



# Current Evidence on Traditional Chinese Exercises for Quality of Life in Patients With Essential Hypertension: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Yang Song<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Jialin Li<sup>4</sup>, Bíró István<sup>2,3</sup>, Rongrong Xuan<sup>4,5</sup>, Sheng Wei<sup>6</sup>, Guanghui Zhong<sup>6</sup> and Yaodong Gu<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Sports Science, Ningbo University, Ningbo, China, <sup>2</sup> Doctoral School of Safety and Security Sciences, Obuda University, Budapest, Hungary, <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Engineering, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary, <sup>4</sup> Medical School of Ningbo University, Ningbo University, Ningbo, China, <sup>5</sup> The Affiliated Hospital of Medical School, Ningbo University, Ningbo, China, <sup>6</sup> Ningbo Municipal Hospital of T.C.M., Ningbo, China

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

#### Edited by:

Guido laccarino, University of Naples Federico II, Italy

#### Reviewed by:

Danilo Contiero, University of the West of Scotland, United Kingdom Hector Wing Hong Tsang, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong

> \*Correspondence: Yaodong Gu guyaodong@hotmail.com

#### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Hypertension, a section of the journal Frontiers in Cardiovascular Medicine

> Received: 09 November 2020 Accepted: 16 December 2020 Published: 20 January 2021

#### Citation:

Song Y, Li J, István B, Xuan R, Wei S, Zhong G and Gu Y (2021) Current Evidence on Traditional Chinese Exercises for Quality of Life in Patients With Essential Hypertension: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front. Cardiovasc. Med. 7:627518. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2020.627518 Essential hypertension is one of the most common chronic diseases seen in primary human health care that could lead to various health problems and reduce the quality of life (QOL). This study was performed to evaluate the effects of traditional Chinese exercises (TCE) on QOL in patients with essential hypertension. Three English databases and one Chinese database were searched for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) until August 2020. A total of 13 RCTs with 1,361 hypertensive patients met the inclusion criteria, 10 trials employed Tai Chi and 3 trials employed Qigong, including Dongeui Qinggong, Yijinjing, and Wuginxi. Despite a large heterogeneity within studies, it is demonstrated that TCE may be an effective therapy to improve the QOL of hypertensive patients. More specific, compared with no intervention, the meta-analysis presented that Tai Chi significantly improved both the physical and mental component of the 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36) QOL scale, and it was found that the simplified 24-form Tai Chi with a frequency of 30-50 min per session at five to eight sessions per week was the most commonly used setting. The pooling also revealed that Tai Chi and Qigong had some significantly positive effects on QOL based on other scales. However, more rigorously designed RCTs are warranted for further verification. This systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs demonstrated that Tai Chi may be an effective therapy to improve the QOL of patients with essential hypertension. All these findings provide helpful information for hypertensive patients and medical personnel.

Keywords: essential hypertension, traditional Chinese exercises, quality of life, randomized controlled trial, meta-analysis

# INTRODUCTION

Hypertension, also known as "the silent killer," is a clinical syndrome that is generally characterized by the systemic elevated arterial pressure (1, 2). It is one of the most common chronic diseases seen in primary human health care and has been found to be the major independent risk factor that leads to cardio-cerebrovascular diseases (3, 4). There are two types of hypertension, primary

1

hypertension and secondary hypertension, with the former being the most common one but the pathogenesis is still unclear. According to a research published on the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)*, hypertension is responsible for at least 7.6 million deaths per year globally, equal to 13.5% of all deaths (5). In addition, it has been predicted that the total number of adults diagnosed with hypertension would increase by 60% to ~1.56 billion in 2025 (6), which puts a huge burden on global health care resources and the communities.

