GMR
The Original

HOW STRENGTH TRAINING AND RUNNING MATTER IN REBUILDING MUSCLE AMONG ADULTS: A DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS

[1]Dr. Khuda Bakhsh, [2*]Dr. Tariq Hashmi, [3]Dr.Azmatullah, [4]Dr.Ghulam Ahmad, [5]Dr.Fayyaz Hussain,

[1]Associate Professor of Education, GC University Faisalabad, khudabakhsh@gcuf.edu.pk
[2]Professor of Urdu, GC University Faisalabad, drtariqhashmi@gcuf.edu.pk
[3]Associate Professor of History, GC University Faisalabad
[4]Associate Professor of Arabic, GC University Faisalabad
[5]Assistant Professor of Punjabi, GC University Faisalabad
***Corresponding Author**: Dr. Tariq Hashmi, drtariqhashmi@gcuf.edu.pk

ABSTRACT
Beginning in their fourth decade of life, adults gradually lose skeletal muscle mass and strength, and this process accelerates significantly during periods of illness, injury, inactivity, or immobilization. Although their roles in muscle regeneration are explained differently in professional and general literature, running and strength (resistance) training are two of the most popular forms of exercise. To identify areas of agreement, disagreement, and gaps in the descriptions of strength training and running's involvement in adult muscle healing found in published guidelines, consensus statements, systematic reviews, and groundbreaking research. A qualitative documentary analysis of a selected corpus that includes global recommendations for physical exercise, consensus statements, meta-analyses, and significant experimental studies use thematic coding. The five themes that emerged were as follows: (1) resistance training is consistently found to be the main stimulus for muscle hypertrophy and strength; (2) running is a potent driver of cardiorespiratory and metabolic health, with a modest and context-dependent effect on muscle size; (3) concurrent training can interfere with adaptations under some circumstances, but the interference appears to be minimal for the majority of non-athletic adults; and (4) nutrition, especially protein intake and recovery condition the response to both modes. According to the documentary evidence, jogging is a helpful complement rather than a substitute for strength training, which is the cornerstone for anybody trying to rebuild muscle. Combining both is advised for overall wellness. There are also gaps in the research on concurrent training for women, the elderly, and those with long-term medical conditions.

KEYWORDS: resistance training, running, muscle hypertrophy, sarcopenia, concurrent training, adults, documentary analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

Skeletal muscle is more than just the body's movement tissue. It is a protein storage, a metabolic organ, a factor in mobility and independence, and a long-term health prediction. When it reaches clinically significant levels, the loss of muscle mass and strength with aging is referred to as sarcopenia (Cruz-Jentoft et al., 2019). Sedentary lifestyles, bed rest, injuries, unexercise-based weight-loss programs, and chronic illness all hasten declines. Therefore, "rebuilding" muscle—that is, regaining or increasing lost muscle mass and function—is a problem for individuals of all ages, not just athletes or the elderly.

In public discourse, two exercise modalities predominate. Muscles are used in strength training, also known as resistance training, to operate against external loads like weights, machines, bands, or body weight. Running is a common, affordable, weight-bearing, repeated aerobic exercise. People often want to know which is better for their muscles, whether running "burns" muscle, and if they can do both at the same time. Responses are dispersed across recommendations, position statements, meta-analyses, and individual studies, each of which has a different audience and goal. Documentary analysis may demonstrate how the information is presented, where it converges, and where conclusions are based on shakier foundations by treating the papers themselves as the data. That is the strategy used in this post.

1.1 Research Questions

1. How do major documents describe the role of strength training in rebuilding muscle among adults?
2. How do they describe the role of running?
3. What do they say about combining the two (concurrent training)?
4. What conditions (nutrition, age, sex, health status) do they identify as modifying the response?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Design

This research involves a qualitative examination of documents. Documents were seen as artifacts that frame knowledge for practitioners and the general public, as well as sources of proof. The analysis is both thematic and narrative. No new individuals were recruited, no new quantitative data was produced, and it is not a proper systematic review.

