eTable 1. Studies showing a relationship between athlete body composition and performance in sport. Studies are sorted 1) by the most prevalent sport category by taxonomy (49); and 2) by year of publication. Values are mean (SD) if not otherwise stated. See search term combination, inclusion- and exclusion criteria in supplementary material.

| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Endurance sport | Effect of heavy strength training on thigh muscle cross-sectional area, performance determinants, and performance in well-trained cyclists (61). 2009 | Investigate the effect of heavy resistance training on BC and performance in cyclists. <br> Endurance + RT versus endurance only | Cycling, Highly trained. T3. <br> Male $(\mathrm{n}=18) \&$ female ( $\mathrm{n}=2$ ) <br> Interventional | 28.5y (2) | MRI <br> S.P.: <br> Diet, physical activity, technical details on positioning | Not described | Not described | Endurance + RT increased strength and CSA in thigh muscle by $4.6 \%$ (0.5), without change in BM, and increased PO in Wingate 30s by $9.4 \%$ (2.9). |
|  | Skin-fold thickness and training volume in ultratriathletes (51). 2009 | Investigate which of anthropometry or training was of more importance for a successful finish in a Triple Iron triathlon | Triathlon, recreational. T2. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=29$ ) <br> Prospective, observation | 42.1 y (8.1) | Skinfold ${ }^{4}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Not described | $\begin{gathered} 81.8 \mathrm{~mm}(23) \\ 15.3 \%(3.2) \end{gathered}$ | Not described | $33 \%$ of total race time was explained by SSK (positively associated), with no effect from weekly training volume. SSK was not associated with swim- or cycle time; only run time. |
|  | In-season strength maintenance training increases well- | Investigate the effect of strength maintenance training on CSA, strength, and performance. | Cycling, Highly trained. T3. <br> Male | 30y (3) | MRI <br> S.P.: <br> Diet, physical activity, | Not described | Not described | Increased strength (23\% (3)) and CSA (4.4\% (0.6)) were maintained, |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | trained cyclists' performance (60). 2010 | Endurance + RT versus endurance only | $\begin{gathered} (\mathrm{n}=12) \& \text { female } \\ (\mathrm{n}=1) \\ \text { Interventional } \end{gathered}$ |  | technical details on positioning |  |  | without change in BM, and with improvement in 40-min PPO (6\% (2)), and $\mathrm{W}_{\text {max }}$ ( $8 \%$ (1)) during competition period. |
|  | Differential correlations between anthropometry, training volume, and performance in male and female Ironman triathletes (52). 2010 | Identify predictors of triathlon performance in nonprofessional athletes | Triathlon, Recreational T2. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=27$ ) \& female ( $\mathrm{n}=16$ ) <br> Prospective observation | $\begin{gathered} 30.3 y \\ \text { (male) \& } \\ 36.5 y \\ \text { (female) } \end{gathered}$ | Skinfold ${ }^{3}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Time of day, intratester reliability. | $70,6 \mathrm{~mm}$ (male) \& 87 mm (female) $13.7 \%$ (male) $\& 23,6 \%$ (female) $^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.0 \mathrm{~kg}(4.7) \\ (\text { male }) \& \\ 28.0 \mathrm{~kg}(2.4) \\ (\text { female })^{2} \end{gathered}$ | $47 \%$ of race time in females was explained by average weekly training volume (negatively associated). 55\% of males' race time was explained by BF (\%) (positively associated). |