In early 2020, a novel coronavirus disease, i.e., corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19), has swept across the globe, caused thousands of deaths and millions of economic loss (7, 8). The situation now has not been controlled, where the number of infected people is still increasing greatly every day. According to the latest official report published by the World Health Organization (WHO), there have been 24,299,923 confirmed cases of COVID-19, including 827,730 deaths globally by 4:33 pm CEST, 28 August 2020 (9). In order to restrain the humanto-human spread of COVID-19, most of the governments have suggested the citizens to stay at home (10). However, although home isolation can be effective in infection control, it may also bring some potential health threats. Emerging studies indicated that home isolation during this period has led to a substantial decrease in physical activity levels and a profound increase in sedentary behavior worldwide, which may rapidly deteriorate cardiovascular health, increase the incidence of hypertension, and further exacerbate the global burden (11, 12).

Despite the continuous exploration of hypertension treatment during the past decades, the main therapy for essential hypertension is still pharmacological management taking antihypertensive drugs regularly (1, 13). However, the effectiveness and patient compliance are always limited because of the high cost and several adverse effects, such as long-term medication and hypokalemia (1, 14). Therefore, alternative therapies with greater efficiency and no side effect are much warranted.

In recent years, traditional Chinese exercises (TCE) have gained popularity worldwide because of their benefit on improving both physical and mental health in patients with chronic diseases (15). TCE are comprehensive mind-body exercises that incorporate appropriate body movement, breathing patterns, and meditation (16). For example, Tai Chi, which now basically consists of 24 moves, emphasizes the unity of relaxation and dynamic balance. It can help to enhance the muscle strength, joint stability, and relieve the pressure. Wuqinxi, which is a set of TCE that imitates the movement of tiger, deer, bear, ape, and bird, focuses on the combination of dynamic and static or inside and outside, and could regulate the function of the internal organs. An increasing number of studies have investigated the effects of TCE on patients with essential hypertension and most found that TCE are effective in reducing diastolic and systolic blood pressure although there are some differences in experimental design (17, 18). Also, there are several systematic reviews and meta-analysis that have further summarized and confirmed these advantages (3, 19, 20). Nevertheless, the effects of TCE on quality of life (QOL) in patients with essential hypertension were not covered in previous studies. QOL is a broad-ranging concept that emphasizes the measurement and scoring of a person's multiple aspects, including perceived physical health, mental state, beliefs, social relations, etc., which can be used for the comprehensive assessment of patients with essential hypertension (21). Thus, the purpose of this study was to systematically review and evaluate the effects of TCE on QOL in patients with essential hypertension.

# METHODS

# **Protocol Registration**

This systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines, and the PRISMA registration number is CRD42020218981.

### **Inclusion Criteria**

To be included into this systematic review, previous studies must meet the following eligibility criteria in accordance with PICOS.

#### Participants

Participants who are over 18 years old and have been diagnosed with essential hypertension based on the past or current definitions of hypertension were included, while there is no limit on sex and ethnicity. However, participants with serious organic disease and its complications were not included.

#### Interventions

TCE were limited to a few common ones, such as Tai Chi, Qigong, Baduanjin, Wuqinxi, Yijinjing, and Liuzijue. Both single TCE interventions and TCE interventions with health education were considered.

#### Comparison

There was no restriction regarding the control group (e.g., health education, behavioral regulation, and routine lifestyle were all treated as a homogeneously no-intervention group) but studies comparing the TCE interventions with other exercise modalities, such as aerobic and resistance exercise, were excluded.

#### Outcome

The primary outcome collected and analyzed from the included studies was QOL based on different types of scales.

#### Study Design

Only randomized controlled trials (RCTs) investigating the effects of TCE on QOL in patients with essential hypertension were considered; cross-sectional studies, observational studies, conference papers, etc., were not included. Because TCE are primarily originated and developed in China, both Chinese and English papers published on peer-reviewed journals were covered.

# **Search Strategy and Data Sources**

A systematic literature search was performed in the following four online electronic databases to identify all the relevant studies from their inception until 10 August 2020: Google Scholar (all years), Web of Science (1960-present), ScienceDirect (all years), and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (all years, available at https://www.cnki.net/). The following search terms were used in English databases: ("essential hypertension" AND "quality of life") AND ("Tai Chi" OR "Qigong" OR "Baduanjin" OR "Wuqinxi" OR "Yijinjing" OR "Liuzijue" OR "traditional Chinese exercise"), while their Chinese counterparts were used in the Chinese database. The search strategy was slightly modified in order to suit each database.

