RETHINKING HEAVY BARBELL TRAINING – INJURY RISK VS. NECESSITY IN NON-POWERLIFTING POPULATIONS

NICK TUMMINELLO, NSCA-CPT

While exercises such as barbell squats and deadlifts are not inherently dangerous, this article will argue that the relative increase in injury risk associated with very heavy loading—relative to an individual's current strength level—raises important questions regarding their necessity for individuals whose goals do not involve competitive powerlifting.

The purpose of this article is not to criticize barbell training or the personal trainers or coaches who employ it, nor is it a critique of barbell training as a whole. Rather, it focuses specifically on the efficacy and practicality of heavy barbell lifting—defined here as loads performed in the 1 – 5 repetition maximum (RM) range, excluding landmine variations—for the purpose of developing maximal strength in non-powerlifting populations.

With the goal of maximizing client safety while improving strength, this article will examine current research and ongoing professional debate regarding optimal lifting technique, the relationship between load intensity and injury risk, and the transferability of maximal strength to functional performance. Finally, practical programming recommendations will be presented for general population clients, physique-focused trainees, and athletes, with an emphasis on effectiveness, safety, and long-term training sustainability.

REDUCING TRAINING RELATED INJURY RISK

In professional discussions of injury prevention, it is not uncommon for someone to interject, "you can't prevent all injuries," as though this were a novel insight rather than a widely understood reality among both practitioners and clients. A rational, science-based approach to strength training acknowledges that not all risk is avoidable, but that unnecessary risk is avoidable, given that injury risk is a modifiable factor. In other words, there is a meaningful difference between an activity carrying greater relative risk and being inherently dangerous. This distinction separates evidence-based coaching from dogma.

In the context of this article, the position is not "anti-barbell," but rather pro-context, pro-pragmatism, and pro-client outcome. Therefore, it is reasonable to re-examine whether near-maximal barbell loading (1 – 5RM) remains an optimal—or even necessary—tool for general strength development.

This article will examine how, for many clients and athletes (i.e., non-powerlifters), the answer does not point toward maximal-effort barbell squats and deadlifts. Instead, the evidence supports a broader, more inclusive view of strength training—one that values load as a tool, but not at the expense of longevity.

THE TWO SIDES OF THE DEBATE, SUMMARIZED

The debate around heavy barbell lifts (1 – 5RM), such as squats or deadlifts, for non-powerlifting populations often splits into two camps. The following outlines the common reasons given by each side of the debate in attempt to justify their position.

CAMP 1. HEAVY LIFTS CAN BE RISKY / WE SHOULD BE CAUTIOUS

- Some caution is warranted that suggest these lifts are inherently risky.
- When loads approach tissue limits, or technique fails badly, risk increases.
- Repeated or prolonged stress, fatigue, recovery deficits, and prior injury can all magnify risk.
- Many personal trainers argue that form cues (e.g., maintaining a "neutral spine," limiting excessive flexion) are potential protective measures, especially under heavy loads.

CAMP 2. HEAVY LIFTS ARE NOT INHERENTLY HARMFUL / TECHNIQUE IS OVEREMPHASIZED

- The spine is relatively robust and adaptable; many people tolerate large loads safely.
- Injury is far more complex than "lift heavy, get hurt."
- Research suggests that "perfect" does not necessarily prevent injury.
- Injury is complex; not just mechanical forces, but it also includes biological, behavioral, psychological, and contextual factors.

THE AUTHOR'S TAKE AND SYNTHESIS

It is the author's view that the truth is somewhere in the middle:

- Heavy barbell lifts are not inherently unsafe, but do carry increased risk as loads approach tissue limits.
- We should not let fear prevent growth. But in practice, attention to load, programming, and individual tolerance still matters.
- Technique and coaching cues are useful, especially as load increases, but they are guardrails, not guarantees.
- Spinal motion is inevitable; the idea of a perfectly static "neutral spine" is unrealistic.
- Focus should be more on intelligent load management rather than obsessing over minor deviations in form.
- Injury often arises from a combination of factors: excessive load, fatigue, poor recovery, or ignoring warning signs.

