# The Effects of Yoga on Cardiovascular Risk Factors among Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Yoga is the ancient Indian practice which gains universal recognition after the

celebration of World yoga day in 2015.

factors such as HTN, lipid profile, and

anthropometric measures among patients

with T2DM so that strong evidence can be

generated through the pooled analysis of

How to cite this article: Anuradha, Rojaria NS,

Kaur J, Saini M. The effects of yoga on cardiovascular

risk factors among patients with type 2 diabetes

mellitus: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J

Revised: 04-Jan-2022

Published: 21-Mar-2022

quality trials.

Yoga 2022;15:3-11.

Submitted: 17-Sep-2021

Accepted: 21-Jan-2022

#### Abstract

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is a fastest evolving metabolic disorder and India houses second highest number of patients with diabetes after China. Cardiovascular diseases are the major cause of mortality among patients with T2DM. Yoga is an ancient Indian practice that proves to be effective for patients with diabetes. The present systematic review and meta-analysis has been conducted to see the benefits of yoga on blood pressure, lipid profile, and anthropometric measures among patients with T2DM. The articles were extracted from three databases - PubMed, The Cochrane library, and Google scholar. Only English language articles, with PEDro score≥6, were included in the current study. The duplicates were removed using Mendeley. Fourteen randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and three 3 non-RCTs were included in the analysis. The meta-analysis was done using Review Manager 5.3. The results reveal that yoga is effect in improving blood pressure (P < 0.01), lipid profile (P<0.01) except HDL (P=0.06), and anthropometric measures (P<0.01) except waist-hip ratio (P=0.79). Heterogeneity was also high for most of the variables. It may be concluded from the results that the yoga is effective in improving of blood pressure, lipid profile, and anthropometric measures. However, high heterogeneity sought the need of more high quality RCTs to affirm these findings.

**Keywords:** Hypertension, lipid profile, type 2 diabetes mellitus, yoga

### Introduction

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is a metabolic disease which is increasing at alarming rate. It is characterized by increase in the blood glucose level. This increase in blood glucose leads to multisystem complications in the human body.<sup>[1]</sup> T2DM mostly exist in deadly quartet which include glucose intolerance, hypertension (HTN), obesity, and hypertriglyceridemia.<sup>[2]</sup> A recent cohort study stated that DM at baseline is a significant predictor of HTN incidence with odds ratio, 3.14 and 95% confidence interval, 2.17-4.54.<sup>[3]</sup> Obesity and DM goes hands-on-hands. Recent study has revealed that nearly 90% patients of T2DM are either obese or overweight.<sup>[4]</sup> Hypertriglyceridemia is common among patients with diabetes. This quadrant is the major risk factor for the development of cardiovascular disease. Therefore, the control of this quadrant among the patient with T2DM is the major concern as cardiovascular disease is the leading cause of mortality among Indians.<sup>[5]</sup>

For reprints contact: WKHLRPMedknow\_reprints@wolterskluwer.com

Mother Teresa Saket College of Physiotherapy, Chandi Mandir, Panchkula - 134 107, Haryana, India. E-mail: xs4minaxi@gmail.com



# Anuradha. Niharika Singh Rojaria, Jaspreet Kaur, Minaxi Saini<sup>1</sup>

Department of Physiotherapy, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar, <sup>1</sup>Mother Teresa Saket College of Physiotherapy, Panchkula, Haryana, India

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Extensive literature support the benefit of Yoga on blood glucose,[6] HTN,[7,8] obesity,<sup>[9]</sup> and lipid profile<sup>[10,11]</sup> among patients with T2DM. This literature mostly includes small trials, with poor quality, and with inconclusive results. This lack their capability to generate the quality evidence to support the practice of yoga among these patients. Available systematic reviews and meta-analysis have included data up to 2015.<sup>[12-14]</sup> However, most of the quality research are of after 2015 after the Address for correspondence: introduction of world yoga day. Therefore, Dr. Minaxi Saini. this systematic review and meta-analysis are conducted to see the benefit of yoga therapy on major cardiovascular risk

## Methods

This meta-analysis and systematic review was performed as per the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines.

### Search strategy

The search strategy was drafted by two authors (MS and A) by doing extensive search of the articles related to the topic. Mesh terms were also taken into consideration while drafting the search strategy. Any query was discussed with another two authors (JK and NS). Three databases (PubMed, The Cochrane Library, and Google scholar) were searched systematically from inception to till August, 31 2021 by the two authors independently (MS and A) Only human trial and English language were taken as filter. The search strategy for one database is available in Table 1.

### **Study selection process**

The study selection process was done independently by the two authors (MS and A). MS and A consulted JK and NS, respectively, for any doubt in selection of articles. Final decision of inclusion and exclusion was taken by the mutual consent by all the four authors (MS, A, JK, NS). The duplicates were removed through Mendeley database. After the removal of duplicates, the remaining articles were screened on the basis of eligibility criteria. Then, the full-text of all the eligible articles was printed out. The full-text articles were also screened again on the basis of same eligibility criteria. The rejected full text articles were also screened again to recover any potential neglect.

### **Eligibility criteria**

The eligibility criteria were decided as per Participants, Intervention, Control, Outcome, and study design (PICOS).

- 1. The study must be conducted on patients with T2DM (P)
- 2. The study examining and comparing the yoga intervention (asana or pranayama or meditation) with other usual care or control or placebo group (I and C)
- 3. The study evaluating and comparing at least one of the outcome measure (O)
- 4. The randomized control trial (RCT), randomized cross-over studies, cluster-randomized control trial, or quasi-experimental trials were included (S).

### **Exclusion criteria**

- 1. The study participants having other comorbid state such as diabetic nephropathy and retinopathy.
- 2. Unavailability of data in mean ± standard deviation (SD) will be excluded (only for meta-analysis)
- 3. PEDro score <6.

