

Title page

Title: Comparative effectiveness of different exercises on bone mineral density in postmenopausal women: a systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Authors: Yi Li (0000-0002-6714-3028) PhD^{1,2,3}, Xiaoyi Wang MSc^{1,2,3}, Ruishi Zhang MSc^{1,2,3}, Siyi Zhu PhD^{1,2,3}, Liqiong Wang PhD^{1,2,3}, Jingming Huang PhD^{1,2,3}, Xinling Gan^{1,2,3}, Suhang Xie Msc^{1,2,3}, Tao Wu BD^{1,2,3}, Chengqi He PhD^{1,2,3*}

Affiliations:

Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan Province, People's Republic of China, 610041, Key Laboratory of Rehabilitation Medicine, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan Province, People's Republic of China, 610041, Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan Province, People's Republic of China, 610041

* Corresponding Author:

Dr. Chengqi He

No 37 Guo-xue-xiang Street, Chengdu

Tel: +86 85422847

Fax: +86 85422847

E-mail: hxfhqc2015@126.com

Comparative effectiveness of different exercises on bone mineral density in postmenopausal women: a systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Objective: To compare and rank different exercise interventions on bone mineral density (BMD) in postmenopausal women.

Data Sources and Study Selection: MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, AMED, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Scopus and Web of Science were searched from database inception to January 2021 of randomized controlled studies investigating the effect of exercise more than six months on BMD in postmenopausal women.

Data Extraction and Synthesis: Data at baseline and post intervention (or the change from baseline) were extracted. A Bayesian random-effects network meta-analysis was performed.

Main Outcomes and Measures: The primary outcome was the change of BMD (at lumbar spine, femoral neck, and total hip) from baseline values. Effect size measures were mean differences with 95% credible intervals (CrIs).

Results: We identified 3324 citations and included 66 studies with a total number of 4336 participants. Associated with BMD at lumbar spine (LS) improve were found for multicomponent exercise, resistance training, mind body exercise, lower impact exercise, high impact exercise, and whole body vibration. With regard to femoral neck (FN), only multicomponent exercise, whole body vibration, and mind body exercise were effective. As for total hip (TH), only multicomponent exercise, resistance training, and flexibility exercise

were found to be beneficial. Moreover, no matter the age of postmenopausal women, and the duration of intervention (range between 6 to 18 months), some certain kinds of exercise could be performed to improve BMD at LS and FN.

Conclusions and Relevance: This NMA confirms that exercise therapy has clear benefits on bone mineral density in postmenopausal women. It also shows that the magnitude of effect varies depending on the outcome of interest, the age of participants, and the duration of intervention. Clinicians might consult the ranking of the exercise intervention presented in this study, when designating an optimal, individualized exercise prescription to improve BMD.

Introduction

In the early years after menopause, postmenopausal women experience dramatic decreases in bone mineral density (BMD), which may increase the likelihood of developing osteoporosis and fragility fractures.^{1, 2} As reported, approximately one-third of postmenopausal women have osteoporosis.³ Every year, the number of osteoporotic fracture is estimated to be about nine million worldwide, 61% of which are women.⁴ Osteoporotic fracture is associated with substantial morbidity and mortality, imposing a significant negative impact not only on the patients themselves, but also on society in terms of cost of health care and fracture therapy.⁵

Different types of physical exercise, including aerobic exercise, impact exercise, strength training and balance training are used in clinical practice to maintain or increase BMD.^{6, 7} Several systematic reviews, including meta-analyses, have investigated the efficacy of different exercise interventions for BMD.⁸⁻¹⁰ However, review articles reported that the BMD effects of exercise are modest at best,^{11, 12} which may partially due to the large variety of

exercise regimens and participant characteristics. Therefore, it is challenging to decide which is the most appropriate treatment and this may account for the variation in clinical practice.

Traditional pairwise meta analyses depend on qualified randomized controlled trials (RCTs) having similar treatment and control groups, and studies with different comparators were excluded consequently. Network meta-analysis (NMA), which synthesises evidence from direct and indirect comparisons of multiple treatments, makes it practical for simultaneous inferences regarding clinical efficacy of all available treatment groups.^{13, 14} Moreover, it has the potential to enhance the power of the estimation as compared to traditional meta analyses. In the meantime, NMA could inform clinicians and patients by ranking of the effectiveness of different treatments.¹⁵

To our knowledge, no study has yet used NMA to compare the effects of different exercises on bone mineral density in postmenopausal women. The objective of this systematic review and hierarchical Bayesian network meta-analysis was to pool data from RCTs to compare the relative effects of all available exercise interventions on BMD in postmenopausal women, providing an up-to-date and comprehensive overview of evidence-based treatments.

Methods

Data Sources and Search Strategies

This systematic review was performed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement and the PRISMA network meta-analysis extension statement.^{16, 17} The review protocol was registered in the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Protocols (identifier: INPLASY202140107).

Two independent reviewers performed the search procedures. The following electronic databases were searched from inception to 17 January, 2021: MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, AMED, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Scopus and Web of Science. We also searched using the World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform search portal, such as ClinicalTrials.gov and ISRCTN, to identify further studies. No language restriction was applied. Furthermore, the bibliographies of selected articles and relevant review articles were examined for additional potentially relevant studies. A combination of relevant free text terms, synonyms and subject headings relating to postmenopausal women, intervention of interest and randomized controlled trial were included in the strategy. The detailed search strategies for MEDLINE are provided in Supplementary Appendix 1, and the search terms will be adjusted appropriately to the different syntax requirements of the other databases.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Articles were eligible if they met the following inclusion criteria: (1) RCTs designed to compare any therapeutic exercise intervention with other forms of exercise, sham exercise or no exercise control group with usual activity; (2) Subjects were healthy or osteoporotic postmenopausal women; (3) Intervention lasted at least 6 months of duration; (4) The study provided original data or sufficient information about at least one of the following outcomes: BMD measured by dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DEXA) or dual-photon absorptiometry (DPA) at lumbar spine (LS), total hip (TH), or/and femoral neck (FN) locations. We further excluded studies with (1) cross-over trials, non-RCTs or non-clinical trials; (2) mixed gender or mixed pre- and postmenopausal cohorts without separate subgroup analyses; (3) the

addition of any medications (e.g. bisphosphonates, glucocorticoid or hormone replacement therapy) with a dedicated effect on bone metabolism, but participants who consumed calcium and vitamin D were eligible for inclusion; (4) identical exercise interventions between the intervention groups; (5) conference abstracts with no corresponding full article published in a peer-reviewed journal or no specific data provided even after contacting the author.

Categorization of exercises

In order to determine the effects of different types of exercise, we categorized the exercise intervention into ten categories. The definition of these interventions is provided in table 1.

Outcome Measures and Risk of bias Assessment

Pairs of members of the review team used a pre-piloted extraction form to independently extract relevant data. A third arbitrator was involved in case any disagreements occurred. From each study, we extracted general manuscript information (author, year of publication, region), demographic and clinical characteristics of participants (number of participants, age, body mass index (BMI), years since menopause, additional supplement), intervention protocols (type of exercise, frequency, duration, main part of exercise, setting of intervention, session length, compliance and adverse events), quality assessment and outcomes.

BMD at LS, TH or/and FN locations were assessed by DXA or DPA immediately post intervention. The primary outcome was change of BMD from baseline values (end-point score minus baseline score). If the results were merely presented in figures, values were extracted using a plot digitizer program.¹⁸ Quality assessments were performed with the PEDro scale.¹⁹

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis

The mean difference of the change score was used to estimate the effect size (ES)

(Supplementary Appendix 2). Pooling of effect estimates across studies were conducted using random-effects models, due to the variation of the results of previous systematic reviews.⁸

We performed a meta-analysis using STATA V16.0 (StataCorp, Texas, USA) for all available direct comparisons. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed by the Q test and estimated I² value. Heterogeneity was considered moderate or high when I² values were above 25% and 50%, respectively.²⁰

We also developed network plots using Stata version 16 to visualize the relative amount of relative evidence and comparative relationships of different exercise interventions. Moreover, in order to check for publication bias which may be caused by small studies, a network funnel plot was generated when ten or more trials were available for one comparison.²¹

Network analysis was conducted in GeMTC 0.14.3 (Generate Mixed Treatment Comparisons). We checked for inconsistency between all direct and indirect evidence to compare different exercise interventions with regard to BMD at LS, FN, and TH, and calculated mean differences along with corresponding 95% credible interval (CrI) with a Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo method.

GeMTC was implemented as follows: the initial values scaling is 2.5, a long burn-in period (20000 iterations) and follow-up period (50000 iterations) with a thinning interval of 10 was allowed for convergence. The number of chains was set to four. Once the comparative efficacy of the interventions were identified, they were ranked to determine which one was superior. We used surface under cumulative ranking (SUCRA) rather than the probability of

being the best (PrBest) intervention because SUCRA is regarded as the more precise method for calculating ranking probabilities.^{13, 22} The values of SUCRA equals one or zero means an exercise intervention ranks first or last, respectively. SUCRA was performed using OpenBUGS (Version 3. 2. 3).

We performed a subgroup analysis to establish the effectiveness relative to the intervention duration (≤ 8 , 9–18, and > 18 months, taking the remodeling cycle between cancellous and cortical bone into account²³) and the age (< 60 and ≥ 60). The sensitivity analysis was conducted by deleting studies of low quality.

