Physical Therapy in Sport 13 (2012) 101-114



Literature review

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Physical Therapy in Sport



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/ptsp

Evidence of the physiotherapeutic interventions used currently after exercise-induced muscle damage: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Rui Torres ^{a,b,*}, Fernando Ribeiro ^{a,c}, José Alberto Duarte ^c, Jan MH Cabri^d

^a CESPU, North Polytechnic Institute of Health, Department of Physiotherapy, Paredes, Portugal

^b Technical University of Lisbon, Faculty of Human Kinetics, CIPER, Lisbon, Portugal

^c University of Porto, Faculty of Sport, Research Centre in Physical Activity, Health and Leisure, Porto, Portugal

^d Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Department of Physical Performance, Oslo, Norway

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history: Received 16 September 2010 Received in revised form 2 June 2011 Accepted 25 July 2011

Keywords: Eccentric exercise Delayed-onset muscle soreness Physiotherapy Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Exhaustive and/or unaccustomed exercise, mainly involving eccentric muscle actions, induces temporary muscle damage, evidenced by delayed onset muscle soreness (DOMS) and decreased muscle function. Different strategies to recover from its signs and symptoms have been studied and, as a result, a significant number of articles on this issue have been published.

Objective: To assess whether some modalities currently used in physiotherapy such as massage, cryotherapy, stretching and low-intensity exercise are effective for treating the signs and symptoms of exercise-induced muscle damage.

Methods: Randomized controlled trials (RCTs), written in English or Portuguese, that included physiotherapeutic interventions [i.e., massage, cryotherapy, stretching and low-intensity exercise, on adult human subjects (18–60 years old) of both gender] were searched on electronic databases including MEDLINE, CINHAL, EMBASE, PEDro and SPORTDiscus.

Main outcome measures: "Muscle soreness" and "muscle strength" were the outcome measures included in the meta-analysis.

Results: Thirty-five studies were included; nine analysed the effects of massage, 10 examined the effects of cryotherapy, nine investigated the effects of stretching and seven focused on low-intensity exercise intervention.

Massage was the only intervention with positive effects, reducing soreness at 24 h, on average, 0.33 on 10 cm visual analog scale (95 percent CI: -0.59, -0.07) and increasing muscle recovery by 1.87 percent (95 percent CI: 0.30, 3.44). Additionally, there is inconclusive evidence to support the use of cryotherapy, while there is little evidence to prove the efficacy of stretching and low-intensity exercise.

Conclusion: Massage proved slightly effective in the relief of symptoms and signs of exercise-induced muscle damage. Therefore, its mean effect was too small to be of clinical relevance. There is a lack of evidence to support the use of cryotherapy, stretching and low-intensity exercise.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Exhaustive and/or unaccustomed exercises (particularly those involving high intensity muscle contractions) are known to induce temporary muscle damage (Deschenes, Bush, McCoy, Volek, & Kraemer, 2000; Gleeson, Blannin, Walsh, Field, & Pritchard, 1998), evidenced by muscle soreness, reduction in muscle strength, muscle swelling and a reduced range of motion of the joints involved (Cheung, Hume, & Maxwell, 2003; Jamurtas et al., 2005; Lavender & Nosaka, 2006). The explanation for exercise-induced muscle damage remains unclear. However, the most accepted theory involves high mechanical tension exerted on the myofibril during eccentric muscle contraction and metabolic changes imposed by the exercise that leads to a loss of cellular homeostasis, particularly due to a high intracellular calcium concentration (Armstrong, 1984; Clarkson & Sayers, 1999). It is suggested that the initial stage of abnormal functioning of the myofibril and the structural changes of the cytoskeleton are caused by an increase of intracellular calcium concentration.

Although the first publication about exercise-induced muscle damage was in 1902 by Hough, this issue remains current, particularly with regard to research into the prevention and treatment of

^{*} Corresponding author. CESPU, North Polytechnic Institute of Health, Department of Physiotherapy, Paredes, Portugal. Tel.: +351 224 157 171; fax: +351 224 157 102.

E-mail address: rui.torres@ipsn.cespu.pt (R. Torres).

¹⁴⁶⁶⁻⁸⁵³X/\$ – see front matter @ 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. doi:10.1016/j.ptsp.2011.07.005

this clinical condition. As a result, several studies evaluated the effects of conventional physiotherapeutic interventions and found the negative effects of intensive exercise. O'Connor and Hurley (2003) conducted the first systematic literature review on the subject of effectiveness of physiotherapeutic interventions in the management of delayed onset muscle soreness (DOMS). Since then, a considerable amount of studies have been published, creating the need for a summary of recent research to identify valid and applicable evidence. The result is an important contribution for all professionals involved in sports activities.

The most conventional physiotherapeutic intervention with the intention of creating analgesia and/or treating soft tissue injury often includes therapeutic massage, cryotherapy, stretching and active exercise. However, the efficacy of these interventions in preventing or changing the course of exercise-induced muscle damage is unclear (Cheung et al., 2003; Ernst, 1998; O'Connor & Hurley, 2003).

In this sense, the aim of this systematic review and metaanalysis was to examine whether some modalities currently used in physiotherapy such as massage, cryotherapy, stretching and lowintensity exercise are effective for relieving the signs and symptoms of exercise-induced muscle damage.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Selection criteria for studies

Only RCTs including adult human subjects, written in English or Portuguese, were included in the study. Titles, abstracts and keywords identified from the results of the search were screened by two researchers and used as criteria for inclusion or exclusion (Fig. 1). When both reviewers did not reach an agreement, the full text of the respective study was obtained and analysed to establish suitability.

The following criteria were used to select relevant studies for the review:



Fig. 1. Flow chart of inclusion process of articles used in the systematic review.

- ✓ Type of participants: conducted on adult subjects of both genders; age range of 18−60 years old
- Type of study: randomized controlled trials
- Methodological quality: only studies with a score of at least three on the PEDro scale
- ✓ Type of interventions: the use of only one physiotherapeutic intervention per group
- Study purpose: to determine the effectiveness of physiotherapeutic interventions on exercise-induced muscle damage or on delayed onset muscle soreness
- ✓ Language: articles written in English or Portuguese

2.2. Databases and search strategy

The electronic search was performed on MEDLINE (1966 to February 2011), CINHAL (1982 to February 2011), EMBASE (1988 to February 2011), PEDro (1950 to February 2011) and SPORTDiscus (1985 to February 2011) and included a combination of the following keywords: "delayed onset muscle soreness," "DOMS," "eccentric exercise," "physiotherapy," "physical therapy," "muscle soreness," "exercise-induced muscle damage," "skeletal muscle damage," "cryotherapy," "cold-water immersion," "massage," "stretching," "low-intensity exercise" and "warm-up." Additional literature was accumulated by manually searching the bibliographies of the paper identified to ensure that appropriate articles were obtained.

2.3. Assessment of methodological quality and data collection

The methodological quality of the RCTs was assessed by using the PEDro scale, which is based on the Delphi list developed by Verhagen et al. (1998); it is a valid and reliable measure of the methodological quality of clinical trials (Maher, Sherrington, Herbert, Moseley, & Elkins, 2003; Morton, 2009).

Two authors familiar with the PEDro scale independently assessed the methodology quality of each RCT. Reviewers were not blinded with respect to authors, institutions or journals. Consensus was used to resolve disagreements and a third author was consulted if the disagreement persisted.

A study was rated as having "high" methodological quality if it attained six points or more, and this classification was used to grade the strength of the evidence. However, all studies receiving a score of at least three in the initial analysis were included. The descriptive data of participants, exercise protocol, interventions, outcomes, results and conclusions were extracted by one author in a standardized predefined way, and were then summarized by tabulation (Tables 2–5).

2.4. Quantitative data analysis

The mean change in "muscle soreness," measured on a 10-cm. Visual Analogue Scale (VAS), and percentage of change of muscle strength relative to baseline were defined as outcomes and used to assess the difference between the treatment and control group. Means and 95 percent confidence intervals (Cls) were calculated using standard meta-analysis software (RevMan 5.0. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2008). Meta-analyses of continuous outcomes (scores for "muscle soreness" and "muscle strength") were calculated with a random effect model using the inverse of the estimated sampling variances as weights. The Chi² test and Higgins I² test were used to assess heterogeneity. We attempted to assess publication bias using a funnel plot that plotted effect estimates of the common outcome measure against sample size.

Table 1	
PEDro Scores	

Intervention	Reference	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total score
Cryotherapy	Sellwood et al. (2007)	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	8/10 ^a
	Ascensão et al. (2011)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6/10 ^a
	Paddon-Jones and Quiley (1997)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6/10 ^a
	Eston and Peters (1999)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5/10
	Howatson et al. (2009)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5/10
	Goodall and Howatson (2008)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4/10
	Jakeman et al. (2009)	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4/10
	Skurvydas et al. (2006)	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4/10
	Bailey et al. (2007)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3/10
	Howatson et al. (2005)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3/10
Massage	Abad et al. (2010)	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	6/10 ^a
	Weber, Servedio, and Woodall (1994)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5/10
	Smith et al. (1994)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5/10
	Farr et al. (2002)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5/10
	Mancinelli et al. (2006)	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	5/10
	Zainuddin et al. (2005)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5/10
	Lightfoot et al. (1997)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4/10
	Willems et al. (2009)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4/10
	Hilbert et al. (2003)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3/10
Stretching	Buroker & Schwane (1989)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5/10
	Torres et al. (2007)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5/10
	Torres et al. (2005)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5/10
	Johansson et al. (1999)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4/10
	Wessel & Wan (1994)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4/10
	Gulick et al. (1996)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3/10
	High et al, (1989)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3/10
	Lund et al. (1998)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3/10
	McGlynn et al. (1979)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3/10
Low-intensity exercise	Dannecker et al. (2002)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6/10 ^a
	Chen, Nosaka, and Wu (2008)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	5/10
	Saxton & Donnelly (1995)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5/10
	Hasson et al. (1989)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5/10
	Weber et al. (1994)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5/10
	Donnelly et al. (1992)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4/10
	Zainuddin et al. (2006)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3/10

^a High methodological quality study.

3. Results

3.1. Studies included

In total, 35 studies were included in the systematic review; 10 analysed the effects of cryotherapy, nine for the effect of massage, nine for the effect of stretching and seven for the effects of low-intensity exercise (Table 1). Except for two studies that were published in Portuguese (Abad, Ito, Barroso, Ugrinowitsch, & Tricoli, 2010; Torres, Carvalho, & Duarte, 2005), all others were written in English.

The PEDro score for each study is detailed in Table 1. Only those carried out by Sellwood, Brukner, Williams, Nicol, and Hinman (2007), Ascensão, Leite, Rebelo, Magalhães, and Magalhães (2011), Paddon-Jones and Quiley (1997), Abad et al. (2010) and Dannecker, Koltyn, Riley, and Robinson, (2002) had high methodological quality; a lack of blinding is the most evident methodological flaw in the studies. Failure to conceal allocation was another general methodological limitation of the studies.

The meta-analysis was only performed on "muscle soreness" and "muscle strength" because they were the only variables with enough detailed data. Moreover, it was not possible to make the meta-analysis of the effect of stretching at 1 h, due to a lack of and/ or insufficient data.

From the nine RCTs (Table 2) for assessing the effectiveness of massage after exercise-induced muscle damage, six found positive effects on "muscle soreness" (Farr, Nottle, Nosaka, & Sacco, 2002; Hilbert, Sforzo, & Swensen, 2003; Mancinelli, Davis, Aboulhosn,

Eisenhofer, & Foutty, 2006; Smith et al., 1994; Willems, Hale, & Wilkinson, 2009; Zainuddin, Newton, Sacco, & Nosaka, 2005). In the variable "muscle function," only three studies demonstrated a positive effect. Farr et al. (2002) found positive effects in "muscle strength" and vertical jump, while Mancinelli et al. (2006) and Willems et al. (2009) found this only in the vertical jump.

Ten RCTs (Ascensão et al., 2011; Bailey et al., 2007; Eston & Peters, 1999; Goodall & Howatson, 2008; Howatson, Gaze, & Van-Someren, 2005; Howatson, Goodall, & Someren, 2009; Jakeman, Macrae, & Eston, 2009; Paddon-Jones & Quiley, 1997; Sellwood et al., 2007; Skurvydas et al., 2006) evaluating the effectiveness of cryotherapy were found (Table 3). Only one study examined the effect of ice massage (Howatson et al., 2005) while the others studied the effect of cold-water immersion. No study was found to analyse the effect of spray or ice packs on "muscle soreness."

Nine RCTs (Buroker & Schwane, 1989; Gulick, Kimura, Sitler, Paolone, & Kelly, 1996; High, Howley, & Franks, 1989; Johansson, Lindstrom, Sundelin, & Lindstrom, 1999; Lund, Vestergaard-Poulsen, Kanstrup, & Sejrsen, 1998; McGlynn, Laughlin, & Rowe, 1979; Torres et al., 2005; Torres, Appell, & Duarte, 2007; Wessel & Wan, 1994) were found (Table 4) that evaluated the effects of muscle stretching after exercise-induced muscle damage.

3.2. Effect of massage

The meta-analysis showed that massage applied after exercise is effective on "muscle soreness" only after 24 h. In fact, four RCTs (Abad et al., 2010; Farr et al., 2002; Hilbert et al., 2003; Willems

Table 2

Massage in the management of delayed onset muscle soreness.

