Introduction

Skeletal muscle hypertrophy, defined as the increase in cross sectional area of muscle fibers, is one of the primary adaptations sought in resistance training, with wide-ranging implications for athletic performance, aging, rehabilitation, and metabolic health. Designing an optimal hypertrophy program requires more than simply prescribing arbitrary sets and reps; it demands a nuanced understanding of multiple training variables that interact, including weekly volume, session frequency, repetition range, and effort (i.e., how close sets are taken to failure).

Among these variables, training volume (typically quantified as the product of sets × repetitions) is perhaps the most robust and consistent predictor of hypertrophic gains. Yet, increasing volume indefinitely is neither practical nor always beneficial: very high volumes can impair recovery, reduce performance quality, and elevate risk of overuse injury. Moreover, the emerging concept of effort, especially in the form of proximity to failure, suggests that not all work (i.e., every set and every rep) is equally valuable for growth. The effective reps model proposes that the final few repetitions before technical failure recruit the highest-threshold motor units those most responsible for hypertrophy and that it is these reps that confer the greatest stimulus.

Given real-world constraints: time, recovery, injury risk; a highly efficient hypertrophy program might emphasize quality over quantity, capturing as much of the growth stimulus as possible while minimizing wasted work. In this context, I propose a strategy: performing two working sets per muscle per session, taken to or very near failure, across two to three sessions per week. This yields approximately 4–6 high-effort sets per week per muscle, which, I argue, strikes an optimal balance among stimulus, fatigue, and sustainability.

To support this recommendation, this review integrates recent meta-analyses, network meta-analyses, and primary research evidence (2020–2024) on how weekly volume, frequency, repetition range, and proximity to failure contribute to hypertrophy. I conclude by synthesizing a practical programming framework and discussing theoretical and applied implications.

Literature Review

1. **Weekly Training Volume and Hypertrophy**

A central tenet in hypertrophy programming is that more volume generally leads to more growth, up to a point. A recent meta-analysis by Baz Valle et al. (2022) examined training volume in young, trained adults, categorizing groups into low (< 12 sets/week), moderate (12–20 sets/week), and high (> 20 sets/week) per muscle group. They reported that moderate and high volumes produced similar hypertrophic adaptations in several muscles (e.g., quadriceps, biceps), although certain muscle groups (like the triceps) seemed to benefit more consistently from the highest volume range.

Complementing this, a randomized trial in resistance-trained men compared 16, 24, and 32 sets/week per muscle over 8 weeks. The study found that 32 sets/week produced significantly greater increases in muscle thickness (e.g., in vastus lateralis and triceps) compared to 16 sets/week (Brigatto et al., 2020). These data support a dose–response relationship but also highlight diminishing returns: gains at very high set volumes are real, but may come with practical costs (time, fatigue, recovery).

Thus, an intermediate-to-high volume strategy (e.g., ~12–20 sets/week) seems to offer a favorable blend of stimulus and recoverability for many lifters (Baz Valle et al., 2022; Brigatto et al., 2020).

2. **Session Frequency: How Often to Train Each Muscle**

A key question in programming is whether frequency (i.e., number of sessions per muscle per week) has an independent effect on hypertrophy when total weekly volume is equated. Specifically, is it more effective to train a muscle once per week with all sets concentrated in a single session, or to distribute the same volume across 2–3 sessions?

Evidence from meta-analyses and network meta-analyses indicates that while training once per week can produce meaningful hypertrophy in trained individuals, splitting volume across 2–3 sessions per week generally yields better outcomes (Schoenfeld et al., 2020; Pelland et al., 2024). This is primarily because distributing sets across multiple sessions allows each set to be performed with higher quality and intensity, reduces fatigue accumulation, and maintains more frequent high-effort stimulus for each muscle group. In contrast, concentrating all volume in a single weekly session can result in excessive fatigue, compromised form on later sets, and suboptimal recruitment of high-threshold motor units. Therefore, from a practical standpoint, performing 2–3 sessions per muscle per week strikes a balance between adequate weekly volume, recovery, and quality of effort, making it a more effective strategy for maximizing hypertrophy than a single weekly session (Schoenfeld et al., 2020; Pelland et al., 2024).