Certainty of evidence

Confidence in Network Meta-Analysis (CINeMA) was used to assess the certainty of evidence from the NMA.²⁴ Two independent researchers graded the evidence on the basis of within-study bias, reporting bias, indirectness, imprecision, heterogeneity and incoherence. We rated the evidence from the NMA as a whole to manifest the strength of the NMA recommendations.

Results

A flowchart of the search process is shown in Supplementary Appendix 3. We identified 3324 records from the initial title and abstract screening, and a total of 66 studies with a total number of 4336 participants fulfilled the inclusion criteria and were finally included in this network meta-analysis. A detailed list of the included and excluded studies (with reasons) is provided in Supplementary Appendix 4.

The baseline characteristics of participants and exercise protocol of all the included studies are presented in Table 2 and 3. Sample size ranged from 15 to 246 participants (mean age

range, 50·5–79·6 years). Most RCTs were from USA (n=15), followed by Australia (n=8) and Canada (n=7). The mean menopausal year ranged from at least 0·5 to 30 years, and the mean body mass index (BMI) varied from 19·7 to 28·8 kg/m². The exercise intervention were delivered at home, center, or both. Compliance with the exercise ranged from 39% to 96%.

The PEDro scores of the included studies ranged from 3 to 8, with a mean score of 5·4. 11 (17%) studies can be considered as high, 42 (64%) were considered to be of moderate, and 13 (19%) of low quality. A detailed evaluation of the methodological quality is provided in Supplementary Appendix 5.

All models converged well. The parameter PSRF of all outcomes are close to 1, indicating a favorable convergence. No significant differences in comparison groups of all outcomes were found by inconsistency between direct and indirect estimates from the node splitting analysis (Supplementary Appendix 6). Supplementary Appendix 7 depicts the network diagram of eligible comparisons for BMD at LS (fifty eight studies with 3665 participants), FN (fifty studies with 3376 participants), and TH (twenty studies with 1664 participants), respectively.

Associated with BMD at LS improve were found for the multicomponent exercise 0·01 g/cm², (95% CrI 0·01 to 0·02), resistance training 0·01 g/cm², (95% CrI 0·00 to 0·02), mind body exercise 0·01 g/cm², (95% CrI 0·00 to 0·02), lower impact exercise 0·01 g/cm², (95% CrI 0·00 to 0·02), high impact exercise 0·03 g/cm², (95% CrI 0·00 to 0·07), and whole body vibration 0·01 g/cm², (95% CrI 0·0 to 0·02). After 12 studies of low quality were excluded, 25-36 there were no longer an association of high and lower impact exercise

with improved BMD when compared with control (table 4).

Among the high quality trials, high impact exercise had the highest probability of being the best exercise intervention (SUCRA value of 0·88 compared with 0·72 for resistance training and 0·66 for multicomponent exercise). However, there were only three trials for this intervention and the results were limited by wide 95% CrIs. When all trials were included, high impact exercise was also the best exercise intervention (0·91) followed by multicomponent exercise (0·71) and flexibility exercise (0·61) (Supplementary Appendix 8).

Only multicomponent exercise (0·03 g/cm², 95% CrI 0·01 to 0·04), whole body vibration (0·02 g/cm², 95% CrI 0·00 to 0·03), and mind body exercise (0·02 g/cm², 95% CrI 0·00 to 0·03) were effective for improving BMD at FN. Moreover, multicomponent exercise yielded significant benefits relative to resistance training, and moderate impact exercise. After nine studies of low quality were excluded,^{25, 26, 28-30, 32-34, 37}, the effect size of multicomponent exercise versus lower impact exercise turned to increase from 0·02 g/cm² to 0·03 g/cm², with 95% CrI of 0·01 to 0·05, while the other findings kept consistent with the prior data (table 5).

Among the high quality trials, multicomponent exercise had the highest probability of being the best exercise intervention (0·94 compared with 0·68 for water based exercise and 0·61 for whole body vibration). When all trials were included, the SUCRA and rankogram plots followed a similar pattern (Supplementary Appendix 9).

Only multicomponent exercise (0·01 g/cm², 95% CrI 0·00 to 0·01), resistance training (0·01 g/cm², 95% CrI 0·00 to 0·02), and flexibility exercise (0·01 g/cm², 95% CrI 0·00 to 0·02) were effective for improving BMD at TH. Moreover, resistance training, and flexibility

exercise yielded significant benefits versus whole body vibration. After two studies of low quality were excluded,^{27, 34} multicomponent exercise was associated with improved BMD at TH compared with whole body vibration, while the other findings kept consistent with the prior data (Supplementary Appendix 11).

Among the high quality trials, resistance training had the highest probability of being the best exercise intervention (0.85 compared with 0.8 for flexibility exercise and 0.72 for multicomponent exercise). When all trials were included, the SUCRA and rankogram plots followed a similar pattern (Supplementary Appendix 10).

For participants with age no less than 60, whole body vibration, lower impact exercise, resistance training and multicomponent exercise were beneficial for improving BMD at LS (Supplementary Appendix 12.1). With regard to BMD at FN, multicomponent exercise was superior to control, moderate impact exercise and resistance training (Supplementary Appendix 12.2). No exercise was found effective for BMD at TH in participants with age no less than 60 (Supplementary Appendix 12.3).

For participants younger than 60 years old, mind body exercise, resistance training, multicomponent exercise, and high impact exercise were beneficial for improving BMD at LS. With regard to BMD at FN, mind body exercise, multicomponent exercise, and flexibility exercise were superior to control (Supplementary Appendix 14.2). No exercise was found effective for BMD at TH in participants younger than 60 years old (Supplementary Appendix 14.3). Supplementary Appendix 13 and 15 showed the bayesian ranking profiles of comparable treatments in different populations.

For exercise intervention with duration no more than eight months, whole body vibration,

mind based exercise, resistance training, and multicomponent exercise were beneficial for improving BMD at LS (Supplementary Appendix 16.1). With regard to BMD at FN, multicomponent exercise was superior to control, lower and moderate impact exercise, resistance training, as well as flexibility exercise (Supplementary Appendix 16.2). No exercise was found effective for BMD at TH when the intervention duration was no more than eight months (Supplementary Appendix 16.3).

For exercise intervention with duration between 9 to 18 months, resistance training, high impact exercise, flexibility exercise and multicomponent exercise were beneficial for improving BMD at LS (Supplementary Appendix 18.1). With regard to BMD at FN, mind body exercise was superior to control, whereas resistance training produced significant improvement for BMD at TH (Supplementary Appendix 18.3). Supplementary Appendix 17 and 19 showed the bayesian ranking profiles of comparable treatments in different intervention duration.

No subgroup analyses could be performed for the BMD at LS, FN, and TH with duration of intervention more than 18 months due to insufficient evidence.

Supplementary Appendix 20 summarizes the certainty of evidence for the three networks (details on the CINeMA assessment of each pairwise comparisons are provided in appendix 21.1-3). The comparison-adjusted funnel plots were visually inspected. No apparent publication bias was found for BMD at LS and FN, except for BMD at TH (Supplementary Appendix 22).

Discussion

In this NMA, we comprehensively display the comparative effect of all available exercise

interventions on bone mineral density in postmenopausal women. According to the CINeMA criteria, the quality of evidence was low to very low, suggesting that findings should be interpreted with caution. The results indicate that: (1) depending on outcome of interest, multicomponent exercise (for BMD at LS, FN), and resistance training (for BMD at TH) were the most effective interventions; (2) Multicomponent exercise improved all the outcomes to a varying degree; (3) No matter the age of postmenopausal women, and the duration of intervention (range between 6 to 18 months), some certain kinds of exercise could be performed to improve BMD at LS and FN.

Lack of physical activity is related to decreased bone mass, whereas exercise involving bone loading could promote the increase of bone mass. Therefore, exercise has been proposed as a promising method to manage osteoporosis. Yet even exercise is recommended by multiple international guidelines,³⁸⁻⁴⁰ the magnitude of benefit of exercise intervention has been considered as moderate at best,^{11, 12, 41} which may be partially due to the large variety of exercise regimens and participant characteristics. Our results align with previous systematic review and meta-analyses where protocols including different intensity of impact exercise, as well as protocols including impact exercise with resistance training, were effective at preventing bone density loss at LS and FN.^{42, 43} Also, our results is consistent with the results of Kemmler,⁴⁴ where resistance training tends to have larger effect size than impact exercise and multicomponent exercise. According to previous evidence, high intensity resistance training typically has beneficial effects only on the spine.⁴⁵ And impact exercise, such as skipping, hopping, constantly attenuated before transmission to the spine, resulting in an osteogenic stimulus merely for the hips.⁴⁶ Hence, single component training intervention

generally produces a site-specific effect on bone. It also has been observed that adaptive skeletal response necessitates dynamic rather than static mechanical stimulation, and exercise intensity, stimulation frequency, as well as mechanical loading pattern are all crucial elements for enhancing skeletal response.⁴⁷ Accordingly, multicomponent exercise integrating all the crucial elements may be the optimum choice for improving postmenopausal bone health. This may be the reason why multicomponent exercise could improve all the outcomes to a varying degree.