These above bullet points are based on claims that require evidentiary support and critical examination, which is what the following sections of this article will address.

RESISTANCE TRAINING SAFETY: SEPARATING DATA FROM DOGMA

Numerous epidemiological studies and systematic reviews consistently demonstrate that resistance training—particularly within general fitness and supervised settings—is among the safest forms of physical activity, with injury rates substantially lower than those observed in most recreational and competitive sports (14,16).

For example, resistance training injury rates have been estimated at approximately 0.24 – 1.0 injuries per 1,000 training hours, whereas running-related injury rates are reported to be 2 – 10 times higher. Team-based sports such as football and soccer show even greater injury incidence, commonly ranging from 6 – 10 injuries per 1,000 hr of participation (19).

However, these data represent only part of the broader safety discussion. The critical issue is not whether resistance training is safer than field, court, or combat sports, but rather, which forms of resistance training carry relatively greater or lesser risk. Without addressing this distinction, generalized statements about the safety of resistance training lack meaningful contextual validity. This is because strength training methods carry different levels of injury risk due to factors such as loading magnitude, exercise selection, and training context.

For example, based on the available epidemiological evidence, bodybuilding and traditional strength training has an injury incidence ratio of ~0.24 – 1.0 injuries per 1,000 training hr with an injury prevalence of ~12.6% (1,19,28). Whereas, powerlifting has an injury incidence ratio ~1.0 – 5.8 injuries per 1,000 hr and an injury prevalence of ~56.6% (1,19,28).

In other words, the available evidence indicates that bodybuilding and general strength training are relatively safer than powerlifting, as these approaches consistently demonstrate lower injury rates among resistance training modalities. This is likely due to the use of controlled loading, greater reliance on machine-based or moderate free-weight exercises, and the absence of routine maximal-effort lifts.

POWERLIFTING AND CONTEXTUAL RISK

Given the evidence provided in the previous section, research and injury surveillance data from powerlifting populations who routinely train and compete with loads near their physiological limits can offer useful insight into the risks associated with heavy loading relative to one's capacity.

One study examined injury prevalence in powerlifting, defining injury as pain or impaired bodily function that affected an athlete's ability to train (33). The sample included a balanced representation of male and female sub-elite powerlifters. The findings showed that injury was prevalent in both men and women, with 70% of participants (73 out of 104) reported having an active injury, and 87% (83 out of 95) reported having sustained at least one injury within the previous 12 months (33). Most injuries occurred during training; however, only 16% of those currently injured (11 out of 70) reported that they were required to completely stop training as a result (33).

A separate investigation examined injuries and overuse syndromes in powerlifting, with a specific focus on pain experienced during routine training sessions. The purpose of the study was to document the prevalence of training-related pain (29). The study included 245 competitive and elite powerlifters representing 97 affiliated powerlifting clubs. The findings indicated that 43.3% of participants reported pain-related issues during routine training although they did not require complete interruption of training (29).

With these injury data in mind, it is important to note the common injury profiles in powerlifting and bodybuilding/general strength training.

Powerlifting: Research shows a higher prevalence of muscle strains, ligament sprains, and acute overuse injuries due to frequent near-maximal loading (1,5,6).

Bodybuilding and General Strength Training: Research shows a higher prevalence of tendinitis, chronic overuse injuries, and connective tissue irritation, likely due to higher training volume and repetitive moderate loads (5,28,44). These data indicate that powerlifters not only demonstrate a high prevalence of training-related musculoskeletal injuries, but that the types of injuries associated with powerlifting tend to be more severe.

It is important to note that powerlifting is a performance-driven sport, not a health-oriented training model. Powerlifting's primary objective is to maximize performance in the squat, bench press, and deadlift, often accepting elevated injury risk as an inherent trade-off. In contrast, most non-powerlifting populations engage in resistance training to improve health, physical function, body composition, and overall quality of life. Within this context, injury risk is not a secondary concern—it is a central programming consideration.