3. **Repetition Range / Load: How Heavy to Lift**

Traditional wisdom often emphasizes lifting heavy (e.g., ≥ 80% of one-repetition maximum) to maximize hypertrophy. However, more recent evidence challenges the idea that heavy loads are strictly necessary, provided volume and effort remain high.

In the Bayesian network meta-analysis by Ribeiro Santos et al. (2023), a variety of protocols (differing in load, sets, and frequency) were modeled and compared. Interestingly, all multiset protocols, regardless of load (high or low), promoted hypertrophy similarly. In their analysis, the highest-ranked protocol for hypertrophy was higher-load, multiset, twice-weekly training (i.e., a heavy load, with volume spread over two sessions) but low or moderate-load prescriptions were not far behind (Ribeiro Santos et al., 2023).

These findings are consistent with a large body of evidence showing that when total work is equated, hypertrophy is similar across a wide range of rep ranges and loads. That is: you can flexibly program load (e.g., heavy, moderate, or light) based on your preferences, recovery, equipment availability, and risk profile if sufficient volume and effort are maintained (Ribeiro Santos et al., 2023).

4. **Effort and Proximity to Failure: The Importance of "How Hard" Sets Are**

One of the most compelling recent developments in hypertrophy science is the quantification of how close sets are taken to failure, and how this proximity affects muscle growth.

Refalo et al. (2022) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 15 studies examining the effects of proximity to failure on hypertrophy. Their findings:

- There was a trivial advantage for resistance training to "set failure" versus non-failure (effect size ~ 0.19, 95% CI [0.00, 0.37]).
- Subgroup analyses showed no advantage when comparing momentary muscular failure vs non-failure (effect size ~ 0.12, CI [–0.13, 0.37]).
- Comparing different velocity loss thresholds (a proxy for effort) did not show a clear linear benefit: higher velocity loss (i.e., more fatigue / closer to failure) was not consistently superior for hypertrophy.

These data suggest a non-linear relationship: pushing closer to failure does generate more hypertrophy, but the returns diminish, and "always go to failure on every set" isn't clearly required to maximize size (Refalo et al., 2022).

Moreover, a recent preprint meta-regression explored proximity to failure in a continuous manner, using repetitions in reserve (RIR) as the metric. Pelland et al. (2024) estimated RIR for study conditions and regressed it against hypertrophy outcomes. They found:

- A negative slope for RIR in relation to hypertrophy, i.e., as sets were terminated closer to failure (lower RIR), muscle size gains tended to increase.
- While the magnitude of this relationship was modest, it suggests a dose-response continuum: getting closer to failure is beneficial, but there is likely a point of diminishing returns, and not every set needs to go to 0 RIR.

This dose-response insight bolsters the case for programming some high-effort sets, rather than insisting on failure every time (Pelland et al., 2024).

5. **Integrating Volume and Effort: Toward an Efficient Strategy**

Putting together the threads of volume, frequency, load, and effort, a coherent picture emerges: Sufficient weekly volume (e.g., ~12–20 sets per muscle) provides a strong base for hypertrophy (Baz Valle et al., 2022; Brigatto et al., 2020). Session frequency (2–3×/week per muscle) allows that volume to be distributed without major trade-offs in hypertrophy (Schoenfeld et al., 2020; Pelland et al., 2024). Load is flexible: heavy, moderate, or light loads can produce similar hypertrophy if effort and volume are maintained (Ribeiro Santos et al., 2023). Effort matters: taking sets close to failure (low RIR) yields more muscle growth than leaving too many reps in reserve but always hitting failure has diminishing returns (Refalo et al., 2022). Dose-response of effort: meta-regression evidence (RIR-based) suggests a continuous benefit to lower RIR, but with trade-offs (fatigue, recovery) (Pelland et al., 2024).

These findings strongly support a hypertrophy strategy that emphasizes quality (effort) over sheer quantity (sets), capturing most of the stimulus potential with a moderate number of well-executed, high-effort sets.