In order to ensure a rigorous and thorough literature search, two authors independently screened and assessed all the retrieved articles from the databases based on the included criteria. Any disagreements regarding the inclusion would be discussed and resolved with the third author. Moreover, all reference lists from the included studies and the retrieved reviews were doublechecked using the citation snowballing method to ensure that all the potential relative articles were located (22, 23).

### **Data Extraction and Management**

Two authors independently screened, extracted, and summarized the following relevant data from all the original articles: (1) the basic characteristics of included studies (authors, country where the trial was performed, and publication year); (2) the basic characteristics of participants (number, age, gender, blood pressure, and diagnosis of hypertension); (3) study intervention (the types of exercise, frequency, and duration); and (4) outcome parameters and primary results. Any differences regarding data extraction would be discussed and resolved with the third author. Mendeley Reference Management Software (Mendeley Ltd., Netherlands) was used to organize papers and generate citations.

#### **Risk of Bias Assessment**

Two authors independently assessed the risk of bias of all the included studies using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Assessment Tool, which includes the following seven domains: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other biases (24). There are three grades for each domain: low risk of bias, unclear risk of bias, and high risk of bias. Any disagreements regarding the risk of bias assessment would be discussed and resolved with the third author.

## **Statistical Analysis**

The Review Manager software (RevMan 5.4, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2020) was applied to perform the meta-analysis. Because the outcomes from the included studies were all continuous, they were presented as the mean difference (MD, applicable if data in the same unit) or standardized mean difference (SMD, applicable otherwise) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). The Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test and *I*-square ( $I^2$ ) statistic were used to assess heterogeneity among studies, and it was considered as significant when  $I^2 > 50\%$ . The outcome data from each included studies were combined through a meta-analysis by using the random effects model. Firstly, the overall effect of TCE on QOL was determined using the difference before and after intervention, and then subgroups were further

created based on the types and duration of TCE interventions. In addition, the publication bias was evaluated using the funnel plot asymmetry if 10 trials (at least) were covered in a meta-analysis. Results were considered statistically significant when p < 0.05.

# RESULTS

# **Literature Search Results**

The literature search and selection process are presented in Figure 1. A total of 976 studies were identified through database searching. After removing 763 irrelevant or duplicate records based on titles, the remaining 213 studies were further evaluated according to the eligibility criteria. Then, 171 papers from Google Scholar, 13 papers from Web of Science, 7 from ScienceDirect, and 5 from China National Knowledge Infrastructure were excluded for the following several reasons (e.g., the experimental design is not randomized, studies not related to TCE or essential hypertension or QOL, study protocols without outcomes, studies not written in English or Chinese, and review studies). Seven studies were excluded because of duplicates between databases, while three studies were further eligible for inclusion after double-checking the references of all the included studies and the retrieved systematic reviews. In total, 13 studies were finally included in this review.

# **Risk of Bias**

The quality of all selected studies was assessed in terms of risk of bias, and the results were presented in Figure 2 and Table 1. Less than half of the included studies (n = 6) clearly described the process of random sequence generation. Two studies that allocated participants based on the order of hospitalization were judged to have high risk of bias, while the remaining studies (n = 5) were judged as unclear risk of bias as none of them gave the detailed procedure. Regarding the allocation concealment, three studies conceal the allocation from both researchers and participants using opaque envelope, etc., eight studies did not clearly describe the allocation concealment, while two studies did not conceal the allocation from both researchers and participants. In addition, since there is less trial reported to blind their participants, personnel, and outcome assessors or they did not blind them, these two domains were also the major sources that increase the risk of bias. However, a low risk of bias was reported in most studies for the incomplete outcome data (n = 12) and selective reporting (n = 13), and there were no other biases described in these studies.