INJURY RISK AND LOAD INTENSITY

Injury risk in resistance training is multifactorial and influenced by variables such as training history, technical proficiency, recovery adequacy, exercise selection, and load management. Among these factors is training intensity relative to maximal capacity (e.g., percentage of 1RM), which has emerged as a key variable influencing both performance adaptations and injury risk. Epidemiological data indicate that musculoskeletal injuries in resistance training are most frequently associated with maximal or near-maximal loading, particularly during compound barbell lifts such as the squat and deadlift (19,33).

Although the musculoskeletal system—including the spine—does adapt to mechanical loading, adaptation does not imply invulnerability (4,17). Injury risk remains load-dependent and context-specific, particularly when absolute loads approach maximal capacity.

THE NUANCE OF "FORM:" WHAT ACTUALLY CONSTITUTES POOR TECHNIQUE?

A central point of contention in discussions about heavy barbell training concerns what truly constitutes "poor form." Traditional coaching paradigms often imply that deviations from textbook technique substantially increase injury risk. However, research has not demonstrated that adherence to a singular, idealized movement pattern guarantees injury prevention, nor that biomechanics alone can reliably predict injury occurrence (7,40).

The multifactorial nature of back pain and injury—encompassing neurological, psychological, anatomical, recovery, and load-management factors— means a single "bad lift" rarely causes chronic problems. Instead, they more commonly reflect cumulative exposure over time, with symptoms emerging once overall tissue tolerance is exceeded, often perceived as a "final straw" event.

MOVEMENT VARIABILITY

Evidence increasingly suggests that movement variability and individual biomechanical differences are normal, and often adaptive, features of human movement rather than markers of dysfunction. For example, Van Dieën et al. found that trained lifters may deviate from textbook "neutral" form without increased injury if loads are appropriate and fatigue is managed, suggesting form deviations aren't automatically dangerous (37). Complementing this view, Baumeister et al. found that movement variability, not perfect repetition of form, may help reduce injury risk by spreading stress over different tissues. Therefore, rigid form may not always be ideal (2).

SPINAL FLEXION

Another great example of how movement variability and individual biomechanical differences are normal is the challenges to the "danger of lumbar flexion" narrative. In that, biomechanical studies consistently show that some degree of lumbar flexion occurs even during technically sound lifting, challenging the notion that a perfectly static "neutral spine" is either realistic or necessary for safety (26,38).

Moreover, epidemiological research examining lifting-related injuries has found weak or inconsistent associations between specific lifting postures and injury incidence, indicating that load magnitude, training volume, fatigue, and recovery status may be more influential determinants of injury risk than form alone (24,31). That said, other studies show that lumbar spine loading is strongly influenced by lifting posture and load proximity (13,20). In that, lifting with a more upright torso, coordinated hip–knee motion, and keeping the load close to the body substantially reduces lumbar shear and compressive forces, whereas stooped or awkward postures increase spinal loading and reduce tissue tolerance, particularly as load and fatigue increase. In practical terms, this means that using what is commonly considered "proper" lifting biomechanics, like lifting close to the body with a neutral spine, reduces spinal loading.

TISSUE TOLERANCE

With the above in mind, the relevance of biomechanics is not uniform across all loading conditions. However, as external load approaches an individual's maximal capacity, biomechanical deviations likely become increasingly consequential. In that, near-maximal barbell lifts (1 – 3RM) substantially narrow the margin for error, such that even small alterations in bar path, trunk position, or force distribution can disproportionately increase localized tissue stress and exceed current load tolerance (8,25).

For example, excessive forward trunk lean during a heavily loaded squat can meaningfully increase lumbar extensor demands and spinal loading, resulting in greater compressive and shear forces on the lumbar spine. In some individuals, these increased forces may exceed the tolerance of local tissues (11,15,32). Thus, while imperfect mechanics are not inherently injurious under moderate loading, the interaction between high absolute load and reduced mechanical tolerance is a key mechanism by which injury risk escalates. This is because all connective and muscular tissues (e.g., tendons, ligaments, muscles, bones, discs) have known mechanical load limits. If the applied stress (e.g., intensity, frequency, duration, speed) exceeds the tissue's tolerance, injury can occur. Therefore, good lifting form can reduce injury risk because it helps manage mechanical loads on tissues more effectively, but the evidence shows that form alone is not a guarantee of injury prevention.