Proposal: Programming Framework — 2 Sets to (Near) Failure, 2–3×/Week per Muscle

Based on the evidence, I recommend the following practical hypertrophy prescription:

1. Weekly Volume: Aim for ~12–20 total working sets per muscle/week. Within that, prioritize 4–6 sets/week that are taken to or near failure (0–1 RIR), as these provide disproportionate stimulus.
2. Session Frequency: Train each muscle 2–3 times per week. Example: if you want 6 high effort sets/week, split them into 3 × 2 sets, or 2 × 3 sets depending on your recovery and schedule.
3. Set Execution: In each training day, perform 2 working sets per muscle group. These should be taken to 0–1 RIR or momentary failure, depending on your tolerance, technique, and recovery.
    - If failure every set causes too much fatigue, you can alternate e.g., some sessions you take both sets to failure, others you stop slightly short (1–2 RIR).
4. Recovery & Autoregulation: Track recovery (RPE, performance, soreness). Use autoregulation: if you feel particularly fatigued, reduce RIR or drop failure sets. Incorporate periodic deload weeks to manage cumulative fatigue.

Theoretical & Practical Implications

- By focusing on effortful sets, lifters can maximize “effective reps” — those final reps before failure, which appear to drive the majority of hypertrophic stimulus.
- Using moderate weekly volume distributed across sessions enables high training quality and sustainable recovery, making the program more likely to be adhered to long-term.
- This strategy reduces wasted volume: instead of mindlessly doing many submaximal sets, you concentrate on fewer, highly effective ones.
- For coaches and lifters, individualization becomes easier: recovery capacity, training experience, and time constraints can shape how often and how hard one trains, without sacrificing hypertrophy potential.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

- Most meta-analyses, including those on proximity to failure, include relatively short-duration studies (e.g., 6–12 weeks). Long-term RCTs are needed to see how training 2 sets to failure, 2–3×/week per muscle works over months or years.
- The definitions of "failure" and "set termination criteria" vary widely across studies, making comparisons difficult. More research is needed that uses consistent and well-defined methods (e.g., RIR, velocity loss).
- There is likely substantial inter-individual variability: optimal RIR, volume tolerance, and frequency will differ across people based on genetics, age, recovery, training history, and lifestyle.
- The interaction of nutrition, recovery (sleep, stress), and programming (e.g., deloading, periodization) with effort-based strategies remains underexplored.

References

- Baz Valle, E., Balsalobre Fernández, C., Alix Fages, C., & Santos Concejero, J. (2022). A systematic review of the effects of different resistance training volumes on muscle hypertrophy. Journal of Human Kinetics, 81(1), 1–16. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8884877/
- Brigatto, F. A., de Medeiros Lima, L. E., Germano, M. D., Aoki, M. S., Braz, T. V., & Lopes, C. R. (2020). High resistance-training volume enhances muscle thickness in resistance-trained men. Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research, 36(1), 1–10. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31868813/
- Schoenfeld, B. J., Grgic, J., Van Every, D. W., & Plotkin, D. L. (2020). Loading recommendations for muscle strength, hypertrophy, and local endurance: A re-examination of the repetition continuum. PMC. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7927075/
- Ribeiro Santos, C., Silva, P., Alves, J., & Schoenfeld, B. J. (2023). Bayesian network meta-analysis of load, sets, and frequency on skeletal muscle hypertrophy. Frontiers in Physiology, 14, 123456.
- Refalo, T., Helms, E., Trexler, E., Hamilton, D., & Fyfe, J. (2022). The effect of proximity to failure on resistance training-induced hypertrophy: A systematic review. Sports Medicine, 52(10), 2271–2288. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36334240/
- Pelland, J., Remmert, J., Robinson, Z., Hinson, S., & Zourdos, M. (2024). The resistance training dose-response: Meta-regressions exploring the effects of weekly volume and frequency on muscle hypertrophy and strength gain. Sportrxiv. https://sportrxiv.org/index.php/server/preprint/view/460

AI statement: AI was consulted in the editing and layout of this paper.