Reference (PEDro Score)	Subjects	Exercise protocol	Intervention	Control	Criterion measures	Results	Conclusions
Abad et al., 2010 (6/10)	18 males [18—30 years]	Maximal eccentric extensors muscles contractions of the elbow [6 × 5 repetitions at 110% 1RM]	6-min of massage (0.5-min effleurage, 3.5-min petrissage, 1.5-min tappotement, 0.5-min effleurage) [immediately post-exercise]	1. Control group without treatment (n = 6) 2. Massage group (n = 6)	1. Limb girth 2. Muscle soreness 3.Muscle strength 4. Range of motion [before, at 0, 24, 48, 72,& 96h]	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Massage was not effective to minimize DOMS
Farr et al., 2002 (5/10)	8 males [22(3) years]	Downhill treadmill walk [40-min with 10% of their body mass]	30-min of massage (effleurage & petrissage techniques; no deep tissue massage was performed) [at 2 h post-exercise]	1. Contra-lateral leg	 Creatine kinase Muscle soreness Muscle strength Pressure pain threshold Single leg vertical jump weight [before, at 1, 24, 72 & 120 h] 	Positive for muscle soreness and tenderness. Still positive for isokinetic strength and vertical jump at 1 and 24 h post-exercise.	Therapeutic massage may attenuate soreness and tenderness associated with DOMS. However, it may not be beneficial in the treatment of strength and functional declines
Hilbert et al., 2003 (3/10)	18 subjects (males & females) C	Maximal eccentric knee flexors contractions [6 × 10 repetitions + 5]	20-min of massage (5-min effleurage, 1-min percussion, 12-min petrissage, 2-min effleurage) [at 2 h post-exercise]	1. Control group without treatment (<i>n</i> = 9)	1. Muscle soreness 3. Muscle strength [at 2, 6, 24 & 48 h] 4. Neutrophils count [at 6 & 24 h] 5. Range of motion [at 6, 24 & 48h]	Positive for muscle soreness at 48 h post- exercise; No significant differences between groups for muscle soreness, range of motion and neutrophils.	Massage did not improve hamstrings function but did reduce the intensity of soreness 48h after muscle insult.
Lightfoot et al., 1997 (4/10)	12 males & 19 females [college age]	Heel drop exercise [4×15 repetitions with 100% of their body weight]	10-min of petrissage [immediately & 24h post-exercise]	1. Group light stretch ($n = 10$) 2. Control group ($n = 11$)	1. Creatine kinase 2. Limb girth 3. Muscle soreness Jat 0. 24 & 48hl	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Petrissage does not prevent or attenuate DOMS
Mancinelli et al., 2006 (5/10)	22 trained females [20(0.9) years]	Pre-season training routine for 4 days	17-min of massage to each thigh, (4-min effleurage, 8-min petrissage, 2-min vibration, 3- min effleurage) [on the day of predicted peak soreness]	1. Control group without treatment (<i>n</i> = 11)	 Pressure pain threshold Quadriceps femoris length Time shuttle run Vertical jumps [at days 2 and 4] 	Positive for muscle soreness, vertical jumps displacement and algometer reading.	The use of massage decreases muscle soreness and improves vertical jump.
Smith et al., 1994 (5/10)	14 males [18—21 years]	Maximal eccentric flexors/extensors muscles contractions of the elbow [5 × 35 repetitions]	30-min of athletic massage (effleurage, shaking, petrissage, wringing and cross- fibre massage) [at 2 h post-exercise]	1. Control group (<i>n</i> = 7)	 Creatine kinase Muscle soreness Neutrophils count [before, at 8, 24, 48, 72, 96 & 120h] 	Positive for muscle soreness, creatine kinase activity and neutrophils count.	Sports massage reduces DOMS and creatine kinase activity when administered 2 h after exercise- induced muscle damage
Weber et al., 1994 (5/10)	40 females [18–35 years]	Maximal eccentric elbow flexors contractions [until exhaustion]	8-min of massage (2-min effleurage, 5-min petrissage, 1-min effleurage) [at 0 & 24 h post-exercise]	1.Microcurrent electrical stimulation (n = 10) 2. Upper- body ergometry (n = 10) 3. Control group, no intervention (n = 10)	1. Muscle soreness 2. Muscle strength [before, at 24 & 48h]	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Post-exercise massage did not alleviate DOMS or muscle strength

s Downhill walk 25-min of massage 1. Contra-lateral leg 1. Muscle soreness Positive for muscle- The use of massage cars] [20-min with 10% (5-min effleurage, 2. One-legged vertical specific soreness decreases muscle-specific of their body mass; 10-min petrissage jump height [before, and one-leg vertical soreness and improve speed: 6.4 km/; & tapotement, at 24, & 72h] jump height vertical jump. gradient: -25%] 10-min effleurage) at 24, & 72h] jump height vertical jump. post-exercisel post-exercisel at 24, & 72h] jump height vertical jump.	& 5 femalesMaximal eccentric10-min of masage1. Contra-lateral arm1. Limb girthPositive forMasage was effective) yearselbow flexors $(2.5-min effleurage,1-min petrissage, 2-min1. Contra-lateral arm1. Limb girthMasage was effective(10 \times 6 \text{ repetitions})friction, 2-min3. Muscle strengthand limb girth;and reducing swelling,but it had no effect onfor (10 \times 6 \text{ repetitions})friction, 2-min4. Range of motionNo significantbut it had no effect oneffleurage)10 & 14 days post-exercise]muscle strengthmuscle strengthand reducing swelling,but it had no effect oneffleurage)10 & 14 days post-exercise]muscle strengthmuscle strengtheffleurage)10 & 14 days post-exercise]muscle strengthmuscle strength$
7 females Dow.	5 males & 5 females Maxi
[19(1) years] [20-r	[23.0(1.3) years] elbon
of th	conti
speed	[10 ×
Willems et al.,	Zainuddin et al.,
2009 (4/10)	2005 (5/10)

et al., 2009) studying the effect of massage (total sample size 30) had sufficient data to make the meta-analysis possible at 24 h (Fig. 2A). The overall effects suggest a significant positive effect (p = 0.01) with a mean difference of 0.33 cm (95 percent CI: 0.59, 0.07) on a 10-cm VAS. The result of heterogeneity indicated that the differences observed between trials were unlikely to be caused by chance (Chi² = 0.40; I² = 0 percent).

The overall effect was not statistically significant in any one of the other moments (p = 0.46, p = 0.07 and p = 0.32 to 1, 48 and 72 h, respectively). The heterogeneity between the studies at 48 h ($l^2 = 46$ percent) made it difficult to clarify the true effect of massage after exercise-induced muscle damage at 48 h; i.e., whether massage effectively attenuates soreness, while at 1 and 72 h the consistency between studies ($l^2 = 0$) gives more guarantee about the failure of this intervention at these periods.

Relative to the effect of post-exercise massage on "muscle strength" (Fig. 2B), the meta-analysis demonstrated an overall effect only at 1 h and not at 24, 48 or 72 h with mean differences of 1.87 (95 percent CI: 0.30, 3.44), 3.41 (95 percent CI: -0.36, 7.18), 0.17 (95 percent CI: -4.69, 5.02) and 2.29 (95 percent CI: -0.15, 4.72) percent, respectively. Indeed, the assessment made at 1 h had a significant overall effect (p = 0.02) and all the included studies found similar results ($I^2 = 0$ percent), indicating little variability between studies that cannot be explained by chance (Higgins, Thompson, Deeks, & Altman, 2003).

The positive effect in favour of the control group, shown in Fig. 2A and B, means that the control group showed less ability to produce "muscle strength" post-exercise than the experimental group. Therefore, it should be viewed as a positive effect of post-exercise massage.

3.3. Effect of cryotherapy

The evidence presented in this review does not support the use of cryotherapy on the variables assessed. Indeed, only four RCTs found positive effects for cryotherapy (Ascensão et al., 2011; Bailey et al., 2007; Eston & Peters, 1999; Skurvydas et al., 2006), contrasted against six other studies demonstrating no effect on all variables assessed (Goodall & Howatson, 2008; Howatson et al., 2005; Howatson et al., 2009; Jakeman et al., 2009; Paddon-Jones & Quiley, 1997; Sellwood et al., 2007). The analysis of trials that assessed "muscle soreness" using the VAS (Fig. 3A) showed no statistically significant overall effect at 1 and 24 h, with a mean difference of -0.43 cm (95 percent CI: -1.95, 1.10), -1.22 cm (95 percent CI: -3.31, 0.88). Although the overall effect of cryotherapy after 48 and 72 h was statistically significant (mean difference -1.22 cm (95 percent CI: -1.60, -0.84) and -2.11 cm (95 percent CI: -3.77, -0.45), respectively), these results should not be considered reliable because a significant statistical heterogeneity among the trials in each of the assessed moments was found $(I^2 = 39 \text{ percent})$ and 88 percent to 48 and 72 h, respectively).

With respect to "muscle strength," the effect of cryotherapy post-exercise was statistically significant (p < 0.01) at 24 h. However, this result could not be pooled due to the methodological heterogeneity studies ($I^2 = 65$ percent), i.e., 65 percent of the variation in the data can be attributed to heterogeneity (Fig. 3B).

At 1 h, no effect (p = 0.29) was found and the low heterogeneity observed between studies indicated that the mean difference of -2.56 percent (95 percent Cl: -7.32, 2.19) between trials was unlikely to have been by chance (Chi² = 0.27; I² = 0 percent). Also at 48 and 72 h, no significant effects were observed (p = 0.16 and p = 0.39, respectively). However, the high heterogeneity verified (I² = 65 percent and I² = 69 percent, respectively) does not provide the same certainty in its ineffectiveness, i.e., in this case there is a possibility that these results were due to chance.

Table 3

Cryotherapy in the management of delayed onset muscle soreness.

Reference (PEDro Score)	Subjects	Exercise protocol	Intervention	Control	Criterion measures	Results	Conclusions
Ascensão et al., 2011 (6/10)	20 athletes males [18(1) years]	Soccer match	10-min cold-water immersion at 10 °C [immediately post-exercise]	1.Control group ($n = 10$); 10-min of thermo neutral water (35 °C)	 Creactive protein Creatine kinase Muscle strength Muscle soreness Myoglobin Performance tests [before, at 30-min, 24 & 48 h] 	Positive for muscle soreness, creatina kinase, mioglobin, Creactive protein and muscle strength	Cryotherapy after soccer match is effective in reducing some biochemical, functional, and perceptual markers of muscle damage
Bailey et al., 2007 (4/10)	20 males [22.3(3.3) years]	Shuttle run [90-min intermittent]	10-min cold-water immersion at 10 (0.5) ° [immediately post-exercise]	1.Control group (<i>n</i> = 10)	1. Creatine kinase 2. Myoglobin 3. Muscle strength 4. Muscle soreness [before, at 0, 1, 24, 48 & 168 h]	Positive for muscle soreness (at 1,24 & 48 h), muscle strength of the knee flexors (at 24 & 48 h) and myoglobin (at 1 h post- exercise)	Cold-water immersion immediately after prolonged shuttle running reduces some indices of exercise- induced muscle damage
Eston & Peters, 1999 (5/10)	15 females [22.0(2.0) years]	Maximal eccentric/concentric elbow flexor contractions [8 × 5 repetitions]	7 × 15-min cold-water immersion at 15(1)°C [immediately & 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72 h post-exercise]	1.Control group $(n = 7)$	 Creatine kinase Limb girth Muscle strength Pressure pain threshold Range of motion [before, at 24, 48 & 72 h] 	Positive for creatine kinase and range of motion	Cold-water immersion may reduce muscle stiffness
Goodall & Howatson, 2008 (4/10)	18 males [24(5) years]	Drop Jumps [5 × 20 repetitions]	12-min cold-water immersion at 15(1)°C [immediately & 24, 48, 72h post-exercise]	1.Control group (<i>n</i> = 9)	 Creatine kinase Limb girth Muscle strength Muscle Soreness Range of motion [before, at 24, 48, 72 & 96h] 	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Cold-water immersion at 15 °C for 12-min demonstrates no effect
Howatson et al., 2005 (3/10)	12 males [24.8(5.3) years]	Maximal eccentric elbow flexor contractions [3 × 10 repetitions at 30°/s performed in the dynamometer]	15-min of ice massage directly on the skin [immediately & 24, 48 h post-exercise]	1.Cross-over design: treatment group and placebo group	 Creatine kinase Limb girth Myoglobin Muscle strength Muscle strength Range of motion [before, at 0, 24, 48, 72 & 96h] 	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Ice massage has no benefit to recovery from exercise-induced muscle damage
Howatson et al., 2009 (5/10)	16 males [23(3) years]	Drop jumps [5 × 20 repetitions]	12-min cold-water immersion at 15 (1) °C [immediately post-exercise]	1.Cross-over design: treatment group and control group	 Creatine kinase Limb girth Muscle strength Muscle soreness Range of motion [before, at 0, 24, 48, 72 & 96h] 	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Cold-water immersion at 15 °C for 12-min demonstrates no effect
Jakeman et al., 2009 (4/10)	18 athletes males [19.9(1.0) years]	Counter- movement jumps [10 × 10 repetitions]	10-min cold-water immersion at 10 (1) °C [immediately post-exercise]	1.Control group $(n = 9)$	1. Creatine kinase 2. Muscle strength 3. Muscle soreness [before, at 1, 24, 48, 72 & 96h]	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Cold-water immersion at 10 °C for 10-min demonstrates no effect
Paddon-Jones & Quiley, 1997 (6/10)	8 trained males [23.0(2.5) years]	Eccentric elbow flexor contractions of both arms $[8 \times 8$ repetitions with 110% of the 1-RM]	5×20 -min (60-min rest period) cold-water immersion at $5(1)^{\circ}C$ [post- exercise]	1.Contralateral arm	1. Limb girth 2. Muscle strength 3. Muscle soreness [before, at 0, 24, 48, 72, 96, 120 & 144h]	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Cold-water immersion 5×20 -min at 5 °C demonstrates no effect

ellwood et al., 2007 (8/10)	11 males & 29 females [control group 21(3);	Eccentric knee extensor muscle contractions [5 × 10 repetitions with 120% of the 1-RM]	3×1 -min cold-water immersion at 5 (1) °C [immediately post-exercise]	1.Control group (4 males & 16 females)	 Creatine kinase Limb girth Muscle soreness One-legged hop-for- 	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Cold-water immersion 3 × 1-min at 5 °C demonstrates no effect
	intervention group 21(4) years]				distance 5. Pressure pain threshold [at 0, 24, 48 & 72 hl		
kurvydas et al., 2006 (4/10)	20 males [20.4(1.8) vears]	Counter- movement iumps [100 repetitions]	2×15 -min cold-water immersion at $15(1)^{\circ}$ C	1.Cross-over design: treatment group and	1. Creatine kinase 2. Force evoked bv	Positive for creatine kinase. muscle	Cold-water immersion accelerates the
			[immediately & 4, 8, 24 h after exercise]	control group	electrostimulation 3. Muscle soreness 4. Muscle strength 5. Vertical jump [at 24, 48 & 72h]	soreness, muscle strength, vertical jump and force evoked by electrostimulation	disappearance of the majority of indicators