# **Study Characteristics**

The basic characteristics of all the included studies are shown in **Table 2**. In the 13 included RCTs published from 2010 to 2019, most of them were conducted in People's Republic of China (n = 11, 84.62%), and the remaining two studies were conducted in Republic of Korea and Australia, respectively (n = 1, 7.69%). Four studies were published in English, while the other nine were published in Chinese. The 13 studies involved a total of 1,361 patients aged 30–80 years old (681 in the intervention group and 680 in the control group), and all studies (n = 13, 100%) included both male and female participants. The severity





of essential hypertension varied between studies, with diastolic blood pressure (DBP) ranging from 80 to 110 mmHg and systolic blood pressure (SBP) ranging from 130 to 180 mmHg. Three

diagnostic criteria for essential hypertension were found used in these included studies. Regarding the types of TCE intervention, Tai Chi was applied in 10 studies, and 24-form Yang style Tai

Trials	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias	
Gou et al. (25)	High	High	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	
Han et al. (26)	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	
Hong et al. (27)	Unclear	Unclear	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	
_i (28)	High	High	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	
iu et al. (29)	Low	Unclear	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	
/la et al. (30)	Low	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Low	
Park et al. (31)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	
Shou et al. (32)	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	
Sun et al. (33)	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	
Kiao et al. (34)	Low	Unclear	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	
(u et al. (35)	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	
hang (36)	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	
heng et al. (37)	Unclear	Unclear	High	High	Low	Low	Low	

TABLE 1 | Risk of bias summary.

Chi was the most common one. Qigong was applied in three studies, including Dongeui Qinggong, Yijinjing, and Wuqinxi, and they were considered as a homogeneous TCE intervention as the theory and principles are similar among them. The treatment duration ranged from 2 months to 5 years, and the common session lasted about 30 to 60 min, with 5 to 8 sessions per week. Seven scales were used to assess the QOL, with the 36-item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36) being the most common one. Results were further examined in the following three parts: (1) overall effects of TCE on QOL, (2) effects of Tai Chi on QOL, and (3) effects of Qigong on QOL.

#### **Overall Effects of TCE on QOL**

In the comparison of the overall effects of TCE and control interventions on QOL, 13 studies were covered for the metaanalysis. After pooling the findings of all these studies, it was indicated that TCE did help to improve the QOL among people with essential hypertension irrespective of all the other variables (types of TCE and QOL scales, and the number/duration of sessions) although the heterogeneity is extremely high (MD = 49.95; 95% CI: 37.75–62.16; p < 0.00001;  $I^2 = 100\%$ ). The forest plot of the pooled effects is shown in **Figure 3**.

## Effects of Tai Chi on QOL

A total of 10 studies investigating the effects of Tai Chi on QOL in patients with essential hypertension were included in this category. SF-36 scale was used in 8 studies (26, 28–30, 32–35) while the Leishmania Hypertension scale and the Generic Quality of Life Inventory (GQOL) scale were used in the remaining two studies (25, 37) to assess QOL, respectively.

There are two components in the SF-36 scale, with the physical component scale including physical function, role physical, bodily pain, and general health domains and the mental component scale including vitality, social function, role emotional, and mental health domains. Using the SF-36 scale in eight studies, which involve 981 participants, the meta-analysis found that Tai Chi can significantly improve every domain of the