|  | Personal best marathon time and longest training run, not anthropometry, predict performance in recreational 24hour ultrarunners (53). 2011 | Identify predictors of ultramarathon race time performance | Ultrarunning, Recreational. T2. $\begin{gathered} \text { Male } \\ (\mathrm{n}=63) \end{gathered}$ <br> Prospective observation | 46.9y (10.3) | Skinfold ${ }^{5}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Inter- and intratester reliability | $\begin{gathered} 89.9 \mathrm{~mm} \\ (31.1) \\ 16.1 \%(4.1)^{3} \end{gathered}$ | Not described | Previous race performance and longest training session (both negatively associated), rather than anthropometric characteristics, were significant predictors of race success (total model explained |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $47 \%$ of variance in race time). |
|  | Personal best time, not anthropometry or training volume, is associated with total race time in a triple iron triathlon (58). 2011 | Identify predictors for race time in triple triathlon finishers, comparing to nonfinishers | Triathlon, Recreational. T2. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Male } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=81) \end{aligned}$ <br> Prospective observation | $\begin{gathered} 39.0 \mathrm{y}(35.3- \\ 46.3)^{\$} \end{gathered}$ | Skinfold ${ }^{4}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Inter- and intratester reliability | 72.3 mm (finishers) versus 80.8 mm (non- finishers) $13.7 \%$ (finishers) versus $15.1 \%$ (non- finishers) | 40.3 kg <br> (finishers) versus 41.1 kg (nonfinishers) | $\begin{gathered} \text { BF (\%) and SSK } \\ \text { were positively } \\ \text { associated with } \\ \text { run-time and total } \\ \text { race time in } \\ \text { finishers. In the } \\ \text { model explaining } \\ 87 \% \text { of total race } \\ \text { time, only } \\ \text { previous personal } \\ \text { best time was } \\ \text { significant } \\ \text { (positively } \\ \text { associated). } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Similarities and differences in anthropometry and training between recreational male $100-\mathrm{km}$ ultramarathoners and marathoners (54). 2012 | Investigate whether 100-km ultramarathoners \& marathoners were similar in anthropometry and training | Running, recreational. T2. <br> Male (ultramarathoners, $\mathrm{n}=166$ \& marathoners, $\mathrm{n}=126$ ) <br> Prospective observation | Ultramarathoners 45.8 (9.5) \& marathoners 42.8 (10.8) | Skinfold ${ }^{3}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Inter- and intratester reliability Not ISAK. | $\begin{gathered} 86.6 \mathrm{~mm} \\ (32.4)^{4} \text { (ultra- } \\ \text { marathoners) } \\ \text { versus } \\ 87.4 \mathrm{~mm} \\ (27.2)^{4} \\ \text { (marathoners) } \\ \\ 16.2 \%(4.3)^{3} \\ \text { versus } 16.2 \% \\ (3.7)^{3} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.9 \mathrm{~kg}(3.9) \\ (\text { ultra- } \\ \text { marathoners) } \\ \text { versus } 38.1 \mathrm{~kg} \\ (3.9) \\ \text { (marathoners) } \end{gathered}$ | No difference in anthropometry between groups. BM, BF (\%), age (all positively associated) \& weekly running km (negatively associated) predicted race time by $40 \%$ in ultramarathoners. BF (\%) (positively associated) and speed of running in training (negatively |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | associated) predicted race time by $44 \%$ in marathoners. |
|  | A Comparison of anthropometric and training characteristics among recreational male ironman triathletes and ultra-endurance cyclists (73). 