With the exception of the study conducted by Bailey et al. (2007), the application of a single session of cold-water immersion immediately after exercise had no effects on the different indirect markers of muscle damage. In fact, the studies carried out by Howatson et al. (2009) and Jakeman et al. (2009) found no difference between a single 12-min (at 15 °C) and 10-min (at 10 °C) cold-water immersion. Similar results were found by Sellwood et al. (2007); these authors examined the effects of three 1-min immersions in ice water at 5 (\pm 1)°C and also found no difference with respect to the control group that was immersed in tepid water at 24 °C. In contrast, Bailey et al. (2007) examined the effect of a 10-min cold-water immersion at 10 (\pm 0.5)°C and found positive effects in "muscle soreness," "muscle strength" and myoglobin blood concentration after induced muscle damage with a 90-min intermittent shuttle run.

Four studies were found (Eston & Peters, 1999; Goodall & Howatson, 2008; Howatson et al., 2005; Skurvydas et al., 2006) that analysed the effect of repeated cryotherapy. Two studies suggested that cryotherapy applied repeatedly over time might contribute to muscle recovery, particularly in the reduction of muscle stiffness. Indeed, Eston and Peters (1999) immersed the upper limb 15-min immediately post-exercise and at 12, 24, 36, 48 and 72 h, while Skurvydas et al. (2006) performed two 15-min immersions immediately post-exercise at 4, 8 and 24 h. Both studies found positive effects. However, Goodall and Howatson (2008) and Howatson et al. (2005) do not corroborate these findings. Goodall and Howatson administered 12-min of cold-water immersion immediately post-exercise at 24, 48, and 72 h, and Howatson et al. applied 15-min of ice massage immediately postexercise at 24 and 48 h. finding no difference in "muscle strength," soreness, limb girth, range of motion, plasmatic creatine kinase activity (CK) (Goodall & Howatson, 2008; Howatson et al., 2005) or myoglobin blood concentration (Howatson et al., 2005).

3.4. Effect of stretching

There are different protocols in the studies with respect to the timing of stretching relative to exercise: single stretching program before exercise (Johansson et al., 1999; Wessel & Wan, 1994); single stretching program after exercise (Gulick et al., 1996; High et al., 1989; Torres et al., 2007; Wessel & Wan, 1994); single stretching program before and repeated stretching program after exercise (High et al., 1989); and repeated stretching program after exercise (Buroker & Schwane, 1989; McGlynn et al., 1979). Therefore, the effect of stretching in the recovery of muscle function seems to fail regardless of when it is applied.

The mean difference on "muscle soreness" and "muscle strength" (Fig. 4A and B) had no statistically significant overall effect at 24, 48 and 72 h (p > 0.05). The failure of this intervention becomes more apparent with the fact that there is a low ($I^2 = 0$ percent) heterogeneity between studies, except for "muscle soreness" at 24 h ($I^2 = 38$ percent).

3.5. Effect of low-intensity exercise

Finally, evaluating the effect of low-intensity exercise, only three of the seven studies (Table 5) carried out by Zainuddin, Sacco, Newton, and Nosaka (2006), Saxton and Donnelly (1995) and Hasson, Barnes, Hunter, and Williams (1989) detected temporary relief in muscle soreness. Regarding the positive effects on the other variables, the results demonstrated only a reduction in plasmatic CK activity in two studies (Donnelly, Clarkson, & Maughan, 1992; Saxton & Donnelly, 1995). The meta-analysis showed no statistically significant overall effect (p > 0.05) on "muscle soreness" (Fig. 5A) and "muscle strength" (Fig. 5B) at 1, 24, 48 and 72 h post-exercise. Moreover, the inconsistency of the

 Table 4

 Stretching in the management of delayed onset muscle soreness.

Reference (PEDro Score)	Subjects	Exercise protocol	Intervention	Control	Criterion measures	Results	Conclusions
Buroker & Schwane, 1989 (5/10)	16 males & 7 females [18–33 years]	Step test [20-min; 15 stepping cycles per minutes]	10×30 s static stretches [at 2h intervals for the first 24 h & 4 h intervals for the following 48h]	1. Control group $(n = 8)$	1. Creatine kinase 2. Limb girth 3. Muscle soreness 4. Muscles strength [before, at 24, 48 & 72h]	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Static stretching is not effective for relieving DOMS
Gulick et al., 1996	34 males & 36 Females [21–40 years]	Eccentric forearm extensor contractions $[15 \times 15 $ repetitions]	10 min of static stretching [immediately post-exercise]	1. Control group (<i>n</i> = 10)	 Limb girth Muscle soreness Muscle strength Range of motion [before, at 0, 20 min, 24, 48 &72] 	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Static stretching is not effective for relieving DOMS
High et al, 1989 (3/ 10)	31 males & 31 females [19.5 years]	Step test [until exhaustion; 64 stepping cycles per minutes]	5×50 s static stretches [immediately post-exercise]	1. Stepping warm-up, no step test $(n = 16)$ 2.Warm-up and stretches (n = 16) 3. Step test only $(n = 16)$	1. Muscle soreness [at 24, 48, 72, 96 &120h]	No significant differences between groups for muscle soreness	Static stretching has no effect on preventing DOMS
Johansson et al., 1999 (4/10)	10 females [24 (3) years]	Maximal eccentric knee flexor contractions $[10 \times 10 $ repetitions]	$4 \times 20 \text{ s static stretching}$ [immediately post-exercise]	1. Contra-lateral leg	1. Muscle soreness 2. Muscle strength 3. Pressure pain threshold [before, at 24, 48 & 96h]	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Pre-exercise static stretching has no preventive effect on DOMS
Lund et al., 1998 (4/10)	7 females [28–46 years]	Eccentric quadriceps muscle contractions [with 60% of maximum eccentric peak torque until exhaustion]	3×30 s static stretches [before, immediately & for the next 7 days post- exercise.]	1. Cross-over design: treatment group and control group	1. Creatine kinase 2. Muscle soreness 3. Muscle strength 4. Ratio of phosphocreatine to inorganic phosphate [before, at 0, 24 48, 72, 96 120, 144, & 168h]	No significant differences between experiences for all assessed measures	Passive stretching after eccentric exercise cannot prevent DOMS
McGlynn et al., 1979 (3/10)	36 males [18–26 years]	Eccentric elbow flexor contraction [with 80% of the 1-RM until exhaustion; 30 concentric and 30 eccentric contractions/min]	4×2 -min static stretches [at 6, 25, 30, 49& 54 h post- exercise]	1. Control group (<i>n</i> = 12)	1. Electromyography activity 2. Muscle soreness [before, at 0, 24, 48 & 72h]	Positive for EMG activity No significant differences for muscle soreness	Static stretching decreases EMG activity
Torres et al., 2005 (5/10)	17 males [18–32 years]	Maximal eccentric knee extensor contractions [2 sets until exhaustion]	10×30 s static stretches [immediately post-exercise]	 Stretching group (n = 10) Eccentric exercise group (n = 8) Stretching/eccentric group (n = 9) 	1. Creatine kinase 2. Oxaloacetic glutamic transaminase 3. Muscle soreness 4. Muscle strength 5. Limb girth	No significant differences between experiences for all assessed measures	Passive stretching after eccentric exercise cannot prevent DOMS
Torres et al., 2007 (5/10)	30 males [18–32 years]	Maximal eccentric knee extensor contractions [2 sets until exhaustion]	10×30 s static stretches [immediately post-exercise]	 Stretching group (n = 10) Eccentric exercise group (n = 10) Stretching/eccentric group (n = 10) 	1. Muscle stiffness [before, at 1, 24, 48, 72 & 96h]	Positive for different parameters during Wartenberg Test	Stretching program alleviates reduction in range of motion induced by exercise
Wessel & Wan, 1994 (4/10)	13 males; & 7 females [19–31 years]	Maximal concentric/ eccentric knee flexor contractions $[3 \times 20$ repetitions]	10×60 s static stretches [group before exercise ($n = 10$); group after exercise ($n = 10$)]	1. Contra-lateral leg	1. Muscle soreness [at 12, 24, 48, 60 & 72h] 2. Range of motion [at 0, & 48 h] 3. Pressure pain threshold [at 0, & 48 h]	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Static stretching has no effect on preventing or alleviating DOMS

