Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Heliyon



journal homepage: www.cell.com/heliyon

# Effect of high-intensity interval training compared to moderate-intensity continuous training on body composition and insulin sensitivity in overweight and obese adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Silvia Sanca-Valeriano <sup>a,\*</sup>, Marcos Espinola-Sánchez<sup>b</sup>, José Caballero-Alvarado<sup>c</sup>, Carlos Canelo-Aybar<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Escuela de Medicina, Universidad César Vallejo, Peru

<sup>b</sup> Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad Privada del Norte, Peru

<sup>c</sup> Facultad de Medicina Humana, Universidad Privada Antenor Orrego, Peru

<sup>d</sup> Iberoamerican Cochrane Centre, Biomedical Research Institute Sant Pau (IIB Sant Pau), Spain

# ARTICLE INFO

CelPress

Keywords: High-intensity interval training Physical exercise Obesity Overweight Insulin sensitivity Body composition

# ABSTRACT

*Objective:* To compare the effects of high-intensity interval training (HIIT) and moderate-intensity continuous training (MICT) on adults with overweight and obesity. Outcomes, including changes in insulin sensitivity, weight, body mass index (BMI), waist circumference, and body fat, were analyzed.

*Methods:* A systematic literature review was conducted. This review is registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) under the number CRD42021281899. Clinical trials involving individuals who are overweight and obese and comparing HIIT with MICT effects on insulin sensitivity, weight, BMI, body fat percentage, and waist circumference were included. PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, and Scopus databases were searched using controlled vocabulary and free-text terms related to HIIT, obesity, and overweight. The search included studies published until September 2022. The Rob2 tool was used to assess the risk of bias. The results were presented through meta-analyses that provided summary estimators and confidence intervals. Subgroup analyses were conducted to assess the effect of the risk of bias on the outcomes. This research did not receive any specific funding.

*Results*: Of the 2534 articles, 30 met the eligibility criteria. The intervention duration ranged from 4 to 16 weeks. The observed effects for each outcome were as follows: insulin sensitivity (p = 0.02), weight (p = 0.58), BMI (p = 0.53), waist circumference (p = 0.87), body fat percentage (p = 0.07), body fat mass in kilograms (p = 0.39). The level of evidence obtained was moderate except for waist circumference, which was rated as low. Limitations included heterogeneity in training protocols, measurements, and study duration. Additionally, a risk of bias was identified in these studies.

*Conclusion*: HIIT and MICT did not significantly differ in their effects on weight, BMI, waist circumference, or body fat mass in adults with overweight and obesity. However, a moderate beneficial effect of HIIT was observed on insulin sensitivity. Therefore, further evidence is required to confirm these findings.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: silviinoe@gmail.com (S. Sanca-Valeriano).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e20402

Received 28 April 2023; Received in revised form 21 September 2023; Accepted 22 September 2023

Available online 23 September 2023

<sup>2405-8440/© 2023</sup> Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

### 1. Introduction

Obesity is a prominent global public health concern, as acknowledged by the World Health Organization. In 2016, the number of adults who are overweight or obese surpassed 2 billion, with over 650 million classified as obese [1]. Additionally, obesity substantially affects healthcare expenses, with medical costs for individuals with obesity being 30–40% higher than those for individuals with a normal weight [2].

Obesity and a sedentary lifestyle are associated with at least 18 endocrine and cardiovascular comorbidities [3,4]. This association is attributed to an increase in the size and number of adipocytes, leading to insulin resistance [5,6] and an imbalance in glucose homeostasis, resulting in metabolic complications [7,8]. Moreover, a previous study revealed that elevated insulin and triglyceride levels were associated with increased body composition measurements, such as abdominal area and adipose tissue content, regardless of type 2 diabetes [9].

Interval training involves a series of high-intensity exercises similar to or approaching anaerobic exercises, interspersed with periods of lower intensity [10]. High-intensity interval training (HIIT) targets intensities between 80% and 100% of the maximum heart rate or aerobic capacity, with intervals lasting from 6 s to 4 min, followed by a brief period of reduced oxygen consumption [11]. HIIT can be customized to accommodate individual conditions, making it suitable for patients with chronic illnesses [12], such as cardiovascular diseases [13,14] and type 2 diabetes [15–17].

Continuous training, also known as continuous exercise or steady-state training, encompasses any form of physical training performed without rest intervals and can be executed at low, moderate, or high exercise intensities [18]. Moderate-intensity continuous training (MICT) is characterized by exercising at 55–70% of the maximum heart rate, typically for durations of 20–60 min [19], 60–65% of maximal oxygen consumption, or 65% of the maximum power output [20].

When comparing HIIT and MICT in individuals with obesity, similar metabolic and cardiovascular improvements were reported for both interventions [21]. Evidence from small-sample experimental studies on adults with obesity suggests that HIIT may have stronger beneficial effects on body composition and insulin sensitivity than MICT [22]. Furthermore, moderate-level evidence indicates that HIIT can enhance insulin sensitivity and body composition in adults; however, this is more likely to occur in adults at a higher risk of cardiovascular disease and diabetes than in healthy adults [23].

Previous reviews examining the effects of HIIT and MICT on cardiovascular risk factors did not include their effect on insulin sensitivity [24,25], whereas the other review did not include their effect on waist circumference [25]. Insulin sensitivity and waist circumference measurements are crucial because of their close association with metabolic health and the risk of developing chronic diseases, especially type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular diseases [9]. However, evidence regarding the comparative effects of HIIT and MICT on changes in insulin sensitivity and improvements in body composition in adults who are overweight and obese remains inconclusive [26]. Furthermore, the effects of HIIT and MICT may vary based on population characteristics [27].

By conducting a systematic review and meta-analysis of the available studies, this study aimed to provide a comprehensive and rigorous synthesis of the existing evidence on the effects of HIIT and MICT on body composition and insulin sensitivity in this population. The findings of this study will offer robust and reliable information for healthcare professionals, researchers, and individuals who are overweight or obese, enabling them to make informed decisions regarding the most beneficial exercise approach for enhancing body composition and insulin sensitivity. Moreover, this research will facilitate the development of more effective and personalized interventions for weight management and disease prevention in this population.

We performed a systematic review assessing the effect of HIIT (I) compared with that of MICT (C) in adults with overweight and obese (P) by analyzing the changes in insulin sensitivity (O). The secondary outcomes were body weight, body mass index, abdominal waist circumference, and body fat. This study aimed to address the following question: What is the effect of HIIT compared with MICT on body composition and insulin sensitivity in adults with overweight and obesity?

# 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Systematic review with meta-analysis

The protocol for this systematic review was registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) (CRD42021281899). This study adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (2020).

### 2.2. Structured question and outcome prioritization

The systematic review considered the following elements of the research using the PICO framework.

Acronym	Definition	Description
Р	Population	Adults who are overweight and obese
I	Intervention	High-intensity interval training
С	Comparison	Moderate-intensity continuous training
0	Outcome	Insulin sensitivity
		Body weight

### S. Sanca-Valeriano et al.

### (continued)

Acronym	Definition	Description
		Body mass index
		Abdominal waist circumference
		Body fat

# 2.3. Search strategy and database

PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, and Scopus databases were searched. In our article search, we employed controlled vocabulary and free-text terms related to HIIT, including "high intensity interval training," "high intensity interval training exercise," and "high intensity interval training group." Similarly, we employed terms related to obesity and overweight, including "obese," "obese adult," "overweight," and "overweight adult." During the article search, no restrictions were imposed on the publication start date, and articles published up to September 30, 2022, were included. One of the researchers on the team (JC) conducted this process. No filters were applied during the search to identify studies, and manual searches of the selected articles were not conducted.

In the systematic search, only the elements of the PICO question related to population (obesity) and intervention (HIIT) were considered to ensure a comprehensive search for relevant studies. The following search formulae were used in the respective scientific databases.

MEDLINE/PubMed	EMBASE/OVID	SCOPUS	WEB OF SCIENCE
<pre>((("high intensity interval training"[Mesh]) OR ("high intensity interval training"[tiab]) OR ("high intensity interval training exercise"[tiab]) OR ("high intensity interval training group"[tiab]))) AND (((Obesity [Mesh]) OR (obese[tiab]) OR ("obese adult"[tiab]) OR (overweight[tiab]) OR ("overweight adult"[tiab])))</pre>	(((exp "high intensity interval training"/) OR ("high intensity interval training".tw.) OR ("high intensity interval training exercise". tw.) OR ("high intensity interval training group".tw.))) AND (((exp Obesity/) OR (obese.tw.) OR ("obese adult".tw.) OR (overweight.tw.) OR ("overweight adult".tw.)))	((("high intensity interval training") OR ("high intensity interval training") OR ("high intensity interval training exercise") OR ("high intensity interval training group"))) AND (((Obesity) OR (obese) OR ("obese adult") OR (overweight) OR ("overweight adult")))	((("high intensity interval training") OR ("high intensity interval training") OR ("high intensity interval training exercise") OR ("high intensity interval training group"))) AND (((Obesity) OR (obese) OR ("obese adult") OR (overweight) OR ("overweight adult")))

### 2.4. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Clinical trials that involved individuals with obesity or overweight, determined by body mass index, body fat percentage, and/or waist circumference, were included. Additionally, studies involving adults aged 18 years and older, without sex restrictions, were included. Studies that evaluated HIIT and MICT programs using training protocols based on parameters such as maximum heart rate, maximal oxygen consumption, or maximum aerobic speed were included. In cases where two interval training protocols were employed, the interval regimen with the highest volume was selected for comparison with the MICT.

Studies that incorporated complementary nutritional interventions were only included if these interventions were the same for all participants. Studies that assessed insulin sensitivity using a homeostatic model assessment (HOMA) or a similar test with comparable physiological explanations were also included. Furthermore, studies that evaluated body composition, including weight (in kilograms), body mass index, waist circumference (in centimeters), visceral fat mass, or any other measurement of body fat, were included.

Studies that included participants with any type of chronic disease, pregnant or postpartum patients, or individuals engaged in elite athletic training were excluded. Furthermore, studies with HIIT and MICT programs lasting less than 3 weeks and those that incorporated an additional component of pharmacological intervention were excluded. Articles published in languages other than Spanish or English were also excluded.

### 2.5. Study selection

After the article search, the Rayyan program was used to eliminate duplicate articles, which was independently performed by two researchers (SS and ME). Discrepancies were resolved by a third researcher (CC). Subsequently, the remaining articles were reviewed based on their titles and abstracts using the eligibility criteria. Additionally, full-text articles were reviewed, and those that met the selection criteria were included. Two researchers (SS and ME) independently conducted these procedures, and any discrepancies were resolved by a third researcher (CC).

### 2.6. Data extraction and risk of bias assessment

In the selected studies, two researchers (SS and ME) independently extracted participant characteristics, the number of individuals in each group, outcome values for each variable of interest, and HIIT and MICT protocols. Mean and standard deviation values were calculated for insulin sensitivity, waist circumference, body mass index, and body fat mass. In case of data discrepancies, the full text of

the article was re-examined to verify the extracted information. Two researchers (SS and ME) independently assessed the risk of bias in each study. The Rob2 tool was used for clinical trials, and any disagreements were resolved by a third researcher (CC).

# 2.7. Assessment of the certainty of the evidence

The quality of evidence was assessed using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach [28]. The GRADEpro tool, as detailed on the website (https://gradepro.org), was utilized to construct evidence tables for the evaluated outcomes [29]. Two reviewers (SS and ME) rated the quality of evidence for each outcome. As is customary in systematic reviews, we adopted a partially contextualized approach to rate the certainty of evidence. This means that for a point estimate (or range) of a single outcome, we evaluated our certainty that the true effects lay within the boundaries of what we considered a trivial, small, medium, or large effect without considering evidence from other outcomes.

