

1 **Pulsed electromagnetic fields may be effective for the management of primary**
2 **osteoporosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis**

3

4 Siyi Zhu^{a,b}, Yi Li^{a,b}, Liqiong Wang^{a,b}, Jinming Huang^{a,b}, Kangping Song^{a,b}, Xinling Gan^{a,b},
5 Xiaona Xiang^{a,b}, Chengqi He^{a,b*}, Lin Yang^{a,b*}

6

7 ^aRehabilitation Medical Center, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan,
8 China.

9 ^bRehabilitation Medicine key laboratory of Sichuan Province, West China Hospital, Sichuan
10 University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China.

11

12 *Corresponding author: Dr. Chengqi He or Dr. Qiang Gao or Dr. Lin Yang at the Rehabilitation
13 Medical Center, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, No. 37 Guoxue Alley, Wuhou
14 District, 610041, Chengdu, China. Email: hxfhcq@126.com (CH) or 5648197@qq.com (LY).

15

16 **Abbreviated title:** Pulsed electromagnetic fields for primary osteoporosis

17 **Key words:** Osteoporosis, Electromagnetic Fields; Bone Density; Physical Therapy
18 Modalities; Disability Evaluation

19 **Word Count:** 350 words (Abstract)

20 3735 words (Main text)

21

22 **ABSTRACT**

23 **Objective:** To investigate the effectiveness of pulsed electromagnetic fields (PEMFs) for the
24 management of primary osteoporosis in older adults.

25 **Design:** Systematic review and meta-analysis.

26 **Data Sources:** MEDLINE, EMBASE, Web of Science, CENTRAL and CCTR, Physiotherapy
27 Evidence Database, CNKI, VIP, Wan Fang, ClinicalTrials.gov and Current controlled trials from
28 the inception dates to April 30, 2021.

29 **Eligibility criteria for study selection:** Randomised controlled trials or quasi-randomised trials
30 examining the effects of PEMFs compared to placebo or sham or other agents for the
31 management of primary osteoporosis (including those with previous fractures).

32 **Data extraction and synthesis:** Two independent reviewers extracted data. Primary outcomes
33 were bone mass and number of incident fractures. Secondary outcomes were functional
34 assessments, quality of life, and adverse events. Risk of bias was assessed with the Cochrane
35 Collaboration's tool and certainty of evidence with the grading of recommendations assessment,
36 development and evaluation (GRADE) framework. A random effects model was used to calculate
37 mean differences and 95% confidence intervals.

38 **Results:** Eight trials including 396 participants met the inclusion criteria. Low certainty evidence
39 showed that PEMFs was non-inferior to conventional pharmacological agents in preventing the
40 decline of Bone Mineral Density (BMD) at the lumbar (MD 0.01; CI -0.04 to 0.06) and femur
41 neck (MD 0.01; CI -0.02 to 0.04), and improving balance function measured by Berg Balance
42 Scale (BBS) (MD 0.01; CI -0.09 to 0.11) and Timed Up and Go test (MD -0.04; CI -0.80 to 0.72),
43 directly after intervention. The similar effects were observed in BMD and BBS at 12- and 24-
44 weeks follow-up from baseline with moderate certainty evidence. Very low certainty evidence
45 showed that PEMFs (versus exercise) had small but significant effect on BMD at the femur neck
46 (MD 0.10; CI 0.01 to 0.20), and no effect on BMD at the lumbar (MD 0.15; CI -0.04 to 0.35).

47 **Conclusion:** PEMFs had positive effects non-inferior to first-line treatment on BMD and balance
48 function in older adults with primary osteoporosis, but with low to very low certainty evidence
49 and short-term follow-ups. There is a need for high-quality randomised controlled trials
50 evaluating PEMFs for the management of primary osteoporosis.

51 **Registration:** PROSPERO CRD42018099518.

52

53 INTRODUCTION

54 Osteoporosis is a systemic and multifactorial skeletal disorder characterized by low bone mineral
55 density and skeletal fragility that occur with aging, with a consequent increase of susceptibility to
56 low-trauma fractures ¹. The most prevalent symptoms of osteoporosis are fractures at vertebrae,
57 proximal femur (hip), and wrist affecting patients' physical function and quality of life. It is
58 estimated that over 200 million people worldwide are affected by osteoporosis, accounting for 8.9
59 million fractures annually ². The possibility of osteoporotic fractures exceeds 40% and the
60 probability of hip fracture alone could target 20% in white female population over 50 years old ³.
61 In China, a higher incidence of hip fractures in men than in women was reported ⁴. Each year,
62 osteoporotic fractures account for over 432,000 hospitalizations and 2.5 million medical visits in
63 the USA ⁵. The treatment costs for fractures were recorded at nearly \$17 billion in the USA in
64 2005 ⁶, and €31.7 billion in Europe in 2000 ⁷. Therefore, osteoporosis has been identified as a
65 major health burden globally by WHO, due to its high prevalence, disability rate, related
66 mortality and poor quality of life ⁸.

67 Rehabilitation interventions given its important roles in modifying risk factors related to fractures,
68 restoring function and improving quality of life are frequently recommended as an option in the
69 nonpharmacological management of osteoporosis ^{9,10}. Pulsed electromagnetic fields (PEMFs) at a
70 specific intensity and frequency have been proved effective in attenuating bone loss and the relief
71 of pain and discomfort after osteoporosis. As we reviewed elsewhere ¹¹, PEMFs were found to be
72 positive at promoting bone formation by stimulating the formation and differentiation of
73 osteoblasts, and negative at inhibiting the function of osteoclasts in bone resorption.
74 Experimental studies suggest that PEMFs may exert effects on Ca²⁺-related receptors on the bone
75 cell membrane which play a regulatory role in the maintenance of bone remodelling ¹². Further,
76 the exposure of PEMFs could influence the physiopathology of osteoporosis by targeting
77 inflammation and potentially relieving pain via these regulatory processes and improvements in
78 bone remodeling ¹³.

