1	High-Intensity Interval Training Improves physical morphology, Cardiopulmonary Fitness
2	and Metabolic Risk Indicators of Cardiovascular Disease in Children and Adolescents: A
3	Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
4	Menjie ^{1*a} Zou Shuangling ^{1a} Majia ^{2a} Xiang chenmin ^{2a} Li Shufeng ^{2a} Wang Junli ^{2b}
5	(a Fenyang College, Shanxi Medical University, Fenyang, Shanxi, 032200; b Xinjiang University, 830046)
6	ABSTRACT
7	Objective To systematically evaluate the safety and efficacy of high-intensity interval training in
8	children and adolescents.
9	Design Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
10	Methods Eight databases were searched. Descriptive analysis of the efficacy and safety of high-
11	intensity interval training on body shape, cardiorespiratory fitness, and metabolic risk markers for
12	cardiovascular disease between children and adolescents. Subgroup analysis was performed with age,
13	participants, intervention time, and exercise frequency as covariates.
14	Results 47 studies included 2995 children and adolescents. Meta-analysis results showed that high-
15	intensity interval training significantly improved cardiorespiratory fitness indicators (VO $_{2max}$, SBP, DBP
16	and HR _{max}) and cardiovascular disease metabolic risk indicators (TC, HDL-C). HIIT had no significant
17	effect on body shape indicators (BMI, BF% and WC) and some cardiometabolic indicators (TG and
18	LDL-C).
19	Conclusion Current evidence shows insufficient evidence that high-intensity interval training with
20	intermittent running as the main form of exercise improves body shape indicators in children and

^{*} Corresponding author: Meniie, 1986, master, meniie2020@126.com, research direction: sports NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. medicine, exercise to promote health and health management.

- adolescents. Nevertheless, it deserves to recommend for the purpose of improving cardiorespiratory
 fitness and reducing the metabolic risk of cardiovascular disease.
- 23 Keywords: High-Intensity Interval Training, Children, Adolescents, Somatotype, Cardiopulmonary fitness,
- 24 Cardiovascular disease.

25 INTRODUCTION

26 In 2018, the World Health Organization (WHO) conducted a summary analysis of 16 million children 27and adolescents in 146 countries and regions based on 298 population surveys and pointed out that 85% of 28 girls and 78% of boys in the world did not meet the WHO recommended standards, which leads to the 29 inevitable global trend towards the insufficient physical activity of adolescents [1]. There is growing evidence 30 that physical inactivity in children and adolescents increases the prevalence of cardiovascular disease in 31 adulthood and affects cognitive development, social interaction and even current and future health[2, 3]. 32 Insufficient physical activity between children and adolescents is highly correlated with metabolic diseases 33 in adulthood, especially increasing the risk of diseases such as metabolic obesity, type 2 diabetes mellitus 34 (T_2DM) , cardiovascular disease (CVD), and cancer[4]. To achieve the goal of reducing the insufficient rate of physical activity by 15% in 2030, it is necessary to enhance the level of physical activity of children and 35 36 adolescents[5]. What we all know is that continuous aerobic exercise can increase the aerobic capacity of the body, improve the sensitivity of insulin resistance, improve the level of lipometabolism and reduce the risk of 37 38 diseases caused by physical inactivity. However, aerobic exercise lasts for a long time and has a single rhythm, 39 which makes it difficult for most people to persist. But one of the main obstacles to achieving regular physical activity for current children and adolescents is the lack of time. Therefore, it is likely to replace aerobic 40 41 exercise with high-intensity interval training (HIIT), because HIIT has the advantages of low time cost, less 42 exercise volume, easy persistence, and equivalent exercise effect to aerobic exercise. HIIT refers to the

training method that is repeated multiple times at a greater than or equal to anaerobic threshold or maximal lactate steady-state intensity with incomplete recovery between each set of exercises. The body is more sensitive to the stimulation of HIIT and produces more comprehensive benefits in terms of sports ability, skeletal muscle metabolism and energy consumption.

In recent years, the comparison between HIIT and continuous aerobic exercise effect value has become a hot research topic, and the research groups are mainly obese and athletes: Obese people focus on body composition, metabolism and cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF), while athletes are primarily concerned with athletic performance and physiological adaptation during exercise[6].

51 HIIT research on obese children and adolescents and normal children and adolescents has gradually 52attracted attention and achieved certain research results. A recently published meta-analysis of HIIT targeting 53 obese children and adolescents showed that HIIT was effective in improving cardiometabolic level, cardiopulmonary adaptability, and aerobic capacity of obese children and adolescents, but the evidence for 54 conclusions about body composition improvement is insufficient[7]. Meta-analysis of healthy children and 55 adolescents has shown that HIIT can effectively improve the health level of children and adolescents and 56 cardiovascular disease risk factors[8]. Meta-analysis of young athletes shows that HIIT can improve the 57 58aerobic and anaerobic exercise ability of young athletes, and the time cost is lower. Comparing HIIT with moderate-intensity continuous training (MICT) found similar effects on body composition, blood pressure in 59 childhood obesity[9] and greater improvements in cardiorespiratory fitness in children and adolescents. HIIT 60 61 can be used as an alternative training mode of MICT to maintain cardiometabolic health and it can be applied 62 to the management of childhood obesity. Whereas, previous studies have small sample sizes, deviation of 63 outcome index measurement tools, language bias[8], and unclear description of exercise dose[10], especially 64 lack subgroup analyses on the influence of pre-puberty and pubertygender[7] that affect the stability of results.

65	Given the above, this study will systematically evaluate the effectiveness and safety of HIIT for children and
66	adolescents, expecting to provide a scientific basis for the promotion of HIIT in children and adolescents.
67	METHODS
68	Protocol
69	A systematic review and meta-analyses were conducted in accordance with the 27 checklists applying
70	the established guidelines of the PRISMA statement 2020[11], whose aim is to serve as a basis for reporting
71	systematic reviews of randomized trials. Besides there is no registration review protocol for this study.
72	Document retrieval strategy
73	The computer retrieves PubMed, The Cochrane Library, Embase, Web of science, Science Direct, CNKI,
74	WanFang and VIP databases. In addition, research published by Google Scholar was hand-searched.
75	Randomized controlled and non-randomized controlled trials on the health efficacy and safety of HIIT
76	between children and adolescents were collected. The retrieval time limit was from the establishment of the
77	database to January 1, 2022. We employed the following MeSH terms: High-Intensity Interval Training,
78	High-Intensity Interval, High-Intensity Intermittent, Adolescence, Teenagers, randomized controlled trial,
79	RCT, etc. Taking PubMed as an example, the specific search strategy is shown in Table 1.
80	Inclusion and exclusion criteria
81	Studies of children and adolescents were considered for the systematic review provided they met
82	the following inclusion criteria:
83	• Type of study: Randomized controlled trial (RCT) or controlled trial.
84	• Participants: Children and adolescents aged 5 to 19 (Normal weight, obesity, disease, etc.).

- Interventions: The control group received no intervention. The experimental group was high-intensity
- 86 interval training, and the interventions had no specific requirements except for intensity (intensity
- 87 $\geq 80\%$ HR_{max} or $\geq 100\%$ aerobic speed or $\geq 80\%$ VO_{2max}).
- Outcome indexes: body shape indicators, CRF indicators and cardiovascular disease metabolic risk
- 89 indicators.
- 90 Studies were excluded in the following cases:
- 91 Not reported in Chinese or English.
- 92 Controlled experiment before and after intervention.
- 93 Duplicate published literature.
- Studies that could not extract important outcome data.

Ω	Б
9	J.

	Table 1 Full-search strategy for PubMed.
Number	Search terms
#1	Adolescent [MeSH Terms]
#2	(((((Adolescence [Title/Abstract]) OR (Teens [Title/Abstract])) OR
	(Teenagers [Title/Abstract])) OR (Youths [Title/Abstract])) OR (Female
	Adolescents [Title/Abstract])) OR (Male Adolescents [Title/Abstract])
#3	#1 or #2
#4	High-Intensity Interval Training [MeSH Terms]
#5	((((High-Intensity Interval [Title/Abstract]) OR (High-Intensity Intermittent
	[Title/Abstract])) OR (High-Intensity Intermittent Exercises
	[Title/Abstract])) OR (Sprint Interval Trainings [Title/Abstract])) OR
	(HIIT[Title/Abstract])
#6	#4 or #5
#7	randomized controlled trial [MeSH Terms]
#8	(((RCT[Title/Abstract]) OR (Randomized [Title/Abstract])) OR
	(Randomized Clinical [Title/Abstract])) OR (Controlled Clinical Trials
	[Title/Abstract])
#9	#7 or #8
#10	#9 AND #6 AND #3

97 Literature screening and data extraction

98	Two researchers (Zou Shuangling and Xiang Chenmin) independently screened the literature, extracted
99	data and cross-checked. If there was any disagreement, it would be resolved through consultation. If additional
100	information was required, contact the corresponding author by email. The extracted content includes:(i) the
101	basic information of the included studies: research title, author, publication year, journal name, etc.; (ii)
102	baseline characteristics and interventions of the study subjects; (iii) outcome index data and outcome index
103	measurement methods. (iv) Whether lost to follow-up, withdrawal, medical supervision measures and
104	description of adverse reaction events, etc.
105	Risk of bias and evaluation of literature quality included in the study
106	The bias risk assessment tools Cochrane (RoB2.0) and RevMan 5.3 independently evaluated the risk of
107	bias in the included studies by two investigators (Menjie and Majia) and cross-checked the results.
108	Statistical analysis
109	Meta-analysis was performed using RevMan 5.3 and Stata 15.0 software. The measurement data used
110	mean difference (MD) as the effect analysis statistics, and each effect amount provided its 95% confidence
111	interval (CI). Sensitivity analysis of the included studies was performed to assess data robustness, and
112	heterogeneity magnitude was evaluated in combination with I ² : when I ² < 25% is low heterogeneity, I ² = 25~50% for the second sec
113	is moderate heterogeneity, $I^2 > 50\%$ is high heterogeneity, the level of meta-analysis is set to $\alpha=0.05$. If the
114	heterogeneity between the results was not statistically significant, a fixed-effects model was used for meta-
115	analysis; if there was statistical heterogeneity between the studies, a random-effects model was used for meta-
116	analysis and subgroup analysis was used to analyze the sources of heterogeneity further. Publication bias is
117	graphically assessed by Egger's linear regression analysis.

118 **RESULTS**

119 Literature screening process and results

- 3,868 studies were retrieved in December 2021: 471 studies were deleted for duplication ,and after
 title and abstract screening, 3195 studies were considered ineligible and 202 full texts were screened
 based on inclusion/exclusion criteria. Finally a total of 47 studies were included, and the content of the
- 123 literature selection process and results are shown in Fig.1.

124 Incorporate basic characteristics of research

- 125 Table 2 summarizes the basic characteristics of 47 studies[12-58], which investigated a total of 2995
- subjects (HIIT group: 1749, control group: 1246). Among them, there were 1165 boys (38.90%), 1156 girls
- 127 (38.60%) and 696 girls (23.24%) who did not mention gender. There were 2328 children (77.73%) and 667
- adolescents (22.27%). 438 were overweight/obese (14.62%); 106 athletes (3.54%); 433 sick children and
- adolescents (14.46%); There were 26 studies with medical supervision description (55.32%), 0 studies without
- 130 medical supervision and 21 studies without detailed description (44.68%).

131 Study quality assessment (risk of bias) and sensitivity analysis

- 132 A total of 47 studies were included in this meta-analysis, with reasonable overall risk bias and good
- 133 quality papers (Fig. 2). Egger's examined BMI, BF%, WC, VO_{2max}, SBP, DBP, and HR_{max} and found
- 134 that BF% was at risk of publication bias (p<0.05) (Table 3). The sensitivity results showed that the
- 135 overall data were stable (Supplemental Fig. 1-11).



Table 2 Basic features of the included studies

		Country	Lesion	Age		sample		Intervention measure	Intervention time		outcome	
Author	Year			experimental group	control group	experimental group (male/female)	control group (male/female)	experimental group	control group	experimental group	control group	indicator
Valérie et al.[12]	2022	France	Obesity	13.0 ± 1.1	13.2 ± 1.0	19(11/8)	11(6/5)	mode of motion: ergometer bicycle exercise time:15mins exercise frequency: twice/week exercise intensity:75% to 90% VO _{2 max}	not any physical training	16 weeks	16 weeks	1,2
Engel et al[22].	2019	Germany	healthy	11.6 ± 0.2	11.7 ± 0.3	17 (11/6)	18(11/7)	mode of motion: micro-session of Functional HIIT exercise time:>6 mins exercise frequency: week 1:3 times; week 2 to 4:4 times exercise intensity: >85% HR _{max}	mode of motion: regular school class	4 weeks	4 weeks	1
Georges et al.[51]	2010	France	healthy	10.3±9.8	10.1 ±1.2	22	19	mode of motion: interval run exercise time:18 to 39 minutes exercise frequency:3 additional PE and 2 regular mandatory PE exercise intensity:80 to 85% of MAS	mode of motion: regular mandatory PE exercise time:60 mins exercise frequency: 2/week	7 weeks	7 weeks	1,8,1
MCNARRY et al.[15]	2020	England	asthma	Asthma: 14.1±0.9 No-asthma: 14.1±0.8	Asthma :14.2±1.0 No-asthma: 13.9±0.9) Asthma group: 18 (10/8) No-asthma:17 (9/8)	Asthma group: 18 (11/7) No-asthma:16 (9/7)	mode of motion: games-based activities informed by formative work exercise time:30 mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity: >90%HR _{max}	exercise time:30 mins	6 mouths	6 mouths	1),8
Mazurek et al.[42]	2014	Poland	females	19.5±0.6		24	42	mode of motion: Mechanically-braked cycle ergometers exercise time:47 mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:60% HR _{max} mode of motion: Diet + HIIT	mode of motion: regular PE exercise time:47 mins exercise frequency: 1/week	8 weeks	8 weeks	(1,3,4,5, 6,7,8
Plavsic et al.[16]	2020	Serbia	Obesity	16.6±1.3	15.8 ± 1.5	22	22	(electronically braked cycle ergometer) exercise time:43mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:85 to 90% of HR _{max}	mode of motion: Diet	12 weeks	12 weeks	1,2,3,4, 5,6,7,8, 9,0,11
Cvetković et al.[29]	2018	Serbia.	obese males			10	11	mode of motion: PE+HIIT (interval runs) exercise frequency:2/week	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency: 2/week	12weeks	12weeks	(1,2,9,10, (1)
Leahy et al.[23]	2019	Australia	healthy	16.2±0.4	16.2±0.4	38	30	mode of motion: included a combi- nation of aerobic-based and resistance- based exercise time:12–20 min exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:>85% HR _{max}		14 weeks	14 weeks	1,8

Costigan et al.[34]	2016	UK	healthy	15.7±0.7	15.6±0.6	21	22 (11/11)	mode of motion: gross motor cardiorespiratory exercises exercise time:8-10mins exercise frequency:3/week	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency:3/week	8 weeks	8 weeks	1
Rosenkranz et al.[48]	2012	Manhattan	healthy	8.8±0.6	9.8±4.1	8	8	mode of motion: performed on an indoor track exercise time:30mins exercise frequency: sessions spaced at least 48 h exercise intensity:100–130% of MAS		8 weeks	8 weeks	1,3,4,5, 6,7,9,10
Hammami et al.[30]	2018	Tunisia	soccer players	15.9 ± 0.4	15.8 ± 0.7	10	10	mode of motion: small-sided soccer drills exercise time:35-45mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: ~ 85% HR _{max}	mode of motion: regular physical activity exercise frequency: 2/week	8 weeks	8 weeks	1,2
Winn et al.[13]	2021	UK	Asthma	Asthma: 13.7 ± 1.0 No-asthma: 13.8 ± 1.1	Asthma: 13.4±1.2 No-asthma: :13.5±1.0	221(116/105)	69(21/48)	mode of motion: game-based activities exercise frequency:3/week exercise time:30mins exercise intensity: >90% HR _{max}	mode of motion: incremental ramp test	6 mouths	6 mouths	1
Malte Nejst Larsen et al.[17]	2020	Denmark	healthy	10±0.3	10±0.3	57	115	exercise time:12 mins exercise frequency:5/week	mode of motion: PE lessons	10 mouths	10 mouths	9,0
Soori et al.[18]	2020	Iran	hyperactivity	12.55 ± 0.15	12.5 ± 0.45	26 (9/17)	17 (11/6)	mode of motion:20 meters running program exercise time:>10 mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity: 85% HR _{max}		6 weeks	6 weeks	(1)
Racil et al.[45]	2013	Tunisian	obese	15.6 ± 0.7	15.9±1.2	11	12	mode of motion: short bursts exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:100 to 110 % of MAS	non-exercising	12weeks	12 weeks	2,3,4,5, 6,7,8
Lambrick et al.[35]	2016	UK	Healthy and obese	obesity:93±0.8 normal:92±0.7	obesity:94±0.8 normal:9.2±0.8	normal:13 (8/5) obesity:15 (10/5)	normal:13 (7/6) obesity:14 (7/7)	mode of motion: equipment exercise time:40 min exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: 40% difference between GET and VO _{2max}	mode of motion: PE	8 weeks	8 weeks	(1,2,3,8, (1)
Baquet et al.[57]	2001	France	health	12.8 ± 1.2	13.5 ± 0.9	503(263/240)	48(21/27)	mode of motion: PE+ running exercises. exercise time:3 h exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:100 to 120% MAS	mode of motion: PE exercise exercise time:3 h frequency:3/week	10 weeks	10 weeks	1),2
Tjønna et al.[54]	2009	Norway	Obese	14.0 ±0.3 years		13	14	mode of motion: walking/running exercise time:.40min exercise frequency: 2/week exercise intensity:90% HR _{max}	mode of motion: exercise exercise frequency: 2/month	e 3 mouths	12 mouths	(1,2,3,8, 9,0