# 2.8. Data analysis plan

The means and pre-post-intervention mean differences for numerical outcomes and their respective standard deviations were extracted from the studies. Pooled effect sizes were estimated using a fixed-effects or random-effects model based on the heterogeneity among the studies and the chosen epidemiological approach. Weighted mean differences (WMD) were used to measure the variation in mean differences in the outcomes obtained from HIIT and MICT interventions. Heterogeneity among the studies was assessed by inspecting the forest plot for all outcomes, supplemented with the evaluation of the Q statistic and I<sup>2</sup> parameters for relative effects. Funnel plots were used to examine publication bias. A subgroup analysis was conducted based on the risk of bias presented in the different outcomes of the included studies. Analyses were performed using RevMan 5.4 software.



Fig. 1. PRISMA flowchart for the study selection.

# Table 1 Characteristics of participants in the included studies and description of body weight and fat mass measurement instruments.

Study	Country	Population Characteristics	HIIT		MICT		Dietary Control (DC) and Regular Physical Activity	Measure of
			Age (years)	Sample Size (M/ F)	Age (years)	Sample Size (M/ F)	(RPA)	TBM/FM
Ahmadizad <sup>30</sup>	Iran	Healthy overweight men, taking no medications with no experience of regular exercise	$25\pm1$	10 (10 M)	$25\pm1$	10 (10 M)	DC and RPA: recorded daily and instructed for its maintenance.	TBM: ES FM: BIA
Boukabous <sup>31</sup>	Canada	Women (60 and 75 years): with abdominal obesity (waist circumference $\geq$ 88 cm), non-smoker, physically inactive, moderate or no alcohol consumption, apparently healthy, and without medical treatment that could influence metabolism.	66.0 ± 3.4	9 (9 M)	$64.2\pm3.7$	9 (9F)	DC: Instructed to maintain their dietary habits, recording 3 days before and after the study. RPA: NR	TBM: ES FM: DXA
Cheema <sup>32</sup>	Australia	Adults with abdominal obesity, without physical activity, who are apparently healthy.	$43\pm19$	6 (3 M/ 3F)	$36\pm15$	6(2 M/ 4F)	DC and RPA: lack of follow-up.	TBM: ES FM: SF
Chin <sup>33</sup>	China	Adult men, overweight and obese (BMI $\geq$ 23 kg/m <sup>2</sup> , and percentage of body fat >20%), apparently healthy, without medical and chronic health conditions, and without high levels of physical activity.	$22.8\pm3.1$	14 (14 M)	$22.8\pm3.1$	9(9 M)	DC and RPA: instructed to maintain their dietary habits and daily physical activities	TBM and FM: BIA
D'Amuri <sup>34</sup>	Italy	Adults (18–50 years old), obese (BMI: $30-55 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ), without physical activity, apparently healthy.	$40\pm7$	16 (9 M/ 7F)	$37\pm9$	16 (8 M/ 8F)	DC: Received personalized hypocaloric diet and 4- day dietary record. RPA: NR	TBM and FM: BIA
Dupuit <sup>35</sup>	France	Postmenopausal women, overweight or obese (BMI: >25 kg/m <sup>2</sup> and $\leq$ 40 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) with stable eating habits and low physical activity for at least the previous 3 months, without hormone replacement therapy, apparently healthy.	$59.9\pm5.9$	10 (10F)	$67.1 \pm 7.2$	8 (8F)	DC and RPA: instructed to maintain their dietary habits and daily physical activities.	TBM: MS FM: DXA
Galedari <sup>36</sup>	Iran	Adult men (20–40 years old) who are overweight (BMI over 27 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), apparently healthy, without medications or supplements such as omega 3, and non-smokers.	$30.8\pm7.6$	10 (10 M)	$28.8 \pm 6.1$	12 (12 M)	DC: Received individually calorie-restricted diet. A 3-day record at the beginning and last week of training. RPA: NR	TBM: MS FM: DXA
Gerosa- Neto <sup>37</sup>	Brazil	Apparently healthy adults of both sexes who are overweight and obese without alcohol or drug abuse.	$\textbf{41.4} \pm \textbf{9.3}$	10 (NR)	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{50.4} \pm \\ \textbf{11.6} \end{array}$	10 (NR)	DC and RPA: NR	TBM and FM: NR
Gerosa- Neto <sup>38</sup>	Brazil	Adult men with obesity, healthy without physical activity, non-smokers, and not addicted to alcohol ( $\leq$ 30 g/day).	$\textbf{27.5} \pm \textbf{6.9}$	11 (11 M)	$29.8 \pm 4.0$	11(11 M)	DC and RPA: instructed to maintain their dietary habits and daily physical activities.	TBM and FM: NR
Gerosa- Neto <sup>39</sup>	Brazil	Men (18–35 years old) with obesity (BMI $\geq$ 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), without regular physical activity, apparently healthy, non- smokers and without high alcohol consumption.	$29.6 \pm 4.9$	13(13 M)	$29.6 \pm 4.9$	13 (13 M)	DC: Instructed to maintain their usual food intake; no nutritional intervention was provided. RPA: Instructed to avoid other types of physical training during the study.	TBM: NR FM: BIA
Gripp <sup>40</sup>	Brazil	Adults (30–50 years) with overweight or obesity, non- smokers, with physical activity no more than 2 days a week during the last 3 months, and primarily involved in sedentary occupations, with prior medical clearance for participation.	$38\pm 6$	11 (11 M)	$39\pm5$	11 (11 M)	DC: Dietary monitoring and recording for 3 non- consecutive days, instructed to maintain it. RPA: NR	TBM: MS FM: DXA
Hu <sup>41</sup>	China	Adult women (18–25 years) of Chinese ethnicity who are overweight (BMI: $\geq$ 23 kg/m <sup>2</sup> and percentage of body fat over 30%), with a sedentary lifestyle without regular physical activity, non-smokers, not accustomed to drinking alcohol, not using oral contraceptive pills, and medications known to affect body mass and metabolism.	$21.5\pm1.7$	15 (15F)	$21.5\pm1.7$	15 (15F)	Dietary record for 3 days over 4 weeks. DC and RPA: instructed to maintain their dietary habits and daily physical activities.	TBM and FM: DXA
Inoue <sup>42</sup>	Brazil	Adult men (18–36 years old), healthy, sedentary ( $\leq$ 1 day/ week of structured physical activity), BMI 28–35 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ,	$30.0\pm5.4$	10 (10 M)	$30.0\pm5.4$	10(10 M)	DC and RPA: instructed to maintain their dietary habits and daily physical activities.	TBM and FM: NR

# Table 1 (continued)

6

Study	Country	Population Characteristics	HIIT		MICT		Dietary Control (DC) and Regular Physical Activity	Measure of	
			Age (years)	Sample Size (M/ F)	Age (years)	Sample Size (M/ F)	(RPA)	TBM/FM	
		non-smokers, without medication or drug use or alcohol abuse.							
Kong <sup>43</sup>	China	Adults (18–30 years old), overweight or obese (BMI: $\geq$ 23 kg/m <sup>2</sup> and body fat percentage greater than 30%), not physically active, non-smokers, non-alcoholics, apparently healthy, not consuming oral contraceptive pills or any prescribed medication that affects body composition or the endocrine system.	$19.8\pm0.8$	10 (10F)	$19.9\pm2.1$	8 (8F)	DC: 3-day dietary record. RPA: Monitored. DC and RPA: instructed to maintain their dietary habits and daily physical activities.	TBM: ES FM: DXA	
Martins <sup>21</sup>	Norway	Sedentary adults with obesity, not on a weight loss diet or unstable weight, not taking medication that affects appetite or weight.	$33.9\pm7.8$	16(M/F = 0.4)	$33.0\pm9.9$	14 (M/F = 0,6)	DC: Instructed to maintain their usual dietary habits, 3-day record at the beginning and in the last week.	TBM: ES FM: DXA	
Nie <sup>44</sup>	China	Adult women (18–25 years old) with obesity (percentage of body fat $\geq$ 35%), without regular physical activity, non- smokers, apparently healthy, and without current use of prescription drugs (including contraceptive pills).	$21.0 \pm 1.1$	16 (16F)	$20.9\pm1.6$	14(14F)	RPA: Daily record and instructed to maintain it. DC and RPA: instructed to maintain their dietary habits and daily physical activities.	TBM and FM: BIA	
Poon <sup>45</sup>	China	Adult men (40–59 years old) of Chinese ethnicity, with overweight/obesity (BMI: >22.9 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), physically inactive, and without medical conditions and chronic health issues.	$49.6\pm7.8$	12(12 M)	$46.5\pm3.6$	12(12 M)	DC: Instructed to maintain their usual dietary habits, 3-day diet assessment (before and after the intervention). RPA: NR	TBM and FM: BIA	
Ram <sup>46</sup>	Australia	Physically inactive adult men (40–59 years), overweight/ obese (BMI: >22.9 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), without chronic health and medical conditions.	$30\pm 6$	16(16 M)	$26\pm8$	12(12 M)	DC and RPA: instructed to maintain their dietary habits and daily physical activities.	TBM: ES FM: DXA	
Rodrigues <sup>47</sup>	Brazil	Adults who are overweight or obese (BMI: $\geq$ 25 kg/m <sup>2</sup> and waist circumference $\geq$ 80 cm for women and $\geq$ 90 cm for men), without drug or alcohol abuse, and without medication that alters autonomic modulation or participation in the study.	$\begin{array}{l}M~35.6~\pm\\4.2~F~52.0\\\pm~5.8\end{array}$	26 (7 M/ 19F)	$\begin{array}{l} M \; 35.6 \; \pm \\ 4.2 \; F \; 52.0 \\ \pm \; 5.8 \end{array}$	19 (7 M/ 12F)	DC and RPA: NR	TBM: ES FM: NR	
Ryan <sup>48</sup>	United States	Adults with obesity, sedentary, non-smokers, stable weight, not taking any medication or supplement that influences their metabolism, and had no history of cardiovascular or metabolic diseases. The women were premenopausal and not pregnant or lactating; some women were taking birth control medications.	$32\pm7$	16 (7 M/ 9F)	$30\pm 6$	15(5 M/ 10F)	Instructed to maintain body mass. DC: If body mass started to deviate between 1% and 2% from the initial value, they received nutritional guidance to maintain weight. RPA: NR	TBM: NR FM: DXA	
Sawyer <sup>49</sup>	United States	Adult women with obesity (BMI: 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), free of known chronic disease, without regular physical activity.	$\textbf{35.6} \pm \textbf{8.9}$	9(5 M/ 4F)	$\textbf{34.8} \pm \textbf{7.7}$	9(4 M/ 5F)	DC: Instructed to maintain their usual dietary habits; there was no dietary control. RPA: NR	TBM: NR FM: DXA	
Sun <sup>50</sup>	China	Adults (18–30 years old), overweight or obese (BMI: $\geq\!23$ kg/m²), with stable weight, sedentary, healthy lifestyle, non-smokers, non-alcoholics, without medication or nutritional supplements.	$20.8\pm2.7$	15 (15F)	$21.5\pm3.1$	13(13F)	DC: Changed from a normal diet to a low- carbohydrate diet, received nutritional education, and recorded their diet. RPA: Instructed to maintain their usual daily routines and refrain from engaging in any additional exercise.	TBM: ES FM: NR	
Sun <sup>51</sup>	China	Adults (18–30 years old) of Chinese ethnicity with overweight or obesity ( $BMI \ge 23 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ), stable body weight, sedentary, healthy lifestyle, non-smokers, no alcohol	$21.4\pm2.9$	13(13F)	$21.8 \pm 3.1$	12(12F)	DC: Changed from a normal diet to a low- carbohydrate diet, received personalized dietary guidance, and recorded their diet for 3 days per	TBM: ES FM: NR	