### Data extraction and management

The above mentioned data were extracted from the included studies by the two authors independently (MS and A) and any query was discussed with the another two authors (JK and NS). Data were extracted on the excel sheet prepared as per PRISMA guidelines. The following categories were decided: (1) Bibliometric data (Author's name, year of publication, continent/ country, and study duration), (2) study design, (3) study participants data (age/gender, sample size, and sampling

	Table 1: Search strategy for PubMed database	
Search	Query	Items found
1	Search ((((Yoga[Title/Abstract] OR Yogasan[Title/Abstract] OR Pranayam[Title/Abstract] OR Yog[Title/ Abstract] OR Dhyana[Title/Abstract] OR asana[Title/Abstract]))) AND ((Diabetes[Title/Abstract] OR Diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR Adult onset diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR Non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR Type 2 Diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR Type 2 Diabetes[Title/ Abstract] OR T2DM[Title/Abstract]))) AND ((Body composition[Title/Abstract] OR Body weight[Title/ Abstract] OR Waist circumference[Title/Abstract] OR waist hip ratio[Title/Abstract] OR Body mass index[Title/Abstract])))	39
2	Search ((((Blood pressure[Title/Abstract] OR Arterial pressure[Title/Abstract] OR hypertension[Title/ Abstract] OR systolic blood pressure[Title/Abstract] OR diastolic blood pressure[Title/Abstract]))) AND ((Yoga[Title/Abstract] OR Yogasan[Title/Abstract] OR Pranayam[Title/Abstract] OR Yog[Title/ Abstract] OR Dhyana[Title/Abstract] OR asana[Title/Abstract]))) AND ((Diabetes[Title/Abstract] OR Diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR Adult onset diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR Type 2 Diabets mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR Type 2 Diabets[Title/ Abstract] OR T2DM[Title/Abstract] OR Diabetes mellitus Type 2[Title/Abstract] OR Diabetes Type 2[Title/ Abstract] OR Diabetes Type 2[Title/Abstract] OR Diabetes Type 2[Title/	72
3	Search (((((Diabetes[Title/Abstract] OR Diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR adult onset diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR type 2 Diabetes mellitus[Title/Abstract] OR type 2 diabetes[Title/Abstract] OR T2DM[Title/Abstract]))) AND ((Yoga[Title/ Abstract] OR Yogasan[Title/Abstract] OR Pranayam[Title/Abstract] OR Yog[Title/Abstract] OR Dhyana[Title/ Abstract] OR asana[Title/Abstract])))) AND ((Lipid profile[Title/Abstract] OR cholesterol[Title/Abstract] OR High density lipoprotein cholesterol[Title/Abstract] OR High density lipoprotein cholesterol[Title/Abstract] OR Triglyceride[Title/Abstract])))	33

method), (4) Intervention detail (Type, frequency, and duration of yoga), (5) Control group detail (Type-usual care/placebo etc., frequency, and duration), and (6) Outcome measures (blood pressure-systolic blood pressure and diastolic blood pressure (SBP and DBP); Anthropometric measures-body weight (BW), body mass index (BMI), waist-hip ratio (WHR), and waist circumference (WC); lipid profile-total cholesterol (TC), triglycerides (TG), high-density lipoprotein (HDL), and low-density lipoprotein (LDL).

The corresponding author of the full-text eligible studies was contacted to retrieve any missing data through E-mail. Wherever the data were missing for SD then it was imputed as per Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Intervention. The data for TC and triglyceride were converted using the software to bring homogeneity in the units.

### Data items

The primary outcomes for the study were blood pressure, i.e., SBP and DBP and total lipid profile i.e., TC, TG, HDL, and LDL. The secondary outcome measure was anthropometric i.e., BW, BMI, WHR, and WC.

### Assessment of quality of individual study

The methodological quality of individual study was assessed through the PEDro rating scale. It is a reliable<sup>[15]</sup> and valid<sup>[16]</sup> score for the measurement of methodological quality of RCTs. It is an 11-items score having maximum score of 11. A score of 6 or more is considered as high quality; while a score <5 is considered a fair and a score below 3 is considered poor.

#### Study risk of bias assessment

Assessment of risk of bias of individual study as well as across the studies was evaluated using Review Manager 5.3 (RevMan version 5.3; The Nordic Cochrane Centre, Copenhagen, Denmark). Risk of bias of the individual study was evaluated through Cochrane Collaboration's modified tool. It consists of seven items: "random sequence generation, allocation concealment, selective reporting, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, and other sources of bias." On the basis of these items, the study can be classified as high risk, low risk, or unclear risk. Assessment of risk of bias across the studies was evaluated through the heterogeneity analysis. Funnel plot was also plotted and analysed for publication bias.

### Statistical analysis

It was also done using Review Manager 5.3 (RevMan 5.3) which is a Cochrane Collaboration's software for systemic reviews and meta-analysis. Weighted mean difference (WMD), 95% CI and overall effect was computed by feeding data for mean, SD and total number subjects

for both control and diabetic group. Forest plots for each outcome measure were also produced. Significance level was set at 0.05. Random model was used for the analysis. Heterogeneity was tested using  $I^2$  statistics. Heterogeneity of "0%–25% was considered as low heterogeneity, 26%–75% as moderate heterogeneity and 76%–100% as substantial heterogeneity" in  $I^2$  test. If the  $I^2$  value is >50% then sensitivity analysis was performed. Additional analysis such as sensitivity and subgroup analysis was also performed as per the availability of the data.