79 PEMFs have been widely used as an clinical option for the management of pain and discomfort
80 related to osteoporosis since the introduce of its usage for non-union fractures was approved by
81 FDA in 1979 ¹⁴. However, clinical trials evaluating the effectiveness of PEMFs have been
82 conducted with inconsistent results, to which parameters of PEMFs used in studies, follow-up
83 time points and clinical settings differ across studies may lead ¹¹. In order to expand upon the

84 current knowledge on whether PEMFs is an effective physical agent for osteoporosis clinically, a
85 systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical trials was performed to compare PEMFs with
86 placebo or sham or other agents for the management of primary osteoporosis in older adults.

87

88 **METHODS**

89 This systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted in accordance with the Cochrane
90 Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions¹⁵ and reported based on Preferred Reporting
91 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses guidelines (PRISMA)¹⁶. The protocol of this
92 study is available in PROSPERO (CRD42018099518)¹⁷.

93

94 **Identification and selection of studies**

95 We searched the MEDLINE (via Ovid), EMBASE (via Ovid), Web of Science, CENTRAL and
96 CCTR (via The Cochrane Library), Physiotherapy Evidence Database (via PEDro website),
97 CNKI, VIP, Wan Fang, ClinicalTrials.gov (<https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/>) and Current
98 controlled trials (www.controlled-trials.com) from the inception dates to December 9, 2018,
99 using the keywords *pulsed electromagnetic fields* and *osteoporosis*. The Open Grey
100 (<http://www.opengrey.eu/>) was searched for the Grey Literature research. The detailed electronic
101 search strategies are provided in Supplementary Appendix I. An additional search was performed
102 under a mechanism of living systematic review¹⁸ to identify recently published randomized
103 clinical trials (RCTs) from December 10, 2018 to April 30, 2021 using the databases and
104 keywords described above. The whole procedure was assisted by a librarian from Sichuan
105 University.

106 Randomised controlled trials or quasi-randomised trials examining the effects of PEMFs
107 compared to placebo or sham or other agents for the management of primary osteoporosis
108 (including those with previous fractures) were included if they met the inclusion criteria listed in
109 Box 1. Studies were excluded if the study population had a diagnosis of corticosteroid-induced
110 osteoporosis or other secondary osteoporosis (e.g., rheumatoid arthritis), studies where
111 participants had a history of hip replacement or surgery related with osteoporotic fractures, the
112 study type was observational studies, review articles, abstracts, conference reports and book
113 chapters.

114 A three-stage screening methodology was performed to select relevant RCTs for this review.

115 Primarily, all titles were screened by one reviewer (SYZ) for eligibility and irrelevant papers
116 were excluded accordingly. Secondary, two reviewers (YL and LQW or KPS) independently
117 reviewed each study title and abstract. Thirdly, two independent reviewers (XNX and JMH or
118 XLG) accessed the full text to assess against the eligibility criteria for each potentially eligible
119 study. A third reviewer (CQH or LY) was involved for any disagreement.

120

121 **Assessment of characteristics of studies**

122 ***Quality assessment***

123 The risk of bias was assessed by using the Cochrane Collaboration's 'Risk of bias' tool ¹⁵. Seven
124 key domains were assessed by two reviewers (SYZ and LQW): 1) the randomization sequence
125 generation, 2) allocation concealment, 3) blinding of participants and personnel, 4) blinding of
126 outcome assessment, 5) incomplete outcome data, 6) selective reporting, and 7) other bias. The
127 included studies were graded as low, unclear, or a high risk of bias. Methodological quality was
128 assessed with the use of Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro) tool ¹⁹, which was proved
129 reliable ²⁰ and valid ²¹. Each criterion in the PEDro scale with a range of 0-10 was scored 1
130 ("yes") or 0 ("no, don't know/unclear"). Generally, trials with a PEDro summary score of over
131 five. were considered to have adequate methodological quality ²². Finally, we used Grading of
132 Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations (GRADE) ²³ to describe the
133 overall quality of the body of evidence.

134

135 ***Participants***

136 To be included, studies involved participants were healthy older adults (including those with
137 previous fractures) aged over 50 years with primary osteoporosis ²⁴, recognized by two distinct
138 types ²⁵: 1) type I occurred in postmenopausal women; 2) type II, known as senile osteoporosis,
139 occurred in both men and women.

140

141 ***Interventions***

142 All RCTs applying electromagnetic fields with pulsed signal and extremely low frequencies
143 (between 5 and 300 Hz) for the management of primary osteoporosis were included. The
144 parameters (frequency and intensity) of PEMFs, sessions per week and total duration of the
145 treatment period were recorded to describe the interventions.

146

147 **Outcome measures**

148 All outcomes were continuous data and recorded as the percent change from baseline to post-
149 intervention and different follow-up timepoints. To be included, trials had to provide original
150 data or sufficient information about at least one of outcomes on bone mass, number of incident
151 fractures, self-reported data on the changes in balance and quality of life, physical activity and
152 function, and adverse events. Primary outcomes were bone mass (e.g., Bone Marrow Density or
153 Bone Mineral Content) immediately post-intervention and at follow-ups, and number of incident
154 fractures. Secondary outcomes were functional assessments (e.g., Berg Balance Scale, Timed Up
155 and Go test), quality of life (e.g., EuroQoL (EQ 5D)) and adverse events (e.g., falls and death).

156

157 **Data extraction and analysis**

158 Two independent reviewers (SYZ and YL) extracted the following information from eligible
159 studies: lead author; year of publication; original country; subject characteristics; study design;
160 treatment information; intervention protocol; outcome measures; raw outcome data; follow-up
161 period and other relevant information. Disagreements were resolved by consensus.