Heliyon 9 (2023) e20402

# Table 1 (continued)

 $\checkmark$ 

Study	Country	Population Characteristics	HIIT		MICT		Dietary Control (DC) and Regular Physical Activity	Measure of
			Age (years)	Sample Size (M/ F)	Age (years)	Sample Size (M/ F)	(RPA)	TBM/FM
		consumption, no use of prescription drugs or supplements to lose weight.					week. RPA: Instructed to maintain their usual daily routines and refrain from engaging in any additional exercise.	
Sun <sup>52</sup>	China	Adults (18 and 30 years old) with overweight (BMI: $\geq$ 23 kg/m <sup>2</sup> , body fat $\geq$ 30%), stable body mass, non-smokers, non-alcoholics, without using oral contraceptive pills or any medication that would affect body mass, fasting glucose, or insulin levels.	$21.5\pm1.8$	14(14F)	$20.9 \pm 1.4$	14(14F)	DC: Instructed not to alter their usual diet or restrict intake, recorded their diet for 3 days a week before the intervention and in the fourth, eighth, and twelfth week during the intervention. RPA: Instructed to maintain normal daily physical activities and avoid additional exercises.	TBM and FM: BIA
Vaccari <sup>53</sup>	Italy	Adults (18 and 50 years old) with obesity, stable weight, apparently healthy, without medical and chronic health conditions, without consumption of drugs that influence energy metabolism and cardiorespiratory adjustments to exercise, without consumption of beta-blockers.	$40.1\pm0.4$	16(NR)	37.3 ± 0.6	16(NR)	DC: Received personalized diets. RPA: NR	TBM: MS FM: BIA
Vella <sup>54</sup>	United States	Adults who are overweight or obese (18–44 years old), without chronic health and medical conditions, without antihypertensive or lipid-lowering medications, not currently pregnant or breastfeeding, do not have regular menstrual cycles, and non-smokers.	$23.1\pm6.6$	8(2 M/ 6F)	$28.9 \pm 8.1$	9(5 M/ 4F)	DC: Maintained a similar diet. RPA: NR	TBM and FM: NR
Zapata- Lamana <sup>55</sup>	Chile	Adults (20 and 40 years old) who are overweight or obese, without physical activity, without chronic medical and health conditions, not taking antidepressants, and not pregnant.	$21.2\pm1.4$	14(14F)	$21.3\pm1.4$	14(14F)	DC: Instructed to maintain usual nutritional habits; no recording was conducted. Standardized diet for 1 week before initial measurements and after the training. RPA: NR	TBM and FM: DXA
Zhang <sup>56</sup>	China	Adult women (18–22 years old) who are overweight or obese (BMI $\geq$ 25 kg/m <sup>2</sup> , body fat percentage $\geq$ 30) with stable body weight participating in a physical education class twice a week, but not in other regular physical activities or training; no chronic health and medical conditions, no current use of prescription drugs.	$21.5\pm1.7$	15(15F)	$20.9\pm1.4$	15(15F)	DC: Daily recording. DC and RPA: Instructed to maintain their dietary habits and daily physical activities.	TBM and FM: DXA
Zhang <sup>57</sup>	China	Adult women (18–23 years old) who are overweight or obese (percentage of body fat ≥30%), with stable body weight, without regular physical activity except attending physical education classes twice a week, without medical and chronic health conditions, and no current use of prescription medications, including oral contraceptives.	$19.7\pm1.1$	12(12F)	$21.0\pm2.4$	11(11F)	DC and RPA: daily recording from 3 weeks before the end of the intervention.	TBM and FM: DXA
Zhang <sup>58</sup>	China	Overweight/pre-obese adults (BMI: $\geq 25 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ; body fat percentage $\geq 28$ ), stable body weight, without regular physical training except for participation in physical education classes twice a week; no chronic medical and health conditions, no weight or metabolism medication use.	$21.0\pm1.0$	12(12F)	$20.6\pm1.2$	12(12F)	DC and RPA: instructed to maintain their usual dietary habits; daily recording during the 3 weeks before the intervention period.	TBM and FM: BIA

S. Sanca-Valeriano et al.

Total body mass (TBM), fat mass (FM): body mass index (BMI), mechanical scale (MS), electronic scale (ES), dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA), bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA), skin fold (SF), not reported (NR), DC: dietary control, RPA: regular physical activity.

Study	Duration	HIIT			MICT			Main outcomes		
	(weeks)	Modality	Frequency (days/ weeks)	Protocol	Modality	Frequency (days/ weeks)	Protocol			
Ahmadizad et al., 2015	6	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 10–15 min. HIIT: 8–11 exercise intervals with 2–3 min active rest. (Intensity: 90% of individual VO <sub>2max</sub> values). Cool-down: 10 min.	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 10–15 min. MICT: 30–70 min at 50–60% VO <sub>2max</sub> , depending on HIIT energy expenditure. Cool-down: 10 min.	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body mass, fat mass, and insulin resistance in men who were overweight		
Boukabous et al., 2019	8	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 3 min (50–70% HRR). HIIT: 6 intervals of 1 min at 90% HRR with 2 min of active recovery at 40% HRR. Cool-down: 2 min at 40% HRR.	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 2 min (40% HRR). MICT: 45 min (55% HRR). Cool-down: 3 min (40% HRR).	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body mass, fat mass, and abdominal circumference in inactive older women		
Cheema et al., 2015	12	Boxing	4	Warm-up: 5 min. HIIT: 3 intervals - 2:1 (intense activity/rest). Total of 30 min at >75% at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> .	Brisk walk	4	Warm-up: 5 min. MICT: 45 min (unsupervised).	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body mass, fat mass, and abdominal circumference in men and women with abdominal obesity and BMI $>$ 25 kg/m <sup>2</sup>		
Chin et al., 2020	8	Runs	3	Warm-up: 5 min. HIIT: $12 \times 1$ min at 90% HRR, interspersed with $11 \times 1$ min active recovery at 70% HRR. Cool-down: 5 min.	Runs	3	Warm-up: 5 min. MICT: 30 min at 60% HRR. Cool-down: 5 min.	Body fat mass significantly decreased in the HIIT group compared with the MICT group.		
D'Amuri et al., 2021	12	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 10 min at 50% VO <sub>2peak</sub> HIIT: 3–7 repetitions of 3 min at 100% VO <sub>2peak</sub> interspersed with 1.5 min at 50% VO <sub>2peak</sub> . Cool-down at 50% VO <sub>2peak</sub>	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 10 min at 50% VO <sub>2peak</sub> MICT: progressively increased. 60% VO <sub>2peak</sub> . Cool down to 50% VO <sub>2peak</sub>	MICT and HIIT showed comparable effects within groups in weight loss and changes in fat mass. No significant changes were observed in plasma insulin.		
Dupuit et al., 2020	12	Cycling	3	Warm-up: 5 min. HIIT: 60 min 8 s at 80–90% of HR <sub>peak</sub> with 12 s of active recovery. Cool-down: 2 min.	Cycling	3	Warm-up: 5 min. MICT: 40 min at 55–60% of PPO Cool-down: 2 min.	Body weight, total fat mass, and hip circumference decreased in the HIIT and MICT groups after 12 weeks. However, MICT and HIIT showed comparable effects.		
Galedari et al., 2017	12	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 5 min. HIIT: $6-12 \times 1$ min at 90–95% at 50-60% HR <sub>max</sub> (85–90% VO <sub>2</sub> peak) interspersed with 1 min of active rest at 65–70% at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> (50–55% VO <sub>2peak</sub> ). Total time for each session ranged from 12 to 24 min. Cool-down: 5 min.	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 5 min. MICT: 18–35 min at 65–70% at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> (50–55% VO <sub>2peak</sub> ). Cool-down: 5 min.	No significant difference was observed between the HIIT and MICT groups in the homeostatic model assessment-insulin resistance.		
Gerosa-Neto et al., 2016	16	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 10 min at 70% at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> . HIIT: 4 intervals of 4 min at 90% of 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> , interspersed with 3	Treadmill	5	Warm-up: 10 min at 70% at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> . MICT: 30 min at 70% at	No group exhibited significant changes in body composition; however, the HIIT group tended to exhibit reduced total body weight and BMI. In the HIIT group,		

# Table 2 Description of HIIT and MICT intervention protocols and main outcomes.

(continued on next page)

Heliyon 9 (2023) e20402

8

Table 2 (continued)

Study	Duration	HIIT			MICT		Main outcomes		
	(weeks)	Modality	Frequency (days/ weeks)	Protocol	Modality	Frequency (days/ weeks)	Protocol		
				min of active recovery (70% at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> ). Cool-down: 5 min.			50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> . Cool-down: 5 min.	insulin sensitivity showed a trend for improvement.	
Gerosa-Neto et al., 2020	6	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 7 min. HIIT: 10 efforts of 1 min at 100% MAV interspersed with 1 min passive interval.	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 7 min. MICT: session at 65% MAV in the time necessary for the caloric expenditure of HIIT.	No significant difference was observed between the HIIT and MICT groups in insulin sensitivity	
Gerosa-Neto et al., 2019	6	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 5 min. HIIT: 10 efforts at 100% MAV of 1 min duration with 1-min intervals of passive recovery.	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 5 min. MICT: 35 min at 65% MAV.	No significant difference was observed between the HIIT and MICT groups in BMI	
Gripp et al., 2021	8	Cycling	3	Warm-up: 5 min. HIIT: 85–100% of shuttle test.	Cycling	3	Warm-up: 5 min. MICT: 60–75% shuttle test.	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on BMI and fat mass.	
Hu et al., 2021	12	Cycling	3	HIIT: 4 min at 90% VO <sub>2peak</sub> followed by 3 min of recovery for ~60 min with equivalent mechanical work (200/300 kJ).	Cycling	3	MICT: ~65 min at 60% VO <sub>2peak</sub> with equivalent mechanical work (200/ 300 KJ).	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body mass, BMI, and fat mass.	
Inoue et al., 2020	6	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 5 min. HIIT: 10 bouts of intermittent running of 1 min at 100% MAV, interspersed with 1 min of passive recovery.	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 5 min. MICT: 40 min at 65% MAV.	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body mass, BMI, and fat mass.	
Kong et al., 2016	5	Cycling	4	Warm-up: 3-min. HIIT: 60 repetitions: 8 s at ~90% of VO <sub>2peak</sub> interspersed with 12 s of recovery for 20 min. Cool-down: 3-min.	Cycling	4	Warm-up: 3-min. MICT: 40 min at 60% VO <sub>2</sub> <sub>peak.</sub> Cool-down: 3-min.	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body mass, BMI, and fat mass.	
Martins et al., 2016	12	Cycling	3	Warm-up: 5min. HIIT: 8 s of speed and 12 s of recovery at 85–90% at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> . Cool-down: 5 min.	Cycling	3	MICT: average 32 min 70% of at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> .	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body mass and waist circumference.	
Nie et al., 2018	12	Cycling	3-4	Warm-up: 10 min at 50–60% $HR_{max}$ . HIIT: 4 min sessions at 90% $VO_{2max}$ interspersed with 3 min rest until 300 kJ per session. Cool-down: 5 min at 50–60% $HR_{max}$ .	Cycling	3-4	Warm-up: 10 min at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> . MICT: 60% VO <sub>2max</sub> until reaching 300 kJ of planned work. Cool-down: 5 min at 50–60% HR <sub>max</sub> .	HIIT and MICT led to a similar decrease in body mass, BMI, and body fat mass	
Poon et al., 2020	8	Running/walking on a treadmill or outdoors	3	Warm-up: 5 min at 60% $HR_{max}$ . HIIT: 6–10 series of 1 min at 80–90% of $HR_{max}$ separated by 1 min of active recovery at 50% of	Jog/walk briskly on a treadmill or outdoors	3	Warm-up: 5 min at 60% HR <sub>max</sub> . HIIT: 30–50 min at 65–70% of HR <sub>max</sub> .	No differences were observed in fat mass, BMI, and waist circumference between the HIIT and MICT groups.	