physical component scale [physical function (MD = 7.54; 95% CI: 5.65–9.43; *p* < 0.00001; *I*<sup>2</sup> = 65%), role physical (MD = 10.07; 95% CI: 6.64 to 13.49; p < 0.00001;  $I^2 = 80\%$ ), bodily pain (MD = 9.40; 95% CI: 4.67–14.13; p < 0.0001;  $I^2 = 83\%$ ), and general health (MD = 6.95; 95% CI: 2.51–11.39; p = 0.002;  $I^2 = 88\%$ ] and the mental component scale [vitality (MD = 9.40; 95% CI: 7.87–10.93; p < 0.00001;  $I^2 = 0\%$ ), social function (MD = 9.56; 95% CI: 2.84–16.28; p = 0.005;  $I^2 = 91\%$ ), role emotional (MD = 9.09; 95% CI: 3.62-14.55; p = 0.001;  $I^2 = 86\%$ ), and mental health domains (MD = 9.85; 95% CI: 7.08-12.61; p  $< 0.00001; I^2 = 64\%$ ] when compared with the control group (Figures 4, 5). A subgroup meta-analysis was conducted between Tai Chi and the control group to examine if the heterogeneity could be partially explained by the different duration of the interventions: thus, the duration below 3 months was considered as short term, between 3 and 6 months was considered as medium term, and above 6 months was considered as long term. However, the heterogeneity was not resolved since there are still significant heterogeneities in these trials, with  $I^2$  ranging from 0 to 96% (Figures 4, 5).

One study, involving 98 participants, examined the effects of Tai Chi on QOL based on the Leishmania Hypertension scale (37). Using the random effects model, it was found that all the 11 domains were significantly lower in participants performing Tai Chi than their counterparts in the control group [physical symptom (MD = -10.77; 95% CI: -13.45 to -8.09; p < 0.00001), somatization symptom (MD = -10.80; 95% CI: -11.79 to -9.81; p < 0.00001), sexual function (MD = -4.40; 95% CI: -4.99 to -3.81; p < 0.00001), sleep quality (MD = -1.43; 95% CI: -2.23 to -0.63; p = 0.0005), angry/vitality (MD = -4.85; 95% CI: -5.33 to -4.37; p <0.00001), anxiety (MD = -4.14; 95% CI: -4.81 to -3.47; p < -4.810.00001), repression (MD = -2.98; 95% CI: -3.63 to -2.33; p < 0.00001), obsession (MD = -3.23; 95% CI: -3.82 to -2.64; p < 0.00001), interpersonal relationships (MD = -3.88; 95% CI: -4.63 to -3.13; p < 0.00001), working order (MD = -5.71; 95%) CI: -6.26 to -5.16; p < 0.00001), and hostility (MD = -4.15;

#### TABLE 2 | The basic characteristics of included studies.

Study	Country/ Region	Sample size (finished, <i>N</i> )	Gender	Age (years)	Blood pressure	Diagnosis of hypertension	Intervention	Control	Frequency and duration	Outcome parameters
			M/F	-	SBP/DBP (mmHg)					
Gou et al. (25)	China	N: 108 TCE: 54 CON: 54	TCE: 30/24 CON: 31/23	TCE: 75.38 $\pm$ 5.69 CON: 74.29 $\pm$ 4.58	NA	NA	Tai Chi	Conventional therapy	6 months (patient customization)	Quality of life (GQOL-74)
Han et al. (26)	China	N: 58 TCE: 30 CON: 28	38/22	62.12 ± 10.51	163.1±8.2/ 100.2±9.1	WHO/ISH	Simplified 24-form Tai Chi	Conventional therapy	1–2 sessions per day (45–60 min per session) for 5 years	Quality of life (SF-36)
Hong and Wang (27)	China	N: 50 TCE: 25 CON: 25	NA	NA	TCE: $134.08 \pm 8.87/88.32 \pm 5.99$ CON: $131.88 \pm 6.61/89.56 \pm 4.88$	NA	Traditional Shaolin Yijinjing	Routine lifestyle	7 sessions per week (1.5 h per session) for 12 weeks	Quality of life (WHOQOL-BREF
Li (28)	China	N: 122 TCE: 61 CON: 61	TCE: 30/31 CON: 33/28	TCE: 51.08 $\pm$ 8.77 CON: 50.51 $\pm$ 8.68	TCE: 161.58 ± 18.24/110.51 ± 12.36 CON: 158.61 ± 22.13/107.94 ± 12.78	NA	Simplified 24-form Tai Chi	Conventional therapy	5–8 sessions per week (50–60 min per session) for 12 weeks	Quality of life (SF-36)
Liu et al. (29)	China	N: 70 TCE: 35 CON: 35	TCE: 18/17 CON: 19/16	TCE: 62.4 $\pm$ 2.4 CON: 63.1 $\pm$ 2.1	TCE: $157.96 \pm$ $15.24/97.24 \pm$ 6.84 CON: $158.45 \pm$ 15.73/97.85 $\pm$ $6.58$	Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Hypertension in China (2010 revised version)	Simplified 24-form Tai Chi	Conventional therapy	1 session (40–60 min) per day for 1 year	Quality of life (SF-36)
Ma et al. (30)	China	N: 113 TCE: 55 CON: 58	TCE: 54/25 CON: 55/24	TCE: 70.24 ± 10.25 CON: 69.71 ± 10.84	TCE: 149.06 ± 19.51/90.74 ± 8.24 CON: 150.19 ± 18.30/89.16 ± 9.37	NA	Simplified 24-form Tai Chi	Usual care	3–5 sessions per week (60 min per session) for 24 weeks	Health-related quality of life (SF-36)
Park et al. (31)	Republic of Korea	N: 52 TCE: 25 CON: 27	TCE: 13/12 CON: 22/5	TCE: 54.52 $\pm$ 6.96 CON: 52.93 $\pm$ 8.45	TCE: $134.45 \pm$ $10.41/85.23 \pm$ 6.43 CON: $130.47 \pm 13.93/$ $85.41 \pm 7.83$	NA	Dongeui Qigong	Routine lifestyles	5–7 sessions per week (50 min per session) for 12 weeks	Quality of life (MYMOP)