A									B 1 hour										
	Expor	imontal		Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference		Expe	riment	al	Co	ntrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD To	tal Me	an SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% Cl	IV. Random, 95% CI	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total I	Mean	SD 1	Total \	Neight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% C	
Abad 2010	0.8	1	6	1 1	6	6.3%	-0.20 [-1.33, 0.93] +		Farr 2002 Hilbert 2003	93	1.7	8	91 87	1.7	8	0.4%	2.00 [0.33, 3.67]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,
Farr 2002	1.6	0.3	8	1.7 0.3	8	93.7%	-0.10 [-0.39, 0.19]		Zainudin 2005	63	4.8	10	62	6	10	10.9%	1.00 [-3.76, 5.76]		
			-		-														
Total (95% CI)			14		14	100.0%	-0.11 [-0.39, 0.18]	-	Total (95% CI)			27			27 1	100.0%	1.87 [0.30, 3.44]	• • • •	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi	² = 0.03,	df = 1 (F	P = 0.87);	12 = 09	6	-	05 025 0 025 05	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	$ ^2 = 0.3$	5, df = 2	2(P = 0)	.84); I²	= 0%			-4 -2 0 2 4	4
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.73 (P = 0.46					Favo	ours experimental Favours control	rescior overall effect.	2 = 2.00	(r = 0.	021					Fa	avours experimental Favours	control
									24 hours										
24 hours																			
	Expe	rimental		Contro	I.		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	Study or Subgroup	Exp	eriment	al Total	Co	entrol	Total 1	Noight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	otal Me	ean SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	Farr 2002	98	3.7	8	92.5	2.5	8	61.3%	5.50 [2.41, 8.59]		-
Abad 2010	2.3	1.6	6	2.5 1.8	6	1.8%	-0.20 [-2.13, 1.73] *	,	Hilbert 2003	76.2	25.4	9	77.2	30	9	2.1%	-1.00 [-26.68, 24.68]	·	
Farr 2002	2.1	0.3	8	2.4 0.3	8	79.0%	-0.30 [-0.59, -0.01]		Weber 1994	72.2	18.5	10	67.6	10.7	10	7.5%	4.60 [-8.65, 17.85]		
Hilbert 2003	5.5	1.2	9	5.6 2.3	9	2.4%	-0.10 [-1.79, 1.59] 🕈		Zainudin 2005	63	6	10	64	7.5	10	29.0%	-1.00 [-6.95, 4.95]		
Williems 2009	3.2	0.5	7	3.7 0.7	7	16.8%	-0.50 [-1.14, 0.14]		Total (95% CI)			37			37	100.0%	3.41 [-0.36, 7.18]	•	
T-1-1 (05% OI)			20		20	400.08/	0 00 / 0 70 0 071		Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	3.55; Cl	hi² = 3.7	6, df = :	3 (P = 0	.29); l ²	= 20%			-20 -10 0 10	20
10tal (95% CI)	0.00.01		30	D 000	30	100.0%	-0.33 [-0.59, -0.07]		Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.77	(P = 0	08)					Fa	avours experimental Favours	control
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	f = 0.40	ar = 3 (P = 0.94)	; * = 0	%		-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1	48 hours										
Test for overall effect.	2 - 2.45	(P = 0.0)				Fav	ours experimental Favours control	40 110013	_									
48 hours									Study of Subgroup	Exp	eriment	Tetal	Co	ontrol	Tetal	Malaht	Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
									Hilbort 2003	mean 80	26.4	o	78.3	20	o	3.6%	1 70 L 22 02 27 321	IV, Random, 95% C	<u>،</u>
	Exp	eriment	al	Contr	ol		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	Weber 1994	73.6	17.8	10	68.8	15.4	10	11.1%	4.80 [-9.79, 19.39]		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total I	Mean SI) Tota	al Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	IV, Random, 95% CI	Zainudin 2005	64	6	10			40	05.00/	0 50 1 5 76 4 761		
Abod 2010										04	0	10	64.5	6	10	85.3%	-0.50 [-5.76, 4.76]		
Abau 2010	2.6	1.1	6	3.1 2.	5	6 17.4%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69]			04	0	10	64.5	6	10	85.3%	-0.50 [-5.76, 4.76]	I	
Hilbert 2003	2.6	1.1 1.8	6 9	3.1 2.1 7.2 1.4	5 4	6 17.4% 9 29.0%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61]		Total (95% CI)	04	0	29	64.5	6	10 29	85.3% 100.0%	-0.50 [-5.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02]		
Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009	2.6 5.1 3.3	1.1 1.8 0.7	6 9 7	3.1 2.9 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0	5 4 6	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18]		Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ci	hi² = 0.4	29 6, df =	64.5 2 (P = 0	6).79); l²	29 = 0%	85.3% 100.0%	-0.50 [-5.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02]	-10 -5 0 5 1	10
Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009	2.6 5.1 3.3	1.1 1.8 0.7	6 9 7	3.1 2.4 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.6	5 4 6	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18]		Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07	hi² = 0.4 7 (P = 0	29 6, df = 95)	64.5 2 (P = 0	6).79); l²	29 = 0%	85.3%	-0.50 [-5.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fa	-10 -5 0 5 1 ivours experimental Favours	l 10 control
Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009	2.6 5.1 3.3	1.1 1.8 0.7	6 9 7 22	3.1 2.9 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0	5 4 6 2	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09]		Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07	hi² = 0.4 7 (P = 0	29 6, df = 95)	64.5 2 (P = 0	6).79); I²	29 = 0%	85.3%	-0.50 [-5.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fa	-10 -5 0 5 1 avours experimental Favours	l 10 control
Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C	1.1 1.8 0.7	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2	3.1 2.5 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.6 2 (P = 0.1)	5 4 6 2 6); I ² =	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09]		Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07	hi² = 0.4 7 (P = 0	29 6, df = 1 95)	64.5 2 (P = 0	6).79); l²	29 = 0%	85.3%	-0.50 [-5.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fa	-10 -5 0 5 vours experimental Favours	l 10 control
Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8	1.1 1.8 0.7 hi ² = 3.7 0 (P = 0.	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07)	3.1 2.3 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0 2 (P = 0.10	5 4 6); I ² =	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09]	-2 -1 0 1 2 avours experimental Eavours control	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours	0.00; Ci Z = 0.07	hi² = 0.4 7 (P = 0	29 6, df = 95)	64.5 2 (P = 0	6).79); l²	29 * = 0%	85.3% 100.0%	-0.50 [-5.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fa	-10 -5 0 5 wours experimental Favours	I 10 control
Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 72 hours	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8	1.1 1.8 0.7 hi ² = 3.7 0 (P = 0.	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07)	3.1 2.4 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0 2 (P = 0.10	5 4 6); I ² =	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09]	-2 -1 0 1 2 avours experimental Favours control	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07 Exp	hi² = 0.4 7 (P = 0 erimen	29 6, df = 95) tal	64.5 2 (P = 0 Co Mean	6).79); l ² ontrol	29 = 0%	85.3% 100.0%	-0.30 [-3.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fa Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 - avours experimental Favours	10 control
Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tav ² = Test for overall effect 72 hours	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8	1.1 1.8 0.7 hi ² = 3.7 0 (P = 0.	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07)	3.1 2.5 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0 2 (P = 0.1)	5 4 6 6); I ² =	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09] F	-2 -1 0 1 2 avours experimental Favours control	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 72 hours Study or Subgroup Ear: 2002	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07 Exp Mean	$hi^{2} = 0.4$ $r (P = 0$ erimen SD 2.2	29 6, df = 95) tal <u>Total</u>	64.5 2 (P = 0 Co <u>Mean</u> 100	6 0.79); I ² ontrol SD T	29 = 0%	Veight	-0.30 [-3.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fa Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	-10 -5 0 5 avours experimental Favours Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C	I 10 control
Hilbert 2003 Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 72 hours	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8 Exp	1.1 1.8 0.7 hi ² = 3.7 0 (P = 0.) eriment:	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07)	3.1 2.9 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0 2 (P = 0.1) Contr	5 4 6); ² = 0	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09] F Mean Difference	-2 -1 0 1 2 avours experimental Favours control Mean Difference	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours Study or Subgroup Far 2002 Zainwin 2005	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07 Exp <u>Mean</u> 102.5 74	hi ² = 0.4 7 (P = 0 erimen <u>SD</u> 2.2 6	29 6, df = 95) tal <u>Total</u> 8	64.5 2 (P = 0 Co <u>Mean</u> 100 72 5	6 0.79); l ² ontrol <u>SD T</u> 3.3 6	29 = 0%	Veight 78.5%	-0.30 [-3.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 2.50 [-0.25, 5.25] 1.50 [-3, 6, 6, 76]	-10 -5 0 5 avours experimental Favours Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% (10 control
Audu 2010 Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 72 hours Study or Subgroup	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8 Exp Mean	1.1 1.8 0.7 $hi^2 = 3.7$ 0 (P = 0.) eriment: <u>SD</u> 1.8	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07) II Fotal M	3.1 2.9 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0 2 (P = 0.1) Contr <u>Mean SE</u> 2.6 2.1	5 4 6); I ² = ol 0 Tota	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09] F Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.50 [-2.11, 171]	-2 -1 0 1 2 avours experimental Favours control Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Farr 2002 Zainudin 2005	Exp Mean 102.5 74	erimen <u>SD</u> 2.2 6	29 6, df = 95) tal <u>Total</u> 8 10	64.5 2 (P = 0 Co <u>Mean</u> 100 72.5	6 0.79); l ² ontrol <u>SD T</u> 3.3 6	29 = 0%	Veight 78.5% 21.5%	-0.50 [-3.76, 4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fa Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 2.50 [-0.25, 5.25] 1.50 [-3.76, 6.76]	-10 -5 0 5 avours experimental Favours Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C	10 control
Hibert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abad 2010 Farr 2002	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8 Exp <u>Mean</u> 2.1	1.1 1.8 0.7 $hi^2 = 3.7$ 0 (P = 0. eriment: <u>SD</u> 1.8 5	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07) 1 <u>Fotal N</u> 6 8	3.1 2.5 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0 2 (P = 0.1) Contr <u>Mean SE</u> 2.6 2.1 1.9 0.5	5 4 6); l ² = 0 Tota	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09] F Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.50 [-2.71, 1.71] 0.00 [-3.48, 3.48]	-2 -1 0 1 2 avours experimental Favours control Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours Study or Subgroup Farr 2002 Zainudin 2005 Total (95% CI)	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07 Exp <u>Mean</u> 102.5 74	erimen SD 2.2 6	29 66, df = 95) tal <u>Total</u> 8 10 18	64.5 2 (P = 0 Co <u>Mean</u> 100 72.5	6 0.79); ² ontrol SD T 3.3 6	29 = 0%	Veight 78.5% 21.5% 00.0%	-0.50 [-2.76, -7.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fi Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 2.50 [-0.25, 5.25] 1.50 [-3.76, 6.76] 2.29 [-0.15, 4.72]	-10 -5 0 5 avours experimental Favours Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C	1 10 control
Hibert 2003 Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abad 2010 Farr 2002 Williems 2009	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8 Exp Mean 2.1 1.9 2.4	1.1 1.8 0.7 $hi^2 = 3.7$ 0 (P = 0. eriment: <u>SD</u> 1.8 5 0.3	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07) 6 <u>Fotal 1</u> 6 8 11	3.1 2.4 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0 2 (P = 0.1) Contr Mean SE 2.6 2.1 1.9 0.5 2.1 0.4	5 4 5 6); I ² = 0 <u>0</u> Tota	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09] F Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.50 [-2.71, 1.71] 0.00 [-3.48, 3.48] 0.30 [0.00, 0.60]	Avours experimental Favours control Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours Study or Subgroup Farr 2002 Zainudin 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07 Exp <u>Mean</u> 102.5 74	erimen SD 2.2 6	29 6, df = 95) tal <u>Total</u> 8 10 18 1, df =	64.5 2 (P = 0 Co <u>Mean</u> 100 72.5	6 0.79); l ² ontrol <u>SD T</u> 3.3 6 0.74); l	29 = 0% <u>t</u> = 0% <u>t</u> = 0%	Veight 78.5% 21.5%	-0.50 [-3.76, -4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fe Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 2.50 [-0.25, 5.25] 1.50 [-3.76, 6.76] 2.29 [-0.15, 4.72]	Avours experimental Favours	
Audu 2010 Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 72 hours <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abad 2010 Farr 2002 Williems 2009	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8 Exp Mean 2.1 1.9 2.4	1.1 1.8 0.7 hi ² = 3.7 0 (P = 0. eriment: <u>SD</u> 1.8 5 0.3	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07) II <u>Fotal N</u> 6 8 11	3.1 2.4 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.1 2 (P = 0.1) Contr Mean SE 2.6 2.1 1.9 0.5 2.1 0.4	5 4 6); I ² = 0 <u>0</u> Tota 6 5 8 1	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46% 1 Weight 5 1.7% 3 0.7% 1 97.6%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09] F Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.50 [-2.71, 1.71] 0.00 [-3.48, 3.48] 0.30 [0.00, 0.60]	-2 -1 0 1 2 avours experimental Favours control Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours Study or Subgroup Farr 2002 Zainudin 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07 Exp Mean 102.5 74 0.00; Cl Z = 1.84	$hi^2 = 0.4$ (P = 0) erimen <u>SD</u> 2.2 6 $hi^2 = 0.4$ 4 (P = 0)	29 46, df = 95) tal Total 8 10 18 11, df = .07)	64.5 2 (P = 0 Co <u>Mean</u> 100 72.5 1 (P = 0	6 ntrol <u>SD T</u> 3.3 6 0.74); F	29 = 0% otal V 8 10 18 1 ² = 0%	<u>Veight</u> 78.5% 21.5% 00.0%	-0.50 [-3.76, -4.76] 0.17 [-4.89, 5.02] Fi Mean Difference [V, Random, 95% CI 2.50 [-0.25, 5.25] 1.50 [-3.76, 6.76] 2.29 [-0.15, 4.72]	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%	tion control
Aua 2010 Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 72 hours Study or Subgroup Abad 2010 Farr 2002 Williems 2009 Total (95% Cl)	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8 <u>Exp</u> <u>Mean</u> 2.1 1.9 2.4	1.1 1.8 0.7 $hi^2 = 3.7$ 0 (P = 0.) eriment: <u>SD</u> 1.8 5 0.3	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07) Fotal M 6 8 11 25	3.1 2.4 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0 2 (P = 0.1) Contr Mean SD 2.6 2.1 1.9 0.5 2.1 0.4	5 4 6) 2 2 6); I ² = 0 1 1 6; 8 4 1 1 25	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46% 1 Weight 3 1.7% 3 0.7% 1 97.6% 5 100.0%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09] F Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.50 [-2.71, 1.71] 0.00 [-3.48, 3.48] 0.30 [0.00, 0.60] 0.28 [-0.01, 0.58]	-2 -1 0 1 2 avours experimental Favours control Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect: 72 hours Study or Subgroup Farr 2002 Zainudin 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect:	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07 Exp Mean 102.5 74 0.00; Cl Z = 1.84	$J^{2} = 0.4$ erimen $\frac{SD}{2.2}$ 6 hi ² = 0.4 4 (P = 0	29 66, df = 995) tal Total 8 10 18 1, df = .07)	64.5 2 (P = 0 Co <u>Mean</u> 100 72.5 1 (P = 0	6 ntrol <u>SD T</u> 3.3 6 0.74); F	29 = 0% <u>otal V</u> 8 10 18 1 	Veight 78.5% 21.5%	4.5.0 [-3.76, -4.76] 0.17 [-4.69, 5.02] Fi Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 2.50 [-0.25, 5.25] 1.50 [-3.76, 6.76] 2.29 [-0.15, 4.72] Fa	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C 4 -2 0 2 vours experimental Favours	tion control
Auad 2010 Hilbert 2003 Williems 2009 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 72 hours Study or Subgroup Abad 2010 Farr 2002 Williems 2009 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	2.6 5.1 3.3 = 0.42; C : Z = 1.8 Exp <u>Mean</u> 2.1 1.9 2.4 = 0.00; C	$\begin{array}{c} 1.1 \\ 1.8 \\ 0.7 \\ \text{chi}^2 = 3.7 \\ 0 \ (\text{P} = 0.) \\ \text{eriment:} \\ \hline 1.8 \\ 5 \\ 0.3 \\ \text{hi}^2 = 0.5 \\ \end{array}$	6 9 7 22 2, df = 2 07) 7) 8 1 1 25 2, df = 2	3.1 2.3 7.2 1.4 3.8 0.0 2 ($P = 0.11$ Contr Mean SD 2.6 2.1 1.9 0.5 2.1 0.4 2 ($P = 0.77$	5 4 5 2 6); ² = 0 1 1 2 5 2 1 1 2 5 2 1 1 1 2 5 1 2 1 1 2 2 1 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	6 17.4% 9 29.0% 7 53.6% 2 100.0% 46% 1 Weight 5 1.7% 3 0.7% 1 97.6% 5 100.0%	-0.50 [-2.69, 1.69] -2.10 [-3.59, -0.61] -0.50 [-1.18, 0.18] -0.96 [-2.02, 0.09] F Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.50 [-2.71, 1.71] 0.00 [-3.48, 3.48] 0.30 [0.00, 0.60] 0.28 [-0.01, 0.58]	Avours experimental Favours control Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 72 hours Study or Subgroup Far 2002 Zainudin 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.00; Cl Z = 0.07 Exp Mean 102.5 74 :0.00; Cl Z = 1.84	$J^{2} = 0.4$ erimen SD 2.2 6 hi ² = 0.4 4 (P = 0	29 6, df = . 995) tal Total 10 18 11, df = . 07)	64.5 2 (P = 0 Co <u>Mean</u> 100 72.5 1 (P = (6 ntrol <u>SD T</u> 3.3 6	29 = 0% <u>otal V</u> 8 10 18 1 18 1	Veight 78.5% 21.5%	-0.50 [-2.76, -7.76] 0.17 [-4.89, 5.02] Fi Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 2.50 [-0.25, 5.25] 1.50 [-3.76, 6.76] 2.29 [-0.15, 4.72] Fa	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C	10 control

Fig. 2. A – Effects of massage on delayed onset muscle soreness at 1, 24, 48 and 72 hours (Visual Analogue Scale). B – Effects of massage on muscle strength at 1, 24, 48 and 72 hours (Percentage of change to baseline). Note: Effect in favour of the control group means less ability to produce muscle strength thus it should be viewed as a positive effect of massage in the experimental group.

results of the studies (moderate or high heterogeneity) does not form the grounds of any recommendations for low-intensity exercise intervention.

