12 = 97.4\%$							

**Fig. 5** Time course analysis on circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells following resistance exercise (**a**), forest plot of standardized mean difference for CD34<sup>+</sup> cells in circulation at follow-up measurement  $\leq 6$  h and > 6 h

The effect size of exercise on  $Pax7^+$  cell expansion of human skeletal muscle is more pronounced in untrained than trained individuals (untrained: SMD=0.81; p < 0.001vs trained: SMD=0.32; p < 0.05) (Fig. S2). This result

after resistance exercise (**b**). *CI* confidence interval, *df* degree of freedom,  $I^2$  inconsistency between studies, *SE* standard error

suggests a greater level of inflammation occurs in untrained skeletal muscle during challenge. The causal relationship between  $Pax7^+$  cell expansion and inflammation is supported by an increase in  $Pax7^+$  cells after treatments of a mixture of

inflammatory mediators in an in vitro study [110]. The range of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells of trained individuals was 3–33 cells per 100 myofibers [15, 19, 57, 63, 77] compared with 4–13 cells per 100 myofibers of the untrained individuals [4, 7, 8, 14, 38, 66, 67, 73, 76, 90, 92, 100]. There was only one exception that showed minimal changes (<10%) in Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell increases 24 h following exercise with the low baseline value (11.5 cells per 100 myofibers) in active participants [57].

# 4.2 Aerobic Exercise-Induced Stem Cell Expansion in Human Muscle Remains Uncertain

The literature assessing the effect of aerobic exercise on Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell content is limited [4, 38, 63]. An acute bout of aerobic exercise was observed to transiently deplete Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells (-32%) in human skeletal muscle followed by a rapid repletion in 3 h after a 60-min aerobic exercise at 70%  $VO_{2max}$  [63]. This brief reduction led to no overall effect in the current meta-analysis when the time of post-exercise recovery was not considered. One study showed an elevated Pax7<sup>+</sup>/MyoD<sup>+</sup> fraction 24 h following high-intensity aerobic exercise at 90–95%  $VO_{2max}$  (+343%) and resistance exercise (+265%) concurrent with declines of Pax7<sup>+</sup>/MyoD<sup>-</sup> fraction [4]. Moderate exercise at 55–60%  $VO_{2max}$  has no apparent effect on such changes. This study was excluded for the meta-analysis because the total Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell content was not provided.

Both aerobic and resistance exercises cause cell death [111, 112] and senescent cell clearance [34, 113] in muscle tissues, particularly at high intensity. Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells residing in surrounding myofibers are required for instantaneous donation of nuclei to maintain the size and youth of the muscle tissues [114, 115]. In this meta-analysis, resistance exercise shows more prominent response in post-exercise Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell increases compared with aerobic exercise. Despite no overall increases in muscle Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells after aerobic exercise, a significant increase in Pax $7^+$  cells (+41%) occurs when an aerobic exercise was conducted using eccentric muscle contraction [38]. Eccentric-based resistance exercise produces more muscle damage than concentric-based aerobic exercise [116]. In addition, aerobic exercise imposes a much greater challenge to pulmonary ventilation than resistance exercise, which inevitably causes lung damage and airway inflammation [117–119]. At rest, lungs are the main consumers of bone marrow-derived stem cells [120] for regenerating the short-lived airway epithelial cells [121]. Pulmonary illness is known to cause muscle loss [122, 123]. These findings point to a possibility that a competition for bone marrow-derived stem cells between lungs and muscles may explain the lower replenishment of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in muscle after aerobic exercise compared with resistance exercise.

# 4.3 Pax7<sup>+</sup> Cell Expansion in Human Muscle Peaks at 24 Hours and Vanishes by 96 Hours After Resistance Exercise

The present meta-analysis shows a large effect (SMD=0.89, p < 0.001) of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion in response to resistance exercise, assessed 24 h after the workout. This significant effect can last for 72 h (SMD = 1.03, p < 0.001), which is consistent with a recent systematic review summarized from four original studies [16]. In this meta-analysis, we included 18 original resistance exercise studies that provided quantitative perspective of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion in human skeletal muscle, further suggesting that this response peaks at 24 h post-exercise. Resistance exercise induces a protracted Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion in human skeletal muscle up to 157% in 24 h (SMD = 0.89, *p* < 0.001), 45% in 48 h (SMD = 0.99, p < 0.001), and 57% in 72 h (SMD = 1.03, p < 0.001) postexercise. This effect vanished by day 4 (SMD = -0.14, p = 0.53). Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells are essential for myogenesis [8, 12, 15, 57, 67, 92] following senescent cell clearance [34, 113], resulting in exercise-induced muscle rejuvenation [4, 124, 125]. However, a sustained Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion also implies a longer period of inflammation. Inflammation is featured by pain, heat, redness, swelling, and loss of function which provide an explanation of delayed-onset muscle soreness after resistance exercise.