The results of subgroup analysis based on the age of participants are different from those of Rahimi et al.⁴⁸ The possible reason for these divergent results may be caused by the number of included studies, and different inclusion criteria, such as controlled trial, language, additional supplement of calcium and vitamin D. Apart from the beneficial effects of mechanical stimulus on bone itself, older women were still sensitive to exercise maybe partially due to an increase of calcium absorption caused by exercise.⁴⁹

Typically, prolonged intervention duration should result in greater bone benefit, at least when strain was periodically progressed. According to the view that exercise-induced changes of BMD were primarily caused by remodeling, and taking into account the length of a remodeling cycle in adults, interventions less than 8 months may be insufficient to determine the full amount of new mineral bone.²³ However, the subgroup analysis demonstrated considerably higher effects of several exercises on BMD at LS and FN among studies with short compared with longer duration. Moreover, participants seemed to be more sensitive to multicomponent exercise at LS and FN. We attributed this suspicious finding to the complex interaction of exercise parameters.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first network systematic review to compare and rank different exercise interventions on BMD in postmenopausal women. We conducted a thorough search of multiple databases and sources to identify eligible studies without language restriction. All the process during literature search, data extraction and methodological quality assessment were performed by a pair of independent reviewers to minimize potential bias.

Nevertheless, several noteworthy limitations in this network meta-analysis should be addressed. A significant limitation is that we were not entirely relied on author description of exercise and control groups for classification. Exercise intervention and group are rarely standardized and vary substantially among studies. Therefore, based on description of the article and the definition of exercise according to our criteria, we categorized the exercise intervention. Besides, although strict inclusion criteria was set to make the interventions were reasonably similar among studies, the included treatments still contained various exercise interventions. It suggests that further disassemble of the specific physical elements that constitute an effective combined intervention should be investigated.

Second, despite our attempt to contact the related authors, some outcome data remain unavailable. Therefore, a few of the SDs of the absolute change in BMD was calculated according to specific formula, which may affected the accuracy of the data. Additionally, substantial publication bias was found in studies investigating the effect of exercise in BMD at TH. Given the nature that authors tend to report positive results, the actual effect of exercise on BMD could be somewhat lower than the values reported here.

Third, the primary outcome of our study is the change of BMD, however, it only accounts

for about 60% of variation in bone strength. Other surrogate parameter like microarchitecture were not included. Moreover, for the analysis of results, only the effect sizes at the end of the intervention were extracted rather than those at further follow-up times, which can be criticized. However, we believe that just as medication, exercise intervention are most beneficial during the duration of implementation. Therefore, the effect sized post intervention were considered the most relevant.

Last, PEDro scale is used to evaluate methodological quality, it may underestimate risk of bias of included studies when compared with Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool.⁵⁰ Furthermore, since the overall very low graded evidence, the relative treatment estimates may alter as a more high-quality evidence obtained.

Contributors

HCQ obtained funding for the study and LY, ZSY and HCQ designed it. WXY and ZYS screened the literature search, acquired reports of relevant trials, selected included studies. WLQ and WT extracted data. XSH,GXL and HJM did all statistical analyses. HCQ, ZSY and LY analysed and interpreted the data. LY and HCQ drafted the report. All the authors critically reviewed the report and approved the final submitted version.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Funding/Support

This study was supported by Sichuan Province Science and Technology Support Program (No. 2020YJ0210) and West China Nursing Discipline Development Special Fund Project, Sichuan University (No. HXHL20001).

Reference

1. Finkelstein JS, Brockwell SE, Mehta V, et al. Bone mineral density changes during the menopause transition in a multiethnic cohort of women. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2008;**93**(3):861-868.
2. Kanis JA, Johnell O, Oden A, et al. Ten year probabilities of osteoporotic fractures according to BMD and diagnostic thresholds. *Osteoporos Int.* 2001;**12**(12):989-995.
3. Foundation IO. What is osteoporosis? *Epidemiology.* Published August 4, 2017.
4. Johnell O, Kanis JA. An estimate of the worldwide prevalence and disability associated with osteoporotic fractures. *Osteoporos Int.* 2006;**17**(12):1726-1733.
5. Hernlund E, Svedbom A, Ivergard M, et al. Osteoporosis in the European Union: medical management, epidemiology and economic burden. A report prepared in collaboration with the International Osteoporosis Foundation (IOF) and the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industry Associations (EFPIA). *Arch Osteoporos.* 2013;**8**:136.
6. Cosman F, de Beur SJ, LeBoff MS, et al. Clinician's Guide to Prevention and Treatment of Osteoporosis. *Osteoporos Int.* 2014;**25**(10):2359-2381.
7. Beck BR, Daly RM, Singh MA, Taaffe DR. Exercise and Sports Science Australia (ESSA) position statement on exercise prescription for the prevention and management of osteoporosis. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2017;**20**(5):438-445.
8. Shojaa M, Von Stengel S, Schoene D, et al. Effect of Exercise Training on Bone Mineral Density in Post-menopausal Women: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Intervention Studies. *Front Physiol.* 2020;**11**:652.
9. Kemmler W, Shojaa M, Kohl M, von Stengel S. Effects of Different Types of Exercise on Bone Mineral Density in Postmenopausal Women: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.

Calcif Tissue Int. 2020;**107**(5):409-439.

10. Howe TE, Shea B, Dawson LJ, et al. Exercise for preventing and treating osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2011(7):CD000333.

11. Howe TE, Shea B, Dawson LJ, et al. Exercise for preventing and treating osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2011(7):CD000333.

12. Zhao R, Zhao M, Xu Z. The effects of differing resistance training modes on the preservation of bone mineral density in postmenopausal women: a meta-analysis. *Osteoporosis International*. 2015;**26**(5):1605-1618.

Osteoporosis International. 2015;**26**(5):1605-1618.

13. Shim S, Yoon BH, Shin IS, Bae JM. Network meta-analysis: application and practice using Stata. *Epidemiol Health*. 2017;**39**:e2017047.

14. Mills EJ, Thorlund K, Ioannidis JP. Demystifying trial networks and network meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2013;**346**:f2914.

15. Ioannidis J. Next-generation systematic reviews: prospective meta-analysis, individual-level data, networks and umbrella reviews. *Br J Sports Med*. 2017;**51**(20):1456-1458.

16. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*. 2009;**339**:b2535.

17. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;**162**(11):777-784.

18. Digitizer P. Available at: <http://plotdigitizer.sourceforge.net/>. Modified October 10,2020. 2001.

19. de Morton NA. The PEDro scale is a valid measure of the methodological quality of clinical trials: a demographic study. *Aust J Physiother.* 2009;**55**(2):129-133.
20. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ.* 2003;**327**(7414):557-560.
21. Chaimani A, Higgins JP, Mavridis D, Spyridonos P, Salanti G. Graphical tools for network meta-analysis in STATA. *PLoS One.* 2013;**8**(10):e76654.
22. Mbuagbaw L, Rochweg B, Jaeschke R, et al. Approaches to interpreting and choosing the best treatments in network meta-analyses. *Syst Rev.* 2017;**6**(1):79.
23. Eriksen EF. Cellular mechanisms of bone remodeling. *Rev Endocr Metab Disord.* 2010;**11**(4):219-227.
24. Nikolakopoulou A, Higgins JPT, Papakonstantinou T, et al. CINeMA: An approach for assessing confidence in the results of a network meta-analysis. *PLoS Med.* 2020;**17**(4):e1003082.
25. Basseij EJ, Ramsdale SJ. Weight-bearing exercise and ground reaction forces: a 12-month randomized controlled trial of effects on bone mineral density in healthy postmenopausal women. *Bone.* 1995;**16**(4):469-476.
26. Bocalini DS, Serra AJ, dos Santos L, Murad N, Levy RF. Strength training preserves the bone mineral density of postmenopausal women without hormone replacement therapy. *Journal of Aging & Health.* 2009;**21**(3):519-527.
27. Kerr D, Ackland T, Maslen B, Morton A, Prince R. Resistance training over 2 years increases bone mass in calcium-replete postmenopausal women. *Journal of Bone & Mineral Research.* 2001;**16**(1):175-181.

28. Nichols JF, Nelson KP, Peterson KK, Sartoris DJ. Bone-Mineral Density Responses to High-Intensity Strength Training in Active Older Women. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*. 1995;**3**(1):26-38.
29. Lau EMC, Woo J, Leung PC, Swaminathan R, Leung D. The Effects of Calcium Supplementation and Exercise on Bone-Density in Elderly Chinese Women. *Osteoporosis International*. 1992;**2**(4):168-173.
30. Lord SR, Ward JA, Williams P, Zivanovic E. The effects of a community exercise program on fracture risk factors in older women. *Osteoporosis International*. 1996;**6**(5):361-367.
31. Martin D, Notelovitz M. Effects of aerobic training on bone mineral density of postmenopausal women. *J Bone Miner Res*. 1993;**8**(8):931-936.
32. Milliken LA, Going SB, Houtkooper LB, et al. Effects of exercise training on bone remodeling, insulin-like growth factors, and bone mineral density in postmenopausal women with and without hormone replacement therapy. *Calcified Tissue International*. 2003;**72**(4):478-484.
33. F O, E P-N, J N-N, C O, A T. Effects of isoflavone and counter-resistance training on bone mineral density in postmenopausal women. *Rev Bras Cineantropom Desempenho Hum*. 2013;**15**:726–736.
34. Pruitt LA, Taaffe DR, Marcus R. Effects of a One-Year High-Intensity Versus Low-Intensity Resistance Training-Program on Bone-Mineral Density in Older Women. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*. 1995;**10**(11):1788-1795.
35. Tsuritani I, Brooke-Wavell KS, Mastana SS, et al. Does vitamin D receptor polymorphism influence the response of bone to brisk walking in postmenopausal women? *Hormone*

Research. 1998;**50**(6):315-319.

