

# Network meta-analysis on the effects of various exercise modalities on pain control in populations with chronic nonspecific low back pain

(Ke Zhao, Harbin sport university, Zhangjiakou university, China)<sup>1</sup>

(Hua Li, Harbin sport university, China)<sup>2</sup>

(Li Li, Harbin sport university, China)<sup>3</sup>

(Yongxiao li\*, Jiangsu Ocean university, China)<sup>4</sup>

**【Abstract】 Objective:** This study aims to comprehensively evaluate and compare the effects of various exercise modalities on the control of chronic nonspecific low back pain through a network meta-analysis, in order to identify the most effective interventions. **Methods:** Adhering strictly to the PRISMA guidelines, this study selected randomized controlled trials from databases including PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, Cochrane Library, and Scopus, up to June 30, 2024. Data were processed using Stata 17.0 software, and the effect sizes were synthesized using standardized mean differences (SMD) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). The SUCRA method was used to rank the effectiveness of the interventions. **Results:** A total of 26 studies involving 1,507 participants aged between 20 and 63.5 years were included. The network meta-analysis revealed that yoga [SMD = -1.71 (-2.93, -0.49),  $P < 0.05$ ] and core stability training [SMD = -0.81 (-1.44, -0.18),  $P < 0.05$ ] were significantly more effective than the control group. SUCRA probability ranking indicated that Tai Chi (SUCRA = 77.4) might be the best modality for improving control

---

<sup>1</sup> Ke Zhao, PhD candidate, research interests in exercise health promotion, school physical education and pedagogy. E-mail: zhaoke@hrbipe.edu.cn: first author

<sup>2</sup> Hua Li, PhD candidate, research interests in exercise health promotion, school physical education and pedagogy. E-mail: lihua@hrbipe.edu.cn

<sup>3</sup> Li Li, PhD candidate, research interests in exercise health promotion, school physical education and pedagogy. E-mail: lilili@hrbipe.edu.cn

<sup>4</sup> Yongxiao li, Ph.D, Associate Professor, Research Interests: School Sports and pedagogy. E-mail: liyongxiao@jou.edu.cn: corresponding author

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

of chronic nonspecific low back pain. Conclusion: This network meta-analysis demonstrates the intervention effects of different exercise modalities on chronic nonspecific low back pain, with Tai Chi potentially being the most effective intervention. This provides an important reference for non-pharmacological interventions in chronic nonspecific low back pain.

**Keywords:** Exercise intervention; Chronic nonspecific low back pain; Inhibitory control; Network meta-analysis

Chronic nonspecific low back pain, as the main type of back pain, is characterized by unclear pain causes and the absence of specific pathological structural changes. It primarily manifests as soreness in the lower back or lumbosacral area, which may be accompanied by limited mobility[1, 2]. In 2020, 619 million people globally were affected by back pain, a number expected to rise to 843 million by 2050[3]. In the United States, chronic nonspecific low back pain has become one of the most common health issues among adults, with millions affected annually, resulting in substantial medical expenses, as reported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) [4]. Chronic nonspecific low back pain not only causes persistent pain but also adds to the medical burden, posing a severe public health issue[5, 6]. Therefore, enhancing the timely diagnosis, comprehensive treatment, and prevention of chronic nonspecific low back pain is of great importance and has become a significant challenge in the global public health field [7].

While pharmaceutical treatment, a traditional method, may alleviate pain in the short term, its effects are often limited and come with a range of side effects, such as dependency, gastrointestinal discomfort, and cardiovascular risks [8]. Hence, seeking alternative therapies to alleviate patient suffering and improve quality of life is crucial. Against this backdrop, exercise therapy has attracted widespread attention as a potentially more effective intervention. According to a review by Hayden, exercise therapy may be more effective than conventional treatments in improving pain [9]. As research in exercise science deepens, physical exercise, as a safe and economical intervention, has shown significant effects on various types

of chronic pain[10–12]. Beyond alleviating pain, exercise also effectively improves patients’ mental health[13]. For example, a randomized controlled trial indicated that chronic nonspecific low back pain patients who regularly engage in aerobic exercise outperformed the control group in terms of pain relief, providing strong evidence for the efficacy of exercise as an intervention[14]. There are many types of exercise measures used to intervene in chronic nonspecific low back pain, such as yoga, combined exercises, Pilates, Qigong therapy, suspension training, and Tai Chi, all of which have shown positive therapeutic effects[15–17].

However, there is still considerable debate over which type of exercise intervention is most effective. Traditional meta-analyses can only merge studies that compare directly, making it difficult to analyze data without direct comparisons[17–19]. Network meta-analysis, on the other hand, can merge both direct and indirect evidence to compare different interventions, thus addressing the limitations of traditional meta-analyses in indirect comparisons and offering greater precision [20]. Therefore, this article, based on published studies, compares the efficacy of different exercise modalities on chronic nonspecific low back pain through network meta-analysis, providing a comprehensive and reliable reference for selecting the best intervention for chronic nonspecific low back pain through direct comparison.

## 1 Data and Methods

This systematic review was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: PRISMA Statement[21]. and registered on the Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) platform with the registration number CRD42024597460.

### 1.1 Search Methods

Searches were conducted in five databases: EBSCO, PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, and Cochrane, with the search period extending up to June 30, 2024, starting from the inception of each database. The search strategy involved a combination of the following keywords: (1) exercise, Strength Training, physical exercise, physical

activity, Pilates, sports, fitness, Functional Training, Cardio Training, Yoga, Exercise Therapy; (2) Adult, Mature, Grown-up, Adulthood, Middle-aged, Elderly, Senior, Full-grown, Professional, Independent, Mature Individual, Established Person; (3) Chronic Non-Specific Low Back Pain, CNSLBP, Nonspecific Low Back Pain, Chronic Low Back Pain, Persistent Low Back Pain, RCT, experiment, trial. The Boolean operator "AND" was used to link these three groups of terms. Additionally, references from published systematic reviews and meta-analyses were tracked and included in the study to ensure the comprehensiveness of the literature search. For example, the search string used in Web of Science was: TS=(exercise OR "Strength Training" OR "physical exercise" OR "physical activity" OR Pilates OR sports OR fitness OR "Functional Training" OR "Cardio Training" OR Yoga OR "Exercise Therapy") AND TS=(Adult OR Mature OR "Grown-up" OR Adulthood OR "Middle-aged" OR Elderly OR Senior OR "Full-grown" OR Professional OR Independent OR "Mature Individual" OR "Established Person") AND TI=("Chronic Non-Specific Low Back Pain" OR CNSLBP OR "Nonspecific Low Back Pain" OR "Chronic Low Back Pain" OR "Persistent Low Back Pain").