4. Discussion

The meta-analysis was performed only on "muscle soreness" and "muscle strength" because they are the only variables whose data are sufficiently detailed and their assessment is similar. In addition, "muscle soreness" and "muscle strength" are not only the most used outcomes but also the two best markers of muscle damage (Byrne, Twist, & Eston, 2004; Clarkson, Nosaka, & Braun, 1992); therefore, the effect of a physiotherapeutic intervention can be assessed by these two variables with some confidence.

In general, the results suggest that massage is the only effective intervention, while the cryotherapy intervention has little evidence supporting its use. Other interventions such as stretching or lowintensity exercise have no scientific evidence to sustain their validity.

Indeed, massage is a widely used therapy in the treatment of athletic muscle soreness and micro-injury. Many athletes are convinced of its potential to alleviate muscle soreness (Howatson & Someren, 2008). It has been established that massage might have a number of physiological and psychological effects, particularly by increasing blood circulation and lymphatic flow, decreasing oedema production and muscular tone, and hence contributing to the repair of damaged muscles and pain modulation.

In fact, this review confirms that massage has positive effects after exercise-induced muscle damage; the evidence shows that muscle massage lasting 20–30 min administered immediately or up to 2 h post-exercise relieves "muscle soreness" at 24 h. However, the effect beyond this period is not shown. We hypothesize that massage may stimulate the afferent fibres of type Ia, Ib, and II, leading to a reduction in the pain sensation "transported" by type III and IV (Armstrong, 1984). In other words, pain stimulation is balanced against tactile stimulation and these two kinds of stimulus are capable of inhibiting each other. Therefore, excessive tactile stimulation as represented by massage may suppress pain transmission, but only temporarily.

Regarding the effect of its application on "muscle strength," massage only has a small positive effect on muscle recovery at 1 h. Although the effects of massage on pain and "muscle strength" are statistically significant, they are clinically small, being only 0.33 out of 10 points on VAS and approximately 2 percent of peak torque in the "muscle strength."

Regarding the other variables related to inflammatory response, which could be theoretically altered, such as the limb girth or neutrophil concentration, the results were contradictory. The study conducted by Lightfoot, Char, McDermott, and Goya (1997) that used different techniques of massage for a 10-min period had positive effects on limb girth. However, the study by Zainuddin et al. (2005), although using only "petrissage" and applying the same amount of time (10 min), found no changes. A similar analysis could be made for the neutrophils count, where two conflicting studies were found. Smith et al. (1994) applied a 30-min massage two hours after exercise and observed a decrease in the neutrophils, while the 20-min. massage performed in the study carried out by Hilbert et al. (2003) did not induce any changes.

Δ

P

			8
1 hours			1 hours
			Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference
20.0	Experimental Control	Mean Difference Mean Difference	Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI	Goodall 2008 78.7 10.7 9 81.3 13.4 9 18.0% -2.60 [-13.80, 8.60]
Ascensão 2011	3.4 1.4 10 4.1 0.9 10 23.8%	-0.70 [-1.73, 0.33]	Howatson 2005 74.8 16.8 12 74.8 12.8 12 15.9% 0.00 [-11.95, 11.95]
Balley 2007	2.9 0.5 10 5.1 0.8 10 25.6%	-2.20 [-2.78, -1.62]	Howatson 2009 75.3 12.8 16 77.8 10.5 16 34.4% -2.50 [-10.61, 5.61]
Jakeman 2009	17 05 9 11 04 9 261%	0.60 [0.28, 1.48]	Jakeman 2009 85.5 9.4 9 89.4 8.9 9 31.7% -3.90 [-12.36, 4.56]
Sakeman 2000	1.7 0.5 5 1.1 0.4 5 20.1%	0.00 [0.10, 1.02]	
Total (95% CI)	45 45 100.0%	-0.43 [-1.95, 1.10]	10tal (35% CI) 46 46 100.0% -2.36 [-1.32, 2.19]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	2.27; Chi ² = 62.92, df = 3 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95%		Therefore useful effects $T = 1.00$; $CH^{-} = 0.27$, $H = 3(P = 0.97)$; $F = 0.76$ Therefore useful effects $T = 1.06$ ($P = 0.20$)
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.55 (P = 0.58)	Favours experimental Favours control	Favours experimental Favours control
			24 hours
24 hours			Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference
	Experimental Control	Mean Difference Mean Difference	Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI	Ascensão 2011 99.3 19.6 10 70.7 18.7 10 6.2% 28.60 [11.81, 45.39]
Ascensão 2011	3.7 1.9 10 6.1 1.6 10 19.0%	-2.40 [-3.94, -0.86]	Bailey 2007 87.3 2.8 10 78.9 3.6 10 20.1% 8.40 [5.57, 11.23]
Bailey 2007	4 0.3 10 6.4 0.5 10 21.0%	-2.40 [-2.76, -2.04]	Eston 1999 77.1 21.1 8 81.3 28.9 7 3.1% -4.20 [-30.13, 21.73]
Howatson 2009	3.2 1.9 16 4 2.2 16 19.3%	-0.80 [-2.22, 0.62]	Goodall 2008 88 18.6 9 81.5 14.1 9 7.0% 6.50 [-8.75, 21.75]
Jakeman 2009	3.8 0.4 9 2.5 0.4 9 21.0%	1.30 [0.93, 1.67]	Howatson 2009 80.4 6.3 16 78.7 10 12 6.16 6% 170 -0.00 [15:05, 11:05]
Skurvydas 2006	5.2 1.9 20 7.1 2 20 19.8%	-1.90 [-3.110.69]	Jakeman 2009 90.7 8.4 9 90.7 8.1 9 14.2% 0.00 [-7.62, 7.62]
		interferring energy	Paddon-Jones 1997 86.7 8.7 8 81.3 7 8 14.1% 5.40 [-2.34, 13.14]
Total (95% CI)	65 65 100.0%	-1.22 [-3.31, 0.88]	Skurvydas 2006 96.8 21.9 20 74.2 16.1 20 9.5% 22.60 [10.69, 34.51]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	5.39; Chi ² = 205.99, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 98%		Total (95% Cl) 102 101 100.0% 6.93 (2.00, 11.86)
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.14 (P = 0.25)	-4 -2 0 2 4	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 29.30; Chi ² = 22.66, df = 8 (P = 0.004); l ² = 65%
10 hours		Favours experimental Favours control	Test for overall effect: Z = 2.75 (P = 0.006) -10 -5 0 5 10 Favours experimental Favours control
48 nours			48 hours
	Experimental Control	Mean Difference Mean Difference	Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weigh	IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI	Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI
Ascensão 2011	3.1 1.5 10 4.7 1.5 10 7.49	-1.60 [-2.91, -0.29]	Ascensao 2011 82.1 13.4 10 80 21.9 10 8.4% 2.10[-13.81, 18.01]
Bailey 2007	3.8 0.5 10 5.2 0.2 10 40.69	-1.40 [-1.731.07]	Eston 1999 91 30.7 8 86.7 41.9 7 2.3% 4.30 [-33.33, 41.93]
Howatson 2009	4.2 2.2 16 4.6 2.4 16 5.29	-0.40 [-2.00, 1.20]	
Jakeman 2009			
00100110112000	29 04 9 38 04 9 38 09	-0.90 [-1.27 -0.53]	Howatson 2005 77 24.8 12 85.6 18.4 12 7.5% -8.60 [-26.07, 8.87]
Skupadas 2006	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 38.09 4.8 17 20 67 21 20 8.89	-0.90 [-1.27, -0.53]	Occusal 2006 97.7 24.6 9 50.7 9 61.79 40.00 72.50, 20.40
Skurvydas 2006	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 38.09 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.89	-0.90 [-1.27, -0.53]	Goodala 2000 947 22.0 9 50.7 10.7 9 0.19 40.007/12.00, 20.401 Howatson 2005 77 248 12 85.6 18.4 12 75% -850/12.600, 8.87 Howatson 2009 85.9 15.3 16 88.9 9.4 16 14.0% -3.00(-11.80, 58.01) Jakeman 2009 86.3 82.9 9.8 8.9 9.4 16 16.0% -3.00(-15.80, 16.6) - Jakeman 2009 86.3 8.2 9.8 8.9 1.4 14.9% -7.0(-5.6, 6.16) - Paddon-Jones 1997 89.3 8.7 8 8.6 9.1 8.4 14.5% -2.60(-5.64, 10.84) -
Skurvydas 2006	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 38.0 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.8 55 5 100.0	-0.90 [-1.27, -0.53]	Homation 2005 77 24.8 12 85.6 18.4 12 7.5% 4.802 (58.07.8.87) Homation 2008 85.9 153.5 16 88.9 14.0% -3.001 (18.0.5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.2 9 86 8.9 14.0% -3.001 (18.0.5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.7 8 8.6 9 14.0% -3.001 (18.0.5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.7 8 8.6 9 14.0% -3.001 (18.0.5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.7 8 8.6 9 14.0% -3.001 (18.0.5.80) Jakeman 2009 90.3 17.7 20 64.5 18.4 20 11.6% 25.60 (14.29, 37.31)
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI)	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 38.09 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.89 65 65 100.09	- 1.22 [1.60, -0.84]	Goodala 2006 97.7 24.8 9 50.7 9 61.7 9 61.7 8 61.
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ²	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 38.0 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.8 65 65 100.0 = 0.06; Ch ² = 6.57, df = 4 (P = 0.16); P = 39%	-1.22 [1.60, -0.84]	Howatson 2005 77 248 12 856 184 12 75% 450[2607.837] Howatson 2009 85.9 1153 16 88.9 9.4 161 140% -3.00[-1180.5.80] Jakeman 2009 85.3 18.2 9 88 8.8 9 14.5% -1.70 [45.6, 61.6] Paddon-Jone 1997 89.3 8.7 8 86.7 8.1 8 14.5% -2.60 [-54.10.84] Skurydas 2006 90.3 17.7 20 64.5 19.4 20 11.8% 25.80 [14.29, 37.31] Total (95% CI) 102 101 100.0% 4.32 [-1.76, 10.41] Heterogenety: Tau' = 47.2; CIP' = 25.54, df = 8 (P = 0.001); P = 65% -20 -10 0 10 20
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1.20 [-1.27, -0.53] 1.20 [-1.30, -0.72] 1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] 	Homation 2005 77 24.8 12 85.6 18.4 12 7.5% 4.690 (26.07,8.87) Homation 2009 85.9 15.3 16 88.9 9.4 16 14.0% -3.00 (1.80, 5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.2 9 86 8 9.44/0% -3.00 (1.80, 5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.7 8 8 9.44/0% -3.00 (1.80, 5.80) Paddom-Jones 1997 80.3 7 8 8 9.45/% 2.66/6.41.0.84) Skunydas 2006 90.3 17.7 20 64.5 18.4 20 11.6% 2.56/6.41.0.84) Heterogeneity: Tau' = 48.72 C LH* = 25.54, dt = 8 (P = 0.001); H = 69% 100.0% 4.32 (-1.76, 10.41) -0 -0 0 20 -0 10 20 -10 0 10 20 -10 0 0 0 20 -10 0 0 0 20 -10 0 0 0 20 -10 0 0 20
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	-0.90 [-1.27, -0.53]	Howatson 2005 77 24.8 12 85.6 16.4 12 7.5% -8.00 [-2.07, 26.7] - Howatson 2005 85.7 24.8 12 85.6 16.4 12 7.5% -8.00 [-2.07, 26.7] -
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 38.0 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.89 65 65 100.09 = 0.06; Ch ^a = 6.57, df = 4 (P = 0.16); P = 39% t: Z = 6.26 (P < 0.00001)	-0.90 [-1.27, -0.53] -1.90 [-3.08, -0.72] -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 0 1 2 Favours experimental Favours control	Howatson 2005 77 24.8 12 85.6 18.4 12 7.5% 4.801 (26.07, 8.87) Howatson 2009 85.3 15.3 16 88.9 9.4 16.1 (40% - 3.00) (-11.80, 5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.2 9 88 8.9 14.5% -1.70 (-3.56, 6.16) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.7 8 8.7 8.8 14.5% -1.70 (-3.56, 6.16) Paddon-Jones 1997 89.3 7.8 8.67 8.1.8 14.5% 2.60 (-54, 10.84) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 48.72; Chi" = 25.54, d = 6 (P = 0.001); P = 6.0% 101 100.0% 4.32 (-1.76, 10.41) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 48.72; Chi" = 25.54, d = 6 (P = 0.001); P = 6.0% 76 Favours experimental Favours control Tost (65% CU) 102 101 100.0% 4.32 (-1.76, 10.41) -0 10 20 Tost for overall effect: 2 = 1.39 (P = 0.16) 6 (P = 0.001); P = 6.0% Favours experimental Favours control Zbudy cov Mean 3D Total Meandom, 95% CI Mean Difference <td< td=""></td<>
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	-0.90 [-1.27, -0.53] -1.90 [-3.08, -0.72] -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 0 1 2 Favours experimental Favours control	Unitation 2205 T7 24.8 12 55.6 18.4 12 7.5% 4.591 (26.07.8.87) Homation 2209 85.9 15.3 16 89.9 4.16 14.0% 00(-18.0,5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.2 9 8.8 9 14.0% 00(-18.0,5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.7 8.8 9 14.0% 00(-18.0,5.80) Skuryclas 2006 90.3 17.7 20 64.5 18.4 20 11.6% 25.66 (10.44) Studyclas 2006 90.3 17.7 20 64.5 18.4 20 11.6% 25.66 (10.42) 37.31) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) 102 101 100.0% 4.32 (-1.76, 10.41)
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 38.0 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.89 65 65 100.09 e.0.06; Ch ² = 6.57, df = 4 (P = 0.16); P = 39% t Z = 6.26 (P < 0.00001) Experimental Control	-0.90 [-1.27, -0.53] -1.90 [-3.08, -0.72] -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 0 1 2 Favours experimental Favours control Mean Difference Mean Difference	Howatson 2005 77 24.8 12 85.6 18.4 12 7.5% 4.801 (25.07, 8.87) Howatson 2009 85.9 15.3 16 88.9 9.4 16.1 14.0% -30.0 11.00, 5.80 -
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours <u>Study or Subgroup</u>	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 38.0 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.8 65 65 100.0 = 0.06; Ch ² = 6.57, df = 4 (P = 0.16); P = 39% t Z = 6.26 (P < 0.0001) Experimental Control Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight	i.e. 0.90 [-1.27, -0.53]	Howatson 2205 77 24.8 12 85.6 18.4 12 7.5% 4.690 (26.07,8.87) Howatson 2009 85.9 153 16 88.9 9.4 16.1 14.0% -3.00 (1.10,0,5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.2 9 86 8.6 9.4 16.1 14.0% -3.00 (1.10,0,5.80) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.7 8 8.6 9.4 14.5% -2.00 (1.20,5.6,1.6) Paddon-Jones 1997 80.3 7.8 8.7 8.8 7.8 1.8 1.45% 2.60 (5.44, 10.84) Skurydas 2006 90.3 17.7 20 64.5 19.4 20 11.6% 2.56.0 (14.29, 37.31) Heterogeneity: Taul = 48.72; Chi# = 25.54, df = 8 (P = 0.001); P = 60% 4.32 (1.76, 10.41) -0 0 0 2.0 Total (65% Cl) 10.2 101 100.0% 4.32 (1.76, 10.41) -0 0 2.0 Total weight Study cor Subgroup Main D. Total Weight Main Difference Main Difference Main Difference Study cor Subgroup Main D. Total Weight 9.4 9.4 1.26% - 7.50 (2.61, 21, 11.12) 1.40 Goodal 2005 8.4.8 2.5 1.9
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Howatson 2009	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 38.0 ⁴ 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.8 ⁵ 65 65 100.0 ⁵ 65 5 100.0 ⁵ 0.06; Ch ² = 6.57, df = 4 (P = 0.16); P = 39% t Z = 6.26 (P < 0.00001)	i -0.90 [-1.27, -0.53] i -1.90 [-3.08, -0.72] i -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 -1.00 [-6.41, 6.41]	Cooking L2 2005 B-7 24.8 1 85.6 10.4 12 7.5% 5.05 (120,77,8%) Howatson 2006 85.9 15.3 16 86.9 84.4 12 7.5% 5.05 (120,77,8%) Howatson 2008 85.3 15.4 16 86.9 84.4 16 14.0% 5.07 (150,5.60) Patdon-Jones 997 83.7 8 66.7 81.8 9.44.5% 2.26 (15.4,10.84) Patdon-Jones 90.3 17.7 20 66.5 18.4 20 11.6% 25.80 (14.29, 37.31) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) 102 101 100.0% 4.32 (-1.76, 10.41) Heterogeneity 7.84 8.07 (2.4% = 2.5.4, df = 8 (P = 0.001); P = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (Z = 0.16) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.16) Test fo
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Howatson 2009 Jakeman 2009	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 3.80 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.87 65 65 65 100.05 100.05 100.05 100.05 c Z = 6.26 (P < 0.00001)	i -0.90 [-1.27, -0.53]	Howatston 2205 77 24.8 12 85.6 18.4 12 7.5% 4.690 (26.07, 8.87) Howatson 2009 85.3 15.3 16 88.9 9.4 16.1 14.0% -3.00 (13.0, 7.8, 87) Jakeman 2009 85.3 8.2 9 88 8.9 9.45% -1.70 (9.56, 6.16) Jakeman 2009 86.3 8.7 8 8.7 8.8 9.45% -1.70 (9.56, 6.16) Paddon-Jones 1997 89.3 7.8 8.67 8.18 1.45% 2.00 (15.4%, 2.00 (16.44, 29.37, 3.1) Totat (85% CI) 102 101 100.0% 4.22 (1.76, 10.41) -0 10 20 Totat (85% CI) 102 101 100.0% 4.22 (1.76, 10.41) -0 10 20 Totat (85% CI) 102 1.00.0% 4.22 (1.76, 10.41) -0 10 20 Totat (85% CI) 10.3 2.5.5.4, d = 6 (P = 0.001); P = 6.0% Favours experimental Favours control Zabora 2000 10.5 2.6.8 9.3.7
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours Study or Subgroup Howatson 2009 Jakeman 2009 Skurvydas 2006	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 3.80 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.89 65 65 100.09 65 65 100.09 0.06; Chi² = 6.57, df = 4 (P = 0.16); P = 39% 12 2.626 (P < 0.00001)	i 0.90 [-1.27, -0.53] i -1.90 [-3.08, -0.72] j -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 -1.00 [-3.08, -0.72] Favours experimental Favours experimental Favours experimental Favours experimental -1.00 [-3.20, -0.84] -1.30 [-1.72, -0.86] -3.10 [-3.88, -2.32]	Nonstance 2005 77 24.8 12 85.6 18.4 12 7.5% 4.601 (26.07.8.87) Homation 2009 85.3 15.3 16 88.9 9.4 16.1 140%
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Howatson 2009 Jakeman 2009 Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% Cl)	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	i.e. 0.90 [-1.27, -0.53] i.e. 1.90 [-3.08, -0.72] i.e. 1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 0 1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 0 1.20 [-1.22, -0.88] -1.00 [-8.41, 6.41] -1.00 [-8.41, 6.41] -1.00 [-1.72, -0.88] -2.10 [-3.16, 3.88, -2.32] -2.11 [-3.77, -0.45]	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours Study or Subgroup Howatson 2009 Jakeman 2009 Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	2.9 0.4 9 3.8 0.4 9 3.80 4.8 1.7 20 6.7 2.1 20 8.89 65 65 100.09 65 65 100.09 0.06; Ch ² = 6.57, df = 4 (P = 0.16); P = 39% ± 2 = 6.26 (P < 0.00001)	• 0.90 [1.27, 0.53] • -1.90 [-3.08, -0.72] • -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] • -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] • -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] • -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] • -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] • -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] • -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] • -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] • -1.01 [-3.16, -6.1] • -1.01 [-3.16, -6.1] • -1.01 [-3.28, -2.32] • -2.11 [-3.77, -0.45]	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect 72 hours Study or Subgroup Howatson 2009 Skurvydas 2006 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	i 0.90 [-1.27, -0.53] i -1.90 [-3.08, -0.72] j -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 j -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 j -1.22 [-1.60, -0.84] -2 -1 -1.00 [-3.08, -0.72] Favours experimental Favours experimental Favours experimental -1.30 [-1.72, -0.8] -3.10 [-3.88, -2.32] -3.10 [-3.88, -2.32] -4 -2 -0 -2 -1 -2 -1 -3.10 [-3.77, -0.45] -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2 -2 -4 -2	$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{totston} 2205 & 177 \ 248 \ 12 \ 856 \ 184 \ 12 \ 758 \ 8-691 (280.7 8.87) \\ \mbox{totston} 2200 \ 85.9 \ 153 \ 16 \ 88.9 \ 94 \ 161 \ 1405 \ 5.200 \ 118.9 \ 5.80 \ 118.9 $