36. Young CM, Weeks BK, Beck BR. Simple, novel physical activity maintains proximal femur bone mineral density, and improves muscle strength and balance in sedentary, postmenopausal Caucasian women. *Osteoporosis International*. 2007;**18**(10):1379-1387.

37. Kerr D, Morton A, Dick I, Prince R. Exercise effects on bone mass in postmenopausal women are site-specific and load-dependent. *Journal of Bone & Mineral Research*. 1996;**11**(2):218-225.

38. Tarantino U, Iolascon G, Cianferotti L, et al. Clinical guidelines for the prevention and treatment of osteoporosis: summary statements and recommendations from the Italian Society for Orthopaedics and Traumatology. *J Orthop Traumatol*. 2017;**18**(Suppl 1):3-36.

39. Rossini M, Adami S, Bertoldo F, et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis, prevention and management of osteoporosis. *Reumatismo*. 2016;**68**(1):1-39.

40. Compston J, Cooper A, Cooper C, et al. UK clinical guideline for the prevention and treatment of osteoporosis. *Arch Osteoporos*. 2017;**12**(1):43.

41. Forwood MR, Burr DB. Physical activity and bone mass: exercises in futility? *Bone Miner*. 1993;**21**(2):89-112.

42. Martyn-St James M, Carroll S. A meta-analysis of impact exercise on postmenopausal bone loss: the case for mixed loading exercise programmes. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2009;**43**(12):898-908.

43. Zhao R, Zhang M, Zhang Q. The Effectiveness of Combined Exercise Interventions for Preventing Postmenopausal Bone Loss: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*. 2017;**47**(4):241-251.

44. Kemmler W, Shojaa M, Kohl M, von Stengel S. Effects of Different Types of Exercise on Bone Mineral Density in Postmenopausal Women: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Calcified Tissue International*. 2020;**107**(5):409-439.
45. Martyn-St James M, Carroll S. High-intensity resistance training and postmenopausal bone loss: a meta-analysis. *Osteoporosis International*. 2006;**17**(8):1225-1240.
46. Zhao R, Zhao M, Zhang L. Efficiency of jumping exercise in improving bone mineral density among premenopausal women: a meta-analysis. *Sports Med*. 2014;**44**(10):1393-1402.
47. Borer KT. Physical activity in the prevention and amelioration of osteoporosis in women : interaction of mechanical, hormonal and dietary factors. *Sports Med*. 2005;**35**(9):779-830.
48. Mohammad Rahimi GR, Smart NA, Liang MTC, et al. The Impact of Different Modes of Exercise Training on Bone Mineral Density in Older Postmenopausal Women: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Research. *Calcified Tissue International*. 2020;**106**(6):577-590.
49. Nelson ME, Fisher EC, Dilmanian FA, Dallal GE, Evans WJ. A 1-y walking program and increased dietary calcium in postmenopausal women: effects on bone. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 1991;**53**(5):1304-1311.
50. Sterne JAC, Savovic J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2019;**366**:l4898.

Table 1 Definitions of exercise interventions and control comparator

Table 2 Characteristics of included studies

Table 3 Exercise prescription characteristics of included studies

Table 4 Relative effect estimates for the contrasts between the different interventions and control arms on BMD at LS

Table 5 Relative effect estimates for the contrasts between the different interventions and control arms on BMD at FN

Table 1 Definitions of exercise interventions and control comparator

Type	Definition
Flexibility exercise (FE)	Exercises aimed at improving flexibility and coordination of body.
Whole body vibration (WBV)	A whole-body vibration platform was used to apply training.
Wellness exercise (WE)	Low intensity exercises that focused on well-being.
Lower impact exercise (LIE)	Exercises impose a small amount impact through the bones, such as standing, walking, stair climbing, and gentle heel drops.
Moderate impact exercise (MIE)	Exercise impose a moderate force by pushing off and returning to the ground. Both feet generally leave the ground but with less height and force than with high impact activity, such as running, jumping, hopping and heel drops with sufficient force
High impact exercise (HIE)	Exercise in which a large force is created on returning to the ground, usually from a greater height, like exertional jumps.
Mind body exercise (MBE)	Exercises emphasize the interactions among mind, body, psychology and behavior, intending to influence physical function and promote health, such as Tai Chi, yoga, Pilates and eight-section brocade.
Water based exercise (WBE)	Exercises performed in an aquatic environment in which the buoyancy of water enables limbs to move efficiently with less effort, improving the coordination of movement
Resistance training (RT)	Exercises using different modes of training with a wide range of resistive loads like free weights, resistance bands, or weights machines
Multicomponent exercise (ME)	A combination of more than one of the above exercise interventions within a single intervention group
Control	Participants continue their routine daily life activities, and try to avoid any systematic exercise training programs throughout the study.

Table 2 Characteristics of included studies

Study	Region	Sample size	Age (years) ^a	BMI (kg/m ²) ^{a,b}	Years since menopause ^a	Osteoporosis or Osteopenia was diagnosed before eNAollment	Additional Supplement
Sen 2020	Turkey	RT+WBV: 15	RT+WBV: 55.0 ± 4.6	RT+WBV: 26.6 ± 2.7	RT+WBV: 8.0 ± 4.1	Y	Calcium and vitamin D
		RT+MIE: 16	RT+MIE: 53.1 ± 4.4	RT+MIE: 26.5 ± 3.9	RT+MIE: 7.7 ± 5.3		
		C: 18	C: 54.5 ± 6.0	C: 26.7 ± 3.8	C: 9.3 ± 4.0		
ElDeeb2020	Egypt	WBV: 22	WBV:55.09±4.19	WBV:28.4±1.31	3 years or more	Y	Calcium and vitamin D
		C: 21	C: 57.29±4.44	C: 28.3±1.54			
Montgomery 2020	UK	HIE (continuous): 15	HIE(continuous): 56.0 ± 3.0	HIE(continuous): 25.4 ± 2.0	1 – 5 years	N	NA
		HIE(intermittent): 14	HIE(intermittent): 53.3 ± 3.2	HIE(intermittent): 25.0 ± 4.7			
		C: 12	C: 54.3 ± 3.8	C: 25.2 ± 2.6			
de Oliveira2019	Brazil	WBV: 17	WBV: 56.4±6.5	WBV: 26.2±2.6	WBV 8.8±5.1	Y	No
		MBE: 17	MBE: 55.6±6.8	MBE: 27.2±2.7	MBE: 8.4±7.1		
		C: 17	C: 54.1±5.3	C: 27.3±2.5	C: 9.1±7.0		
Duff2016	Canada	RT:22	RT: 65.3±4.6	NA	NA	NA	Calcium and vitamin D
		FE:22	FE: 65±4.7				
Wang2015	China	MBE (traditional):40	MBE(traditional):58.54±3.37	NA	At least 6 months	N	No
		MBE (simplified):40	MBE(simplified): 57.93±3.22				
		C:39	C: 58.54±3.37				
Nicholson2015	Australia	RT:28	RT: 66.0±4.1	RT: 26.0±3.2	At least 5 years	N	No
		C:29	C: 65.6±4.7	C: 24.5±2.9			
Liu2015	China	MBE:48	MBE:63.23±7.56	NA	MBE: 13.79±6.27	Y	No
		C:42	C:61.87±8.29				
Moreira2014	Brazil	WBE:59	WBE: 58.6±6.71	NA	At least 5 years	Partial	calcium and vitamin D
		C:41	C: 59.3±6.07				

Lai2013	Taiwan	WBV: 14 C: 14	WBV:60.1±7.1 C: 62.4±7.1	WBV:22.7±1.9 C: 23.1±4.4	WBV:9.8±8.7 C: 10.6±6.9	Y	No
Kemmler2013	Germany	HIE+RT:43 WE:42	HIE+RT: 52.3±2.3 WE: 52.4±2.7	NA	HIE+RT: 2±0.7 WE: 2.1±0.6	Partial	calcium and vitamin D
Chilibeck2013	Canada	RT+LIE:86 FE:88	RT+LIE:55.3±6.3 FE: 56.7±6.5	NA	At least 1 year	N	calcium and vitamin D
Basat2013	Turkey	RT:11 MIE:12 C:12	RT: 55.9±4.9 MIE: 55.6±2.9 C: 56.2±4	RT: 25±4.7 MIE: 26.4±3.5 C: 27.5±3.7	RT: 6±3.6 MIE: 6.5±2 C: 6.2±3.3	Y	calcium and vitamin D
Orsatti2013	Brazil	RT:18 C:18	RT:56.6±8.8 C:55.3±8	RT:26±3 C:30.4±5.3	RT:8.7±6.1 C:7.7±6.2	NA	No
Wayne2012	USA	MBE:43 C: 43	MBE: 58.8±5.6 C: 60.4±5.3	MBE: 25.8±4.2 C: 24.5±4	More than 1 year	Y	calcium
Karakiriou2012	Greece	RT+MIE:10 WBV:13 C:9	RT+MIE: 53.4±0.87 WBV: 53.38±1.1 C: 53±1.45	NA	RT+MIE: 4.8±0.57 WBV: 5.12±0.76 C: 3.5±0.68	Y	NA
Bolton2012	Australia	RT +MIE:19 C:20	RT +MIE: 60.3±5.6 C: 56.3±4.7	RT +MIE:25.2±4.3 C: 25±4.4	RT +MIE:13±7.4 C: 11.7±7.1	Y	calcium and vitamin D
von Stengel2011	Germany	MIE +RT:50 MIE +RT+WBV:50 C:51	MIE +RT: 68.6±3 MIE +RT+WBV: 68.8±3.6 C: 68.1±2.7	MIE +RT: 26.2±4.2 MIE +RT+WBV:26.5±4.2 C: 27.5±5	NA	N	calcium and vitamin D
von Stengel2011(1)	Germany	WBV(vertical):34 WBV(rotational):29 C:34	WBV(vertical): 68.1±4 WBV(rotational):67.9±3.8 C: 67.6±4.1	WBV(vertical):26.9±4.12 WBV(rotational): 27.2±4.26 C: 26.4±5.6	NA	N	calcium and vitamin D
Tartibian2011	Iran	LIE:20 C:18	LIE: 61.4±6.9 C: 58.9±8.1	LIE: 25.1±7.1 C: 28.5±3.7	At least 8 years	NA	No