## 1.2 Inclusion Criteria

Based on the PICOS principles, criteria for inclusion and exclusion of literature were established. The inclusion criteria are as follows: (1) The study population consists of adults (aged 18 and above) suffering from nonspecific low back pain; (2) Interventions involve different modes of exercise in a real-world setting, with an intervention period of no less than 4 weeks; (3) Interventions include conventional treatment methods; (4) Treatment outcomes are recorded using the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS); (5) The study design is a randomized controlled trial (RCT). The exclusion criteria are as follows: (1) Cross-sectional studies, case-control studies, and other descriptive studies; (2) Reviews, abstracts, letters, and comments lacking a clear description of the study design; (3) Articles with incomplete data provision and where required data cannot be obtained through other means.

### 1.3 Data Extraction

Data extraction and literature screening were independently conducted by two members of the research team, both trained in evidence-based methodology and with long-term focus on chronic nonspecific low back pain in adults. In cases of disagreement during the screening or extraction process, a third member of the team, experienced in the field of treatment for chronic nonspecific low back pain in adults, was consulted. Together, they discussed and made the final decisions. The process primarily focused on extracting key information including the first author's name, year of publication, country where the study was conducted, sample size of the adult population involved in the study, type of interventions used, duration of the intervention, frequency of the intervention, complete intervention cycle, and the primary outcome measures used to assess the effectiveness of the intervention.

### 1.4 Research Quality Assessment

The quality of the studies included in the analysis was comprehensively and rigorously assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Assessment Tool[22]. This assessment framework thoroughly covers seven core dimensions: effectiveness of the randomization process, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessors, concealment of allocation, completeness and accuracy of outcome data, selective reporting of study results, and the presence of other potential biases. For each dimension, a detailed evaluation was conducted and the results were categorized into three levels: high risk of bias, indicating a significant potential for bias; unclear risk of bias, where risk levels cannot be determined due to insufficient information; and low risk of bias, suggesting lower risk and higher reliability of data.

### 1.5 Data Processing

Data processing was conducted using Stata 17.0 software. As the outcome measures of the studies were continuous variables and the assessment tools and units varied slightly among individual studies, the standardized mean difference (SMD) combined with a 95% confidence interval (CI) was used to calculate the combined effect size. The comparison results were interpreted based on effect size (ES) and the 95%

confidence interval (95% CI), and interventions were ranked using both the magnitude of ES and the Surface Under the Cumulative Ranking curve (SUCRA) values. Additionally, a corrected comparison funnel plot was utilized to assess publication bias.

## 2. Research Results

### 2.1 Literature Search Results

A preliminary search from various databases yielded 1070 relevant publications. Using a literature management software and by reviewing titles and abstracts, publications that did not meet the inclusion criteria were excluded. Ultimately, 26 studies were included in the analysis, with the specific selection process illustrated in Figure 1.

### 2.2 Basic Characteristics of the Included Studies

This research included 26 articles, encompassing 1,507 participants with age ranging from 20 to 63.5 years. The basic characteristics of the studies included are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Basic characteristics of the included literature

Author & Year	Country	N	Mean age (years)	Exercise type	Dose
Akhtar et al <sup>[23]</sup> , 2017	Pakistan	C=55	45.50±6.61	Usual Care	60min, 2times, 6weeks
		E=53	46.39±7.43	Core stabilization exercise	
Arampatzis et al <sup>[24]</sup> , 2017	Germany	C=20	31.4±5.5	Usual Care	90min, 2times, 13weeks
		E=20	31.9±6.0	Disturbance exercise	
Gladwell et al <sup>[25]</sup> , 2006	UK	C=14	45.9±8.0	Usual Care	60min, 1time3, 6weeks
		E=20	36.9±8.1	Pilates	
Bae et al <sup>[26]</sup> , 2018	Korea	C=18	32.4±10.7	Abdominal crunch exercise	30min, 3time3, 12weeks
		E=18	32.7±6.1	Core stabilization exercise	
Byoung-Hwan et al <sup>[27]</sup> , 2015	Korea	C=10	44.2±2.70	Usual Care	30min, 5times, 12weeks
		E1=10	46.0±3.37	Swiss ball Sling	
		E2=10	46.2±3.22	exercise	
Cho et al <sup>[28]</sup> , 2014	Korea	C=15	44.0±6.7	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks
		E=15	48.1±6.9	Core stabilization	