2012 | Investigate if race performance was related to anthropometric characteristics, training characteristics or both. | Triathlon \& Ultraendurance cycling, Recreational level. <br> T2. <br> Male triathletes ( $\mathrm{n}=83$ ) \& Male ultracyclists ( $\mathrm{n}=84$ ) <br> Prospective observation | Triathletes 41.5y (8.9) \& ultracyclists 43.8y (7.5) | Skinfold ${ }^{3}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Intra-tester reliability | $\begin{gathered} 15.7 \%(4.6) \\ \text { (triathletes) \& } \\ 15.7 \%(4.3) \\ \text { (ultra- } \\ \text { cyclists) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.6 \mathrm{~kg}(4.2) \\ & \text { (triathletes) \& } \\ & 40.3 \mathrm{~kg}(3.5) \\ & \text { (ultra- } \\ & \text { cyclists) } \end{aligned}$ | $46 \%$ of variance in race time in triathletes was explained by indices of FM (positively associated), while <br> $44 \%$ of variance in split cycling time was explained by inducers of FM (positively correlated) and cycling speed in training (negatively associated). In cyclists $29 \%$ of variance in race time was explained in a model with only BF (\%) significant. |
|  | Effect of heavy strength training on muscle thickness, | Investigate the effect of supplemental heavy strength training on muscle thickness and | Nordic Combined, well-trained. T3. | 19.5y (2.5) | Ultrasound S.P.: | Not described | Not described | Strength training increased muscle mass by $7.4 \%$ (2.7), with no |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { Sport } \\ \text { taxonomy } \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age |  <br> standardisation | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | strength, jump performance, and endurance performance in well-trained Nordic Combined athletes (62). 2012 | determinants of performance in welltrained Nordic Combined athletes. <br> Endurance + strength versus endurance only | Male ( $\mathrm{n}=17$ ) <br> Interventional |  | Time of day, rested. |  |  | change in BM. Upper- and lower body 1RM increased by $12 \%$ (2.0) and 23.0\% (5.0), respectively. Vertical jump height increased by $8.8 \%$ (1.7). No change in $\mathrm{VO}_{2 \text { max }}$ or TT in neither group. |
|  | Comparison of training and anthropometric characteristic between recreational male halfmarathoners and marathoners (56). 2013 | Investigate relationship between anthropometrics and race time in halfmarathoners and marathoners, respectively | Running, Recreational. T2. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=147$ halfmarathoners and 126 marathoners) <br> Prospective observation | 41.5y (10.5) | Skinfold ${ }^{4}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Inter- and intratester reliability | 99.9mm (35.6) (half- marathon) versus 88.3 mm (26.2) (marathon) $17.5 \%$ (4.6) (half- marathon) versus $16.3 \%$ (3.6) (marathon) | $\begin{aligned} & 39.1 \mathrm{~kg}(3.1) \\ & \text { (half- } \\ & \text { marathon) } \\ & \text { versus } 38.3 \mathrm{~kg} \\ & \text { (3.3) } \\ & \text { (marathon) } \end{aligned}$ | Marathoners had lower BF than half-marathoners. BF (\%) (positively associated) and running speed during training (negatively associated) predicted race time by 43-45\% in both groups. |
|  | Characteristics, changes, and influence of BC during a 4486 km transcontinental ultramarathon: | Investigate changes in BC measured by MRI and effect on performance | Ultramarathon, Recreational. T2. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=22$ ) | 49.1y (11.5) | MRI S.P.: Time of day, technical equipment standardisation | 13.36 litre | 37.32 litre | Baseline levels of VAT were negatively correlated with training volume and intensity over the year prior to |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | results from the TransEurope FootRace mobile wholebody MRIproject (74). 2013 |  | Prospective observation |  |  |  |  | the race. Change in VAT during race was the most sensible parameter to distinguish finishers from non-finishers. |