Zhu Kunru[19]	2020	China	Healthy girl	16.35±0.490	17.20±0.410	20 (0/20)	20 (0/20)	mode of motion: rope skipping exercise time:15-20mins exercise frequency:3/week	Regular training 15- 20mins	12 weeks	12 weeks	1)
Li kang[31]	2018	China	Healthy girl	16.34±0.91	16.63±0.90	38 (0/38)	54 (0/54)	mode of motion: sprints exercise time:4-9mins (Stepwise increase) exercise frequency:2/week	Regular PE	8 weeks	8 weeks	1),8
Mu Taiyang[24]	2019	China	Overweight and obese male judoka	17.00±0.89	17.18±0.98	11 (11/0)	11 (11/0)	mode of motion: Running and judo training exercise time:45mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:>85% HR _{max}	Regular training 45mins	12 weeks	12 weeks	1,2,3
Yang Zhongwu[25]	2019	China	teenagers	11.50±0.513	11.50±0.513	20 (10/10)	20 (10/10)	exercise time:45mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:85% to 90% HR _{max}	60% to 70% HR_{max}	8 weeks	8 weeks	1,3
Huo Kaiwen[20]	2020	China	teenagers	boy:12.70±0.48 girl:12.50±0.53	boy:12.80±0.42 girl:12.90±0.32	20	20	exercise time:50-60mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:90% to 95% HR _{max}	Regular training 50 to 60mins	8 weeks	8 weeks	1,8
Ma Qin[21]	2020	China	Obese male adolescents	13.53±0.72	13.90±0.89	15 (15/0)	15 (15/0)	mode of motion: Combination of training exercise time:40-50mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:85% HR _{max}	Regular PE	8 weeks	8 weeks	1),2
Dai Xiangdi[14]	2021	China	Healthy teenagers	About 14	About 14	49	47	mode of motion: Combination of training exercise time:20mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:65% to 85% HR _{max}	Regular PE	8 weeks	8 weeks	1
Cao et al.[49]	2012	China	Obese adolescent boys	13-15	13-15	20 (20/0)	20 (20/0) J2	mode of motion: Combination of training exercise time:50-60mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:90% to 95% HR _{max}	Daily habits	8 weeks	8 weeks	1,2,8,9, 10
Martin Smith et al.[26]	2019	Scottish	from 2 higher PE class	17±0.3	16.8±0.5	22(13/9)	30 (19/11)	mode of motion: running sprints exercise time:25-26mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:92% of HR _{max}	mode of motion: PE exercise time:1 h	4 weeks	4weeks	1,3,4,5, 6,7,8,9, 10
Ludyga et al.[27]	2019	Switzerland	healthy male adolescents	14±0.8	13.9±0.6	32	28	mode of motion: a circuit training exercise time:20 mins				1), (1)
Ruiz-Ariza et al.[28]	2019	Spain	healthy	13.79 ± 1.38	13.67 ± 1.29	90(46/44)	94(52/42)	mode of motion: Combination of training exercise time:16mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: over 85% HR _{max}	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency: 2/week	12 weeks	12 weeks	1)
Racil et al. [36]	2016	Tunis	obese adolescent females	14.2±1.2 years		17	14	mode of motion: Combined interval running exercise time:>35mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:100% MAS	mode of motion: non- exercising group	12 weeks	12 weeks	2,3,9,0, 11

Weston et al.[37]	2016	United Kingdom	Healthy and obese	14.1 ± 0.3	14.1 ± 0.3	41 (33/8)	60(30/30)	mode of motion: Many kinds of sports exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:90% HR _{max}	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency: 3/week	10 weeks	10 weeks	1,2,3,9, 10
Racil et al.[38]	2016	Tunisia	obese female adolescents	16.6 ± 0.9	16.9 ± 1.0	23	19	mode of motion: plyometric exercises exercise time: 26 to28mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:100%VO _{2 max}	no exercise	12 weeks	12 weeks	2,3,8
McNarry et al.[39]	2015	UK	health and obesity	Obesity: 9.3 ± 0.9 normal: 9.2 ± 0.8	Obesity: 9.3 ± 0.9 normal: 9.2 ± 0.8	normal:13 obesity:15	normal:16 obesity:11	mode of motion: physical activity exercise time:10 mins exercise frequency:2/week	usual care control group	6 weeks	6 weeks	1,8,1
Martin et al.[40]	2015	UK	healthy	16.9 ± 0.3	16.8 ± 0.6	20(13 / 7)	23(18/5)	mode of motion: Sprint combination training exercise time:60 mins exercise frequency:3/week	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency: 3/week	7 weeks	7 weeks	1
Peter Riis Hansen et al.[46]	2013	Porto district Portugal	t, Overweight children	8—12	8—12	20 (17/3)	11 (7/4)	mode of motion: technical football exercises and small-sided football games exercise time:1h-1.5h exercise frequency:4/week exercise intensity: > 80% HR _{max}	mode of motion: compulsory sport curriculum at school exercise frequency: 2/week exercise time:45 to 90min/time	3mouths	3mouths	1,9,10,11
Patrick Mucci et al.[47]	2013	Tanner	prepubescent children	10.3±0.7	9.8±0.6	9 (4/5)	9 (6/3)	mode of motion: running exercise time:30mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:100%-130%	usual physical activities	8 weeks	8 weeks	8
Buchan et al.[50]	2012	West of Scotland	adolescent youth	16.7±0.1	16.3±0.5	17 (15/2)	24 (20/4)	mode of motion: repetitions of maximal sprint running exercise time:54mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity: maximal sprint running	maintain normal activity patterns	7weeks	7weeks	1,2.4,5, 6,7,9,0
Breil et al.[52]	2010	Bern, Switzerland	Healthy elite junior alpine skiers	17.4±1.1	16.6±1.1	13	8	mode of motion: cycle ergometer; ski- speciWc obstacle running course containing slalom, balancing and jumping elements exercise frequency:15 times training exercise time:16mins exercise intensity:90–95% HR _{max}	continued their normal endurance and strength training	11days	11days	1,2,8,1
Ferrete et al.[44]	2014	Spain	Healthy young soccer players	9.32±0.25	8.26±0.33	11	13	mode of motion: underwent soccer training: 1/4 squat, deep jumps, CMJ with weight, and sprint exercises exercise intensity: maximal voluntary intensity using player's body weight (or body weight plus light resistances) as external resistance exercise time:30mins exercise frequency:3/week	mode of motion: underwent soccer training exercise time:30mins exercise frequency:3/week	26weeks	26weeks	2

Lau et al.[41]	2015	Hong Kong	overweight children	11.0 ± 0.6	10.6 ± 0.6	15	12	mode of motion: intermittent running; attended normal PE exercise time:72mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:120% of MAS	mode of motion: attended normal PE exercise time:35mins exercise frequency:2/week	6weeks	6weeks	(Ì), (ÌÌ)
Boer et al.[43]	2014	Belgian	adolescents an young adults with intellectual disability	d 18±3.2	17.4±2.4	17 (11/6)	14 (9/5)	mode of motion: cycling exercise time:40mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: >100%VTR	participated in usual everyday scholar activities without supervised exercise training	15 weeks	15weeks	1,2,3,4, 5,9,0
A. M. McManus et al.[55]	2005	Hong Kong	boys	10.35±0.32	10.51 ± 0.3	10	15	mode of motion: Loop pedalling exercise time:20mins exercise frequency:3time/week	normal physical activity	8weeks	8weeks	8, 1
Helgerud et al.[58]	2001	America	male	18.1±0.8	18.1±0.8	9	10	mode of motion: run + game exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: 90 to 95% of HR _{max}	Regular exercise	8weeks	8weeks	8
G. Baquet et al.[56]	2002	France	pubescent children	9.7±0.9	10.1±0.4	20(10/10)	33(13/20)	mode of motion: high intensity intermittent running exercises exercise time:30mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:100 to130% of MAS	Normal PE	7weeks	7weeks	2,8,1
Anneke van Biljon et al.[32]	2018	The Republi	c children	11.1 ± 0.8	11.1 ± 0.8	29	24	mode of motion: Sprint cycle exercise time:23mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity: > 80% HR _{max}	Normal PE	5weeks	5weeks	1,3,8,9, 10
Juliana Pizzi et al.[33]	2017	America	Obese Adolescences	12.18 ± 1.5	14.29 ± 1.8	20	34	mode of motion: running exercise time:45mins exercise frequency:3/two days		12weeks	12weeks	(1,3,4,5, 6, 7
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.[53]	2010	UK	Obese	11.78 ± 0.2	11.87 ± 0.3	8	8	mode of motion: high intensity exercise program loosely based on dance exercise time:20mins exercise frequency:4/week	Normal life	3weeks	3weeks	1,2,3,8, 9,10

138 Notes: ①BMI,②BF%,③WC,④TC,⑤TG,⑥HDL-C,⑦LDL-C,⑧VO₂,⑨SBP,⑩DBP, ①HR_{max}



Fig. 2 Analysis of the risk of bias according to the Cochrane Collaboration Guideline

		Ta	ble 2 Three-	line table of E	gger's Publish	ing Bias			
Outcomes	Number of studies	Root MSE	Std. Eff.	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	p> t	[95% Cont	f. Interval]
BMI	36	1.524	slope	.2195473	.2006643	1.09	0.282	1882517	.6273462
			bias	-1.013953	.7345551	-1.38	0.176	-2.506749	.4788423
BF%	20	1.605	slope	6003318	.3335849	1.80	0.089	100504	1.301168
			bias	-2.485502	1.056721	-2.35	0.030	-4.70559	2654136
WC	16	1.673	slope	.7849622	.5614075	1.40	0.184	4191371	1.9890611
			bias	-3.023636	1.763666	-1.71	0.108	-6.806323	.7590503
VO _{2max}	19	1.644	slope	3187151	.4612036	-0.69	0.499	-1.29177	.6543394
			bias	2.870097	1.416205	2.03	0.059	1178346	5.858029
SBP	14	1.446	slope	.078006	.3490282	0.22	0.827	6824612	.8384732
			bias	-1.319617	1.166486	-1.13	0.280	-3.861171	1.221937
DBP	14	1.8	slope	.0417849	.4332558	0.10	0.925	9021983	.9857682
			bias	3722117	1.448374	-0.26	0.802	-3.527947	2.783524
HR _{max}	13	2.569	slope	-1.718386	1.203516	-1.43	0.181	-4.367307	.9305347
			bias	5.734588	3.564588	1.61	0.136	-2.111017	13.58019

143 Subgroup analysis

144	Substantial sources of heterogeneity can be explored through subgroup analyses. Due to
145	differences in the age, participants, intervention time, and exercise frequency of HIIT intervention in
146	children and adolescents included in the study, HIIT's assessment of body morphology, CRF and
147	cardiovascular disease metabolic risk indicators may be affected. Therefore, subgroup analyses have
148	performed that were based on the age (5~15 years old, \geq 15 years old), participants (health, obesity,
149	Else whose participants are not specified, not limited to healthy, obese people, etc.), intervention time
150	(≤ 10 weeks, >10 weeks) and exercise frequency (≥ 3 times/week, <3 times/week), it was shown in
151	Table 4.
152	Meta-analysis results
153	Indicators of body morphology
154	In 42 studies, HIIT (n=1638) did not improve body morphology compared to the control group
155	(n=1080).
156	In 37 studies, the HIIT group (n=1518) had no significant effect on BMI [MD=-0.30, 95% CI (-
157	0.72,0.13), p=0.17] compared with the control group (n=954). In 20 studies, the HIIT group (n=829)
158	had no significant effect on BF% [MD=-0.79,95% CI (-1.64,0.06), p=0.07] compared with the control
159	group (n=394). In 16 studies, the HIIT group (n=314) had no significant effect on WC [MD=-1.24, 95%
160	CI (-2.78,0.30) compared with the control group (n=359) (Fig. 3).
161	CRF Indicators
162	In 32 studies, HIIT (n=702) effectively improved CRF indices compared with control groups
163	(n=791), but clinical heterogeneity was high, so a subgroup analysis of CRF indexes was conducted

164 (Fig. 4).

			The Number	Decled estimate			Test for subgroup
Outcomes	Subgroup		of studies	[SMD/MD (95 %CI)]	p value	I ² (%)	differences
BF(%)	Participants	Health	4	1.23(-0.96,3.42)	p=0.270	42.0%	
		Obesity	11	-1.59(-2.59, -0.58)	p=0.002	77.0%	
		Else	5	0.12(-1.11,1.35)	p=0.850	0.0%	p=0.020
WC(cm)	Participants	Health	2	0.57(-3.54,4.67)	p=0.790	0.0%	
		Obesity	8	-2.06(-3.26, -0.86)	p<0.001	0.0%	p=0.350
		Else	6	-0.36(-3.82,3.09)	p=0.840	83.0%	
VO_{2max}	Age	5<<15	10	3.99(2.76,5.22)	p<0.001	44.0%	n = 0.120
		≥15	9	1.76(0.75,2.76)	p=0.090	91.0%	p=0.130
	Participants	Health	5	3.49(1.57,5.41)	p<0.001	42.0%	
		Obesity	6	2.12(0.05,4.18)	p=0.040	92.0%	p<0.001
		Else	8	3.31(1.93,4.69)	p<0.001	0.0%	
	Intervention Time	≤10 weeks	14	3.59(2.38,4.81)	p<0.001	44.0%	p=0.130
		>10 weeks	5	1.77(-0.26,3.79)	p=0.090	91.0%	
	Exercise Frequency	<3 times/week	9	3.09(1.80,4.38)	p<0.001	65.0%	p=0.750
		\geq 3 times/week	10	2.76(1.21,4.31)	p<0.001	67.0%	
SBP	Age	5<<15	10	-2.00(-4.22,0.21)	p=0.008	69.0%	p=0.100
		≥15	4	-4.99(-7.83, -2.15)	p<0.001	0.0%	p=0.100
	Participants	Health	3	-2.84(-5.16, -0.52)	p=0.020	23.0%	
		Obesity	7	-3.20(-6.47,0.07)	p=0.006	73.0%	p=0.910
		Else	4	-1.89(-6.70, 2.92)	p=0.440	69.0%	
	Intervention Time	≤ 10 weeks	7	-2.11(-5.01,0.79)	p=0.150	60.0%	p=0.530
		>10 weeks	7	-3.43(-6.30,0.56)	p=0.020	72.0%	

	Exercise Frequency	<3 times/week	5	-3.48(-7.42,0.46)	p=0.080	75.0%	p=0.067
		\geq 3 times/week	9	-2.48(-4.78, -0.19)	p=0.030	55.0%	
DBP	Age	5< <15	10	-1.59(-3.93,0.74)	p=0.180	74.0%	0.070
		≥15	4	-4.99(-7.83, -2.15)	p<0.001	0.0%	p=0.070
	Participants	Health	3	-2.84(-5.16,0.52)	p=0.020	23.0%	
		Obesity	7	-2.52(-5.92,0.89)	p=0.150	79.0%	p=0.940
		Else	4	-1.89(-6.70,2.92)	p=0.440	69.0%	
	Intervention Time	≤ 10 weeks	7	-1.44(-4.77,1.90)	p=0.400	73.0%	p=0.37
		>10 weeks	7	-3.43(-6.3, -0.56)	p=0.020	72.0%	
	Exercise Frequency	<3 times/week	5	-3.48(-7.42,0.46)	p=0.080	75.0%	p=0.54
		\geq 3 times/week	9	-2.00(-4.63,0.44)	p=0.140	69.0%	
HR_{max}	Age	5< <15	10	7.27(2.12,12.41)	p=0.006	97.0%	0 008
		≥15	2	-2.82(-8.21,2.57)	p=0.300	0.0%	p=0.008
	Participants	Health	2	45.39(-39.87,130.65)	p=0.300	100.0%	
		Obesity	4	-0.01(-2.47,2.46)	p=1.000	41.0%	p=0.570
		Else	6	0.22(-1.50,1.06)	p=0.740	13.0%	
	Intervention Time	≤ 10 weeks	8	0.09(-1.16,1.34)	p=0.890	14.0%	p=0.650
		>10 weeks	3	-0.48(-2.67,1.70)	p=0.660	35.0%	_
	Exercise Frequency	<3 times/week	5	-1.85(-3.86,0.16)	p=0.070	0.0%	p=0.030
		\geq 3 times/week	6	0.45(-0.02,0.92)	p=0.060	3.0%	

