

1 **Blood flow restriction resistance training as an alternative to resistance training**
2 **alone to improve strength in elderly: a systematic review with meta-analysis**

3 **Short title**

4 Blood flow restriction training improves strength in the elderly

5 **Authors**

6 **André Luiz Silveira Mallmann**^{1*} ([0000-0002-4994-098X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4994-098X)): conceptualization; data curation,
7 investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, software, validation,
8 visualization, roles/writing – original draft; **Leonardo Peterson dos Santos**² ([0000-0001-8623-5596](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8623-5596)):
9 data curation, formal analysis, methodology, software, validation; **Lucas Denardi**
10 **Doria**² ([0000-0002-9595-5875](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9595-5875)): formal analysis, investigation, methodology, software; **Luis**
11 **Fernando Ferreira**¹ ([0000-0002-9496-4884](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9496-4884)): conceptualization, investigation, methodology,
12 visualization; **Thiago Rozales Ramis**³ ([0000-0002-5252-1209](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5252-1209)): conceptualization,
13 methodology, supervision, visualization, writing – review & editing; **Luís Henrique Telles da**
14 **Rosa**¹ ([0000-0002-4807-7176](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4807-7176)): conceptualization, data curation, methodology, supervision,
15 validation, visualization, writing – review & editing.

16 * Corresponding author e-mail address: almallmann@hcpa.edu.br

17 Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre (HCPA).

18 2350, Ramiro Barcelos St., 90420-010, Porto Alegre – RS, Brazil.

19 1. Federal University of Health Sciences of Porto Alegre, Physiotherapy department, Porto
20 Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.,

21 2. Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, autoimmune diseases laboratory, Porto Alegre,
22 Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

23 3. Federal University of Santa Maria, Physical Education Department, Santa Maria – Rio
24 Grande do Sul, Brazil.

25 **Blood flow restriction resistance training as an alternative to resistance training alone to**

26 **improve strength in elderly: a systematic review with meta-analysis**

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 ABSTRACT

49 The purpose of this research was to perform a systematic review with meta-analysis to
50 compare the effects of resistance training with blood flow restriction (BFR) to the effects of
51 non-training (CON) and traditional RT on strength in elderly people. This was a systematic
52 review with meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials (RCTs), published in English, from
53 inception to 2022, conducted using MEDLINE (PubMed), EMBASE, Web of Science and
54 Cochrane Library. The methodological quality was assessed using GRADE protocol. The risk
55 of bias was assessed using RoB2 software. Standardized mean differences (SMD), mean
56 difference, were pooled using a random-effects model. A $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically
57 significant. Eight RCT's were included. We found no significant differences in the effects
58 between BFR and RT (SMD = -0.18 [-0.56 to 0.19]; $p = 0.34$; $I^2 = 12\%$). Also, evidence from
59 our research shows that the effect of BFR is better than non-training (CON) for strengthening
60 in older adults (SMD = 0.63 [0.24 to 1.01]; $p = 0.001$; $I^2 = 11\%$). Our primary findings show
61 that training with BFR may be an alternative methodology of training for the elderly and this
62 training strategy may be interesting for health professionals working with elderly people with
63 low tolerance to high intensity RT.

64 KEY-WORDS

65 Kaatsu; Vascular occlusion; Strength training; Muscle strength; Older; Aging.

66

67 INTRODUCTION

68 The world's population, according to UN data, could reach 2.1 billion people over the
69 age of 60 by 2050. With the increase in life expectancy, the need arises to find alternative
70 interventions capable of preserving or even improving the health, functionality, and autonomy
71 of individuals of older age groups [1]. Aging generates a sharp decline in the capacity to produce
72 strength, based on the neurological and musculoskeletal systems, a factor that determines

73 autonomy and, consequently, the quality of life of the elderly [2]. It has been discussed the
74 importance of strength for health in people in advanced age groups, since there is an important
75 relationship between this ability and the performance of simple daily tasks for older people
76 [3,4]. The literature has shown that the reduction in the ability to produce strength may be
77 related to several health conditions that negatively influence the quality of life of the elderly,
78 such as an increased risk of limited mobility, increased dependence for activities of daily living
79 (ADL), cognitive decline in older elderly, and an increased risk of mortality from all causes [5-
80 7].

81 Although the resistance training (RT) is referred to in the scientific literature as an
82 effective strategy for preserving or improving strength [4,8], there are certain situations, like
83 people with joint injury, osteoarthritis and other conditions that make its application not
84 recommendable or difficult to apply due to low tolerance presented by these populations [8-
85 10]. Over the last two decades, a training modality that has stood out in research around the
86 world is resistance training associated with vascular occlusion, also known as Blood Flow
87 Restriction training (BFR), which is the main subject of this review [11-14]. BFR is
88 characterized by using tourniquets or cuffs that create a blockage in blood vessels in one or
89 more members of the human body. Concomitantly, RT exercises are performed with the limbs
90 submitted to vascular occlusion in this training strategy [13].

91 Studies have demonstrated the efficiency of this method, which has been showing
92 strength gains similar to those generated by high intensity RT in young and elderly populations
93 [11]. However, the main advantage in using this training strategy in populations that are unable
94 to use high intensities in RT, due to joint limitations or due to dysfunctions, is the use of much
95 lower weights to produce a satisfactory strength improvement, as mentioned, since the effect,
96 resulting from BFR, seems to demonstrate better results with lower intensity when compared
97 to BFR associated to high intensity(amount of weight shifted)[13]. Studies show that the

98 adequate intensity for the BFR to present more satisfactory results seems to be approximately
99 between 20 and 50% of 1RM for young populations, values that are determined according to
100 other variables, such as the choice of exercises, volume, and density of the training sessions
101 [13]. Thus, BFR emerges as a viable alternative for a population that suffers from disorders of
102 the neurological and musculoskeletal system, resulting in a lower risk of injury from RT and,
103 therefore, justifying the need for a greater understanding of the efficiency of this intervention
104 [14,15].

105 Although there are several studies that have been willing to understand the effects of
106 BFR on the capacity to produce strength, there are no systematic reviews that have evaluated
107 the influence of BFR on strength in people over sixty years of age. a systematic review by
108 Centner et al, (2019) sought to compare the effects of BFR to the effects of RT on strength in
109 older people. However, the population included in this research consisted of people over the
110 age of fifty [16]. In this study, we restricted the population to people over the age of sixty,
111 taking into account that this is a population that has very specific needs and limitations, as
112 mentioned as well as a difference from people over fifty years in neuromuscular and functional
113 characteristics that are naturally associated to aging. There is a lack in the literature that needs
114 attention to help health professionals to better understand this intervention. For the reasons
115 mentioned, the aim of this review was to compare the effect of strength training associated to
116 vascular occlusion with traditional resistance training and/or non-training on strength in people
117 older than sixty years.

118

119 METHODS

120 *Research registration*

121 We conducted this systematic review with meta-analysis in accordance with PRISMA
122 statement (see Supplemental Digital Content 1 that is a table with PRISMA check list) [17].

123 Search commission of Federal University of Health Sciences from Porto Alegre registration
124 number: 084/2020. PROSPERO registration number: CRD42020220729.