S. Sanca-Valeriano et al.

Table 2 (continued)

Study	Duration	HIIT			MICT		Main outcomes		
	(weeks)	Modality	Frequency (days/ weeks)	Protocol	Modality	Frequency (days/ weeks)	Protocol		
Ram et al., 2020	6	Cycling	3	$HR_{max}$ . Cool-down: 5 min at 50% $HR_{max}$ Warm-up: 3 min at 65% of $HR_{peak}$ . HIIT: 24 min, 10 × 1 min intervals at ~90% $HR_{peak}$ with 1-min active recovery intervals at a low workload. Cool-down: 2 min at low intensity.	Cycling	3	Cool-down: 5 min at 50% HR <sub>max</sub> . MICT: 30 min of continuous exercise at 65–75% of HR <sub>peak</sub> .	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body mass, BMI, and fat mass	
Rodrigues et al., 2020	16	Cycling or treadmill	3	Warm-up: 10 min HIIT: $4 \times 4$ min bouts at 85–95% HR <sub>peak</sub> , interspersed with 3 min of recovery at 50–70% HR <sub>peak</sub> . Cool-down: 5 min	Cycling or treadmill	5	MICT: 30 min at 60–70% HR <sub>peak</sub> .	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on BMI and waist circumference	
Ryan et al., 2020	12	Cycling, treadmill, elliptical, or rowing	4	Warm-up: 3 min at ~65% HR <sub>max</sub> , HIIT: 10x1-min intervals at 90% of HR <sub>max</sub> with 1 min of low-intensity active recovery between intervals. Cool-down: 3 min at ~65% HR <sub>max</sub> .	Cycling, treadmill, or elliptical.	4	MICT: 45 min at 70% of HR <sub>max</sub> .	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on insulin sensitivity. When trained participants abstained from exercise for 4 days, insulin sensitivity returned to pre-training levels in both groups.	
Sawyer et al., 2016	8	Cycling	3	$\label{eq:Warm-up: 5 min at 50-60\%} HIIT: 10 \times 1 min of 90-95\% HR_{max} separated by 1 min of active recovery. Cool-down: 5 min at 50-60\% HR_{max}.$	Cycling	3	Warm-up: 5 min at 50–60% of HR <sub>max</sub> . MICT: 30 min of exercise at 70–75% of HR <sub>max</sub> . Cool-down: 5 min at 50–60% of HR <sub>max</sub> .	HIIT and MICT decreased waist circumference. Body fat percentage decreased in the HIIT group but not in t MICT group. However, neither group h a significant decrease in absolute fat ma No significant changes were observed i body weight and BMI.	
Sun et al., 2019	4	Cycling	5	HIIT: 10 repetitions $\times$ 6 s and rest intervals of 9 s.	Cycling	5	MICT: 30 min at 50–60% of VO <sub>2peak</sub> .	A low-carbohydrate diet is a useful approach for improving body compositi in women who are overweight or obese Incorporated exercise training (HIIT or MICT) has no additional effects on weig loss, but has additional benefits on cardiorespiratory fitness, and HIIT is mo time efficient than the traditional MICT	
Sun et al., 2021	4	Cycling	5	HIIT: 10 repetitions $\times$ 6 s and rest intervals of 9 s.	Cycling	5	MICT: 30 min at 50–60% of VO $_{2max}$ .	The short-term carbohydrate restriction diet caused significant weight loss and improved insulin sensitivity in women who are overweight/obese, although th combination with exercise training (HI or MICT) had no additional benefits on t examined cardiometabolic profiles.	
Sun et al., 2019	12	Cycling	3	HIIT: 9 repetitions $\times$ 4 min at 90% of VO_{2peak} with 3 min of passive recovery until 200–300 kJ.	Cycling	3	MICT: $\sim$ 61 min at 60% VO <sub>2peak</sub> until reaching 200–300 kJ.	HIIT and MICT induced similar reduction in body mass. Insulin sensitivity was improved significantly on post-training measures in HIIT, but remained unchanged in MICT.	

Table 2 (continued)

per minute; kJ, kilojoule.

Study	Duration	HIIT			MICT			Main outcomes		
	(weeks)	Modality	Frequency (days/ weeks)	Protocol	Modality	Frequency (days/ weeks)	Protocol			
Vaccari et al., 2020	12	Treadmill	3	Warm-up: 10 min (50% of V'O <sub>2peak</sub> ). HIIT: 3–7 repetitions of 3 min of bouts of walking (100% V'O <sub>2peak</sub> ), interspersed with 1.5 min of low- intensity walking (50% of V'O <sub>2peak</sub> ). Cool-down: 5 min (50% of V'O <sub>2peak</sub> ).	Treadmill	3	MICT: 44+-8 min corresponding to 60% of the initial V'O <sub>2peak</sub> .	Body mass, BMI, and fat mass decreased in the MICT and HIIT groups. The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body mass, fat mass, and insulin resistance in men who were overweight		
Vella et al., 2016	8	Treadmill, cycle ergometer, elliptical, jogging, or biking outdoors	3-4	Warm-up: 5 min HIIT: 10x1-min bouts of high- intensity exercise at 75–80% HRR, separated by 1-min recovery bouts at 35–40% HRR. Cool-down: at 35–40% HRR.	Treadmill, cycle ergometer, elliptical, jogging, or biking outdoors	3	Warm-up: 5 min. MICT: 20 min continuous exercise at 55–59% of HRR. Cool-down: 35–40% HRR.	The HIIT and MCT groups had similar effects on body weight, BMI, and insulin.		
Zapata- Lamana et al., 2018	12	Cycling	3	Warm-up: 5 min. HIIT: 4x4 at 90% VO <sub>2peak</sub> , with 2 min of active recovery between intervals and 4 min of recovery.	Cycling	3	Warm-up: 5 min. MICT: 45–50 min of exercise at a constant cadence (70–80 rpm) at 95% of the first ventilatory threshold.	Before the intervention, no differences were observed between HIIT and MICT groups in total body mass and fat mass. Total body mass decreased significantly in the MICT group but not in the HIIT group. No changes were observed with HOMA-IR		
Zhang et al., 2017	12	Cycling	3-4	HIIT: 4 min at 90% $VO_{2max}$ intensity, followed by a 3-min passive recovery until reaching 300 kJ of work was achieved.	Cycling	3–4	MICT: intensity of 60% $VO_{2max}$ until reaching 300 kJ of work was achieved.	The changes in body mass and body fat percentage did not differ significantly between the HIIT and MICT groups		
Zhang et al., 2020	12	Cycling	3-4	Warm-up: 10 min. HIIT: 4 intervals of 4 min at 90% of VO <sub>2peaks</sub> interspersed with passive recovery of 3 min. Cool-down: 5 min.	Cycling	3-4	Warm-up: 10 min. MICT: continuous exercise at an intensity of 60% of VO <sub>2peak</sub> for a total work done of 200 kJ. Cool-down: 5 min.	The changes in body mass and body fat percentage did not differ significantly between the HIIT and MICT groups		
Zhang et al., 2015	12	Treadmill	4	Warm-up: 10 min. HIIT: 4 sets at 4 min intervals at 85–95% HR <sub>peak</sub> , interspersed with 3 min walks at 50–60% HR <sub>peak</sub> and a 7 min rest. Cool-down: 5 min at 50–60% HR <sub>peak</sub> .	Treadmill	4	Warm-up: 10 min. MICT: 33 min at 60–70% of HR <sub>peak</sub> . Cool-down: 5 min at 50–70% HR <sub>peak</sub> .	The changes in body mass, BMI, waist abdominal, and body fat percentage did not differ significantly between the HIIT and MICT groups		

S. Sanca-Valeriano et al

Heliyon 9 (2023) e20402

### 3. Results

### 3.1. Study Selection

The search strategy identified 2534 potentially relevant articles. Of these, 462, 842, 666, and 564 were from PubMed, Embase, Scopus, and Web of Science, respectively. After excluding 1465 duplicate articles, the remaining 1069 articles were screened based on their titles and abstracts, leaving 102 articles for full-text review. Following a comprehensive assessment of the full-text articles against the eligibility criteria, 30 articles were selected for the systematic review (Fig. 1).

### 3.2. Characteristics of Included Studies

The selected studies comprised 30 articles [21,30–58] published between 2015 and 2021, including adults with overweight and obesity. The number of participants in the selected studies ranged from 6 to 26 participants per study. Among the selected studies, nine studies [30,33,36,38–40,42,45,46] evaluated interventions in men only, 12 studies [31,35,41,43,44,50–52,55–58] in women only, and nine studies [21,32,34,37,47–49,53,54] in both men and women. Participants' age varied across the studies, with a minimum mean age of 19.8  $\pm$  0.8 in the study by Kong et al. [45] and a maximum mean age of 66  $\pm$  3.4 in the study by Boukabous et al. [33] (Table 1).

The follow-up duration for HIIT and MICT interventions in these studies varied from 4 to 16 weeks, with the exercise frequency ranging from three to five times per week. Similarly, the type of exercise, session duration, and intensity differed between the training interventions in the selected studies (Table 2). Additionally, most studies instructed participants to maintain their regular diet and physical activity.

Effect of the Interventions:

*Weight:* Among the selected studies, 22 [21,30,31,33–35,37,41–46,49–53,55–58] investigated individuals with overweight or obesity and compared the effect of HIIT and MICT interventions on weight variation. The HIIT and MICT groups included 273 and 259 participants, respectively. No significant differences were observed in weight variation [WMD = -0.01 (95% confidence interval [CI]: -0.38 to 0.35; I<sup>2</sup> = 0%, p = 0.58)] between HIIT and MICT. Subgroup analysis based on the risk of bias also supported this finding (Fig. 2).

**Body Mass Index:** Among the selected studies, 20 [31,33-35,37,39-47,49-53,58] evaluated individuals with overweight or obesity and compared the variation in body mass index before and after HIIT and MICT interventions. The HIIT and MICT groups included 257 and 237 participants, respectively. No significant differences were observed in the variation of body mass index [WMD = 0.06 (95% CI: -0.12 to 0.23; I<sup>2</sup> = 0%, p = 0.53)] between HIIT and MICT. Subgroup analysis based on the risk of bias also supported this finding (Fig. 3).

Waist Circumference: Only 13 studies [21,31,32,34,35,45–47,49,50,53,54,58] evaluated individuals with overweight or obesity