2.2 Document corpus

Documents were selected purposively to represent four categories:

Category	Examples in corpus
International guidelines	WHO 2020 Guidelines about sedentary behavior and physical exercise; Americans' Physical Activity Guidelines (2nd edition summary)
Consensus statements	European consensus on sarcopenia (EWGSOP2)
Systematic reviews and meta-analyses	Training volume and hypertrophy dose-response; training frequency and strength; hypertrophy and load; protein supplementation; and simultaneous training
Landmark and review studies	Reviews of hypertrophy after aerobic training; the traditional concurrent-training interference research; early high-intensity strength training in very elderly folks

2.3 Inclusion criteria

Documents that (a) addressed adults (18 years of age and older), (b) referenced muscle mass, strength, or a similar function as an outcome, (c) dealt with resistance training, running, or other aerobic activity, and (d) were peer-reviewed or published by a recognized health authority were all included.

2.4 Analysis

The claimed purpose of each workout modality, the strength of the claim, the population under study, the impact on muscle growth vs strength versus function, and any cautions were all carefully examined and categorized. Iterative comparison was used to arrange codes into themes. When interpreting statements, credibility was bolstered by going back to the original text of the papers and highlighting any discrepancies.

3. Findings

Theme 1: Resistance training is the primary documented stimulus for rebuilding muscle

The best method for increasing muscle mass and strength throughout the corpus is resistance training. Adults should engage in muscle-strengthening exercises involving all major muscle groups at least twice a week, according to both U.S. and WHO standards (Bull et al., 2020; Piercy et al., 2018). Resistance training is also at the core of treatment according to the sarcopenia consensus (Cruz-Jentoft et al., 2019).

The body of historical evidence is impressive. High-intensity leg-extension training produced significant strength increases and modest improvements in mobility in frail nursing home patients with a mean age of almost 90 years in a classic experiment (Fiatarone et al., 1990). Resistance training consistently increases muscular strength in older persons, according to meta-analytic research (Peterson et al., 2010). Resistance training is a health-promoting strategy that affects muscular, bone, metabolic, and functional outcomes, according to Westcott (2012).

The stimulus's operation is also explained in the materials. After mechanical stress, muscle protein synthesis increases, and repeated workouts with proper diet and recuperation result in net accretion. The practical detail is refined by many meta-analyses:

- The volume. Weekly sets per muscle group and hypertrophy have a dose-response relationship, with higher volumes often linked to larger increases but diminishing returns (Schoenfeld et al., 2017a).
- Load: Both heavy and light loads cause hypertrophy when sets are done close to muscle failure, while higher loads encourage maximal strength (Schoenfeld et al., 2017b).
- Frequency: The distribution of weekly volume seems to be the main factor that makes frequency important. When volume remains constant, training a muscle more often has no effect on strength (Grgic et al., 2018).

Progressive overload, or progressively increasing the strain on the muscle, is the fundamental idea, according to the constant message.

Theme 2: Running is documented as a health and fitness stimulus, with a modest, context-dependent role in muscle

Running and aerobic exercise documents focus on body composition, mental health, metabolic control, and cardiorespiratory fitness. Adults should engage in 150–300 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic exercise or 75–150 minutes of vigorous-intensity aerobic activity per week, according to guidelines (Bull et al., 2020). Running effectively satisfies this recommendation's vigorous aim.

The texts are more subtle when it comes to muscle in particular. Reviews show that aerobic exercise may result in quantifiable hypertrophy, notably in lower limb muscles and in elderly, deconditioned, or untrained individuals (Konopka & Harber, 2014). However, the benefit diminishes with training, and the size is often lesser than that of

resistance training. Running has minimal effect on the muscles of the upper body and torso since it is primarily a lower-body, repetitive-load sport.
Additionally, running improves mitochondrial density, capillarization, and fatigue resistance, all of which contribute to muscle quality as much as quantity. These are a component of rebuilding that muscle-size measurements may overlook, and they are functionally significant. In addition to helping with muscle repair, running offers impact loading that promotes bone health.
The publications also include an implicit or clear warning about a risk: excessive running volumes may lead to both fat and lean tissue loss when caloric intake is inadequate. Running volume and diet are thus important for everyone who wants to gain muscle.

Theme 3: Concurrent training, interference and its limits

The notion that endurance training "interferes" with the development of strength stems from early research demonstrating that individuals who exercised both attributes concurrently saw a muted development of strength (Hickson, 1980). The image has been improved by later papers. Strength gains were lower in concurrent groups, according to a meta-analysis of concurrent training, and interference was most noticeable when endurance exercise was done often, for extended periods of time, or as running rather than cycling (Wilson et al., 2012). Interference may exist under some circumstances, depending on training volume, intensity, order, and recuperation, according to reviews of the molecular and practical literature (Fyfe et al., 2014).