125

126 *EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM*

127 This was a systematic review with meta-analysis based on a focused question described
128 in a PICO format [18]. We established: Patient/Problem/Population = Elderly (age \geq 60 years),
129 Intervention = Resistance training with blood flow restriction, Comparison = Resistance
130 training/placebo/non-training, Outcomes = Strength and Study design = Randomized clinical
131 trials.

132 All studies were screened and assessed for eligibility regarding our inclusion and
133 exclusion criteria, which were based on the PICOS principle (i.e., extracting population,
134 intervention, comparison intervention, outcome measures and study design information).

135 *Data sources.*

136 The electronic databases used were MEDLINE (PubMed), Web of Science, Cochrane
137 Library, and EMBASE in February 2022. We used a comprehensive search strategy tailored to
138 each database. In cases of missing data, authors of selected papers were contacted. When
139 contacted authors did not answer, data were extrapolated from figures, using Image J software,
140 or using available data and mathematics formulas provided by Cochrane's handbook as
141 presented at section 2.4 [19].

142 *Search strategy*

143 For identification of relevant studies, a systematic literature search was performed by
144 two blinded researchers (Mallmann, ALS & Doria, LD). Keywords and medical subject
145 headings (MeSH) for the terms "Blood flow restriction", "Kaatsu"; "Vascular occlusion",
146 "Strength training", "Resistance Training", "Muscle strength", "Elderly", "Older" and "Aging"
147 were selected. No filters were used to perform this search. The term OR was used for Union of

148 MeSH terms and “entry terms”, and the term AND was used to attach the terms. The complete
149 string used at PUBMED and adapted for the other databases is fully described at Supplemental
150 Digital Content 2. Study information, including title and abstract, were exported from the
151 databases and stored in a citation manager (Mendeley1, version1.17.9). Before further
152 processing of the studies all duplicates were removed.

153 PARTICIPANTS

154 *Inclusion and exclusion criteria*

155 We included: (1) Participants were older than 60 years, (2) the study design allowed to
156 compare resistance training combined with blood flow restriction to traditional resistance
157 training and/or to a control group (without any intervention or placebo training, such as light
158 stretching), and (3) strength were assessed pre- and post-intervention. No restriction on
159 publication date was imposed.

160 We excluded: (1) participants received any kind of substance that could interfere on
161 study results, (2) the manuscript was not written in English, Portuguese, or Spanish languages
162 or (3) meta-analysis articles.

163 Tables with inclusion/exclusion decisions by reviewer and agreements can be accessed
164 at Supplemental Digital Content 3

165

166 PROCEDURES

167 *Data extraction and assessment of reviewer agreement*

168 First, two researchers (Mallmann, ALS and Doria, LD) screened, independently, all the
169 studies titles, then abstracts and, finally, the full text of the included papers. This process was
170 made in three steps and the reviewers were blinded about the coworker screening. In case of
171 any discrepancy, a third reviewer (Dos Santos, LP) were asked to find an agreement and decide
172 to include or not the paper. The sheets of inclusion/exclusion process for Mallmann, ALS and

173 Doria, LD is available at Supplementary material 2. All data from each study were screened
174 using a bibliographic management program (Mendeley1, version1.17.9).

175 After screening of the studies, all relevant considered articles were assessed for
176 eligibility based on their full texts. At this stage, we extracted information about (1) population
177 characteristics, (2) primary outcome measures, (3) methods, (4) exercise/interventional
178 characteristics and (5) the main result of the study. When intervention effects were assessed at
179 multiple time points, only the very last time point was considered (as post-training value). When
180 available, data were extracted in the form of delta mean ($mean_{change}$), delta standard deviation
181 (SD_{change}), and sample size of the studies to perform the meta-analysis. In case of incomplete
182 raw data availability, we contacted the corresponding author of the manuscript or extrapolated
183 the data from figures, if the authors could not be reached. When the article reported baseline
184 and post-intervention outcomes, however, without $mean_{change}$ and SD_{change} , we used the
185 equation (Delta mean = post-training mean – baseline mean) to calculate the delta value.
186 Considering cochrane’s handbook recommendations to calculate the SD_{change} , we used the
187 correlation equals zero, since none of the selected papers provided the delta data as mean \pm
188 pattern deviation [19]. In order to find SD_{change} for selected studies, the following formula was
189 used.

$$190 \quad SD_{E, change} = \sqrt{SD_{E, baseline}^2 + SD_{E, final}^2 - (2 \times Corr \times SD_{E, baseline} \times$$

191 $SD_{E, final}$

192 (1)

193 Where Corr is correlation coefficient in the experimental group, $SD_{E, baseline}$ is baseline
194 standard deviation in the experimental group, $SD_{E, final}$ is final standard deviation in the
195 experimental group and $SD_{E, change}$ is standard deviation of the changes in the experimental
196 group. When data were presented by interquartile range (IQR), it was decided to transform these

197 data in order to standardize the results of all studies in $\text{mean}_{\text{change}}$ and $\text{SD}_{\text{change}}$. The equation
198 used to calculate the $\text{mean}_{\text{change}}$ is available below [20].

$$199 \quad \underline{x} \approx \frac{q_1 + m + q_3}{3}$$

200 (2)

201 Where q_1 is the first quartile, m is the median and q_3 is the third quartile. Finally, to
202 find the $\text{SD}_{\text{change}}$ presented by IQR, we use the calculation available below [20].

$$203 \quad S \approx \frac{q_3 - q_1}{1.35}$$

204 (3)

205 The choice for using these formulas was based on a previous Systematic Review with
206 meta-analysis about effects of BFR training on strength, hypertrophy, and functionality for
207 people with osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis [21].

208 The extracted data of included studies are sample characteristics (number of
209 participants, age, Body Mass Index (BMI), Duration of the intervention (weeks), frequency
210 (sessions per week), sets, repetitions, interval (seconds), one maximum repetition percentual,
211 blood flow restriction pressure (BFR mmHg) and the delta strength, resulting from
212 interventions).

213 *Methodological quality assessment*

214 Methodological quality of reports was determined using the Grading of
215 Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE). The peer reviewed
216 analysis is available at supplementary material 4. For each of the 7 items of the GRADE scale,
217 two reviewers (Mallmann, ALS and Doria, LD) assessed the studies independently.
218 Disagreements about methodological quality were resolved by a third reviewer (Dos Santos,
219 LP). The GRADE approach considers the risk of bias and the body of evidence to rate the
220 certainty of the evidence into one of four levels:

221 High certainty: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate
222 of the effect.

223 Moderate certainty: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate — the true effect
224 is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially
225 different.

226 Low certainty: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited — the true effect may be
227 substantially different from the estimate of the effect.

228 Very low certainty: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate — the true
229 effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.

230 Studies were included independently of the methodological quality calculated.

231 *Risk of bias*

232 The risk of bias of the studies was assessed using the risk of bias tool 2.0 (RoB2) from
233 Cochrane [22]. Two authors (Mallmann, ALS and Doria, LD) independently assessed the risk
234 of bias. In the case of disagreement, the subject was discussed with another author (Dos Santos,
235 LP). The evaluators analyzed the randomization process, deviations from intended
236 interventions, missing outcome data, measurement of the outcome, and selection of the reported
237 results. The studies were classified into low, moderate, or high risk of bias.