# 4.4 Exercise Induces a Transient Increase in Circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> Cells

CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow-derived stem cells are multipotent and can further differentiate into both endothelial progenitor cells and satellite cells in muscle tissues [32, 94, 95, 126]. The results of this study reveal a transient release of CD34<sup>+</sup> cells into circulation occurs prior to Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion in human skeletal muscle. The response of increasing CD34<sup>+</sup> cells lasts no more than 2 h [55]. The temporal relationship of immediate increases of circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells followed by a delayed Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion in muscle tissues suggests a replenishment of stem cell reserves in challenged muscle tissues from bone marrow. This result matches well to the observation of a transient depletion of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in skeletal muscle followed by a quick return to the pre-exercise level in 3 h [63], reflecting a quick migration of circulating bone marrow-derived hematopoietic stem cells into the challenged muscle tissues [55]. Both aerobic exercise [58, 68, 78, 79, 81, 88] and resistance exercise [82, 84] increase circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells to a similar extent. However, the rise-and-fall pattern of circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells appear to be delayed in an intensity-dependent manner during resistance exercise [60]. Taken together, a crosstalk between muscle and bone according to the magnitude of tissue inflammation might determine the duration of post-exercise release of circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells and muscle Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion. Circulating levels of CD34<sup>+</sup> cells is also influenced by the rate of bone marrow output and the rate of peripheral tissue consumption. As aforementioned, lungs are the major consumer of bone marrow stem cells [120, 127]. We cannot preclude the possibility that the quicker return to baseline of circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells after aerobic exercise is associated with greater stem cell demands from the challenged lungs compared with resistance exercise. In this meta-analysis, the insignificant result of exercise-induced circulating level of CD34<sup>+</sup> cells at higher age remains unclear [62, 69, 79]. It may be associated with greater inflammation and stem cell demand of lungs after exercise. Further analysis could include the CC16/SP-D ratio, a valid and sensitive marker for lung epithelium damage, assessed together with circulating levels of CD34<sup>+</sup> cells after exercise.

# 4.5 DNA Editing

The accumulated findings to date may be instrumental to indicate a new direction for improving muscle performance associated with genetic variation and aging. Techniques for enrichment and engraftment of autologous CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow stem cells following CRISPR-Cas9 DNA editing are currently available for humans [128, 129]. Recruitment of CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow stem cells to replenish peripheral stem cells in skeletal muscle requires tissue inflammation induced by exercise [130]. For those patients who have lose their capacity to exercise, contracting skeletal muscle via electrical stimulation can be an alternative way to induce adequate inflammatory response for homing and proliferating DNA-edited bone marrow stem cells. Exercise training combined with transplantation of DNA-edited CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow stem cells opens a vast range of future possibilities to engineer muscle phenotypes for both medical and nonmedical purposes. This approach gives us a hope to accelerate evolution of humans into a species with better fitness.

# 5 Conclusions

Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells are myogenic stem cells contributing to muscle repair by a quick fusion of nuclei into the cytoplasm of myofibers and plays a key role in muscle plasticity against acute exercise challenges. Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in muscle tissue are transiently depleted during exercise followed by a quick replenishment within 3 h, and further elevated (~50%) during 24–72 h after exercise. Exercise-induced Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell expansion in human skeletal muscle remains normal at higher age, despite lower reserves after age 50 years. Transient increases in circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> bone marrow stem cells during exercise are associated with post-exercise proliferation of Pax7<sup>+</sup> cells in exercised muscle. The immediate increases in circulating CD34<sup>+</sup> cells after both aerobic and resistance exercise suggest that inflammatory mediators originating from inflammation of damaged muscle may be responsible for triggering the release of bone marrow-derived stem cells and seeding to damaged muscle for repopulating muscle stem cells. More studies are required to conclude the effect of acute aerobic exercise on Pax7<sup>+</sup> cell content in human skeletal muscle.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-022-01767-z.

# Declarations

**Funding** No source of funding was used to assist in the preparation of this work.

**Conflicts of interest/competing interests** Luthfia Dewi, Yin-Chou Lin, Andrew Nicholls, Giancarlo Condello, Chih-Yang Huang, and Chia-Hua Kuo have no conflicts of interest that are directly relevant to the content of this article.

Ethics approval Not applicable.

Consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication Not applicable.

Availability of data and material The datasets created and analyzed in this study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Code availability Not applicable.

Author contributions LD and CHK formulated the review. LD and CYH conducted database searches independently. LYC checked the references. LD, CYH, and CHK took part in the screening process and data extraction. LD performed the meta-analyses. LD, LYC, and CHK wrote the first draft on the manuscript. All authors critically revised the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript.

# References

- Moss FP, Leblond CP. Satellite cells as the source of nuclei in muscles of growing rats. Anat Rec. 1971;170(4):421–35. https:// doi.org/10.1002/ar.1091700405.
- Schmalbruch H. The morphology of regeneration of skeletal muscles in the rat. Tissue Cell. 1976;8(4):673–92. https://doi. org/10.1016/0040-8166(76)90039-2.
- 3. Bischoff R. Proliferation of muscle satellite cells on intact myofibers in culture. Dev Biol. 1986;115(1):129–39. https://doi. org/10.1016/0012-1606(86)90234-4.
- Nederveen JP, Joanisse S, Séguin CM, Bell KE, Baker SK, Phillips SM, et al. The effect of exercise mode on the acute response of satellite cells in old men. Acta Physiol (Oxf). 2015;215(4):177–90. https://doi.org/10.1111/apha.12601.
- Cadot B, Gache V, Gomes ER. Moving and positioning the nucleus in skeletal muscle: one step at a time. Nucleus. 2015;6(5):373-81. https://doi.org/10.1080/19491034.2015. 1090073.