### **Results**

### Search results

Total 32568 studies were found after the advance search in three databases: PubMed, Cochrane Library, and Google scholar by two authors (MS and A) independently. 848 were removed due to duplication using Mendeley software. Title and abstract of remaining 31720 studies were evaluated on the basis of eligibility criteria. After initial scanning, 31704 records were excluded as not meeting inclusion criteria. Remaining 46 full text articles were scanned independently by two authors for eligibility. From these articles, 29 were excluded due to reasons as mentioned in Figure 1. Excluded studies were also scanned by another two authors (JK and NS) to retrieve any potential neglect. Figure 1 showed the flow diagram of the study. Total 17 studies were included qualitative analysis (systematic review)[11, 17-32] and 15 were considered for quantitative analysis (meta-analysis) as data for mean ± SD was not available for two studies.<sup>[17,20]</sup>

### Study characteristics and study quality

The characteristics of included studies is represented in Supplementary Table 1. As shown in table, 13 were RCT, 1 was randomized cross-over study, 3 were nonRCT. 13 studies were from India, 1 each from England, USA, Australia, and Cuba. Six studies were having PEDro 6 and 7 was scored by another 6 studies. 8 and 9 scoring on PEDro was obtained by 1 study each. In 17 studies, total 1725 patients with T2DM were included. 804 were in experimental group and 807 were in the control group. The total duration of the yoga protocol was immediate, 2 months, 40 days, and 45 days in 1 study each. One study has not mentioned about the duration of the protocol. In 8 studies, the yoga protocol was given for 3 months. 6 months and 9 months of yoga protocol were given in one study each.

The duration of one session of yoga was very variable among the studies. It was from immediate to 2 h, as shown in Supplementary Table 1. Yogic intervention is also variable. Pranayama, asana, suryanamaskara, hath yoga, prayer, deep breathing, Debts Recovery Appellate Tribunals, quick reaction team etc., were given as yogic intervention. Control group has given the nonyogic intervention. Two studies<sup>[28,30]</sup> have given sham yoga to the



Figure 1: Flow diagram of study as per PRISMA guidelines

control group. Only two studies<sup>[11,20]</sup> have taken follow-up of the participants. Two studies have not provided the mean  $\pm$  SD.<sup>[17,20]</sup> The insignificant improvement was found only in two studies.<sup>[20,30]</sup> Rest of the studies has shown significant improvement in at least one of the outcome measure.

#### **Results for primary outcome**

#### Blood pressure

Total eight studies have taken blood pressure as outcome measure. Among these two studies have not reported about the mean  $\pm$  SD. Therefore, the forest plot was produced

		Yoga		C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
2.1.1 Systolic blood press	ure								
Dasappa et al 2017	-13.77	11.35	52	-5.94	14.83	57	17.8%	-7.83 [-12.76, -2.90]	
Hegde et al 2020	11.2	7.3	20	11.5	6.7	20	19.9%	-0.30 [-4.64, 4.04]	
Mullur & Ames 2016	-5.2	8.58	5	6.2	8.02	5	7.0%	-11.40 [-21.69, -1.11]	·
Ramamoorthi et al 2021	1.75	9.43	20	1.6	8.67	20	15.7%	0.15 [-5.46, 5.76]	
Sreedevi et al 2017	-6	14.23	32	3.2	18.1	35	10.6%	-9.20 [-16.96, -1.44]	
Viswanathan et al 2020	-0.8	8.97	150	4.6	8.49	150	28.9%	-5.40 [-7.38, -3.42]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			279			287	100.0%	-4.77 [-7.85, -1.69]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 7.52	; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	1.72, df	'= 5 (P	= 0.04);	1 <sup>2</sup> = 579	6			
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	0.04 (P = 1	0.002)							
2.1.2 Diastolic blood pres	sure								
Dasappa et al 2017	-8.92	7.01	52	-2.65	6.7	57	19.3%	-6.27 [-8.85, -3.69]	
Hegde et al 2020	1	2.9	20	1.9	3.3	20	22.8%	-0.90 [-2.83, 1.03]	
Mullur & Ames 2016	-2.6	6.42	5	0	5.7	5	5.3%	-2.60 [-10.13, 4.93]	
Ramamoorthi et al 2021	-1.08	6.13	20	0.92	6.2	20	13.6%	-2.00 [-5.82, 1.82]	
Sreedevi et al 2017	-3.1	9.5	32	3.1	8.9	35	11.5%	-6.20 [-10.62, -1.78]	
Viswanathan et al 2020	0.1	4.36	150	1.8	4.48	150	27.5%	-1.70 [-2.70, -0.70]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			279			287	100.0%	-3.00 [-4.92, -1.09]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 3.20	; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	5.44, dt	= 5 (P	= 0.009	); l <sup>2</sup> = 68	1%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	8.08 (P = 1	0.002)							
									Yoga Control