Study or Subgroup	Expe	eriment SD	al C Total Mean	ontrol SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
BMI		17724		2.2	20			
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018) Baquet et al.(2001)	19.2	4.5	29 20.5	3.9	24 48	1.5%	-1.30 [-3.56, 0.96] 0.25 [-0.75, 1.26]	Ţ
Boer et al.(2014)	27.7	4.7	17 26.9	2.9	14	1.2%	0.80 [-1.90, 3.50]	+
Breil et al.(2010)	21.8	2.2	13 22.8	2.6	8	1.5%	-1.00 [-3.16, 1.16]	1
Buchan et al.(2011) Cap et al.(2012)	21.31	2.1	17 22.31	2.5	24	2.1%	-1.00 [-2.41, 0.41]	1
Costigan et al.(2016)	21.72	2.34	20 23.11	3.53	20	1.8%	-0.57 [-2.30, 1.16]	-
Cvetković et al.(2018)	26.35	3.33	10 26.16	4.49	11	0.9%	0.19 [-3.17, 3.55]	
Engel et al.(2019)	16.5	2	17 18.5	4.1	18	1.6%	-2.00 [-4.12, 0.12]	7
Hammami et al.(2018)	20	2.0	10 20.3	3.5	10	2.1%	-0.30 [-2.51, 1.51]	4
Huo Kaiwen(2020)	19.23	2.8	20 19.15	3.82	20	1.6%	0.08 [-2.00, 2.16]	+
Juliana Pizzi et al.(2017)	28.35	4.3	20 29.6	4.31	34	1.4%	-1.25 [-3.63, 1.13]	1
Lambrick et al. (2016) Lau et al. (2015)	20.49	4.52	15 25.2	4.22	12	1.4%	-1.30 [-3.51, 0.91]	-
Leahy et al. (2019)	21.7	3.1	38 22.8	2.8	30	2.1%	-1.10 [-2.51, 0.31]	-
Li kang(2018)	20.89	3.02	38 21.21	3.19	54	2.2%	-0.32 [-1.60, 0.96]	1
Ludyga et al.(2019) Lynne Mary Boddy et al.(2010)	21.3	3.8	32 21.4	4.8	28	1.5%	-0.10 [-2.31, 2.11]	-
Ma Qin(2020)	26.96	0.83	15 27.16	0.67	15	2.7%	-0.20 [-0.74, 0.34]	
Martin et al.(2015)	21.6	2.5	26 22.5	3	23	2.0%	-0.90 [-2.46, 0.66]	1
Martin Smith et al. (2019) Mazurek et al. (2014)	22.5	2.5	22 21.8	2.1	30	2.2%	0.70 [-0.59, 1.99]	Ţ
McNarry et al.(2015)	20.49	4.52	28 19.46	4.02	27	1.5%	1.03 [-1.23, 3.29]	÷
MCNARRY et al. (2020)	21.51	3.51	35 20.06	4.24	34	1.8%	1.45 [-0.39, 3.29]	t
Mu Taiyang(2019) Peter Rijs Hancon et al (2012)	27.4	2.91	11 28.1	3.63	11	1.2%	-0.70 [-3.45, 2.05]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	30.9	2.0 3.3	20 27.0	3.3 4	22	1.470	-1.30 [-3.47, 0.87]	-
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	18.1	4.3	8 18.3	2.3	8	0.9%	-0.20 [-3.58, 3.18]	+
Ruiz-Ariza et al.(2019) Tigene et al.(2000)	21.92	4.11	90 20.76	2.97	94	2.3%	1.16 [0.12, 2.20]	
Valérie et al.(2009)	34.1	0.5 4.4	13 32.9	0.5 5	14 11	2.7%	-0.80 [-4.36, 2.76]	+
Weston et al.(2016)	21.8	4.5	41 20.5	2.7	60	2.0%	1.30 [-0.24, 2.84]	+
Winn et al.(2021)	21	3.9	221 21.08	4	69	2.3%	-0.08 [-1.15, 0.99]	
Yang Zhongwu(2019) Zhu Kunru(2020)	20.25	1.82	20 20.37	2.11	20	2.2%	-2.63 [-3.85, -1.41]	1
Subtotal (95% CI)	20.20	1.72	1513		942	63.6%	-0.30 [-0.72, 0.13]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.88; Chi ²	= 105.24	, df = 35	5 (P < 0.00001)	; I ^z = 67	%			
Testion overall ellect. Z = 1.57 (i	= 0.17)							
BF% Paguat at al (2001)	22.00	0.0	502 40 72	7.00	40	1 500	2 2 2 14 4 6 5 5 0	_
Boer et al (2014)	30.4	9.0	17 32	7.09	40	0.5%	-1.60 [-6.55, 3.35]	-
Breil et al.(2010)	12	7.9	13 11.6	6.4	8	0.4%	0.40 [-5.77, 6.57]	
Buchan et al.(2011)	19.2	5.8	17 16.62	7.2	24	0.7%	2.58 [-1.41, 6.57]	
Caolet al.(2012) Cvetković et al.(2018)	26.41	4.82	20 32.58	5.55	20	1.0%	-6.17 [-9.39, -2.95] 1.55 [-4.69, 7.79]	
Ferrete et al.(2014)	12.8	3.1	11 12.2	3.9	13	1.2%	0.60 [-2.20, 3.40]	
G. Baquet et al. (2002)	22.2	8.8	20 21.4	7.4	33	0.6%	0.80 [-3.81, 5.41]	Ť
Hammami et al.(2018) L'ambrick et al.(2016)	14.8	10.73	10 14.9	1.8	10	2.0%	-0.10[-1.55, 1.35] -0.17[-5.34, 5.00]	4
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.(2010)	40.56	8.18	8 35.45	8.7	8	0.2%	5.11 [-3.16, 13.38]	+
Ma Qin(2020)	29.65	2.3	15 30.3	2.31	15	1.9%	-0.65 [-2.30, 1.00]	- 2 1
Mu Taiyang(2019) Playsic et al (2020)	20.2	2.69	11 21.19 22 44	5.37	11	0.9%	-0.99 [-4.54, 2.56] -2 20 [-5 23 0 83]	-
Racil et al.(2013)	34.3	1.7	11 35.4	1.2	12	2.2%	-1.10 [-2.31, 0.11]	-
Racil et al.(2016)	36.4	1.5	17 39.3	0.7	14	2.5%	-2.90 [-3.70, -2.10]	
Racil et al.(2016)(2) Tignna et al.(2009)	36.5 38.6	1.3 07	23 37	1.9 0.6	19 14	2.4%	-0.50 [-1.51, 0.51] -0.50 [-0.99 -0.01]	1
Valérie et al.(2003)	33.8	3.6	19 37.7	3.6	11	1.2%	-3.90 [-6.57, -1.23]	-
Weston et al.(2016)	18.3	11.1	41 19.6	7.8	60	0.8%	-1.30 [-5.23, 2.63]	+
Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.77: Chi ²	= 66.26	df = 19	829 (P < 0.00001)	² = 719	394 6	24.6%	-0.79 [-1.64, 0.06]	
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.83 (F	P = 0.07)							
wc								
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018)	61.7	5.6	29 65.8	7.2	24	0.9%	-4.10 [-7.63, -0.57]	
Boer et al.(2014)	91.5	13.1	17 95.9	8.2	14	0.3%	-4.40 [-11.96, 3.16]	1
Junana Pizzi et al.(2017) Lambrick et al.(2016)	94.46 69.55	12.6	20 95.62	12.49	34 27	0.3%	-1.16 [-7.96, 5.64] 5.51 [0.08: 10.94]	
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.(2010)	77.3	6.9	8 71.6	7.7	8	0.3%	5.70 [-1.46, 12.86]	
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	72.5	9.8	22 71.3	6.1	30	0.6%	1.20 [-3.44, 5.84]	- 1
mazurek et al.(2014) Mu Taivang(2019)	63.2 91.63	4.5 7.09	24 64.4 11 93.86	4.1	42	1.5%	-1.20 [-3.39, 0.99] -2.23 [-9.69, 5.23]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	91.5	7.8	22 96.9	11.4	22	0.4%	-5.40 [-11.17, 0.37]	
Racil et al.(2013)	90.3	6.7	11 92.8	3.7	12	0.6%	-2.50 [-6.98, 1.98]	
Racil et al.(2016) Racil et al.(2016)(2)	91 an	6 8	17 94 23 02	4	14 10	0.9%	-3.00 [-6.54, 0.54]	7
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	60.6	11.3	8 62.3	5.7	8	0.2%	-1.70 [-10.47, 7.07]	
Tjønna et al.(2009)	98.1	2.2	13 100.1	2.3	14	1.9%	-2.00 [-3.70, -0.30]	-
Weston et al. (2016)	77.4	13.7	41 70	8.8	60	0.6%	7.40 [2.65, 12.15]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	00.00	2.09	314	3.78	359	11.8%	-1.24 [-2.78, 0.30]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 4.76; Chi ²	= 36.58,	df = 15	(P = 0.001); I ² =	59%			5.76 S. 197	
i est for overall effect: Z = 1.58 (F	r = 0.11)							
								-100 -50 0 50 100
								Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

167 168

Fig. 3 Forest plot of body morphology indicators

Study or Subgroup	Expe Mean	rimental <u>SD</u> T	otal	Mean	ontrol SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
VO _{2max}						6484	10 10/10/10/10		
A. M. McManus et al.(2005)	50.7	3.7	10	45.4	б.4	15	1.8%	5.30 [1.33, 9.27]	
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018)	20.5	7.2	29	15.9	7.9	24	1.8%	4.60 [0.49, 8.71]	-
Capital (2010)	33.82	2.46	13	27.76	3.68	8 20	7.2%	6.06 (4.1.2, 8.00)	-
G. Baguet et al.(2002)	47.5	7.2	20	45.3	7.2	33	1.8%	2.20 [-1.80, 6.20]	+ -
Georges et al.(2010)	54.1	3.4	22	47.9	6.7	19	2.0%	6.20 [2.87, 9.53]	775.
Helgerud et al.(2001)	64.3	3.9	9	59.5	4.4	10	1.9%	4.80 [1.07, 8.53]	-
Huo Kaiwen(2020)	48.57	3.49	20	46.09	5.67	20	2.1%	2.48 [-0.44, 5.40]	-
Lambrick et al. (2016)	54.26	9.6	28	54.31	7.78	27	1.7%	-0.05 [-4.66, 4.56]	T_
Leany et al. (2019)	22.16	9.0	38	20.1	10.5	30	1.0%	3.00 [-1.84, 7.84]	~
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.(2010)	42.59	7.51	8	45.71	7.09	8	1.2%	-3.12 [-10.28, 4.04]	
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	51.81	7.37	22	46.77	5.68	30	1.9%	5.04 [1.35, 8.73]	-
Mazurek et al.(2014)	41.7	7.1	24	38.3	7.1	42	1.9%	3.40 [-0.16, 6.96]	-
Patrick Mucci et al.(2013)	85.7	6.3	9	82.1	6.7	9	1.4%	3.60 [-2.41, 9.61]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	23.9	3.7	22	23.3	4.8	22	2.1%	0.60 [-1.93, 3.13]	Ť
Racil et al. (2013)	39.7	1.8	11	38.6	1.4	12	2.3%	1.10 [-0.23, 2.43]	ſ
Tignna et al (2009)	39.2	11	13	38.8	1.5	19	2.4%	0.40 [-0.39, 1.19] A 10 [3 31 A 90]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)	- 50	1010	379	01.0		416	36.3%	2.91 [1.80, 4.02]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.40; Chi ²	= 77.53, d	f=18 (P <	0.00	001); l² =	77%				
iest for overall effect: Z = 5.14 (P	< 0.0000'	9							
SBP									
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018)	107.7	9.8	29	111.6	7.4	24	1.7%	-3.90 [-8.54, 0.74]	
Boer et al.(2014)	113	8	17	119	10	14	1.3%	-6.00 [-12.47, 0.47]	
Buchan et al.(2011)	106	11	17	109	11	24	1.2%	-3.00 [-9.83, 3.83]	
Caolet al.(2012) Ovetković et al.(2019)	112.18	0.42	20	117.16	0.42	20	1.8%	-4.98 [-8.96, -1.00]	
Verkovic et al. (2016)	110.0	14.10 4.1	10	124.00	17.56	8	0.7% [] Q %	310 [-19.47, 2.77]	
Malte Neist Larsen et al. (2020)	103.4	8.6	57	105.9	9.7	115	2.1%	-2.50 [-5.35, 0.35]	
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	118	8	22	125	13	30	1.5%	-7.00 [-12.73, -1.27]	
Peter Riis Hansen et al.(2013)	112	9	20	122	10	11	1.2%	-10.00 [-17.10, -2.90]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	110.3	8.5	22	114.4	6.8	22	1.7%	-4.10 [-8.65, 0.45]	
Racil et al.(2016)	115	5	17	118	5	14	1.9%	-3.00 [-6.54, 0.54]	-
Rosenkranz et al. (2012)	103.8	2.5	8	105.5	3.7	8	2.0%	-1.70 [-4.79, 1.39]	1
Meeton et al. (2009)	120.9	11	13	119.8	2.1	14	2.3%	1.10[-0.45, 2.65]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)	122		301			375	22.1%	-2.73 [-4.67, -0.79]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 7.45; Chi ² : Tect for everall effect: 7 = 2.76 (P	= 37.23, d	f= 13 (P =	0.00	04); I ² = I	65%				
restion overall ellect. Z = 2.70 (F	- 0.000)								
DBP									
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018)	107.7	9.8	29	111.6	7.4	24	1.7%	-3.90 [-8.54, 0.74]	
Boer et al.(2014)	113	8	17	119	10	14	1.3%	-6.00 [-12.47, 0.47]	
Buchan et al. (2011)	106	11	17	109	11	24	1.2%	-3.00 [-9.83, 3.83]	
Caolet al. (2012) Cvotković ot al. (2019)	112.18	0.42	20	117.10	0.42	20	1.8%	-4.98 [-8.96, -1.00]	
Lynne Mary Boddy et al (2010)	64.6	4.15	8	58.8	5.3	8	1.6%	5 80 10 80 10 80	
Malte Nejst Larsen et al.(2020)	103.4	8.6	57	105.9	9.7	115	2.1%	-2.50 [-5.35, 0.35]	-
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	118	8	22	125	13	30	1.5%	-7.00 [-12.73, -1.27]	
Peter Riis Hansen et al.(2013)	112	9	20	122	10	11	1.2%	-10.00 [-17.10, -2.90]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	110.3	8.5	22	114.4	6.8	22	1.7%	-4.10 [-8.65, 0.45]	
Racillet al. (2016)	115	5	17	118	5	14	1.9%	-3.00 [-6.54, 0.54]	<u> </u>
rtusenkranz et al.(2012) Tignna et al.(2009)	103.8	2.5	12	105.5	3.1	14	∠.U% 2.2%	-1.70[-4.79, 1.39] 1.10[-0.46-2.661	ļ
Weston et al (2009)	120.9	11	41	119.6	2.1	60	2.370	4 00 [-0.45, 2.65]	<u> </u>
Subtotal (95% CI)	122		301	110	10	375	22.8%	-2.42 [-4.45, -0.38]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; Chi ²	= 43.85, d	f=13 (P <	0.00	01); I² = 1	70%				
rest for overall effect: Z = 2.33 (P	= 0.02)								
HRmax	10000	30	96.57	2002200	5824	1754555	(5)[24:57]		
A. M. McManus et al.(2005)	193	6	10	195	7	15	1.6%	-2.00 [-7.14, 3.14]	
Breil et al.(2010) Custković et al.(2010)	192	7	13	196	7	8	1.4%	-4.00 [-10.17, 2.17]	
G Benuet et al. (2018)	198.3	2.9	10	200.72	3.89	11	2.1%	-2.42 [-5.34, 0.50]	
Georges et al (2002)	201	6	20	204	7	33 19	1.0%	2 00 [-2 02 6 02]	
Lambrick et al. (2016)	202.54	11.12	28	200	11.43	27	1.4%	0.54 [-5.42, 6.50]	+
Lau et al.(2015)	205.9	11.6	15	200.5	12.2	28	1.1%	5.40 [-2.01, 12.81]	+
Ludyga et al.(2019)	190.6	17.6	32	101.6	17.3	22	0.9%	89.00 [79.54, 98.46]	
McNarry et al.(2015)	202.46	11.13	28	202.41	11.62	27	1.4%	0.05 [-5.97, 6.07]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	183	9	22	182	25	22	0.7%	1.00 [-10.10, 12.10]	
Racil et al. (2016)	202.8	2.1	17	202.3	2.2	14	2.3%	0.50 [-1.02, 2.02]	Ι
Subtotal (95% CP	207.95	0.7	26	207.5	0.9	2/3	18 9%	0.45 [-0.06, 0.96]	▲
Heterogeneity: Tau? = 59 56: Chi	² = 348 55	df = 11 (2 π J P < Ω	00001)	² = 97%	243	10.070	5.51 [1.24, 10.30]	▼
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.48 (P	= 0.01)				0170				
									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Fig. 4 Forest plot of CRF indicators



1	7	1
1	7	2

173	In 19 studies, HIIT group (n=379) effectively increased VO _{2max} [MD=2.91, 95% CI (1.80, 4.02),
174	p<0.001] compared with the control group (n=416) but with higher heterogeneity (I^2 =77%, p<0.001.
175	The results of the subgroup analysis showed that HIIT was more effective in aged 5~15 years (HIIT:
176	n=179, control group: n=189), healthy children and adolescents (HIIT: n=133, control group: n=141),
177	intervention time ≤ 10 weeks (HIIT: n=244, control group: n=292) and exercise frequency <3 times/week
178	(HIIT: n=179, control group: n=209)
179	In 14 studies, HIIT group (n=301) effectively reduced SBP [MD=-2.73, 95% CI (-4.67, -0.79),

180 p=0.006] compared with the control group (n=375) but with higher heterogeneity ($I^2=65\%$, p<0.001).

The results of the subgroup analysis showed that HIIT was more effective in aged 5~15 years (HIIT: n=
223, control group: n=285), else children and adolescents (HIIT: n=104, control group: n=122),
intervention time ≤10 weeks (HIIT: n=145, control group: n=174) and exercise frequency ≥3times/week
(HIIT: n= 219, control group: n=294).
In 14 studies, HIIT group (n=301) effectively reduced DBP [MD=-2.42, 95% CI (-4.45, -0.38),

p=0.02] compared with control group (n=375) but with higher heterogeneity (I^2 =70%, p<0.001). The results of the subgroup analysis showed that HIIT was more effective in aged 5~15 years (HIIT: n= 223, control group: n=285), else children and adolescents (HIIT: n=104, control group: n=122), intervention

time ≤ 10 weeks (HIIT: n=145, control group: n=174) and exercise frequency ≥ 3 times/week (HIIT:

190 **n=219**, control group: **n=294**).

In 12 studies, HIIT group (n=243) and the control group (n=233) had an effective increase in HR_{max}

192 [MD=5.91, 95% CI (1.24, 10.58), p=0.01] compared with HIIT [MD=5.91, p=0.001] but with higher

heterogeneity ($I^2=97\%$, p<0.001). The results of subgroup analysis showed that HIIT was more

194 effective in aged 5~15 years children (HIIT: n=208, control group: n=101), healthy children and

adolescents (HIIT: n=95, control group: n=82), intervention time >10 weeks (HIIT: n=49, control

196 group: n=47) and exercise frequency <3 times/week (HIIT: n=108, control group: n=120).