Author(s) [Year]	Country	Group	Mean (SD)	Intervention	Duration																																																																																												
Hwi-young et al <sup>[29]</sup> , 2014	Korea	C=15	36.5±7.7	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 4weeks																																																																																												
		E=15	38.1±7.9	Core stabilization exercise		Hwangbo et al <sup>[30]</sup> , 2015	Korea	C=15	34.0±2.9	Usual Care	50min, 3times, 6weeks	E=15	34.5±4.0	Core stabilization exercise	Jing et al <sup>[31]</sup> , 2019	Chinese	C=13	60.67±2.58	Usual Care	60min, 3times, 12weeks	E1=15	58.13±5.38	Tai Chi	E2=15	58.4±5.08	Core stabilization exercise	Kimberly et al <sup>[32]</sup> , 2005	Greece	C=26	35.2±9.7	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 8weeks	E=29	39.2±11.4	Core stabilization exercise	Kumar et al <sup>[33]</sup> , 2011	India	C=9	22.5±1.09	Usual Care	15min, 8weeks	E=9	Core stabilization exercise	Lee et al <sup>[34]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=6	43.3±9.9	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 12weeks	E1=15	42.7±13.4	Strength exercise	E2=15	46.7±8.1	Combination exercise	Michaelson et al <sup>[35]</sup> , 2016	Sweden	C=35	52.1±17.16	Usual Care	120min, 1time, 8weeks	E=35	49.3±14.0	Core stabilization exercise	Noormohammadpour et al <sup>[36]</sup> , 2017	Iran	C=10	41.3±6.4	Usual Care	8weeks	E=10	43.3±7.5	Core stabilization exercise	Roh et al <sup>[37]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=49	50.5±9.1	Usual Care	30min, 3times, 12weeks	E=53	49.5±10.6	Sling exercise	Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks	E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise	Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks
Hwangbo et al <sup>[30]</sup> , 2015	Korea	C=15	34.0±2.9	Usual Care	50min, 3times, 6weeks																																																																																												
		E=15	34.5±4.0	Core stabilization exercise		Jing et al <sup>[31]</sup> , 2019	Chinese	C=13	60.67±2.58	Usual Care	60min, 3times, 12weeks	E1=15	58.13±5.38	Tai Chi			E2=15	58.4±5.08	Core stabilization exercise		Kimberly et al <sup>[32]</sup> , 2005	Greece	C=26	35.2±9.7	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 8weeks	E=29	39.2±11.4	Core stabilization exercise	Kumar et al <sup>[33]</sup> , 2011	India	C=9	22.5±1.09	Usual Care	15min, 8weeks	E=9	Core stabilization exercise	Lee et al <sup>[34]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=6	43.3±9.9	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 12weeks			E1=15	42.7±13.4	Strength exercise		E2=15	46.7±8.1	Combination exercise	Michaelson et al <sup>[35]</sup> , 2016	Sweden	C=35	52.1±17.16	Usual Care	120min, 1time, 8weeks	E=35	49.3±14.0	Core stabilization exercise	Noormohammadpour et al <sup>[36]</sup> , 2017	Iran	C=10	41.3±6.4	Usual Care	8weeks	E=10	43.3±7.5	Core stabilization exercise	Roh et al <sup>[37]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=49	50.5±9.1	Usual Care	30min, 3times, 12weeks	E=53	49.5±10.6	Sling exercise	Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks	E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise	Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks	E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization
Jing et al <sup>[31]</sup> , 2019	Chinese	C=13	60.67±2.58	Usual Care	60min, 3times, 12weeks																																																																																												
		E1=15	58.13±5.38	Tai Chi																																																																																													
		E2=15	58.4±5.08	Core stabilization exercise		Kimberly et al <sup>[32]</sup> , 2005	Greece	C=26	35.2±9.7	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 8weeks	E=29	39.2±11.4	Core stabilization exercise	Kumar et al <sup>[33]</sup> , 2011	India	C=9	22.5±1.09	Usual Care	15min, 8weeks	E=9	Core stabilization exercise	Lee et al <sup>[34]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=6	43.3±9.9	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 12weeks	E1=15	42.7±13.4	Strength exercise	E2=15	46.7±8.1	Combination exercise	Michaelson et al <sup>[35]</sup> , 2016	Sweden	C=35	52.1±17.16	Usual Care	120min, 1time, 8weeks	E=35	49.3±14.0	Core stabilization exercise	Noormohammadpour et al <sup>[36]</sup> , 2017	Iran	C=10	41.3±6.4	Usual Care	8weeks	E=10	43.3±7.5	Core stabilization exercise	Roh et al <sup>[37]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=49	50.5±9.1	Usual Care	30min, 3times, 12weeks	E=53	49.5±10.6	Sling exercise	Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks	E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise	Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks	E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization																		
Kimberly et al <sup>[32]</sup> , 2005	Greece	C=26	35.2±9.7	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 8weeks																																																																																												
		E=29	39.2±11.4	Core stabilization exercise		Kumar et al <sup>[33]</sup> , 2011	India	C=9	22.5±1.09	Usual Care	15min, 8weeks	E=9	Core stabilization exercise	Lee et al <sup>[34]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=6	43.3±9.9	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 12weeks	E1=15	42.7±13.4	Strength exercise			E2=15	46.7±8.1	Combination exercise		Michaelson et al <sup>[35]</sup> , 2016	Sweden	C=35	52.1±17.16	Usual Care	120min, 1time, 8weeks	E=35	49.3±14.0	Core stabilization exercise	Noormohammadpour et al <sup>[36]</sup> , 2017	Iran	C=10	41.3±6.4	Usual Care	8weeks	E=10	43.3±7.5	Core stabilization exercise	Roh et al <sup>[37]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=49	50.5±9.1	Usual Care	30min, 3times, 12weeks	E=53	49.5±10.6	Sling exercise	Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks	E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise	Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks	E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization																								
Kumar et al <sup>[33]</sup> , 2011	India	C=9	22.5±1.09	Usual Care	15min, 8weeks																																																																																												
		E=9		Core stabilization exercise		Lee et al <sup>[34]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=6	43.3±9.9	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 12weeks	E1=15	42.7±13.4			Strength exercise	E2=15	46.7±8.1		Combination exercise	Michaelson et al <sup>[35]</sup> , 2016	Sweden	C=35	52.1±17.16	Usual Care	120min, 1time, 8weeks	E=35	49.3±14.0	Core stabilization exercise	Noormohammadpour et al <sup>[36]</sup> , 2017	Iran	C=10	41.3±6.4	Usual Care	8weeks	E=10	43.3±7.5	Core stabilization exercise	Roh et al <sup>[37]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=49	50.5±9.1	Usual Care	30min, 3times, 12weeks	E=53	49.5±10.6	Sling exercise	Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks	E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise	Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks	E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization																																
Lee et al <sup>[34]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=6	43.3±9.9	Usual Care	50min, 2times, 12weeks																																																																																												
		E1=15	42.7±13.4	Strength exercise																																																																																													
		E2=15	46.7±8.1	Combination exercise		Michaelson et al <sup>[35]</sup> , 2016	Sweden	C=35	52.1±17.16	Usual Care	120min, 1time, 8weeks	E=35	49.3±14.0	Core stabilization exercise	Noormohammadpour et al <sup>[36]</sup> , 2017	Iran	C=10	41.3±6.4	Usual Care	8weeks	E=10	43.3±7.5	Core stabilization exercise	Roh et al <sup>[37]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=49	50.5±9.1	Usual Care	30min, 3times, 12weeks	E=53	49.5±10.6	Sling exercise	Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks	E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise	Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks	E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization																																															
Michaelson et al <sup>[35]</sup> , 2016	Sweden	C=35	52.1±17.16	Usual Care	120min, 1time, 8weeks																																																																																												
		E=35	49.3±14.0	Core stabilization exercise		Noormohammadpour et al <sup>[36]</sup> , 2017	Iran	C=10	41.3±6.4	Usual Care	8weeks	E=10	43.3±7.5	Core stabilization exercise	Roh et al <sup>[37]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=49	50.5±9.1	Usual Care	30min, 3times, 12weeks	E=53	49.5±10.6	Sling exercise	Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks	E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise	Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks	E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization																																																								
Noormohammadpour et al <sup>[36]</sup> , 2017	Iran	C=10	41.3±6.4	Usual Care	8weeks																																																																																												
		E=10	43.3±7.5	Core stabilization exercise		Roh et al <sup>[37]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=49	50.5±9.1	Usual Care	30min, 3times, 12weeks	E=53	49.5±10.6	Sling exercise	Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks	E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise	Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks	E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization																																																																	
Roh et al <sup>[37]</sup> , 2016	Korea	C=49	50.5±9.1	Usual Care	30min, 3times, 12weeks																																																																																												
		E=53	49.5±10.6	Sling exercise		Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks	E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise	Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks	E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization																																																																										
Shamsi et al <sup>[38]</sup> , 2014	Iran	C=20	38.5±11.9	Usual Care	40min, 3times, 6weeks																																																																																												
		E=19	47.7±10.4	Core stabilization exercise		Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks	E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization																																																																																			
Tang et al <sup>[39]</sup> , 2016	Chinese	C=41	43.6±6.4	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 6weeks																																																																																												
		E=41	41.7±5.6	Core stabilization																																																																																													