|  | Strength <br> training <br> improves <br> cycling <br> performance, <br> fractional utilization of VO2max and cycling economy in female cyclists (63). 2016 | Investigate the effect of adding RT to cyclists' normal endurance training on cycling performance. <br> Endurance + RT versus endurance only | Cycling, well trained. <br> T2. <br> Female ( $\mathrm{n}=19$ ) <br> Interventional | 33.2 y (7.8) | MRI <br> S.P.: <br> Diet, physical activity, technical MRI procedure | Not described | Not described | $\begin{gathered} \text { RT increase } 1 \mathrm{RM} \\ \text { in leg press } \\ (38.6 \pm 19.0 \%) \\ \text { and thigh-muscle } \\ \text { CSA ( } 7.4 \pm 5.3 \% \text { ) } \\ \text { (BM did not } \\ \text { change) and leads } \\ \text { to improvements } \\ \text { in cycling } \\ \text { performance } \\ \text { (6.4 } \pm 7.9 \% \text { in } \\ \text { MPO during } 40 \\ \text { min all-out-test) } \\ \text { and cycling } \\ \text { economy } \\ (.3 .5 \pm 3.1 \% \\ \text { decrease in } \mathrm{VO} \\ \text { at a PO of } \\ 150 \mathrm{~W}) . \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Heavy strength training improves running and cycling performance following | Investigate the effects of adding RT to female duathletes' normal endurance training on both cycling and running performance. | Duathlon, well trained. T2. <br> Female ( $\mathrm{n}=19$ ) | Not given | DXA <br> S.P.: <br> Diet, physical activity. | Not described | Not described | RT increased leg lean mass (3.1 $\pm$ $4.0 \%$ ) and 1 RM half-squat ( $45 \pm$ $22 \%$ ), and improved 5 min all-out |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | Baseline BF <br> (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | prolonged submaximal work in welltrained female athletes (64). 2017 | Endurance + RT versus endurance only | Interventional |  |  |  |  | performance immediately after prolonged submaximal work in both running distance $(4.7 \pm$ $6.0 \%)$ and MPO in cycling ( $7.0 \pm$ $4.5 \%$ ) |
|  | Effect of two different intensity distribution training programmes on aerobic and BC variables in ultra-endurance runners (75). 2019 | Investigate the effects of two different intensity distribution training programs on aerobic performance, strength and BC in ultraendurance runners. <br> Polarized (POL) versus Threshold (THR) | Ultra-endurance running. T2. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=20$ ) <br> Interventional | 38.7 (9.5) | DXA <br> S.P.: <br> Calibration of machine | POL: $18.4 \%$ (6.0) \& THR: 14.9\% (5.3) | POL: 56.6 kg (6.8) \& THR: 60.6 kg (7.2) | THR reduced FM (-2.3kg) \& BM (1.6 kg ), hence BF (\%) (-18.8\%). POL reduced FM (-1.6kg), hence BF (\%) (-11.2\%). POL increased TTE ( $+2.4 \%$ ) and RE at $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}(-$ $5.4 \%$ ) and $12 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}(-4.5 \%)$. Overall, no differences between groups. |
|  | Anthropometric, physiological, and performance developments in cross-country skiers (57). 2021 | Investigate whether changes in competitive performance (FISpoints) could be predicted by changes in laboratory-assessed qualities (incl. anthropometry) and training volumes | Cross Country skiing. <br> Highly trained. T3. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=16$ ) \& female ( $\mathrm{n}=14$ ) <br> Longitudinal, prospective | 20.5y (2.0) | DXA <br> S.P.: <br> Time of day, fasting. | Not described <br> (Male: 9.7 kg (1.5) <br> \& Female: <br> 13.2 kg (3.3) | Male: 63.0 kg <br> (5.8) <br> \& Female: <br> 47.1 kg (2.9) | FIS distance points were predicted by BM, FM, LBM, $\mathrm{VO}_{2 \text { peak }}$ and speed in females, but no prediction of sprint points was significant. None of the |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | performance indicators could be predicted in males. <br> Improvement in BC and aerobic capacity seems more beneficial for females than males. |