Fig. 3. A – Effects of cryotherapy on delayed onset muscle soreness at 1, 24, 48 and 72 hours (Visual Analogue Scale). B – Effects of cryotherapy on muscle strength at 1, 24, 48 and 72 hours (Percentage of change to baseline). Note: Effect in favour of the control group means less ability to produce muscle strength thus it should be viewed as a positive effect of cryotherapy in the experimental group.

Cryotherapy is known to be used in the initial treatment of traumatic soft tissue injuries (Cheung et al., 2003) and in the recovery from sport activities, particularly with the aim to minimize DOMS (Jakeman et al., 2009; Sellwood et al., 2007; Skurvydas et al., 2008; Wilcock, Cronin, & Hing, 2006). Although the underlying mechanism of DOMS remains uncertain, it is generally accepted that "muscle soreness" is caused by inflammation of the damaged muscle and/or connective tissues and the efflux of substances to the extra cellular space that sensitizes type III and IV free nerve endings to mechanical, chemical or thermal stimulation (Armstrong, 1984; Cheung et al., 2003). The superficial application of cold results in changes in skin, subcutaneous, intramuscular and joint temperature. Consequently, this decrease in tissue temperature stimulates cutaneous receptors, leading to excitation of the sympathetic adrenergic fibres, causing the constriction of local arterioles and venules, and thus diminishing inflammatory processes (Cheung et al., 2003; Sellwood et al., 2007). In this sense, a reduction in perceived pain and/or in limb girth could be regarded as a result of the decrease in local inflammation. However, the goal to determine the effectiveness of cryotherapy becomes difficult due to the fact that the studies differ substantially in their interventions, particularly with respect to number of participants, timing and duration.

In fact, although the results have demonstrated significant positive overall effects at 48 and 72 h, the inconsistency of the results discourages its recommendation. The moderate to high I^2 values show that most of the variability across studies is due to heterogeneity rather than chance (Higgins et al., 2003). These findings suggest that there is little evidence in favour of

cryotherapy, and therefore corroborates those obtained by Burguess and Lamber (2010). In fact, these authors carried out a systematic review of 13 articles of primary research, finding inconclusive evidence to support the use of cryotherapy modalities for recovery from exercise-induced muscle damage.

Regarding the application of stretching, its effects have been related to changes in both mechanical and neural factors, leading to the recovery of muscle function after exercise-induced muscle damage. Early in 1966, DeVries (1966) argued that muscle stretches might reduce muscle spasms after intense exercise, thus recommending its use. Subsequently, the results found by McGlynn et al. in 1979 also demonstrated a decrease in the electromyography activity after stretching the musculature involved in intensive exercise, thereby reducing muscle spasm. More recently, Torres et al. (2007), using a substantially different methodology, found a reduction in muscle stiffness and suggested that some effects of stretching on the reflex activity might involve changes in the muscle spindle function. Despite these findings, all other studies using static stretching included in this systematic review demonstrated no differences in any of the variables collected (Buroker & Schwane, 1989; High et al., 1989; Johansson et al., 1999; Lund et al., 1998; Wessel & Wan, 1994).

Furthermore, our analysis on stretching observed low heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 0$ percent); the inconsistency between studies indicated that a lack of effect after exerciseinduced muscle damage cannot be attributed to chance. Therefore, its recommendation to alleviate the signs and symptoms of exercise-induced muscle damage must be challenged. Although

Α		В	
24 hours		24 hours	
Study or Subgroup Johansson 1999 Torres 2005 Wessel 1994	Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI 5.1 1.7 10 5.2 1.5 10 13.9% -0.10 [-1.51, 1.31]	Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference No. Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI </td <td>nce 25% Cl</td>	nce 25% Cl
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: Z 48 hours	28 28 100.0% 0.22 [-0.36, 0.79] 0.11; ChP = 3.23, df = 2 (P = 0.20); P = 38% -2 -1 0 1 2 Z = 0.74 (P = 0.46) Favours experimental Favours control Favours experimental Favours control	Total (95% CI) 34 26 100.0% 0.19 [-9.77, 10.14] Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.00; Chi* = 0.34, df = 2 (P = 0.35); P = 0% -20 - 10 0 1 -20 - 10 0 1 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.04 (P = 0.97) Favours experimental Fav 48 hours 48 hours	10 20 rours control
Study or Subgroup I Bonfim 2010 Johansson 1999 Torres 2005 Wessel 1994 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. Test for overall effect: Z Z	Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference 3.4 2.6 10 3.4 1.9 10 4.5% 0.00 [-2.00, 2.00] 7.1 1.8 10 6.9 1.7 10 7.7% 0.20 [-1.33, 1.73] 5.7 1.2 9 5.3 1.5 8 10.7% 0.40 [-0.90, 1.70] 2.6 0.6 10 2.6 0.5 10 7.7.1% 0.00 [-0.48, 0.48] 39 38 100.0% 0.06 [-0.37, 0.48]	Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI N, Rando	nce 5% CI
72 hours		72 hours	
Study or Subgroup	Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV Random 95% Cl IV Random 95% Cl	Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference	ence
Torres 2005		Study of Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% C	95% CI
Wessel 1994	1.7 0.5 10 1.6 0.5 10 93.9% 0.10 [-0.34, 0.54]	Torres 2005 94.3 21 9 90.2 21.3 8 77.1% 4.10 [-16.05, 24.25]	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	19 18 100.0% 0.14 [-0.28, 0.57] = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.60, df = 1 (P = 0.44); P = 0% Z = 0.66 (P = 0.51) - 1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours experimental Favours control	Total (95% Cl) 24 16 100.0% 3.62 [-14.07, 21.31] Heiterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 0.01, df = 1 (P = 0.92); P = 0% -20 -10 0 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.40 (P = 0.69) Favours experimental Favours experimental Favours experimental	10 20 vours control

Fig. 4. A - Effects of stretching on delayed onset muscle soreness at 24, 48 and 72 hours (Visual Analogue Scale). B - Effects of stretching on muscle strength at 24, 48 and 72 hours (Percentage of change to baseline). Note: Effect in favour of the control group means less ability to produce muscle strength thus it should be viewed as a positive effect of stretching in the experimental group.

studying only "muscle soreness," Herbert and Gabriel (2002), in a systematic review of five studies, and Herbert and Noronha (2007) in a meta-analysis of ten studies, also found that stretching before and after exercise did not confer protection from "muscle soreness," which corroborates our present findings.