With the above taken as a whole, these studies support a shift away from rigid technique prescriptions, because movement deviations are not inherently injurious, and toward a more adaptable model of movement quality—one that prioritizes load management, fatigue control, and the development of robust movement capacity across slightly variable positions, especially in non-maximal training contexts.

In practice, this suggests that "form" should be contextualized within individual anatomy, training history, and load exposure rather than treated as a binary standard of "safe" versus "unsafe" movement (39). Personal training and coaching should prioritize the development of robust movement capacity—the ability to safely express force across a range of slightly variable positions—rather than rigid enforcement of a single technical archetype. That said, technique remains important, especially in higher loading conditions. Therefore, "neutral spine" can be a useful coaching cue for minimizing unwanted spinal loading, but not a protective guarantee (34,38).

TRANSFER OF MAXIMAL STRENGTH TO FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE

A common justification for heavy barbell training is the assumption that increasing maximal strength enhances functional performance across sport and daily activities. While maximal strength is a foundational physical quality, its contribution to functional performance appears to follow a diminishing-returns relationship beyond a sufficient baseline level. Meta-analyses and longitudinal studies indicate that once an athlete or client has developed adequate strength to meet the mechanical demands of their activity, further increases in 1RM capacity yield progressively smaller improvements in sprint speed, jump performance, movement economy, and injury resilience (9,35,42).

It is also important to note that training strategies employing moderate loads (approximately 70 – 85% of 1RM) have been shown to produce comparable improvements in strength expression and superior transfer to athletic performance when combined with intentional acceleration, velocity specificity, and multiplanar movement patterns (3,43). These approaches more closely replicate the temporal and coordinative demands of sport and daily movement, thereby enhancing neural and mechanical transfer.

Importantly, near-maximal barbell lifting introduces trade-offs that extend beyond performance adaptation. The neuromuscular benefits associated with heavy loading, such as enhanced motor unit recruitment and rate coding, occur alongside substantially increased mechanical stress and recovery demand (10,21). As training loads approach maximal capacity, the margin for error narrows; small deviations in technique, fatigue accumulation, or recovery adequacy carry disproportionately greater consequences. This increases the likelihood of exceeding an individual's current physical capacity, particularly in populations without a competitive need for maximal lifting.

Additionally, very heavy lifting in the 1 – 3RM range exposes joints, connective tissues, and passive structures to disproportionately high stresses, without clear evidence of superior transfer to functional performance, durability, or injury resilience in non-powerlifting populations (19,42). For general fitness clients and many athletes, these costs are difficult to justify when comparable performance outcomes can be achieved through lower-risk methods. Moreover, evidence from exercise adherence research suggests that submaximal resistance training is associated with higher enjoyment, better tolerance, and lower dropout rates in general populations—factors that directly influence long-term training success and health outcomes (22,36).

DEBUNKING THE COMMON DEFENSES OF HEAVY LIFTING FOR NON-POWERLIFTERS

Before providing practical program design recommendations based on the above information, it is worth addressing a few of the common counterarguments that tend to surface when the risks or necessity of heavy barbell training for non-powerlifters are questioned.

The following counterarguments rely more on rhetoric than reasoning. They may sound convincing in casual conversation, but they crumble under even basic logical inspection.

1. "IT'S USUALLY SMALLER, WEAKER PEOPLE WHO SAY HEAVY BARBELL LIFTING IS RISKY."

This is a classic ad hominem fallacy—dismissing an argument by attacking the person rather than addressing the argument itself. The underlying implication is that the validity of a statement depends on the individual's size or lifting ability. By that logic, if the same statement were spoken by the strongest lifter in the gym, would it suddenly become more valid? Clearly, it would not.

