WHITE PAPER 05 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

The True Science of Hypertrophy

What Builds Muscle—and What Merely Feels Like It Does

> *"Muscle grows from repeated, recoverable loading—not from chasing a sensation."*

Executive Thesis

Muscle growth has been buried beneath a vocabulary of pumps, burns, shocks, angles, hormone spikes, microtears, and secret repetition ranges. Most of that language confuses an acute experience with a long-term adaptation. A muscle can burn without growing. It can become sore without growing. It can grow without either sensation being dramatic.

Hypertrophy is the enlargement of muscle tissue over time. Resistance training produces it when training repeatedly creates a sufficient muscular demand, the dose can be recovered from, and nutrition supplies the material required to remodel tissue. No single rep range, exercise angle, or post-workout feeling owns that process.[1]

What Muscle Growth Actually Is

Long-term hypertrophy is assessed through changes such as muscle-fiber cross-sectional area, ultrasound-measured thickness, or magnetic-resonance-imaging muscle volume. Each method has limitations, but all attempt to separate durable tissue change from the temporary swelling, fluid shift, glycogen storage, and inflammation that can follow a workout.

At the tissue level, growth requires accumulated periods in which muscle-protein synthesis exceeds breakdown. Even this statement needs care. Early in a new program, a large protein-synthesis response may support repair of unfamiliar damage rather than new contractile tissue. In a longitudinal study, integrated myofibrillar protein synthesis related to hypertrophy only after training reduced the initial muscle-damage response.[2] One impressive acute laboratory signal is not the same thing as measured growth.

Force Demand Recruits the System

The nervous system grades force by recruiting motor units and altering their firing behavior. Henneman's size principle describes the general order: lower-threshold units are recruited before progressively higher-threshold units as force demand rises.[3] Heavy loads create high force demands immediately. Lighter loads can also require high-threshold recruitment as sustained effort and fatigue make the remaining repetitions increasingly demanding.

This is why external load cannot be treated as a complete measure of the stimulus. Muscle length, moment arms, range of motion, repetitions, effort, velocity intention, stability, and fatigue all change the internal force requirement. Mechanical tension is useful shorthand for that loading environment; it is not a number printed on a plate.

There Is No Exclusive Hypertrophy Rep Range

In resistance-trained men, 12 weeks of whole-body training with roughly 30–50% of one-repetition maximum for 20–25 repetitions per set produced muscle growth similar to training at roughly 75–90% for 8–12 repetitions when sets were taken to volitional failure.[4] Heavier training retained an advantage for bench-press one-repetition-maximum improvement. The distinction is crucial: many loads can build muscle, but the best way to build a specific strength test still includes practicing heavy work related to that test.

Effort becomes especially important at low loads. In an eight-week unilateral knee-extension study, training at 30% of one-repetition maximum produced clear quadriceps growth when sets reached failure but not when the low-load sets stopped much earlier. At 80%, reaching failure added no hypertrophy advantage over stopping short in that protocol.[5] Failure is therefore a tool, not a commandment. The lighter the load, the more repetitions may be required to create a comparable recruitment demand.

> **PROGRAMMING BOUNDARY**
> A set does not become productive merely because the lifter adds unplanned repetitions to chase a burn. Follow the prescribed sets, repetitions, load, range, and progression. If performance exceeds the plan, record it and advance the next programmed exposure rather than turning every session into an improvised failure test.

Volume Matters, but More Is Not Infinite

Hypertrophy responds to accumulated hard training. In untrained men, six months of training with five sets per exercise produced greater upper-arm muscle-thickness gains than lower-set conditions in several comparisons.[6] The 2026 ACSM synthesis likewise found that higher weekly volumes can enhance hypertrophy on average.[1]

That does not mean every added set is productive. Volume has a recovery cost, studies report group averages, and the useful dose depends on training status, exercise selection, effort, sleep, nutrition, and the muscle being measured. The correct dose is enough work to force adaptation without degrading technique, performance, or the next exposure.

The Academy's seven-week progression moves from higher-repetition work toward heavier, lower-repetition work. That is a coherent way to expose the body to different loading demands while keeping progression measurable. It should be defended as an applied framework—not as proof that one seven-week sequence is the only or universally optimal hypertrophy prescription.

Range and Muscle Length Matter

The rejection of angle chasing must not become denial of anatomy. Joint position changes muscle length, leverage, and force distribution. In a 12-week within-person study, seated leg curls produced greater wholehamstring hypertrophy than prone leg curls, particularly in the biarticular hamstrings placed at longer lengths.[7] That is a meaningful programming difference, not proof that every minor angle change deserves another exercise.