162 All meta-analyses were performed using analysis was performed using Review Manager
163 (RevMan) software (The Cochrane Collaboration, version 5.4). For each included study, the
164 mean difference (MD) of percentage change with 95% confidential intervals (CIs) was calculated
165 when the outcome measures were consistent across studies or else the standard mean difference
166 (SMD) was calculated instead for continuous outcomes (reporting mean and standard deviation
167 (SD) or standard error (SE) of the mean). If the MD was not reported, it was calculated as the
168 change between values of the baseline and post-intervention. In the case that the value of SD
169 (SD_{diff}) was not reported, it was obtained 1) by multiplying SEs of means by the square root of
170 the sample size when standard errors (SEs) of the means were reported, or 2) with SDs at the
171 baseline ($SD_{baseline}$) and post-intervention SD (SD_{post}) in addition to the within-groups bivariate
172 correlation coefficient (r)²⁶:

$$SD_{diff} = \sqrt{SD_{baseline}^2 + SD_{post}^2 - (2 \times r \times SD_{baseline} \times SD_{post})}$$

173 The I^2 statistic was employed for evaluating heterogeneity and a standard χ^2 test was employed
174 for detecting whether significant heterogeneity existed. Heterogeneity was statistically significant

175 at $P < 0.10$ after due consideration of I^2 statistic, of which a value greater than 50% was
176 considered substantial heterogeneity²⁷. The random-effects model was applied where the
177 evidence of heterogeneity was found.

178 The comparison was established between PEMFs and placebo control or exercise in the meta-
179 analysis. The subgroup analysis was conducted to detect the effectiveness relative to different
180 follow-up timepoints (postintervention; follow-up at 12, 24 weeks from baseline). To evaluate the
181 quality and consistency of pooled results, the sensitivity analysis was conducted by deleting each
182 included study. Where the data allowed, assessment of publication bias was performed. All tests
183 were two-tailed, and $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

184

185 **RESULTS**

186 **Flow of studies through the review**

187 In total, 806 articles were identified by our search, of which 124 duplicate articles were removed.
188 Based on title and abstract screening, 632 of these articles were excluded. Full texts of 50 articles
189 were read, a further 42 articles were excluded, remaining 8 articles included in the data extraction
190 and analysis of the review (Figure 1)²⁸⁻³⁵.

191

192 **Characteristics of studies**

193 *Quality*

194 All included studies achieved PEDro scores over 5, among which five studies achieved the score
195 over 8 (Table 1)^{28,29,31-33}. Of the 8 included studies, 2 studies were rated as 'low risk of bias' in all
196 domains^{31,32}, and other studies were classified as 'unclear risk of bias' for at least 1 aspect or
197 'high risk of bias' for at least 2 aspects. In results of GRADE, the quality of the evidence for the
198 comparison between PEMFs versus placebo control was low or moderate, and that for the
199 comparison between PEMFs versus exercise was very low. The results of the risk of bias and
200 GRADE are presented in the Supplementary Tables and Figures.

201

202 *Participants*

203 In total, data were extracted for 396 participants, comprising 183 participants in PEMFs group
204 and 213 participants in placebo control (alendronate/pharmacological therapy) or exercise group.

205 Mean age ranged from 56.3 to 70 years, with a gender ratio of 49 to 347. Participant
206 characteristics are detailed in Table 2.

207
208 ***Intervention***
209 The frequency and intensity of PEMFs exposure varied at 8-100 Hz and 1.2-5 mT separately. A
210 range of 30-36 PEMFs sessions, with 30-60 min/session, were prescribed for participants, and 4
211 to 72 weeks follow-up were conducted across all studies. Control intervention types included
212 first-line pharmacological agents (e.g., Alendronate, intake of Vitamin D and Calcium) and
213 exercise (e.g., whole body vibration and resistance training). The intervention characteristics of
214 the included studies are detailed in the Table 2.

215
216 ***Outcome measures***
217 The outcome measures in each study with the categories of bone mass and functional assessments
218 are detailed in Table 2.

219
220 **Effect of intervention I: PEMFs versus control group**

221 ***Bone Mineral Density (BMD)***
222 Five studies (study population, N=248)^{28,30-33} and three studies (study population, N=124)
223 ^{30,32,33} reported data on percentage change in BMD at the lumbar and femur neck respectively
224 after intervention directly (Figure 2). Low certainty evidence showed that PEMFs has no effect
225 on BMD at the lumbar (MD 0.01; CI -0.04 to 0.06) and femur neck (MD 0.01; CI -0.02 to 0.04)
226 with no statistically significant heterogeneity (lumbar: $I^2 = 0\%$, $P = 0.48$; femur neck: $I^2 = 0\%$, $P =$
227 0.79). Two studies (study population, N=125)^{31,32} performed follow-ups at 12 and 24 weeks from
228 baseline on percentage change in BMD at the lumbar (Figure 2). Moderate certainty evidence
229 showed that there is no statistically significant effect on BMD at the lumbar at the 12 weeks
230 follow-up (MD -0.01; CI -0.28 to 0.25) and the 24 weeks follow-up (MD -0.02; CI -0.30 to 0.26)
231 with no statistically significant heterogeneity (12 weeks: $I^2 = 0\%$, $P = 1.00$; 24 weeks: $I^2 = 0\%$, P
232 $= 0.98$). No significant changes in heterogeneity and overall effect were observed in the
233 sensitivity analysis.