#### Figure 2: Forest plot for blood pressure

	1	Yoga		C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% (	1	IV, Random, 95% CI	
3.1.1 Total cholesterol											
Mondal et al 2018	-5.1	19.82	10	0.1	23.21	10	10.7%	-0.23 [-1.11, 0.6	5]	+	
Nagarathna et al 2012	-20.66	24.27	141	-15.75	25.26	136	11.8%	-0.20 [-0.43, 0.04	1]		
Rani K & Sreekumaran E 2013	-39.7	3.69	73	2.51	4.94	70	9.9%	-9.66 [-10.84, -8.44	3]		
Shantakumari et al 2013	-25.32	19.37	50	9.49	22.82	50	11.5%	-1.63 [-2.09, -1.11	3]	*	
Sharma et al 2020	-56	25.21	52	-5	31.05	52	11.5%	-1.79 [-2.25, -1.33	3]	•	
Singh et al 2008	-16.23	27.52	30	-4.5	29.51	3	9.9%	-0.41 [-1.61, 0.71	3]	-+	
Sreedevi et al 2017	6.26	36.8	32	15.83	49.5	35	11.5%	-0.22 [-0.70, 0.2]	ń	+	
Vaishali et al 2012	-34.2	19.69	27	-23.9	12.55	30	11.4%	-0.62 [-1.16, -0.09	31	-	
Viswanathan et al 2020 Subtotal (95% CI)	-2.5	31.55	150 565	-6	28.51	150 536	11.8% 100.0%	0.12 [-0.11, 0.3	4) )]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1.86; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P	= 321.78, = 0.001)	df= 8 (	P < 0.0	0001); P	= 98%				-		
3.1.2 Triglycerides											
Gordon et al 2008	-9.75	3.72	77	7.98	3.71	77	9.9%	-4.75 -5.37 -4 1	81	-	
Mondal et al 2018	-5	17.88	10	0.6	14.96	10	9.5%	-0.33 [-1.21 0.5]	51	-	
Nagarathna et al 2012	-26.82	51 24	141	-29 48	68 66	136	10.3%	0.04 -0.19 0.21	21		
Ramamoorthi et al 2012	-0.01	0.49	20	-0.25	0.00	20	0.0%	0.55 60.02 1 1	21	<b>↓</b>	
Rani K & Sreekumaran F 2013	-36 51	619	72	10.20	9.50	70	9.3%	-5.88 -6.64 -5.1	1	+	
Shantakumari et al 2013	-21 77	26.46	50	25.17	03.54	60	10 2%	-0.69[-1.09 -0.2	21		
Sharma at al 2020	-21.77	46.26	50	20.17	25 14	50	10.2%	-1 28 [-1 70 -0 9	3	•	
Singh et al 2008	-25.56	40.20	30	-5.84	25 42	20	10.2%	-0.51 (-1.02 0.00	2		
Voicholi et al 2006	-20.00	47.40	30	-0.04	11 55	20	10.1%	-0.01 [-1.03, 0.00	21	-	
Valshall et al 2012	-18.0	11.3	150	-8.07	11.00	150	10.0%	-0.91 (-1.40, -0.3)	) )	1	
Subtotal (95% Cl)	-11	40	630	4	40.00	625	10.3%	-1.38 [-2.29, -0.48	5] []	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 3.01 (P	= 411.13, = 0.003)	df= 9 (	P < 0.0	0001); P	= 98%						
3.1.3 Low density lipoprotein											
Gordon et al 2008	-0.08	0.09	77	0.17	0.08	77	14.4%	-2.92 [-3.38, -2.40	5]	•	
Nagarathna et al 2012	-11.27	20.21	146	-0.87	21.48	136	14.7%	-0.50 [-0.74, -0.20	51	-	
Rani K & Sreekumaran E 2013	-27.82	3.49	73	4.92	3.97	70	13.1%	-8.72 [-9.80, -7.6	51		
Shantakumari et al 2013	-24.23	20.6	50	0.49	18.31	50	14.5%	-1.26 [-1.690.8]	31	-	
Singh et al 2008	-14.6	26.07	30	-3.63	32.22	30	14.4%	-0.37 (-0.88, 0.1)	1	-	
Vaishali et al 2012	-21.04	9.31	27	-7.44	10.72	30	14.2%	-1.33 [-1.910.7	51	-	
Viswanathan et al 2020	1.5	22.08	150	-2.5	20.41	150	14.7%	0.19 [-0.04, 0.4	j j		
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2.36: Chi <sup>2</sup> :	378 42	df = 6 (	553 P < 0 0	0001) 12	= 98%	543	100.0%	-2.04 [-3.19, -0.88	]	•	
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.45 (P	= 0.0006	)		00017,1	- 00 %						
									F		_
									-20	-10 0 10	20
										ravouis (rogaj -ravouis (control)	
	Exp	erimen	tal	C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random, 95% Cl	
Gordon et al 2008	0.03	0.03	77	-0.02	0.03	77	14 9%	0.05/0.04/0.061			
Nagarathna et al 2012	312	8 32	141	-0.92	8 0.00	136	14.0%	4 08 [2 15 6 01]			
Rani K & Sreekumaran E 2012	4.06	1 22	72	-3.26	1.00	70	14 904	7 31 [6 02 7 60]			
Chantakumari at al 2013	2.50	5.65	60	-1.4	0.74	60	12 204	2 62 10 74 6 60			
Cinah at al 2000	2.52	0.05	20	-1.1	0.74	20	13.2%	3.02 [0.74, 0.50]			
Singh et al 2008	3	4.83	30	0.7	3.32	30	14.0%	2.30 [0.20, 4.40]			
vaishali et al 2012	5.85	0.63	27	1.24	0.92	30	14.8%	4.61 [4.20, 5.02]		-	
Viswanathan et al 2020	0	7.9	150	1	7.3	150	14.2%	-1.00 [-2.72, 0.72]			
Total (95% CI)			548			543	100.0%	3.01 [-0.18, 6.20]		◆	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 17.84; Ch	i <sup>2</sup> = 1921	.52, df	= 6 (P ·	< 0.0000	)1); l²=	100%			-20	-10 0 10	20
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.85 (F	° = 0.06)									Favours [Control] Favours [Yoga]	20

#### Figure 3: Forest plot for lipid profile

using six studies [Figure 2]. The results show the significant reduction of SBP and DBP in yoga group in comparison to

the control group (P = 0.002) with WMD = -4.77 and -3.00, respectively. However, the heterogeneity was moderate i.e.,



Figure 4: Forest plot for anthropometric measures



**Figure 5: Funnel Plots** 

57% and 68% respectively for SBP and DBP. Sensitivity analysis by removing two studies<sup>[17,20,25,28]</sup> has decreased the heterogeneity, as shown in Supplementary Figure 1.

#### Lipid profile

#### Total cholesterol

Total nine and ten studies for TC and TG, respectively, and eight studies each for HDL and LDL were included for meta-analysis [Figure 3]. The analysis reveals the significant improvement in TC, TG, and LDL with P = 0.001, 0.003, and 0.001; WMD = -1.52, -1.38, and -2.04 respectively. However, the heterogeneity was substantial i.e., 98% for TC, TG, and LDL. The results for HDL were also in favor of Yoga therapy. However, the difference was not significant (P = 0.06). Removal of single or many studies has not changed the heterogeneity to the significant level.