The correct question is not, "Can this angle feel different?" It is, "Does this position create a repeatable, tolerable loading exposure that improves the outcome we actually care about?" Angles are tools. Progression remains the system.

What the Pump, Soreness, EMG, and Hormones Do Not Prove

A pump shows that fluid has shifted into working tissue. Soreness shows that an exercise created an unfamiliar or damaging stress. Surface electromyography estimates electrical activity near an electrode. None of those observations, alone, establishes future hypertrophy.

The same is true of acute systemic hormone elevations. In a cohort of 56 young men, post-exercise changes in growth hormone, free testosterone, and insulin-like growth factor 1 did not explain gains in lean mass or leg-press strength.[8] The Morton training study reached the same practical conclusion.[4] Local cellular signaling and normal endocrine function matter; a temporary bloodstream spike is simply not a scoreboard for muscle growth.

Nutrition and Recovery Supply the Adaptation

Training provides the demand. Food and recovery determine whether the body can repeatedly answer it. A large meta-analysis found that protein supplementation modestly enhanced resistance-training gains in lean mass and strength, with average benefits plateauing around a total daily intake of approximately 1.6 grams per kilogram of body mass in the studied healthy adults.[9] That number is an estimate, not a universal ceiling or a requirement to buy supplements.

Total energy intake, protein quality and distribution, sleep, illness, medication, age, and training history all affect the result. No advanced method can compensate indefinitely for inadequate nutrition or recovery.

The Academy Standard

Build hypertrophy through exercises that can be loaded, repeated, and progressed. Use compound lifts to train large amounts of muscle efficiently. Keep technique and range consistent enough that an increase in performance means something. Add a variation only when it solves a defined problem—not because novelty created a new sensation.

Muscle growth is the accumulated result of productive exposures. The session is a signal. The program is the dose. The months and years are the adaptation.

Conclusion

The true science of hypertrophy is less theatrical than the marketing. Muscles grow when sufficiently demanding resistance training is performed often enough, progressed over time, and supported by food and recovery. Load matters, but it is not acting alone. Volume matters, but it is not unlimited. Failure can matter, but it is not mandatory. Angles matter, but they do not replace progression.

> *“Do not chase the feeling of growth. Build the conditions that make growth unavoidable.”*

References

1. Currier BS, D'Souza AC, Fiatarone Singh MA, et al. American College of Sports Medicine position stand. Resistance training prescription for muscle function, hypertrophy, and physical performance in healthy adults: an overview of reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897
2. Damas F, Phillips SM, Libardi CA, et al. Resistance training-induced changes in integrated myofibrillar protein synthesis are related to hypertrophy only after attenuation of muscle damage. J Physiol. 2016;594(18):5209–5222. doi:10.1113/JP272472
3. Henneman E, Somjen G, Carpenter DO. Functional significance of cell size in spinal motoneurons. J Neurophysiol. 1965;28:560–580. doi:10.1152/jn.1965.28.3.560
4. Morton RW, Oikawa SY, Wavell CG, et al. Neither load nor systemic hormones determine resistance training-mediated hypertrophy or strength gains in resistance-trained young men. J Appl Physiol. 2016;121(1):129–138. doi:10.1152/japplphysiol.00154.2016
5. Lasevicius T, Schoenfeld BJ, Silva-Batista C, et al. Muscle failure promotes greater muscle hypertrophy in low-load but not in high-load resistance training. J Strength Cond Res. 2022;36(2):346–351. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000003454
6. Radaelli R, Fleck SJ, Leite T, et al. Dose-response of 1, 3, and 5 sets of resistance exercise on strength, local muscular endurance, and hypertrophy. J Strength Cond Res. 2015;29(5):1349–1358. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000000758
7. Maeo S, Huang M, Wu Y, et al. Greater hamstrings muscle hypertrophy but similar damage protection after training at long versus short muscle lengths. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2021;53(4):825–837. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000002523
8. West DWD, Phillips SM. Associations of exercise-induced hormone profiles and gains in strength and hypertrophy in a large cohort after weight training. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2012;112:2693–2702. doi:10.1007/s00421-011-2246-z
9. Morton RW, Murphy KT, McKellar SR, et al. 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. Br J Sports Med. 2018;52(6):376–384. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2017-097608