234
235 ***Berg Balance Scale (BBS)***

236 Three studies (study population, N=168)^{31,32,35} conducted the assessment of BBS after
237 intervention directly (Figure 3). Low certainty evidence showed that there is no statistically
238 significant effect on percentage change in BBS (MD 0.01; CI -0.09 to 0.11) with no statistically
239 significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, $P = 1.00$). Two studies (study population, N=125)^{31,32} carried
240 out follow-ups at 12 and 24 weeks from baseline on percentage change in BBS (Figure 3).
241 Moderate certainty evidence showed that no statistically significant effect is detected on BBS at
242 the 12 weeks (MD 0.00; CI -0.13 to 0.14) and 24 weeks follow-up (MD -0.00; CI -0.15 to 0.14)
243 with evidence of no statistically significant heterogeneity (12 weeks: $I^2 = 0\%$, $P = 0.99$; 24 weeks:
244 $I^2 = 0\%$, $P = 0.99$). No significant changes in heterogeneity and overall effect were observed in
245 the sensitivity analysis.

246
247 ***Timed Up and Go (TUG) test***
248 Two studies (study population, N=127)^{31,35} assessed the percentage change in TUG test after
249 intervention directly (Figure 3). Low certainty evidence showed that there is no statistically
250 significant effect on TUG (MD -0.04; CI -0.80 to 0.72) with no statistically significant
251 heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, $P = 0.97$). No significant changes in heterogeneity and overall effect were
252 observed in the sensitivity analysis.

253
254 **Effect of intervention II: PEMFs versus exercise group**
255 Three studies (study population, N=110)^{29,33,34} investigated the effect of PEMFs on percentage
256 change in BMD at the lumbar and femur neck respectively after intervention directly (Figure 4).
257 Very low certainty evidence showed that PEMFs has small but significant effect on BMD at the
258 femur neck (MD 0.10; CI 0.01 to 0.20), and no effect on BMD at the lumbar (MD 0.15; CI -0.04
259 to 0.35), both with no statistically significant heterogeneity respectively (femur neck: $I^2 = 28\%$, P
260 $= 0.25$; $I^2 = 47\%$, $P = 0.15$). In the sensitivity analysis, one study²⁹ was found to be a contributor
261 to results of non-significant heterogeneity and the effect on BMD at the femur neck. After
262 excluding the study, the heterogeneity was reduced to 0% (femur neck: $P = 0.96$; $P = 0.86$), and
263 the small but significant effect on BMD at the femur neck was eliminated (MD 0.00; CI -0.15 to
264 0.16).

265
266 **DISCUSSION**

267 This systematic review and meta-analysis of 8 studies involving 396 participants demonstrated
268 PEMFs as a physical therapy was non-inferior to conventional pharmacological agents in
269 preventing the decline of BMD and balance function for the management of primary osteoporosis
270 in older adults. Meanwhile, we also found that PEMFs might be slightly more effective in
271 increasing BMD than exercise. According to our knowledge, no systematic review and meta-
272 analysis was initiated before, except one network meta-analysis exploring effects of
273 nonpharmacological interventions including PEMFs on balance function only ³⁶, and several
274 narrative reviews including clinical studies were retrieved ^{11,37,38}. Our results are in consistent
275 with findings from previous reviews^{11,36,37} that PEMFs achieved positive effects on BMD and
276 balance function for older adults with primary osteoporosis, implicating that PEMFs may
277 potentially become a promising treatment option.

278 Bisphosphonates and exercise were both identified as the first-line interventions for the
279 management of osteoporosis in the latest evidence-based guideline ¹⁰. Our study established
280 comparisons between PEMFs and active placebo or exercise based on groups set by included
281 studies, and sub-group analysis was stratified by different intervals between the baseline, post-
282 intervention, and follow-ups. BMD, as a surrogate measure for therapeutic effectiveness, can be
283 assessed by various methods, among which dual x-ray absorptiometry (DXA) was proved to be
284 reliable in the diagnosis of osteoporosis and have relatively good responsiveness in RCT ^{39,40}.
285 Our study demonstrated that there was no difference between PEMFs and active placebo in
286 improving BMD at the lumbar and femur neck in all sub-group meta-analysis, which suggests
287 PEMFs is nearly effective as pharmacological agents for osteoporosis, and the effect could last
288 for at least 24 weeks. Moreover, the effects of PEMFs versus exercise on BMD at the lumbar was
289 not significant, while that was detected as small but significant on BMD at the femur neck. Our
290 results were considered fairly stable as the sensitivity analysis only detected one study ²⁹ affecting
291 the heterogeneity and effect of PEMFs versus exercise on BMD at the femur neck. This is likely
292 due to variations in exercise characteristics (e.g., duration, training load and training volume).
293 Therefore, this part of results should be interpreted with caution.

294 Impaired balance function is an important risk factor increasing the incidence of falling and
295 fracture, which is modifiable by balance-improving interventions ⁴¹. In line with results on BMD,
296 no statistically significant difference was observed for balance function measured by BBS and
297 TUG after the intervention of PEMFs versus active placebo. In the sub-group analysis, the effect