TABLE 2	Continued
---------	-----------

Study	Country/ Region	Sample size (finished, <i>N</i> )	Gender	Age (years)	Blood pressure	Diagnosis of hypertension	Intervention	Control	Frequency and duration	Outcome parameters
			M/F	-	SBP/DBP (mmHg)	-				
Shou et al. (32)	China	N: 198 TCE: 98 CON: 100	TCE: 48/50 CON: 55/45	TCE: M: $52 \pm$ 6.46; F: 51 ± 7.09 CON: M: 52 ± 8.98; F: 51 ± 7.54	TCE: $139.42 \pm 9.47/$ $83.20 \pm 9.45$ CON: $142.90 \pm 7.91/$ $82.40 \pm 7.82$	Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Hypertension in China (2010 revised version)	Simplified 24-form Tai Chi	General daily lifestyle intervention	1–2 sessions per day (40–90min per session) for 3 months	Quality of life (SF-36)
Sun et al. (33)	Australia	N: 266 TCE: 136 CON: 130	TCE: 19/117 CON: 29/101	45–80	TCE: $130.71 \pm$ 16.65/82.21 $\pm$ 7.94 CON: 130.46 $\pm$ 15.97/81.92 $\pm$ 8.25	World Diabetes Association standard 2002	Tai Chi	Non-exercise- related activities	3-h group exercise and 2-h home exercise per week for 12 months	quality of life
Xiao et al. (34)	China	N: 84 TCE: 42 CON: 42	TCE: 24/18 CON: 22/20		TCE: $151.4 \pm$ 10.3/90.8 ± 10.5 CON: $151.8 \pm$ 10.2/90.4 ± 10.2	Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Hypertension in China (2010 revised version)	Eight-style Tai Chi	Conventional therapy	5 sessions per week (60 min per session) for 3 months	Quality of life (SF-36)
Xu et al. (35)	China	N: 60 TCE: 30 CON: 30	TCE: 17/13 CON: 18/12	TCE: 38.07 ± 8.09 CON: 37.63 ± 9.09	TCE: $158.4 \pm$ 8.8/97.5 ± 4.2 CON: $159.1 \pm$ 7.5/96.7 ± 5.0	WHO/ISH (4th revised version)	Simplified 24-form Tai Chi	Conventional therapy	2 sessions per day (10 min per session) for 8 weeks	Quality of life (SF-36)
Zhang. (36)	China	N: 82 TCE: 41 CON: 41	TCE: 26/15 CON: 25/16	TCE: $55.2 \pm 5.3$ CON: $55.3 \pm 5.1$	NA	NA	Wuqinxi	Conventional therapy	1 session per day (1.5 h per session) for 6 months	Quality of life (PRO)
Zheng et al. (37)	China	N: 98 TCE: 49 CON: 49	TCE: 20/29 CON: 19/30	TCE: 54.71 ± 5.43 CON: 55.77 ± 6.24	TCE: $157.96 \pm$ $15.24/97.24 \pm$ 6.84 CON: $158.45 \pm$ 15.73/97.85 $\pm 6.58$	Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Hypertension in China (2010 revised version)	Simplified 24-form Tai Chi	Conventional therapy	4–8 sessions per week (40–60 min per session) for 3 months	Quality of life (Leishmania hypertension scale)