238

239 STATISTICAL ANALYSES

240 We conducted a meta-analysis using $\text{mean}_{\text{change}}$ and $\text{SD}_{\text{change}}$ from each study. All
241 outcome measures were continuous variables. Two meta-analyses, representing the effects of
242 interventions, were performed: the random-effects model with the mean difference (MD) or
243 standardized mean difference (SMD). MD was performed when studies reported outcomes with
244 the same assessment scale or instrument. When the same outcomes between studies were
245 evaluated but analyzes by different scales or instruments, we performed SMD [19]. The

246 calculation of SMD is represented by dividing the difference in mean outcome between groups
247 by the standard deviation of the result within the groups. The formula between groups within
248 each study used is available below [21,23].

249

$$250 \quad S_{within} = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1) S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1) S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}}$$

251 (4)

252 The 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used, and the heterogeneity of the studies
253 included in the meta-analysis was assessed using the inconsistency test (I^2). Inconsistence was
254 considered as low, moderate or high when values were 25%, 50% and 75% or more respectively
255 [19,24]. The software used for statistical analysis was RevMan (Review Manager 5.4.1, The
256 Cochrane Collaboration, 2020), and we considered significant statistically when $P < 0.05$.

257

258 RESULTS

259 *Search strategy*

260 The searches were performed in the five databases from beginning to 2022 and returned
261 6,956 (380 duplicates) (Fig 1). After removing duplicates, reading the titles, abstracts and full
262 texts, eight studies, between 2013 and 2020, were kept for analysis. Six of them compared BFR
263 training to a non-training group (CON) [25-30] and six of them compared BFR training to a
264 group trained with traditional moderate or high intensity RT [25,27,29,31,32].

265

266 **Fig 1.** Flow chart including literature search and selection steps following PRISMA
267 statement.

268

269 *Meta-analysis data*

270 Fig 2(A) shows the comparison of BFR with RT for selected papers. Only studies with similar
271 methodologies were included in this analysis, minimizing the risk of biasing findings. Studies

272 were included in our meta-analysis if the assessments of strength were made preferentially with
273 bilateral knee extension (KE) exercise. We also included, for this meta-analysis, papers that
274 evaluated participants with Leg press and unilateral KE exercises. Although, a sensibility
275 analysis, represented by figure 2(B), was made by excluding the study from Letieri et al, 2018
276 because the training was slightly different from the others for the use of unilateral KE, whereas
277 the other authors compared bilateral KE for both groups. Nevertheless, there were no
278 significative differences between training methodologies, even without considering said study
279 [27].

280

281 **Fig 2.** Forest plot graph of the strength of elderly trained with BFR versus Resistance training.
282 A: comparison for all studies with similar methodology including unilateral and bilateral KE;
283 B: sensibility analysis excluding the paper from Letieri et al, 2018 that used unilateral knee
284 extension; *KE*: knee extension; *BFR*: blood flow restriction; I^2 : inconsistency test
285 (heterogeneity); *SD*: standard deviation; *Std*: Standardized, *95% CI*: confidence interval, *IV*:
286 inverse variance, *Random*: random effects model

287

288 Fig 3 shows the comparison between BFR and CON and its sensibility analysis. Figure
289 3 (A) is the overall comparison between all studies that included groups without any
290 intervention between assessments or applied placebo training (e.g., light stretch training).
291 Figure 3 (B, C and D) illustrates the sensibility analysis we made to minimize the bias of that
292 comparison. Were excluded papers with methodological differences that could interfere on
293 results. First (B) we excluded studies from Letieri et al, 2018 and Vechin et al, 2015 for using
294 unilateral KE and Leg Press (LP), respectively. Second (C) we reintroduced only the study from
295 Vechin et al, 2015 and at least we excluded this one again and reintroduced that from Letieri et
296 al, 2018. Although, the difference between groups remained significative in favor of BFR
297 training.

298

299 **Fig 3.** Forest plot graph of the strength of elderly trained with BFR versus Control group
300 (without training or placebo training).A: comparison for all studies with similar methodology
301 including LP, unilateral and bilateral KE; B: sensibility analysis excluding the papers that used
302 unilateral KE and LP; C: sensibility analysis excluding only the study from Letieri et al, 2018
303 that used unilateral KE; D: sensibility analysis excluding only the article from Vechin et al,
304 2015 that used LP; *KE*: knee extension; *BFR*: blood flow restriction; *I²*: inconsistency test
305 (heterogeneity); *SD*: standard deviation; *Std*: Standardized, *95% CI*: confidence interval, *IV*:
306 inverse variance, *Random*: random effects model.
307

308 *Risk of Bias*

309 All selected studies were analyzed for their risk of bias according to the GRADE
310 Approach tool, by Cochrane Collaboration. The data presented were analyzed using RoB 2
311 software.

312 Among the analyzed fields, shown in Figure 5, the greatest risk of bias was found in the
313 random sequence generation field, with one study that did not present such variable (12%); at
314 the field about measurement of the outcome, most studies (75%) were classified as “some
315 concerns” for risk of bias, because the methods for assess the outcomes were not the very best
316 way to do that. All selected studies were included in the systematic review, independently of
317 quality assessment results.

318 For more details about risk of bias, see figs 4 and 5 (for complete peer reviewed risk of
319 bias see the figure at Supplemental Digital Content 4).

320

321 **Fig 4.** Risk of bias graph considering all studies pooled.

322

323 **Fig 5** Risk of bias for individual studies and according to the different criteria assessed.

324

325 *Quality assessment*

326 Overall studies quality assessment show that the evidence present low quality, in
327 accordance with GRADE tool. The lowest quality shown is for risk of bias domain since a study

328 presented high risk of bias for randomization process. For complete data, see table at
329 Supplemental Digital Content 5 with each reviewer quality assessment.

330 *Studies Data*

331 In table 1 the characteristics of sample are presented. It is possible to notice that are
332 homogeneity between groups in each study in age and body mass index (BMI). The mean age
333 across studies was $69,2 \pm 5,4$, and the mean BMI $26,2 \pm 2,8$. The total sample analyzed was 232
334 older (≥ 60 years old) men (76) and women.

335 Table 2 shows that there is no pattern in the duration of the training period (6 to 16
336 weeks), in the number of repetitions (from 10 to failure) or in the BFR pressure used (from 71
337 to 270 mmHg) for the included papers. However, it is possible to observe that the number of
338 sets (2 to 4) and the interval between them (30 to 60 seconds) followed the ACSM
339 recommendation for resistance training [4]. It is also possible to see that for resistance training
340 using the BFR resource, the percentages of a maximum repetition (1RM) were lower (20-30%
341 1RM) than those of traditional resistance models (70-80% 1RM).