Slatkovska2011	Canada	WBV(90):67	WBV(90): 60.5±7	WBV(90): 24.9±4	WBV(90): 8.6±6	Y	No
		WBV(30):68	WBV(30): 59.6±6	WBV(30): 24.5±3.6	WBV(30): 9.5±6.7		
		C:67	C: 60.8±5.5	C: 24.2±3.4	C: 9.4±6.2		
Marques2011	Portugal	RT:23	RT: 67.3±5.2	RT: 28.8±4.6	NA	Y	No
		MIE:24	MIE: 70.3±5.5	MIE: 27.5±3.8			
		C:24	C: 67.9±5.9	C: 28.1±3.5			
Marques2011(1)	Portugal	MIE+ RT:30	MIE+ RT: 70.1±5.4	MIE+ RT: 28.4±3.7	NA	Y	No
		C:30	C: 68.2±5.7	C: 28.2±3.7			
Sakai2010	Japan	LIE:49	LIE: 68.3±0.8	LIE: 22.4±0.4	NA	NA	NA
		C:45	C: 68.2±0.5	C: 22.6±0.4			
Kemmler2010	Germany	MIE +RT:123	MIE +RT: 68.9±3.9	NA	NA	Partial	calcium and vitamin D
		WE:123	WE: 69.2±4.1				
Beck2010	Australia	WBV(H):15	WBV(H): 68.9±7	WBV(H): 26.7±4.4	At least 5 years	Y	No
		WBV(L):13	WBV(L): 68.5±8.6	WBV(L): 24.8±2.9			
		C:14	C: 74.2±8.1	C: 25.7±4.2			
Bebenek2010	Germany	HIE+RT:43	HIE+RT: 52.3±2.3	NA	1-3 years	NA	calcium and vitamin D
		WE:42	WE: 52.4±2.7				
Chuin2009	Canada	RT:11	RT: 65.4±3.5	RT:26.54±2.74	NA	NA	No
		C:7	C: 67.4±3.8	C: 26±2.83			
Bocalini2009	Brazil	RT:15	RT: 69±9	RT: 28±4	NA	NA	No
		C:10	C: 67±8	C: 27±6			
Park2008	Japan	MIE +RT:25	MIE +RT: 68.3±3.6	NA	MIE +RT: 18.3±2.5	NA	No
		C:25	C: 68.4±3.4		C: 18.7±2.8		
Bergstrom2008	Sweden	LIE+RT:48	LIE+RT: 58.9±4.3	LIE+RT: 24.4±2.6	NA	Y	Calcium and vitamin D
		C:44	C: 59.6±3.6	C: 24.9±2.3			
Young2007	Australia	MIE :10	MIE: 65.2±7.7	MIE: 26.2±4	MIE: 16.1±7.7	NA	Calcium

		RT+MIE:9	RT+MIE: 63.1±4.6	RT+MIE: 26.9±8.2	RT+MIE: 11.8±8.3		
		HIE+RT+MIE:12	HIE+RT+MIE: 65.1±7.6	HIE+RT+MIE: 26.3±2.8	HIE+RT+MIE: 14.9±9.2		
Woo2007	Hong Kong	MBE:30	MBE: 69.67±2.8	MBE: 24.4±4.3	NA	NA	No
		RT:30	RT: 69.57±3.2	RT: 24.6±4			
		C:30	C: 69.27±3	C: 24.93±3			
Maddalozzo2007	USA	RT:29	RT: 52.3±3.3	19–30	RT: 2.1±0.8	NA	No
		C:29	C: 52.5±3		C: 2±0.7		
Evans2007	USA	MIE:21	MIE: 62±5.3	NA	MIE: 6.6±5.9	NA	soy protein isolate, milk protein isolate
		C:22	C: 63.1±5		C: 8.3±5		
Wu2006	Japan	LIE:31	LIE: 55.2±2.8	LIE: 22.4±2.9	LIE: 3.6±1.8	NA	No
		C:33	C: 54.9±2.9	C: 20.9±2.2	C: 3.7±2.1		
Korpelainen2006	Finland	MIE:84	MIE: 72.9±1.1	MIE: 25.7±3.4	NA	Y	No
		C:76	C: 72.8±1.2	C: 25.5±3.5			
Gusi2006	Spain	WBV:14	WBV: 66±6	NA	At least 5 years	NA	No
		LIE:14	LIE: 66±4				
Englund2005	Sweden	MIE+RT:21	MIE+RT: 72.8±3.6	MIE+RT: 25.2±2.7	NA	NA	No
		C:19	C: 73.2±4.9	C: 26.1±3.2			
Verschueren2004	Belgium	WBV:25	WBV: 64.6±3.3	WBV: 26.34±3.6	WBV: 16.9±6.3	NA	NA
		RT:22	RT: 62.9±3.8	RT: 27.4±3.5	RT 15.5±6		
		C:24	C: 64.2±3.1	C: 26.51±5.8	C: 14.6±6.6		
Liu-Ambrose2004	Canada	RT:32	RT: 79.6±2.1	NA	RT: 29.8±5	Y	No
		FE:34	FE: 78.9±2.8		FE: 30.3±6.5		
		C:32	C: 79.5±3.2		C: 29.7±6.3		
Chan2004	Hong Kong	MBE:67	MBE: 54.4±3.3	MBE: 24.1±4.7	MBE: 4.9±2.5	NA	NA
		C:65	C: 53.6±3.2	C: 23.5±4.6	C: 4.5±2.4		

Milliken2003	USA	MIE+RT:25 C:27	40–65	NA	3–10 years postmenopause	NA	Ca citrate
Jessup2003	USA	MIE+RT:9 C:9	MIE+RT: 69.1±2.8 C: 69.4±4.2	NA	MIE+RT: 23.7±11.3 C: 22.1±11.2	NA	Ca2+ and vitamin D
Going2003	USA	MIE+RT:25 C:27	MIE+RT: 55.3±4.4 C: 55.9±5.1	MIE+RT: 25.6±3.8 C: 25.6±4	3–10 years postmenopause	NA	Ca citrate
Hans2002	Switzerlan, USA, France	LIE:99 C:32	LIE: 67.6±5.2 C: 66±4.8	NA	At least 5 years	Y	Calcium and vitamin D
Chilibeck2002	Canada	RT:10 C:12	RT: 56.8±2 C: 58.8±1.8	RT: 27±1.7 C: 26.6±1.2	RT: 8.6±2.2 C: 8.3±1.7	Y	Calcium and vitamin D
Kerr2001	Australia	RT1: 42 RT2+LIE: 42 C: 42	RT1: 60±5 RT2+LIE: 59±5 C: 62±6	NA	RT1: 11±6 RT2+LIE: 9±5 C: 12±6	NA	Calcium
Iwamoto2001	Japan	LIE+RT:8 C:20	LIE+RT: 65.3±4.7 C: 64.9±5.7	LIE+RT: 19.7±1.3 C: 19.9±2.1	LIE+RT: 16.3±5.9 C: 14.8±6.4	Y	Calcium and vitamin D3
Rhodes2000	Canada	RT:22 C:22	RT: 68.8±3.2 C: 68.2±3.5	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bemben2000	USA	RT(high load):10 RT(high repetition):7 C:8	RT(high load): 50.5±2 RT(high repetition): 51.9±2.3 C: 52.3±1.4	RT(high load): 28.7±2.4 RT(high repetition): 23.2±1.2 C: 24.2±1.7	RT(high load): 3.6±0.7 RT(high repetition): 2.4±0.7 C: 3±0.7	N	Calcium and vitamin D
Tsuritani 1998	UK	LIE:33 C:36	60-70	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ebrahim1997	UK	LIE:49 C:48	LIE: 66.4±7.8 C: 68.1±7.8	LIE: 26.6±4.3 C: 26.3±4.8	NA	NA	NA