- Egner IM, Bruusgaard JC, Gundersen K. Satellite cell depletion prevents fiber hypertrophy in skeletal muscle. Development. 2016;143(16):2898–906. https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.134411.
- Dreyer HC, Blanco CE, Sattler FR, Schroeder ET, Wiswell RA. Satellite cell numbers in young and older men 24 hours after eccentric exercise. Muscle Nerve. 2006;33(2):242–53. https:// doi.org/10.1002/mus.20461.
- Snijders T, Verdijk LB, Smeets JS, McKay BR, Senden JM, Hartgens F, et al. The skeletal muscle satellite cell response to a single bout of resistance-type exercise is delayed with aging in men. Age (Dordr). 2014;36(4):9699. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11357-014-9699-z.
- Seale P, Sabourin LA, Girgis-Gabardo A, Mansouri A, Gruss P, Rudnicki MA. Pax7 is required for the specification of myogenic satellite cells. Cell. 2000;102(6):777–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/ s0092-8674(00)00066-0.
- Chargé SB, Rudnicki MA. Cellular and molecular regulation of muscle regeneration. Physiol Rev. 2004;84(1):209–38. https:// doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00019.2003.
- Relaix F, Montarras D, Zaffran S, Gayraud-Morel B, Rocancourt D, Tajbakhsh S, et al. Pax3 and Pax7 have distinct and overlapping functions in adult muscle progenitor cells. J Cell Biol. 2006;172(1):91–102. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.200508044.
- Bellamy LM, Joanisse S, Grubb A, Mitchell CJ, McKay BR, Phillips SM, et al. The acute satellite cell response and skeletal muscle hypertrophy following resistance training. PLoS ONE. 2014;9(10): e109739. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone. 0109739.
- Farup J, Rahbek SK, Knudsen IS, de Paoli F, Mackey AL, Vissing K. Whey protein supplementation accelerates satellite cell proliferation during recovery from eccentric exercise. Amino Acids. 2014;46(11):2503–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00726-014-1810-3.
- Hyldahl RD, Olson T, Welling T, Groscost L, Parcell AC. Satellite cell activity is differentially affected by contraction mode in human muscle following a work-matched bout of exercise. Front Physiol. 2014;5:485. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2014.00485.
- Nederveen JP, Joanisse S, Snijders T, Ivankovic V, Baker SK, Phillips SM, et al. Skeletal muscle satellite cells are located at a closer proximity to capillaries in healthy young compared with older men. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2016;7(5):547–54. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcsm.12105.
- Snijders T, Nederveen JP, McKay BR, Joanisse S, Verdijk LB, van Loon LJ, et al. Satellite cells in human skeletal muscle plasticity. Front Physiol. 2015;6:283. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys. 2015.00283.
- Welle S, Totterman S, Thornton C. Effect of age on muscle hypertrophy induced by resistance training. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 1996;51(6):M270–5. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/ 51a.6.m270.
- Verdijk LB, Snijders T, Drost M, Delhaas T, Kadi F, Van Loon LJC. Satellite cells in human skeletal muscle; from birth to old age. Age. 2014;36(2):545–57. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11357-013-9583-2.
- Walker DK, Fry CS, Drummond MJ, Dickinson JM, Timmerman KL, Gundermann DM, et al. Pax7+ satellite cells in young and older adults following resistance exercise. Muscle Nerve. 2012;46(1):51–9. https://doi.org/10.1002/mus.23266.
- Joanisse S, McKay BR, Nederveen JP, Scribbans TD, Gurd BJ, Gillen JB, et al. Satellite cell activity, without expansion, after nonhypertrophic stimuli. Am J Physiol Regul Integr and Comp Physiol. 2015;309(9):R1101–11. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpregu. 00249.2015.
- Corbel SY, Lee A, Yi L, Duenas J, Brazelton TR, Blau HM, et al. Contribution of hematopoietic stem cells to skeletal muscle. Nat Med. 2003;9(12):1528–32. https://doi.org/10.1038/nm959.

- Ferrari G, Cusella-De Angelis G, Coletta M, Paolucci E, Stornaiuolo A, Cossu G, et al. Muscle regeneration by bone marrowderived myogenic progenitors. Science. 1998;279(5356):1528– 30. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.279.5356.1528.
- Bittner RE, Schöfer C, Weipoltshammer K, Ivanova S, Streubel B, Hauser E, et al. Recruitment of bone-marrow-derived cells by skeletal and cardiac muscle in adult dystrophic mdx mice. Anat Embryol (Berl). 1999;199(5):391–6. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s004290050237.
- Tamaki T, Okada Y, Uchiyama Y, Tono K, Masuda M, Nitta M, et al. Skeletal muscle-derived CD34+/45- and CD34-/45- stem cells are situated hierarchically upstream of Pax7+ cells. Stem Cells Dev. 2008;17(4):653–67. https://doi.org/10.1089/scd.2008. 0070.
- Camargo FD, Green R, Capetenaki Y, Jackson KA, Goodell MA. Single hematopoietic stem cells generate skeletal muscle through myeloid intermediates. Nat Med. 2003;9(12):1520–7. https://doi. org/10.1038/nm963.
- Krause DS, Ito T, Fackler MJ, Smith OM, Collector MI, Sharkis SJ, et al. Characterization of murine CD34, a marker for hematopoietic progenitor and stem cells. Blood. 1994;84(3):691–701.
- Montarras D, Morgan J, Collins C, Relaix F, Zaffran S, Cumano A, et al. Direct isolation of satellite cells for skeletal muscle regeneration. Science. 2005;309(5743):2064–7. https://doi.org/ 10.1126/science.1114758.
- Ieronimakis N, Balasundaram G, Rainey S, Srirangam K, Yablonka-Reuveni Z, Reyes M. Absence of CD34 on murine skeletal muscle satellite cells marks a reversible state of activation during acute injury. PLoS ONE. 2010;5(6): e10920. https:// doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0010920.
- Fina L, Molgaard HV, Robertson D, Bradley NJ, Monaghan P, Delia D, et al. Expression of the CD34 gene in vascular endothelial cells. Blood. 1990;75(12):2417–26. https://doi.org/10.1002/ eji.1830250606.
- Lee JY, Qu-Petersen Z, Cao B, Kimura S, Jankowski R, Cummins J, et al. Clonal isolation of muscle-derived cells capable of enhancing muscle regeneration and bone healing. J Cell Biol. 2000;150(5):1085–100. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.150.5.1085.
- Beauchamp JR, Heslop L, Yu DS, Tajbakhsh S, Kelly RG, Wernig A, et al. Expression of CD34 and Myf5 defines the majority of quiescent adult skeletal muscle satellite cells. J Cell Biol. 2000;151(6):1221–34. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.151.6.1221.
- Tamaki T, Akatsuka A, Ando K, Nakamura Y, Matsuzawa H, Hotta T, et al. Identification of myogenic-endothelial progenitor cells in the interstitial spaces of skeletal muscle. J Cell Biol. 2002;157(4):571–7. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.200112106.
- Lee TXY, Wu J, Jean WH, Condello G, Alkhatib A, Hsieh CC, et al. Reduced stem cell aging in exercised human skeletal muscle is enhanced by ginsenoside Rg1. Aging (Albany NY). 2021;13(12):16567–76. https://doi.org/10.18632/aging.203176.
- Yang C, Jiao Y, Wei B, Yang Z, Wu JF, Jensen J, et al. Aged cells in human skeletal muscle after resistance exercise. Aging (Albany NY). 2018;10(6):1356–65. https://doi.org/10.18632/ aging.101472.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372: n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71.
- Brown P, Brunnhuber K, Chalkidou K, Chalmers I, Clarke M, Fenton M, et al. How to formulate research recommendations. BMJ. 2006;333(7572):804–6. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj. 38987.492014.94.
- PeÑAilillo L, Blazevich A, Numazawa H, Nosaka K. Metabolic and muscle damage profiles of concentric versus repeated eccentric cycling. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2013;45(9):1173–81. https:// doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e31828f8a73.

