	Training Group (n = 17)	Control Group (n = 17)	Statistics
Age (years) 95% CI	24.6 ± 5.4 22.7 - 26.5	26.3 ± 6.4 24.1 - 28.4	$F_{1,33} = 1.403; p = 0.24$
Gender (%)	F: 5 (29.4%) M: 12 (70.6%)	F: 6 (35.3%) M: 11 (64.7%)	Pearson's χ^2 : $p = 0.81$
Weight (kg) 95% CI	66.7 ± 9.6 61.7 - 71.7	$\begin{array}{c} 68.6 \pm 12.9 \\ 61.2 - 76.1 \end{array}$	$F_{1,33} = 0.228; p = 0.64$
Height (cm) 95% CI	170.0 ± 10.5 164.7 - 175.4	170.6 ± 8.4 165.8 - 175.5	$F_{1,33} = 0.028; p = 0.86$

 Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the participants.

CI = Confidence Interval; F = Females; M = Male

		R	Responsiveness			
Hand	Motor task	ICC _{2,1} CV (%) SEM		SEM	SRD	
		Session 1 vs. 2 (95% C.I.)	Session 1 vs. 2 (95% C.I.)	Session 1 vs. 2 (95% C.I.)	SRDi	SRDi (%)
	Tip	0.94 (0.81-0.96)	6.1	±1.07	4.2	23.9
Dominant	Key	0.95 (0.92-0.97)	4.8	±0.92	3.62	17.2
	Tripod	0.98 (0.97-0.99)	3.9	±1.26	4.93	14.8
	Handgrip	0.99 (0.98-0.99)	2.9	±1.09	4.29	10.7
	Tip	0.94 (0.89-0.97)	6.4	±1.24	4.86	29.8
Non-dominant	Key	0.95 (0.90-0.97)	5.6	±0.99	3.89	19.3
	Tripod	0.99 (0.97-0.99)	3.1	±1.21	4.73	15.2
	Handgrip	0.99 (0.98-0.99)	3.0	±1.04	4.06	10.8

Table 2. Reproducibility and responsiveness of maximal strength measurements from the dominant and non-dominant hands.

ICC, Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; C.I., Confidence Interval; CV, Coefficient of Variation; SEM, Standard Error of Measurement; SRDi, Individual Smallest Real Difference; SRDi%, Individual Smallest Real Difference in percentage. SEM and SRDi absolute values follow the same unit of measurement (Newton) of the relative outcome measure.

Side S	Strength	Training Group			Control Group			Training vs Controls
	outcomes	PRE	POST	PRE-POST Within-subjects	PRE	POST	PRE-POST	PRE-POST
							Within-subjects	Between-subjects
Right Hand	Key Pinch	$\begin{array}{c} 21.4 \pm 4.1 \\ (19.3 - 23.5) \end{array}$	24.4 ± 4.8 (21.9 - 26.9)	+14.0%**	21.9 ± 4.2 (19.8 - 24.0)	$\begin{array}{c} 23.1 \pm 5.5 \\ (20.3 - 25.9) \end{array}$	+5.5%	+8.5%*
	Tip Pinch	17.9 ± 3.8 (16.0 - 19.8)	$\begin{array}{c} 19.2 \pm 4.1 \\ (17.1 - 21.3) \end{array}$	+7.3%*	$18.3 \pm 5.0 \\ (15.9 - 20.9)$	$18.4 \pm 5.0 \\ (15.8 - 20.8)$	0.1%	+7.2%*
	Tripod Pinch	$\begin{array}{c} 35.8 \pm 10.1 \\ (30.6 - 41.0) \end{array}$	36.8 ± 9.5 (31.7 - 41.7)	+2.8%	32.7 ± 7.5 (28.4 - 35.8)	33.2 ± 7.5 (29.5 - 36.9)	+1.5%	+1.3%
	Handgrip	$\begin{array}{c} 42.9 \pm 11.6 \\ (36.9 - 48.9) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 43.9 \pm 11.1 \\ (38.2 - 49.6) \end{array}$	+2.3%	$38.7 \pm 10.2 \\ (33.6 - 43.8)$	39.5 ± 9.4 (35.0 - 44.4)	+2.1%	+0.2%
Left Hand	Key Pinch	20.6 ± 4.2 (18.5 - 22.7)	22.2 ± 4.6 (19.8 - 24.6)	+7.8%*	21.1 ± 4.8 (19.7 - 23.5)	21.4 ± 3.8 (19.5 - 23.3)	+1.4%	+6.4%*
	Tip Pinch	16.9 ± 3.9 (14.9 - 18.9)	$18.5 \pm 4.1 \\ (16.4 - 20.6)$	+9.5%*	16.8 ± 6.1 (13.8 - 19.8)	17.6 ± 6.3 (14.5 - 20.7)	+4.8%	+4.7%*
	Tripod Pinch	33.1 ± 8.3 (28.8 - 37.4)	33.8 ± 8.0 (29.7 $-$ 37.9)	+2.1%	32.3 ± 8.8 (26.3 - 35.1)	$\begin{array}{c} 32.7 \pm 8.9 \\ (28.2 - 37.0) \end{array}$	+0.1%	+2.0%
	Handgrip	$\begin{array}{c} 40.1 \pm 11.0 \\ (38.8 - 46.0) \end{array}$	40.8 ± 11.3 (35.0 - 46.6)	+1.7%	36.9 ± 9.7 (31.8 - 41.4)	37.4 ± 8.8 (33.0 - 41.8)	+1.3%	+0.4%