Evidence and reasoning, not muscle mass or lifting totals, determine the truth of a claim. Whether someone squats 95 lb or 900 lb has no bearing on whether heavy barbell training carries a higher relative injury risk for non-powerlifting populations. In short, argument validity rests on logic, not load. A personal record cannot shield an idea from critical scrutiny.

2. "I KNOW SOMEONE IN THEIR 80S WHO STILL COMPETES IN POWERLIFTING. THEY FEEL GREAT AND HAVE NO INJURIES."

This is a textbook example of the anecdotal fallacy, which is using a single personal case to claim that a practice is universally safe or effective. In the fitness world, it is akin to saying, "My grandfather smoked a pack a day and lived to 100, so cigarettes must not be harmful."

In risk management, recommendations are guided by probabilities based on population-level risks, not guarantees because some people tolerate certain stressors better than others.

Stating that heavy barbell training carries increased injury risk does not imply it is guaranteed to cause harm. Rather, it indicates that, relative to moderate loading or alternative resistance training methods, near-maximal barbell lifts involve a higher likelihood of injury, particularly for non-powerlifting populations.

3. "ANYTHING CAN INJURE YOU IF YOU DO IT WRONG."

On the surface, this statement may seem reasonable, but it represents a false equivalence because it sidesteps the issue of relative risk. While any exercise performed inappropriately can cause injury, a poorly executed biceps curl is not in the same injury-risk category as a maximal-effort barbell back squat—just as tripping on a curb is not equivalent to skydiving without a parachute. This comparison is not intended to suggest that heavy barbell lifting is literally as dangerous as skydiving, but rather to illustrate that context, load, and complexity critically shape risk.

The purpose is not to demonize heavy barbell exercises; rather, it is to acknowledge that higher absolute loads relative to one's current strength level amplify injury risk. A risk-aware approach recognizes this reality and informs safer and more effective programming.

4. "THIS IS FEARMONGERING. WE SHOULDN'T BE DEMONIZING EXERCISES."

From the author's perspective, stating that heavy barbell lifting carries higher injury risk for non-powerlifters is simply good sense—intended to help people make informed training decisions. However, some may label this advice as "fearmongering" or "demonizing exercises." This characterization is concerning because it is emotionally-driven language used to position oneself as virtuous while attempting to portray people who provide well-intentioned guidance—aimed at helping others train smarter—as villains.

By definition, fearmongering involves deliberately trying to make people afraid when such fear is unnecessary or unreasonable. Advising caution or discernment based on evidence does not meet that definition. In reality, people are empowered by such advice because they gain a clearer understanding of risks and benefits, make smarter training choices, and recognize that alternatives exist. This is not fear, it is informed decision making.

5. "MANY RECREATIONAL SPORTS CARRY MORE RISK THAN HEAVY LIFTING. YET I DON'T SEE TRAINERS ADVISING PEOPLE TO STOP PLAYING THE SPORTS THEY LOVE."

This comparison reflects a straw man argument that conflates voluntary risk taken for enjoyment with perceived necessity in training. Individuals who participate in recreational sports knowingly accept higher injury risk in exchange for engaging in activities they enjoy. This is fundamentally different from the belief—often shaped by powerlifting-biased strength training discourse—that heavy barbell lifting is required to achieve general fitness or performance goals.

The purpose of highlighting the relative risk of near-maximal barbell lifting is not to discourage barbell use or to "demonize" specific exercises. Rather, it is to help personal trainers and clients become more informed consumers of training information. While resistance training is generally a safe endeavor, performing heavy (near-maximal) barbell squats and deadlifts introduces additional and often unnecessary risk for non-powerlifting populations who can achieve their goals through alternative methods with more favorable risk–benefit profiles.

Now that we have cleared away the common fallacies and anecdotes, we can turn to the practical program design recommendations.