- van de Vyver M, Myburgh KH. Cytokine and satellite cell responses to muscle damage: interpretation and possible confounding factors in human studies. J Muscle Res Cell Motil. 2012;33(3–4):177–85. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10974-012-9303-z.
- Moreau D, Chou E. The acute effect of high-intensity exercise on executive function: a meta-analysis. Perspect Psychol Sci. 2019;14(5):734–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619850568.
- 40. Garber CE, Blissmer B, Deschenes MR, Franklin BA, Lamonte MJ, Lee IM, et al. Quantity and quality of exercise for developing and maintaining cardiorespiratory, musculoskeletal, and neuromotor fitness in apparently healthy adults: guidance for prescribing exercise. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2011;43(7):1334–59. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e318213fefb.
- Scribbans TD, Vecsey S, Hankinson PB, Foster WS, Gurd BJ. The effect of training intensity on VO2max in young healthy adults: a meta-regression and meta-analysis. Int J Exerc Sci. 2016;9(2):230–47.
- 42. De Pauw K, Roelands B, Cheung SS, de Geus B, Rietjens G, Meeusen R. Guidelines to classify subject groups in sport-science research. Int J Sports Physiol Perform. 2013;8(2):111–22. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.8.2.111.
- Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2019;366: 14898. https://doi.org/10. 1136/bmj.14898.
- JPT H, Jagoe T, J C, M C, T L, MJ P, et al. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.3 (updated February 2022); 2022.
- Fritz CO, Morris PE, Richler JJ. Effect size estimates: current use, calculations, and interpretation. J Exp Psychol Gen. 2012;141(1):2–18. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024338.
- 46. Lamberink HJ, Otte WM, Sinke MRT, Lakens D, Glasziou PP, Tijdink JK, et al. Statistical power of clinical trials increased while effect size remained stable: an empirical analysis of 136,212 clinical trials between 1975 and 2014. J Clin Epidemiol. 2018;102:123–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.06.014.
- 47. Faraone SV. Interpreting estimates of treatment effects: implications for managed care. P T. 2008;33(12):700–11.
- Lee DK. Alternatives to P value: confidence interval and effect size. Korean J Anesthesiol. 2016;69(6):555–62. https://doi.org/ 10.4097/kjae.2016.69.6.555.
- Hoaglin DC. Misunderstandings about Q and "Cochran's Q test" in meta-analysis. Stat Med. 2016;35(4):485–95. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/sim.6632.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ. 2003;327(7414):557–60. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557.
- Aguayo D, Mueller SM, Boutellier U, Auer M, Jung HH, Flück M, et al. One bout of vibration exercise with vascular occlusion activates satellite cells. Exp Physiol. 2016;101(2):295–307. https://doi.org/10.1113/EP085330.
- 52. Abou Sawan S, Hodson N, Babits P, Malowany JM, Kumbhare D, Moore DR. Satellite cell and myonuclear accretion is related to training-induced skeletal muscle fiber hypertrophy in young males and females. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2021;131(3):871–80. https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00424.2021.
- Roberts LA, Raastad T, Markworth JF, Figueiredo VC, Egner IM, Shield A, et al. Post-exercise cold water immersion attenuates acute anabolic signalling and long-term adaptations in muscle to strength training. J Physiol. 2015;593(18):4285–301. https:// doi.org/10.1113/jp270570.
- Baker JM, Nederveen JP, Parise G. Aerobic exercise in humans mobilizes HSCs in an intensity-dependent manner. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2017;122(1):182–90. https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl physiol.00696.2016.