342

Table 1. Participant's characteristics at baseline

	Group	N	Gender	Age (y)	BMI (Kg/m ²)	Occlusion Cuffs placement	Cuffwidth
Bigdeli et al, 2020	BFR	10	M	67.6(5.1)	25.4(3.2)	proximal portion of extremities	5cm
	RT	10		66.3(4.6)	25.7(1.7)	-	-
	CON	10		69.3(7.4)	26.2(2.8)	-	-
Cook et al, 2019	BFR	10	4M, 6F	76.4(6.6)	27.5(3.3)	proximal portion of the leg	6x83 cm
	RT	11	5M, 6F	76.3(8.7)	26.5(3.0)	-	-
Cook et al, 2017	BFR	12	5M, 7F	76.5(4.2)	26.8(2.4)	Proximal portion of the leg	6x83 cm
	RT	12	5M, 7F	76.7(5.4)	26.8(2)	-	-
	CON	12	5M, 7F	74.8(5.1)	26.2(2.1)	-	-
Letieri et al, 2018	BFR	22		68.7(4.7)	27.5(2.8)	Not described	Notdescribed
	RT	22	56F	69.2(4.6)	29.1(4.2)		
	CON	12		69(6.4)	29.6(3.8)		
Vechin et al, 2015	BFR	8	14M, 9F	65(2)	27.4(6.2)	proximal portion of the thigh.	18 cm wide

	RT	8		62(3)	26.8(6)	-	-
	CON	7		66(5)	26.7(6.2)	-	-
						most proximal	
	BFR	10		70(6)	20.8(2.5)	portion of both	50mm
Yasuda et al, 2016			F			thighs.	
	MH-Tr	10		72(7)	20.9(2.1)	-	-
	CON	10		68(6)	22.3(2.8)	-	-
						most proximal	
Yasuda et al, 2015	BFR	9	2M, 7F	71.8(6.2)	21.1(2.2)	portion of both	(30mm)
						arms.	
	CON	8	1M, 7F	68.0(5.1)	22.0(3.0)	-	-
						most proximal	
Yasuda et al, 2013	BFR	9	3M, 6M	71.3(7.1)	20.8(2.5)	portion of both	50mm
						legs.	
	CON	10	2M, 8F	67.7(6)	21.3(2.8)	-	-

343

344

345

346

347

348

n: sample number; *y*: years; BMI: body mass index; kg: weight; m²: height squared; *BFR*: blood flow restriction training group; *RT*: resistance training group; *CON*: control group; *MH-Tr*: Moderate to High intensity resistance training; *M*: Male; *F*: Female; cm: centimeters; mm: millimeters; Values are reported as mean±standard deviation (SD) .

349

Table 2. Characterization of the training in the studies resulting from the search in the databases.

	Group	Duration (weeks)	Frequency (sessions per week)	sets	reps	interval (seconds)	Training Intensity (%1RM)	BFR pressure (mmHg)
Bigdeli et al, 2020	BFR				10	60	25-35	50-70% AOP
	RT	6	3	2-4	10	60	25-35	-
	CON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cook et al, 2019	BFR			1-3	42.9(14)	60	30-50	184(25)
	HL	12	2	1-3	23.5(5)	60	70	
Cook et al, 2017	BFR	12	2	3	Failure	60	30-50	184(25)
	RT				10	60	70	-
	CON	12	2	3	-	-	Light dumbbells or elástica bands	-

	LI+BFR_H			3-4	15	30	20-30	185(5,45)
Letieri et al, 2018	LI+BFR_L	16	3	3-4	15	30	20-30	105(6,5)
	HI			3-4	6-8	60	70-80	-
	LI			-	-	-	-	-
	CON			-	-	-	-	-
Vechin et al, 2015	BFR				15	60	20-30	71+9
	RT	12	2	3-4				
	CON		-				-	
Yasuda et al, 2016	BFR			4	15-30	30	-	161(12)
	MH-Tr	12	2					
	CON	12	-		-	-	-	-

Yasuda et al, 2015	BFR	12	2	4	15-30	30	-	196 (18)
	CON-T			4	15-30	30	-	
Yasuda et al, 2014	BFR	12	2	4	10-30	20	20-30	120-270
	CON			-	-	-	-	-

350 *AOP*: Arterial Occlusion Pressure an exception for mmHg; *%IRM*: percentage of one maximum repetition; *mmHg*: mercury millimeters; *BFR*: Blood flow restriction resistance training; *RT*: Resistance training; *HL*: High
351 load training; *LI+BFR_H*: low intensity blood flow restriction high pressure; *LI+BFR_L*: low intensity blood flow restriction low pressure; *HI*: high intensity; *LI*: low intensity; *MH-Tr*: Moderate to High intensity resistance
352 training; *CON-T*: Control training; *Reps*: Repetitions per set; BFR pressure showed in mean±standard deviation.

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

Table 3. Summary of strength results selected studies

	<u>BFR Training</u>					<u>RT</u>					<u>CON</u>				
	n	pre	post	Delta		n	pre	post	Delta		n	pre	post	Delta	
Bigdeli et al, 2020															
KE	10	31.7 ± 9.9	37.6 ± 9.4	5.90 ± 25.95		10	31 ± 8.2	35.8 ± 8	4.80 ± 11.46		10	29.5 ± 6.7	27.8 ± 9	-1.7 ± 11.22	
CP		31.4 ± 11	37.8 ± 12.2	6.40 ± 16.43			31.9 ± 10.2	37.2 ± 12.4	14.25 ± 16.06			26.2 ± 10.2	23.7 ± 10.8	-2.5 ± 14.86	
Cook et al, 2019															
KE	10	36.6 ± 17.6	47.1 ± 20	10.5 ± 26.64		11	39 ± 18.8	60.5 ± 25.3	21.5 ± 31.52						
KF		28.5 ± 10.2	33.2 ± 12.6	4.7 ± 16.21		26	± 10.3	34.8 ± 8	8.8 ± 13.04						
Cook et al, 2017															
KE				9.12 ± 25.95					36.79 ± 30.28					0.6 ± 8.48	
LC	12			5.38 ± 15.56		12			8.23 ± 14.71		12			0.4 ± 2.47	
LP				18.70 ± 71.29					22.50 ± 77.85					-0.2 ± 18.02	
Letieri et al, 2018															
RKE	LI+BFR_H	93.51 ± 17.43	119.47 ± 14.4	25.96 ± 22.96		91.7 ± 13.48	116.01 ± 14.5	24.31 ± 19.8		80.54 ± 9.86	80.07 ± 10.96	-0.47 ± 14.74			
	LI+BFR_L	22 94.77 ± 14.97	109.7 ± 14.2	14.93 ± 20.63		22				12					
LKE	LI+BFR_H	94.35 ± 16.08	118.13 ± 15.02	23.78 ± 22		89.4 ± 13.4	116.57 ± 13.7	27.17 ± 18.91		77.48 ± 10.38	78.35 ± 12.09	0.87 ± 15.93			
	LI+BFR_L	92.65 ± 16.16	110.21 ± 15.21	17.56 ± 22.19											
Vechin et al, 2015															
Leg Press		8 273 ± 114	316 ± 141	43.00 ± 181.32		8				7	224 ± 81	203 ± 84	-21 ± 116.69		