		HIIT		1	MICT			Mean Difference	Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI		
3.1.1 Some concerns risk										01 02 03 04 05 Overa	
Ahmadizad et al., 2015	-1.2	1.97	10	-1.1	0.74	10	7.8%	-0.10 [-1.40, 1.20]	+		• Low risk
Boukabous et al., 2019	-0.5	5.6	9	0.8	1.72	9	0.9%	-1.30 [-5.13, 2.53]			1 Some concerns
D'Amuri., 2021	-5.7	5.64	16	-6	2.62	16	1.4%	0.30 [-2.75, 3.35]			High risk
Hu et al., 2021	-3.7	2.58	15	-3.37	1.18	15	6.5%	-0.33 [-1.77, 1.11]			D1 Randomisation process
Kong et al., 2016	0.7	4.69	10		1.57	8	1.4%	1.60 [-1.50, 4.70]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$	D2 Deviations from the Intended interventions
Martins et al., 2016	-1.3	2.1	13	-0.8	3.2	13	3.1%	-0.50 [-2.58, 1.58]		• • • • • • •	D3 Missing outcome data
Nie et al., 2018	-3.9	6.16	16		2.04	14	1.3%	0.30 [-2.90, 3.50]			D4 Measurement of the outcome
Ram et al., 2020	-0.9	9.78	16	1.8		12	0.5%	-2.70 [-7.69, 2.29]		• • • • • •	D5 Selection of the reported result
Sun et al., 2019(a)	-2.85	1.12	15	-2.6	1.3	13	16.2%	-0.25 [-1.16, 0.66]	+	•••••	
Sun et al., 2019(b)	-3.9	3	14	-4.6	3.4	14	2.4%	0.70 [-1.68, 3.08]			
Sun et al., 2021	-2.7	1.3	13	-2.5	1.3	12	12.8%	-0.20 [-1.22, 0.82]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$	
Vaccari et al., 2020	-5.7	1.38	16			16	23.7%	0.20 [-0.55, 0.95]	*	•••••	
Zapata-Lamana et al., 2018	-0.4	1.4	14	-1.9	2.6	14	5.6%	1.50 [-0.05, 3.05]		• • • • • • •	
Zhang et al., 2015	-5.2	4.75	12			12	1.8%	-0.70 [-3.44, 2.04]		• • • • • • •	
Zhang et al., 2017	-3.3	3.19	15		1.18	15	4.5%	0.10 [-1.62, 1.82]	+		
Zhang et al., 2020	-3.1	3.8	12	-0.2	1.3	11	2.6%	-2.90 [-5.18, -0.62]			
Subtotal (95% CI)			216			204	92.4%	-0.04 [-0.42, 0.33]	1		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Cl			15 (P =	0.51); I	<sup>2</sup> = 0%						
Test for overall effect Z = 0.23	(P = 0.8	(2)									
										D1 D2 D3 D4 D5 Over	
3.1.2 High risk										D1 D2 D3 D4 D5 Over	Low risk
Cheema et al., 2015		11.09	6		1.38	6	0.2%				Some concerns
Dupuit et al., 2020	-0.8	6.75	10		1.07	8	0.7%	0.00 [-4.25, 4.25]			High risk
Gerosa-Neto et al., 2016	-2.4	8.85	10		1.92	10	0.4%	-1.20 [-6.81, 4.41]			D1 Randomisation process
Inoue et al., 2020	-0.5	5.03	10		1.83	10	1.2%	-0.20 [-3.52, 3.12]			D2 Deviations from the intended interventions
Poon et al., 2020	-0.8	2.45	12		1.58	12	4.9%	0.90 [-0.75, 2.55]			D3 Missing outcome data
Sawyer et al., 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	-0.1	13.8	9 57	0	1.7	9 55	0.2%	-0.10 [-9.18, 8.98]		•••••	D4 Measurement of the outcome
				0.00.17	~~	55	1.0%	0.38 [-0.95, 1.70]	Ť		D5 Selection of the reported result
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Cl			(P = 0.)	84); 1*=	0%						US Selection of the reported result
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.56	(P=0.5	(8)									
Total (95% CI)			273			259	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.38, 0.35]	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Cl	hi <sup>2</sup> = 16.6	62, df = 3	21 (P =	0.73);1	= 0%				-20 -10 0 10	20	
Test for overall effect Z = 0.07	(P = 0.9	15)							-20 -10 0 10 HILT MICT	20	
Test for subgroup differences	: Chi² = (	0.36, df=	= 1 (P =	= 0.55),	<sup>2</sup> = 0%	5					

Fig. 2. Forest plot showing the results on weight variation comparing the HIIT with the MICT.



Test for subgroup differences: Chi<sup>2</sup> = 1.54, df = 1 (P = 0.21), I<sup>2</sup> = 35.1%

Fig. 3. Forest plot showing the results on body mass index variation comparing the HIIT with the MICT.

and compared the variation in waist circumference before and after HIIT and MICT interventions. The HIIT and MICT groups included 168 and 154 participants, respectively. No significant differences were observed in the variation of waist circumference [WMD = -0.11 (95% CI: -1.41 to 1.18; I<sup>2</sup> = 75%, p = 0.87)] between HIIT and MICT. However, four [32,34,35,53] of the 13 included studies indicated a greater variation in waist circumference in favor of HIIT, whereas one study favored MICT [54]. Among the 13 studies, only the study by D'Amuri et al. [34] differentiated waist circumference by sex; therefore, both sex categories were included in the analysis. Subgroup analysis based on the risk of bias also revealed no significant differences in waist circumference variation between the HIIT

		HIIT			MICT			Mean Difference		Mean Difference									
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	\$D	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	ſ	V, Random, 95% Cl				-					
3.3.1 Some concerns											<u>D1</u>	D2	D3	<u>D4</u>	DS			_	
Boukabous et al., 2019	0.1	2.53	9	-2.3	3.85	9	7.1%	2.40 [-0.61, 5.41]			•	•	•	•	•	•		•	Low risk
Rodrigues et al., 2020	-2.5	2.83	26	-4	5.66	19	7.5%	1.50 [-1.27, 4.27]		+	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	Some concerns
Sun et al., 2019(a)	-3.8	1.98	15	-4.3	2.87	13	9.3%	0.50 [-1.35, 2.35]		+	•	•	•			1		۲	High risk
Subtotal (95% CI)			50			41	23.9%	1.14 [-0.23, 2.51]		•							ſ	D1	Randomisation process
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.0	10; Chi² =	= 1.20,	df = 2 (	(P = 0.5	5); I² =	0%											[	D2	Deviations from the intended interventions
Test for overall effect: Z =	1.63 (P	= 0.10	)														ſ	D3	Missing outcome data
																	ſ	D4	Measurement of the outcome
3.3.2 High risk											01	D2	D3	D4	DS	Overall	F	D5	Selection of the reported result
Cheema et al., 2015		6.58	6		2.91	6		-6.10 [-11.86, -0.34]											
D'Amuri., 2021 (H)	-15.9		8		7.76	9	2.7%	-9.00 [-15.82, -2.18]											
D'Amuri., 2021 (M)	-17.2	3	8	-18.5	5.48	7	4.7%	1.30 [-3.26, 5.86]			-							Θ	Low risk
Dupuit et al., 2020	-3.8	1.96	10	-1.6	2.6	8	8.7%	-2.20 [-4.37, -0.03]		-								٠	Some concerns
Martins et al., 2016	-1.8	4	13	-2.6	4.6	13	6.6%	0.80 [-2.51, 4.11]										•	High risk
Poon et al., 2020	-0.1	1.4	12	-1.9	2.93	12	9.3%	1.80 [-0.04, 3.64]				•					,	D1	Randomisation process
Ram et al., 2020	-1.8		16	0	6.48	12		-1.80 [-5.64, 2.04]										D2	Deviations from the intended interventions
Sawyer et al., 2016	-2.7		9	-1.4		9	6.2%	-1.30 [-4.83, 2.23]										D3	Missing outcome data
Vaccari et al., 2020		0.46	16		1.74	16		-1.70 [-2.58, -0.82]		-			•	•			- 1	D4	Measurement of the outcome
Vella et al., 2017		1.76	8		3.69	9	7.7%	5.20 [2.50, 7.90]				•	•		•	•	,	D5	Selection of the reported result
Zhang et al., 2015	-4.7	1.59	12	-3.7	2	12		-1.00 [-2.45, 0.45]		-	. •		•	•	•				
Subtotal (95% CI)			118			113		-0.60 [-2.15, 0.95]		-									
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 4.3				0 (P < 0	.0000	1);  ²=	77%												
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.76 (P	= 0.45	)																
Total (95% CI)			168			154	100.0%	-0.11 [-1.41, 1.18]		•									
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 3.7	'9; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	= 51.15	5. df = 1	3 (P < 0	.0000	1);   <sup>2</sup> =	75%		<u> </u>	+ + +	+		_						
Test for overall effect: Z =				v					-10	-5 0 5	10								
<b>T</b> 16 1 1 10			·	1 10			201			HIIT MICT									

Test for subgroup differences: Chi<sup>2</sup> = 2.72, df = 1 (P = 0.10), I<sup>2</sup> = 63.3%

Fig. 4. Forest plot showing the results on abdominal waist variation comparing the HIIT with the MICT.

### S. Sanca-Valeriano et al.

### and MICT groups (Fig. 4).

**Body Fat Percentage:** Fourteen studies [30,32,34,35,40,41,43-46,49,55-57] evaluated individuals with overweight or obesity and compared the variation in body fat percentage before and after HIIT and MICT interventions. The HIIT and MICT groups included 175 and 159 participants, respectively. Among these studies, only the study by Zhang et al. [57] observed differences in body fat variation in favor of HIIT over MICT. However, when the studies were analyzed together, no significant differences were observed in body fat percentage [WMD = -0.50 (95% CI: -1.05 to 0.04; I<sup>2</sup> = 0%, p = 0.07)] between HIIT and MICT. Similarly, a subgroup analysis based on the risk of bias revealed no significant differences in the variation in body fat percentage between HIIT and MICT (Fig. 5).

**Body Fat Mass:** Eleven studies [31,34,35,43,44,46,49,53,55-57] assessed individuals with overweight or obesity and compared variations in body fat mass before and after HIIT and MICT interventions. The HIIT and MICT groups included 143 and 132 participants, respectively. No significant differences were observed in body fat mass [WMD = -0.19 (95% CI: -0.64 to 0.25; I<sup>2</sup> = 0%, p = 0.39)] between HIIT and MICT. Subgroup analysis based on the risk of bias also revealed no significant differences in the variations in body fat mass between the HIIT and MICT groups (Fig. 6).

*Insulin Sensitivity:* Eleven studies [30,33-38,40,49,51,52] assessed individuals with overweight or obesity and compared variation in insulin sensitivity measured using HOMA before and after HIIT and MICT interventions. The HIIT and MICT groups included 128 and 122 participants, respectively. A significant difference was observed in the variation of insulin sensitivity [WMD = -0.19 (95% CI: -0.35 to -0.03; I<sup>2</sup> = 51%, p = 0.02)] in favor of HIIT over MICT. Subgroup analysis revealed that in studies that reported the level of risk for certain considerations, the variation in insulin sensitivity favored HIIT over MICT, whereas this variation was not observed in studies with a high risk of bias. Additionally, among the 11 studies included for this outcome, three demonstrated significantly higher insulin sensitivity in favor of HIIT [30,33,52], whereas the other eight studies did not demonstrate significant differences [34–38,40,49,51] (Fig. 7).

*Publication Bias Assessment:* A Funnel plot was used to assess potential publication bias in selected studies that evaluated individuals with overweight or obesity and compared the variation in weight, body mass index, abdominal waist, percentage of body fat, body fat, and insulin sensitivity. Modest differences in symmetrical distribution were observed in the funnel plot, suggesting no publication bias in weight (Fig. 8,a), BMI (Fig. 8,b), abdominal waist circumference (Fig. 8,c), body fat mass percentages (Fig. 8,d), body fat mass in kilograms (Fig. 8,e), and insulin sensitivity (Fig. 8,f).

*Risk of Bias:* Most of the selected studies presented a risk of bias with certain considerations for different outcomes. Nevertheless, the outcome related to abdominal waist circumference displayed a higher frequency of a high risk of bias. Furthermore, all studies in domain 2 had some risk of bias. A graphical representation of the risk of bias was observed for the respective effect measurements of the interventions.

*Certainty Assessment of the Evidence*: Six outcomes of the systematic review were analyzed using the GRADE methodology. Among these, a moderate level of certainty was achieved for outcomes related to weight, body mass index, insulin sensitivity, and percentage and kilogram of body fat mass. However, the level of certainty was rated low for abdominal waist circumference (Table 3).