298 of PEMFs on BBS at 12, 24 weeks follow-up was also not statistically significant, confirming
299 that PEMFs is as effective as conventional pharmacological agents in improving balance function
300 which could last for 24 weeks. In consistent with a previous systematic review³⁶, it reported that
301 PEMFs exert positive effect on BBS and TUG tests reflecting balance function. However, the
302 network meta-analysis was conducted to further compare the effects of five interventions on
303 balance function with the conclusion that balance and strength training was better than other
304 interventions. Only one study using data on PEMFs was included in the analysis, compared to
305 that we included 3 studies, and no study was ever conducted to directly compare the effect of
306 PEMFs versus other non-pharmacological interventions on balance function, combining these
307 two may explain, in part, the conflicting results. Furthermore, our sensitivity analysis detecting
308 no changes in levels of heterogeneity and effect confirmed our results as relatively robust.
309 To overcome the shortcomings of the “statistically significant difference”, the minimum
310 clinically important difference (MCID) defined as “the smallest change that is important to
311 patients” is employed to generate a threshold value for such change⁴². Any patient whose
312 responses help them reach the MCID threshold is considered as responders. Thus, a certain
313 proportion of responders to the total participants involved in a trialed intervention indicates the
314 likelihood of patients under the same condition also responding favorably to the same
315 intervention⁴³. However, no definite consensus reached on the MCID of BMD and balance
316 function. Some evidence showed that changes by 2-5% at the lumbar and 8% at the proximal
317 femur⁴⁴, a point-drop in BBS associated with a 3-4% increase in risk of falling⁴⁵, and an
318 improvement of 2-3 seconds in TUG test were considered as MCID for the older population⁴⁶. In
319 our study, no study included used the MCID and responder rate to evaluate the effect of PEMFs,
320 thus, it is hard to determine the clinical importance of improvements achieved by PEMFs on
321 BMD and balance function compared with placebo and exercise. Furthermore, the successful
322 treatment of osteoporosis is prevention of fractures, while no treatment can completely eliminate
323 fracture risk¹⁰. Although a certain increase in BMD and the improvement in balance function for
324 osteoporosis may result in a reduction in fracture risk, no risk and number of incident fracture
325 were reported in studies included in our review. Therefore, studies with reporting measures of
326 MCID, fracture risk and incidence in the future are required to further confirm that the effect of
327 PEMFs in treating osteoporosis is of clinical importance to clinicians and patients.
328 This review has several strengths. To date, we are the first to conduct a systematic review and

329 meta-analysis to explore the effect of PEMFs on BMD and balance function for primary
330 osteoporosis. Secondary, the results of our study were fairly stable due to studies included were
331 of appropriate methodological quality, and no significant heterogeneity was found in the analysis.
332 Furthermore, a key finding of this review was that PEMFs as an intervention alone achieved an
333 effect non-inferior to first-line treatment (pharmacological agents and exercise) on improvements
334 in BMD and balance function for older adults with primary osteoporosis. At last, a librarian
335 familiar with the development of searches and a mechanism of living systematic review were
336 involved over a course of 3 years to ensure no study was missed in compliance with the study
337 protocol.

338 There are several limitations to this review that deserve consideration. The primary limitation of
339 our review was the limited number of included studies with only 8 studies comprising of 396
340 participants for the analysis, from which the level of evidence generated were moderate to very
341 low. In some sub-group analyses, only 2-3 studies were included from which some uncertainty in
342 the results interpretation may exist based on data extracted. In addition, as the maximum PEMF
343 treatment session lasted for 16 weeks and the longest follow-up was 24 weeks for the analysis,
344 the error among the minimum percentage change in BMD and balance function may stay
345 undetectable and further deepened the uncertainty⁴⁴. Furthermore, the clinical relevance of the
346 findings was limited, combined with no study reported data on MCID, responder rate and
347 incident fracture and only two studies^{31,32} included used intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis.
348 According to accumulated evidence^{11,47}, the parameters of non-pharmacological interventions,
349 including intensity, frequency, and duration, were critical to impact changes in outcome measures
350 for osteoporosis, while our study could not conduct the sub-group analysis based on different
351 parameters due to limited information retrieved. Another potential limitation was the systematic
352 search was limited to English and Chinese manuscripts available in full text, and some relevant
353 trials may be missed.

354

355 **CONCLUSION**

356 In summary, moderate to very low certainty evidence showed that PEMFs as an intervention
357 alone has positive effects non-inferior to first-line treatment (pharmacological agents and exercise)
358 on BMD and balance function in older adults with primary osteoporosis and should be considered
359 as a promising option in the management of osteoporosis. Although uncertainty about responses

360 to the intervention and changes in outcome measures may be existed but undetectable, our
361 findings may still be fairly stable as we consistently found similar results in the primary and
362 sensitivity analyses. For further deeply confirming the effect of PEMFs for osteoporosis, adding
363 endpoints like fracture risk and incidence, and outcome measures like MCID and responder rate
364 to the core collection are necessary. In the future, researchers planning a PEMFs study should
365 optimize the study design, with taking factors not limited to undetectable errors under outcomes,
366 parameters of interventions, longer follow-up period, larger sample size and ITT analysis into
367 consideration, to generate high certainty evidence.

368

369 **DECLARATIONS**

370

371 **Acknowledgements**

372 We are grateful for the partnership and support from the library of Sichuan University for the
373 development of search strategy, also and the clinical research and statistics office of West China
374 Hospital for data processing and analysis.

375

376 **Funding**

377 This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation (81972146 to Chengqi He,
378 and 82002393 to Siyi Zhu), the Department of Science and Technology of Sichuan Province
379 (2020YJ0210 to Chengqi He, 2021YFS0004 and 2021YJ0424 to Siyi Zhu), China Postdoctoral
380 Science Foundation (2020M673251), Health Commission of Sichuan Province (20PJ034), and
381 West China Hospital of Sichuan University (2019HXBH058 to Siyi Zhu). The funders played no
382 role in the design, conduct, or reporting of this study.

383

384 **Availability of Data and Materials**

385 Not applicable

386

387 **Authors' contributions**

388 All authors have made substantial contributions to the study design. SYZ and YL have
389 contributed to the ongoing data collection. All listed authors have contributed to the drafting of
390 the manuscript.