|  | Fitness testing and career progression in AFL football (71). 2005 | Investigate relationships between anthropometric \& fitness tests, and subsequent career progression <br> Drafted players versus not-drafted. | Australian Football, Talented players. T2. <br> Male <br> ( $\mathrm{n}=205$ drafted; 78 not-drafted) <br> Longitudinal, prospective cohort | 18y | Skinfold ${ }^{3}$ <br> S.P.: <br> ISAK level I <br> trained. | 56mm (13.0) | Not described | Fitness tests (20 min sprint time, running vertical jump, and agilityand shuttle run test), rather than anthropometry (not included in model), predict success of football career. |
|  | Relationship between BC, leg strength, anaerobic power, and onice skating performance in division I men's hockey athletes (76). 2010 | Investigate relationships between the off-ice laboratory testing of BC and leg strength and power, and on-ice skating speed. | Ice hockey, trained. <br> T2. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=21$ ) <br> Prospective <br> observation | 20.7y (1.6) | ADP <br> S.P.: <br> Diet, clothing, procedure according to manufacturer's instruction. | $\begin{gathered} 11.9 \%(4.6) \\ (10.8 \mathrm{~kg} ; 4.7) \end{gathered}$ | 78.1 kg (6.6) | $19 \%$ of variance in fastest skating speed of short distances ( 54 m ) were explained by \%fatigue (positively <br> associated) from Wingate test. Variance in average skating speed of short and longer |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation | Baseline BF <br> (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | distances (54-89 <br> m) were explained by BF <br> (\%) by $25 \%-29 \%$ (positively associated). |
|  | Development of dribbling in talented youth soccer players aged 12-19 years: a longitudinal study (59). 2010 | Identify predictors of dribbling and sprinting performance | Soccer, Talented youth players. T2. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=267$ ) <br> Longitudinal, prospective cohort | 12-19y | BIA <br> S.P.: <br> Not reported | 7.43-9.59\% | $\begin{gathered} 35.1 \mathrm{~kg}(5.9)- \\ 66.4 \mathrm{~kg}(5.6) \end{gathered}$ | LBM ( $\times 0.01$ ) had a small effect on shuttle dribbling time; but age $(\times 0.10)$ and training hours ( $\times 0.02$ ) had stronger impact (all negatively associated) |
|  | Increases in intracellular water explain strength and power improvement over a season (77). 2014 | Investigate effect of changes in BC over a season on performance (leg strength and jump performance) | Team ball sports, Top national level. T3. <br> Male <br> $(\mathrm{n}=40) \&$ female ( $\mathrm{n}=23$ ) <br> Longitudinal, prospective cohort | 20.0y (5.2) | DXA <br> (and deuterium and bromide dilution) <br> S.P.: <br> Hydration status | $\begin{gathered} 15,6 \% \text { (4.0) } \\ \text { (male) \& } \\ 25,9 \% \text { (4.9) } \\ \text { (female) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69.8 \mathrm{~kg}(8.3) \\ \text { (male) \& } \\ 47.4 \mathrm{~kg}(6.5) \\ \text { (female) } \end{gathered}$ | Performance, FFM, TBW and ECW significantly increased, and \%FM decreased. ICW was unchanged and was identified as the only predictor of performance (positively associated). |
|  | The relationship between physical characteristic and match | Investigate whether anthropometric and physical abilities explained variance in match collision | Rugby, Elite union. T4. <br> Female | 25.0 y (4.0) | Skinfold ${ }^{4}$ S.P.: | Not described | Not described | Physical characteristics explain $\sim 19 \%$ $54 \%$ of the |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | Baseline BF <br> (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | collision performance among elite international female rugby union players (78). 2022 | performance among rugby union players | $(\mathrm{n}=51)$ <br> Longitudinal, prospective cohort |  | Time of day, fasted, ISAK level III trained. |  |  | variance in performance. High BM and BF $(\%)$ had positive influence by coefficients of $0.09-0.16$, while power and strength coefficients were $0.08-0.25$. |