197 Cardiovascular metabolic indicators

In 8 studies, compared with the control group (n=141), the HIIT group (n=186) significantly improved the metabolic risk index of cardiovascular disease, but some of the indicators were not statistically significant (Fig. 5).

In 8 studies, HIIT (n=141) effectively reduced TC compared with control group (n=186) [MD=-0.27, 95%CI (-0.38, -0.17), p<0.001] with no significant heterogeneity (I²=14%, p=0.32). In 7 studies,

compared with the control group (n=172), HIIT (n=124) effectively increased HDL-C [MD=0.07, 95% CI (0.02, 0.12), p=0.003] without significant heterogeneity (I^2 =0%, p=0.93). In 8 studies, the effect of HIIT on TG was not statistically significant between HIIT (n=141) and control group (n=186) [MD=-0.00, 95% CI (-0.15, 0.14), p=0.95]. In 7 studies, the effect of HIIT on LDL-C was not statistically significant between HIIT (n=124) and control group (n=172) [MD=-0.17, 95% CI (-0.34, 0.00), p=0.05].

208 **DISCUSSION**

209 More and more studies have revealed that physical activity can significantly improve the physical 210 health of children and adolescents[1]. Nevertheless, the global survey data shows that most children and adolescents do not meet the standards of physical activity guidelines, which seriously affects their 211 212 current and future health[1]. To improve the level of physical activity of children and adolescents and 213 achieve the goal of reducing the incidence of physical inactivity in children and adolescents by 15% in 2142030[5], WHO issued the updated "2020 WHO Guidelines on Physical Activity and Sedentary 215 Behavior" in 2020, which recommended that children and adolescents should engage in an average of 216 not less than 60 minutes of moderate-to vigorous-intensity physical activity per day. Because children 217 and adolescents are concentrated on campus most of the time, considering that physical activity is 218 limited by time, HIIT is a good choice for its sports characteristics.

This study is the first to systematically evaluate the safety and efficacy of HIIT in terms of body shape, CRF, and cardiovascular disease metabolic risk indicators for children and adolescents of all ages (including health, obesity and disease) by synthesizing 47 eligible randomized controlled trials. With strict inclusion and exclusion criteria (age, exercise intensity, exercise frequency and exercise time), 47 studies were assessed. Available evidence shows that HIIT can significantly improve most indicators of children and adolescents' health: improved CRF indexes (VO_{2max}, SBP, DBP and HR_{max}) and

cardiovascular disease metabolic risk indicators (TG and HDL-C). In addition, there is insufficient evidence that HIIT improves body shape indicators (BMI, BF% and WC) and some cardiometabolic measures (TG, LDL-C) in children and adolescents.

228 Statistical heterogeneity consisted in most outcome measures due to multiple factors. First, our 229 meta-analysis includes children and adolescents, who span a wide age range. Since this stage is prepubertal and adolescence, the developmental speed is related to age. Previous studies have shown that 230 231 prepubertal children may obtain greater benefits in HIIT[7], and different developmental stages may 232 affect the assessment of HIIT in body shape indicators. Secondly, the participants included in the study have healthy, overweight, obese, and partially diseases, together with children and adolescents with 233 234 sports training experience, which led to differences in participants at baseline level and affected the 235 assessment of HIIT outcomes. Third, the study intervention time ranges from 1.57 weeks to 40 weeks, and it is generally believed that a longer exercise intervention time is more likely to obtain greater 236 237benefits. Finally, the exercise frequency of participants is an essential part of exercise prescription or 238 exercise program, and the exercise frequency of the included studies varied from 2 to 5 times/week, 239 which may affect the evaluation of HIIT outcomes.

In addition, this study also determined the HIIT dose-response relationship: with interval running as the primary form of exercise, the exercise intensity is $\geq 80\%VO_{2max}/\geq 100\%MAS/\geq 80\%HR_{max}$. For healthy children and adolescents aged 5~15 years old, the health benefit is the greatest when the intervention time is ≤ 10 weeks and the exercise frequency is 2~5 times/week, while children and adolescents aged ≥ 15 years cannot recommend exercise doses due to the limited number of included studies.

245 Effect of HIIT on body shape of children and adolescents



Fig. 6 Participants subgroup analysis of BF% max in children and adolescents in the HIIT group and the control group

246

249

	Expe	erimer	Ital	0	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Else									
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018)	61.7	5.6	29	65.8	7.2	24	7.7%	-4.10 [-7.63, -0.57]	+
Boer et al.(2014)	91.5	13.1	17	95.9	8.2	14	3.1%	-4.40 [-11.96, 3.16]	
Lambrick et al.(2016)	69.55	7.3	28	64.04	12.49	27	5.0%	5.51 [0.08, 10.94]	
Mazurek et al.(2014)	63.2	4.5	24	64.4	4.1	42	10.3%	-1.20 [-3.39, 0.99]	-
Weston et al.(2016)	77.4	13.7	41	70	8.8	60	5.8%	7.40 [2.65, 12.15]	+
Yang Zhongwu(2019)	68.05	2.89	20	72.2	3.79	20	10.5%	-4.15 [-6.24, -2.06]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			159			187	42.4%	-0.36 [-3.82, 3.09]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 13.92; Ch	ni ² = 28.6	2, df =	5 (P <	0.0001)	I ² = 83	%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (I	P = 0.84)								
Health									
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	72.5	9.8	22	71.3	6.1	30	6.0%	1.20 [-3.44, 5.84]	+
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	60.6	11.3	8	62.3	5.7	8	2.5%	-1.70 [-10.47, 7.07]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			30			38	8.5%	0.57 [-3.54, 4.67]	♦
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ²	= 0.33.	df = 1 (P = 0.5	7); 2 = (0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P = 0.79)								
Obesity									
Juliana Pizzi et al.(2017)	94.46	12.6	20	95.62	11.81	34	3.7%	-1.16 [-7.96, 5.64]	
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.(2010)	77.3	6.9	8	71.6	7.7	8	3.4%	5.70 [-1.46, 12.86]	
Mu Taiyang(2019)	91.63	7.09	11	93.86	10.44	11	3.2%	-2.23 [-9.69, 5.23]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	91.5	7.8	22	96.9	11.4	22	4.6%	-5.40 [-11.17, 0.37]	
Racil et al.(2013)	90.3	6.7	11	92.8	3.7	12	6.2%	-2.50 [-6.98, 1.98]	-+
Racil et al.(2016)	91	6	17	94	4	14	7.7%	-3.00 [-6.54, 0.54]	-
Racil et al.(2016)(2)	90	6	23	92	3	19	9.1%	-2.00 [-4.80, 0.80]	-
Tjønna et al.(2009)	98.1	2.2	13	100.1	2.3	14	11.2%	-2.00 [-3.70, -0.30]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			125			134	49.1%	-2.06 [-3.26, -0.86]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ²	= 6.18,	df = 7 (P = 0.5	2); I ² = (0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.37 (P = 0.000	(8)							
Total (95% CI)			314			359	100.0%	-1.24 [-2.78, 0.30]	+
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 4.76; Chi ²	= 36.58	. df = 1	5 (P =	0.001): I	² = 59%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.58 (P = 0.11)								-100 -50 0 50 100
Test for subgroup differences: ($hi^{2} = 21$	0 df =	2 (P =	0.36) 13	- 4 6%				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Fig. 7 Participants subgroup analysis of WC max in children and adolescents in the HIIT group and the control group

252 Previous studies have shown that HIIT can effectively improve the body shape indicator of children

253 and adolescents. There is now insufficient evidence that HIIT improves body shape BMI, BF%, and WC indicators in children and adolescents. The findings are consistent with previous studies [7, 8], but there 254255are diametrically opposite conclusions[9]. Although this study showed that HIIT had no significant 256 effect on the body shape indicators of children and adolescents, it may have a greater impact on the reliability of the results due to the large range of subjects included in the study. Further analysis found 257that HIIT had a significant effect on obese children and adolescents with BF% [MD=-1.59, 95% CI (-258259 2.59, -0.58), p=0.002] (Fig. 6) and WC [MD=-2.06, 95% CI (-3.26, -0.86]), p<0.001] (Fig. 7), the effect 260 of the study results was positive, and it had no significant effect on BMI [MD=-0.91, 95% CI (-1.91, 0.09), p=0.08]. Metabolic disorders caused by overweight/obesity are the pathological basis of various 261 metabolic diseases such as T₂DM and CVD. Adverse metabolic phenotypes are highly associated with 262 263 obesity in children and adolescents. Unfortunately, more than 50% of children and adolescents will carry obesity into adulthood, and the proportion increases with age[3]. In addition, children and adolescents 264265with increased BMI will increase the risk of T₂DM, stroke, coronary heart disease and cancer. As well as prospective cohort studies have shown that BF% and WC, the two body shape indicators, dropped to 266 267 the normal range significantly reducing the prevalence of obesity-related diseases[59]. Therefore, a 268 healthy body shape in children and adolescents is crucial.

At present, the key to the childhood obesity epidemic is inflammation and metabolic disorders. Anti-inflammatory and antioxidant interventions help regulate inflammation and metabolic disorders caused by obesity. Significant progress has been made in the prevention and treatment of obesity, but obesity-related diseases still cannot be effectively controlled. It is worth noting that majority of childhood and adolescent obesity is caused by insufficient physical activity. The prevalence of obesity in the physically inactive population has increased and there is still a potential risk in physically inactive

275	non-obese individuals. However, it is gratifying that regular exercise can independently reduce the risks
276	of obesity due to metabolic disorders, such as T ₂ DM, CVD, and cancer, and can play a critical role in
277	related diseases[4]. Particularly early exercise interventions are more effective in children and
278	adolescents. Recent research has shown that running-based HIIT can improve the physical health of
279	obese teenagers, and it is suggested to conduct a larger-scale survey of participants from different
280	schools[10].

What's more, we found a subset of athletes in healthy children and adolescents[30, 44, 52]. The research subjects were other children and adolescents with partial intellectual disability[43] and nonuniform subjects (the included participants were overweight, obese and healthy children and adolescents, and the data could not be classified and extracted)[35, 37]. There may be certain data risks due to the inconsistency of the population classification of the study subjects.

The sensitivity analysis of this meta-analysis results in high stability, and we can conclude that although HIIT does not improve body shape indicators in children and adolescents, its recommendation for obese children and adolescents should be retained.

289 Effect of HIIT on CRF in children and adolescents

290 CRF has become one of the most extensive components of physical health research because of its strong 291 correlation with health outcomes. Strong epidemiological evidence suggests that CRF is inversely associated 292 with a high incidence of CVD, all-cause mortality and cancer in the healthy population. CRF can be used as 293 a predictor of cancer mortality, and higher levels of CRF can independently reduce cancer mortality in women 294 and men[60]. This study confirmed that HIIT is an effective method to improve CRF indicators in children 295 and adolescents, and the findings are consistent with those of most meta-analysis studies. Because of the 296 differences in whether research subjects are obese or not, there is still controversy about HIIT replacing MICT[9], still, it has gradually been widely accepted because HIIT is more cost-effective. Although the relationship between physical activity and the incidence and mortality of CVD, T_2DM and cancer, etc. and its preventive effect have been demonstrated, children and adolescents still face the plight of insufficient physical activity. Extensive research has been carried out in the field of sports medicine, and a great many of research results has been obtained.

Our meta-analysis results show that HIIT can effectively improve the CRF index, but there is some statistical heterogeneity. We conducted a subgroup analysis of CRF index heterogeneity, and found that the participants were the source of VO_{2max} heterogeneity; age and exercise frequency are the source of HR_{max} heterogeneity. However, age, participants, intervention time and exercise frequency are not heterogeneous sources of SBP and DBP.

 VO_{2max} is the gold standard for evaluating CRF. Obese children and adolescents exhibit considerable limitations in physical activity due to skeletal muscle oxidative disorders in obese children and adolescents. Considering the influence of weight on VO_{2max} level, The VO_{2max} of obese children and adolescents' overall baseline level is low, and its change is more sensitive to HIIT intervention. In contrast, the VO_{2max} level in healthy children and adolescents tends to be stable.

Our results show that age is the main source of heterogeneity in HR_{max}. According to the actual situation of included studies, in this subgroup analysis, ages between 5~15 years old and \geq 15 years old were divided into groups. Although not grouped by pre-pubertal and adolescence, the actual grouping covers prepubertal and adolescent ages to a greater extent.

In this subgroup analysis, the proportion of obese adolescents aged ≥ 15 years in this subgroup analysis is more[16, 36, 38, 49]. Children are more resilient, making them more tolerant of HIIT and more resistant to fatigue than adolescents. More importantly, HIIT is more closely related to children's exercise habits,

combined with children's exercise patterns (game)[35]and reward mechanisms[53, 55, 56]in the included
 studies, which make pre-adolescent children more autonomous and motivated to participate.

321 It is worth noting that high-intensity training triggers autonomic nervous disturbances and high exercise 322 frequency triggers fatigue accumulation while also causing a "compensatory effect". Subgroup analysis included 6 studies [18, 36, 41, 51, 52, 55] with exercise frequency \geq 3 times/week. Since children's tolerance, 323 autonomy and motivation to participate are more advantageous than adolescents, a study has shown that HR_{max} 324 325 has the potential to predict VO_{2max} , which also further confirms the role of age in HR_{max} and VO_{2max} [MD = 326 3.99, 95% CI (2.76, 5.22), p < 0.001]. Future research is supposed to pay attention to the dose-response 327 relationship in exercise frequency towards CRF and focus on the interest and reward mechanism of HIIT in 328 pre-puberty children during the specific implementation process. Simultaneously, improve the design of HIIT 329 in adolescents to enhance their initiative and motivation to participate.

330 According to the available evidence, we can conclude that the intervention time ≤ 10 weeks, the frequency 331 of exercise <3 times/week, and healthy children and adolescents aged 5~15 are more sensitive to improving 332 VO_{2max} after HIIT intervention. The intervention time >10 weeks, the frequency of exercise <3 times/week, 333 and healthy children and adolescents aged $5 \sim 15$ are more sensitive to improving HR_{max} after HIIT intervention. Although partial results fail to explain the source of heterogeneity, VO_{2max} and HR_{max}, which are considered 334 335 to the most important outcome indicators for evaluating CRF, well explain the heterogeneity. Despite certain sources of heterogeneity in SBP and DBP, their sensitivity analysis still suggests that the results are stable 336 337 due to their relatively mature measurement methods. In summary, HIIT is recommended for improving CRF 338 indicators in children and adolescents.

339 Effect of HIIT on metabolic risk indicators of CVD in children and adolescents

340 At present, insufficient physical activity, unreasonable dietary structure, obesity, metabolic syndrome

and other metabolic risk factors for cardiovascular disease are gradually superimposed, resulting in a sharp increase in the risk of CVD and T_2DM . Metabolic risk factors of cardiovascular disease in children and adolescents during this period have a significant influence on the onset of adulthood[3]. The good news is that cardiovascular risk factors are largely preventable, especially the effectiveness of exercise in improving metabolic risk markers for cardiovascular diseases is supported by substantial evidence.

According to our research, a meta-analysis of HIIT intervention in children and adolescents, HIIT was effective in improving TC and HDL-C that are metabolic risk index of cardiovascular disease in children and adolescents, still, the effect on TG and LDL-C appeared to be insignificant. The results of this meta-analysis are similar to the previous meta-analysis results[7], but there are some differences in the analysis of HIIT evaluation on children and adolescents in another study[8], whose difference may be caused by HIIT's limited improvement of healthy children and adolescent blood lipids[42]. Most of the crowds we have included are healthy children and adolescents, and their incorporations are mostly obese children and adolescents.

353 Our convergence analysis results show that HIIT can effectively improve the level of TC and HDL-C, without significant heterogeneity. Racil[45] and Boer et al.[43] reported that HIIT reduced TC in 354 children and adolescents with a clinically significant (P<0.05) and low risk of bias assessment, which 355 356 are encouraging findings. Notably, Racil et al.[45] evaluated obese girls and Boer et al.[43] evaluated children and adolescents with disabilities. Racil[45] and Juliana et al.[33] reported that HIIT reduced 357 HDL-C in children and adolescents with clinical significance (p<0.05).Racil et al.[45] and Plavsic et 358 359 al.[16] evaluated objects are obese girls. The limitations of study methods and subjects for TG and HDL-360 C in the included studies may confuse the results, so caution should be exercised in interpreting these results. Though HIIT does not improve TG and LDL-C levels, the importance of TG as an independent 361 362 risk factor for CVD cannot be ignored. The effect of HIIT on LDL-C [MD=-0.17, 95% CI (-0.34, 0.00),

363 p=0.05] was at a statistical critical value. After excluding the included studies one by one, it found that the study by Juliana et al. [33] had a high risk. After the exclusion, the effect of HIIT on LDL-C was 364 365 statistically significant (p < 0.001) and there was no significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 24\%$, p = 0.25). 366 The sensitivity analysis results in this meta-analysis were highly stable and showed no significant heterogeneity. We can conclude that HIIT is effective in improving TC and HDL-C in children and 367 adolescents, with little effect on TG and LDL-C. Considering the small sample size included in this 368 369 meta-analysis, future research requires expanding the sample size further. 370 Assessment of diet and leisure-time physical activity 371 35 studies [13-15, 17, 19-35, 39, 41, 43, 47-53, 55-58] did not describe dietary assessment in detail. 12 372 studies[12, 16, 19, 36-38, 40, 42, 44-46, 54]informed not to change dietary habits. 35 studies[12-15, 17, 373 18, 20-28, 30-35, 39, 41, 43, 45, 48-53, 55-58]did not describe leisure-time physical activity in detail, and 12 studies[16, 19, 29, 36-38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 47, 54]conducted detailed assessments of leisure-time physical 374375 activity. Although 74.47% of the studies did not describe the diet in detail, it can be understood as maintaining 376 the original eating habits and physical activities by reading the full text. Furthermore, although 25.53% were 377 assessed for dietary habits and leisure-time physical activity, the impact of dietary and leisure-time physical 378 activity assessments on outcomes was not elucidated. It is worth noting that maintaining the original dietary 379 habits and physical activity helps to rule out the influence of diet on HIIT outcomes, simultaneously diet and leisure physical activity may be important limiting factors and sources of bias. 380 381 Adverse events and compliance

In this meta-analysis, although only 21 studies [12, 16, 18, 22, 26-29, 37, 38, 40, 43-45, 48, 50-52, 54, 55, 58] (42.55%) reported withdrawal events due to family and subjective will (193 people dropped out, accounting for 6.445 of the total study, with a dependency of 93.56%). In addition, there were sicked children

385	and adolescents in the included studies [13, 15, 18, 43], but no adverse events occurred, and the safety and
386	dependence were good. A previous meta-analysis of HIIT reported the occurrence of adverse events such as
387	leg discomfort, joint sprains, asthma, myocardial infarction, etc[61]. The occurrence of adverse events was
388	attributed to the study subjects belonging to high-risk groups for adverse events, such as patients with
389	coronary heart disease and hypertension, but there seemed to be no difference in adverse events between the
390	HIIT group and the control group. Besides, medical supervision was described in 55.32% of the included
391	articles in this meta-analysis. Therefore, these factors may cause biases, but the results were skewed towards
392	more positive effects.