PROGRAMMING IMPLICATIONS FOR NON-POWERLIFTING POPULATIONS

Designing effective resistance training programs for general population clients and non-powerlifting athletes requires balancing performance gains with injury risk, recovery capacity, and long-term adherence. Given evidence that moderate-load training can produce strength and hypertrophy adaptations comparable to heavier loading when effort is high (27,30). Programming should emphasize load efficiency and use the lowest effective intensity necessary to achieve the desired adaptation while managing cumulative stress. From a practical standpoint, this supports prioritizing heavy, but not maximal, loading, with most strength work occurring in the ~6 – 8RM range rather than repeated exposure to 1 – 5RM intensities. This approach provides a sufficient mechanical stimulus for strength development while avoiding the narrower margin for error and elevated injury risk associated with near-maximal lifting.

It is important to note that this does not mean the 1 – 5 repetition range should be avoided. Rather, loads corresponding to a 6 – 8RM can be used for 1 – 5 repetitions, with the intent of performing the concentric phase of each repetition as fast as possible. For most clients, the foundation of training involves prioritizing moderate-load (~60 – 80% 1RM) resistance exercises performed for 6 – 12 repetitions per set, taken near volitional fatigue, with occasional exposure to heavier loads for skill maintenance and strength assessment.

Additionally, unilateral variations, in particular, can deliver many of the systemic benefits of traditional barbell lifts, such as progressive overload, axial demand, and full-body integration, while reducing absolute spinal loading, making them well-suited for athletes and general fitness populations.

Moreover, incorporating velocity-based methods and bodybuilding-style training allows personal trainers to target specific neuromuscular qualities, such as rate of force development, mechanical tension, and regional hypertrophy, without relying on maximal loads (41). These methods expand the stimulus toolbox while preserving a favorable risk–reward profile.

Beyond physiology, program success is strongly influenced by behavioral factors. Enjoyment, confidence, and perceived safety are key determinants of adherence, and fear of injury is a common reason for dropout in resistance training programs (3). By limiting unnecessary exposure to maximal loading and emphasizing technical competence, autoregulation, and variation, personal trainers can improve both consistency and long-term outcomes.

An emphasis on injury risk management, sustainability, and adherence does not undermine performance, it supports it. While squat and deadlift movement patterns remain valuable, the benefits of their heavy-loaded variations must be weighed against their injury risk in non-powerlifting populations, whose goals often have little to do with maximal strength in specific lifts.

When comparable results can be achieved without routinely approaching maximal loads, the justification for higher-risk methods diminishes. While increasing risk of exceeding one's capacity during training may be acceptable and even necessary in competitive strength sports, it is far less defensible in training contexts centered on health, performance longevity, and resilience.

REFERENCES

1. Aasa, U, Svartholm, I, Andersson, F, and Berglund, L. Injuries among weightlifters and powerlifters: A systematic review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 51: 211-219, 2017.

2. Baumeister, J, Reinecke, K, Schubert, M, and Weiss, M. Effects of repetitive lifting and mental fatigue on neuromuscular function. *European Journal of Applied Physiology* 111(3): 411-419, 2011.

3. Behm, DG, and Sale, DG. Velocity specificity of resistance training. *Sports Medicine* 15(6): 374-388, 1993.

4. Belavy, DL, Adams, M, Brisby, H, Cagnie, B, Danneels, L, Fairbank, J, et al. Disc herniations in astronauts: What causes them, and what does it tell us about herniation on Earth? *European Spine Journal* 26(S1): 144-154, 2017.

5. Bukhary, HA, Basha, NA, Dobel, AA, Alsufyani, RM, Alotaibi, RA, and Almadani, SH. Prevalence and patterns of injuries across weight-training sports. *Cereus* 15(11): e49759, 2022.

6. Calhoon, G, and Fry, AC. Injuries and damage caused by excess stress in bodybuilding and powerlifting. 1999.

7. Carroll, TJ, Riek, S, and Carson, RG. Neural adaptations to resistance training: Implications for movement control and injury risk. *Sports Medicine* 49(Suppl 1): 29-40, 2019.