 Yasuda et al, 2016

KE (MVC)	91.82 ± 19.71	103.36 ± 22.12	11.54 ± 29.63	91.39 ± 32.69	101.44 ± 37.02	10.05 ± 49.39	108.16 ± 65.81	112.24 ± 61.73	04.08 ± 90.23
KE 1RM	68.32 ± 30.8	77.03 ± 33.39	8.71 ± 45.43	65.03 ± 45.14	70.21 ± 43.26	5.18 ± 62.52	50.81 ± 40.32	51.18 ± 41.05	0.37 ± 57.54
LP 1RM	244.85 ± 79.95	304.11 ± 87.47	59.26 ± 118.5	249.55 ± 79.01	312.57 ± 90.29	63.02 ± 119.98	211.06 ±	215.85 ± 149.78	4.79 ± 208.47

 Yasuda et al, 2015

EF	9	79.6 ± 85.82	100.74 ± 98.26	21.14	130.46	8	59.71 ± 98.25	58.47 ± 110.7	-1.24 ± 148.01	8
EE		84.42 ± 69.34	106.53 ± 70.35	22.11 ± 98.78	68.34 ± 45.23	70.35 ± 47.24	02.01 ± 65.40			

 Yasuda et al, 2013

KE	9	50 ± 20	64 ± 26	14.00 ± 32.8	10	10	52 ± 26	55 ± 27	3 ± 37.48
LP		145 ± 47	191 ± 56	46.00 ± 73.11			143 ± 56	142 ± 51	-1 ± 75.74

363 *BFR*: Blood flow restriction resistance training; *RT*: Resistance training; *CON*: Control; *LI+BFR_H*: Low Intensity blood flow restriction high pressure; *LI+BFR_L*: Intensity blood flow restriction low pressure; *KE*:
 364 knee extension; *KF*: knee flexion; *CP*: chest press; *LC*: leg curl; *LP*: leg press; *RKE*: right knee extension; *LKE*: left knee extension; *EF*: elbow flexion; *EE*: elbow extension; *Delta*: Pos – pre; Data in mean ± standard
 365 deviation;

366 Short training protocols describing for each study are presented at Supplemental Digital
367 Content 6

368

369 DISCUSSION

370 It is important to note that this was the first systematic review to consider previous
371 papers with active and non-active people aged at sixty or more years trained with BFR and
372 compared to RT alone, as well as to people that did not train. Our main finding is the absence
373 of statistically significant difference between elderly people trained either with BFR or RT
374 which justifies the applicability of BFR for people that presents any kind of intolerance to
375 traditional RT. Also, it is important to observe the lack of standardizing on RCT's methods,
376 specially talking about training protocols and outcome measures.

377

378 *Blood flow restriction vs Resistance training alone*

379 Our results show, by meta-analysis (Figure 2), that there are no statistically significant
380 differences between groups trained with BFR or RT alone and these findings are in consistency
381 with previous literature [33].

382 In some cases, BFR showed bigger strength improvements than RT alone (Table 3),
383 while in other studies the results from RT were better than BFR for strength improvement and
384 these cases must be analyzed. Study from Letieri *et al*, (2018) show results favorable to BFR,
385 when compared to RT and the study from Bigdeli *et al.*, (2020) show results favorable to BFR
386 only for leg extension exercise [25, 27]. In the other hand, in the studies from Cook *et al.*, (2017)
387 and from Vechin *et al.* (2015), RT was more effective than BFR for strength gains [26,28].
388 Differences between studies that could explain why BFR is better in some papers, as the study
389 from Letieri *et al*, (2018), remains on AOP, training intensity (1RM%), number of repetitions
390 per set, also known as training volume, weekly frequency, between sets intervals [4].

391 First, Letieri *et al.* (2018) show the best results in favor of BFR and, not coincidentally,
392 this is the study with biggest duration, between all selected papers for this review [27]. In line
393 with that, the study from Loenneke *et al.*, (2012) show that BFR present better results for
394 strength improvement, with a bigger effect size, when intervention has longer duration, with
395 ten or more weeks from baseline to post-intervention assessments, and this fact could explain
396 our findings at the studies from Bigdeli *et al.*, (2020), Cook *et al.*, (2017) and Vechinet *al.*,
397 (2015), because of the short duration of this studies [25, 26, 28, 33]. It is important to note that
398 the study from Bigdeli *et al.*, (2020) was conducted for only 6 weeks, while the studies from
399 Cook *et al.*, (2017) and Vechin *et al.*, (2015) lasted for 12 weeks, that is, only 2 weeks more
400 than the study from Loenneke *et al.*, (2012) found as a time cut point for better strength
401 improvements resulting from BFR training [25, 26, 28, 33]. Another note that deserves our
402 attention is the fact that most of studies about BFR training lasted from 4 to 12 weeks of training,
403 including all kinds of population and this is a reason to difficult a better understanding about
404 this training modality and its impacts on strength due to its short durations.

405 Although BFR presents less neural drive, our findings show that there is no difference
406 in strength gains between this methodology and RT. A systematic review with meta-analysis
407 from Centner and Benedikt, (2020) found inconclusive results comparing muscle activation
408 between low load BFR training (LL-BFR) and HL-RT, but most of the studies included in this
409 paper lasted for less than 10 weeks, that is the time that, as seen, when BFR starts to show
410 bigger improvement on muscle strength compared to RT [34].

411 A study from 2021 [35] compared two groups with a repeated measures cross-over
412 design intervention, performed in two sessions of isometric exercises of the knee extensors on
413 two separate days in random and counterbalanced order. The low load group (LL) trained with
414 20% of the maximum voluntary contraction (MVC) and the low intensity group with blood
415 flow restriction (LL-BFR) trained at 20% of the (MVC), but with 50% of its arterial occlusion

416 pressure (AOP), which was determined in a personalized way before the beginning of the
417 intervention. The findings of this study suggests that BFR is better than traditional RT with low
418 loads for strength improvements and this is an interesting line of thinking, keeping in mind that
419 people with older ages may not be able to accomplish sets of RT with optimal loads for strength
420 gains [35].

421 We hypothesized that, due to the typical physical limitations of the population within
422 this age, the BFR training could generate gains similar or even superior to the RT since,
423 theoretically, this population would not be able to displace the same percentages of 1RM as a
424 young population. Therefore, they would end up training with low intensity resistance training
425 (LL-RT), a technique that seems to be less efficient, according to the study by Hughes et al.,
426 (2017), than BFR training for strength gains [14]. In this 2017 review, the authors sought studies
427 that compared BFR to RT for strength gains in patients with clinical musculoskeletal condition.
428 The research strategy included studies dealt with patients with osteoarthritis of the knees (n=3),
429 ligament injuries (n=3), sporadic inclusion body myositis (n=1) and older adults susceptible to
430 sarcopenia (n=13), corroborating our hypothesis that the older population, which, as stated, has
431 a greater inability to perform training with higher intensities [14].

432 Although our hypothesis considered that in some cases this population, over 60 years of
433 age, could not perform strength exercises with high loads, our search strategy, which considered
434 medically stable elderly individuals, returned studies that compared BFR training to high
435 intensity RT. And the results of the comparison, performed in this review (Figure 2), suggests
436 that strength gains may be similar to moderate and high intensity RT.