					n exercise	
		C=40	48.0±4.0	Usual Care		
Tekur et al[40], 2012	India	E=40	49.0±3.6	Core stabilization exercise	45min, 7times, 4weeks	
		C=57	72.6±6.0	Usual Care		
Teut et al[41], 2016	Germany	E1=61	73.0±5.6	Yoga	45min, 2times, 12weeks	
		E2=58	72.4±5.7	Qigong		
				Core		
Ulger et al[42], 2023	Turkey	C=12	55.08±2.67	stabilization exercise	60min, 2times, 8weeks	
		E=16	47.12±7.07	Yoga		
		C=56	41.6±12.9	Usual Care		
				Core		
Ulger et al[43], 2017	Turkey	E=57	48.4±1.86	stabilization exercise	60min, 3times, 6weeks	
				Usual Care		
Williams et al[44], 2009	USA	C=47	47.6±1.47	Usual Care	30min, 7times, 24weeks	
		E=43	48.4±1.86	Yoga		
		C=15	20.5±0.5	Usual Care		
Yoo et al[45], 2012	Korea	E=15	20.1±0.7	Sling exercise	45min, 3times, 4weeks	
		C=46	51.62±4.03	Usual Care		
				Core		
Zhang et al[46], 2015	Chinese	E=46	48.71±3.8	stabilization exercise	40min, 7times, 8weeks	
				Usual Care		
		C=26	35.2±9.7	Usual Care		
Koumantakis et al[47], 2005	Greece	E=29	39.2±11.4	Core stabilization exercise	40-60min, 2times, 8weeks	
				Usual Care		
		C=20	51.30±7.01	Usual Care		
Joshua et al[48], 2013	Korea	E=20	50.35±9.26	Core stabilization exercise	40min, 3times, 8weeks	

Note: E=Experimental Group; C=Control Group.

### 3. Network Meta-Analysis Results

#### 3.1 Network Evidence Map

Figure 2 displays the network relationship diagram for 12 intervention measures affecting individuals with chronic nonspecific low back pain. Connections between the nodes indicate direct comparisons between two interventions, while the absence of a line indicates no direct comparison between them. The size of the circles



represents the sample size included for each intervention method, and the width of the lines indicates the frequency of comparisons between the two interventions.

### 3.2 Results of the Network Meta-Analysis

The 26 studies reported on the efficacy of different exercise modalities for chronic nonspecific low back pain. Yoga [SMD = -1.71 (-2.93, -0.49),  $P < 0.05$ ] and core stability training [SMD = -0.81 (-1.44, -0.18),  $P < 0.05$ ] were significantly more effective than the control group. However, combined training [SMD = -1.48 (-4.03, 1.08),  $P > 0.05$ ], Pilates [SMD = -0.55 (-3.00, 1.89),  $P > 0.05$ ], Qigong [SMD = -1.23 (-3.88, 0.91),  $P > 0.05$ ], suspension training [SMD = -1.40 (-2.82, 0.02),  $P > 0.05$ ], Swiss ball exercises [SMD = -0.88 (-3.12, 1.36),  $P > 0.05$ ], strength training [SMD = -1.36 (-3.91, 1.19),  $P > 0.05$ ], perturbation therapy [SMD = -0.39 (-2.82, 2.04),  $P > 0.05$ ], sit-up exercises [SMD = 0.09 (-2.82, 2.04),  $P > 0.05$ ], and Tai Chi [SMD = -2.13 (-4.32, 0.06),  $P > 0.05$ ] did not show statistically significant differences compared to the control group (see Table 2).

Table 2 The results of cross comparison among interventi

<b>Strength exercise</b>												
-0.48 (-3.88, 2.92)	<b>Swiss ball</b>											
0.04 (-2.88, 2.97)	0.52 (-1.72, 2.7)	<b>sling exercise</b>										
-0.13 (-3.46, 3.21)	0.35 (-2.75, 3.45)	-0.17 (-2.74, 2.40)	<b>Qigong</b>									
0.35 (-2.48, 3.18)	0.83 (-1.72, 3.3)	0.31 (-1.56, 2.18)	0.48 (-1.67, 2.62)	<b>yoga</b>								
-0.81 (-4.34, 2.73)	-0.33 (-3.65, 2.99)	-0.85 (-3.68, 1.98)	-0.68 (-3.93, 2.58)	-1.16 (-3.89, 1.58)	<b>Pilates</b>							
0.12 (-2.34, 2.57)	0.60 (-2.80, 4.00)	0.07 (-2.85, 3.00)	0.25 (-3.09, 3.58)	-0.23 (-3.06, 2.60)	0.92 (-2.62, 4.46)	<b>Combination exercise</b>						
-0.55 (-3.18, 2.08)	-0.07 (-2.40, 2.26)	-0.59 (-2.15, 0.96)	-0.42 (-2.66, 1.81)	-0.90 (-2.27, 0.47)	0.26 (-2.27, 2.78)	-0.67 (-3.30, 1.97)	<b>core stabilization exercise</b>					
0.77 (-2.59, 4.13)	1.25 (-1.88, 4.38)	0.73 (-1.88, 3.34)	0.90 (-2.16, 3.96)	0.42 (-2.08, 2.9)	1.58 (-1.71, 4.86)	0.65 (-2.71, 4.02)	1.32 (-0.86, 3.50)	<b>Tai Chi</b>				
-1.45 (-4.98, 2.08)	-0.97 (-4.28, 2.34)	-1.49 (-4.31, 1.33)	-1.32 (-4.57, 1.92)	-1.80 (-4.52, 0.92)	-0.64 (-4.10, 2.81)	-1.57 (-5.10, 1.96)	-0.90 (-3.41, 1.62)	-2.22 (-5.49, 1.05)	<b>Abdominal crunch exercise</b>			
-0.97 (-4.49, 2.55)	-0.49 (-3.80, 2.81)	-1.01 (-3.83, 1.80)	-0.84 (-4.08, 2.40)	-1.32 (-4.04, 1.40)	-0.16 (-3.61, 3.2)	-1.09 (-4.61, 2.44)	-0.42 (-2.93, 2.09)	-1.74 (-5.01, 1.53)	0.48 (-2.96, 3.92)	<b>Disturbance exercise</b>		
-1.36 (-3.91, 1.19)	-0.88 (-3.12, 1.36)	-1.40 (-2.82, 0.02)	-1.23 (-3.38, 0.91)	-1.71 (-2.93, -0.49)	-0.55 (-3.00, 1.89)	-1.48 (-4.03, 1.08)	-0.81 (-1.44, -0.18)	-2.13 (-4.32, 0.06)	0.09 (-2.35, 2.52)	-0.39 (-2.82, 2.04)	<b>con</b>	

### 3.3 Ranking of Intervention Effectiveness

Based on the Surface Under the Cumulative Ranking (SUCRA) methodology, the potential ranking of effectiveness for interventions addressing chronic nonspecific low back pain among 12 different measures is as follows: Tai Chi (SUCRA = 77.4) > Yoga (SUCRA = 72.1) > Suspension Training (SUCRA = 63.0) > Combined Training (SUCRA = 61.6) > Strength Training (SUCRA = 59.2) > Qigong (SUCRA = 57.5) > Swiss Ball (SUCRA = 48.0) > Core Stability Training (SUCRA = 44.8) > Pilates (SUCRA = 40.5) > Perturbation Therapy (SUCRA = 34.5) > Sit-up Exercises (SUCRA = 23.4) (see Table 3).