| H000000000000 | Preparation of former heavyweight oarsmen to compete as lightweight rowers over 16 weeks: three case studies (66). 2006 | Evaluate health and performance effects of BM-reduction in 3 lean athletes switching to lightweight category | Rowing, National level. T3. <br> Male <br> ( $\mathrm{n}=3$ ) <br> Interventional | 18-23y | Skinfold ${ }^{4}$ <br> S.P.: <br> ISAK level III trained, intratester reliability. | $\begin{gathered} 39.7-81.3 \mathrm{~mm} \\ \sim 5.0-9.0 \mathrm{~kg}^{£} \end{gathered}$ | $\sim 37.0-39.5 \mathrm{~kg}^{£}$ | While small loss of BM $(2 \mathrm{~kg})$ was accommodated without loss of performance, athlete with largest loss of BM $(8 \mathrm{~kg},-$ $0.84 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{wk}))$ showed absolute performance decrement $(+6 \mathrm{sec}$ 2000 m row $).$ |
|  | Combination of gradual and rapid weight loss: effects on physical performance and psychological state of elite | Investigate the effects of a gradual and rapid BM loss on the physical performance and psychological state of elite judo athletes. <br> Weight loss versus control | Judo, national/international level. T3/T4. Male ( $\mathrm{n}=10$ ) \& Female ( $\mathrm{n}=10$ ) Interventional | 17.0y (1.0) | Skinfold ${ }^{1}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Not described | $\begin{gathered} 11.8 \% \text { (2.8) } \\ \text { (male-weight } \\ \text { loss) \& } 22.5 \% \\ \text { (7.5) (female- } \\ \text { weight loss) } \\ \text { versus } \\ 13.7 \% \text { (5.4) } \\ \text { (male-control) } \\ \text { \& } \end{gathered}$ | Not described | Weight-loss group lost $3.9 \%$ <br> BM and $10 \%$ BF <br> (\%) in 4 weeks, both significantly <br> more than control. <br> Weight-loss impaired longduration |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {D }}$ | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | judo athletes (69). $2009$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 23.6 \%(6.6) \\ \text { (female- } \\ \text { control) } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { performance (>30 } \\ & \text { sec) by } 4.5 \% \text {, } \\ & \text { while tension and } \\ & \text { confusion } \\ & \text { increased, and } \\ & \text { vigour decreased. } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Long-term effect of weight loss on BC and performance in elite athletes (67). 2011 | Investigate effect of rate of BM- reduction on long-term changes in BC and performance. <br> Slow-rate (-0.7\% of BM/wk) versus fast-rate (-1.4\% of BM/wk). | Mixed sports, Elite level. T4. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=9$ ) \& female ( $\mathrm{n}=14$ ) <br> Interventional | 22.5y (3.7) | DXA <br> S.P: <br> Fasting, time of day, calibration, intratester reliability. | $\begin{gathered} 16.5 \%(6.7) \\ \text { (male) \& } \\ 29.0 \%(6.0) \\ \text { (female) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63.9 \mathrm{~kg}(8.9) \\ \text { (male) \& } \\ 45.6 \mathrm{~kg}(4.5) \\ \text { (female) } \end{gathered}$ | Similar total loss of BM (-5.8\% of BM) in both groups. Slow-rate BM-loss resulted in higher loss of FM ( $31 \%$ versus $23 \%$ ) and a slight increase in LBM ( $+2.0 \%$ ) compared to no change in LBM in fast-rate BMloss. No difference between groups at 12 month follow up (both regained BM). Overall: LBM and performance well preserved during BMreduction. |
|  | The Psychological and Physiological | Investigate the effects of LEA on health and performance indices associated with the | Taekwondo, highly trained. T4. | 19y | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DXA } \\ & \text { S.P.: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.7 \% \\ (11.4 \mathrm{~kg}) \end{gathered}$ | 54.5 kg | 8-week BW loss resulted in -9.8 kg BM and -4.9 kg FM. Only last |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, $\&$ standardisation | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Consequences of Low Energy Availability in a Male Combat Sport Athlete (68). 2021 | MAT and RED-S models. | $\text { Male }(\mathrm{n}=1)$ <br> Interventional |  | Following published best practice protocol (79). |  |  | week with large energy deficit resulted in health markers impairment. <br> Performance was preserved, athlete won BUC. |