Brooke1997	UK	LIE:40 C:38	LIE: 64.2±3.1 C: 64.9±3	LIE: 25.6±3.5 C: 25.8±3.8	LIE: 14.6±6.6 C: 15.1±5.5	NA	No
Lord1996	Australia	LIE+RT:90 C:89	LIE+RT: 71.7±5.4 C: 71.5±5.3	NA	NA	NA	No
Kerr1996	USA	RT(high load):28 RT(high repetition):28	RT(high load): 58.4±3.7 RT(high repetition): 55.7±4.7	NA	RT(high load): 7.8±3.5 RT(high repetition): 6.3±4	NA	No
Pruitt1995	USA	RT(high load):8 RT(high repetition):7 C:11	RT(high load): 67±0.5 RT(high repetition): 67.6±1.4 C: 69.6±4.2	RT(high load): 24.5±3.4 RT(high repetition): 23.9±1.6 C: 25.1±3.1	NA	NA	Calcium and vitamin D
Prince1995	Australia	LIE:42 Calcium:42	LIE: 63±5 Calcium: 62±5	NA	LIE: 16±5 Calcium: 16±6	NA	Calcium
Nichols1995	USA	RT:17 LIE:17	RT: 67.8±1.6 LIE: 65.2±1.2	NA	RT: 17.9±1.5 LIE: 18±1.5	NA	No
Bassey1995	UK	MIE:20 WE:24	MIE: 54±4 WE: 55±3	MIE: 24.6±2.7 WE: 24.9±3.8	MIE: 7±4 WE: 7±5	NA	Calcium
Nelson1994	USA	RT:20 C:19	RT: 61.1±3.7 C: 57.3±6.3	RT: 24.4±2.5 C: 23.1±2.2	RT: 11.6±5 C: 9.8±4.6	NA	Partial: Calcium and vitamin D
Martin1993	USA	MIE(45min):16 MIE(30min):20 C:19	MIE(45min): 57.8±7.1 MIE(30min): 60.3±7.8 C: 56.7±6.9	NA	MIE(45min): 9.5±8.9 MIE(30min): 12.8±8.8 C: 8.5±7	NA	Calcium and vitamin D
Hatori1993	Japan	LIE(above AT):12 LIE(below AT):9 C:12	LIE(above AT): 56±4 LIE(below AT): 58±5 C: 58±8	LIE(above AT): 23.4±2.3 LIE(below AT): 23.5±2.4 C: 24.6±3.3	LIE(above AT): 7.5±4.8 LIE(below AT): 5.8±4.3 C: 8.9±7.6	NA	No

Lau1992	Australia	MIE:11 C:12	MIE: 79(76-81) C: 75(71-78)	NA	NA	NA	Calcium
Grove1992	USA	HIE:5 LIE:5 C:5	HIE:54±2 LIE:57±4 C:56±4	NA	HIE:4±3 LIE:3±2 C:4	NA	No
Sinaki1989	USA	RT:34 C:31	RT: 55.6±4.5 C: 56.5±4.5	N	At least 6 months	N	No

Abbreviations: NA: not available; RT: resistance training; WBV: whole body vibration; LIE: lower impact exercise; MIE: moderate impact exercise; HIE: higher impact exercise; CMJ: countermovement jump; MBE: mind based exercise; FE: flexibility exercise; WBE: water based exercise; WE: wellness exercise

- a. Data expressed as mean (SD) or median (range).
- b. Calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared

c. Table 3 Exercise prescription characteristics of included studies

Study	Type of exercise	Duration (mons)	Frequency	Main part of exercise intervention	Setting of intervention	Session length (min)	Compliance	Adverse events
Sen 2020	E1: RT+MIE E2: RT+WBV C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	RT: back and lower body muscle groups MIE: jump rope, from a minimum of 10 to a maximum of 60 per session WBV: amplitude 2-4mm, frequency 30-35Hz	Center-based, supervised	20-60	E1: 84.1% E2: 81.3%	No
ElDeeb2020	E: WBV C: routine daily life activities	6	2 days/week	WBV: amplitude 2-4mm, frequency 25-35Hz, vertically	Center-based, supervised	5-10	NA	NA
Montgomery 2020	E1:HIE (continuous) E2:HIE (intermittent) C: routine daily life activities	12	3 days/week	HIE (continuous): 30 CMJs at a stimulus frequency of 15 jumps per minute HIE (intermittent): 30 CMJs at a stimulus frequency of 4 jumps per minute	home-based, unsupervised	8	E1: 60% E2: 68.5%	No
de Oliveira2019	E1:WBV E2:MBE (mind body exercise) C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	WBV: amplitude 4mm, frequency 20Hz, horizontally MBE: Pilates for all main muscle groups, intensity was based on Borg (between 5 and 6)	Center-based, supervised	E1:5 E2:60	E1: 91.3% E2: 92.6%	Falls(2,2,1) Fracture(0,0,1)
Duff2016	E: RT C: flexibility exercise	9	3 days/week	RT: 2 sets of 8–12 repetitions of exercise for all major muscle groups Flexibility exercise: 2 sets held for 20–30 s of full body flexibility exercises	Center-based, supervised	NA	E: 84% C: 87%	No
Wang2015	E1: MBE (traditional) E2: MBE (simplified)	12	4 days/week	MBE (traditional): Yang style Tai Chi MBE (simplified): Simplified Tai Chi resistance	Center/home-based, partially supervised	E1: 60 E2: 60	NA	No

	C: routine daily life activities			training					
Nicholson2015	E: RT C: routine daily life activities	6	2 days/week	RT: squats, lunges, and chest press, utilizing light weights and a very high number of repetitions	Center-based, supervised	50	E:89%	Neck pain (1,0) Knee pain (1,0)	
Liu2015	E: MBE C: routine daily life activities	12	3 times/day	MBE: modified eight-section Brocade, 7 repetitions per time, thrice daily	home-based, unsupervised	NA	E:96%	No	
Moreira2014	E: WBE C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	WBE: eight strength/power water based exercise at 55 %-90% of HRmax	Center-based, supervised	50-60	E:85%	No	
Lai2013	E: WBV C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	WBV: magnitude 3.2g, frequency 30Hz, horizontally	Center-based, supervised	5	E:88%	No	
Kemmler2013	E: HIE+RT C: wellness exercise	12	3 days/week	HIE: four times 15-20 repetitions of different types of multilateral jumps were performed at a frequency of 0.5-2Hz and 90s of rest RT: two sets of 8 to 9 repetitions for trunk and lower limb muscle groups at 80% 1RM Wellness exercise: low intensity exercise focused on different objective	Center-based, supervised	45-60	E: 67% C: 70%	No	
Chilibeck2013	E: RT+LIE C: FE	48	RT:2 days/week Walking:4 days/week Flexibility exercise:4	RT: Two sets of eight repetitions for all major muscle groups were done at 80% of 1RM LIE: Walking brisk walking at 70% of HRmax FE: stretching exercises for all major muscle groups	Center/home-based, partially supervised	20-30	E:77%	No	

			days/week					
Basat2013	E1:RT E2:MIE C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	RT: one set of ten repetition exercise for lower limb and back muscle groups MIE: jump rope, 10 jumps/day, +5 jumps/week, maximum 50 jumps/day	Center-based, supervised	60	E: > 60%	NA
Orsatti2013	E: RT C: routine daily life activities	9	3 days/week	RT: three sets of 8-12 repetitions for all major muscle groups at 60-80% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	50-60	NA	No
Wayne2012	E: MBE C: routine daily life activities	9	4 days/week	MBE: Wu style or Yang style Tai Chi, 4 classes/week for a total of 99.5 hours	Center/home-based, partially supervised	30-60	NA	No
Karakiriou2012	E1:WBV E2:RT+MIE C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	WBV: amplitude 1.5 mm, frequency 35-40Hz RT: 2-3 sets of 10-12 repetitions for all major muscle groups were done at 70% of 1RM MIE: step exercise at 70-85% of HRmax	Center-based, supervised	E1:7-12	E1: 79.1% E2: 80.4%	NA
Bolton2012	E: RT +MIE C: routine daily life activities	13	3 days/week	RT: two sets of eight repetitions and one set of 12 repetitions resistance training MIE: jump building up to 10 three times daily	Center/home-based, partially supervised	60	E:88%	NA
von Stengel2011	E1: MIE +RT E2: MIE +RT+WBV C: WE	18	2 days/week	MIE: dancing at 70–80% HRmax RT: 3 sets of 15 repetitions for all major muscle groups were done using elastic belts WBV: amplitude 1.7 mm, frequency 25-35Hz WE: low intensity exercise	Center/home-based, partially supervised	20-60	E1:75% E2:80%	No
von Stengel2011(1)	E1: WBV(vertical) E2: WBV(rotational) C: WE	12	3 days/week	WBV(vertical): amplitude 1.7 mm, frequency 35Hz WBV(rotational): amplitude 12 mm, frequency	Center-based, partial supervised	15	E1:73% E2:68% C:71%	No