Table 3 SUCRA values and effect sizes for effectiveness of each intervention

Intervention	SUCRA	Optimal Probability (%)	Ranking
Taichi	77.4	33.6	1
Yoga	72.1	8	2
Sling exercise	63	4.7	3
Combination exercise	61.6	13.8	4
Strength exercise	59.2	12.6	5
Qigong	57.5	11.2	6
Swiss ball	48	6.3	7
Core stabilization exercise	44.8	0	8
Pilates	40.5	4.9	9
Disturbance exercise	34.5	3	10
Abdominal crunch exercise	23.4	1.9	11
Con	18	0	12

### 3.4 Detection of Publication Bias

According to Figure 3, the included studies are mostly symmetrically distributed around the zero line, with the majority of points located in the upper part of the funnel, and only a few points falling outside the funnel plot. Overall, the results indicate a low possibility of publication bias in this study. The Egger's method was used to test for publication bias, yielding a P-value of 0.161, suggesting no significant publication bias. However, the interpretation of these results should still be approached with caution.

## 4 Discussion

This study through network meta-analysis reveals that Tai Chi is more effective than other exercise interventions in alleviating chronic nonspecific low back pain in adults. This finding diverges from previous literature, which indicated that Pilates was the best exercise choice for improving chronic nonspecific low back pain in adults[49]. However, the SUCRA ranking results from this study place Tai Chi above combined exercises, Pilates, Qigong, suspension training, Swiss ball exercises, strength training, perturbation therapy, sit-up exercises, and yoga in terms of effectiveness. This suggests that Tai Chi could be considered a more effective strategy for treating and preventing chronic nonspecific low back pain. The unique effectiveness of Tai Chi in back pain intervention may be closely related to its emphasis on "slowness." Practitioners gradually deepen their perception of subtle body changes through slow and coherent movements, enhancing proprioception. This heightened bodily awareness not only improves the coordination of muscle tension and relaxation but also focuses on joint stability and flexibility, as well as the overall flow and balance of qi and blood[50, 51].

Currently, there is no unified conclusion on the specific mechanisms by which physical activity improves and controls chronic nonspecific low back pain, but numerous studies consistently show that physical activity plays a significant role in reducing chronic nonspecific low back pain[52-55]; Semrau et al. observed significant pain relief in patients after an eight-week exercise intervention[56]; similarly, research by Zhu et al. further supports the positive impact of physical activity on reducing back pain[57]. The two major mechanisms universally accepted by the academic community are the neurophysiological mechanism and the vascular mechanism, which provide robust support for explaining the principles behind exercise interventions. (1) Neurophysiological mechanism: Numerous studies indicate that during exercise, the hypothalamus and pituitary gland of vertebrates release amino compounds and other neurotransmitters that have significant analgesic effects, reducing patients' pain and alleviating discomfort

caused by chronic nonspecific low back pain[58–60]. Furthermore, exercise can regulate the activity of brain areas associated with pain perception, such as the parietal and frontal lobes, enhancing the brain's capacity to process pain information and reducing the sensitivity of chronic low back pain patients to pain, thereby improving their quality of life[61, 62]. Exercise also significantly increases the secretion of neurotrophic factors, which play a crucial role in neuronal repair processes, helping to alleviate pain and promote the repair of damaged nerves[63]. (2) Vascular mechanism: Studies indicate that chronic nonspecific low back pain often accompanies local blood circulation obstruction and tissue hypoxia[64]. Prolonged sitting, standing, and improper exercise can hinder back muscle and blood circulation, exacerbating back pain [65]. However, exercise can promote blood flow in back muscles and soft tissues, improving circulation. Specific exercise patterns can promote rhythmic muscle contractions, thus dilating blood vessels, improving blood supply and waste disposal, and alleviating muscle fatigue and pain[66–68].

In the realm of neurophysiology, Tai Chi emphasizes precise muscle control and the coordination of movements, which requires the brain to finely regulate the intensity and sequence of muscle contractions [62, 69]. This precise neural regulation enhances the nervous system's response speed and sensitivity to movement, optimizes neural conduction pathways, and reduces errors in neural transmission [70]. Additionally, Tai Chi enhances proprioceptive input to the lumbar and lower limb joints, restoring joint stability and effectively alleviating pain caused by joint instability[71, 72]. Chronic nonspecific low back pain is often associated with neural adhesions, which are typically due to chronic inflammation or poor posture limiting neural mobility and increasing pain signal transmission[73–75]. Tai Chi alleviates pain by increasing the range of neural mobility, reducing neural adhesions and compression [76]. Further research suggests that Tai Chi practice can regulate gene expression related to inflammation, reducing the activity of key inflammatory factors such as NF- $\kappa$ B, thus diminishing chronic inflammatory

responses and associated pain [77, 78]. Moreover, Tai Chi enhances the secretion of endogenous analgesics like endorphins, providing emotional relief and a sense of pleasure from movement, thereby becoming an effective non-pharmacological treatment option[79].

The vascular mechanism further indicates that Tai Chi improves local blood circulation, accelerating the clearance of inflammatory products, reducing inflammatory responses, and alleviating pain[62, 80, 81]. More efficient blood circulation not only enhances the nutrient supply to muscles but also speeds up the elimination of metabolic waste, reducing pain caused by fatigue [82]. This improvement in blood circulation helps increase vascular elasticity, reducing the risk of arteriosclerosis and vascular stiffness[80]. Enhanced vascular elasticity can decrease the resistance in lumbar and lower limb vessels, increasing blood flow and thereby relieving chronic nonspecific low back pain[82]. Additionally, emotional stress often exacerbates pain symptoms; negative emotions can lead to overactivation of the sympathetic nervous system, further causing muscle tension and poor blood circulation. Tai Chi, with its slow movements and deep breathing techniques, significantly reduces the activation level of the sympathetic nervous system, decreases the secretion of stress hormones like adrenaline, and helps patients achieve deep relaxation on both physiological and psychological levels[83]. Finally, prolonged Tai Chi practice can enhance the muscular strength of cardiac tissues, increase the elasticity of the heart valves, improve cardiac output, return blood volume, and myocardial oxygen reserve capacity, significantly improving the cardiac blood supply system[84]. These changes help provide more blood and oxygen to the lumbar muscles and bones, promoting the repair and regeneration of lumbar tissues, thereby alleviating back pain.

## 5 Comprehensive Implications for Research and Clinical Practice Research Implications

## 5.1 Implications for research

Network meta-analysis enables indirect treatment comparisons (ITC) by quantifying and ranking different intervention measures. This approach allows us to clearly define the differences in effectiveness among various types of exercises in improving chronic low back pain in adults. By comparing the impact sizes of each type of exercise, we can identify the most effective exercise modality. This method facilitates the design of more precise randomized controlled trials for future research, ensuring that interventions are targeted and based on robust evidence. This strategy not only enhances the reliability of research findings but also contributes to the development of tailored treatment plans that are more likely to yield significant benefits for patients with chronic low back pain.