8. Cholewicki, J, and McGill, SM. Mechanical stability of the in vivo lumbar spine: Implications for injury and chronic low back pain. *Clinical Biomechanics* 11(1): 1-15, 1996.

9. Cormie, P, McGuigan, MR, and Newton, RU. Developing maximal neuromuscular power: Part 1—Biological basis of maximal power production. *Sports Medicine* 41(1): 17-38, 2011.

10. Ekkekakis, P, Parfitt, G, and Petruzzello, SJ. The pleasure and displeasure people feel when they exercise at different intensities. *Sports Medicine* 41(8): 641-671, 2011.

11. Escamilla, RF. Knee biomechanics of the dynamic squat exercise. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 33(1): 127-141, 2001.

12. Fry, AC, and Kraemer, WJ. Resistance exercise overtraining and overreaching: Neuroendocrine responses. *Sports Medicine* 23(2): 106-129, 1997.

13. Gallagher, S, and Marras, WS. Tolerance of the lumbar spine to shear: A review and recommended exposure limits. *Clinical Biomechanics* 27(10): 973-978, 2012.

14. Grgic, J, Lazinica, B, Schoenfeld, BJ, and Pedisic, Z. Injury incidence and risk factors in resistance training: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Medicine* 52(11): 2523-2538, 2002.

15. Gullett, JC, Tillman, MD, Gutierrez, GM, and Chow, JW. A biomechanical compari-son of back and front squats in healthy trained individuals. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 23(1): 284-292, 2009.

16. Hamill, BP. Relative safety of weightlifting and weight training. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 8(1): 53-57, 1994.

17. Hides, JA, Stanton, WR, Mendis, MD, Gildea, J, and Sexton, MJ. Effect of motor control training on muscle size and function of the deep trunk muscles in elite athletes with low back pain. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy* 49(10): 707-717, 2019.

18. Jovanović, M, and Flanagan, EP. Researched applications of velocity based strength training. *Journal of Australian Strength and Conditioning* 22(2): 58-69, 2014.

19. Keogh, JW, and Winwood, PW. The epidemiology of injuries across the weight-training sports. *Sports Medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)* 47(3): 479-501, 2017.

20. Kingma, I, Faber, GS, Bakker, AJ, and van Dieën, JH. Lumbar loading during lifting: A comparative study of three lifting techniques. *Spine* 31(18): 2100-2106, 2006.

21. McBride, JM, Triplett-McBride, T, Davie, A, and Newton, RU. The effect of heavy- vs. light-load jump squats on the development of strength, power, and speed. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 16(1): 75-82, 2002.

22. Morton, RW, Oikawa, SY, Wavell, CG, Mazara, N, McGlory, C, Quadrilatero, J, Baechler, BL, et al. Neither load nor systemic hormones determine resistance training–mediated hypertrophy or strength gains in resistance-trained young men. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 121(1): 129-138, 2016.

23. Nimphius, S, McGuigan, MR, and Newton, RU. Changes in muscle architecture and performance during a competitive season in female softball players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 32(8): 2115-2123, 2018.

24. O'Sullivan, P, Caneiro, JP, O'Keeffe, M, O'Sullivan, K, and Dankaerts, W. Cognitive functional therapy: An integrated behavioral approach for the targeted management of disabling low back pain. *Physical Therapy* 98(5): 408-423, 2018.

25. Saraceni, N, Campbell, A, Kent, P, Ng, L, Straker, L, and O'Sullivan, P. Does intra-lumbar flexion during lifting differ in manual workers with and without a history of low back pain? A cross-sectional laboratory study. *Ergonomics* 65(10): 1380-1396, 2022.

26. Saraceni, N, Kent, P, Ng, L, Campbell, A, Straker, L, and O'Sullivan, P. To flex or not to flex? Is there a relationship between lumbar spine flexion during lifting and low back pain? A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy* 50(3): 121-130, 2020.

27. Schoenfeld, BJ, Grgic, J, Ogborn, D, and Krieger, JW. Strength and hypertrophy adaptations between low- vs. high-load resistance training: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 31(12): 3508-3523, 2017.