#### Anthropometric measures

Total four, eight, and two studies were found for BW, BMI, and WHR, respectively [Figure 4]. The results were



Figure 6: Risk of bias assessment

in favor of Yoga therapy. However, it was not significant for WHR (P = 0.79). The WMD was -2.59, -1.22, -0.01for BW, BMI, and WHR, respectively [Figure 4]. The heterogeneity was moderate to substantial (>70%). The sensitivity analysis revealed that the heterogeneity reduces to the significant level by keeping the studies with 3 months duration only. This has reduced the heterogeneity to significant level [Supplementary Figure 2].

### Publication bias and risk of bias

The publication bias is represented through funnel plot [Figure 5]. No publication bias was found for BP, TC, and TG. However, funnel plot analysis showed the publication bias for LDL, HDL, BW, BMI, and WHR. The risk of bias graph and summary is represented in Figure 6.

### Discussion

This systematic review and meta-analysis was performed to explore the effect of yoga on cardiovascular risk factors among patients with T2DM. The primary outcomes measures were SBP, DBP, TC, TG, HDL, and LDL. The secondary outcome measures were BW, BMI, WHR, and WC. The findings of the meta-analysis reveal that the yoga is beneficial in improving all the outcome measures. However, the results are not significant for WHR and HDL. Heterogeneity was also high for these variables. The sensitivity analysis does not affect the results in term of heterogeneity and significance level for these variables. Various reviews<sup>[31]</sup> have also discussed the benefit of yoga intervention among patients with T2DM. Many systematic reviews and meta-analysis has also evaluated the benefit of yoga for the patients with T2DM.<sup>[12-14,33,34]</sup> Our results are in agreement with this literature. However, our study is superior to the existing literature as their database search is bound up to 2015 and we have searched up to August, 2021. Therefore, we are able to get more recent and quality articles as most of the quality research in yoga therapy is after the introduction of world yoga day in 2015. Our meta-analysis results are based upon the 15 trial and among these 13 were RCTs. This is the biggest strength of this yoga based meta-analysis. Second, we have included studies which have PEDro score  $\geq 6$  which strengthen the evidence generated by this systematic review and meta-analysis.

There are a few limitations of this systematic review and meta-analysis. First, high heterogeneity for study variables. This is the biggest limitation. This may be because of the methodological variations among the studies. Secondly, the maximum studies which we are able to get are from India. This is because yoga is an ancient Indian practice and Indian are more aware about its true concept and benefits. However, Yoga gains universal recognition after the celebration of world yoga day. Now the good quality trials are coming from around the world. Finally, we get few studies for each subgroup analysis this could be the limitation of the study.

### **Future scope**

These results of this study could be taken as ground for future RCT. The study also sought the need of more trial on anthropometric measures as we get a few studies on BW, WC, and WHR, and these studies are also having publication bias as revealed through the funnel plots. The anthropometric measures are important risk factor for cardiovascular diseases; therefore, more high quality studies are required for the effect of yoga on anthropometric measures among patients with T2DM. Further, the inclusion of more homogenous studies in future meta-analysis may reduce the heterogeneity.

#### **Clinical significance**

This meta-analysis generates the evidence for the effectiveness of yoga intervention in the reduction of blood pressure, lipid profile, and anthropometric measures. These three are important risk factors for the cardiovascular disease. This may help the yoga instructors for evidence-based practice for the benefit of patients with T2DM.

### Conclusions

It may be concluded from the results that the yoga is effective in reduction of blood pressure, lipid profile, and anthropometric measure for patients with T2DM. However, higher heterogeneity in forest plot analysis sought the requirement of large scale good quality RCT. The good quality trial of long duration is also warranted as maximum trial which we get is of short duration ( $\leq$ 3 months).

### **Ethical clearance**

No ethical clearance is required.

### Acknowledgments

This work has been submitted at Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar for the partial fulfilment for the degree of Maters of Science (Yoga therapy and Science) by the first author.

#### Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

### **Conflicts of interest**

There are no conflicts of interest.

### References

- 1. Forbes JM, Cooper ME. Mechanisms of diabetic complications. Physiol Rev 2013;93:137-88.
- Kaplan NM. The deadly Quartet: Upper-body obesity, glucose intolerence, Hypertriglyceridemia, and Hypertension. Arch Intern Med 1989;149:1514-20.
- Tsimihodimos V, Gonzalez-Villalpando C, Meigs JB, Ferrannini E. Hypertension and diabetes mellitus: Coprediction and time trajectories. Hypertension 2018;71:422-8.
- Bramante CT, Lee CJ, Gudzune KA. Treatment of obesity in patients with diabetes. Diabetes Spectr 2017;30:237-43.
- Abdul-Aziz AA, Desikan P, Prabhakaran D, Schroeder LF. Tackling the burden of cardiovascular diseases in India: The essential diagnostics list. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes 2019;12:1-4.
- Chimkode SM, Kumaran SD, Kanhere VV, Shivanna R. Effect of yoga on blood glucose levels in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. J Clin Diagn Res 2015;9:C01-3.
- Gowtham L, Vasanthi B, Jayshree N, Mini Jacob S. Yoga on RBC morphology for diabetics and hypertensive patients 51 original article Indian. Indian J Physiol Pharmacol 2018;62:51-8.
- Cohen DL, Division H. Yoga and hypertension. J Yoga Phys Ther 2013;3:1-6.
- Tikhe AS, Pailoor S, Metri K, Ganpat TS, Ramarao NH. Yoga: Managing overweight in mid-life T2DM. J Midlife Health 2015;6:81-4.
- Nagarathna R, Tyagi R, Kaur G, Vendan V, Acharya IN, Anand A, et al. Efficacy of a validated yoga protocol on dyslipidemia in diabetes patients: NMB-2017 India trial. Medicines (Basel) 2019;6:E100.
- 11. Shantakumari N, Sequeira S, El deeb R. Effects of a yoga intervention on lipid profiles of diabetes patients with dyslipidemia. Indian Heart J 2013;65:127-31.
- Innes KE, Selfe TK. Yoga for adults with type 2 diabetes: A systematic review of controlled trials. J Diabetes Res 2016;2016:6979370.
- Cui J, Yan JH, Yan LM, Pan L, Le JJ, Guo YZ. Effects of yoga in adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus: A meta-analysis. J Diabetes Investig 2017;8:201-9.
- 14. Thind H, Lantini R, Balletto BL, Donahue ML, Salmoirago-Blotcher E, Bock BC, *et al.* The effects of yoga among adults with type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Prev Med 2017;105:116-26.
- 15. Maher CG, Sherrington C, Herbert RD, Moseley AM, Elkins M. Reliability of the PEDro scale for rating quality of randomized

controlled trials. Phys Ther 2003;83:713-21.