## 5.2 Implications for clinical practice

The results of this network meta-analysis provide a solid evidence base for guiding the selection of exercise interventions for adults with chronic low back pain. We found that Tai Chi is the most effective form of exercise for improving chronic low back pain in adults. We hope these findings will serve as valuable decision-making information for educators and experts who develop exercise guidelines. This should aid in formulating more targeted and effective strategies to manage and alleviate chronic low back pain through non-pharmacological interventions.

## 6. The limitations of this study

This study also has certain limitations: First, the study focuses only on exercise interventions and does not include other potential interventions (such as pharmacological treatments, psychological interventions, etc.), which may limit the applicability of the results. Lastly, because self-reported pain is highly subjective, these data may be affected by subjective perceptions changing over time, potentially impacting the accuracy of the data and thus the stability of the results. These limitations inevitably have a negative impact on the accuracy of the study conclusions, so the findings should be cautiously generalized.

## References :

1. Marunica Karšaj J, Grubišić F, Balen D, Jug J, Grazio S. Chronic non-specific low back pain disability and depressive symptoms in working men and women: a cross-sectional study. *Rheumatology International*. 2024;1-9.
2. Turci AM, Nogueira CG, Carrer HCN, Chaves TC. Self-administered stretching exercises are as effective as motor control exercises for people with chronic non-specific low back pain: a randomised trial. *Journal of Physiotherapy*. 2023;69(2):93-9.
3. Ferreira ML, De Luca K, Haile LM, Steinmetz JD, Culbreth GT, Cross M, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of low back pain, 1990–2020, its attributable risk factors, and projections to 2050: a systematic analysis of the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *The Lancet Rheumatology*. 2023;5(6):e316-e29.
4. Herman PM, Qureshi N, Arick SD, Edelen MO, Hays RD, Rodriguez A, et al. Definitions of chronic low back pain from a scoping review, and analyses of narratives and self-reported health of adults with low back pain. *The journal of pain*. 2023;24(3):403-12.
5. Ambrosio L, Mazzuca G, Maguolo A, Russo F, Cannata F, Vadalà G, et al. The burden of low back pain in children and adolescents with overweight and obesity: from pathophysiology to prevention and treatment strategies. *Therapeutic advances in musculoskeletal disease*. 2023;15:1759720X231188831.
6. Park SC, Kang M-S, Yang JH, Kim T-H. Assessment and nonsurgical management of low back pain: a narrative review. *The Korean Journal of Internal Medicine*. 2023;38(1):16.
7. Organization WH. WHO guideline for non-surgical management of chronic primary low back pain in adults in primary and community care settings: World Health Organization; 2023.
8. Kuyi K, Joshi S, Kaushik V. To Determine the Effect of Iliopsoas MET along with the Conventional Therapy on Pain, Functional Disability and lumbar lordosis in the Patients with Non-Specific Low Back Pain. *Indian Journal of Physiotherapy & Occupational Therapy Print-(ISSN 0973-5666) and Electronic-(ISSN 0973-5674)*. 2023;17(1):22-6.
9. Hayden JA, Ellis J, Ogilvie R, Malmivaara A, van Tulder MW. Exercise therapy for chronic low back pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2021;(9).
10. Searle A, Spink M, Ho A, Chuter V. Exercise interventions for the treatment of chronic low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Clinical rehabilitation*. 2015;29(12):1155-67.
11. Saragiotto BT, Maher CG, Yamato TP, Costa LO, Menezes Costa LC, Ostelo RW, et al. Motor control exercise for chronic non-specific low-back pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 1996;2016(11).
12. Macedo LG, Saragiotto BT, Yamato TP, Costa LO, Menezes Costa LC, Ostelo RW, et al. Motor control exercise for acute non-specific low back pain. *Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 1996;2016(2).
13. Ho EK-Y, Chen L, Simic M, Ashton-James CE, Comachio J, Wang DXM, et al. Psychological interventions for chronic, non-specific low back pain: systematic review with network meta-analysis. *bmj*. 2022;376.
14. Meng X-G, Yue S-W. Efficacy of aerobic exercise for treatment of chronic low back pain: a meta-analysis. *American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation*. 2015;94(5):358-65.



15. Wang X-Q, Zheng J-J, Yu Z-W, Bi X, Lou S-J, Liu J, et al. A meta-analysis of core stability exercise versus general exercise for chronic low back pain. *PLoS one*. 2012;7(12):e52082.
16. Van Middelkoop M, Rubinstein SM, Verhagen AP, Ostelo RW, Koes BW, van Tulder MW. Exercise therapy for chronic nonspecific low-back pain. *Best practice & research Clinical rheumatology*. 2010;24(2):193-204.
17. Wood L, Foster NE, Lewis M, Bishop A. Exercise interventions for persistent non-specific low back pain—does matching outcomes to treatment targets make a difference? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Pain*. 2021;22(2):107-26.
18. Owen PJ, Miller CT, Mundell NL, Verswijveren SJ, Tagliaferri SD, Brisby H, et al. Which specific modes of exercise training are most effective for treating low back pain? Network meta-analysis. *British journal of sports medicine*. 2020;54(21):1279-87.
19. Geneen LJ, Moore RA, Clarke C, Martin D, Colvin LA, Smith BH. Physical activity and exercise for chronic pain in adults: an overview of Cochrane Reviews. *Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2017;(4).
20. Mavridis D. Network meta-analysis in a nutshell. *BMJ Ment Health*. 2019;22(3):100-1.
21. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, Chaimani A, Schmid CH, Cameron C, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2015;162(11):777-84.
22. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in medicine*. 2002;21(11):1539-58.
23. Muhammad Waseem A, Hossein K, Syed Amir G. Effectiveness of core stabilization exercises and routine exercise therapy in management of pain in chronic nonspecific low back pain: a randomized controlled clinical trial. 2017.
24. Arampatzis A, Schroll A, Catalá MM, Laube G, Schüller S, Dreinhofer K. A random-perturbation therapy in chronic non-specific low-back pain patients: a randomised controlled trial. *European journal of applied physiology*. 2017;117:2547-60.
25. Gladwell V, Head S, Haggart M, Beneke R. Does a program of Pilates improve chronic non-specific low back pain? *Journal of sport rehabilitation*. 2006;15(4):338-50.
26. Bae C-R, Jin Y, Yoon B-C, Kim N-H, Park K-W, Lee S-H. Effects of assisted sit-up exercise compared to core stabilization exercise on patients with non-specific low back pain: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2018;31(5):871-80.
27. Oh B-H, Kim H-H, Kim C-Y, Nam C-W. Comparison of physical function according to the lumbar movement method of stabilizing a patient with chronic low back pain. *Journal of Physical Therapy Science*. 2015;27(12):3655-8.
28. Cho I, Jeon C, Lee S, Lee D, Hwangbo G. Effects of lumbar stabilization exercise on functional disability and lumbar lordosis angle in patients with chronic low back pain. *Journal of physical therapy science*. 2015;27(6):1983-5.
29. Cho H-y, Kim E-h, Kim J. Effects of the CORE exercise program on pain and active range of motion in patients with chronic low back pain. *Journal of physical therapy science*. 2014;26(8):1237-40.
30. Hwangbo G, Lee C-W, Kim S-G, Kim H-S. The effects of trunk stability exercise and a combined exercise program on pain, flexibility, and static balance in chronic low back pain patients. *Journal of physical therapy science*. 2015;27(4):1153-5.