393 Advantages and limitations

Advantages of this study: (i) Retrieval was not limited by publication date. (ii) Research participants were not limited to specific children and adolescents but includes all children and adolescents, regardless of health, disease, etc. (iii) Subgroup analysis was carried out to explain the heterogeneity of research results, especially the analysis of exercise dose variables such as age (prepubertal and adolescence), research subjects, intervention time and exercise frequency, which were often ignored by previous studies. (iv) No-blank control was excluded in this study, and unbalanced results caused due to non-blank control were avoided.

Limitations of this study: (i) Although this review strictly implemented the retrieval strategy, due to limited conditions, only the literature published in Chinese and English were retrieved, and there may still be some publication bias due to the lack of a small number of published literatures. (ii) This study only included the information on children and adolescents in school, but lacks data about children and adolescents outside of school, which may have a certain influence on the conclusion. (iii) Quality of included studies may be another factor, 12.77% of the studies did not use the randomized control model,

407 and 17.02% of the studies reported the randomized control model, but did not describe the randomized 408 process. (iv) Although guidelines for HIIT have been established, the details of some guidelines still 409 need to be refined. (v) The biggest limiting factor may be that the age span of the individuals included 410 in the study was large, and important influencing factors such as exercise intensity, frequency, and time 411 were not completely consistent, and the heterogeneity was considerable.

Although subgroup analyses have been performed, some results still could not clarify the source of heterogeneity. For example, Sexual differences in developmental rates during childhood and adolescence (due to the mixed-gender or too small sample size for subgroup analysis), different methods of outcome measures, and diet and leisure-time physical activity may all be sources of heterogeneity. In addition, the included studies did not disaggregate by gender, and the impact of gender on children and adolescents was still unclear, so gender differences should be fully considered in future research.

418 **CONCLUSION**

419 HIIT is safe, effective and less time-consuming for child and adolescent health. Because of its 420 potential to improve body shape, CRF, and cardiovascular disease risk markers, it should be incorporated into the daily management of physical activity in children and adolescents. More 421 422 importantly, the effect of HIIT has a higher consistency in gender, population, and age (pre-adolescence 423 and adolescence), so it has a higher generality in improving physical health. Although there were dropouts and losses to follow-up during this process, no adverse events caused by HIIT occurred. These 424 425findings highlight the potential role of HIIT as a strategy for improving the health between children and 426 adolescents. Considering the lack of more detailed standards for HIIT interventions in the included 427 studies, it is worth studying specific HIIT interventions (optimal exercise interval time and interval 428 intensity) in different ages, genders and participants to make HIIT more effective and scientific.

429	In conclusion, strengthening medical supervision and adequate warm-up before exercise is more
430	feasible for the promotion of HIIT in children and adolescents.
431	Funding Information
432	The co-funding of the Teaching Reform and Innovation Project of Shanxi Provincial Department
433	of Education (J2021967) and the Teaching Reform and Innovation Project of Fenyang College of Shanxi
434	Medical University (FJ202013).
435	Acknowledgment:
436	The completion of the thesis is very grateful to the co-funding of the Teaching Reform and
437	Innovation Project of Shanxi Provincial Department of Education (J2021967) and the Teaching
438	Reform and Innovation Project of Fenyang College of Shanxi Medical University (FJ202013). Many
439	thanks to the authors for their hard work.
440	Author's contribution:
441	Menjie made the agreement on this manuscript and revised it; Ma Jia, Zou Shuangling and Xiang
442	Chenmin run a database search, selected included meta-analysis, evaluate its quality and extract data;
443	Xiang Chenmin, Zou Shuangling and Wang Junli made statistical analysis; Li Shufeng contributed to
444	the formulation of the protocol and revised the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final
445	version of the manuscript and agreed to the author's presentation order.
446	Statement of Conflict of Interest:
447	The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.
448	References:
449	1. Guthold R, Stevens GA, Riley LM, Bull FC. Global trends in insufficient physical activity among adolescents:
450	a pooled analysis of 298 population-based surveys with 1.6 million participants. The Lancet Child & Adolescent
451	Health. 2020;4(1):23-35.
452 453	2. Gutnoid R, Stevens GA, Kiley LM, Bull FC. Worldwide trends in insufficient physical activity from 2001 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 358 population-based surveys with 1.9 million participants. LANCET GLOB HEALTH.

454 2018 2018-10-01;6(10):e1077-86.

- 455 3. Weihrauch-Bluher S, Schwarz P, Klusmann JH. Childhood obesity: increased risk for cardiometabolic
 456 disease and cancer in adulthood. METABOLISM. 2019 2019-03-01;92:147-52.
- 457 4. Bell LA, Fletcher EA, Timperio A, Vuillermin P, Hesketh K. Preschool children' s physical activity and 458 cardiovascular disease risk: A systematic review. J SCI MED SPORT. 2019;22(5):568-73.
- 459 5. WHO. Global action plan on physical activity 2018-2030: more active people for a healthier world. World460 Health Organization. 2018.
- 6. Schoenmakers PPJM, Reed KE. The effects of recovery duration on physiological and perceptual responses
 of trained runners during four self-paced HIIT sessions. J SCI MED SPORT. 2019;22(4):462-6.
- 463 7. Eddolls WTB, McNarry MA, Stratton G, Winn CON, Mackintosh KA. High-Intensity Interval Training
 464 Interventions in Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review. SPORTS MED. 2017;47(11):2363-74.
- 8. Monserrat Solera-Martínez ÁHIM. High-Intensity Interval Training and Cardiometabolic Risk Factors in
 Children: A Meta-analysis. PEDIATRICS. 2021;148(4):e2021050810.
- 467 9. Liu J, Zhu L, Su Y. Comparative Effectiveness of High-Intensity Interval Training and Moderate-Intensity
 468 Continuous Training for Cardiometabolic Risk Factors and Cardiorespiratory Fitness in Childhood Obesity: A
 469 Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. FRONT PHYSIOL. 2020 2020-04-03;11.
- 470 10. Meng C, Yucheng T, Shu L, Yu Z. Effects of school-based high-intensity interval training on body
- 471 composition, cardiorespiratory fitness and cardiometabolic markers in adolescent boys with obesity: a randomized472 controlled trial. BMC PEDIATR. 2022;22(1).
- 473 11. Blegen MA. PRISMA. Nursing research (New York). 2010 2010-01-01;59(4):233.
- 12. Julian V, Costa D, O Malley G, Metz L, Fillon A, Miguet M, et al. Bone Response to High-Intensity Interval
- Training versus Moderate-Intensity Continuous Training in Adolescents with Obesity. OBESITY FACTS.2022;15(1):46-54.
- 477 13. Winn CON, Mackintosh KA, Eddolls WTB, Stratton G, Wilson AM, McNarry MA, et al. Effect of high-
- intensity interval training in adolescents with asthma: The eXercise for Asthma with Commando Joe's® (X4ACJ)
 trial. J SPORT HEALTH SCI. 2021;10(4):488-98.
- 480 14. Xiangdi D. Research on the Design and Effect of HIIT in Middle School Physical Education: Jianghan
- 481 University; 2021.
- 482 15. MCNARRY MA, WINN CON, DAVIES GA, EDDOLLS WTB, MACKINTOSH KA. Effect of High 483 Intensity Training and Asthma on the VO2 Kinetics of Adolescents. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise.
- 484 2020;52(6):1322-9.
- 16. Plavsic L, Knezevic OM, Sovtic A, Minic P, Vukovic R, Mazibrada I, et al. Effects of high-intensity interval
- training and nutrition advice on cardiometabolic markers and aerobic fitness in adolescent girls with obesity.
- 487 Applied physiology, nutrition, and metabolism. 2020 2020-01-01;45(3):294-300.
- 488 17. Larsen MN, Madsen M, Nielsen CM, Manniche V, Hansen L, Bangsbo J, et al. Cardiovascular adaptations
- 489 after 10months of daily 12-min bouts of intense school-based physical training for 8-10-year-old children. PROG
 490 CARDIOVASC DIS. 2020 2020-11-01;63(6):813-7.
- 18. Soori R, Goodarzvand F, Akbarnejad A, Effatpanah M, Ramezankhani A, Teixeira AL, et al. Effect of high-
- 492 intensity interval training on clinical and laboratory parameters of adolescents with attention deficit hyperactivity
- 493 disorder. SCI SPORT. 2020;35(4):207-15.
- 494 19. Kunru Z. An experimental study on the effect of high intensity intermittent skipping training on the fitness
- 495 of High School girls Take Yudan University Affiliated Middle School (Qingpu Branch) as an example:
 496 Shanghai University of Sport; 2020.
- 497 20. Kaiwen H. Study on the application of high intensity interval training as "Exercise each class" in Junior

- 498 middle school grade one physical education class: Shanxi Normal University; 2020.
- 499 21. Qin M. Research on Aerobic Exercise and TABATA Training's Intervention on Exercise Ability and Cardiac
- 500 Autonomic Nervous Function in Obese Adolescents Aged 13 to 15: Liaoning Normal University; 2020.
- 501 22. Engel FA, Wagner MO, Schelhorn F, Deubert F, Leutzsch S, Stolz A, et al. Classroom-Based Micro-Sessions
- of Functional High-Intensity Circuit Training Enhances Functional Strength but Not Cardiorespiratory Fitness in
 School Children—A Feasibility Study. Frontiers in Public Health. 2019 2019-11-14;7.
- 504 23. Leahy AA, Eather N, Smith JJ, Hillman CH, Morgan PJ, Plotnikoff RC, et al. Feasibility and Preliminary
- 505 Efficacy of a Teacher-Facilitated High-Intensity Interval Training Intervention for Older Adolescents. PEDIATR
- 506 EXERC SCI. 2019;31(1):107-17.
- Taiyang M. Effect of high intensity interval training on body weight control and physical fitness of Judo
 athletes: Capital University of Physical Education And Sports; 2019.
- 25. Zhongwu Y. Experimental Research on the Effect of High intensity Interval Training and Continuous
 Training on Physical Fitness and Health Adolescent: Capital University of Physical Education And Sports;
- 511 2019.
- 512 26. Martin-Smith R, Buchan DS, Baker JS, Macdonald MJ, Sculthorpe NF, Easton C, et al. Sprint Interval
 513 Training and the School Curriculum: Benefits Upon Cardiorespiratory Fitness, Physical Activity Profiles, and
 514 Cardiometabolic Risk Profiles of Healthy Adolescents. PEDIATR EXERC SCI. 2019;31(3):296-305.
- Cardiometabolic Risk Fromes of Freating Adorescents: FEDIATIC EXERC Set. 2017,51(5):270-505.
- 515 27. Ludyga S, Pühse U, Lucchi S, Marti J, Gerber M. Immediate and sustained effects of intermittent exercise 516 on inhibitory control and task-related heart rate variability in adolescents. J SCI MED SPORT. 2019;22(1):96-100.
- on inhibitory control and task-related heart rate variability in adolescents. J SCI MED SPORT. 2019;22(1):96-100.
 Ruiz-Ariza A, Suárez-Manzano S, López-Serrano S, Martínez-López EJ. The effect of cooperative high-
- 518 intensity interval training on creativity and emotional intelligence in secondary school: A randomised controlled
- 519 trial. EUR PHYS EDUC REV. 2019;25(2):355-73.
- 520 29. Cvetković N, Stojanović E, Stojiljković N, Nikolić D, Scanlan AT, Milanović Z. Exercise training in 521 overweight and obese children: Recreational football and high-intensity interval training provide similar benefits
- 522 to physical fitness. SCAND J MED SCI SPOR. 2018;28:18-32.
- 30. Hammami A, Randers MB, Kasmi S, Razgallah M, Tabka Z, Chamari K, et al. Effects of soccer training on
 health-related physical fitness measures in male adolescents. J SPORT HEALTH SCI. 2018;7(2):169-75.
- 525 31. Kang L. Experimental Study on the Effect of High Intensity Interval Training on the Physical Health of High
 526 School Girls: Shanxi Normal University; 2018.
- 527 32. van Biljon A, McKune AJ, DuBose KD, Kolanisi U, Semple SJ. Do Short-Term Exercise Interventions
 528 Improve Cardiometabolic Risk Factors in Children? The Journal of pediatrics. 2018 2018-01-01;203:325-9.
- 529 33. Juliana Pizzi LFDS. Reduction in Butyrylcholinesterase Activity and Cardiovascular Risk Factors in Obese
- 530 Adolescents after 12-Weeks of High-Intensity Interval Training. Journal of Exercise Physiology online. 531 2017;20(3):110-20.
- 532 34. Costigan SA, Eather N, Plotnikoff RC, Hillman CH, Lubans DR. High-Intensity Interval Training for
 533 Cognitive and Mental Health in Adolescents. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2016 2016-10-01;48(10):1985-93.
- 534 35. Lambrick D, Westrupp N, Kaufmann S, Stoner L, Faulkner J. The effectiveness of a high-intensity games 535 intervention on improving indices of health in young children. J Sports Sci. 2016 2016-01-20;34(3):190-8.
- 536 36. Racil G, Coquart J, Elmontassar W, Haddad M, Goebel R, Chaouachi A, et al. Greater effects of high-
- 537 compared with moderate-intensity interval training on cardio-metabolic variables, blood leptin concentration and
- 538 ratings of perceived exertion in obese adolescent females. BIOL SPORT. 2016 2016-03-06;33(2):145-52.
- 539 37. Weston KL, Azevedo LB, Bock S, Weston M, George KP, Batterham AM. Effect of Novel, School-Based
- 540 High-Intensity Interval Training (HIT) on Cardiometabolic Health in Adolescents: Project FFAB (Fun Fast
- 541 Activity Blasts) An Exploratory Controlled Before-And-After Trial. PLOS ONE. 2016 2016-08-

542 03;11(8):e159116.