Other publications, however, cast doubt on the validity of this result regarding muscle size. According to a review of concurrent-training research, increasing endurance work typically does not impair hypertrophy in ordinary, non-elite individuals (Murach & Bagley, 2016). Since maximum strength and power are more prone to interference than hypertrophy, there seems to be a difference between the two bodies of study in both the population and the result. This is because athletes who pursue large volumes of both are the main source of interference data. These texts' practical theme is that, for the majority of individuals, doing both has more advantages than disadvantages. The suggested remedies to interference issues are modest: divide sessions when feasible, steer clear of really high running volumes if hypertrophy is the primary objective, and make sure you have enough protein and calories.

Theme 4: Nutrition, recovery and individual factors condition the response

A fourth theme is the environment in which training is conducted. A meta-analysis found that protein supplementation boosts muscle development and strength gains during resistance training, with benefits peaking at around 1.6 g of protein per kilogram of body weight per day in the pooled data (Morton et al., 2018). The fact that older people are often described as displaying "anabolic resistance" and needing stronger stimuli or more protein to achieve the same response strengthens the case for resistance exercise and nutritional care in later life. Hormones, medication, illness, rest and recovery, training level (beginners progress the fastest), and medicines are other factors. According to sarcopenia papers, rebuilding is possible at any age, although the rate and ceiling differ.

Theme 5: Consistent recommendation, inconsistent prescription

Comparing the papers reveals a noteworthy trend. They agree that it's best to do both aerobic and muscle-strengthening exercises. On how, they are less in agreement. Minimum frequencies for weight training and minutes for aerobic exercise are specified in guidelines, but they don't provide much direction on sequencing, relative focus when the main objective is muscle rebuilding, or modifications for those recuperating from sickness or injury. Compared to young males, there is less data on women, older persons, and those with chronic illnesses in concurrent-training research. The health benefits of muscle-strengthening exercise are supported by observational data, including its correlation with a decreased risk of death (Momma et al., 2022). However, these studies are insufficient to resolve issues about the best programming.

4. DISCUSSION

A division of labor is supported by the documentary evidence. Because strength training focuses on the biological mechanism—mechanical tension and increasing overload—that propels hypertrophy and strength throughout the body, it is the cornerstone of muscle regeneration. Running should not be anticipated to replace resistance training; rather, it is a supplement that enhances the cardiorespiratory and metabolic environment in which muscle functions and provides some lower-body muscular benefit, especially for novices.
The common fear that jogging will "eat" muscle is unfounded. The materials indicate that the risk is mostly linked to very high running volumes, low calorie intake, or when the goals are maximal power and strength. It has been shown that weight training in conjunction with moderate running helps the typical adult rebuild muscle after a period of inactivity or as they age.
The method also explains why simplistic debates over "cardio versus weights" persist. While strength training is evaluated on muscle and strength, running is evaluated on aerobic fitness and cardio metabolic health. When they are compared on a single outcome, the choice of outcome influences the result. Framing them as competitors misses the fact that most individuals need both.

4.1 Practical implications

The following comments are an overview of the resources that were looked at rather than specific medical advice:

- Make progressive resistance training a priority at least two, preferably two to three, days a week. This should include all major muscle groups and involve sets that are taken near to exhaustion with progressively increasing load or volume.
- In accordance with recommendations, include jogging or other aerobic activity. For the majority of individuals, moderate quantities are unlikely to hinder muscle regeneration.
- Avoid sudden, large increases in running volume and attempt to keep sessions apart to reduce interference.
- Encourage adaptation by getting enough protein and calories, getting enough sleep, and gradually increasing the load.
- Adjust for medication, age, chronic illness, or injuries. Before beginning strenuous programs, those with medical issues or those who have been inactive for a long period should see a doctor or other trained exercise specialist.