N, number; M, male; F, female; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; TCE, traditional Chinese exercises; CON, control interventions; NA, not available; WHO/ISH, World Health Organization/International Society of Hypertension; GQOL-74, Generic Quality of Life Inventory-74; SF-36, 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey; WHOQOL-BREF, World Health Organization Quality of Life; MYMOP, Measure Yourself Medical Outcome Profile; PRO, Patient-Reported Outcomes.

	TCE				CON			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup Mean SD Tot		Total	l Mean SD Total		Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl		
Gou et al. 2017	93.74	12.1	54	49.84	11.32	54	7.7%	43.90 [39.48, 48.32]	+
Han et al. 2010	114.4	27.83	30	23.3	18.47	30	7.3%	91.10 [79.15, 103.05]	
Hong et al. 2017	44.47	1.91	25	12.47	2.77	25	7.8%	32.00 [30.68, 33.32]	•
Li. 2018	41.96	3.14	61	18.09	1.58	61	7.8%	23.87 [22.99, 24.75]	
Liu et al. 2018	119.3	27.65	35	10.7	12.54	35	7.4%	108.60 [98.54, 118.66]	
Ma et al. 2018	30.18	3.1	55	7.83	2.11	58	7.8%	22.35 [21.37, 23.33]	
Park et al. 2017	3.4	0.27	25	1.94	0.58	27	7.8%	1.46 [1.22, 1.70]	
Shou et al. 2018	115.9	25.83	104	18	16.89	104	7.7%	97.90 [91.97, 103.83]	-
Sun et al. 2015	47.08	11.72	136	19.11	5.04	130	7.8%	27.97 [25.82, 30.12]	-
Xiao. 2018	128.7	2.69	42	79.8	4.77	42	7.8%	48.90 [47.24, 50.56]	•
Xu. 2016	108.1	22.92	30	21.8	5.91	30	7.5%	86.30 [77.83, 94.77]	-
Zhang. 2019	77.1	8.9	41	56.9	5.2	41	7.8%	20.20 [17.04, 23.36]	-
Zheng et al. 2015	105.87	4.41	49	53.31	3.78	49	7.8%	52.56 [50.93, 54.19]	•
Total (95% CI)			687			686	100.0%	49.95 [37.75, 62.16]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup>	= 496.58; (	Chi² = 1	3710.3	5, df = 1	2 (P < 0	.00001	); I <sup>2</sup> = 100	)%	
Test for overall effec	t: Z = 8.02	P < 0.0	0001)						-100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [CON] Favours [TCE]
									Favours (CON) Favours (TCE)

FIGURE 3 | Meta-analysis of the overall effects of TCE on QOL vs. the control intervention. TCE, traditional Chinese exercises; CON, control; SD, standard deviations; CI, confidence intervals; IV, inverse variance.