- Racil G, Zouhal H, Elmontassar W, Abderrahmane AB, De Sousa MV, Chamari K, et al. Plyometric exercise
 combined with high-intensity interval training improves metabolic abnormalities in young obese females more so
- than interval training alone. Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism. 2016 2016-01-01;41(1):103-9.
- 546 39. McNarry MA, Lambrick D, Westrupp N, Faulkner J. The influence of a six-week, high-intensity games
- 547 intervention on the pulmonary oxygen uptake kinetics in prepubertal obese and normal-weight children. Applied
- 548 Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism. 2015;40(10):1012-8.
- 40. Martin R, Buchan D, Baker J, Young J, Sculthorpe N, Grace F. Sprint interval training (SIT) is an effective
- method to maintain cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF) and glucose homeostasis in Scottish adolescents. BIOL
 SPORT. 2015 2015-08-04;32(4):307-13.
- 41. Lau PW, Wong DP, Ngo JK, Liang Y, Kim CG, Kim HS. Effects of high-intensity intermittent running
 exercise in overweight children. EUR J SPORT SCI. 2015 2015-01-20;15(2):182-90.
- 42. Mazurek K, Krawczyk K, Zmijewski P, Norkowski H, Czajkowska A. Effects of aerobic interval training versus continuous moderate exercise programme on aerobic and anaerobic capacity, somatic features and blood lipid profile in collegate females. Ann Agric Environ Med. 2014 2014-01-20;21(4):844-9.
- 43. Boer P, Meeus M, Terblanche E, Rombaut L, Wandele ID, Hermans L, et al. The influence of sprint interval
- training on body composition, physical and metabolic fitness in adolescents and young adults with intellectual
- disability: a randomized controlled trial. CLIN REHABIL. 2014;28(3):221-31.
- 44. Ferrete C, Requena B, Suarez-Arrones L, de Villarreal ES. Effect of Strength and High-Intensity Training on
- Jumping, Sprinting, and Intermittent Endurance Performance in Prepubertal Soccer Players. J STRENGTH COND
 RES. 2014;28(2):413-22.
- 563 45. Racil G, Ben Ounis O, Hammouda O, Kallel A, Zouhal H, Chamari K, et al. Effects of high vs. moderate
- 564 exercise intensity during interval training on lipids and adiponectin levels in obese young females. EUR J APPL
- 565 PHYSIOL. 2013;113(10):2531-40.
- 46. Hansen PR, Andersen LJ, Rebelo AN, Brito J, Hornstrup T, Schmidt JF, et al. Cardiovascular effects of 3
- months of football training in overweight children examined by comprehensive echocardiography: a pilot study. J
 Sports Sci. 2013 2013-01-20;31(13):1432-40.
- Mucci P, Baquet G, Nourry C, Deruelle F, Berthoin S, Fabre C. Exercise testing in children: Comparison in
 ventilatory thresholds changes with interval-training. PEDIATR PULM. 2013;48(8):809-16.
- 48. Rosenkranz SK, Rosenkranz RR, Hastmann TJ, Harms CA. High-intensity training improves airway
 responsiveness in inactive nonasthmatic children: evidence from a randomized controlled trial. J APPL PHYSIOL.
 2012 2012-04-01;112(7):1174-83.
- 49. Feng C, CaoJie, Zhao L, He L. Effects of aerobic interval training on cardiac function and physical fitness in obese teenagers. Journal of Jilin University (Medical edition). 2012 2012-05-28;38(03):586-9.
- 576 50. Buchan DS, Young JD, Simpson AD, Thomas NE, Cooper S, Baker JS. The effects of a novel high intensity
- 577 exercise intervention on established markers of cardiovascular disease and health in Scottish adolescent youth.
- 578 Journal of Public Health Research. 2012 2012-05-25;1(2):24.
- 579 51. Baquet G, Gamelin FX, Mucci P, Thevenet D, Van Praagh E, Berthoin S. Continuous vs. interval aerobic 580 training in 8- to 11-year-old children. J STRENGTH COND RES. 2010 2010-05-01;24(5):1381-8.
- 581 52. Breil FA, Weber SN, Koller S, Hoppeler H, Vogt M. Block training periodization in alpine skiing: effects of
- 582 11-day HIT on VO2max and performance. EUR J APPL PHYSIOL. 2010;109(6):1077-86.
- 583 53. Lynne Mary Boddy GSAF. The effectiveness of a 'short, sharp, shock' high intensity exercise intervention
- in 11- and 12-year-old Liverpool schoolgirls. Arch Exerc Health Dis. 2010;1(1):19-25.
- 585 54. Tjønna AE, Stølen TO, Bye A, Volden M, Slørdahl SA, Ødegård R, et al. Aerobic interval training reduces

- cardiovascular risk factors more than a multitreatment approach in overweight adolescents. CLIN SCI. 2009 2009 02-01;116(4):317-26.
- 588 55. McManus AM, Cheng CH, Leung MP, Yung TC, Macfarlane DJ. Improving Aerobic Power in Primary
- 589 School Boys: A Comparison of Continuous and Interval Training. INT J SPORTS MED. 2005;26(9):781-6.
- 590 56. Baquet G, Berthoin S, Dupont G, Blondel N, Fabre C, van Praagh E. Effects of high intensity intermittent
- training on peak VO(2) in prepubertal children. INT J SPORTS MED. 2002 2002-08-01;23(6):439-44.
- 592 57. Baquet G, Berthoin S, Gerbeaux M, Van Praagh E. High-intensity aerobic training during a 10 week one-
- 593 hour physical education cycle: effects on physical fitness of adolescents aged 11 to 16. INT J SPORTS MED. 2001
- 594 2001-05-01;22(4):295-300.
- 58. Helgerud J, Engen LC, Wisloff U, Hoff J. Aerobic endurance training improves soccer performance. Med
 Sci Sports Exerc. 2001 2001-11-01;33(11):1925-31.
- 597 59. Juonala M, Magnussen CG, Berenson GS, Venn A, Burns TL, Sabin MA, et al. Childhood adiposity, adult
- adiposity, and cardiovascular risk factors. N Engl J Med. 2011 2011-11-17;365(20):1876-85.
- 599 60. Kodama S, Saito K, Tanaka S, Maki M, Yachi Y, Asumi M, et al. Cardiorespiratory Fitness as a Quantitative
- 600 Predictor of All-Cause Mortality and Cardiovascular Events in Healthy Men and Women: A Meta-analysis. JAMA :
- 601 the journal of the American Medical Association. 2009 2009-01-01;301(19):2024-35.
- 602 61. Martland R, Mondelli V, Gaughran F, Stubbs B. Can high-intensity interval training improve physical and
- 603 mental health outcomes? A meta-review of 33 systematic reviews across the lifespan. J Sports Sci. 2020 2020-02-
- 604 01;38(4):430-69.
- 605

	Table 1 Full-search strategy for PubMed.
Number	Search terms
#1	Adolescent [MeSH Terms]
#2	(((((Adolescence [Title/Abstract]) OR (Teens [Title/Abstract])) OR
	(Teenagers [Title/Abstract])) OR (Youths [Title/Abstract])) OR (Female
	Adolescents [Title/Abstract])) OR (Male Adolescents [Title/Abstract])
#3	#1 or #2
#4	High-Intensity Interval Training [MeSH Terms]
#5	((((High-Intensity Interval [Title/Abstract]) OR (High-Intensity Intermitter
	[Title/Abstract])) OR (High-Intensity Intermittent Exercises
	[Title/Abstract])) OR (Sprint Interval Trainings [Title/Abstract])) OR
	(HIIT[Title/Abstract])
#6	#4 or #5
#7	randomized controlled trial [MeSH Terms]
#8	(((RCT[Title/Abstract]) OR (Randomized [Title/Abstract])) OR
	(Randomized Clinical [Title/Abstract])) OR (Controlled Clinical Trials
	[Title/Abstract])
#9	#7 or #8
#10	#9 AND #6 AND #3



Table 2 Basic features of the included studies

				Age		sample		Intervention measure		Intervention ti	me	outcome
Author	Year	Country	Lesion	experimental group	control group	experimental group (male/female)	control group (male/female)	experimental group	control group	experimental group	control group	indicator
Valérie et al.[12]	2022	France	Obesity	13.0 ± 1.1	13.2 ± 1.0	19(11/8)	11(6/5)	mode of motion: ergometer bicycle exercise time:15mins exercise frequency: twice/week exercise intensity:75% to 90% VO _{2 max}	not any physical training	16 weeks	16 weeks	1,2
Engel et al[22].	2019	Germany	healthy	11.6 ± 0.2	11.7 ± 0.3	17 (11/6)	18(11/7)	mode of motion: micro-session of Functional HIIT exercise time:>6 mins exercise frequency: week 1:3 times; week 2 to 4:4 times exercise intensity: >85% HR _{max}	mode of motion: regular school class	4 weeks	4 weeks	0
Georges et al.[51]	2010	France	healthy	10.3±9.8	10.1 ±1.2	22	19	mode of motion: interval run exercise time:18 to 39 minutes exercise frequency:3 additional PE and 2 regular mandatory PE exercise intensity:80 to 85% of MAS	mode of motion: regular mandatory PE exercise time:60 mins exercise frequency: 2/week	7 weeks	7 weeks	1,8, 2
MCNARRY et al.[15]	2020	England	asthma	Asthma: 14.1±0.9 No-asthma: 14.1±0.8	Asthma :14.2±1.0 No-asthma: 13.9±0.9) Asthma group: 18 (10/8) No-asthma:17 (9/8)	Asthma group: 18 (11/7) No-asthma:16 (9/7)	mode of motion: games-based activities informed by formative work exercise time:30 mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity: >90%HR _{max}	exercise time:30 mins	6 mouths	6 mouths	1,8
Mazurek et al.[42]	2014	Poland	females	19.5±0.6		24	42	mode of motion: Mechanically-braked cycle ergometers exercise time:47 mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:60% HR _{max}	mode of motion: regular PE exercise time:47 mins exercise frequency: 1/week	8 weeks	8 weeks	(1,3,4,6, 6,7,8
Plavsic et al.[16]	2020	Serbia	Obesity	16.6±1.3	15.8 ± 1.5	22	22	mode of motion: Diet + HIIT (electronically braked cycle ergometer) exercise time:43mins exercise frequency:2/week	mode of motion: Diet	12 weeks	12 weeks	(1,2,3,4, 5,6,7,8, 9,®,1

Cvetković et al.[29]	2018	Serbia.	obese males			10	11	exercise intensity:85 to 90% of HR_{max} mode of motion: PE+HIIT (interval runs) exercise frequency:2/week	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency: 2/week	12weeks	12weeks	(1,2,9,®, I
Leahy et al.[23]	2019	Australia	healthy	16.2±0.4	16.2±0.4	38	30	mode of motion: included a combi- nation of aerobic-based and resistance-based exercise time:12–20 min exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:>85% HR _{max}		14 weeks	14 weeks	1,®
Costigan et al.[34]	2016	UK	healthy	15.7±0.7	15.6±0.6	21	22 (11/11)	mode of motion: gross motor cardiorespiratory exercises exercise time:8-10mins exercise frequency:3/week	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency:3/week	8 weeks	8 weeks	1
Rosenkranz et al.[48]	2012	Manhattan	healthy	8.8±0.6	9.8±4.1	8	8	mode of motion: performed on an indoor track exercise time:30mins exercise frequency: sessions spaced at least 48 h exercise intensity:100–130% of MAS		8 weeks	8 weeks	1,3,4,6, 6,7,9,®
Hammami et al.[30]	2018	Tunisia	soccer players	15.9 ± 0.4	15.8 ± 0.7	10	10	mode of motion: small-sided soccer drills exercise time:35-45mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: ~ 85% HR _{max}	mode of motion: regular physical activity exercise frequency: 2/week	8 weeks	8 weeks	1,2
Winn et al.[13]	2021	UK	Asthma	Asthma: 13.7 ± 1.0 No-asthma: 13.8±1.1	Asthma: 13.4±1.2 No-asthma: :13.5±1.0	221(116/105)	69(21/48)	mode of motion: game-based activities exercise frequency:3/week exercise time:30mins exercise intensity: >90% HR _{max}	mode of motion: incremental ramp test	6 mouths	6 mouths	1
Malte Nejst Larsen et al.[17]	2020	Denmark	healthy	10±0.3	10±0.3	57	115	exercise time:12 mins exercise frequency:5/week	mode of motion: PE lessons	10 mouths	10 mouths	9,10
Soori et al.[18]	2020	Iran	hyperactivity	12.55 ± 0.15	12.5 ± 0.45	26 (9/17)	17 (11/6)	mode of motion:20 meters running program exercise time:>10 mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity: 85% HR _{max}		6 weeks	6 weeks	2
Racil et al.[45]	2013	Tunisian	obese	15.6 ± 0.7	15.9 ± 1.2	11	12	mode of motion: short bursts exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:100 to 110 % of MAS	non-exercising	12weeks	12 weeks	2,3,4,6, 6,7,8
Lambrick et al.[35]	2016	UK	Healthy and obese	obesity:93±0.8 normal:92±0.7	obesity:94±0.8 normal:9.2±0.8	normal:13 (8/5) obesity:15 (10/5)	normal:13 (7/6) obesity:14 (7/7)	mode of motion: equipment exercise time:40 min exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: 40% difference between GET and VO _{2max}	mode of motion: PE	8 weeks	8 weeks	(),Q,3,®, ¤

Baquet et al.[57]	2001	France	health	12.8 ± 1.2	13.5 ± 0.9	503(263/240)	48(21/27)	mode of motion: PE+ running exercises. exercise time:3 h exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:100 to 120% MAS	mode of motion: PE exercise exercise time:3 h frequency:3/week	10 weeks	10 weeks	1,0
Tjønna et al.[54]	2009	Norway	Obese	14.0 ±0.3 years		13	14	mode of motion: walking/running exercise time:.40min exercise frequency: 2/week exercise intensity:90% HR _{max}	mode of motion: exercise exercise frequency: 2/month	3 mouths	12 mouths	1,2,3,8, 9,®
Zhu Kunru[19]	2020	China	Healthy girl	16.35±0.490	17.20±0.410	20 (0/20)	20 (0/20)	mode of motion: rope skipping exercise time:15-20mins exercise frequency:3/week	Regular training 15-20mins	12 weeks	12 weeks	1
Li kang[31]	2018	China	Healthy girl	16.34±0.91	16.63±0.90	38 (0/38)	54 (0/54)	mode of motion: sprints exercise time:4-9mins (Stepwise increase) exercise frequency:2/week	Regular PE	8 weeks	8 weeks	1,8
Mu Taiyang[24]	2019	China	Overweight and obese male judoka	17.00±0.89	17.18±0.98	11 (11/0)	11 (11/0)	mode of motion: Running and judo training exercise time:45mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity: > 85% HR _{max}	Regular training 45mins	12 weeks	12 weeks	1,2,3
Yang Zhongwu[25]	2019	China	teenagers	11.50±0.513	11.50±0.513	20 (10/10)	20 (10/10)	exercise time:45mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:85% to 90% HR _{max}	60% to 70% $\ensuremath{\text{HR}_{\text{max}}}$	8 weeks	8 weeks	1,3
Huo Kaiwen[20]	2020	China	teenagers	boy:12.70±0.48 girl:12.50±0.53	boy:12.80±0.42 girl:12.90±0.32	20	20	exercise time:50-60mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:90% to 95% HR _{max}	Regular training 50 to 60mins	8 weeks	8 weeks	1,8
Ma Qin[21]	2020	China	Obese male adolescents	13.53±0.72	13.90±0.89	15 (15/0)	15 (15/0)	mode of motion: Combination of training exercise time:40-50mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:85% HR _{max}	Regular PE	8 weeks	8 weeks	1,2
Dai Xiangdi[14]	2021	China	Healthy teenagers	About 14	About 14	49	47	mode of motion: Combination of training exercise time:20mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:65% to 85% HR _{max}	Regular PE	8 weeks	8 weeks	1
Cao et al.[49]	2012	China	Obese adolescent boys	13-15	13-15	20 (20/0)	20 (20/0) J2	mode of motion: Combination of training exercise time:50-60mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:90% to 95% HR _{max}	Daily habits	8 weeks	8 weeks	(1,2,8,9, ©
Martin Smith et al.[26]	2019	Scottish	from 2 higher PE class	17±0.3	16.8±0.5	22(13/9)	30 (19/11)	mode of motion: running sprints exercise time:25-26mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:92% of HR _{max}	mode of motion: PE exercise time:1 h	4 weeks	4weeks	1,3,4,5, 6,7,8,9, 0
Ludyga et al.[27]	2019	Switzerland	healthy male adolescents	14±0.8	13.9±0.6	32	28	mode of motion: a circuit training exercise time:20 mins				1, 2

Ruiz-Ariza et al.[28]	2019	Spain	healthy	13.79 ± 1.38	13.67 ± 1.29	90(46/44)	94(52/42)	mode of motion: Combination of training exercise time:16mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: over 85% HR _{max}	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency: 2/week	12 weeks	12 weeks	0
Racil et al. [36]	2016	Tunis	obese adolescent females	14.2±1.2 years		17	14	mode of motion: Combined interval running exercise time:>35mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:100% MAS	mode of motion: non-exercising group	12 weeks	12 weeks	2,3,9,®, I
Weston et al.[37]	2016	United Kingdom	Healthy and obese	14.1 ± 0.3	14.1 ± 0.3	41 (33/8)	60(30/30)	mode of motion: Many kinds of sports exercise frequency: 3 /week exercise intensity: 90% HR _{max}	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency: 3/week	10 weeks	10 weeks	(),2,3,9, ©
Racil et al.[38]	2016	Tunisia	obese female adolescents	16.6 ± 0.9	16.9 ± 1.0	23	19	mode of motion: plyometric exercises exercise time: 26 to28mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:100%VO _{2 max}	no exercise	12 weeks	12 weeks	2,3,8
McNarry et al.[39]	2015	UK	health and obesity	Obesity: 9.3 \pm 0.9 normal: 9.2 \pm 0.8	Obesity: 9.3 ± 0.9 normal: 9.2 ± 0.8	normal:13 obesity:15	normal:16 obesity:11	mode of motion: physical activity exercise time:10 mins exercise frequency:2/week	usual care control group	6 weeks	6 weeks	1.8, 2
Martin et al.[40]	2015	UK	healthy	16.9 ± 0.3	16.8 ± 0.6	20(13 / 7)	23(18/5)	mode of motion: Sprint combination training exercise time:60 mins exercise frequency:3/week	mode of motion: PE exercise frequency: 3/week	7 weeks	7 weeks	1
Peter Riis Hansen et al.[46]	2013	Porto district Portugal	t, Overweight children	8—12	8—12	20 (17/3)	11 (7/4)	mode of motion: technical football exercises and small-sided football games exercise time: 1h-1.5h exercise frequency:4/week exercise intensity: > 80% HR _{max}	mode of motion: compulsory sport curriculum at school exercise frequency: 2/week exercise time:45 to 90min/time	3mouths	3mouths	(),9,®, ï
Patrick Mucci et al.[47]	2013	Tanner	prepubescent children	10.3±0.7	9.8±0.6	9 (4/5)	9 (6/3)	mode of motion: running exercise time:30mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:100%-130%	usual physical activities	8 weeks	8 weeks	8
Buchan et al.[50]	2012	West of Scotland	adolescent youth	16.7±0.1	16.3±0.5	17 (15/2)	24 (20/4)	mode of motion: repetitions of maximal sprint running exercise time:54mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity: maximal sprint running	maintain normal activity patterns	7weeks	7weeks	(1,2.4,6, 6,7,9,1
Breil et al.[52]	2010	Bern, Switzerland	Healthy elite junior alpine skiers	17.4±1.1	16.6±1.1	13	8	mode of motion: cycle ergometer; ski-speciWc obstacle running course containing slalom, balancing and jumping elements exercise frequency:15 times training exercise time:16mins exercise intensity:90–95% HR _{max}	continued their normal endurance and strength training	11days	11days	0,2,8,0