28. Serafim, TT, de Oliveira, ES, Maffulli, N, Migliorini, F, and Okubo, R. Which resistance training is safest to practice? A systematic review. *Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research* 18(1): 296, 2023.

29. Siewe, J, Rudat, J, Röllinghoff, M, Schlegel, UJ, Eysel, P, and Michael, JW. Injuries and overuse syndromes in powerlifting. *International Journal of Sports Medicine* 32(9): 703-711, 2011.

30. Spiteri, T, Newton, RU, Binetti, M, Hart, NH, Sheppard, JM, and Nimphius, S. Mechanical determinants of faster change of direction and agility performance in female basketball athletes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 28(8): 2205-2214, 2014.

31. Steele, J, Bruce-Low, S, and Smith, D. A reappraisal of strength training techniques in relation to injury risk. *Sports Medicine* 51(1): 1-17, 2021.

32. Straub, RK, Powers, CM, and Witvrouw, E. A biomechanical review of the squat exercise: Implications for clinical practice. *International Journal of Sports Physical Therapy* 19(3): 551-570, 2024.

33. Strömbäck, E, Aasa, U, Gilenstam, K, and Berglund, L. Prevalence and consequences of injuries in powerlifting: A cross-sectional study. *Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine* 6(5): 2325967118771016, 2018.

34. Suchomel, TJ, Nimphius, S, and Stone, MH. The importance of muscular strength in athletic performance. *Sports Medicine* 46(10): 1419-1449, 2016.

35. Suchomel, TJ, Nimphius, S, Bellon, CR, and Stone, MH. The importance of muscular strength: Training considerations. *Sports Medicine* 48(4): 765-785, 2018.

36. Teixeira, PJ, Carraca, EV, Markland, D, Silva, MN, and Ryan, RM. Exercise, physical activity, and self-determination theory. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 9: 78, 2012.

37. van Dieën, JH, Kingma, I, and van der Bug, P. The influence of trunk muscle co-contraction on spinal compression force during lifting. *Journal of Biomechanics* 32(4): 389-398, 1999.

38. van Dieën, JH, Reeves, NP, Kawchuk, G, van Dillen, LR, and Hodges, PW. Motor control changes in low back pain: Divergence in presentations and mechanisms. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy* 49(6): 370-379, 2019.

39. Vigotsky, AD, Bryanton, MA, Nuckols, G, and Beardsley, C. Biomechanical, anthropometric, and psychological determinants of strength performance. *Strength and Conditioning Journal* 41(2): 11-24, 2019.

40. Vigotsky, AD, Zelik, KE, Lake, J, and Hinrichs, RN. Interpreting biomechanics research: A guide for practitioners. *Sports Biomechanics* 21(1): 1-17, 2022.

41. Williams, DM, Dunsiger, S, Ciccolo, JT, Lewis, BA, Albrecht, AE, and Marcus, BH. Acute affective response to a moderate-intensity exercise stimulus predicts physical activity participation 6 and 12 months later. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 11(5): 426-432, 2010.

42. Wisloff, U, Castagna, C, Helgerud, J, Jones, R, and Hoff, J. Strong correlation of maximal squat strength with sprint performance and vertical jump height in elite soccer players. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 38(3): 285-288, 2004.

43. Young, WB. Transfer of strength and power training to sports performance. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 1(2): 74-83, 2006.

44. Zilmer, KJ. Injuries in bodybuilding: Prevalence and types. *PubMed* 2014.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Nick Tumminello has become known as the "Trainer of Trainers" for his ability to provide simple, honest, and immediately applicable solutions to common problems fitness and conditioning professionals face. He has worked with a variety of clients, including National Football League (NFL) athletes, professional mixed martial arts (MMA) fighters, bodybuilders, figure models, military personnel, first responders, and everyday fitness enthusiasts. Tumminello is the 2016 NSCA Personal Trainer of the Year, and the Editor-in-Chief of the Personal Training Quarterly *journal. He is also the author of three books, and the creator of the NT Loop bands.*