|  | Longitudinal development of young talented speed skaters: physiological and anthropometric aspects (72). 1985 | Identify the performancedetermining factors for a successful speed skating career. <br> Successful skaters compared to unsuccessful skaters. | Speed skating, national junior level. T2/T3. <br> Female <br> ( $\mathrm{n}=12$ ) <br> \& male <br> ( $\mathrm{n}=12$ ) <br> Longitudinal prospective cohort | 16-17y | Skinfold ${ }^{1}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Not reported | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Female: } \\ 20.4 \%(3.6) \\ \text { (successful) } \\ \text { versus } 22.0 \% \\ \text { (1.5) } \\ \text { (unsuccessful) } \\ \text { Male: } \\ 10.1 \%(1.0) \\ \text { (successful) } \\ \text { versus } 9.9 \% \\ \text { (1.4) } \\ \text { (unsuccessful) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Female: } \\ 48.7 \mathrm{~kg}(2.6) \\ \text { (successful) } \\ \text { versus } 45.2 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \text { (4.9) } \\ \text { (unsuccessful) } \\ \text { Male: } \\ 70.1 \mathrm{~kg}(5.6) \\ \text { (successful) } \\ \text { versus } 66.2 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \text { (6.5) } \\ \text { (unsuccessful) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | BC did not differ between successful or unsuccessful skaters. Success was characterised by high PO. |
|  | BC and power performance improved after weight reduction in male athletes without hampering hormonal balance (70). 2015 | Investigate the effects of 4-week BW reduction with high protein and reduced carbohydrate intake on BC, performance, hormones, and acid-base balance. | Track and field jump and sprint. T3/T4. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=15$ ) <br> High energy restriction (-750 $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{d})$ versus low energy restriction ($350 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{d}$ ) <br> Interventional | 20-35y | DXA <br> S.P.: <br> Not reported | High energy restr: $8.5 \%$ (2.3) \& low energy restr: 10.6\% (4.5) | High energy restr: 64.4 kg (5.6) \& low energy restr: 67.9 kg (4.2) | Only high energy restriction achieved BM ($2.2 \pm 1.0 \mathrm{~kg}$ ) and FM reduction ($1.7 \pm 1.6 \mathrm{~kg}$ ), and performance improvement in countermovement jump $(+2.6 \pm 2.5$ cm ) and in 20 m sprint $(+0.04 \pm$ 0.04 sec ), but no |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | difference between groups. No changes in hormones. <br> While BF (\%) correlated negatively with jump performance, persons with baseline BF <br> $<10 \%$ were more likely to lose <br> FFM and to have less improvement in performance. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Middle distance / Power } \\ & \text { sport } \end{aligned}$ | Anthropometric and metabolic determinants of 6,000-m rowing ergometer performance in international competitive rowers (80). 