### 4. Discussion

This study compared the effects of HIIT and MICT on weight, body mass index, waist circumference, and body fat in individuals

		HIIT		1	MICT			Mean Difference		Mean Difference								
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Random, 95% CI								
3.5.1 Some concerns											D1	DZ	D3	D4	<u>D5</u>	Overa	1 🦷	Low risk
Ahmadizad et al., 2015	-1	1.83	10	-1.1	1.74	10	12.0%	0.10 [-1.47, 1.67]		+		-					- 0	Some concerns
D'Amuri., 2021	-3.6	7.47	16	-2.9	6.51	16	1.3%	-0.70 [-5.56, 4.16]							4			High risk
Dupuit et al., 2020	-0.3	10.05	10	0.4	3.19	8	0.7%	-0.70 [-7.31, 5.91]	-			-					D1	Randomisation process
Gripp et al., 2021	-1.5	3.41	11	-0.5	2.54	11	4.7%	-1.00 [-3.51, 1.51]									D2	Deviations from the intended interventions
Hu et al., 2021	-2.5	1.89	15	-2.4	1.67	15	18.1%	-0.10 [-1.38, 1.18]		-							D3	Missing outcome data
Kong et al., 2016	0.7	4.58	15	0.9	2.7	8	3.3%	-0.20 [-3.18, 2.78]			•						D4	Measurement of the outcome
Nie et al., 2018	-1.9	2.13	16	-1.7	2.31	14	11.5%	-0.20 [-1.80, 1.40]		-							D5	Selection of the reported result
Ram et al., 2020	-0.1	4.96	16	0.3	4.41	12	2.4%	-0.40 [-3.88, 3.08]										
Sawyer et al., 2016	-0.8	4.85	9	-0.3	5.51	9	1.3%	-0.50 [-5.30, 4.30]										
Zhang et al., 2015	-3.1	3.27	12	-2.8	1.81	12	6.6%	-0.30 [-2.41, 1.81]			•							
Zhang et al., 2017	-2.5	1.89	15	-2.4	1.67	15	18.1%	-0.10 [-1.38, 1.18]		-	•							
Zhang et al., 2020	-3.1	2.3	12	-0.7	0.9	11	14.9%	-2.40 [-3.81, -0.99]			•				•			
Subtotal (95% CI)			157			141	94.9%	-0.54 [-1.09, 0.02]		•								
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.0	10; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	= 8.69, 0	df = 11	(P = 0.6	5); l² =	0%												
Test for overall effect: Z =	1.88 (P	= 0.06)																
3.5.2 High risk											DI	D2	0	<u>D4</u>	<u>D5</u>	Overal	1	Low risk
Cheema et al., 2015	-4	9.27	6	-2.3	9.35	6	0.3%	-1.70 [-12.24, 8.84]			- 🥊			Ι.			1	Some concerns
Poon et al., 2020	-1.3	3	12	-1.5	3.17	12	4.8%	0.20 [-2.27, 2.67]								•		High risk
Subtotal (95% CI)			18			18	5.1%	0.10 [-2.30, 2.51]		-							01	Randomisation process
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.0	10; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	0.12, 0	df = 1 (F	P = 0.73	$);  ^2 = 0$	1%											D2	Deviations from the intended interventions
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.08 (P	= 0.93)															D3	Missing outcome data
																	D4	Measurement of the outcome
Total (95% CI)			175			159	100.0%	-0.50 [-1.05, 0.04]		•							05	Selection of the reported result
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.0	0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	9.07, 0	df = 13	(P = 0.7	7);  2 =	0%		_	-10		10		-					
Test for overall effect: Z =	1.81 (P	= 0.07)							-10	-5 0 5 HIT MICT	10							
To all face and success all faces			0 .16	4 (0 0	041 17	0.00												

Test for subgroup differences: Chi<sup>2</sup> = 0.26, df = 1 (P = 0.61), l<sup>2</sup> = 0%

Fig. 5. Forest plot showing the results of percent change in body fat mass comparing the HIIT with the MICT.

ference
n, 95% Cl D1 D2 D3 D4 D5 Overall
🗕 🚺 🖲 🖲 🚺 🚺 townsk
💶 🥂 🚺 💽 💽 🚺 🚺 Some concerns
💶 🕛 🚺 💽 😨 🚺 🛑 High risk
💻 🕛 💽 💽 🕘 🕛 D1 Randomisation process
💶 🤚 💽 💽 🕛 🕛 D2 Deviations from the intended interventions
💶 🥂 🚺 💽 💽 🕛 D3 Missing outcome data
- 🕒 🕛 💽 💽 🕛 D4 Measurement of the outcome
🛏 🥂 🕴 💽 💽 🚺 D5 Selection of the reported result
- • • • • • • •
9 9 9 9 9
MICT

Fig. 6. Forest plot showing the results of change in body fat mass measured in kilograms comparing the HIIT with the MICT.

		HIIT		1	MICT			Mean Difference	Mean Diffe	erence						
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random	, 95% CI						
3.4.1 Some concerns										<u>D1 D2</u>	<u>D3</u>	<u>D4</u>	DS Ov	erall		
Ahmadizad et al., 2015	-0.93	0.06	10	-0.86	0.07	10	26.2%	-0.07 [-0.13, -0.01]	-	• •	•	•	• (	D	Low risk	
D'Amuri., 2021	-0.32	0.6	16	0.05	2.38	16	1.7%	-0.37 [-1.57, 0.83]		— <u> </u>	•	•	• (	U.	Some concerns	
Dupuit et al., 2020	-0.72	1.78	10	-0.8	0.6	8	1.7%	0.08 [-1.10, 1.26]		— <u> </u>	•	•	• (	D	High risk	
Galedari et al., 2017	-0.6	0.17	10	-0.5	0.27	12	19.9%	-0.10 [-0.29, 0.09]		• •	•	•	• (		D1 Randomisation process	
Gerosa-Neto et al., 2020	-0.8	0.81	11	-0.5	1.6	11	2.1%	-0.30 [-1.36, 0.76]		- 💿 🕛	•	•	• (	D	D2 Deviations from the intended interventions	
Gripp et al., 2021	-0.3	0.2	11	-0.4	0.71	11	9.1%	0.10 [-0.34, 0.54]		- 🙂 🕛	•	•	• (		D3 Missing outcome data	
Sawyer et al., 2016	-0.6	0.65	9	-0.5	0.82	9	4.6%	-0.10 [-0.78, 0.58]		- 🕛 🕛	•	•	• (		D4 Measurement of the outcome	
Sun et al., 2019(b)	-0.58	0.39	14	-0.12	0.5	14	12.6%	-0.46 [-0.79, -0.13]		• •	•	•	• (		D5 Selection of the reported result	
Sun et al., 2021	-0.9	0.7	13	-0.8	1	12	4.6%	-0.10 [-0.78, 0.58]		— 💿 💶	•	•	• (			
Subtotal (95% CI)			104			103	82.5%	-0.08 [-0.13, -0.03]	•							
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00	; Chi <sup>z</sup> = 6	5.31, d	f=8(P	= 0.61)	;   <sup>2</sup> = 0	%										
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	8.00 (P =	0.003)														
3.4.2 High risk										<u>D1</u> D2	<u>D3</u>	<u>D4</u>	D5 Ov	erall	Low risk	
Chin et al., 2020	-0.37	0.29	14	0.32	0.43	9	13.1%	-0.69 [-1.01, -0.37]			•	•	•		I Some concerns	
Gerosa-Neto et al., 2016	-0.4	0.65	10	-0.6	0.94	10	4.3%	0.20 [-0.51, 0.91]		<u>•</u> •	•		•		High risk	
Subtotal (95% CI)			24			19	17.5%	-0.30 [-1.17, 0.56]		-					D1 Randomisation process	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.32	; Chi² = 5	5.04, d	f=1 (P	= 0.02)	; <b> z</b> = 8	0%								1	D2 Deviations from the intended interventions	
Test for overall effect: Z = 0	).69 (P =	0.49)												1	D3 Missing outcome data	
T-4-1/05// 00			400			400	400.00							1	D4 Measurement of the outcome	
Total (95% CI)			128				100.0%	-0.19 [-0.35, -0.03]	- I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I					1	D5 Selection of the reported result	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.02			df = 10	(P = 0.0	J2); I*:	= 51%			-2 -1 0	1	2	1.0				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2									HIT	IICT						
Test for subgroup different	ces: Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 0.25	o, df = 1	(P = 0.	61), l²	= 0%										

Fig. 7. Forest plot showing the results on insulin sensitivity variation comparing the HIIT with the MICT.

with overweight and obesity. The results revealed no significant differences between the two types of exercises in terms of weight, body mass index, waist circumference, and body fat in individuals with overweight and obesity. However, a difference was observed in insulin sensitivity, as measured by HOMA, where the effect of HIIT was significant compared with that of MICT.

In this systematic review, no significant differences were observed in weight reduction and body mass index reduction between HIIT and MICT. Individual studies also showed inconsistent significant differences in weight reduction between the two training methods, except for the studies conducted by Zapata-Lamana et al. [55] and Zhang et al. [57]. The first study [55] observed greater weight reduction in favor of MICT, whereas the second study [57] reported greater weight reduction in favor of HIIT. Additionally, other systematic reviews have reported that HIIT and MICT yield similar results for weight reduction and body mass index in adults with overweight and obesity [24,25].

In this systematic review, the differences in energy expenditure regulation, dietary control, and participant characteristics among the included studies may explain the lack of significant differences in weight reduction and body mass index outcomes between HIIT and MICT.

Similarly, in this systematic review, no significant differences were observed when comparing the variation in waist circumference between HIIT and MICT. However, four of the 13 included studies indicated a greater reduction in waist circumference favoring HIIT [32,34,35,53], whereas one favored MICT [54]. Previous studies with an average duration of 10 weeks have reported reductions in waist circumference for HIIT and MICT but no significant differences between the two training methods [25].

5

O Low risk / Some concerns

🔷 High risk

MD

ń

🔷 High risk





O Low risk / some concerns

MD 10

ė

### Table 3

GRADE assessment of the results of the systematic review.

Certainty assessment						
Participants (studies) follow-up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirect evidence	Inaccuracy	Publication bias	General certainty of the evidence
Weight (Kg)						
532 (22 Controlled experiments)	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \bigcirc$
						Moderate
Body mass index (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) 494 (20 Controlled experiments)	serious	not serious	not serious	not serious		
494 (20 Controlled experiments)	serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \bigcirc$ Moderate
Abdominal waist (cm)						moderate
322 (13 Controlled experiments)	Very serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	$\oplus \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc$
						Baja
Body fat mass (in percentage)						
334 (14 Controlled experiments)	serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \bigcirc$ Moderate
Body fat mass (in kilograms)						Moderate
275 (11 Controlled experiments)	serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \bigcirc$
· • •						Moderate
Insulin sensitivity (mmol. $\mu$ U/m	L)					
250 (11 Controlled experiments)	serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \bigcirc$
						Moderate

Furthermore, a study evaluating HIIT duration discovered that long-term training (>12 weeks) had a greater effect on reducing waist circumference than short-term HIIT [11]. In this review, the duration of training ranged from 3 to 12 weeks; thus, exposure duration to training and variations in protocols must be considered when interpreting the results. These variations in training protocols and individual study characteristics were evident as a high heterogeneity (75%) in the analysis of the waist circumference variation outcome.

This systematic review observed no significant differences in variation in body fat percentage between HIIT and MICT. However, one study by Zhang et al. [57] reported differences favoring HIIT over MICT. Nevertheless, the combined evidence in this meta-analysis did not show differences between HIIT and MICT with respect to variations in body fat percentage or body fat (in kilograms). These results are consistent with those of another review conducted on individuals who are overweight and obese, where HIIT and MICT resulted in significant reductions in total body fat. However, no significant differences were observed between the two types of training [25]. Another study that assessed fat distribution in the trunk and legs by comparing HIIT and MICT reported similar results [21].

Another study that assessed the long-term duration of HIIT ( $\geq 12$  weeks) reported an increased reduction in total body fat among overweight and obese populations [10]. Thus, training duration may affect body weight and fat outcomes. In a pragmatic clinical trial, a comparison was made between 12 weeks of MICT and 12 weeks of HIIT, with the latter performed at home following prior instructions. The MICT group exhibited a significant reduction in body fat, whereas the HIIT group did not [59]. These differences may indicate the importance of supervision during training, the context in which training is performed, and appropriate follow-up protocols. In this systematic review, most studies were conducted under supervision in a training center for HIIT and MICT.

A minimum level of energy expenditure is required to achieve a positive modification and influence lipid reduction. Therefore, training programs should tailor the number, duration, and frequency of exercise sessions [60]. However, the studies in this systematic review exhibited variations in training variables, including the frequency, intensity, type, and duration of HIIT and MICT protocols. The diversity in the protocols could explain the absence of significant differences between the two types of training. Furthermore, the studies included in this systematic review demonstrated differences in energy expenditure during training sessions and varying degrees of dietary control.