437 If the neural drive, as mentioned, is smaller with the application of BFR training than
438 with RT, it is important to try to understand how BFR brings strength improvements similar to
439 RT. The literature has shown the physiological mechanisms that could explain these gains and,
440 thus, enabling new hypotheses for future research with greater direction regarding BFR training

441 to control the loss of strength in the elderly [35,36]. Studies show that there appears to be a
442 strong relationship between the metabolic response, arising from BFR training, and gains, both
443 in strength and muscle hypertrophy. The study by Loenneke et al., (2010) was the first to
444 clarify that the main mechanisms related to gains arising from BFR are apparently the
445 accumulation of metabolites, such as blood lactate, plasma lactate and muscle cell lactate, in
446 addition to being related to activation of fast twitch muscle fibers (FT), even when training
447 intensity is low, and last but not least, gains appear to be related to increased expression of
448 mammalian target of rapamycin (m-TOR) [36].

449 *Blood flow restriction vs non-training*

450 A meta-analysis comparing a BFR group with a control group was performed. The result
451 of this analysis suggests that BFR training can be an effective alternative for strength gain in
452 people over 60 years, since we found a significant difference between groups in favor of the
453 BFR training one (Figure 3).

454 This direction has been consistently shown in the literature. A study from Centner *et al.*,
455 (2019) compared BFR combined with collagen hydrolysate (BFR+CH) against BFR combined
456 with placebo (BFR+PLA) and to a third group that only consumed the protein supplementation
457 (CH). Both groups with BFR training show improvements in strength capacity while CH group
458 demonstrated a decrease in strength gains, suggesting that BFR is better than non-training to
459 strength capacity, even when participants have protein supplementation [35].

460 Keeping in mind that there are some elderly people who is not able to perform resistance
461 exercises with high loads, specially following ACSM's [4] orientations for muscle strength and
462 hypertrophy, due to joint disorders, pain, lack of proprioception and other common conditions
463 of this population, it is important to find therapies or training strategies capable of guaranteeing
464 satisfactory results on the ability to produce muscle strength, insofar as this is a functional
465 capacity that may reduce the risk of falls and mortality as well as increase or maintain the

466 quality of life for elderly who needs to rise from chairs, beds, pick up some objects from the
467 ground and other daily activities that are important for self-autonomy [37, 38].

468 Our results show that BFR can be an alternative to physiotherapists and other health
469 professionals who needs to find a tolerable training strategy to work with patients with joint
470 injury, pain or any disorder that makes RT not recommendable. This is the main finding of our
471 review because, since muscle strength can be improved with the application of the BFR and
472 this, in turn, requires a much lower intensity than the RT, it can be assumed that this modality
473 would become making exercises with weights more tolerable for people with osteoarticular,
474 neurological and/or musculoskeletal disorders.

475 *Blood flow restriction parameters*

476 A secondary finding of our study was to compare different protocols of BFR and its
477 effects on strength in elderly. Although, we could not perform any kind of statistical analysis
478 due to heterogeneity of selected papers for BFR protocols, as well as the small number of studies
479 about BFR and its effects on strength for this specific population, making it difficult to carry
480 out subgroups analysis.

481 It should be observed that the volume (sets x repetitions) and frequency found at the
482 primary studies selected for this review are similar to the guidelines provided by ACSM, except
483 for Yasuda *et al.*, (2013) that studied sets up to 30 repetitions [30]. We could not compare
484 different training volumes, intensities and rest intervals. In the same line, it must be noted that
485 there were no comparisons between different occlusion protocols. The only study that made it
486 was the one from Letieri *et al.*, (2018) that compared two different levels of pressure applied
487 on individuals trained with BFR [27]. Although, it was not possible to elicit the best protocol
488 with just one study. A systematic review from Lixandrão *et al.*, (2018) did this comparison,
489 with a different meta-analysis for each of the BFR characteristics (i.e., cuff width, absolute
490 occlusion pressure, test specificity and occlusion pressure prescription method) and found

491 results in favor of high load resistance training (HL-RT) for all the comparisons. Although, it
492 must be observed the population of said paper, which was composed of young people [34]. Our
493 group sought to perform the same comparison, but with the elderly population, in order to
494 determine whether musculoskeletal deterioration, inherent to advancing age, could interfere
495 with the strength gains arising from BFR training.

496 A systematic review from 2012 compared several variables of the BFR training, in order
497 to ascertain their influence on the results obtained with this modality. The authors' first analysis
498 demonstrates that BFR training could be better utilized when associated with low-intensity
499 resistance exercise than when associated with high-intensity. The researchers compared
500 different occlusion pressures and, according to the survey data, there was no significant
501 difference between groups using higher pressures and groups with lower pressures in strength
502 gains and hypertrophy. Thus, it could be suggested that the pressure used for training may
503 perhaps be much lower than that practiced in other studies [33].

504 By comparing these recommendations to the data obtained from our research, we can
505 draw some conclusions. Regarding training intensity, all studies selected for this review
506 evaluated BFR training associated with similar intensities, ranging between 20 and 35% of
507 1RM, with the exception of the study from Cook et al., (2017), which used between 30 and
508 50% of 1RM and, when compared with the traditional RT, it proved to be less effective than
509 this one for increasing strength, corroborating the research carried out in 2012 [26, 33]. As for
510 the occlusion pressure, there are some inconsistencies between our findings and those of that
511 paper. The article by Letieri et al, (2018) obtained greater strength gains using BFR training
512 with both high and low occlusion pressure when compared to traditional RT [27]. On the other
513 hand, the study by Vechin *et al.* (2015) was the one that obtained the worst outcomes from the
514 BFR compared to the RT, although it used the lowest occlusion pressure of all selected studies
515 [28]. Another important training variable is the weekly frequency that is, in most of selected

516 studies composed by 2 sessions for week, with the exception of two papers and, casually, these
517 works found a tendency of higher strength improvements for BFR groups than the RT [25, 27].
518 A previous systematic review with similar population also found papers with 2 to 3 weeks of
519 duration and, although the authors have not statistically analyzed this variable, results did not
520 show trends to any duration variance as a predictor of better results for strength improvement
521 [39]. It is important to understand the influence of time under ischemic conditions. From
522 selected studies, four training protocols [28-30, 32] made participants remain with inflated cuffs
523 during exercise sets and intervals with an approximate time under ischemic condition of 11
524 minutes, while three training protocols [26, 27, 31] maintained participants under ischemia
525 during exercises and intervals, but deflated during exercises transitions with a approximate time
526 under pressure of 5 minutes per exercise. Last but not least, one training protocol [25] deflated
527 cuffs between sets and between exercises. Comparing our findings with previous literature [40,
528 41], we find no pattern for these training variables that may have some influence on training
529 results. This inconsistency suggests future research in order to investigate, in greater depth, the
530 influence of each of the training variables associated with the BFR and its effects for strength
531 improvement.

532 A potential limitation for this systematic review is the heterogeneity of BFR training
533 and assessments protocols. In some cases, we needed to perform analysis with different
534 exercises (e.g. Leg press and Knee Extension). New papers should be conducted with similar
535 protocols, making it viable to other researchers to compare the same exercises and bring new
536 insights to scientific literature.