- 55. Bonsignore MR, Morici G, Riccioni R, Huertas A, Petrucci E, Veca M, et al. Hemopoietic and angiogenetic progenitors in healthy athletes: different responses to endurance and maximal exercise. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2010;109(1):60–7. https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.01344.2009.
- Bonsignore MR, Morici G, Santoro A, Pagano M, Cascio L, Bonanno A, et al. Circulating hematopoietic progenitor cells in runners. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2002;93(5):1691–7. https://doi. org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00376.2002.
- Nederveen JP, Snijders T, Joanisse S, Wavell CG, Mitchell CJ, Johnston LM, et al. Altered muscle satellite cell activation following 16 wk of resistance training in young men. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2017;312(1):R85-92. https://doi.org/ 10.1152/ajpregu.00221.2016.
- O'Carroll L, Wardrop B, Murphy RP, Ross MD, Harrison M. Circulating angiogenic cell response to sprint interval and continuous exercise. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2019;119(3):743–52. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s00421-018-04065-7.
- Niemiro GM, Parel J, Beals J, van Vliet S, Paluska SA, Moore DR, et al. Kinetics of circulating progenitor cell mobilization during submaximal exercise. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2017;122(3):675–82. https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00936. 2016.
- Ribeiro F, Ribeiro IP, Gonçalves AC, Alves AJ, Melo E, Fernandes R, et al. Effects of resistance exercise on endothelial progenitor cell mobilization in women. Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):17880. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-18156-6.
- 61. Chang E, Paterno J, Duscher D, Maan ZN, Chen JS, Januszyk M, et al. Exercise induces stromal cell-derived factor-1α-mediated release of endothelial progenitor cells with increased vasculogenic function. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2015;135(2):340e-e350. https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.000000000000917.
- Thijssen DHJ, Vos JB, Verseyden C, Van Zonneveld AJ, Smits P, Sweep FCGJ, et al. Haematopoietic stem cells and endothelial progenitor cells in healthy men: effect of aging and training. Aging Cell. 2006;5(6):495–503. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-9726.2006.00242.x.
- Wu J, Saovieng S, Cheng IS, Jensen J, Jean W-H, Alkhatib A, et al. Satellite cells depletion in exercising human skeletal muscle is restored by ginseng component Rg1 supplementation. J Funct Foods. 2019;58:27–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jff.2019.04.032.
- Nederveen JP, Joanisse S, Thomas AC, Snijders T, Manta K, Bell KE, et al. Age-related changes to the satellite cell niche are associated with reduced activation following exercise. FASEB J. 2020;34(7):8975–89. https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.201900787R.
- 65. Toth KG, McKay BR, De Lisio M, Little JP, Tarnopolsky MA, Parise G. IL-6 induced STAT3 signalling is associated with the proliferation of human muscle satellite cells following acute muscle damage. PLoS ONE. 2011;6(3): e17392. https://doi.org/10. 1371/journal.pone.0017392.
- 66. Mackey AL, Rasmussen LK, Kadi F, Schjerling P, Helmark IC, Ponsot E, et al. Activation of satellite cells and the regeneration of human skeletal muscle are expedited by ingestion of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory medication. FASEB J. 2016;30(6):2266– 81. https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.201500198R.
- Nederveen JP, Joanisse S, Snijders T, Thomas ACQ, Kumbhare D, Parise G. The influence of capillarization on satellite cell pool expansion and activation following exercise-induced muscle damage in healthy young men. J Physiol. 2018;596(6):1063–78. https://doi.org/10.1113/JP275155.
- Shill DD, Lansford KA, Hempel HK, Call JA, Murrow JR, Jenkins NT. Effect of exercise intensity on circulating microparticles in men and women. Exp Physiol. 2018;103(5):693–700. https:// doi.org/10.1113/EP086644.
- 69. Ross M, Ingram L, Taylor G, Malone E, Simpson RJ, West D, et al. Older men display elevated levels of senescence-associated

exercise-responsive CD28null angiogenic T cells compared with younger men. Physiol Rep. 2018;6(12): e13697. https://doi.org/10.14814/phy2.13697.