Ferrete et al.[44]	2014	Spain	Healthy young soccer players	9.32±0.25	8.26±0.33	11	13	mode of motion: underwent soccer training ; 1/4 squat, deep jumps, CMJ with weight, and sprint exercises exercise intensity: maximal voluntary intensity using player's body weight (or body weight plus light resistances) as external resistance exercise time:30mins exercise frequency:3/week	mode of motion: underwent soccer training exercise time:30mins exercise frequency:3/week	26weeks	26weeks	2
Lau et al.[41]	2015	Hong Kong	overweight children	11.0 ± 0.6	10.6 ± 0.6	15	12	mode of motion: intermittent running attended normal PE exercise time:72mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity:120% of MAS	mode of motion: attended normal PE exercise time:35mins exercise frequency:2/week	6weeks	6weeks	1, 2
Boer et al.[43]	2014	Belgian	adolescents and young adults with intellectual disability	1 18±3.2	17.4±2.4	17 (11/6)	14 (9/5)	mode of motion: cycling exercise time:40mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: >100% VTR	participated in usual everyday scholar activities without supervised exercise training	15 weeks	15weeks	(1,2,3,4, 6,9,10
A. M. McManus et al.[55]	2005	Hong Kong	boys	10.35±0.32	10.51 ± 0.3	10	15	mode of motion: Loop pedalling exercise time:20mins exercise frequency:3time/week	normal physical activity	8weeks	8weeks	8,7
Helgerud et al.[58]	2001	America	male	18.1±0.8	18.1±0.8	9	10	mode of motion: run + game exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity: 90 to 95% of HR _{max}	Regular exercise	8weeks	8weeks	8
G. Baquet et al.[56]	2002	France	pubescent children	9.7±0.9	10.1±0.4	20(10/10)	33(13/20)	mode of motion: high intensity intermittent running exercises exercise time:30mins exercise frequency:2/week exercise intensity:100 to130% of MAS	Normal PE	7weeks	7weeks	2,8,2
Anneke van Biljon et al.[32]	2018	The Republi	c children	11.1 ± 0.8	11.1 ± 0.8	29	24	mode of motion: Sprint cycle exercise time:23mins exercise frequency:3/week exercise intensity: > 80% HR _{max}	Normal PE	5weeks	5weeks	(1,3,8,9, ©
Juliana Pizzi et al.[33]	2017	America	Obese Adolescences	12.18 ± 1.5	14.29 ± 1.8	20	34	mode of motion: running exercise time:45mins exercise frequency:3/two days		12weeks	12weeks	1,3,4,5, 6, 7
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.[53]	2010	UK	Obese	11.78 ± 0.2	11.87 ± 0.3	8	8	mode of motion: high intensity exercise program loosely based on dance exercise time:20mins exercise frequency:4/week	Normal life	3weeks	3weeks	(1,2,3,8, 9,®

8 Notes: ①BMI,②BF%,③WC,④TC,⑤TG,⑥HDL-C,⑦LDL-C,⑧VO₂,⑨SBP,⑩DBP, □HR_{max}



Fig. 2 Analysis of the risk of bias according to the Cochrane Collaboration Guideline

140

Outcomos	Number	Root	Std Eff	Coof	Std Enn	+	n> t	[05% Conf	Intorvoll
Outcomes	of studies	MSE	Stu. EII.	Coel.	Stu. E11.	ι	µ> נ	[95 % Com	• Intervarj
BMI	36	1.524	slope	.2195473	.2006643	1.09	0.282	1882517	.6273462
			bias	-1.013953	.7345551	-1.38	0.176	-2.506749	.4788423
BF%	20	1.605	slope	6003318	.3335849	1.80	0.089	100504	1.301168
			bias	-2.485502	1.056721	-2.35	0.030	-4.70559	2654136
WC	16	1.673	slope	.7849622	.5614075	1.40	0.184	4191371	1.9890611
			bias	-3.023636	1.763666	-1.71	0.108	-6.806323	.7590503
VO _{2max}	19	1.644	slope	3187151	.4612036	-0.69	0.499	-1.29177	.6543394
			bias	2.870097	1.416205	2.03	0.059	1178346	5.858029
SBP	14	1.446	slope	.078006	.3490282	0.22	0.827	6824612	.8384732
			bias	-1.319617	1.166486	-1.13	0.280	-3.861171	1.221937
DBP	14	1.8	slope	.0417849	.4332558	0.10	0.925	9021983	.9857682
			bias	3722117	1.448374	-0.26	0.802	-3.527947	2.783524
HR _{max}	13	2.569	slope	-1.718386	1.203516	-1.43	0.181	-4.367307	.9305347
			bias	5.734588	3.564588	1.61	0.136	-2.111017	13.58019

 Table 2 Three-line table of Egger's Publishing Bias

Outcomos	Subgroup		The Number	Pooled estimate [SMD/MD	n voluo	$T^{2}(0/)$	Test for subgroup
Outcomes	Subgroup		of studies	(95 %CI)]	p value	1 (%)	differences
BF(%)	Participants	Health	4	1.23(-0.96,3.42)	p=0.270	42.0%	
		Obesity	11	-1.59(-2.59, -0.58)	p=0.002	77.0%	- 0.020
		Else	5	0.12(-1.11,1.35)	p=0.850	0.0%	p=0.020
WC(cm)	Participants	Health	2	0.57(-3.54,4.67)	p=0.790	0.0%	
		Obesity	8	-2.06(-3.26, -0.86)	p<0.001	0.0%	p=0.350
		Else	6	-0.36(-3.82,3.09)	p=0.840	83.0%	
VO _{2max}	Age	5<<15	10	3.99(2.76,5.22)	p<0.001	44.0%	n -0 120
		≥15	9	1.76(0.75,2.76)	p=0.090	91.0%	p=0.130
	Participants	Health	5	3.49(1.57,5.41)	p<0.001	42.0%	
		Obesity	6	2.12(0.05,4.18)	p=0.040	92.0%	p<0.001
		Else	8	3.31(1.93,4.69)	p<0.001	0.0%	
	Intervention Time	≤ 10 weeks	14	3.59(2.38,4.81)	p<0.001	44.0%	p=0.130
		>10 weeks	5	1.77(-0.26,3.79)	p=0.090	91.0%	
	Exercise Frequency	<3 times/week	9	3.09(1.80,4.38)	p<0.001	65.0%	p=0.750
		\geq 3 times/week	10	2.76(1.21,4.31)	p<0.001	67.0%	
SBP	Age	5<<15	10	-2.00(-4.22,0.21)	p=0.008	69.0%	- 0 100
		≥15	4	-4.99(-7.83, -2.15)	p<0.001	0.0%	p=0.100
	Participants	Health	3	-2.84(-5.16, -0.52)	p=0.020	23.0%	
		Obesity	7	-3.20(-6.47,0.07)	p=0.006	73.0%	p=0.910
		Else	4	-1.89(-6.70, 2.92)	p=0.440	69.0%	
	Intervention Time	≤ 10 weeks	7	-2.11(-5.01,0.79)	p=0.150	60.0%	p=0.530
		>10 weeks	7	-3.43(-6.30,0.56)	p=0.020	72.0%	-

Table 2 Th ... -**1-1**of and 1----

	Exercise Frequency	<3 times/week	5	-3.48(-7.42,0.46)	p=0.080	75.0%	p=0.06
		\geq 3 times/week	9	-2.48(-4.78, -0.19)	p=0.030	55.0%	
DBP	Age	5< <15	10	-1.59(-3.93,0.74)	p=0.180	74.0%	. 0.07
		≥15	4	-4.99(-7.83, -2.15)	p<0.001	0.0%	p=0.0
	Participants	Health	3	-2.84(-5.16,0.52)	p=0.020	23.0%	
		Obesity	7	-2.52(-5.92,0.89)	p=0.150	79.0%	p=0.94
		Else	4	-1.89(-6.70,2.92)	p=0.440	69.0%	-
	Intervention Time	≤ 10 weeks	7	-1.44(-4.77,1.90)	p=0.400	73.0%	p=0.3
		>10 weeks	7	-3.43(-6.3, -0.56)	p=0.020	72.0%	
	Exercise Frequency	<3 times/week	5	-3.48(-7.42,0.46)	p=0.080	75.0%	p=0.5
		\geq 3 times/week	9	-2.00(-4.63,0.44)	p=0.140	69.0%	
HR _{max}	Age	5<<15	10	7.27(2.12,12.41)	p=0.006	97.0%	n-0.0
		≥15	2	-2.82(-8.21,2.57)	p=0.300	0.0%	p=0.0
	Participants	Health	2	45.39(-39.87,130.65)	p=0.300	100.0%	
		Obesity	4	-0.01(-2.47,2.46)	p=1.000	41.0%	p=0.5
		Else	6	0.22(-1.50,1.06)	p=0.740	13.0%	
	Intervention Time	≤ 10 weeks	8	0.09(-1.16,1.34)	p=0.890	14.0%	p=0.63
		>10 weeks	3	-0.48(-2.67,1.70)	p=0.660	35.0%	
	Exercise Frequency	<3 times/week	5	-1.85(-3.86,0.16)	p=0.070	0.0%	p=0.0.
		>3 times/week	6	0.45(-0.02.0.92)	p=0.060	3.0%	

	Exp	erimenta	al	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
BMI									
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018)	19.2	4.5	29	20.5	3.9	24	1.5%	-1.30 [-3.56, 0.96]	-
Baquet et al.(2001)	20.22	3.65	503	19.97	3.34	48	2.4%	0.25 [-0.75, 1.25]	+
Boer et al.(2014)	27.7	4.7	17	26.9	2.9	14	1.2%	0.80 [-1.90, 3.50]	+
Breil et al.(2010)	21.8	2.2	13	22.8	2.6	8	1.5%	-1.00 [-3.16, 1.16]	-
Buchan et al.(2011)	21.31	2.1	17	22.31	2.5	24	2.1%	-1.00 [-2.41, 0.41]	
Cao et al.(2012)	27.92	2.54	20	29.11	3.72	20	1.7%	-1.19 [-3.16, 0.78]	~
Costigan et al.(2016)	21.72	2.1	21	22.29	3.53	22	1.8%	-0.57 [-2.30, 1.16]	-
Cvetković et al.(2018)	26.35	3.33	10	26.16	4.49	11	0.9%	0.19 [-3.17, 3.55]	+
Engel et al.(2019)	16.5	2	17	18.5	4.1	18	1.6%	-2.00 [-4.12, 0.12]	~
Georges et al.(2010)	17.6	2.6	22	18.2	3.5	19	1.7%	-0.60 [-2.51, 1.31]	1
Hammami et al.(2018)	20	2	10	20.3	1	10	2.1%	-0.30 [-1.69, 1.09]	1
Huo Kaiwen(2020)	19.23	2.8	20	19.15	3.82	20	1.6%	0.08 [-2.00, 2.16]	t
Juliana Pizzi et al.(2017)	28.35	4.3	20	29.6	4.31	34	1.4%	-1.25 [-3.63, 1.13]	-
Lambrick et al.(2016)	20.49	4.52	28	20.11	4.22	27	1.4%	0.38 [-1.93, 2.69]	Ť
Lau et al.(2015)	23.9	2.5	15	25.2	3.2	12	1.5%	-1.30 [-3.51, 0.91]	~
Leahy et al. (2019)	21.7	3.1	38	22.8	2.8	30	2.1%	-1.10 [-2.61, 0.31]	1
Li kang(2018)	20.89	3.02	38	21.21	3.19	54	2.2%	-0.32 [-1.60, 0.96]	I
Ludyga et al.(2019)	21.3	3.8	32	21.4	4.8	28	1.5%	-0.10 [-2.31, 2.11]	1
Lynne wary Boddy et al.(2010) Ma. Oin/2020	23.0	2.2	15	21.3	3.1	15	1.3%	2.00 [-0.13, 0.13]	
Martin et al. (2015)	20.90	0.03	10	27.10	0.07	10	2.7.70	-0.20[-0.74, 0.34]	
Martin Erail (2013)	21.0	2.0	20	22.0	24	20	2.0%	-0.90 [-2.40, 0.00]	
Maturi Sinur et al. (2013) Maturak et al. (2014)	22.0	2.0	24	21.0	2.1	42	2.270	-0.70 [-0.39, 1.99]	1
McNarry et al. (2014)	20 / 0	4.52	29	19.46	4.02	92	1.5%	1 03 [-1 23 3 20]	+
MCNARPY et al. (2013)	20.43	3.61	35	20.06	4.02	34	1.8%	1.45 [-0.39, 3.29]	Ļ
Mu Taiyang(2019)	21.51	2.01	11	20.00	3.63	11	1.2%	-0.70 [-3.45, 2.05]	+
Peter Rijs Hansen et al (2013)	27.4	2.31	20	20.1	33	11	1.4%	-4 70 [-7 00 -2 40]	-
Playsic et al (2020)	30.9	3.3	22	32.2	4	22	1.5%	-1.30 [-3.47 0.87]	-
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	18.1	4.3	8	18.3	23	8	0.9%	-0.20 [-3.58 3 18]	+
Buiz-Ariza et al (2019)	21.92	4.11	90	20.76	2.97	94	2.3%	1 16 0 12 2 201	-
Tiønna et al.(2009)	34.1	0.5	13	32.9	0.5	14	2.7%	1.20 [0.82, 1.58]	•
Valérie et al.(2022)	32.1	4.4	19	32.9	5	11	0.9%	-0.80 [-4.36, 2.76]	-
Weston et al.(2016)	21.8	4.5	41	20.5	2.7	60	2.0%	1.30 (-0.24, 2.84)	+
Winn et al.(2021)	21	3.9	221	21.08	4	69	2.3%	-0.08 [-1.15, 0.99]	-
Yang Zhongwu(2019)	17.74	1.82	20	20.37	2.11	20	2.2%	-2.63 [-3.85, -1.41]	*
Zhu Kunru(2020)	20.25	1.42	20	20.35	1.19	20	2.5%	-0.10 [-0.91, 0.71]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			1513			942	63.6%	-0.30 [-0.72, 0.13]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.88; Chi ² :	= 105.24	, df = 35	i (P < 0	.00001)	; l ² = 67	%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.37 (P	= 0.17)								
BF%									
Baquet et al.(2001)	22.06	9.6	503	18.73	7.09	48	1.5%	3.33 [1.16, 5.50]	~
Boer et al.(2014)	30.4	7	17	32	7	14	0.5%	-1.60 [-6.55, 3.35]	-
Breil et al.(2010)	12	7.9	13	11.6	6.4	8	0.4%	0.40 [-5.77, 6.57]	+
Buchan et al.(2011)	19.2	5.8	17	16.62	7.2	24	0.7%	2.58 [-1.41, 6.57]	t-
Cao et al.(2012)	26.41	4.82	20	32.58	5.55	20	1.0%	-6.17 [-9.39, -2.95]	-
Cvetković et al.(2018)	31.15	6.9	10	29.6	7.68	11	0.4%	1.55 [-4.69, 7.79]	T
Ferrete et al.(2014)	12.8	3.1	11	12.2	3.9	13	1.2%	0.60 [-2.20, 3.40]	Ť
G. Baquet et al.(2002)	22.2	8.8	20	21.4	7.4	33	0.6%	0.80 [-3.81, 5.41]	Т
Hammami et al. (2018)	14.8	1.5	10	14.9	1.8	10	2.0%	-0.10 [-1.55, 1.35]	L
Lamprick et al. (2016)	24.85	10.73	28	25.02	8.75	27	0.5%	-0.17 [-5.34, 5.00]	1
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.(2010) Ma Oin(2020)	40.55	8.18	15	35.45	8.7	45	0.2%	5.11 [-3.16, 13.38]	
Ma Giri(2020) Mu Teiueng(2010)	29.65	2.3	10	30.3	2.31	10	1.9%	-0.00 [-2.30, 1.00]	
Multariyarig(2019) Playeic et al. (2020)	41.0	2.09	22	21.19	0.37	22	1 1 04	-0.99 [-4.94, 2.90]	-
Pacil et al. (2020)	24.2	1.7	11	26.4	1.2	12	2.206	-1.10[-2.21, 0.03]	
Racil et al. (2015)	36.4	1.6	17	39.3	0.7	14	2.2.0	-2.90 [-3.70 -2.10]	· -
Racil et al (2016)(2)	36.5	13	23	37	1.9	19	2.0%	-0.50[-1.51_0.51]	
Tignna et al (2009)	38.6	0.7	13	39.1	0.6	14	2.7%	-0.50 (-0.99, -0.01)	
Valérie et al (2022)	33.8	3.6	19	37.7	3.6	11	1.2%	-3.90 [-6.57 -1.23]	-
Weston et al.(2016)	18.3	11.1	41	19.6	7.8	60	0.8%	-1.30 [-5.23, 2.63]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			829			394	24.6%	-0.79 [-1.64, 0.06]	(
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.77; Chi ²	= 66.26.	df = 19 ((P < 0.)	00001):	l² = 719	6			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.83 (P	= 0.07)								
1.000									
WC									
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018)	61.7	5.6	29	65.8	7.2	24	0.9%	-4.10 [-7.63, -0.57]	~
Boer et al.(2014)	91.5	13.1	17	95.9	8.2	14	0.3%	-4.40 [-11.96, 3.16]	
Juliana Pizzi et al.(2017)	94.46	12.6	20	95.62	11.81	34	0.3%	-1.16 [-7.96, 5.64]	-
Lambrick et al.(2016)	69.55	7.3	28	64.04	12.49	27	0.5%	5.51 [0.08, 10.94]	
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.(2010)	77.3	6.9	8	71.6	7.7	8	0.3%	5.70 [-1.46, 12.86]	-
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	72.5	9.8	22	71.3	6.1	30	0.6%	1.20 [-3.44, 5.84]	+
Mazurek et al.(2014)	63.2	4.5	24	64.4	4.1	42	1.5%	-1.20 [-3.39, 0.99]	-
mu Laiyang(2019)	91.63	7.09	11	93.86	10.44	11	0.3%	-2.23 [-9.69, 5.23]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	91.5	7.8	22	96.9	11.4	22	0.4%	-5.40 [-11.17, 0.37]	
Racii et al.(2013)	90.3	6.7	11	92.8	3.7	12	U.6%	-2.50 [-6.98, 1.98]	Ţ
Racillet al. (2016)	91	6	17	94	4	14	0.9%	-3.00 [-6.54, 0.54]	
Racillet al.(2016)(2)	90	5	23	92	3	19	1.2%	-2.00 [-4.80, 0.80]	
Rusenkranz et al. (2012) Tigene et al. (2020)	6U.6	11.3	8	02.3	5.7	8	0.2%	-1.70 [-10.47, 7.07]	
rjørina et al.(2009) Westen et al.(2019)	98.1	12.2	13	100.1	2.3	14	1.9%	-2.00 [-3.70, -0.30]	
Vestorierdi.(2010) Vend Zhonowa/2010	11.4 60.05	13.1	41	70 7	0.8 0.70	00	U.0% 1.0%	7.40 [Z.05, 1Z.15]	_
Subtotal (95% CI)	00.00	2.69	314	12.2	3.19	350	11 9%	-4.10 [*0.24, *2.00] -1 24 [-2 79 0 30]	
Hotorogonaity Tou2 - 4 76: Obi2-	- 36 60	df = 16 /	914 (P=0)	001\-8-	- 50%	208	11.070	-1.2-4 [-2.10, 0.30]	1
Test for overall effort 7 – 1.60 /D	= 0.111	ai = 10 (. – 0.1	501),11-	- 5570				
Footion overall ellect. Z = 1.30 (F	- 0.11)								
									-100 -50 0 50 100
									⊢avours [experimental] Favours [control]