537 In the same line, we could not compare BFR parameters, such as AOP, cuff positioning,
538 time under occlusion, high or low intensity with BFR and others because of the wide range of
539 protocols in a few studies. More research must be made with different protocols and, at the

540 same time, similar protocols, so that systematic reviews can be performed comparing subgroups
541 with different BFR training parameters.

542

543 PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

544 Our findings suggests that BFR can be an alternative methodology of training for the
545 elderly who are not able to perform RT with recommended intensity for strength improvement,
546 as meta-analysis demonstrates that there are no significant differences between BFR and RT
547 and also that there is significant difference between BFR and non-training or placebo training
548 (CON).

549 It was not possible to compare BFR parameters, such as AOP, intensity, volume, density
550 and others. New research should be conducted with the aim to compare different BFR protocols
551 and a better description of methodology, in order to make possible a meta-analysis comparing,
552 for example, occlusion pressures, higher or lower intensities, volumes and densities associated
553 with BFR. Furthermore, it would be interesting for researchers to adopt a pattern regarding the
554 choice of exercises, so that it is possible to compare the BFR and RT using data from multiple
555 studies, making feasible a meta-analysis with these two types of training as comparators.

556

557 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

558 There were no fundings of any kind for this research. We would like to thank Dr. Rafaela
559 Cavaleiro do Espírito Santo, who contributed to the realization of this study with
560 considerations that we applied in the final elaboration of this manuscript.

561

562 DECLARATIONS

563 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

564 André Luiz Silveira Mallmann, Leonardo Peterson dos Santos, Lucas Denardi Doria,
565 Luís Fernando Ferreira, Thiago Rozales Ramis and Luís Henrique Telles da Rosa declare that
566 they have no conflict of interest relevant to the content of this review.

567

568 FUNDING

569 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
570 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

571

572 DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

573 All raw data supporting this systematic review are from previously reported studies,
574 which have been cited. Additional processed data that support the findings of the current review
575 are available from the corresponding author upon request.

576

577 ETHICS APPROVAL

578 The research was submitted for the Research Committee from Federal University of
579 Health Sciences from Porto Alegre, Brazil with the register number 23103.205151/2020-51.
580 Because it is a review study, it is not necessary to submit for ethics committees.

581

582 REFERENCES

- 583 1. Tieland M, Trouwborst I, Clark BC. Skeletal muscle performance and ageing. J
584 Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2018;9(1):3–19.
- 585 2. Campolina AG, Adami F, Santos JLF, Lebrão ML. A transição de saúde e as
586 mudanças na expectativa de vida saudável da população idosa: Possíveis impactos da
587 prevenção de doenças crônicas. Cad Saude Publica. 2013;29(6):1217–29.
- 588 3. Lopez P, Pinto RS, Radaelli R, Rech A, Grazioli R, Izquierdo M, et al. Benefits of

- 589 resistance training in physically frail elderly: a systematic review. *Aging Clin Exp Res*
590 [Internet]. 2018;30(8):889–99. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40520-017-0863-z>
- 591 4. American College Of Sports Medicine. Diretrizes do ACSM Para Os Testes de
592 Esforço e Sua Prescrição. 2019.
- 593 5. Manuscript A. NIH Public Access. 2011;58(9):1721–6.
- 594 6. Hospital R. Handgrip strength as a predictor of functional , psychological and social
595 health . A prospective population-based study among the oldest old. 2008;331–7.
- 596 7. Gale CR, Martyn CN, Cooper C. Grip strength , body composition , and mortality.
597 2007;(October 2006):228–35.
- 598 8. Fragala MS, Cadore EL, Dorgo S, Izquierdo M, Kraemer WJ, Peterson MD, et al.
599 Resistance Training for Older Adults: Position Statement From the National Strength and
600 Conditioning Association. *J strength Cond Res*. 2019;33(8):2019–52.
- 601 9. Lavallee ME, Balam T. An overview of strength training injuries: Acute and chronic.
602 *Curr Sports Med Rep*. 2010;9(5):307–13.
- 603 10. Lees FD, Clark PG, Nigg CR, Newman P. Barriers to exercise behavior among older
604 adults: A focus-group study. *J Aging Phys Act*. 2005;13(1):23–33.
- 605 11. Grønfeldt BM, Lindberg Nielsen J, Mieritz RM, Lund H, Aagaard P. Effect of blood-
606 flow restricted vs heavy-load strength training on muscle strength: Systematic review and
607 meta-analysis. *Scand J Med Sci Sport*. 2020;30(5):837–48.
- 608 12. Grutter Lopes K, Alexandre Bottino D, Farinatti P, Coelho De Souza M das G, Alves
609 Maranhão P, De Araujo CMS, et al. Strength training with blood flow restriction – a novel
610 therapeutic approach for older adults with sarcopenia? A case report. *Clin Interv Aging*.
611 2019;14:1461–9.
- 612 13. Patterson SD, Hughes L, Warmington S, Burr J, Scott BR, Owens J, et al. Blood flow
613 restriction exercise position stand: Considerations of methodology, application, and safety.

- 614 Front Physiol. 2019;10(MAY):1–15.
- 615 14. Hughes L, Paton B, Rosenblatt B, Gissane C, Patterson SD. Blood flow restriction
616 training in clinical musculoskeletal rehabilitation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Br
617 J Sports Med. 2017;51(13):1003–11.
- 618 15. Ladlow P, Coppack RJ, Dharm-Datta S, Conway D, Sellon E, Patterson SD, et al.
619 Low-Load Resistance Training With Blood Flow Restriction Improves Clinical Outcomes in
620 Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation: A Single-Blind Randomized Controlled Trial. Front Physiol.
621 2018;9.
- 622 16. Centner C, Wiegel P, Gollhofer A, König D. Effects of Blood Flow Restriction
623 Training on Muscular Strength and Hypertrophy in Older Individuals: A Systematic Review
624 and Meta-Analysis. Sports Med. 2019;49(1):95–108.
- 625 17. Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al.
626 PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidance and exemplars for reporting
627 systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372.
- 628 18. Mattos CT, Ruellas AC de O. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: What are the
629 Implications in the Clinical Practice? Dental Press J. Orthod. 2015;20:17–9. pmid:25741820.
- 630 19. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. (editors).
631 Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2 (updated February
632 2021). Cochrane, 2021. Avail- able from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
- 633 20. Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation
634 from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. BMC Med Res Methodol.
635 2014; 14, 135. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-14-135> PMID: 25524443
- 636 21. dos Santos LP, Santo RCdE, Ramis TR, Portes JKS, Chakr RMdS, Xavier RM (2021)
637 The effects of resistance training with blood flow restriction on muscle strength, muscle
638 hypertrophy and functionality in patients with osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis: A