- Lee HS, Muthalib M, Akimoto T, Nosaka K. Changes in the number of circulating CD34+ cells after eccentric exercise of the elbow flexors in relation to muscle damage. J Sport Health Sci. 2015;4(3):275–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2013.12.005.
- Craenenbroeck EMFV, Vrints CJ, Haine SE, Vermeulen K, Goovaerts I, Van Tendeloo VFI, et al. A maximal exercise bout increases the number of circulating CD34+/KDR+ endothelial progenitor cells in healthy subjects: relation with lipid profile. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2008;104(4):1006–13. https://doi.org/10. 1152/japplphysiol.01210.2007.
- Zaldivar F, Eliakim A, Radom-Aizik S, Leu S-Y, Cooper DM. The effect of brief exercise on circulating CD34+ stem cells in early and late pubertal boys. Pediatr Res. 2007;61(4):491–5. https://doi.org/10.1203/pdr.0b013e3180332d36.
- McKay BR, Ogborn DI, Baker JM, Toth KG, Tarnopolsky MA, Parise G. Elevated SOCS3 and altered IL-6 signaling is associated with age-related human muscle stem cell dysfunction. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 2013;304(8):C717–28. https://doi.org/10. 1152/ajpcell.00305.2012.
- Snijders T, Bell KE, Nederveen JP, Saddler NI, Mazara N, Kumbhare DA, et al. Ingestion of a multi-ingredient supplement does not alter exercise-induced satellite cell responses in older men. J Nutr. 2018;148(6):891–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxy063.
- Möbius-Winkler S, Hilberg T, Menzel K, Golla E, Burman A, Schuler G, et al. Time-dependent mobilization of circulating progenitor cells during strenuous exercise in healthy individuals. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2009;107(6):1943–50. https://doi.org/10. 1152/japplphysiol.00532.2009.
- McKay BR, Ogborn DI, Bellamy LM, Tarnopolsky MA, Parise G. Myostatin is associated with age-related human muscle stem cell dysfunction. FASEB J. 2012;26(6):2509–21. https://doi.org/ 10.1096/fj.11-198663.
- Cermak NM, Snijders T, McKay BR, Parise G, Verdijk LB, Tarnopolsky MA, et al. Eccentric exercise increases satellite cell content in type II muscle fibers. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2013;45(2):230–7. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3182 72cf47.
- Agha NH, Baker FL, Kunz HE, Graff R, Azadan R, Dolan C, et al. Vigorous exercise mobilizes CD34+ hematopoietic stem cells to peripheral blood via the β(2)-adrenergic receptor. Brain Behav Immun. 2018;68:66–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi. 2017.10.001.
- Harris E, Rakobowchuk M, Birch KM. Interval exercise increases angiogenic cell function in postmenopausal women. BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med. 2017;3(1): e000248. https://doi.org/10.1136/ bmjsem-2017-000248.
- Morici G, Zangla D, Santoro A, Pelosi E, Petrucci E, Gioia M, et al. Supramaximal exercise mobilizes hematopoietic progenitors and reticulocytes in athletes. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2005;289(5):R1496–503. https://doi.org/10.1152/ ajpregu.00338.2005.
- Kroepfl JM, Pekovits K, Stelzer I, Fuchs R, Zelzer S, Hofmann P, et al. Exercise increases the frequency of circulating hematopoietic progenitor cells, but reduces hematopoietic colony-forming capacity. Stem Cells Dev. 2012;21(16):2915–25. https://doi.org/ 10.1089/scd.2012.0017.
- Krüger K, Pilat C, Schild M, Lindner N, Frech T, Muders K, et al. Progenitor cell mobilization after exercise is related to systemic levels of G-CSF and muscle damage. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2015;25(3):e283–91. https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12320.
- Laufs U, Urhausen A, Werner N, Scharhag J, Heitz A, Kissner G, et al. Running exercise of different duration and intensity: effect on endothelial progenitor cells in healthy subjects. Eur J

Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil. 2005;12(4):407–14. https://doi.org/10. 1097/01.hjr.0000174823.87269.2e.

- Ross MD, Wekesa AL, Phelan JP, Harrison M. Resistance exercise increases endothelial progenitor cells and angiogenic factors. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2013;46(1):16–23. https://doi.org/ 10.1249/MSS.0b013e3182a142da.
- Yang Z, Wang JM, Chen L, Luo CF, Tang AL, Tao J. Acute exercise-induced nitric oxide production contributes to upregulation of circulating endothelial progenitor cells in healthy subjects. J Hum Hypertens. 2007;21(6):452–60. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj. jhh.1002171.
- Montgomery R, Paterson A, Williamson C, Florida-James G, Ross MD. Blood flow restriction exercise attenuates the exerciseinduced endothelial progenitor cell response in healthy, young men. Front Physiol. 2019;10:447. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys. 2019.00447.
- Stelzer I, Kröpfl JM, Fuchs R, Pekovits K, Mangge H, Raggam RB, et al. Ultra-endurance exercise induces stress and inflammation and affects circulating hematopoietic progenitor cell function. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2015;25(5):e442–50. https://doi. org/10.1111/sms.12347.
- Wardyn GG, Rennard SI, Brusnahan SK, McGuire TR, Carlson ML, Smith LM, et al. Effects of exercise on hematological parameters, circulating side population cells, and cytokines. Exp Hematol. 2008;36(2):216–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exphem. 2007.10.003.
- Kröpfl JM, Beltrami FG, Gruber HJ, Stelzer I, Spengler CM. Exercise-induced circulating hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells in well-trained subjects. Front Physiol. 2020;11:308. https:// doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2020.00308.
- Snijders T, Nederveen JP, Bell KE, Lau SW, Mazara N, Kumbhare DA, et al. Prolonged exercise training improves the acute type II muscle fibre satellite cell response in healthy older men. J Physiol. 2019;597(1):105–19. https://doi.org/10.1113/jp276260.
- Reidy PT, Fry CS, Dickinson JM, Drummond MJ, Rasmussen BB. Postexercise essential amino acid supplementation amplifies skeletal muscle satellite cell proliferation in older men 24 hours postexercise. Physiol Rep. 2017;5(11): e13269. https://doi.org/ 10.14814/phy2.13269.
- 92. Snijders T, Verdijk LB, McKay BR, Smeets JS, van Kranenburg J, Groen BB, et al. Acute dietary protein intake restriction is associated with changes in myostatin expression after a single bout of resistance exercise in healthy young men. J Nutr. 2014;144(2):137–45. https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.113.183996.
- 93. Ross MD, Malone EM, Simpson R, Cranston I, Ingram L, Wright GP, et al. Lower resting and exercise-induced circulating angiogenic progenitors and angiogenic T cells in older men. Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol. 2018;314(3):H392-402. https://doi. org/10.1152/ajpheart.00592.2017.
- 94. Dreyfus PA, Chretien F, Chazaud B, Kirova Y, Caramelle P, Garcia L, et al. Adult bone marrow-derived stem cells in muscle connective tissue and satellite cell niches. Am J Pathol. 2004;164(3):773–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9440(10) 63165-3.
- Zheng B, Cao B, Crisan M, Sun B, Li G, Logar A, et al. Prospective identification of myogenic endothelial cells in human skeletal muscle. Nat Biotechnol. 2007;25(9):1025–34. https:// doi.org/10.1038/nbt1334.
- Carlson BM, Faulkner JA. Muscle transplantation between young and old rats: age of host determines recovery. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 1989;256:C1262–6. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpcell. 1989.256.6.C1262.
- Conboy IM, Conboy MJ, Smythe GM, Rando TA. Notch-mediated restoration of regenerative potential to aged muscle. Science. 2003;302:1575–7. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1087573.