Regarding the assessment of insulin sensitivity using the HOMA method, differences were observed in the pre- and postintervention variations between the HIIT and MICT groups. However, when considering all the included studies, these differences moderately favored HIIT over MICT, and the effect diminished when focusing on the subgroup of studies that exhibited some risk of bias. Among the 11 studies included for this outcome, three demonstrated greater insulin sensitivity favoring HIIT [30,33,52], with the study by Chin et al. [33] showing the highest risk of bias and the most significant effect in favor of HIIT over MICT. In contrast, no significant differences were observed in the other eight studies with a risk of bias [30,52].

In contrast, another study conducted by Martins et al. [21] reported no differences in insulin sensitivity between isocaloric HIIT and MICT workouts. Similarly, Fisher et al. [61], using other tests such as QUICK and oral glucose tolerance, did not observe differences in the variation of insulin sensitivity when comparing HIIT and MICT in youths who are overweight and obese. Additionally, individuals at high altitudes exhibit better insulin sensitivity than those at sea level [62,63]. Exposure to high altitudes enhances glucose and lipid utilization [63]. These population-specific characteristics, among other factors, may explain the differences and heterogeneity of the results.

This study addresses obesity, a global health issue, by evaluating the effects of HIIT and MICT among adults who are overweight and obese. Unlike other studies, this study stands out for assessing various outcomes such as body weight, body mass index, body fat, waist circumference, and insulin sensitivity. Additionally, the study adhered to rigorous guidelines and utilized standardized methods

### S. Sanca-Valeriano et al.

to assess the quality of the evidence. Furthermore, it provides a detailed and applicable comparison of HIIT and MICT, making it relevant to healthcare professionals and individuals aiming to enhance their metabolic health.

However, this systematic review had some limitations owing to the inherent methodological designs of the included studies. Additionally, the references of the selected studies were not manually searched to identify additional sources, potentially leading to the omission of relevant references. Moreover, heterogeneity was observed in the intervention protocols, participant characteristics across the diverse range of included studies, and various instruments for measuring outcomes, such as weight, waist circumference, and body fat mass. Furthermore, discrepancies were noted in the frequency, intensity, and duration of HIIT and MICT training protocols.

### 5. Conclusions

In adults with overweight and obesity, HIIT and MICT did not result in significant differences in weight variation, body mass index, waist circumference, and body fat. However, a moderate variation in favor of HIIT was observed in terms of insulin sensitivity. Nonetheless, the findings of this study indicated a moderate level of evidence for most outcomes, except for waist circumference, which exhibited low certainty. Consequently, further research is warranted to establish a more comprehensive understanding of the effects of these training modalities on the studied outcomes.

We concluded that there were no significant differences in weight variation, body mass index, waist circumference, or body fat between HIIT and MICT in adults who are overweight and obese. Therefore, both types of training may be equally effective in achieving changes in body composition in this population. However, HIIT may offer additional benefits in terms of insulin sensitivity. The limitations of the included studies, such as the risk of bias related to blinding and variations in training protocols, should be considered when interpreting these results and designing future studies in this field.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that HIIT and MICT are effective in improving body composition in individuals who are overweight and obese. However, variations in training protocols should be considered when tailoring the exercise program to individual preferences and capacities. HIIT may be a valuable option to enhance insulin sensitivity for individuals at risk of insulin resistance.

Furthermore, we recommended that more rigorous and higher-quality research be conducted to assess the long-term effects of HIIT and MICT, considering the variability in protocol durations and specific population characteristics. In addition, considering combined interventions and evaluating implementation in community settings would be valuable. These future studies will strengthen the evidence base, provide relevant information to guide clinical practice, and promote effective interventions to improve body composition and insulin sensitivity.

## Author contribution statement

SS: was involved in the conception and design of the study, protocol registration, literature search and reviewer, the acquisition of data, independent reviewer, risk of bias assessment, analyzed and interpreted the data, initial and final manuscript drafts, final approval of the version submitted. She is the guarantor of the review.

ME: literature search, the acquisition of data, independent reviewer, risk of bias assessment, analyzed and interpreted the data, and final manuscript draft, final approval of the version submitted.

JC: literature search, analyzed and interpreted the data, and critical review of final manuscript drafts, final approval of the version submitted.

CC: the conception and design of the study, third independent reviewer, analyzed and interpreted the data, critical review of final manuscript drafts, final approval of the version submitted.

### **Funding statement**

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

### Data availability statement

Data included in article/tables/figures. Material/referenced in article. Any other information will be made available on request.

# Additional information

No additional information is available for this paper.

### Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

#### References

- World Health Organization. Obesity and overweight. [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight. Assessed on July 22, 2023.
- [2] A. Tiwari, P. Balasundaram, Public health considerations regarding obesity, in: StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL), StatPearls Publishing, 2023. January. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK572122/.
- [3] S. Djalalinia, M. Qorbani, N. Peykari, R. Kelishadi, Health impacts of obesity, Pak J Med Sci 31 (1) (2015) 239–242, https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.311.7033.
   [4] A.M. Leiva, M.A. Martínez, C. Cristi-Montero, C. Salas, R. Ramírez-Campillo, X. Díaz Martínez, et al., Sedentary lifestyle is associated with metabolic and
- cardiovascular risk factors independent of physical activity, Rev Med Chil 145 (4) (2017 Apr) 458–467, https://doi.org/10.4067/S0034-98872017000400006. [5] M. Ros Pérez, G. Medina-Gómez, [Obesity, adipogenesis and insulin resistance], Endocrinol. Nutr. 58 (7) (2011) 360–369, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.
- endonu.2011.05.008.
  [6] M. Liu, Y. Huang, X. Xu, X. Li, M. Alam, A. Arunagiri, et al., Normal and defective pathways in biogenesis and maintenance of the insulin storage pool, J. Clin. Invest. 131 (2) (2021 Jan 19), e142240, https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI142240.
- [7] P. Marchetti, M. Bugliani, V. De Tata, M. Suleiman, L. Marselli, Pancreatic beta cell identity in humans and the role of type 2 diabetes, Front. Cell Dev. Biol. 5 (2017) 55, https://doi.org/10.3389/fcell.2017.00055.
- [8] E. Fryk, J. Olausson, K. Mossberg, L. Strindberg, M. Schmelz, H. Brogren, et al., Hyperinsulinemia and insulin resistance in the obese may develop as part of a homeostatic response to elevated free fatty acids: a mechanistic case-control and a population-based cohort study, EBioMedicine 65 (2021 Mar), 103264, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2021.103264.
- [9] M. Zimny, M. Starczewska, M. Szkup, A. Cybulska, E. Grochans, Body composition and biological functioning in polish perimenopausal women with type 2 diabetes, Int J Environ Res Public Health 18 (21) (2021), 11422, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182111422. Oct 30.
- [10] M.J. MacInnis, M.J. Gibala, Physiological adaptations to interval training and the role of exercise intensity, J Physiol 595 (9) (2017 May 1) 2915–2930, https://doi.org/10.1113/JP273196.
- [11] K.S. Weston, U. Wisløff, J.S. Coombes, High-intensity interval training in patients with lifestyle-induced cardiometabolic disease: a systematic review and metaanalysis, Br. J. Sports Med. 48 (16) (2014 Aug) 1227–1234, https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2013-092576.
- [12] L.M. Ross, R.R. Porter, J.L. Durstine, High-intensity interval training (HIIT) for patients with chronic diseases, J Sport Health Sci 5 (2) (2016 Jun) 139–144, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2016.04.005.
- [13] C. Freyssin, C. Verkindt, F. Prieur, P. Benaich, S. Maunier, P. Blanc, Cardiac rehabilitation in chronic heart failure: effect of an 8-week, high-intensity interval training versus continuous training, Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil. 93 (8) (2012 Aug) 1359–1364, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2012.03.007.
- [14] T. Moholdt, E. Madssen, Ø. Rognmo, I.L. Aamot, The higher the better? Interval training intensity in coronary heart disease, J. Sci. Med. Sport 17 (5) (2014 Sep) 506–510, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2013.07.007.
- [15] M.E. Francois, J.P. Little, Effectiveness and safety of high-intensity interval training in patients with type 2 diabetes, Diabetes Spectr. 28 (1) (2015 Jan) 39–44, https://doi.org/10.2337/diaspect.28.1.39.
- [16] K. Karstoft, K. Winding, S.H. Knudsen, J.S. Nielsen, C. Thomsen, B.K. Pedersen, et al., The effects of free-living interval-walking training on glycemic control, body composition, and physical fitness in type 2 diabetic patients: a randomized, controlled trial, Diabetes Care 36 (2) (2013 Feb) 228–236, https://doi.org/ 10.2337/dc12-0658.
- [17] T. Terada, A. Friesen, B.S. Chahal, G.J. Bell, L.J. McCargar, N.G. Boulé, Feasibility and preliminary efficacy of high intensity interval training in type 2 diabetes, Diabetes Res. Clin. Pract. 99 (2) (2013 Feb) 120–129, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2012.10.019.
- [18] D. Hansen, P. Dendale, R.A. Jonkers, M. Beelen, R.J. Manders, L. Corluy, et al., Continuous low- to moderate-intensity exercise training is as effective as moderate- to high-intensity exercise training at lowering blood HbA(1c) in obese type 2 diabetes patients, Diabetologia 52 (9) (2009 Sep) 1789–1797, https:// doi.org/10.1007/s00125-009-1354-3.
- [19] K. Norton, L. Norton, D. Sadgrove, Position statement on physical activity and exercise intensity terminology, J. Sci. Med. Sport 13 (5) (2010 Sep) 496–502, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2009.09.008.
- [20] J.S. Ramos, L.C. Dalleck, A.E. Tjonna, K.S. Beetham, J.S. Coombes, The impact of high-intensity interval training versus moderate-intensity continuous training on vascular function: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Sports Med. 45 (5) (2015 May) 679–692, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0321-z.
- [21] C. Martins, I. Kazakova, M. Ludviksen, I. Mehus, U. Wisloff, B. Kulseng, et al., High-intensity interval training and isocaloric moderate-intensity continuous training result in similar improvements in body composition and fitness in obese individuals, Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab 26 (3) (2016 Jun) 197–204, https:// doi.org/10.1123/ijsnem.2015-0078.
- [22] D. De Strijcker, B. Lapauw, D.M. Ouwens, D. Van de Velde, D. Hansen, M. Petrovic, et al., High intensity interval training is associated with greater impact on physical fitness, insulin sensitivity and muscle mitochondrial content in males with overweight/obesity, as opposed to continuous endurance training: a randomized controlled trial, J. Musculoskelet. Neuronal Interact. 18 (2) (2018 Jun 1) 215–226.
- [23] W.W. Campbell, W.E. Kraus, K.E. Powell, W.L. Haskell, K.F. Janz, J.M. Jakicic, et al., High-intensity interval training for cardiometabolic disease prevention, Med. Sci. Sports Exerc. 51 (6) (2019 Jun) 1220–1226, https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.000000000001934.
- [24] L. Su, J. Fu, S. Sun, G. Zhao, W. Cheng, C. Dou, et al., Effects of HIIT and MICT on cardiovascular risk factors in adults with overweight and/or obesity: a metaanalysis, PLoS One 14 (1) (2019), e0210644, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210644.
- [25] M. Wewege, R. van den Berg, R.E. Ward, A. Keech, The effects of high-intensity interval training vs. moderate-intensity continuous training on body composition in overweight and obese adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Obes. Rev. 18 (6) (2017 Jun) 635–646, https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12532.
- [26] A.E. Smith-Ryan, M.N. Melvin, H.L. Wingfield, High-intensity interval training: Modulating interval duration in overweight/obese men, Phys Sportsmed 43 (2) (2015 May) 107-113, https://doi.org/10.1080/00913847.2015.1037231.
- [27] B. Schmitz, H. Niehues, L. Thorwesten, A. Klose, M. Krüger, S.M. Brand, Sex differences in high-intensity interval training-are HIIT protocols interchangeable between females and males, Front. Physiol. 11 (2020) 38, https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2020.00038.
- [28] Updated October 2013H. Schünemann, J. Brożek, G. Guyatt, A. Oxman (Eds.), GRADE Handbook for Grading Quality of Evidence and Strength of Recommendations, The GRADE Working Group, 2013. Available from: guidelinedevelopment.org/handbook.
- [29] GRADEpro GDT, GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool [Software], McMaster University, 2015 (developed by Evidence Prime, Inc.). Available from: gradepro.org. (Accessed 13 May 2020).
- [30] S. Ahmadizad, A.S. Avansar, K. Ebrahim, M. Avandi, M. Ghasemikaram, The effects of short-term high-intensity interval training vs. moderate-intensity continuous training on plasma levels of nesfatin-1 and inflammatory markers, Horm Mol Biol Clin Investig 21 (3) (2015 Mar) 165–173, https://doi.org/ 10.1515/hmbci-2014-0038.
- [31] I. Boukabous, A. Marcotte-Chénard, T. Amamou, P. Boulay, M. Brochu, D. Tessier, et al., Low-volume high-intensity interval training (HIIT) versus moderateintensity continuous training on body composition, cardiometabolic profile and physical capacity in older women, J Aging Phys Act 27 (4) (2019 Dec 1) 879–889, https://doi.org/10.1123/japa.2018-0309.
- [32] B.S. Cheema, T.B. Davies, M. Stewart, S. Papalia, E. Atlantis, The feasibility and effectiveness of high-intensity boxing training versus moderate-intensity brisk walking in adults with abdominal obesity: a pilot study, BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil 7 (2015) 3, https://doi.org/10.1186/2052-1847-7-3.
- [33] E.C. Chin, A.P. Yu, C.W. Lai, D.Y. Fong, D.K. Chan, S.H. Wong, et al., Low-frequency HIIT improves body composition and aerobic capacity in overweight men, Med. Sci. Sports Exerc. 52 (1) (2020 Jan) 56–66, https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.00000000002097.
- [34] A. D'Amuri, J.M. Sanz, E. Capatti, F. Di Vece, F. Vaccari, S. Lazzer, et al., Effectiveness of high-intensity interval training for weight loss in adults with obesity: a randomised controlled non-inferiority trial, BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med 7 (3) (2021), e001021, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjsem-2020-001021.
- [35] M. Dupuit, M. Rance, C. Morel, P. Bouillon, B. Pereira, A. Bonnet, et al., Moderate-intensity continuous training or high-intensity interval training with or without resistance training for altering body composition in postmenopausal women, Med. Sci. Sports Exerc. 52 (3) (2020 Mar) 736–745, https://doi.org/ 10.1249/MSS.00000000002162.