Table 3.	PRE to POST	changes in th	he maximal	strength of	the hand	l muscles	within-	and between	-subjects.
				()					

The Training Group underwent maximal isometric strength training of the right hand for 4 weeks. The Control group underwent no-intervention between the PRE and POST strength assessments. Contralateral net transfer *between-subjects* calculated by Carroll's equation (Carroll et al. 2006). Absolute values are expressed in Newton; *Significant for p<0.05; ** Significant for p<0.01.

Table 4. Repeated measures ANOVA analysis of dynamometric parameters measured from the FDI muscles before (PRE) and after (POST) 4 weeks of maximal isometric strength training of the right muscle in the CT group or no-intervention in the CONTROL group.

OUTCOMES	Main effect of TIME	Interaction TIME*GROUP	Interaction TIME*SIDE	Interaction TIME*GROUP*SIDE
Key Pinch#	F _{1,62} =23.12; <i>p</i> <0.0005	F _{1,62} =16.64; <i>p</i> <0.0005	F _{1,62} =3.74; <i>p</i> =0.06	F _{1,62} =0.05; <i>p</i> <0.82
Tip Pinch	F _{1,62} =4.06; <i>p</i> =0.03	F _{1,62} =15.86; <i>p</i> <0.0005	F _{1,62} =1.10; <i>p</i> <0.30	F _{1,62} =0.33; <i>p</i> <0.56
Tripod Pinch	$F_{1,62}=12.10; p=0.001$	F _{1,62} =0.04; <i>p</i> =0.84	F _{1,62} =1.22; <i>p</i> <0.27	F _{1,62} =1.56; <i>p</i> <0.22
Handgrip	F _{1,62} =8.25; <i>p</i> =0.006	F _{1,62} =0.09; <i>p</i> =0.76	F _{1,62} =0.77; <i>p</i> <0.38	F _{1,62} =0.03; <i>p</i> <0.96

TIME, PRE *versus* POST; GROUP, CT group *versus* Control group; SIDE, trained (dominant) *versus* untrained (non-dominant). #, Motor task employed during the 4-week training; significance set at p < 0.05