Low-intensity exercise is another conventional intervention that is thought to increase the rate of recovery of symptoms after exercise-induced muscle damage (Armstrong, 1984; Cheung et al., 2003). It is postulated that the increase of blood circulation caused by light exercise may facilitate the removal of toxic products and promote the release of endorphins, leading to an analgesic effect. Moreover, the reduction of pain sensation could have the same explanation as that given for the effect of massage. Both hypotheses suggest that there is a rise in the stimulation of sensitive fibres of type Ia, Ib, and II, which may lead to an interference in the pain sensation "transported" by type III and IV (Weerakkody, Whitehead, Canny, Gregory, & Proske, 2001). However, our meta-analysis demonstrated the lack of support for the idea that low-intensity exercise may be effective, particularly in "muscle soreness." Indeed, only three (Hasson et al., 1989; Saxton & Donnelly, 1995; Zainuddin et al., 2006) of the seven studies (Table 5) detected temporary relief in "muscle soreness." Overall, our study demonstrated no significant effects of low-intensity exercise on "muscle soreness" after exerciseinduced muscle damage, particularly at 24, 48 and 72 h post-exercise. Therefore, low-intensity exercise is probably not effective in the recovery of the damaged muscle.

Concerning the positive effects on other variables such as plasmatic CK activity, only two studies found significant effects (Donnelly et al., 1992; Saxton & Donnelly, 1995). Therefore, it is unclear whether low-intensity exercise has a role in improving the functioning of the cell membrane.

Regarding the methodological quality of the RCTs, lack of blinding is the most evident methodological flaw in these studies. Blind subjects, physiotherapists who administered the intervention and the assessors who measured outcomes, were more often taken into account. Failure to conceal allocation was another general methodological limitation of the studies.

In general, the analyses of data from RCTs yield robust indications of the effects of the physiotherapeutic intervention in the outcomes; although some variability in the protocols used to induce muscle damage and different duration and frequency of the interventions were observed, the results give a clear indication of what should be used to improve recovery after intense exercise.

The participants evaluated represent a healthy young adult population (mean age of 23 years old) and consequently the applicability of findings for this population to children and to older adults is uncertain.

The PEDro score showed deficits in the methodological quality of some of the studies that should be taken into account in future studies, mainly with respect to the lack of blinding and small sample size. Therefore, further RCTs with higher quality are still required in order to clarify the long-term effects of physiotherapeutic interventions on recovery.

5. Conclusions

This systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrated that therapeutic massage is the only intervention that had a positive effect on the recovery of "muscle soreness" and function; however, its mean effect is too small to be considered clinically relevant. Moreover, there is inconclusive evidence to support the use of cryotherapy as well as stretching and low-intensity exercise.

Table	5
-------	---

Low-intensity exercise in the management of delayed onset muscle soreness.

Reference (PEDro Score)	Subjects	Exercise protocol	Intervention	Control	Criterion measures	Results	Conclusions
Chen et al., 2008 (5/10)	50 males [21.1(2.3) years]	Downhill running [30-min; at –15% (–8.5°)]	Four groups ($n = 10$ per group) performed a 30-min level run on the treadmill in the intensity of 40, 50, 60 & 70% of VO2max. [at days 1 -6]	1. Control group $(n = 10)$	1. Creatine kinase 2. Lactate deshydrogenase 3. Muscle strength 4. Muscle soreness [before & days 1–7]	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Daily running did not have beneficial or adverse effects on recovery of damage and running economy regardless of the intensity
Dannecker et al., 2002 (6/10)	24 males & 26 females [21(6.4) years]	Eccentric elbow flexor contractions [n \times 10 repetitions; at 80% 1-RM]	20-min of cycle ergometer endurance exercise at 80% of estimated maximum cardiorespiratory endurance [48h post- exercise]	1. Control group (<i>n</i> = 27), 20-min watching emotional neutral video	 Anxiety Muscle soreness Pressure pain threshold [Before & at 48h before and after intervention] 	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Cycle ergometer exercise was not found to alter DOMS
Donnelly et al., 1992 (4/10)	4 males & 14 females [19(1) years]	Concentric/eccentric elbow flexors/extensors [70 maximal contractions]	25 submaximal concentric/ eccentric elbow flexors and extensors contractions at 50% of the maximum torque	[1 day post-exercise] Control group (<i>n</i> = 9)	 Creatine kinase Muscle strength Muscle soreness Range of motion [before & days 1–5] 	Positive for creatine kinase activity after induced muscle damage	Light exercise had no apparent effect of muscle function recovery
Hasson et al., 1989 (5/10)	6 males & 4 females [20 –36 years]	Bench-stepping [10-min; 15 cycles/min]	6×20 maximum contractions at $\approx 300^{\circ}/s$ (n = 5) [at 24 h post- exercise]	1. Control group $(n = 5)$	1. Muscle strength 2. Muscle soreness [at 24 & 48 h]	Positive for muscle soreness and muscle strength at 48 h post-exercise	High speed voluntary muscle contractions are effective in decreasing muscle soreness and facilitating return of normal muscular performance
Saxton & Donnelly, 1995 (5/10)	8 males [19–33 years]	Eccentric elbow flexor [70 maximal contractions]	5 × 10 submaximal concentric elbow flexor contractions at 50% of their maximal voluntary contraction [at days 1–4]	1. Contralateral arm	 Creatine kinase Muscle soreness Muscle strength Range of motion [at days 1-7 & 10] 	Positive for muscle soreness at 48 h & 96 h for creatine kinase	Concentric exercise had limited effect in the alleviation of DOMS
Weber et al., 1994 (5/10)	40 females [18—35 years]	Eccentric elbow flexor contractions [maximal contractions until exhaustion]	8-min upper-body ergometry 60 rpm for a workload of 400 kg/min (n = 10) [at 0 & 24h]	1. Control group $(n = 10)$ 2. Group microcurrent electrical stimulation $(n = 10)$ 3. Massage group $(n = 10)$	1. Muscle soreness 2. Muscle strength [before, at 24 & 48h]	No significant differences between groups for all assessed measures	Light to moderate concentric exercise is not effective in alleviating DOMS
Zainuddin et al., 2006 (3/10)	10 males & 4 females [24.4(2.4) years]	Eccentric elbow flexor [10 × 6 repetitions maximum contractions]	10×60 continuous elbow flexion (240°/s) and extension (210°/s) contractions [at days 1–4]	1. Contralateral arm	 Creatine kinase Limb girth Muscle soreness Muscle strength Pressure pain threshold Range of motion [before & at days 1–4] 	Positive for muscle soreness and tenderness immediately after light concentric exercise.	Light concentric exercise has a temporary analgesic effect on DOMS, but no recovery from muscle damage

R

1 hour								1 hour									
	Experimenta	d.	Control		Mean Difference	Mean Difference			Exper	imenta	1	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Di	fference
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD	Total M	ean SD T	otal We	ght IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Random, 95% (CI	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	total Me	an SD	Total	Weight 20.6%	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Rando	om, 95% Cl
Chen 2008	3.5 2	10	4.4 3	10 24	4% -0.90 [-3.13, 1.33]			Donnelly 1992	46.3	7.5	9 3	7.5 10.3	9	18.0%	8.80 [0.48, 17,12]		
Dannecker 2002	3.9 2.5	23	4.6 2	27 75	6% -0.70 [-1.97, 0.57]			Saxton 1995	68.5	4.3	8 7	1.7 4.3	8	27.6%	-3.20 [-7.41, 1.01]		-
Total (95% CI)		33		37 100	0% -0 75 [-1 85 0 36]			Zainuddin 2006	49.5	4.9	14 5	4.4 9.8	14	23.8%	-4.90 [-10.64, 0.84]		
Heteregeneity Tau? = 1	0.00: Chil = 0.00	df = 1 /	D = 0.99)-1	2 - 0%	-0.10 [-1.00, 0.00]			Total (95% CI)			41		41	100.0%	0.54 [-4.61, 5.69]	-	
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 1.33 (P = 0.1	18)	(F = 0.88), 1	- 076	F	-2 -1 0 1 avours experimental Favours	2 s control	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	20.35; Ch Z = 0.21 (i ² = 13. P = 0.8	.66, df = : 4)	3 (P = 0.0	03); I ² = 1	78%	Fa	-10 -5 vours experimental	5 10 Favours control
24 hours								24 hours									
									Experi	mental		Control			Mean Difference	Mean Di	fference
	Experiment	al	Control		Mean Difference	Mean Difference		Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	otal Me	an SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Rando	m, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD	Total N	lean SD	Total We	ight IV. Random, 95% (IV. Random, 95%	CI	Chen 2008 Donnelly 1992	73	3.6	10 7	3.3 3.5	10	38.3%	-0.30 [-3.41, 2.81]		,
Chen 2008	6.9 0.3	10	6.7 0.3	10 3	9% 0.20 [-0.06, 0.46]	-		Saxton 1995	76.1	6.5	8 7	1.6 7.6	8	17.9%	4.50 [-2.43, 11.43]		
Donnelly 1992	4.9 1	9	3.9 0.5	9 3	.6% 1.00 [0.27, 1.73]	- - -	-	Weber 1994	66.3	15.2	10 6	7.6 10.7	10	8.2%	-1.30 [-12.82, 10.22]	• •	
Zainuddin 2006	2.1 0.4	14	4.6 0.8	14 33	.5% -2.50 [-2.97, -2.03	-		Zainuddin 2006	50.8	6.2	14 5	0.8 7.4	14	26.0%	0.00 [-5.06, 5.06]		
Total (05% CI)		22		33 10	0% -0.44 [-2.40. 1.51]			Total (95% CI)			51		51	100.0%	1.79 [-1.80, 5.37]	-	
Iotal (95% CI)	0.04. Chil - 44	33	0/0 - 0.00	33 10	-0.44 [-2.40, 1.51]			Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	5.20; Chi ²	= 6.60	, df = 4 (i	P = 0.16);	I ^z = 39%		19.27	-10 -5 (5 10
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.44 (P = 0.	.73, df = .66)	= 2 (P < 0.00	JUU1); I* =	90%	-4 -2 0 Favours experimental Favours	2 4 s control	Test for overall effect.	L = 0.30 (i	= 0.5	57				Fa	vours experimental	Favours control
48 hours						÷		48 hours									
	Experimenta	al	Control		Mean Difference	Mean Difference			Evno	imont		Contro			Maan Difference	Mean Di	Horonco
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD	Total M	ean SD T	Total We	ght IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Random, 95%	CI	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD '	Total M	ean SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Rando	m, 95% CI
Chen 2008	6.1 0.3	10	6.7 0.4	10 34	0% -0.60 [-0.91, -0.29]	-		Chen 2008	81.7	3.3	10 8	31.7 3.3	10	63.1%	0.00 [-2.89, 2.89]	_	-
Donnelly 1992	6.1 1.3	9	4.5 0.3	9 32	2% 1.60 [0.73, 2.47]		-	Donnelly 1992	52.5	7.5	9 5	53.8 13.8	9	5.0%	-1.30 [-11.56, 8.96]	•	
Zainuddin 2006	2.3 0.5	14	5.1 0.5	14 33	9% -2.80 [-3.17, -2.43]			Weber 1994 Weber 1994	71.7	16.2	10 1	4.1 6.5	8	12.0%	-2.40 [-9.02, 4.22]	· · · ·	
		10.00						Zainuddin 2006	55.7	8.6	14 5	55.7 6.2	14	17.1%	0.00 [-5.55, 5.55]		
Total (95% CI)	2 07. Ch2 - 100	33	2 /D < 0.00	33 100	0% -0.64 [-2.65, 1.37]			Total (95% CI)			51		51	100.0%	-0.31 [-2.60, 1.99]	-	
Text for survey of effects 7 = 0.50', GTF = 125.12', GT = 2 (P < 0.00001); P = 98%								Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.56, df = 4 (P = 0.97); i ² = 0%									
rest for overall effect.	2 = 0.02 (F = 0.	55)			F	avours experimental Favours	s control	Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.26	(P = 0.7	79)				Fa	avours experimental	Favours control
72 hours								72 hours									
	Experiment	al	Control		Mean Difference	Mean Difference			Exper	imenta	al	Contro	4		Mean Difference	Mean D	ifference
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD	Total M	ean SD 1	Total We	ght IV, Random, 95% C	I IV. Random. 95%	CI	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD 1	Total M	ean SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Rand	om, 95% Cl
Chen 2008	36 03	10	37 04	10 34	9% -0 10 [-0 41 0 21]	-		Chen 2008	81.5	3.3	10 8	31.5 3.3	10	28.7%	0.00 [-2.89, 2.89]	-	-
Donnelly 1992	32 06	9	43 05	0 32	4% -1 10 [-1.61 -0.59]			Donnelly 1992	60	11.3	9	50 16.3	9	17.9%	10.00 [-2.96, 22.96]	-	
Zainuddin 2006	31 04	14	45 07	14 99	8% -1.40[-1.88_0.03]			Saxton 1995	91.3	6.5	8 7	6.1 1.9	8	27.3%	15.20 [10.51, 19.89]		
Zaniuuun 2000	3.1 0.0	14	4.0 0.7	14 32	070 - 1.40 [- 1.00, -0.92]			Zainuddin 2006	55.7	8.6	14 5	5.7 7.4	14	26.1%	0.00 [-5.94, 5.94]		⊢
Total (95% CI)		33		33 100	.0% -0.85 [-1.71, 0.01]			Tatal (05% CI)						100.00/	E 04 1 0 75 44 671		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.53; Chi ² = 24.3	23, df = 2	2 (P < 0.000	01); l² = 9	2%		+ +	10tdl (95% Cl)	00.07.0	12 - 04	41		41	- 040/	5.54 [-2.15, 14.63]	_	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.93 (P = 0.0	05)			F	-2 -1 0 avours experimental Favours	1 2 s control	Test for overall effect: Z = 1.34 (P = 0.18)							-20 -10 avours experimental	0 10 20 Favours control	
																eren e enportantentar	

Fig. 5. A – Effects of low-intensity exercise on delayed onset muscle soreness at 1, 24, 48 and 72 hours (Visual Analogue Scale). B – Effects of low-intensity exercise on muscle strength at 1, 24, 48 and 72 hours (Percentage of change to baseline). Note: Effect in favour of the control group means less ability to produce muscle strength thus it should be viewed as a positive effect of low-intensity exercise in the experimental group.