- [36] M. Galedari, M.A. Azarbayjani, M. Peeri, Effects of type of exercise along with caloric restriction on plasma apelin 36 and HOMA-IR in overweight men, Sci. Sports 32 (4) (2017 Sept) e137–e145, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scispo.2016.12.002.
- [37] J. Gerosa-Neto, B.M. Antunes, E.Z. Campos, J. Rodrigues, G.D. Ferrari, J.C. Rosa Neto, et al., Impact of long-term high-intensity interval and moderate-intensity continuous training on subclinical inflammation in overweight/obese adults, J Exerc Rehabil 12 (6) (2016 Dec) 575–580, https://doi.org/10.12965/ jer.1632770.385.
- [38] J. Gerosa-Neto, P.A. Monteiro, D.S. Inoue, B.M. Antunes, H. Batatinha, G.P. Dorneles, et al., High- and moderate-intensity training modify LPS-induced ex-vivo interleukin-10 production in obese men in response to an acute exercise bout, Cytokine 136 (2020 Dec), 155249, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cyto.2020.155249.
- [39] J. Gerosa-Neto, V.L.G. Panissa, P.A. Monteiro, D.S. Inoue, J.P.J. Ribeiro, C. Figueiredo, et al., High- or moderate-intensity training promotes change in cardiorespiratory fitness, but not visceral fat, in obese men: a randomised trial of equal energy expenditure exercise, Respir. Physiol. Neurobiol. 266 (2019 Aug) 150–155, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resp.2019.05.009.
- [40] F. Gripp, R.C. Nava, R.C. Cassilhas, E.A. Esteves, C.O.D. Magalhães, M.F. Dias-Peixoto, et al., HIIT is superior than MICT on cardiometabolic health during training and detraining, Eur. J. Appl. Physiol. 121 (1) (2021 Jan) 159–172, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-020-04502-6.
- [41] M. Hu, Z. Kong, S. Sun, L. Zou, Q. Shi, B.C. Chow, et al., Interval training causes the same exercise enjoyment as moderate-intensity training to improve cardiorespiratory fitness and body composition in young Chinese women with elevated BMI, J. Sports Sci. 39 (15) (2021 Aug) 1677–1686, https://doi.org/ 10.1080/02640414.2021.1892946.
- [42] D.S. Inoue, P.A. Monteiro, J. Gerosa-Neto, P.R. Santana, F.P. Peres, K.M. Edwards, et al., Acute increases in brain-derived neurotrophic factor following high or moderate-intensity exercise is accompanied with better cognition performance in obese adults, Sci. Rep. 10 (1) (2020 Aug 10), 13493, https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41598-020-70326-1.
- [43] Z. Kong, S. Sun, M. Liu, Q. Shi, Short-term high-intensity interval training on body composition and blood glucose in overweight and obese young women, J. Diabetes Res. 2016 (2016), 4073618, https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/4073618.
- [44] J. Nie, H. Zhang, Z. Kong, K. George, J.P. Little, T.K. Tong, et al., Impact of high-intensity interval training and moderate-intensity continuous training on resting and postexercise cardiac troponin T concentration, Exp. Physiol. 103 (3) (2018 Mar 1) 370–380, https://doi.org/10.1113/EP086767.
- [45] E.T. Poon, J.P. Little, C.H. Sit, S.H. Wong, The effect of low-volume high-intensity interval training on cardiometabolic health and psychological responses in overweight/obese middle-aged men, J. Sports Sci. 38 (17) (2020 Sep) 1997–2004, https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2020.1766178.
- [46] A. Ram, L. Marcos, M.D. Jones, R. Morey, S. Hakansson, T. Clark, et al., The effect of high-intensity interval training and moderate-intensity continuous training on aerobic fitness and body composition in males with overweight or obesity: a randomized trial, Obes Med 17 (2020 Mar), 100187, https://doi.org/10.1016/j. obmed.2020.100187.
- [47] J.A.L. Rodrigues, G.D. Ferrari, Á.A. Trapé, V.N. de Moraes, T.C.P. Gonçalves, S.S. Tavares, et al., β2 adrenergic interaction and cardiac autonomic function: effects of aerobic training in overweight/obese individuals, Eur. J. Appl. Physiol. 120 (3) (2020 Mar) 613–624, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-020-04301-z.
- [48] B.J. Ryan, M.W. Schleh, C. Ahn, A.C. Ludzki, J.B. Gillen, P. Varshney, et al., Moderate-intensity exercise and high-intensity interval training affect insulin sensitivity similarly in obese adults, J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab. 105 (8) (2020 Aug 1) e2941–e2959, https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgaa345.
- [49] B.J. Sawyer, W.J. Tucker, D.M. Bhammar, J.R. Ryder, K.L. Sweazea, G.A. Gaesser, Effects of high-intensity interval training and moderate-intensity continuous training on endothelial function and cardiometabolic risk markers in obese adults, 2016 Jul 1, J. Appl. Physiol. 121 (1) (1985) 279–288, https://doi.org/ 10.1152/japplphysiol.00024.2016.
- [50] S. Sun, Z. Kong, Q. Shi, M. Hu, H. Zhang, D. Zhang, et al., Non-energy-restricted low-carbohydrate diet combined with exercise intervention improved cardiometabolic health in overweight Chinese females, Nutrients 11 (12) (2019 Dec 13) 3051, https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11123051.
- [51] S. Sun, Z. Kong, Q. Shi, H. Zhang, O.K. Lei, J. Nie, Carbohydrate restriction with or without exercise training improves blood pressure and insulin sensitivity in overweight women, Healthcare (Basel) 9 (6) (2021 May 27) 637, https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9060637.
- [52] S. Sun, H. Zhang, Z. Kong, Q. Shi, T.K. Tong, J. Nie, Twelve weeks of low volume sprint interval training improves cardio-metabolic health outcomes in overweight females, J. Sports Sci. 37 (11) (2019 Jun) 1257–1264, https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2018.1554615.
- [53] F. Vaccari, A. Passaro, A. D'Amuri, J.M. Sanz, F. Di Vece, E. Capatti, et al., Effects of 3-month high-intensity interval training vs. moderate endurance training and 4-month follow-up on fat metabolism, cardiorespiratory function and mitochondrial respiration in obese adults, Eur. J. Appl. Physiol. 120 (8) (2020 Aug) 1787–1803, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-020-04409-2.
- [54] C.A. Vella, K. Taylor, D. Drummer, High-intensity interval and moderate-intensity continuous training elicit similar enjoyment and adherence levels in overweight and obese adults, Eur. J. Sport Sci. 17 (9) (2017 Oct) 1203–1211, https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2017.1359679.
- [55] R. Zapata-Lamana, C. Henríquez-Olguín, C. Burgos, R. Meneses-Valdés, I. Cigarroa, C. Soto, et al., Effects of polarized training on cardiometabolic risk factors in young overweight and obese women: a randomized-controlled trial, Front. Physiol. 9 (2018) 1287, https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2018.01287.
- [56] H. Zhang, T.K. Tong, W. Qiu, X. Zhang, S. Zhou, Y. Liu, et al., Comparable effects of high-intensity interval training and prolonged continuous exercise training on abdominal visceral fat reduction in obese young women, J. Diabetes Res. 2017 (2017), 5071740, https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/5071740.
- [57] H. Zhang, T.K. Tong, Z. Kong, Q. Shi, Y. Liu, J. Nie, Exercise training-induced visceral fat loss in obese women: the role of training intensity and modality, Scand. J. Med. Sci. Sports 31 (1) (2021 Jan) 30–43, https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13803.
- [58] H. Zhang, T.K. Tong, W. Qiu, J. Wang, J. Nie, Y. He, Effect of high-intensity interval training protocol on abdominal fat reduction in overweight Chinese women: a randomized controlled trial, Kinesiology 47 (1) (2015 Jun) 57–66.
- [59] K. Hesketh, H. Jones, F. Kinnafick, S.O. Shepherd, A.J.M. Wagenmakers, J.A. Strauss, et al., Home-based HIIT and traditional MICT prescriptions improve cardiorespiratory fitness to a similar extent within an exercise referral scheme for at-risk individuals, Front. Physiol. 12 (2021), 750283, https://doi.org/ 10.3389/fphys.2021.750283.
- [60] L.C. Hespanhol Junior, J.D. Pillay, W. van Mechelen, E. Verhagen, Meta-analyses of the effects of habitual running on indices of health in physically inactive adults, Sports Med. 45 (10) (2015 Oct) 1455–1468, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0359-y.
- [61] G. Fisher, A.W. Brown, M.M. Bohan Brown, A. Alcorn, C. Noles, L. Winwood, et al., High intensity interval- vs moderate intensity- training for improving cardiometabolic health in overweight or obese males: a randomized controlled trial, PLoS One 10 (10) (2015), e0138853, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0138853.
- [62] R. Barraco, S. Mohanna, S. Seclén, Determinación de la sensibilidad a la insulina usando el método HOMA en poblaciones adultas habitantes de grandes alturas y a nivel del mar [citado 2022 Jun 19], Rev. Méd. Hered. 17 (4) (2006) 206–211. Available from: http://www.scielo.org.pe/scielo.php?script=sci\_ arttext&pid=S1018-130X2006000400004&lng=es.
- [63] N.E. Hill, K. Deighton, J. Matu, S. Misra, N.S. Oliver, C. Newman, et al., Continuous glucose monitoring at high altitude-effects on glucose homeostasis, Med. Sci. Sports Exerc. 50 (8) (2018 Aug) 1679–1686, https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.000000000001624.