391

392 Competing interests

393 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

394

395 REFERENCES

- 396 1. Eastell R, O'Neill TW, Hofbauer LC, et al. Postmenopausal osteoporosis. *Nature reviews*
397 *Disease primers*. 2016;2:16069.
- 398 2. International Osteoporosis Foundation. EPIDEMIOLOGY OF OSTEOPOROSIS AND
399 FRAGILITY FRACTURES. [https://www.osteoporosis.foundation/facts-](https://www.osteoporosis.foundation/facts-statistics/epidemiology-of-osteoporosis-and-fragility-fractures)
400 [statistics/epidemiology-of-osteoporosis-and-fragility-fractures](https://www.osteoporosis.foundation/facts-statistics/epidemiology-of-osteoporosis-and-fragility-fractures). Published 2021. Accessed
401 May 12, 2021.
- 402 3. Bessette L, Ste-Marie L-G, Jean S, et al. The care gap in diagnosis and treatment of
403 women with a fragility fracture. *Osteoporosis International*. 2008;19(1):79-86.
- 404 4. International Osteoporosis Foundation. KEY STATISTICS FOR ASIA.
405 <https://www.osteoporosis.foundation/facts-statistics/key-statistic-for-asia>. Published 2021.
406 Accessed May 12, 2021.
- 407 5. US D. Bone health and osteoporosis: A Report of the Surgeon General. [http://www](http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/bonehealth/content.html)
408 [surgeongeneral.gov/library/bonehealth/content.html](http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/bonehealth/content.html). 2004.
- 409 6. Burge R, Dawson-Hughes B, Solomon DH, Wong JB, King A, Tosteson A. Incidence
410 and economic burden of osteoporosis-related fractures in the United States, 2005–2025.
411 *Journal of bone and mineral research*. 2007;22(3):465-475.
- 412 7. Kanis J, Johnell O. Requirements for DXA for the management of osteoporosis in
413 Europe. *Osteoporosis international*. 2005;16(3):229-238.
- 414 8. Kanis J, Group WS. Assessment of Osteoporosis at the Primary Health Care Level.
415 Geneva. *World Health Organization*. 2008.
- 416 9. Tu KN, Lie JD, Wan CKV, et al. Osteoporosis: a review of treatment options. *Pharmacy*
417 *and Therapeutics*. 2018;43(2):92.
- 418 10. Camacho PM, Petak SM, Binkley N, et al. American Association of Clinical
419 Endocrinologists/American College of Endocrinology clinical practice guidelines for the
420 diagnosis and treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis—2020 update. *Endocrine*
421 *Practice*. 2020;26:1-46.
- 422 11. Zhu S, He H, Zhang C, et al. Effects of pulsed electromagnetic fields on postmenopausal
423 osteoporosis. *Bioelectromagnetics*. 2017;38(6):406-424.
- 424 12. Petecchia L, Sbrana F, Utzeri R, et al. Electro-magnetic field promotes osteogenic
425 differentiation of BM-hMSCs through a selective action on Ca²⁺-related mechanisms.
426 *Scientific reports*. 2015;5:13856.
- 427 13. Vincenzi F, Targa M, Corciulo C, et al. Pulsed electromagnetic fields increased the anti-
428 inflammatory effect of A2A and A3 adenosine receptors in human T/C-28a2
429 chondrocytes and hFOB 1.19 osteoblasts. *PloS one*. 2013;8(5):e65561.
- 430 14. Andrew C, Bassett L, Pawluk RJ, Pilla AA. Augmentation of bone repair by inductively
431 coupled electromagnetic fields. *Science*. 1974;184(4136):575-577.
- 432 15. Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of*
433 *interventions*. John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
- 434 16. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated
435 guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71.

- 436 17. Siyi Z, Wei X, Hongchen H, et al. Pulsed electromagnetic fields (PEMFs) for preventing
437 and treating primary osteoporosis: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized
438 controlled trials. PROSPERO 2018 CRD42018099518.
439 https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospéro/display_record.php?ID=CRD42018099518.
440 Published 2021. Accessed May 16, 2021.
- 441 18. Cochrane Library. Living systematic reviews. [https://community.cochrane.org/review-
442 production/production-resources/living-systematic-
443 reviews#:~:text=Living%20Evidence%20Network-
444 ,What%20is%20a%20living%20systematic%20review%3F,the%20evidence%20\(i.e.%20
445 monthly%20searches\)](https://community.cochrane.org/review-production/production-resources/living-systematic-reviews#:~:text=Living%20Evidence%20Network-,What%20is%20a%20living%20systematic%20review%3F,the%20evidence%20(i.e.%20monthly%20searches)). Published 2021. Accessed May 16, 2021.
- 446 19. Sherrington C, Herbert R, Maher C, Moseley A. PEDro. A database of randomized trials
447 and systematic reviews in physiotherapy. *Manual therapy*. 2000;5(4):223-226.
- 448 20. Maher CG, Sherrington C, Herbert RD, Moseley AM, Elkins M. Reliability of the PEDro
449 scale for rating quality of randomized controlled trials. *Physical therapy*. 2003;83(8):713-
450 721.
- 451 21. de Morton NA. The PEDro scale is a valid measure of the methodological quality of
452 clinical trials: a demographic study. *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy*.
453 2009;55(2):129-133.
- 454 22. da Costa BR, Hilfiker R, Egger M. PEDro's bias: summary quality scores should not be
455 used in meta-analysis. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2013;66(1):75-77.
- 456 23. Group GW. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ: British
457 Medical Journal*. 2004;328(7454):1490.
- 458 24. Soen S, Fukunaga M, Sugimoto T, et al. Diagnostic criteria for primary osteoporosis: year
459 2012 revision. *Journal of bone and mineral metabolism*. 2013;31(3):247-257.
- 460 25. Glaser DL, Kaplan FS. Osteoporosis: definition and clinical presentation. *Spine*.
461 1997;22(24):12S-16S.
- 462 26. Higgins JP, Li T, Deeks JJ. Choosing effect measures and computing estimates of effect.
463 *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. 2019:143-176.
- 464 27. Sedgwick P. Meta-analyses: what is heterogeneity? *Bmj*. 2015;350:h1435.
- 465 28. Abdelaal AA, Taha MM, Amin DI, Draz AH. Effect of pulsed electromagnetic therapy
466 versus low-level laser therapy on bone mineral density in the elderly with primary
467 osteoporosis: a randomized, controlled trial. *Bulletin of Faculty of Physical Therapy*.
468 2017;22(1):34-39.
- 469 29. Elsis HFEM, Mousa GSM, ELdesoky MTM. Electromagnetic field versus circuit weight
470 training on bone mineral density in elderly women. *Clinical interventions in aging*.
471 2015;10:539.
- 472 30. Giordano N, Battisti E, Geraci S, et al. Effect of electromagnetic fields on bone mineral
473 density and biochemical markers of bone turnover in osteoporosis: a single-blind,
474 randomized pilot study. *Current Therapeutic Research*. 2001;62(3):187-193.
- 475 31. Liu H, Liu Y, Yang L, Wang C, Wu Y, He C. Curative effects of pulsed electromagnetic
476 fields on postmenopausal osteoporosis. *Sheng wu yi xue gong cheng xue za zhi= Journal
477 of biomedical engineering= Shengwu yixue gongchengxue zazhi*. 2014;31(1):48-52.
- 478 32. Liu HF, Yang L, He HC, et al. Pulsed electromagnetic fields on postmenopausal
479 osteoporosis in southwest China: A randomized, active□controlled clinical trial.
480 *Bioelectromagnetics*. 2013;34(4):323-332.
- 481 33. Shanb AA, Youssef EF, Muaidi QI, Alothman AA. Whole body vibration versus
482 magnetic therapy on bone mineral density in elderly osteoporotic individuals. *Journal of*