- de Morton NA. The PEDro scale is a valid measure of the methodological quality of clinical trials: A demographic study. Aust J Physiother 2009;55:129-33.
- Singh S, Kyizom T, Singh KP, Tandon OP, Madhu SV. Influence of pranayamas and yoga-asanas on serum insulin, blood glucose and lipid profile in type 2 diabetes. Indian J Clin Biochem 2008;23:365-8.
- Gordon LA, Morrison EY, McGrowder DA, Young R, Fraser YT, Zamora EM, *et al.* Effect of exercise therapy on lipid profile and oxidative stress indicators in patients with type 2 diabetes. BMC Complement Altern Med 2008;8:21.
- Skoro-Kondza L, Tai SS, Gadelrab R, Drincevic D, Greenhalgh T. Community based yoga classes for type 2 diabetes: An exploratory randomised controlled trial. BMC Health Serv Res 2009;9:33.
- Nagarathna R, Usharani MR, Rao AR, Chaku R, Kulkarni R, Nagendra HR. Efficacy of yoga based life style modification program on Medication score and lipid profile in type 2 diabetes – A randomized control study. Int J Diabetes Dev Ctries 2012;32:122-30.
- Vaishali K, Kumar KV, Adhikari P, UnniKrishnan B. Effects of yoga-based program on glycosylated hemoglobin level serum lipid profile in community dwelling elderly subjects with chronic type 2 diabetes mellitus – A randomized controlled trial. Phys Occup Ther Geriatr 2012;30:22-30.
- 22. Beena RK, Sreekumaran E. Yogic practice and diabetes mellitus in geriatric patients. Int J Yoga 2013;6:47-54.
- 23. Mullur RS, Ames D. Impact of a 10 minute seated yoga practice in the management of diabetes. J Yoga Phys Ther 2016;6:1000224.
- 24. Dasappa H, Fathima FN, Prabhakar R. Effectiveness of yoga program in the management of diabetes using community health workers in the urban slums of Bangalore city: A non-randomized controlled trial. J Family Med Prim Care 2016;5:619-24.
- 25. Sreedevi A, Gopalakrishnan UA, Karimassery Ramaiyer S, Kamalamma L. A Randomized controlled trial of the effect of yoga and peer support on glycaemic outcomes in women with type 2 diabetes mellitus: A feasibility study. BMC Complement Altern Med 2017;17:100.
- Mondal S, Kundu B, Saha S. Yoga as a therapeutic intervention for the management of type 2 diabetes mellitus. Int J Yoga 2018;11:129-38.
- 27. Hegde SV, Adhikari P, Kotian SM, Shastry R. Effects of yoga versus sham yoga on oxidative stress, glycemic status, and anthropometry in type 2 diabetes mellitus: A single-blinded randomized pilot study. Int J Yoga Therap 2020;30:33-9.
- 28. Viswanathan V, Sivakumar S, Sai Prathiba A, Devarajan A, George L, Kumpatla S. Effect of yoga intervention on biochemical, oxidative stress markers, inflammatory markers and sleep quality among subjects with type 2 diabetes in South India: Results from the SATYAM project. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 2021;172:108644.
- 29. Ramamoorthi R, Gahreman D, Skinner T, Moss S. Development of sham yoga poses to assess the benefits of yoga in future randomized controlled trial studies. Life (Basel) 2021;11:130.
- 30. McDermott KA, Rao MR, Nagarathna R, Murphy EJ, Burke A, Nagendra RH, *et al.* A yoga intervention for type 2 diabetes risk reduction: A pilot randomized controlled trial. BMC Complement Altern Med 2014;14:212.
- Sharma S, Bhardwaj S, Jangir S, Gupta B. Influence of yoga on status of lipid indices in type 2 diabetes mellitus subjects. International Journal of Diabetes in Developing Countries. 2020;40:410-5.

- Sarika K, Kumar H, Balakrishnan V, Sundaram K. Impact of Integrated Amrita Meditation® technique on stress in type 2 diabetic patients. Indian Journal of Medical Research. 2020;152:508-14.
- 33. Kumar V, Jagannathan A, Philip M, Thulasi A, Angadi P, Raghuram N. Role of yoga for patients with type II diabetes mellitus: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Complementary

Therapies in Medicine. 2016;25:104-12.

34. Jayawardena R, Ranasinghe P, Chathuranga T, Atapattu PM, Misra A. The benefits of yoga practice compared to physical exercise in the management of type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Diabetes and Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research and Reviews. 2018;12:795-805.