- Rader EP, Faulkner JA. Effect of aging on the recovery following contraction-induced injury in muscles of female mice. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2006;101(3):887–92. https://doi.org/10.1152/ japplphysiol.00380.2006.
- Kadi F, Charifi N, Denis C, Lexell J. Satellite cells and myonuclei in young and elderly women and men. Muscle Nerve. 2004;29(1):120–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/mus.10510.
- McKay BR, Toth KG, Tarnopolsky MA, Parise G. Satellite cell number and cell cycle kinetics in response to acute myotrauma in humans: immunohistochemistry versus flow cytometry. J Physiol. 2010;588(17):3307–20. https://doi.org/10.1113/jphysiol.2010. 190876.
- Decaroli MC, Rochira V. Aging and sex hormones in males. Virulence. 2017;8(5):545–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/21505 594.2016.1259053.
- Dechenes CJ, Verchere CB, Andrikopoulos S, Kahn SE. Human aging is associated with parallel reductions in insulin and amylin release. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 1998;275(5):E785–91. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpendo.1998.275.5.E785.
- 103. Guillet C, Prod'homme M, Balage M, Gachon P, Giraudet C, Morin L, et al. Impaired anabolic response of muscle protein synthesis is associated with S6K1 dysregulation in elderly humans. FASEB J. 2004;18(13):1586–7. https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.03-1341fje.
- 104. Kimball SR, Horetsky RL, Jefferson LS. Signal transduction pathways involved in the regulation of protein synthesis by insulin in L6 myoblasts. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 1998;274(1):C221–8. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpcell.1998.274.1. C221.
- 105. Kimball SR, Jurasinski CV, Lawrence JC Jr, Jefferson LS. Insulin stimulates protein synthesis in skeletal muscle by enhancing the association of eIF-4E and eIF-4G. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 1997;272:C754–9. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpcell.1997.272.2. C754.
- 106. O'Connor PM, Kimball SR, Suryawan A, Bush JA, Nguyen HV, Jefferson LS, et al. Regulation of translation initiation by insulin and amino acids in skeletal muscle of neonatal pigs. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 2003;285(1):E40-53. https://doi.org/10. 1152/ajpendo.00563.2002.
- Perfetti R, Rafizadeh CM, Liotta AS, Egan JM. Age-dependent reduction in insulin secretion and insulin mRNA in isolated islets from rats. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 1995;269:E983–90. https:// doi.org/10.1152/ajpendo.1995.269.6.E983.
- Calvanese V, Lee LK, Mikkola HK. Sex hormone drives blood stem cell reproduction. EMBO J. 2014;33(6):534–5. https://doi. org/10.1002/embj.201487976.
- 109. Shahbazi M, Cundiff P, Zhou W, Lee P, Patel A, D'Souza SL, et al. The role of insulin as a key regulator of seeding, proliferation, and mRNA transcription of human pluripotent stem cells. Stem Cell Res Ther. 2019;10(1):228. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s13287-019-1319-5.
- 110. Fu X, Xiao J, Wei Y, Li S, Liu Y, Yin J, et al. Combination of inflammation-related cytokines promotes long-term muscle stem cell expansion. Cell Res. 2015;25(6):655–73. https://doi.org/10. 1038/cr.2015.58.
- 111. Wu J, Saovieng S, Cheng IS, Liu T, Hong S, Lin C-Y, et al. Ginsenoside Rg1 supplementation clears senescence-associated β-galactosidase in exercising human skeletal muscle. J Ginseng Res. 2019;43(4):580–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgr.2018.06. 002.
- 112. Townsend JR, Stout JR, Jajtner AR, Church DD, Beyer KS, Riffe JJ, et al. Polyphenol supplementation alters intramuscular apoptotic signaling following acute resistance exercise. Physiol Rep. 2018;6(2): e13552. https://doi.org/10.14814/phy2.13552.
- 113. Justice JN, Gregory H, Tchkonia T, LeBrasseur NK, Kirkland JL, Kritchevsky SB, et al. Cellular senescence biomarker

p16INK4a+ cell burden in thigh adipose is associated with poor physical function in older women. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2018;73(7):939–45. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glx134.

