**Table S1.** Sensitivity analysis comparing pooled estimates before and after bilateral correction (Cochrane N/2 adjustment).

| | Before bilateral correction | After bilateral correction |
|---|---|---|
| *k* | 19 | 19 |
| Hedges' g | 0.39 | 0.44 |
| 95% CI | 0.19 – 0.59 | 0.23 – 0.64 |
| $I^2$ | 44.43% | 30.30% |
| $\tau^2$ | 0.083 | 0.06 |
| Egger *p* | 0.011 | 0.797 |

**Table S2.** Pooled estimates shown for r = 0.3, 0.5 (main), and 0.7.

| Assumed r | k | Hedges' g | 95% CI | p | $\tau^2$ | $I^2$ (%) | 95% Prediction Interval | Egger p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.3 | 19 | 0.376 | 0.2012 to 0.5508 | <0.0001 | 0.0134 | 8.9 | 0.0900 to 0.6621 | 0.947 |
| 0.5 | 19 | 0.437 | 0.2346 to 0.6400 | <0.0001 | 0.0604 | 30.3 | –0.0853 to 0.9599 | 0.796 |
| 0.7 | 19 | 0.551 | 0.2960 to 0.8059 | <0.0001 | 0.1708 | 54.5 | –0.2984 to 1.4002 | 0.52 |

**Table S3.** Meta-regression results for moderators of intervention effects on grip strength (k = 19 study arms).

| Moderator | β Estimate | SE | Z | p | 95% CI Lower | 95% CI Upper |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age group | 0.71 | 0.20 | 3.63 | <0.001 | 0.32 | 1.10 |
| Training type | –0.17 | 0.25 | –0.69 | 0.49 | –0.66 | 0.32 |
| Comparator type | –0.55 | 0.18 | –3.09 | 0.002 | –0.90 | –0.20 |