			Supple	ementa	ry Ta	ble 1: Characteristics	of inclu	ided studio	es			
Author/year	Country	y Stud	y design	PEDro score	Total	Yoga intervention/one session/total duration	]	Experiment ( <i>n</i> )	Age (years)	Control int	ervention	
Skoro-Kondza et al./2009	England	Expl RCT	oratorty	6	59	Pranayama + asanas/90 r months	min/3	29	NA	Life style ad	lvice	
McDermott et al./2014	India	RCT		8	41	19 asanas + 4 BE + relax + meditation/75 min/2 m	ation 10nths	21	47±9.7	Walking		
Mullur and Ames/2016	USA	RCT		7	10	5 postures + DB/10 min/ months	/3	5	68.8±5.97	Information handouts of	+ yoga class	
Hegde et al./2020	India	RCT		9	40	15 asanas + 3 pranayama 75-90 min/3 months	a/	20	57.1	Nonaerobic walking	ex +	
Ramamoorthi et al./2021	Austrila	Rand cross	lomized s-over study	7	20	Asanas + relaxation/ immediated		20	44.95±9.80	Sham yoga		
Dasappa et al./2017	India	Non	RCT	6	109	10 asana + 3 pranayams + sudarshan kriya/40 min/40 days		52	>35	NA		
Rani K and Sreekumaran E/2013	India	Non	RCT	6	143	Pranayama + asanas + savasana/90 min/3 month	hs	73	64	Walking + n exercises	onspecific	
Shantakumari et al./2013	India	RCT		6	100	13 asana + 4 pranayam + meditation/1 h/2 weeks	-	50	44.46	Standard tre	atment	
Vaishali <i>et al.</i> /2012	India	RCT		7	57	12 asana + 2 pranayama/45-60 min/3 months		27	64.4±3.8	Life style ec	lucation	
Ngarathna <i>et al.</i> /2012	India	RCT		6	277	Asana + yoga kriya/1 h/9 months	9	141	53.46±8.86	Nonyogic B walking	E +	
Singh et al./2008	India	Non	RCT	6	60	5 asana + 5 pranayama + suryanamaskara + conver medication/45 min/45 da	- entional ays	30	NA	Conventiona medication	al	
Viswanathan India et al./2020		RCT		6	300	10 asana + 5 prayanama QRT/50 min/3 months	+	150	50.8±8.3	Simple physexercise	ical	
Sharma et al./2020	India	RCT		6	104	3 prayer + 8 asana + 3 pranayama + meditation/40 min/6 mor	nths	52	NA	Standard tre	atment	
Mondal et al./2018	India	RCT		7	20	Suryanamaskara + asana + pranayama + meditation/35-55 min/3 1	months	10	64.70±4.03	NA		
Sarika <i>et al.</i> /2020	India	RCT		7	30	Yoga + pranayama + meditation/23 min/6 mor	nths	15	54.87±10.27	Life style m instructions	odification	
Gordon et al./2008	Cuba	RCT		6	231	Hath yoga/2 h/6 months		77	64.25	NA		
Sreedevi India RCT et al./2017			7	124	Asana + suryanamaskar + pranayama/60 min	+ DRT	32	51.97±7.40	Satandard ca	are		
Author/year	Co	ontrol	Age (vears)	Foll	low-up riod	Outcome measures	Result			]	Droupouts (%)	
Skoro-Kondza et al./2009		30	NA	6 n	nonth	Lipid profile, blood pressure etc.	No sigr	nificant impro	ovement		NA	
McDermott et al./2014		20 47.2±9.1		]	NA	BMI, weight, WC, TC, TG, SBP, DBP	Signific	ant improve	the groups	7.32		
Mullur and Ames/2016		5 60±10.34		]	NA	BMI, weight, SBP, DBP etc.	Signific	ignificant improvement in only D			Nil	
Hegde et al./20	20 20 57.55			]	NA	SBP, DBP, BMI, WC etc.	Signific stress	Significant improvement in oxyc stress			Nil	
Ramamoorthi et al./2021		20	44.95±9.80	]	NA	TG, SBP, DBP etc.	NA				Nil	
Dasappa et al.	et al./2017 57 >3		>35	]	NA	SBP, DBP etc.	Signific variable	ignificant improvement in outcome ariables				

			Supplen	nentary Table 1: Co	ontd	
Author/year	Control	Age	Follow-up	Outcome measures	Result	Droupouts
	<i>(n)</i>	(years)	period			(%)
Rani K and	70	62	NA	TC, TG, HDL, LDL	Significant within group reduction in	Nil
Sreekumaran				etc.	outcome measures. No significant reduction	
E/2013					in DBP and no between group significant	
					reduction in all outcome measures	
Shantakumari	50	45.51	3 months every	BMI, weight, WHR,	No significant between and within group	Nil
et al./2013			month upto 3	TC, TG, HDL, LDL	improvement	
			months	etc.		
Vaishali et al./2012	30	65.8 + 3.8	NA	TG, TC, HDL, LDL	Significant reduction in SBP and DBP in	5.26
				etc.	intervention group	
Ngarathna	136	51.	38 + 8.39	HDL, LDL, TG, TC	Significant reduction in lipid profile	34.47
et al./2012				et al.		
Singh et al./2008	30	NA	NA	Weight, BMI, TC,	Non-significant decrease in BMI,	Nil
0				TG, HDL, LDL etc.	significant decrease in weight, , TC, TG,	
					and LDL, non-significant elevation in HDL	
					in experimental group	
Viswanathan	150	52.8 + 7.0	NA	BMI, SBP, DBP,	Significant improvement in lipid profile	25
et al./2020				TC, TG, HDL, LDL		
				etc.		
Sharma et al./2020	52	NA	NA	BMI, WHR, TC,	Significant reduction in LDL, TG, and TC	Nil
				TG, HDL, LDL etc.	and significant increase in HDL	
Mondal et al./2018	10	64.40 +	NA	TC, TG, LDL, HDL	Significant reduction in weight, BMI, and	Nil
		4.79		etc.	lipid profile in experimental group	
Sarika <i>et al.</i> /2020	15	48.53 +	NA	Weight, BMI, FBG	Significant improvement in BMI, lipid	Nil
		8.95		etc.	profile	
Gordon et al./2008	77	63.15	NA	TG, LDL, HDL etc.	Significant improvement in BMI, WHR,	55
					and lipid profile	
Sreedevi et al./2017	35	51.92 +	NA	SBP, DBP, BMI.	Significant improvement in lipid rofile	12.1
		6.57		WHR, TC etc.		