31. Liu J, Yeung A, Xiao T, Tian X, Kong Z, Zou L, et al. Chen-style tai chi for individuals (aged 50 years old or above) with chronic non-specific low back pain: a randomized controlled trial. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2019;16(3):517.
32. Williams KA, Petronis J, Smith D, Goodrich D, Wu J, Ravi N, et al. Effect of Iyengar yoga therapy for chronic low back pain. *Pain*. 2005;115(1-2):107-17.
33. Kumar SP. Efficacy of segmental stabilization exercise for lumbar segmental instability in patients with mechanical low back pain: A randomized placebo controlled crossover study. *North American journal of medical sciences*. 2011;3(10):456.
34. Lee J-S, Kang S-J. The effects of strength exercise and walking on lumbar function, pain level, and body composition in chronic back pain patients. *Journal of exercise rehabilitation*. 2016;12(5):463.
35. Michaelson P, Holmberg D, Aasa B, Aasa U. High load lifting exercise and low load motor control exercises as interventions for patients with mechanical low back pain: A randomized controlled trial with 24-month follow-up. *Journal of rehabilitation medicine*. 2016;48(5):456-63.
36. Noormohammadpour P, Kordi M, Mansournia MA, Akbari-Fakhrabadi M, Kordi R. The role of a multi-step core stability exercise program in the treatment of nurses with chronic low back pain: a single-blinded randomized controlled trial. *Asian spine journal*. 2018;12(3):490.
37. Roh HS, Cho WJ, Ryu WJ, Park SJ, An CS. The change of pain and lumbosacral sagittal alignment after sling exercise therapy for patients with chronic low back pain. *Journal of physical therapy science*. 2016;28(10):2789-92.
38. Shamsi MB, Sarrafzadeh J, Jamshidi A. Comparing core stability and traditional trunk exercise on chronic low back pain patients using three functional lumbopelvic stability tests. *Physiotherapy theory and practice*. 2015;31(2):89-98.
39. Tang S, Qian X, Zhang Y, Liu Y. Treating low back pain resulted from lumbar degenerative instability using Chinese Tuina combined with core stability exercises: a randomized controlled trial. *Complementary therapies in medicine*. 2016;25:45-50.
40. Tekur P, Nagarathna R, Chametcha S, Hankey A, Nagendra H. A comprehensive yoga programs improves pain, anxiety and depression in chronic low back pain patients more than exercise: an RCT. *Complementary therapies in medicine*. 2012;20(3):107-18.
41. Teut M, Knilli J, Daus D, Roll S, Witt CM. Qigong or yoga versus no intervention in older adults with chronic low back pain—a randomized controlled trial. *The Journal of Pain*. 2016;17(7):796-805.
42. Ulger O, Oz M, Asliyuce YO. The Effects of Yoga and Stabilization Exercises in Patients With Chronic Low Back Pain: A Randomized Crossover Study. *Holistic Nursing Practice*. 2023;37(4):E59-E68.
43. Ulger O, Demirel A, Oz M, Tamer S. The effect of manual therapy and exercise in patients with chronic low back pain: Double blind randomized controlled trial. *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2017;30(6):1303-9.
44. Williams K, Abildso C, Steinberg L, Doyle E, Epstein B, Smith D, et al. Evaluation of the effectiveness and efficacy of Iyengar yoga therapy on chronic low back pain. *Spine*. 2009;34(19):2066-76.
45. Yoo Y-D, Lee Y-S. The effect of core stabilization exercises using a sling on pain and muscle strength of patients with chronic low back pain. *Journal of physical therapy science*. 2012;24(8):671-4.
46. Zhang Y, Tang S, Chen G, Liu Y. Chinese massage combined with core stability exercises for nonspecific low back pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Complementary therapies in medicine*. 2015;23(1):1-6.

47. Koumantakis GA, Watson PJ, Oldham JA. Trunk muscle stabilization training plus general exercise versus general exercise only: randomized controlled trial of patients with recurrent low back pain. *Physical therapy*. 2005;85(3):209-25.
48. You JH, Kim S-Y, Oh D-W, Chon S-C. The effect of a novel core stabilization technique on managing patients with chronic low back pain: a randomized, controlled, experimenter-blinded study. *Clinical rehabilitation*. 2014;28(5):460-9.
49. Yu Z, Yin Y, Wang J, Zhang X, Cai H, Peng F. Efficacy of Pilates on pain, functional disorders and quality of life in patients with chronic low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2023;20(4):2850.
50. Wang F, Lee E-KO, Wu T, Benson H, Fricchione G, Wang W, et al. The effects of tai chi on depression, anxiety, and psychological well-being: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International journal of behavioral medicine*. 2014;21:605-17.
51. Raman G, Zhang Y, Minichiello VJ, D'Ambrosio CM, Wang C. Tai Chi improves sleep quality in healthy adults and patients with chronic conditions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of sleep disorders & therapy*. 2013;2(6).
52. Wewege MA, Booth J, Parmenter BJ. Aerobic vs. resistance exercise for chronic non-specific low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2018;31(5):889-99.
53. Hayden JA, Cartwright JL, Riley RD, Vantulder MW, Group CLBPIM-A. Exercise therapy for chronic low back pain: protocol for an individual participant data meta-analysis. *Systematic reviews*. 2012;1:1-10.
54. Hayden JA, Van Tulder MW, Tomlinson G. Systematic review: strategies for using exercise therapy to improve outcomes in chronic low back pain. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2005;142(9):776-85.
55. Gordon R, Bloxham S, editors. A systematic review of the effects of exercise and physical activity on non-specific chronic low back pain. *Healthcare*; 2016: MDPI.
56. Semrau J, Hentschke C, Peters S, Pfeifer K. Effects of behavioural exercise therapy on the effectiveness of multidisciplinary rehabilitation for chronic non-specific low back pain: a randomised controlled trial. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*. 2021;22(1):500.
57. Zhu F, Zhang M, Wang D, Hong Q, Zeng C, Chen W. Yoga compared to non-exercise or physical therapy exercise on pain, disability, and quality of life for patients with chronic low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PloS one*. 2020;15(9):e0238544.
58. Didehdar D, Kamali F, Yoosefinejad AK, Lotfi M. The effect of spinal manipulation on brain neurometabolites in chronic nonspecific low back pain patients: a randomized clinical trial. *Irish Journal of Medical Science (1971-)*. 2020;189:543-50.
59. Ionescu AM, Manolescu BN, Popa R, Badea R, Săvulescu S, Tache S, et al. Effects of tramadol treatment on aerobic exercise capacity in subjects with chronic non-specific low back pain. *Palestrica of the Third Millennium Civilization & Sport*. 2015;16(3).
60. Mior S. Exercise in the treatment of chronic pain. *The Clinical journal of pain*. 2001;17(4):S77-S85.
61. Han YM, Chan MM, Choi CX, Law MC, Ahorsu DK, Tsang HW. The neurobiological effects of mind–body exercise: a systematic review and meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies. *Scientific Reports*. 2023;13(1):10948.