- 483 *back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2017;30(4):903-912.
- 484 34. Shanb A-SA, Youssef EF, El-Barkouky MG, Kamal RM, Tawfick AM. The effect of
485 magnetic therapy and active exercise on bone mineral density in elderly women with
486 osteoporosis. *Journal of Musculoskeletal Research*. 2012;15(03):1250016.
- 487 35. Wu Y-C, Xu J, Yang L, Xiong E-F, Xie W, He C-Q. The effect of low-frequency pulsed
488 electromagnetic fields on balance ability of patients with post-menopausal osteoporosis.
489 *Sichuan da xue xue bao Yi xue ban= Journal of Sichuan University Medical science*
490 *edition*. 2014;45(1):116-119.
- 491 36. Zhu L, Wu W, Chen M, et al. Effects of Nonpharmacological Interventions on Balance
492 Function in Patients with Osteoporosis or Osteopenia: A Network Meta-Analysis of
493 Randomized Controlled Trials. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative*
494 *Medicine*. 2021;2021.
- 495 37. Wang R, Wu H, Yang Y, Song M. Effects of electromagnetic fields on osteoporosis: a
496 systematic literature review. *Electromagnetic biology and medicine*. 2016;35(4):384-390.
- 497 38. Wang T, Yang L, Jiang J, et al. Pulsed electromagnetic fields: promising treatment for
498 osteoporosis. *Osteoporosis International*. 2019;30(2):267-276.
- 499 39. Blake GM, Fogelman I. The role of DXA bone density scans in the diagnosis and
500 treatment of osteoporosis. *Postgraduate medical journal*. 2007;83(982):509-517.
- 501 40. Kanis JA, Melton III LJ, Christiansen C, Johnston CC, Khaltsev N. The diagnosis of
502 osteoporosis. *Journal of bone and mineral research*. 1994;9(8):1137-1141.
- 503 41. Choi M, Hector M. Effectiveness of intervention programs in preventing falls: a
504 systematic review of recent 10 years and meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Medical*
505 *Directors Association*. 2012;13(2):188. e113-188. e121.
- 506 42. Stratford PW, Binkley JM, Riddle DL, Guyatt GH. Sensitivity to change of the Roland-
507 Morris back pain questionnaire: part 1. *Physical therapy*. 1998;78(11):1186-1196.
- 508 43. Farrar JT, Portenoy RK, Berlin JA, Kinman JL, Strom BL. Defining the clinically
509 important difference in pain outcome measures. *Pain*. 2000;88(3):287-294.
- 510 44. Cranney A, Welch V, Wells G, et al. Discrimination of changes in osteoporosis outcomes.
511 *The Journal of rheumatology*. 2001;28(2):413-421.
- 512 45. Shumway-Cook A, Baldwin M, Polissar NL, Gruber W. Predicting the probability for
513 falls in community-dwelling older adults. *Physical therapy*. 1997;77(8):812-819.
- 514 46. Podsiadlo D, Richardson S. The timed "Up & Go": a test of basic functional mobility for
515 frail elderly persons. *Journal of the American geriatrics Society*. 1991;39(2):142-148.
- 516 47. Bonaiuti D, Shea B, Iovine R, et al. Exercise for preventing and treating osteoporosis in
517 postmenopausal women. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2002(2).
- 518
- 519

520 **Box of inclusion criteria for eligible studies**

521
522
523

Box 1. Inclusion criteria

Design

- Randomised or quasi-randomised controlled trial
- Published in a peer-reviewed journal
- Full text available in Chinese and English

Participants

- Healthy older adults (including those with previous fractures) aged over 50 years with primary osteoporosis

Intervention

- Electromagnetic fields with pulsed signal and extremely low frequencies (between 5 and 300 Hz)

Outcome measures

- Primary outcomes: bone mass, number of incident fractures
- Secondary outcomes: Functional assessments, quality of life, adverse events

Comparisons

- PEMFs versus sham/nothing
- PEMFs versus placebo/pharmacological agents
- PEMFs versus exercise/other physical agent or intervention
- PEMFs plus other intervention versus other intervention

524
525
526

Table 1
PEDro scores of included studies.