4.2 Implications for research and policy

Future research should compare the effects of running with other aerobic modalities on muscle outcomes in the same individuals; do additional concurrent-training trials in women, older people, and clinical groups; and conduct long-term studies that measure function and quality of life rather than just muscle growth. It would be preferable to emphasize in public health messaging that muscle-strengthening exercise is a specific prescription rather than an optional addition to aerobic exercise.

5. LIMITATIONS

This research has a number of shortcomings. Since it is a narrative, purposeful documentary study rather than a systematic examination, selection bias may have occurred and some pertinent documents may have been left out. The corpus was based on widely accessible English-language sources. The robustness of the conclusions is limited by the underlying study, many of which have small samples, short durations, and unequal representation of women and elderly people. Results represent how the records are framed rather than taking the place of the actual trials. Readers should check the citation information in the original sources before utilizing them in official work.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The documentary evidence unites on a distinct stance across recommendations, consensus statements, meta-analyses, and seminal research. While jogging is a useful companion that enhances cardiovascular and metabolic health and makes a little contribution to muscle, particularly in the lower body, strength training is the most effective method for adults to rebuild muscle. In high-volume situations, concurrent training may dull certain adaptations, but for the majority of individuals, the interference is negligible in comparison to the advantages of integrating both. The primary gaps are seen in evidence for understudied populations and in particular prescription guidelines. Building a foundation of resistance training, adding running in moderate and increasing doses, and supporting both with recovery and nutrition is the evidence-based strategy for both people and practitioners.

REFERENCES

1. Bull, F. C., Al-Ansari, S. S., Biddle, S., et al. (2020). World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 54*(24), 1451-1462.
2. Cruz-Jentoft, A. J., Bahat, G., Bauer, J., et al. (2019). Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. *Age and Ageing, 48*(1), 16-31.
3. Fiatarone, M. A., Marks, E. C., Ryan, N. D., et al. (1990). High-intensity strength training in nonagenarians: effects on skeletal muscle. *JAMA, 263*(22), 3029-3034.
4. Fyfe, J. J., Bishop, D. J., & Stepto, N. K. (2014). Interference between concurrent resistance and endurance exercise: molecular bases and the role of individual training variables. *Sports Medicine, 44*(6), 743-762.
5. Grgic, J., Schoenfeld, B. J., Davies, T. B., et al. (2018). Effect of resistance training frequency on gains in muscular strength: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Medicine, 48*(5), 1207-1220.
6. Hickson, R. C. (1980). Interference of strength development by simultaneously training for strength and endurance. *European Journal of Applied Physiology, 45*(2-3), 255-263.
7. Konopka, A. R., & Harber, M. P. (2014). Skeletal muscle hypertrophy after aerobic exercise training. *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews, 42*(2), 53-61.
8. Momma, H., Kawakami, R., Honda, T., & Sawada, S. S. (2022). Muscle-strengthening activities are associated with lower risk and mortality in major non-communicable diseases: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 56*(13), 755-763.
9. Morton, R. W., Murphy, K. T., McKellar, S. R., et al. (2018). A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of the effect of protein supplementation on resistance training-induced gains in muscle mass and strength in healthy adults. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 52*(6), 376-384.

10. Murach, K. A., & Bagley, J. R. (2016). Skeletal muscle hypertrophy with concurrent exercise training: contrary evidence for an interference effect. *Sports Medicine, 46*(8), 1029-1039.
11. Peterson, M. D., Rhea, M. R., Sen, A., & Gordon, P. M. (2010). Resistance exercise for muscular strength in older adults: a meta-analysis. *Ageing Research Reviews, 9*(3), 226-237.
12. Piercy, K. L., Troiano, R. P., Ballard, R. M., et al. (2018). The Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans. *JAMA, 320*(19), 2020-2028.
13. Schoenfeld, B. J., Grgic, J., Ogborn, D., & Krieger, J. W. (2017b). 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.
14. Schoenfeld, B. J., Ogborn, D., & Krieger, J. W. (2017a). Dose-response relationship between weekly resistance training volume and increases in muscle mass: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 35*(11), 1073-1082.
15. Westcott, W. L. (2012). Resistance training is medicine: effects of strength training on health. *Current Sports Medicine Reports, 11*(4), 209-216.
16. Wilson, J. M., Marin, P. J., Rhea, M. R., et al. (2012). Concurrent training: a meta-analysis examining interference of aerobic and resistance exercises. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 26*(8), 2293-2307.