- 639 systematic review with meta-analysis. PLoS ONE 16(11): e0259574.
640 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0259574>
- 641 22. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: A
642 Revised Tool for Assessing Risk of Bias in Randomised Trials. BMJ. 2019;366:1–8.
643 pmid:31462531
- 644 23. Borenstein M, Hedges L V, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. Introduction to meta-analysis.
645 Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 2009.
- 646 24 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring Inconsistency in Meta-
647 Analyses. BMJ. 2003; 327:557–60. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557> PMID:
648 12958120
- 649 25. Bigdeli S, Dehghaniyan MH, Amani-Shalamzari S, Rajabi H, Gahreman DE.
650 Functional training with blood occlusion influences muscle quality indices in older adults.
651 Arch Gerontol Geriatr [Internet]. 2020;90(March):104110. Available from:
652 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2020.104110>
- 653 26. Cook SB, LaRoche DP, Villa MR, Barile H, Manini TM. Blood Flow Restricted
654 Resistance Training in Older Adults at Risk of Mobility Limitations. Exp Gerontol. 2017
655 Dec;99:138–45.
- 656 27. Letieri RV, Teixeira AM, Furtado GE, Lamboglia CG, Rees JL, Gomes BB. Effect of
657 16 weeks of resistance exercise and detraining comparing two methods of blood flow
658 restriction in muscle strength of healthy older women: A randomized controlled trial. Exp
659 Gerontol [Internet]. 2018;114(July):78–86. Available from:
660 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2018.10.017>
- 661 28. Felipe c. Vechin 1, cleiton a. Libardi, 1, 2 3, miguel s. Conceic, a~ o 2, felipe r. Damas
662 1, manoel e. Lixandra~ o 1, ricardo p.b. berton 2, et al. Comparisons between low-intensity
663 resistance training with blood flow restriction and high-intensity resistance training on

- 664 quadriceps muscle mass and strength in elderly. *J of strength cond res.* 2015;29(4):1071–6.
- 665 29. Yasuda T, Fukumura K, Tomaru T, Nakajima T. Thigh muscle size and vascular
666 function after blood flow-restricted elastic band training in older women. *Oncotarget.* 2016
667 Jun 7;7(23):33595-607. doi: 10.18632/oncotarget.9564. PMID: 27244884; PMCID:
668 PMC5085105.
- 669 30. Yasuda T, Fukumura K, Fukuda T, Uchida Y, Iida H, Meguro M, et al. Muscle size
670 and arterial stiffness after blood flow-restricted low-intensity resistance training in older
671 adults. *Scand J Med Sci Sport.* 2014;24(5):799–806.
- 672 31. Cook SB and Cleary CJ (2019) Progression of Blood Flow Restricted Resistance
673 Training in Older Adults at Risk of Mobility Limitations. *Front. Physiol.* 10:738. doi:
674 10.3389/fphys.2019.00738
- 675 32. Yasuda T, Fukumura K, Uchida Y, Koshi H, Iida H, Masamune K, Yamasoba T, Sato
676 Y, Nakajima T. Effects of Low-Load, Elastic Band Resistance Training Combined With
677 Blood Flow Restriction on Muscle Size and Arterial Stiffness in Older Adults. *J GerontolA*
678 *Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2015 Aug;70(8):950-8. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glu084. Epub 2014 Jun 10.
679 PMID: 24917178.
- 680 33. Loenneke JP, Wilson JM, Marín PJ, Zourdos MC, Bembem MG. Low intensity blood
681 flow restriction training: A meta-analysis. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2012;112(5):1849–59.
- 682 34. Lixandrão ME, Ugrinowitsch C, Berton R, Vechin FC, Conceição MS, Damas F, et
683 al. Magnitude of Muscle Strength and Mass Adaptations Between High-Load Resistance
684 Training Versus Low-Load Resistance Training Associated with Blood-Flow Restriction: A
685 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sport Med.* 2018;48(2):361–78.
- 686 35. Lauber B, König D, Gollhofer A, Centner C. Isometric blood flow restriction exercise:
687 acute physiological and neuromuscular responses. *BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil.*
688 2021;13(1):1–9.

- 689 36. Loenneke JP, Wilson GJ, Wilson JM. A mechanistic approach to blood flow
690 occlusion. *Int J Sports Med.* 2010;31(1):1–4.
- 691 37. Landi F, Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Liperoti R, Russo A, Giovannini S, Tosato M, Capoluongo
692 E, Bernabei R, Onder G. Sarcopenia and mortality risk in frail older persons aged 80 years
693 and older: results from the SIRENTE study. *Age Ageing.* 2013 Mar;42(2):203-9. doi:
694 10.1093/ageing/afs194. Epub 2013 Jan 15. PMID: 23321202.
- 695 38. Gale CR, Martyn CN, Cooper C, Sayer AA. Grip strength, body composition, and
696 mortality. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2007 Feb;36(1):228-35. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyl224. Epub 2006 Oct
697 19. PMID: 17056604.
- 698 39. Centner, C., Wiegel, P., Gollhofer, A., & König, D. (2019). Effects of Blood Flow
699 Restriction Training on Muscular Strength and Hypertrophy in Older Individuals: A
700 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports medicine (Auckland, N.Z.),* 49(1), 95–108.
701 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-0994-1>
- 702 40. Wortman, R. J., Brown, S. M., Elliot, I. S., Finley, Z. J., & Mulcahey, M. K.
703 (2020). Blood Flow Restriction Training for Athletes: A Systematic Review. *The American*
704 *Journal of Sports Medicine,* 036354652096445. doi:10.1177/0363546520964454
- 705 41. Grønfeldt, B. M., Lindberg Nielsen, J., Mieritz, R. M., Lund, H., & Aagaard, P.
706 (2020). Effect of blood-flow restricted vs. heavy-load strength training on muscle strength:
707 Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in*
708 *Sports.* doi:10.1111/sms.13632

Identification of new studies via databases and registers

Identification

Records identified from:
Databases (n = 4):
Database 1 (n = 129)
Database 2 (n = 349)
Database 3 (n = 312)
Database 4 (n = 237)
Registers (n = 0)

Records removed before screening:
Duplicate records (n = 380)
Records marked as ineligible by automation
tools (n = 298)
Records removed for other reasons (n = 82)

Screening

Records screened
(n = 6,576)

Records excluded
(n = 6,457)

Reports sought for retrieval
(n = 119)

Reports not retrieved
(n = 105)

Reports assessed for eligibility
(n = 14)

Reports excluded:
Reason1 (n = 4)
Reason2 (n = 2)

Included

New studies included in review
(n = 8)

Fig1





Fig2




Fig3

As percentage (intention-to-treat)



Fig4

	<u>D1</u>	<u>D2</u>	<u>D3</u>	<u>D4</u>	<u>D5</u>	<u>Overall</u>	
BIGDELI et al, 2020	!	!	+	!	+	!	Low risk
COOK et al, 2018	+	!	+	!	+	!	Some concerns
COOK et al, 2019	+	+	+	!	+	+	Low risk
LETIERI et al, 2018	+	+	+	+	+	+	Low risk
VECHIN et al, 2015	-	!	!	!	+	-	High risk
YASUDA et al, 2013	+	!	+	+	+	!	Some concerns
YASUDA et al, 2015	!	!	+	!	+	!	Some concerns
YASUDA et al, 2016	+	+	+	!	+	+	Low risk

D1 Randomisation process
 D2 Deviations from the intended in
 D3 **Missing outcome data**
 D4 Measurement of the outcome
 D5 Selection of the reported result

Fig5