				12.5Hz WE: low intensity exercise				
Tartibian2011	E: LIE C: routine daily life activities	6	3-6 days/week	LIE: walking on a treadmill at 45-65% HRmax	Center-based, supervised	25-45	>95%	NA
Slatkovska2011	E1: WBV(90) E2: WBV(30) C: routine daily life activities	12	daily	WBV(90): magnitude 0.3g, frequency 90Hz WBV(30): magnitude 0.3g, frequency 30Hz	Home-based, unsupervised	20	E1:79% E2:77%	Dizziness(0,1,0) pain, numbness, or weakness at various leg sites (7,7,0) nausea(2,0,0) inner ear sensitivity(1,0,0) bladder discomfort(1,0,0)
Marques2011	E1: MIE E2: RT C: routine daily life activities	8	3 days/week	MIE: stepping, skipping, graded walking, jogging, dancing, aerobics and step choreographies at 50-85% HRmax RT: two sets of 6-12 repetitions at 50-80% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	60	E1:77.7% E2:78.4%	No
Marques2011(1)	E: MIE+ RT C: routine daily life activities	8	2 days/week	MIE: stepping, heel drops LIRT: squats while wearing weight vests, hip flexors, extensors, and abductors; knee flexors and extensors and upper body exercises performed using elastic bands and dumbbells	Center-based, supervised	60	E: 72.4%	No
Sakai2010	E: LIE C: routine daily life	6	3 sets per day	LIE: three set of one-leg standing exercise consisted of standing on the right leg for 1 min	Home-based, unsupervised	6	70%	NA

	activities			and the left leg for 1 min					
Kemmler2010	E: MIE +RT C:WE	18	2 days/week	MIE: dancing at 70–80% HRmax RT: 3 sets of 15 repetitions for all major muscle groups were done using elastic belts WE: low intensity exercise	Center/home-based, partially supervised	20-60	E:76.3% C:72%	No	
Beck2010	E1:WBV(L) E2:WBV(H) C: routine daily life activities	8	2 days/week	WBV(L): magnitude 0.3g, frequency 30Hz WBV(H): magnitude 1g, frequency 12.5Hz	Center-based, supervised	E1: 15 E2: 4	E1:92.1% E2:91%	Falls(3,1,6)	
Bebenek2010	E: HIE+RT C:WE	12	3 days/week	HIE: Step boards, dance, four times 20 repetitions of different types of multilateral jumps were performed at a frequency of 0.5-2Hz and 90s of rest RT: Functional gymnastics with all together 8 to 12 exercises for trunk and lower limb muscle groups at 70-75% 1RM for 12 repetitions WE: low intensity exercise focused on different objective	Center-based, supervised	60	65%	No	
Chuin2009	E:RT C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	RT: 3 sets of 8 repetitions for all major muscle groups at 80% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	60	NA	NA	
Bocalini2009	E: RT C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	RT: 3 sets of 10 repetitions for all major muscle groups at 50-85% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	60	NA	NA	
Park2008	E: MIE +RT C: routine daily life	12	3 days/week	MIE: weight bearing exercise at 65-70% HRmax	NA	60	NA	NA	

	activities								
Bergstrom2008	E: LIE+RT C: routine daily life activities	12	2 days/week	LIE: fasting walking for 30 minutes RT: strengthening exercises for the arms, legs, back and stomach	Home-based, unsupervised	60	95%	NA	
Young2007	E1:HIE+RT+MIE E2:RT+MIE C: MIE	12	E1:5 days/week E2:5 days/week C:1 days/week	HIE: Exertion stamp four times at a rate of 1 Hz, twice per day. RT: two sets of eight squat repetitions with gradually two-kilogram increments MIE: line dance	Home-based, unsupervised	C:45	E1:80% E2:65% C:70%	No	
Woo2007	E1: MBE E2: RT C: routine daily life activities	12	3 days/week	MBE: Yang style Tai Chi RT: medium strength was used for upper and lower muscle group	Center-based, supervised	NA	E1:81% E2:76%	NA	
Maddalozzo2007	E: RT C: routine daily life activities	12	2 days/week	RT: three sets of back squat and deadlift at 60–75% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	50	84.7%	No	
Evans2007	E: MIE C: routine daily life activities	9	3 days/week	MIE: a four-lane 17-lap per mile indoor track, treadmills, rowing ergometers, and stair-climbing ergometers an intensity of 55% to 80% of VO ₂ peak	Center-based, supervised	45	NA	NA	
Wu2006	E: LIE C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	LIE: walking at 5-6 km/h	Center-based, supervised	60	NA	NA	
Korpelainen2006	E: MIE C: routine daily life activities	30	daily	MIE: walking, knee bends, leg lifts, heel rises and drops, dancing, stamping, stair climbing and stepping up and down from benches.	home-based, supervised	60	75%	NA	

Gusi2006	E: WBV C: LIE	8	3 days/week	WBV: amplitude 3 mm, frequency 12.6Hz LIE: walking	Center-based, supervised	E:30 C:60	78%	No
Englund2005	E:MIE+RT C: routine daily life activities	15	2 days/week	MIE: jogging, steps in different combinations and directions RT: 2 sets of 8-12 repetitions for trunk and lower limb muscle groups using dumbbells	Center-based, supervised	50	67%	No
Verschueren2004	E1: WBV E2: RT C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	WBV: magnitude 2.28-5.09g, frequency 35-40Hz RT: 2 sets of 8-20RM for lower limb muscle groups	NA	E1:30 E2:60	NA	No
Liu-Ambrose2004	E1: RT E2: FE C: routine daily life activities	6	2 days/week	RT: 2 sets of 6-15 repetitions for all major muscle groups at 50-85% of 1RM FE: Ball games, relay races, dance movements, and obstacle courses	Center-based, supervised	50	E1:84% E2:87% C:79%	sore neck, muscle soreness(10,4,1)
Chan2004	E:MBE C: routine daily life activities	12	5 days/week	MBE: Yang style Tai Chi	Center-based, supervised	50	84%	Fracture(1,3)
Milliken2003	E: MIE+RT C: routine daily life activities	12	3 days/week	MIE: jumping, skipping at 50-70% HRmax RT: 2 sets of 6-8 repetitions for all major muscle groups at 70-80% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	75	NA	NA
Jessup2003	E: MIE+RT C: routine daily life activities	8	3 days/week	MIE: walking, stairclimbing with vest RT: 8-10 repetitions at 50%-75% 1RM	Center-based, supervised	60-90	NA	NA
Going2003	E:MIE+RT C: routine daily life activities	12	3 days/week	MIE: walk/jog, skipping, hopping, and stair-climbing/step boxes with weighted vests. RT: two sets of 6-8 repetitions at 70%-80% 1RM	Center-based, supervised	NA	79.9%	NA

Hans2002	E:LIE C: routine daily life activities	24	daily	LIE: Heel-drops: barefoot on a force measuring platform (osteocare)	home-based, unsupervised	3-5	65%	No
Chilibeck2002	E:RT C: routine daily life activities	12	3 days/week	RT: 2 sets of 8-10 repetitions for all major muscle groups at 70% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	NA	77.6%	NA
Kerr2001	E1:RT E2:RT+LIE C: routine daily life activities	24	3 days/week	RT: 3 sets of 8 repetitions for all major muscle groups at 70% of 1RM RT: same resistance exercise with minimal and unchanged load LIE: stationary bicycle riding	Center-based, supervised	60	E1:74% E2:77%	Injury to the wrist (0,1,0)
Iwamoto2001	E:LIE+RT C: routine daily life activities	24	LIE: daily RT:2 days/week	LIE: step and brisk walking RT: gymnastic training, consisting of 15 repetitions of straight leg raising, squatting, and abdominal and back muscle strengthening exercises	home-based,	NA	NA	NA
Rhodes2000	E:RT C: routine daily life activities	13	3 days/week	RT: 3 sets of 8 repetitions for upper and lower muscle groups at 75% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	60	86%	No
Bemben2000	E1: RT(high load) E2: RT(high repetition) C: routine daily life activities	6	3 days/week	RT(high load): 3 sets of 8 repetitions for trunk and lower muscle groups RT(high repetition): 3 sets of 16 repetitions for trunk and lower muscle groups	Center-based, supervised	60	E1:87% E2:93%	No
Tsuritani 1998	E:LIE C: routine daily life activities	12	NA	LIE: brisk walking	NA	NA	NA	NA

Ebrahim1997	E:LIE C: routine daily life activities	24	3 days/week	LIE: brisk walking	Center-based, supervised	40	NA	Falls and fractures
Brooke1997	E:LIE C: routine daily life activities	12	NA	LIE: brisk walking	Partial-supervised	20-50	>90%	Injury(2,0)
Lord1996	E:LIE+RT C: routine daily life activities	12	2 days/week	LIE: side stepping, fast walking, heel rises RT: push-ups, opposing muscle group resistance exercise whilst seated	Center-based, supervised	60	72.9	No
Kerr1996	E1: RT(high load) E2: RT(high repetition) C: routine daily life activities	12	3 days/week	RT(high load): 3 sets of 8 repetitions for one side upper and lower muscle groups at 40-60% of 1RM RT(high repetition)n: 3 sets of 20 repetitions for one side upper and lower muscle groups at 10-20% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	45-60	E1:87% E2:89%	No
Pruitt1995	E1: RT(high load) E2: RT(high repetition) C: routine daily life activities	12	3 days/week	RT(high load): 2 sets of 7 repetitions for all major muscle groups at 80% of 1RM RT(high repetition): 3 sets of 14 repetitions for all major muscle groups at 40% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	55-65	E1:78.6% E2:78.6%	NA
Prince1995	E:LIE C: routine daily life activities	24	4h/week	LIE: walking	Center/home-based, partially supervised	NA	39%	NA
Nichols1995	E:RT C:LIE	12	3 days/week	RT: 1-3 sets of 10-12 repetitions for trunk and lower muscle groups at 50-80% of 1RM LIE: walking	Center-based, supervised	45-60	81.6%	No
Bassey1995	E:MIE	12	1 days/week	MIE: heel drops, jumping, skipping	Center/home-based,	NA	83%	No