62. Xie H, Zhang M, Huo C, Xu G, Li Z, Fan Y. Tai Chi Chuan exercise related change in brain function as assessed by functional near-infrared spectroscopy. *Scientific reports*. 2019;9(1):13198.
63. Verbrugghe J, Agten A, Stevens S, Hansen D, Demoulin C, Eijnde BO, et al. Exercise intensity matters in chronic nonspecific low back pain rehabilitation. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*. 2019;51(12):2434-42.
64. Freiwald J, Magni A, Fanlo-Mazas P, Paulino E, Sequeira de Medeiros L, Moretti B, et al. A role for superficial heat therapy in the management of non-specific, mild-to-moderate low back pain in current clinical practice: A narrative review. *Life*. 2021;11(8):780.
65. Furst B, Furst B. The effect of gravity and upright posture on circulation. *The Heart and Circulation: An Integrative Model*. 2020:319-41.
66. Ebadi S, Ansari NN, Naghdi S, Jalaei S, Sadat M, Bagheri H, et al. The effect of continuous ultrasound on chronic non-specific low back pain: a single blind placebo-controlled randomized trial. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*. 2012;13:1-10.
67. Ma K, Zhuang Z-G, Wang L, Liu X-G, Lu L-J, Yang X-Q, et al. The Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP): consensus on the assessment and management of chronic nonspecific low back pain. *Pain Research and Management*. 2019;2019(1):8957847.
68. Kim S, Bemben MG, Bemben DA. Effects of an 8-month yoga intervention on arterial compliance and muscle strength in premenopausal women. *Journal of sports science & medicine*. 2012;11(2):322.
69. Nan L, Grunberg D, De Silva S, Sivaramakrishnan D. Evaluating the effectiveness of Tai Chi in short-term, medium-term, and long-term on balance and strength among the elderly: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics Plus*. 2024:100080.
70. Kong LJ, Lauche R, Klose P, Bu JH, Yang XC, Guo CQ, et al. Tai Chi for chronic pain conditions: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Scientific reports*. 2016;6(1):25325.
71. Tsang W, Hui-Chan C. Effects of tai chi on joint proprioception and stability limits in elderly subjects. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*. 2003;35(12):1962-71.
72. Kuo C-C, Chen S-C, Wang J-Y, Ho T-J, Lin J-G, Lu T-W. Effects of Tai-Chi Chuan practice on patterns and stability of lower limb inter-joint coordination during obstructed gait in the elderly. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*. 2021;9:739722.
73. Li W, Gong Y, Liu J, Guo Y, Tang H, Qin S, et al. Peripheral and central pathological mechanisms of chronic low back pain: a narrative review. *Journal of pain research*. 2021:1483-94.
74. Knezevic NN, Mandalia S, Raasch J, Knezevic I, Candido KD. Treatment of chronic low back pain—new approaches on the horizon. *Journal of pain research*. 2017:1111-23.
75. Gerdesmeyer L, Noe C, Prehn-Kristensen A, Harrasser N, Al Muderis M, Weuster M, et al. Long-term efficacy of percutaneous epidural neurolysis of adhesions in chronic lumbar radicular pain: 10 year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Pain physician*. 2021;24(5):359.
76. Niederer D, Mueller J. Sustainability effects of motor control stabilisation exercises on pain and function in chronic nonspecific low back pain patients: A systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression. *PloS one*. 2020;15(1):e0227423.
77. Liu H, Salem Y, Aggarwal S. Effects of Tai Chi on biomarkers and their implication to neurorehabilitation—a systemic review. *European Journal of Integrative Medicine*. 2022;50:101391.
78. Oh B, Bae K, Lamoury G, Eade T, Boyle F, Corless B, et al. The effects of tai chi and qigong on immune responses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicines*. 2020;7(7):39.

79. Choi HY, Lee C-H. Can beta-endorphin be used as a biomarker for chronic low back pain? A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Pain Medicine*. 2019;20(1):28-36.
80. Qi F, Soh KG, Nasiruddin NJM, Leong OS, He S, Liu H. Effect of Taichi Chuan on health-related physical fitness in adults: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Complementary Therapies in Medicine*. 2023:102971.
81. Solloway MR, Taylor SL, Shekelle PG, Miake-Lye IM, Beroes JM, Shanman RM, et al. An evidence map of the effect of Tai Chi on health outcomes. *Systematic reviews*. 2016;5:1-11.
82. Wehner C, Blank C, Arvandi M, Wehner C, Schobersberger W. Effect of Tai Chi on muscle strength, physical endurance, postural balance and flexibility: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ open sport & exercise medicine*. 2021;7(1):e000817.
83. Duan D, Wang D, Li H, Li W, Wu D. Acute effects of different Tai Chi practice protocols on cardiac autonomic modulation. *Scientific Reports*. 2024;14(1):5550.
84. Lan L, Wang L. Exercise interventions for patients with myocardial infarction: A descriptive review. 2023.

Previous studies

Identification of new studies via databases and registers

Identification

Studies included in previous version of review (n = 410)  
Reports of studies included in previous version of review (n =15 )

Records identified from\*:  
Databases (n =1070 )  
Registers (n = 310)

Records removed *before screening*:  
Duplicate records removed (n =215)  
Records marked as ineligible by automation tools (n =70 )  
Records removed for other reasons (n =185 )

Screening

Records screened (n = 600)

Records excluded\*\* (n = 121)

Reports sought for retrieval (n =479 )

Reports not retrieved (n =211 )

Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 268)


Reports excluded:  
Conference paper (n=25)  
non-randomized controlled trial (n =42)  
ineligible study participants (n=35)  
incomplete data (n=85)  
ineligible intervention (n=57)


Included

New studies included in review (n =5 )  
Reports of new included studies (n = 20)

Total studies included in review (n = 3)  
Reports of total included studies (n =26 )







- |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| ● A vs J | ● A vs K | ● A vs L | ● A vs B | ● A vs C | ● A vs D |
| ● A vs E | ● A vs F | ● A vs G | ● A vs H | ● A vs I | ● B vs L |
| ● C vs I | ● E vs F | ● G vs H |          |          |          |