- Forcina L, Cosentino M, Musarò A. Mcchanisms regulating muscle regeneration: insights into the interrelated and time-dependent phases of tissue healing. Cells. 2020;9(5):1297. https://doi. org/10.3390/cells9051297.
- Tidball JG. Regulation of muscle growth and regeneration by the immune system. Nat Rev Immunol. 2017;17(3):165–78. https:// doi.org/10.1038/nri.2016.150.
- 116. Callegari GA, Novaes JS, Neto GR, Dias I, Garrido ND, Dani C. Creatine kinase and lactate dehydrogenase responses after different resistance and aerobic exercise protocols. J Hum Kinet. 2017;58:65–72. https://doi.org/10.1515/hukin-2017-0071.
- 117. Tufvesson E, Svensson H, Ankerst J, Bjermer L. Increase of club cell (Clara) protein (CC16) in plasma and urine after exercise challenge in asthmatics and healthy controls, and correlations to exhaled breath temperature and exhaled nitric oxide. Respir Med. 2013;107(11):1675–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2013.08. 004.
- 118. Bolger C, Tufvesson E, Anderson SD, Devereux G, Ayres JG, Bjermer L, et al. Effect of inspired air conditions on exerciseinduced bronchoconstriction and urinary CC16 levels in athletes. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2011;111(4):1059–65. https://doi.org/10. 1152/japplphysiol.00113.2011.
- 119. Combes A, Dekerle J, Dumont X, Twomey R, Bernard A, Daussin F, et al. Continuous exercise induces airway epithelium damage while a matched-intensity and volume intermittent exercise does not. Respir Res. 2019;20(1):12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12931-019-0978-1.
- 120. Rochefort GY, Vaudin P, Bonnet N, Pages JC, Domenech J, Charbord P, et al. Influence of hypoxia on the domiciliation of mesenchymal stem cells after infusion into rats: possibilities of targeting pulmonary artery remodeling via cells therapies? Respir Res. 2005;6(1):125. https://doi.org/10.1186/1465-9921-6-125.
- Rawlins EL, Hogan BL. Ciliated epithelial cell lifespan in the mouse trachea and lung. Am J Physiol Lung Cell Mol Physiol. 2008;295(1):L231–4. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajplung.90209. 2008.
- Welch C, Greig C, Masud T, Wilson D, Jackson TA. COVID-19 and acute sarcopenia. Aging Dis. 2020;11(6):1345–51. https:// doi.org/10.14336/AD.2020.1014.
- Steffl M, Bohannon RW, Petr M, Kohlikova E, Holmerova I. Relation between cigarette smoking and sarcopenia: meta-analysis. Physiol Res. 2015;64(3):419–26. https://doi.org/10.33549/ physiolres.932802.
- 124. Collins CA, Olsen I, Zammit PS, Heslop L, Petrie A, Partridge TA, et al. Stem cell function, self-renewal, and behavioral heterogeneity of cells from the adult muscle satellite cell niche. Cell. 2005;122(2):289–301. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2005. 05.010.
- Sacco A, Doyonnas R, Kraft P, Vitorovic S, Blau HM. Selfrenewal and expansion of single transplanted muscle stem cells. Nature. 2008;456(7221):502–6. https://doi.org/10.1038/natur e07384.
- 126. Pesce M, Orlandi A, Iachininoto MG, Straino S, Torella AR, Rizzuti V, et al. Myoendothelial differentiation of human umbilical cord blood-derived stem cells in ischemic limb tissues. Circ Res. 2003;93(5):e51-62. https://doi.org/10.1161/01.Res.0000090624. 04507.45.
- 127. Adams GR, Zaldivar FP, Nance DM, Kodesh E, Radom-Aizik S, Cooper DM. Exercise and leukocyte interchange among central circulation, lung, spleen, and muscle. Brain Behav Immun. 2011;25(4):658–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2011.01.002.
- Koç ON, Gerson SL, Phillips GL, Cooper BW, Kutteh L, Van Zant G, et al. Autologous CD34+ cell transplantation for patients

with advanced lymphoma: effects of overnight storage on peripheral blood progenitor cell enrichment and engraftment. Bone Marrow Transplant. 1998;21(4):337–43. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bmt.1701096.

- 129. Frangoul H, Altshuler D, Cappellini MD, Chen YS, Domm J, Eustace BK, et al. CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing for sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia. N Engl J Med. 2021;384(3):252–60. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2031054.
- Hoggatt J, Singh P, Sampath J, Pelus LM. Prostaglandin E2 enhances hematopoietic stem cell homing, survival, and proliferation. Blood. 2009;113(22):5444–55. https://doi.org/10.1182/ blood-2009-01-201335.
- 131. Sapp RM, Evans WS, Eagan LE, Chesney CA, Zietowski EM, Prior SJ, et al. The effects of moderate and high-intensity exercise on circulating markers of endothelial integrity and activation in young, healthy men. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2019;127(5):1245– 56. https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00477.2019.

Springer Nature or its licensor holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.

# **Authors and Affiliations**

# Luthfia Dewi<sup>1,7</sup> · Yin-Chou Lin<sup>2,8</sup> · Andrew Nicholls<sup>1</sup> · Giancarlo Condello<sup>3</sup> · Chih-Yang Huang<sup>4,5,6</sup> · Chia-Hua Kuo<sup>1</sup>

- Chia-Hua Kuo kuochiahua@gmail.com; kch@utaipei.edu.tw
- <sup>1</sup> Laboratory of Exercise Biochemistry, University of Taipei, Tianmu Campus, Taipei 11153, Taiwan
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taoyuan 33378, Taiwan
- <sup>3</sup> Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Parma, Parma 43126, Italy
- <sup>4</sup> Cardiovascular and Mitochondrial Related Disease Research Center, Hualien Tzu Chi Hospital, Buddhist Tzu Chi Medical Foundation, Hualien 970, Taiwan
- <sup>5</sup> Center of General Education, Buddhist Tzu Chi Medical Foundation, Tzu Chi University of Science and Technology, Hualien 970, Taiwan
- <sup>6</sup> Department of Medical Research, China Medical University Hospital, China Medical University, Taichung 404, Taiwan
- <sup>7</sup> Department of Nutrition, Universitas Muhammadiyah Semarang, Semarang 50273, Indonesia
- <sup>8</sup> General Education Center, Open University of Kaohsiung, Kaohsiung 812, Taiwan