TMS Protocols	OUTCOMES	Main effect of TIME	Main effect of GROUP	Interaction TIME*GROUP
	RMT	F _{1,64} =2.633; p=0.11	F _{1,64} =0.252; p=0.62	F _{1,64} =0.520; p=0.47
	AMT	F _{1,64} =5.107; p=0.03	F _{1,64} =2.307; p=0.13	F _{1,64} =0.319; p=0.57
Single Pulse TMS	1mVMEP	F _{1,64} =3.016; p=0.09	F _{1,64} =0.771; p=0.38	F _{1,64} =0.001 p=0.99
	CMCT	F _{1,64} =2.672; p=0.11	F _{1,64} =1.221; p=0.27	F _{1,64} =4.357; p=0.04
	RC	F _{1,64} =0.336; p=0.56	F _{1,64} =1.323; p=0.25	F _{1,64} =0.423; p=0.52
Paired Pulse TMS	SICI	F _{1,64} =0.136; p=0.71	F _{1,64} =0.100; p=0.75	F _{1,64} =0.646; p=0.42
	ICF	F _{1,64} =0.764; p=0.38	$F_{1,64} = 0.085; p=0.77$	F _{1,64} =0.039; p=0.84
	SICF	$F_{1,64}$ =0.789; p=0.38	$F_{1,64}$ = 0.156; p=0.69	F _{1,64} =0.650; p=0.42
	LICI 100	F _{1,64} =0.175; p=0.68	F _{1,64} =0.001; p=0.98	$F_{1,64}$ =0.517; p=0.47
	LICI 200	F _{1,64} =.034; p=0.31	F _{1,64} =0.032; p=0.85	F _{1,64} =0.568; p=0.45
	SIHI	$F_{1,64}$ =0.005; p=0.95	F _{1,64} =0.018; p=0.89	$F_{1,64}$ =0.285; p=0.95
	LIHI	F _{1,64} =0.146; p=0.70	F _{1,64} =0.150; p=0.90	F _{1,64} =0.618; p=0.43
Sensory-	SAI	F _{1,64} =0.262; p=0.61	F _{1,64} =1.680; p=0.20	F _{1,64} =0.404; p=0.53
integration	LAI	F _{1,64} =0.020; p=0.89	F _{1,64} =0.212; p=0.64	F _{1,64} =0.001; p=0.99

Table 5. Repeated measures AVOVA analysis of neurophysiological parameters measured from the FDI muscles before (PRE) and after (POST) 4 weeks of maximal isometric strength training of the right muscle in the CT group or no-intervention in the CONTROL group.

RMT, Resting Motor Threshold; AMT, Active Motor Threshold; 1mV MEP, TMS intensity to evoke a MEP of 1mV amplitude; SICI, short-interval intracortical inhibition; ICF,, intracortical facilitation; (SICF), short-interval intracortical facilitation; LICI 100 and LICI 200, long-interval intracortical inhibition at 100 and 200 ms inter-stimulus interval, respectively; SIHI and LIHI, short- and long-interval interhemispheric inhibition, respectively; SAI and LAI, short- and long afferent inhibition, respectively; TIME, PRE *versus* POST; GROUP, CT group *versus* Control group.

FIGURES



Fig. 1 Schematic representation of the experimental design with outcomes measured before and after 4 weeks of maximal unilateral isometric training of right first dorsal interosseus muscles.



Figure 2. Recruitment curves obtained from both the training and control groups are reported for each first dorsal interosseous muscle (FDI).

Recruitment curves acquired at the baseline (PRE, black line) and after 4-week maximal intensity isometric training of the right FDI in the training group or after a 4-week period of no intervention in the control group (POST, grey line) are superimposed. The ordinates indicate mean MEP amplitude and abscissa indicates transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) intensities (in % of the Resting Motor Threshold, RMT). The error bars represent standard error.



Figure 3. Effects of maximal isometric strength training and of no-intervention on intracortical and interhemispheric excitability and on sensory motor integration at cortical level.

Histograms report short-interval intracortical inhibition (SICI), intracortical facilitation (ICF), short-interval intracortical facilitation (SICF), long-interval intracortical inhibition at 100 and 200 ms inter-stimulus interval (LICI100 and LICI200, respectively), short- and long-interval interhemispheric inhibition (SIHI and LIHI, respectively), short- and long afferent inhibition measured bilaterally from the FDI muscle before (white columns) and after (black columns) a 4-week period of maximal isometric strength training of the right FDI (training group) or no intervention (control group). Ordinates indicate MEP amplitude, expressed as a mean \pm SEM percentage value of the unconditioned MEP, induced by single pulse TMS, taken as 100% (dotted horizontal line). In both the training and control groups all parameters of intra- and intercortical excitability and of cortical sensory-motor integration appeared substantially unchanged after the training and the no-intervention period, respectively.