	C: WE			WE: low intensity exercise	partially supervised			
Nelson1994	E:RT	12	2 days/week	RT: 3 sets of 8 repetitions for trunk and lower muscle groups at 50-80% of 1RM	Center-based, supervised	50	87.5%	musculoskeletal problems (13,0)
	C:routine activities	daily	life					
Martin1993	E1:MIE(30min)	12	3 days/week	MIE: treadmills	NA	30-45	E1:79.2%	No
	E2:MIE(45min)						E2:82.4%	
	C:routine activities	daily	life					
Hatori1993	E1:LIE(above AT)	7	3 days/week	LIE: walking	NA	30	NA	No
	E2:LIE(below AT)							
	C:routine activities	daily	life					
Lau1992	E:MIE	10	4 days/week	MIE: step up and down a block (23cm in height)	Center-based, supervised	20-25	NA	No
	C:routine activities	daily	life					
Grove1992	E1:HIE	12	3 days/week	HIE: jumping jack, running-in-place,and knee-to-elbow with jump	Center-based, supervised	60	E1:82.6%	Injury (1,0,0)
	E2:LIE			LIE: slow walk, fast walk, heel jack without a jump			E2:80%	
	C: routine activities	daily	life					
Sinaki1989	E:RT	24	5 days/week	RT: back-strengthening exercises	home-based, unsupervised	NA	NA	No
	C: routine activities	daily	life					

Abbreviations: NA: not available; RT: resistance training; WBV: whole body vibration; LIE: lower impact exercise; MIE: moderate impact exercise; HIE: higher impact exercise; CMJ: countermovement jump; MBE: mind based exercise; FE: flexibility exercise; WBE: water based exercise; WE: wellness exercise

Table 4 Relative effect estimates for the contrasts between the different interventions and control arms on BMD at LS

Control	-0.02 (-0.03,-0.01)	-0.02 (-0.02,-0.01)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.00)	-0.01 (-0.02,-0.00)	-0.04 (-0.07,0.00)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.00)	-0.01 (-0.02,0.00)	-0.01 (-0.02,-0.00)	-0.01 (-0.05,0.03)
-0.01 (-0.02,-0.00)	RT	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	0.02 (0.00,0.03)	0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	0.01 (-0.01,0.02)	-0.02 (-0.05,0.02)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	0.01 (-0.01,0.02)	0.01 (-0.01,0.02)	0.00 (-0.04,0.04)
-0.01 (-0.02,-0.01)	-0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	ME	0.02 (0.01,0.03)	0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	0.00 (-0.00,0.01)	-0.02 (-0.05,0.02)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	0.01 (-0.01,0.02)	0.01 (-0.01,0.02)	0.00 (-0.04,0.04)
0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	0.01 (0.00,0.02)	0.02 (0.01,0.02)	WE	-0.02 (-0.03,0.00)	-0.01 (-0.02,-0.00)	-0.04 (-0.07,0.00)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.00)	-0.01 (-0.02,0.00)	-0.02 (-0.06,0.03)
-0.01 (-0.03,0.00)	-0.00 (-0.02,0.01)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.00)	FE	0.01 (-0.01,0.02)	-0.02 (-0.06,0.02)	0.00 (-0.02,0.03)	0.01 (-0.01,0.03)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	0.00 (-0.04,0.05)
-0.01 (-0.02,-0.00)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	0.00 (-0.00,0.01)	-0.01 (-0.02,-0.00)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	WBV	-0.03 (-0.06,0.01)	-0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	-0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	-0.00 (-0.05,0.04)
-0.03 (-0.07,-0.00)	-0.03 (-0.06,0.01)	-0.02 (-0.06,0.01)	-0.04 (-0.07,-0.00)	-0.02 (-0.06,0.02)	-0.03 (-0.06,0.01)	HIE	0.02 (-0.02,0.06)	0.03 (-0.01,0.06)	0.03 (-0.01,0.06)	0.02 (-0.04,0.08)
-0.01 (-0.02,0.01)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	0.01 (-0.00,0.02)	-0.01 (-0.02,0.01)	0.01 (-0.01,0.03)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	0.03 (-0.01,0.07)	MIE	0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	-0.00 (-0.05,0.04)
-0.01 (-0.02,-0.00)	-0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	-0.01 (-0.02,0.00)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	-0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	0.03 (-0.01,0.06)	-0.00 (-0.02,0.01)	LIE	-0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	-0.01 (-0.05,0.04)
-0.01 (-0.02,-0.00)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	-0.01 (-0.02,0.00)	0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	0.03 (-0.01,0.06)	-0.00 (-0.02,0.01)	0.00 (-0.01,0.01)	MBE	-0.00 (-0.04,0.04)
-0.02 (-0.06,0.03)	-0.00 (-0.05,0.04)	-0.00 (-0.04,0.04)	-0.02 (-0.06,0.03)	-0.00 (-0.05,0.04)	-0.01 (-0.05,0.04)	0.02 (-0.03,0.07)	-0.01 (-0.05,0.04)	-0.00 (-0.05,0.04)	-0.01 (-0.05,0.04)	WBE

Summary estimates from the network meta-analysis are shown in lower left triangle, and summary estimates after excluding low quality studies in upper right triangle. Each cell shows a mean difference (MD), with a 95 % CI in parentheses . For any cell, a negative MD favours the lower-right intervention, and a positive SMD favours the upper-left intervention. Significant results in bold text.

Table 5 Relative effect estimates for the contrasts between the different interventions and control arms on BMD at FN

Control	-0.01 (-0.02,0.00)	-0.03 (-0.05,-0.02)	-0.02 (-0.04,0.00)	-0.01 (-0.04,0.01)	-0.02 (-0.03,-0.00)	-0.00 (-0.04,0.04)	0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	-0.01 (-0.02,0.01)	-0.02 (-0.03,-0.00)	-0.02 (-0.07,0.02)
-0.01 (-0.02,0.00)	RT	-0.02 (-0.04,-0.00)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.02)	-0.00 (-0.03,0.02)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	0.01 (-0.04,0.05)	0.01 (-0.01,0.04)	0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	-0.01 (-0.06,0.03)
-0.03 (-0.04,-0.01)	-0.02 (-0.03,-0.00)	ME	0.01 (-0.01,0.04)	0.02 (-0.00,0.04)	0.01 (-0.00,0.03)	0.03 (-0.01,0.07)	0.04 (0.01,0.06)	0.03 (0.01,0.05)	0.02 (-0.01,0.04)	0.01 (-0.03,0.05)
-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	-0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	0.02 (-0.00,0.04)	WE	0.00 (-0.02,0.04)	-0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	0.02 (-0.03,0.06)	0.02 (-0.01,0.05)	0.01 (-0.01,0.04)	0.00 (-0.03,0.03)	0.01 (-0.05,0.04)
-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	-0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	0.02 (-0.01,0.04)	-0.00 (-0.03,0.03)	FE	-0.00 (-0.03,0.02)	0.01 (-0.03,0.06)	0.02 (-0.01,0.05)	0.01 (-0.02,0.03)	-0.00 (-0.03,0.02)	-0.01 (-0.06,0.04)
-0.02 (-0.03,-0.00)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	0.01 (-0.01,0.03)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.02)	WBV	0.02 (-0.03, 0.06)	0.02 (-0.00, 0.05)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.04)
-0.00 (-0.04,0.04)	0.00 (-0.04,0.05)	0.02 (-0.02,0.06)	0.01 (-0.04,0.05)	0.01 (-0.04,0.05)	0.01 (-0.03,0.06)	HIE	0.01 (-0.04, 0.05)	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.04)	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.03)	-0.02 (-0.08, 0.04)
0.00 (-0.01,0.02)	0.01 (-0.01,0.03)	0.03 (0.01,0.05)	0.01 (-0.01,0.03)	0.01 (-0.01,0.04)	0.21 (-0.00,0.04)	0.01 (-0.04,0.05)	MIE	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.02)
-0.01 (-0.02,0.01)	-0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	0.02 (-0.00,0.04)	0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	0.00 (-0.02,0.03)	0.01 (-0.01,0.03)	-0.01 (-0.05,0.04)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	LIE	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.03)
-0.02 (-0.03,-0.00)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	0.01 (-0.01,0.03)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.02)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.02)	-0.00 (-0.02,0.02)	-0.01 (-0.06,0.03)	-0.02 (-0.04,0.00)	-0.01 (-0.03,0.01)	MBE	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.04)
-0.02 (-0.06,0.02)	-0.02 (-0.06,0.03)	0.00 (-0.04,0.04)	-0.01 (-0.06,0.03)	-0.01 (-0.06,0.03)	-0.01 (-0.05,0.04)	-0.02 (-0.08,0.04)	-0.03 (-0.07,0.02)	-0.02 (-0.06,0.03)	-0.01 (-0.05,0.04)	WBE

Summary estimates from the network meta-analysis are shown in lower left triangle, and summary estimates after excluding low quality studies in upper right triangle. Each cell shows a mean difference (MD), with a 95 % CI in parentheses. For any cell, a negative MD favours the lower-right intervention, and a positive SMD favours the upper-left intervention. Significant results in bold text.