Study	Eligibility criteria and source	Random allocation	Concealed allocation	Baseline comparability	Blind subjects	Blind therapists	Blind assessors	Adequate follow-up	Intention-to-treat analysis	Between-group comparisons	Point estimates and variability	Total score (0 to 10)
Liu Hf et al, 2013 ³²	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9
Liu Hf et al, 2014 ³¹	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
Shanb et al, 2017 ³³	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	8
Shanb et al, 2012 ³⁴	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	5
Elsisi et al, 2015 ²⁹	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	9
Giordano et al, 2001 ³⁰	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7
Wu Yc et al, 2014 ³⁵	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	6
Ashraf et al, 2017 ²⁸	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	8

Table 2
 Characteristics of the included studies.

Study	Participant				Intervention		Outcome measures			Follow-up
	Sample size	Study arms	Age (y)	Male/Female	Type of intervention	Dose per protocol ^a	Primary	Secondary	Efficacy/Effect	
Liu Hf et al, 2013 ³²	41	1. PEMFs (n=20) 2. AL (n=21)	61.70 (1.34) 63.14 (4.32)	0/41	PEMFs	3.82 mT, 8 Hz, 40min/session for a total of 30 sessions.	BMDL	BMDF; 25(OH)D; LE MMT; BBS	Effective as alendronate.	24 weeks
Liu Hf et al, 2014 ³¹	84	1. PEMFs (n=44) 2. AL (n=40)	62.41 (5.47) 62.63 (4.54)	0/84	PEMFs	3.8 mT, 8-12 Hz, 40min/session for a total of 30 sessions.	BMDL; BMDF	VAS; TUG; BBS	Effective as alendronate.	72 weeks
Shanb et al, 2017 ³³	68	1. PEMFs (n=25) 2. WBV (n=25) 3. AL (n=18)	63.9 (3.9) 64.1 (4.4) 64.5 (4.03)	23/45	PEMFs	5 mT, 33 Hz, 50 min/session, 2 sessions/week for 16 weeks.	BMDL; BMDF	Serum calcium and vitamin D	Effective in conjunction with pharmacological treatment.	N/A
Shanb et al, 2012 ³⁴	30	1. PEMFs (n=15) 2. Exercise (n=15)	60-70	0/30	PEMFs	5 mT, 33 Hz, 50 min/session, 3 sessions/week for 12 weeks.	BMDL; BMDF	N/A	Effective as exercise.	N/A
Elsisi et al, 2015 ²⁹	30	1. PEMFs (n=15) 2. CRT-Exercise (n=15)	64.73 (3.08) 65.13 (2.44)	0/30	PEMFs	5 mT, 33 Hz, 30 min/session, 3 sessions/week for 12 weeks.	BMDL; BMDF	N/A	More effective than CRT exercise.	N/A
Giordano et al, 2001 ³⁰	40	1. PEMFs (n=20) 2. Placebo (n=20)	56.3 (4.0) 55.9 (3.1)	0/40	PEMFs	1.2 mT, 100 Hz, 60 min/session, 3 sessions/week for 12 weeks.	BMDL; BMDF	Serum and urinary calcium, phosphate; Serum ALP, osteocalcin and PICP; Urinary hydroxyproline	Not effective in increasing BMD, but effective in stimulating osteogenesis.	1 month
Wu Yc et al, 2014 ³⁵	43	1. PEMFs (n=24) 2. AL (n=19)	59.08 (4.65) 59.53 (5.40)	0/43	PEMFs	3.8 mT, 8-12 Hz, 40min/session for a total of 30 sessions.	TUG; BBS; Balance function	N/A	Effective as alendronate.	N/A

Ashraf et al, 2017 ²⁸	60	1. PEMFs (n=20) 2. LLLT (n=20) 3. Med (n=20)	59.85 (2.35) 60.20 (2.17) 60.00 (2.62)	26/34	PEMFs	4 mT, 33 Hz, 30 min/session, 3 sessions/week for 12 weeks.	BMDL	N/A	More effective than LLLT and AL group.	N/A
----------------------------------	----	--	--	-------	-------	--	------	-----	--	-----

^aWaveforms; Intensity; Frequency; Duration (weeks).

^bAbbreviations. PEMFs=Pulsed electromagnetic fields, AL=alendronate, WBV=Whole body vibration, CRT=Circuit weight training, LLLT=low-level laser therapy, mT=millitesla, Hz=Hertz, BMDL=lumbar bone mineral density, BMDF=femur bone mineral density, 25(OH)D=serum 25OH vitamin, LE MMT=total lower-extremity manual muscle test, BBS=Berg Balance Scale, VAS=Visual Analogue Scale, N/A=not applicable, TUG=Timed Up and Go, ALP=Alkaline Phosphatase, P1CP=Procollagen type I carboxy-terminal propeptide, Med=Medication.




Figure 1. PRISMA flow of studies through the review.




Figure 2. Forest plot analysis of the effects of PEMFs on BMD at the lumbar (A) and femur neck (B) compared with placebo control. Data are presented as mean difference (MD) between treatment and control groups with a 95% confidence interval (CI). SD = Standard Deviation; BMD = Bone Mineral Density; PEMFs = Pulsed Electromagnetic Fields.




Figure 3. Forest plot analysis of the effects of PEMFs on balance function measured by BBS (A) and TUG test (B) compared with placebo control. Data are presented as mean difference (MD) between treatment and control groups with a 95% confidence interval (CI). SD = Standard Deviation; BBS = Berg Balance Scale; TUG = Timed Up and Go; PEMFs = Pulsed Electromagnetic Fields.




Figure 4. Forest plot analysis of the effects of PEMFs on BMD at the lumbar (A) and femur neck (B) compared with exercise group. Data are presented as mean difference (MD) between treatment and control groups with a 95% confidence interval (CI). SD = Standard Deviation; BMD = Bone Mineral Density; PEMFs = Pulsed Electromagnetic Fields.