Fig. 3 Forest plot of body morphology indicators

	Expe	rimenta	ł	Co	ontrol	_		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
2max 8 M McManus et al (7005)	511.7	37	111	45.4	КА	15	1.8%	5 30 (1 33 9 27)	
Anneke van Bilion et al.(2003)	20.5	7.2	29	15.9	7.9	24	1.8%	4.60 [0.49, 8.71]	
Breil et al.(2010)	56.2	5.1	13	54.4	7	8	1.5%	1.80 [-3.79, 7.39]	+-
Cao et al.(2012)	33.82	2.46	20	27.76	3.68	20	2.2%	6.06 [4.12, 8.00]	-
G. Baquet et al. (2002)	47.5	7.2	20	45.3	7.2	33	1.8%	2.20 [-1.80, 6.20]	T
Georges et al.(2010) Helgerud et al.(2001)	54.1	3.4	22	47.9	b./ 4.4	19	2.0%	6.20 [2.87, 9.53] 4 90 [1 07 9 53]	-
Huo Kaiwen(2020)	48.57	3.49	20	46.09	5.67	20	2.1%	2.48 [-0.44, 5.40]	-
Lambrick et al.(2016)	54.26	9.6	28	54.31	7.78	27	1.7%	-0.05 [-4.66, 4.56]	+
Leahy et al.(2019)	53.1	9.6	38	50.1	10.5	30	1.6%	3.00 [-1.84, 7.84]	t-
Li kang(2018) Lumpa Manu Baddu at al. (2010)	32.16	2.83	38	30.11	3.18	54	2.3%	2.05 [0.81, 3.29]	
Martin Smith et al (2019)	42.09	7.31	22	45.71	5.68	30	1.2.%	-3.12 [-10.26, 4.04] 5 04 [1 35 8 73]	
Mazurek et al.(2014)	41.7	7.1	24	38.3	7.1	42	1.9%	3.40 [-0.16, 6.96]	
Patrick Mucci et al.(2013)	85.7	6.3	9	82.1	6.7	9	1.4%	3.60 [-2.41, 9.61]	+-
Plavsic et al. (2020)	23.9	3.7	22	23.3	4.8	22	2.1%	0.60 [-1.93, 3.13]	Ť
Racil et al.(2013) Regil et al.(2016)(2)	39.7	1.8	11	38.6	1.4	12	2.3%	1.10 [-0.23, 2.43]	I
Tiønna et al.(2009)	39.2	1.1	13	31.9	1.5	14	2.4%	4.10 [3.31, 4.89]	*
Subtotal (95% CI)			379	01.0		416	36.3%	2.91 [1.80, 4.02]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.40; Chi ² =	= 77.53, dt	f= 18 (P	< 0.00	001); I² =	77%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.14 (P	< 0.00001	1)							
SBD									
Anneke van Bilion et al (2018)	1077	9.8	29	111.6	74	24	1.7%	-3.90 [-8 54 0 74]	
Boer et al.(2014)	113	8	17	119	10	14	1.3%	-6.00 [-12.47, 0.47]	
Buchan et al.(2011)	106	11	17	109	11	24	1.2%	-3.00 [-9.83, 3.83]	
Cao et al.(2012)	112.18	6.42	20	117.16	6.42	20	1.8%	-4.98 [-8.96, -1.00]	
Cvetkovic et al.(2018)	116.5	14.15	10	124.85	11.58	11	0.7%	-8.35 [-19.47, 2.77]	
Malte Neist Larsen et al (2010)	103.4	8.6	57	105.5	9.7	115	2.1%	-2.50 [-5.35, 0.35]	-
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	118	8	22	125	13	30	1.5%	-7.00 [-12.73, -1.27]	
Peter Riis Hansen et al.(2013)	112	9	20	122	10	11	1.2%	-10.00 [-17.10, -2.90]	
Plavsic et al. (2020)	110.3	8.5	22	114.4	6.8	22	1.7%	-4.10 [-8.65, 0.45]	_
Racil et al.(2016) Recentrant et al.(2012)	115	26	17	118	27	14	1.9%	-3.00 [-6.54, 0.54]	1
Tiønna et al.(2009)	120.9	2.5	13	119.8	2.1	14	2.3%	1.10 [-0.45, 2.65]	+
Weston et al.(2016)	122	11	41	118	10	60	1.8%	4.00 [-0.21, 8.21]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			301			375	22.1%	-2.73 [-4.67, -0.79]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 7.45; Chi ² =	= 37.23, dt	f=13 (P	= 0.00	104); I ² = 6	65%				
Test for overall effect. $Z = 2.76$ (P	= 0.006)								
DBP									
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018)	107.7	9.8	29	111.6	7.4	24	1.7%	-3.90 [-8.54, 0.74]	
Boer et al.(2014)	113	8	17	119	10	14	1.3%	-6.00 [-12.47, 0.47]	
Buchan et al.(2011)	106	11	17	109	11	24	1.2%	-3.00 [-9.83, 3.83]	
Cauler al. (2012) Cyetković et al. (2018)	112.18	1415	20	174.85	0.42	20	1.8%	-4.98 [-8.96, -1.00] -8 35 [-19 47 -2.77]	
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.(2010)	64.6	4.9	8	58.8	5.3	8	1.6%	5.80 [0.80, 10.80]	
Malte Nejst Larsen et al.(2020)	103.4	8.6	57	105.9	9.7	115	2.1%	-2.50 [-5.35, 0.35]	-
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	118	8	22	125	13	30	1.5%	-7.00 [-12.73, -1.27]	
Peter Riis Hansen et al. (2013) Blavoia et al. (2020)	112	9	20	122	10	11	1.2%	-10.00 [-17.10, -2.90]	
Bacil et al (2016)	115	0.0	17	114.4	0.0	14	1.7%	-3.00[-6.54_0.54]	-
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	103.8	2.5	8	105.5	3.7	8	2.0%	-1.70 [-4.79, 1.39]	
Tjønna et al.(2009)	120.9	2	13	119.8	2.1	14	2.3%	1.10 [-0.45, 2.65]	t
Weston et al.(2016)	122	11	41	118	10	60	1.8%	4.00 [-0.21, 8.21]	AT-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² – 9 15: Chi ² -	- 13.85 dt	f = 13 (P	301 < 0.00	01): 12 - 5	20%	3/5	22.8%	-2.42 [-4.40, -0.38]	•
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.33 (P	= 0.02)	13 (F	- 0.00		5.0				
	-,								
HRmax		2			_				
A. M. McManus et al.(2005) Proil et al.(2010)	193	6	10	195	7	15	1.6%	-2.00 [-7.14, 3.14]	
Cvetković et al. (2018)	192	29	10	200.72	3.89	11	2.1%	-2.42[-5.34_0.50]	-
G. Baquet et al.(2002)	201	7	20	204	7	33	1.8%	-3.00 [-6.89, 0.89]	-
Georges et al.(2010)	202	6	22	200	7	19	1.8%	2.00 [-2.02, 6.02]	+
Lambrick et al.(2016)	202.54	11.12	28	202	11.43	27	1.4%	0.54 [-5.42, 6.50]	T
Lau et al.(2015) Ludvoa et al.(2019)	205.9 100 A	11.6 17.6	15	200.5 101.6	12.2	28	1.1% n.a.«	5.40 [-2.01, 12.81] 80 nn 170 54 00 461	
McNarry et al. (2015)	202.46	11.13	28	202.41	11.62	27	1.4%	0.05 [-5.97, 6.07]	+
Plavsic et al.(2020)	183	9	22	182	25	22	0.7%	1.00 [-10.10, 12.10]	
Racil et al.(2016)	202.8	2.1	17	202.3	2.2	14	2.3%	0.50 [-1.02, 2.02]	ţ
Soori et al.(2020) Subtotal (95% CP	207.95	0.7	26	207.5	0.9	17	2.4%	0.45 [-0.06, 0.96]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 59.56° Chi ²	= 348 55	. df = 11	_∠4-J (P < Ω	.0000111	² = 97%	24J	10.070	5.51 [1.24, 10.36]	•
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.48 (P	= 0.01)		, J.		5. 4				
									-100 -50 0 50 100
									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Fig. 4 Forest plot of CRF indicators

	Exp	eriment	al	0	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
TC								Too Back and the second se	
Boer et al.(2014)	8.6	22.9	17	9.55	25.8	14	0.0%	-0.95 [-18.30, 16.40]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Buchan et al.(2011)	3.96	1.81	17	3.55	1.45	24	1.7%	0.41 [-0.63, 1.45]	
Juliana Pizzi et al.(2017)	8.78	34.18	8	8.52	33.17	8	0.0%	0.26 [-32.74, 33.26]	• • • •
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	4.49	0.29	22	4.85	0.22	30	14.5%	-0.36 [-0.50, -0.22]	+
Mazurek et al.(2014)	4.5	0.5	24	4.5	0.6	42	10.5%	0.00 [-0.27, 0.27]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	3.93	0.6	22	4.02	0.74	22	7.2%	-0.09 [-0.49, 0.31]	
Racil et al.(2013)	3.53	0.31	11	3.86	0.16	12	12.6%	-0.33 [-0.53, -0.13]	-
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	8.33	20.5	8	9.38	20.2	8	0.0%	-1.05 [-20.99, 18.89]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Subtotal (95% CI)			129			160	46.5%	-0.25 [-0.38, -0.12]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00	Chi ² =	8.10, df	= 7 (P =	= 0.32);	$ ^2 = 14\%$	5			
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	.75 (P=	0.0002)							
HDL-C									
Buchan et al.(2011)	1.83	1.41	17	2.2	1.46	24	2.2%	-0.37 [-1.26, 0.52]	
Juliana Pizzi et al.(2017)	2.57	10.39	20	2.96	16.92	34	0.0%	-0.39 [-7.68, 6.90]	• • • •
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	1.32	0.84	22	1.31	0.11	30	8.2%	0.01 [-0.34, 0.36]	
Mazurek et al.(2014)	1.8	0.4	24	1.8	0.5	42	12.1%	0.00 [-0.22, 0.22]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	1.33	0.27	22	1.3	0.26	22	14.2%	0.03 [-0.13, 0.19]	+
Racil et al.(2013)	1.08	0.08	11	1	0.03	12	16.8%	0.08 [0.03, 0.13]	•
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	3.11	18.6	8	2.72	14.9	8	0.0%	0.39 [-16.12, 16.90]	• • • •
Subtotal (95% CI)			124			172	53.5%	0.07 [0.02, 0.12]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00	Chi ² =	1.86, df	= 6 (P =	= 0.93);	l ² = 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2	.95 (P =	0.003)							
TG									×
Boer et al.(2014)	3.93	16.7	17	5.28	85.6	14	0.0%	-1.35 [-46.89, 44.19]	+
Buchan et al.(2011)	1.27	0.42	17	1.06	0.49	24	8.3%	0.21 [-0.07, 0.49]	
Juliana Pizzi et al.(2017)	5.68	58.03	8	5.51	48.98	8	0.0%	0.17 [-52.45, 52.79]	• • • • •
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	0.56	0.17	22	0.81	0.28	30	13.1%	-0.25 [-0.37, -0.13]	+
Mazurek et al.(2014)	0.9	0.3	24	0.8	0.2	42	12.7%	0.10 [-0.03, 0.23]	+-
Plavsic et al.(2020)	0.9	0.32	22	1	0.43	22	9.9%	-0.10 [-0.32, 0.12]	
Racil et al.(2013)	1.3	0.05	11	1.23	0.1	12	14.5%	0.07 [0.01, 0.13]	*
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	6.33	54.5	8	6.5	32.5	8	0.0%	-0.17 [-44.14, 43.80]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Subtotal (95% CI)			129			160	58.5%	-0.00 [-0.15, 0.14]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02,	Chi ² = 3	25.15, d	f = 7 (P	= 0.000)7); l ² = 1	72%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.06 (P =	0.95)							
LDL-C									
Buchan et al.(2011)	1.45	0.58	17	1.73	1.21	24	3.6%	-0.28 [-0.84, 0.28]	
Juliana Pizzi et al.(2017)	5.08	1.69	20	4.4	1.74	34	1.5%	0.68 [-0.26, 1.62]	
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	2.89	0.3	22	3.09	0.24	30	12.2%	-0.20 [-0.35, -0.05]	
Mazurek et al.(2014)	2.3	0.5	24	2.4	0.5	42	9.1%	-0.10 [-0.35, 0.15]	
Plavsic et al.(2020)	2.28	0.69	22	2.18	0.55	22	6.2%	0.10 [-0.27, 0.47]	
Racil et al.(2013)	2.18	0.4	11	2.62	0.18	12	8.9%	-0.44 [-0.70, -0.18]	
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	3.48	20.2	8	5.44	22	8	0.0%	-1.96 [-22.66, 18.74]	·
Subtotal (95% CI)			124			172	41.5%	-0.17 [-0.34, 0.00]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02	Chi ² = 9	9.90, df =	= 6 (P =	0.13):	= 39%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1	.93 (P =	0.05)	100						
		1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.							
									-2 -1 0 1 2
									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Fig. 5 Forest plot of cardiovascular metabolic indicators



Fig. 6 Participants subgroup analysis of BF% max in children and adolescents in the HIIT group and the control group

	Expe	erimen	tal	(ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Else									
Anneke van Biljon et al.(2018)	61.7	5.6	29	65.8	7.2	24	7.7%	-4.10 [-7.63, -0.57]	+
Boer et al.(2014)	91.5	13.1	17	95.9	8.2	14	3.1%	-4.40 [-11.96, 3.16]	-++
Lambrick et al.(2016)	69.55	7.3	28	64.04	12.49	27	5.0%	5.51 [0.08, 10.94]	
Mazurek et al.(2014)	63.2	4.5	24	64.4	4.1	42	10.3%	-1.20 [-3.39, 0.99]	+
Weston et al.(2016)	77.4	13.7	41	70	8.8	60	5.8%	7.40 [2.65, 12.15]	
Yang Zhongwu(2019)	68.05	2.89	20	72.2	3.79	20	10.5%	-4.15 [-6.24, -2.06]	*
Subtotal (95% CI)			159			187	42.4%	-0.36 [-3.82, 3.09]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 13.92; Ch	ni² = 28.6	2, df =	5 (P <)	0.0001)	I ² = 83	%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (I	P = 0.84)								
Health									
Martin Smith et al.(2019)	72.5	9.8	22	71.3	6.1	30	6.0%	1.20 [-3.44, 5.84]	+
Rosenkranz et al.(2012)	60.6	11.3	8	62.3	5.7	8	2.5%	-1.70 [-10.47, 7.07]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			30			38	8.5%	0.57 [-3.54, 4.67]	♦
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ²	= 0.33,	df = 1 (P = 0.5	7); 12 = (1%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P = 0.79)								
Obesity									
Juliana Pizzi et al.(2017)	94.46	12.6	20	95.62	11.81	34	3.7%	-1.16 [-7.96, 5.64]	+
Lynne Mary Boddy et al.(2010)	77.3	6.9	8	71.6	7.7	8	3.4%	5.70 [-1.46, 12.86]	
Mu Taiyang(2019)	91.63	7.09	11	93.86	10.44	11	3.2%	-2.23 [-9.69, 5.23]	-+
Playsic et al.(2020)	91.5	7.8	22	96.9	11.4	22	4.6%	-5.40 [-11.17, 0.37]	-
Racil et al.(2013)	90.3	6.7	11	92.8	3.7	12	6.2%	-2.50 [-6.98, 1.98]	
Racil et al.(2016)	91	6	17	94	4	14	7.7%	-3.00 [-6.54, 0.54]	*
Racil et al.(2016)(2)	90	6	23	92	3	19	9.1%	-2.00 [-4.80, 0.80]	*
Tjønna et al.(2009)	98.1	2.2	13	100.1	2.3	14	11.2%	-2.00 [-3.70, -0.30]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			125			134	49.1%	-2.06 [-3.26, -0.86]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ²	= 6.18,	df = 7 (P = 0.5	2); I ² = (9%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.37 (P = 0.000	08)							
Total (95% CI)			314			359	100.0%	-1.24 [-2.78, 0.30]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 4.76; Chi ²	= 36.58	, df = 1	5 (P =	0.001);1	² = 59%	,			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.58 (I	P = 0.11)		0.000		100000000000000000000000000000000000000				-100 -50 0 50 100
Test for subgroup differences: ($hi^2 = 21$	0 df =	2 (P =	0.35) P	= 4.6%				Favours (experimental) Favours (control)

Fig. 7 Participants subgroup analysis of WC max in children and adolescents in the HIIT

group and the control group