2009 | Investigate the anthropometric and metabolic determinants of performance of $6,000 \mathrm{~m}$ rowing | Rowing, Elite. T4. <br> Male ( $\mathrm{n}=25$ ) <br> Prospective observation | 22.2 y (4.8) | Skinfold ${ }^{5}$ <br> S.P.: <br> Following ISAK protocol. | 13.2\% (2.3) | 79.6 kg (4.4) | PO at VT and forced vital capacity were best at predicting performance (by $77 \%$ ) in 6000 m rowing. LBM (r $=-0.77$ ) and PO at VT $(\mathrm{r}=-0.74)$ werethe strongest single correlate of performance. |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { Sport } \\ \text { taxonomy } \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Case Study: BC <br> Periodization in an Olympic- <br> Level <br> Female Middle- <br> Distance <br> Runner Over a <br> 9-Year Career <br> (11). <br> 2018 | Describe results from a science-based approach for BC periodization throughout a 9-year international career. | Middle distance running. Elite level. T5. <br> Female ( $\mathrm{n}=1$ ) <br> Longitudinal observation. | 27-35y | Skinfold ${ }^{4}$ <br> S.P.: <br> ISAK level I <br> trained, intratester reliability. | $\begin{gathered} 61.6 \mathrm{~mm}(9.7) \\ 12.9 \%(1.4) \\ 6.2 \mathrm{~kg}(0.8) \end{gathered}$ | 42.1 kg (0.7) | SSK and BF (\%) varied by $13.0 \%$ and $17.8 \%$,and MM by $0.9 \%$, between noncompetition and competition phases, SSK decreased by years, and the variation correlated positively with race time. |


| Sport taxonomy (50) | Study \& year | Aim | Population, Sex \& Design | Age | BC assessment method, \& standardisation | Baseline BF (\%) or SSK | Baseline MM | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Physiological changes with periodized resistance training in women tennis players (65). 2003 | Investigate <br> physiological and performance adaptations to periodised or nonperiodised RT or control condition | Tennis, Collegiate level. T2. <br> Female ( $\mathrm{n}=30$ ) <br> Interventional | 19.0y (1.0) | Skinfold ${ }^{2}$ <br> S.P: <br> Diet, physical activity, \& time of day | $\begin{gathered} 22.9 \% \text { (3.9) } \\ \text { (periodised) } \\ \text { versus } 23.7 \% \\ \text { (4.9) (non- } \\ \text { periodised) } \\ \text { versus } 22.6 \% \\ \text { (5.7) (control) } \end{gathered}$ | 46.5 kg (4.9) (periodised) versus 46.1 kg (4.0) (nonperiodised) versus 44.6 kg (3.3) (control) | ```Although both programs induced changes in BC (reduced BF (\%); increased FFM), periodised RT achieved superior improvements in FFM (change by \(3.3 \pm 1.7 \mathrm{~kg}\) versus \(1.6 \pm 2.4\) kg ) \& sport performance (increase in jump height by \(50 \%\) versus \(37 \%\); and in ball velocities in three strokes by (mean value) \(\sim 29 \%\) versus ~ \(16 \%\) ).``` |

NOTE: 1RM, one repetition maximum (muscle strength); BF (\%), percent body fat; ADP, Air Displacement Plethysmography; BC, body composition; BF, body fat; BIA, bioelectrical impedance; BM, body mass; BMI, body mass index; BUC, British University Championships; ctrl, control participants; CSA, cross sectional area; DXA, dual Xray absorptiometry; FFM, fat free mass; FM, fat mass; \%FM, percent fat mass; ECW, extracellular water; ICW, intracellular water; LBM, lean body mass; MAT, male athlete triad; MM, muscle mass (measured/reported as LBM, FFM or MM in different studies); MPO, mean power output; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; PO, power output; POL, Polarized training; PPO, peak power output; RE, running economy; RT, resistance training; SBE 100 , season's best equivalent for $100 m$ sprint; SSK, sum of skinfolds; S.P., standardisation procedure (for anthropometric measurement); TBW, total body water; T1-T5, THR, Threshold training, Tier 1-5 performance level of athletes(49); TT, time trial; TTE, time to exhaustion; VAT, visceral adipose tissue; VT, ventilatory threshold; WL, weight loss; $W_{m a x}$, mean power output in Watts; y, year; ${ }^{1}$ SSK 4 sites ${ }^{; 2}$ SSK 3 sites; ${ }^{3}$ SSK 7 sites; ${ }^{4}$ SSK 8 sites; ${ }^{5}$ SSK 6 sites; ${ }^{6}$ SSK 9 sites; ${ }^{ \pm}$captured from graphic illustration; ${ }^{\$}$ numbers are median (interquartile range); ${ }^{\square}$ standardisation includes one or more of the following: measurement performed according to best practice/guidelines, calibration of equipment, training of measurer, evaluation of hydration status, standardisation of assessment protocol (i.e., time of day, diet and physical activity).