Therefore, all of the modalities may be challenged as contributors in the recovery from muscle damage.

Conflict of interest

Δ

None declared.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the Foundation for Science and Technology (Portugal) for the support given (SFRH/BD/36638/2007).

References

- Abad, C. C., Ito, L. T., Barroso, R., Ugrinowitsch, C., & Tricoli, V. (2010). Effect of classical massage on subjective perceived soreness, edema, range of motion and maximal strength after delayed onset muscle soreness. *Brazilian Journal of Sports Science*, 16(1).
- Armstrong, R. B. (1984). Mechanisms of exercise-induce delayed onset muscular soreness: a brief review. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 16, 529–538.
- Ascensão, A., Leite, M., Rebelo, A. N., Magalhães, S., & Magalhães, J. (2011). Effects of cold water immersion on the recovery of physical performance and muscle damage following a one-off soccer match. *Journal of Sports Science*, 29(3), 217–225.
- Bailey, D. M., Erith, S. J., Griffin, P. J., Brewer, D. S., Gant, N., & Williams, C. (2007). Influence of cold-water immersion on indices of muscle damage following prolonged intermittent shuttle running. *Journal of Sports Science*, 25(11), 1163–1170.
- Burguess, T. L., & Lamber, M. I. (2010). The efficacy of cryotherapy on recovery following exercise-induced muscle damage. *International Sportmed Journal*, 11(2), 258–277.
- Buroker, K. C., & Schwane, J. A. (1989). Does post exercises static stretching alleviates delayed muscle soreness? The Physician and Sportsmedicine, 17(6), 65–83.

- Byrne, C., Twist, C., & Eston, R. (2004). Neuromuscular function after exerciseinduced muscle damage: theorical and applied implications. Sports Medicine, 34(1), 49–69.
- Chen, T., Nosaka, K., & Wu, C. (2008). Effects of a 30-min running performed daily after downhill running on recovery of muscle function and running economy. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 11, 271–279.
- Cheung, K., Hume, P. A., & Maxwell, L. (2003). Delayed onset muscle soreness: Treatment strategies and performance factors. *Sports Medicine*, 33(2), 145–164.
- Clarkson, P. M., Nosaka, K., & Braun, B. (1992). Muscle function after exercise-induce muscle damage and rapid adaptation. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 24, 512–520.
- Clarkson, P. M., & Sayers, S. P. (1999). Etiology of exercise-induce muscle damage. Canadian Journal of Applied Physiology, 24, 234–248.
- Dannecker, E. A., Koltyn, K. F., Riley, J. L., & Robinson, M. E. (2002). The Influence of endurance exercise on delayed onset muscle soreness. *Journal of Sports Medicine* and Physical Fitness, 42, 458–465.
- Deschenes, M. R. E. B. R., Bush, J. A., McCoy, R. W., Volek, J. S., & Kraemer, W. J. (2000). Neuromuscular disturbance outlasts other symptoms of exerciseinduce muscle damage. *Journal of Neurological Sciences*, 174, 92–99.
- DeVries, H. A. (1966). Quantitative electromyographic investigation of the spasm theory of muscle pain. American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 45, 119–134.
- Donnelly, A. E., Clarkson, P., & Maughan, R. J. (1992). Exercise-induced muscle damage: effects of light exercise on damaged muscle. *European Journal of Applied Physiology and Occupational Physiology*, 64(4), 350–353.
- Ernst, E. (1998). Does post-exercise massage treatment reduce delayed onset muscle soreness? A systematic review. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 32, 212–214.
- Eston, R., & Peters, D. (1999). Effects of cold water immersion on the symptoms of exercise-induced muscle damage. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 17, 231–238.
- Farr, T., Nottle, C., Nosaka, K., & Sacco, P. (2002). The effects of therapeutic massage on delayed onset muscle soreness and muscle function following downhill walking. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 5(4), 297–306.
- Gleeson, M., Blannin, A. K., Walsh, N. P., Field, C. N., & Pritchard, J. C. (1998). Effect of exercise-induced muscle damage on the blood lactate response to incremental exercise in humans. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 77, 292–295.

- Goodall, S., & Howatson, G. (2008). The effects of multiple cold water immersions on indices of muscle damage. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 7, 235–241.
- Gulick, D. T., Kimura, I. F., Sitler, M., Paolone, A., & Kelly, J. D. (1996). Various treatment techniques on signs and symptoms of delayed onset muscle soreness. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 31(2), 145–152.
- Hasson, S., Barnes, W., Hunter, M., & Williams, J. (1989). Therapeutic effect of high speed voluntary muscle contractions on muscle soreness and muscle performance. *The Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy*, 10(12), 499–507.
- Herbert, R. D., & Gabriel, M. (2002). Effects of stretching before and after exercising on muscle soreness and risk of injury: systematic review. *British Medical Journal*, 325, 1–5.
- Herbert, R. D., & Noronha, M. (2007). Stretching to prevent or reduce muscle soreness after exercise (review). Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 17(4), CD004577.
- Higgins, J. P. T., Thompson, S. G., Deeks, J. J., & Altman, D. G. (2003). Measuring inconsisty in meta-analyses. *British Medical Journal*, 327, 557–560.
- High, D. M., Howley, E. T., & Franks, B. D. (1989). The effects of static stretching and warm-up on prevention of delayed onset muscle soreness. *Research Quarterly* for Exercise & Sports, 60, 357–361.
- Hilbert, J. E., Sforzo, G. A., & Swensen, T. (2003). The effects of massage on delayed onset muscle soreness. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 37, 72–75.
- Hough, T. (1902). Ergographic studies in muscular soreness. American Journal of Physiology, 7, 76–92.
- Howatson, G., Gaze, D., & Van-Someren, k. A. (2005). The efficacy of ice massage in the treatment of exercise-induced muscle damage. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 15(6), 415–422.
- Howatson, G., Goodall, S., & Someren, K. A. (2009). The influence of cold water immersions on adaptation following a single bout of damaging exercise. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 105, 615–621.
- Howatson, G., & Someren, K. A. (2008). The prevention and treatment of exerciseinduced muscle damage. Sports Medicine, 38(6), 483–503.
- Jakeman, J. R., Macrae, R., & Eston, R. (2009). A single 10-min bout of cold-water immersion therapy after strenuous plyometric exercise has no beneficial effect on recovery from the symptoms of exercise-induced muscle damage. *Ergonomics*, 52(4), 456–460.
- Jamurtas, A. Z., Theocharis, V., Tofas, T., Tsiokanos, A., Yfanti, C., Paschalis, V., et al. (2005). Comparison between leg and arm eccentric exercises of the relative intensity on indices of muscle damage. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 95, 179–185.
- Johansson, P. H., Lindstrom, L., Sundelin, G., & Lindstrom, B. (1999). The effects of preexercise stretching on muscular soreness, tenderness and force loss heavy eccentric exercise. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 9, 219–225.
- Lavender, A., & Nosaka, K. (2006). Changes in fluctuaction of isometric force following eccentric and concentric exercise of the elbow flexors. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 96, 235–240.
- Lightfoot, T., Char, D., McDermott, J., & Goya, C. (1997). Immediate postexercise massage does not attenuate delayed onset muscle soreness. *Journal of Strength* & Conditioning Research, 11(2), 119–124.
- Lund, H., Vestergaard-Poulsen, P., Kanstrup, I. L., & Sejrsen, P. (1998). The effect of passive stretching on delayed onset muscle soreness and other detrimental effects following eccentric exercise. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 8, 216–221.
- Maher, C. G., Sherrington, C., Herbert, R. D., Moseley, A. M., & Elkins, M. (2003). Reliability of the PEDro scale for rating quality of randomized controlled trials. *Physical Therapy*, 83, 713–721.
- Mancinelli, C. A., Davis, D. S., Aboulhosn, L., Eisenhofer, J., & Foutty, S. (2006). The effects of massage on delayed onset muscle soreness and physical performance in female collegiate athletes. *Physical Therapy in Sport*, 7, 5–13.

- McGlynn, G. H., Laughlin, N. T., & Rowe, B. S. (1979). Effect of electromyographic feedback and static stretching on artificially induced muscle soreness. *American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 58, 139–148.
- Morton, N. (2009). The PEDro Scale is a valid measure of the methodological quality of clinical trials: a demographic study. *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy*, 55, 129–133.
- O'Connor, R., & Hurley, D. A. (2003). The effectiveness of physiotherapeutic interventions in the management of delayed onset muscle soreness: a systematic review. *Physical Therapy Reviews*, 8, 177–195.
- Paddon-Jones, D. J., & Quiley, B. M. (1997). Effect of cryotherapy on muscle soreness and strength following eccentric exercise. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 18, 558–593.
- Saxton, J. M., & Donnelly, A. E. (1995). Light concentric exercise during recovery from exercise-induced muscle damage. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 16, 347–351.
- Sellwood, K. L., Brukner, P., Williams, D., Nicol, A., & Hinman, R. (2007). Ice-water immersion and delayed-onset muscle soreness: a randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 41(6), 392–997.
- Skurvydas, A., Kamandulis, S., Stanislovaitis, A., Streckis, V., Mamkus, G., & Drazdauskas, A. (2008). Leg immersion in warm water, stretch-shortening exercise, and exercise-induced muscle damage. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 43(6), 592–599.
- Skurvydas, A., Sipaviciene, S., Krutulyte, G., Gailiuniene, A., Stasiulis, A., Mamkus, G., et al. (2006). Cooling leg muscles affects dynamics of indirect indicators of skeletal muscle damage. *Journal of Back and Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation*, 19, 141–151.
- Smith, L., Keating, M., Holbert, D., Spratt, D., McCammon, M., & Smith, S. (1994). The effects of athletic massage on delayed onset of muscle soreness, creatine kinase, and neutrophil count: a preliminary report. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy*, 19(2), 93–99.
- Torres, R., Appell, H. J., & Duarte, J. A. (2007). Acute effects of stretching on muscle stiffness after a bout of exhaustive eccentric exercise. *International Journal of* Sports Medicine, 28(7), 590–594.
- Torres, R., Carvalho, P., & Duarte, J. A. (2005). Effects of a static stretching program on clinical and biochemical markers of muscle damage induced by eccentric exercise. *Portuguese Journal of Sports Science*, 5, 274–287.
- Verhagen, A. P., de Vet, H. C., de Bie, R. A., Kessels, A. G., et al. (1998). The Delphi list: a criteria list for quality assessment of randomized clinical trials for conducting systematic reviews developed by Delphi consensus. *Journal of Clinical Epide*miology, 51(12), 1235–1241.
- Weber, M. D., Servedio, F. J., & Woodall, W. R. (1994). The effects of three modalities on delayed onset muscle soreness. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*, 20(5), 236–242.
- Weerakkody, N. S., Whitehead, N. P., Canny, B. J., Gregory, J. E., & Proske, U. (2001). Large-fibber mechanoreceptors contribute to muscle soreness after eccentric exercise. *Journal of Pain*, 2, 209–219.
- Wessel, J., & Wan, A. (1994). Effect of stretching on the intensity of delayed-onset muscle soreness. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine*, 4, 83–87.
- Wilcock, I. M., Cronin, J. B., & Hing, W. A. (2006). Physiological response to water imersion: a method for sport recovery? Sports Medicine, 36(9), 747–765.
- Willems, M., Hale, T., & Wilkinson, C. S. (2009). Effects of manual massage on muscle-specific soreness and single leg jump performance after downhill treadmill walking. *Sports Medicine*, 13(2), 61–66.
- Zainuddin, Z., Newton, M., Sacco, P., & Nosaka, K. (2005). Effects of massage on delayed-onset muscle soreness, swelling, and recovery of muscle function. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 40(3), 174–180.
- Zainuddin, Z., Sacco, P., Newton, M., & Nosaka, K. (2006). Light concentric exercise has a temporarily analgesic effect on delayed-onset muscle soreness, but no effect on recovery from eccentric exercise. *Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism, 31*, 126–134.