RCT=Randomized controlled trials, NA=Not available, BMI=Body mass index, WC=Waist circumference, SBP=Systolic blood pressure, DBP=Diastolic blood pressure, TG=Triglycerides, FBG=Fasting blood glucose, LDL=Low-density lipoprotein, HDL=High-density lipoprotein, WHR=Waist-hip ratio, BE=Breathing exercise, DB=Deep breathing

	Yoga Control					Mean Difference	N	lean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV,	Random, 95% Cl
2.1.1 Systolic blood press	ure									
Dasappa et al 2017	-13.77	11.35	52	-5.94	14.83	57	0.0%	-7.83 [-12.76, -2.90]		
Hegde et al 2020	11.2	7.3	20	11.5	6.7	20	0.0%	-0.30 [-4.64, 4.04]		
Mullur & Ames 2016	-5.2	8.58	5	6.2	8.02	5	11.3%	-11.40 [-21.69, -1.11]		
Ramamoorthi et al 2021	1.75	9.43	20	1.6	8.67	20	25.2%	0.15 [-5.46, 5.76]		+
Sreedevi et al 2017	-6	14.23	32	3.2	18.1	35	17.1%	-9.20 [-16.96, -1.44]		
Viswanathan et al 2020	-0.8	8.97	150	4.6	8.49	150	46.3%	-5.40 [-7.38, -3.42]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			207			210	100.0%	-5.33 [-9.25, -1.41]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 7.62	; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 5	.94, df=	: 3 (P =	0.11); F	<sup>2</sup> = 50%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2	.67 (P = 1	(800.0								
2.1.2 Diastolic blood press	sure									
Dasappa et al 2017	-8.92	7.01	52	-2.65	6.7	57	0.0%	-6.27 [-8.85, -3.69]		
Hegde et al 2020	1	2.9	20	1.9	3.3	20	0.0%	-0.90 [-2.83, 1.03]		
Mullur & Ames 2016	-2.6	6.42	5	0	5.7	5	4.8%	-2.60 [-10.13, 4.93]		-
Ramamoorthi et al 2021	-1.08	6.13	20	0.92	6.2	20	16.0%	-2.00 [-5.82, 1.82]		*
Sreedevi et al 2017	-3.1	9.5	32	3.1	8.9	35	12.5%	-6.20 [-10.62, -1.78]		-
Viswanathan et al 2020	0.1	4.36	150	1.8	4.48	150	66.8%	-1.70 [-2.70, -0.70]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			207			210	100.0%	-2.35 [-4.04, -0.67]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.85	; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3	.82, df=	: 3 (P =	0.28); F	<sup>2</sup> = 21%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2	.73 (P = 1	0.006)								
									100 60	
									-100 -50	U 50 100

Supplementary Figure 1: Sensitivity analysis for blood pressure

Yoga					0	control		Mean Difference			Mean Difference			
	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Random, 95% CI			
	4.1.1 Body weight													
	Mullur & Ames 2016	-0.54	11.19	5	3.08	12.48	5	0.4%	-3.62 [-18.31, 11.07]					
	Sarika et al 2020	-0.29	2.01	15	0.62	1.1	15	0.0%	-0.91 [-2.07, 0.25]					
	Shantakumari et al 2013	-2.6	2.89	50	0.86	3.12	50	62.2%	-3.46 [-4.64, -2.28]					
	Singh et al 2008	-2.6	2.89	30	0.86	3.12	30	37.3%	-3.46 [-4.98, -1.94]					
	Subtotal (95% CI)			85			85	100.0%	-3.46 [-4.39, -2.53]		•			
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00;	Chi <sup>2</sup> = (	0.00, df	= 2 (P =	= 1.00);	l <sup>2</sup> = 0%								
	Test for overall effect: Z = 7	.29 (P <	0.0000	1)										
	4.1.2 Body mass index										L.			
	Hegde et al 2020	1.2	0.7	20	0.9	0.5	20	65.2%	0.30 [-0.08, 0.68]		<b>—</b>			
	Mullur & Ames 2016	-0.15	2.28	5	1.32	4.51	5	1.6%	-1.47 [-5.90, 2.96]					
	Sarika et al 2020	-0.15	0.81	15	0.23	0.44	15	0.0%	-0.38 [-0.85, 0.09]					
	Shantakumari et al 2013	-1.53	0.93	50	0.3	1.29	50	0.0%	-1.83 [-2.27, -1.39]					
	Sharma et al 2020	-3.03	1.9	52	-0.13	1.9	52	0.0%	-2.90 [-3.63, -2.17]					
	Singh et al 2008	-1.53	0.9	30	0.22	1.26	30	0.0%	-1.75 [-2.30, -1.20]					
	Sreedevi et al 2017	-1.92	1.7	35	-0.2	4.5	35	0.0%	-1.72 [-3.31, -0.13]					
	Viswanathan et al 2020	-0.5	3.92	150	-0.1	3.03	150	33.1%	-0.40 [-1.19, 0.39]		1			
	Subtotal (95% CI)	0.17		1/5	0.000		1/5	100.0%	0.04 [-0.55, 0.01]		Ť			
	Heterogeneity: 1 au- = 0.09;	Chin=	2.97, 01	= 2 (P =	= 0.23);	r= 33%	<b>,</b>							
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	.13 (P =	0.89)											
	4.1.3 Waist-hip ratio													
	Shantakumari et al 2013	-0.05	0.04	50	-0.02	0.04	50	62.6%	-0.03 60.05 -0.011		<b>_</b>			
	Sreedeviet al 2017	-0.05	0.04	32	-0.02	0.04	35	37 4%	0.03 [-0.03, -0.01]		T			
	Subtotal (95% CI)	0.01	0.17	82	0.04	0.00	85	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.05]		T			
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	3 47 df	= 1 (P =	= 0.06\·	$ ^2 = 71\%$								
	Test for overall effect: Z = 0	26 (P =	0.79)		5.00),									
										L				
										-20	-10 0 10 20			
											Favours (Yoga) Favours (control)			

Supplementary Figure 2: Sensitivity analysis for anthropometric measures