95% CI: -5.12 to -3.18; p < 0.00001)]. Similarly, the remaining one study investigating the effects of Tai Chi on QOL based on GQOL also reached positive results (25). Tai Chi significantly improved all the four domains vs. no intervention [physical function (MD = 10.45; 95% CI: 8.17–12.73; p < 0.00001), mention function (MD = 11.20; 95% CI: 9.02–13.38; p <0.00001), social function (MD = 10.47; 95% CI: 8.32–12.62; p< 0.00001), and material life state (MD = 11.78; 95% CI: 9.55– 14.01; p < 0.00001)] (**Table 3**). Nevertheless, the quality of these two studies was found to be relatively poor, which may weaken the reliability of the results.

#### Effects of Qigong on QOL

Three more studies were included in this review, which evaluated the effects of Qigong on QOL based on different scales (27, 31, 36). As it is shown in Table 3, using the World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHOQOL-BREF) scale, those who perform Qigong showed significant differences in two domains when compared to no-intervention participants [physical health (MD = 15.43; 95% CI: 12.21-18.65; p < 0.00001) and psychological health (MD = 12.34; 95% CI: 9.31–15.37; p <0.00001)]. This suggested that Qigong improves both the physical and psychological health. Using the Measure Yourself Medical Outcome Profile (MYMOP) scale, the meta-analysis indicated that Dongeui Qigong resulted in a significant improvement in the activity (MD = 1.83; 95% CI: 1.17–2.49; p < 0.00001) but a decline in the well-being (MD = -1.00; 95% CI: -1.62 to -0.38; p = 0.001) subscale. In addition, when the Patient-Reported Outcomes (PRO) scale is applied, the meta-analysis showed that Wuqinxi Qigong resulted in a significantly lower total score (WMD = -18.80; 95% CI: -24.56 to -13.04; p < 0.001) when compared to the control group, which indicated that Wuqinxi Qigong improved the QOL overall. In general, although the study quality was moderate, more trials using these above scales to evaluate the effects of TCE on QOL are warranted.

# DISCUSSION

TCE are comprehensive mind-body exercises that have been widely applied to treat patients with hypertension. Previous systematic review and meta-analysis mainly focused on some specific types of TCE and investigated their effects on blood pressure. The current study systematically reviewed the previous literature and provided an objective evaluation on the effects of TCE on QOL in hypertensive patients, with the aim of finding out the appropriate TCE that can contribute to more benefits.

Following the eligibility criteria, 13 RCTs comprising a total of 1,361 patients with mild-to-severe essential hypertension were included in this review. Although there is considerable heterogeneity within the included studies, the overall effect was positive with a statistical significance, indicating that TCE had an advantage over control intervention on improving QOL of hypertensive patients. Then, a further detailed subgroup analysis based on different QOL scales and duration of TCE interventions revealed different outcomes regarding the use of TCE. Compared with conventional therapy/usual care, Tai Chi had significantly greater effects on both physical and mental components of SF-36 scale. To sum up, the benefits of Tai Chi on SF-36 QOL were consistent among studies, and it was found that the simplified 24-form Tai Chi with a frequency of 30-50 min per session at five to eight sessions per week was the most commonly used setting. The potential mechanisms by which TCE adds greater help for improving QOL of hypertensive patients have been speculated in previous studies. For example, Tai Chi is a type of TCE that focuses on three aspects, dynamic balance of physical movement, which enhances muscle strength and joint stability; dynamic balance of breathing flow, which improves the depth and regularity of breathing; and psychological regulation, which reduces mental stress (1, 16, 38). Thus, the enhanced QOL after Tai Chi may be associated with the overall improvements of the above three parts.

A TCE CON Mean Difference Mean Difference
Li 2018 64.35 347 61 55.87 40.3 61 19.8% 84.8[7.15,981] Shou etal. 2018 334 65 104 753 87 104 17.3% 810[80,10.20] Xiao. 2018 851 9 42 734 7.9 42 12.1% 11.70[8.08,15.32] Xia. 2016 833 114 30 744 65 30 9.3% 8.98[45.01,360] Subtotal (95% C) 237 237 237 58.5% 8.69[7.61,9.76] Heterogenerity Tarle 30.6(7 - 30/9.1° 2.3%) Testfor overall effect Z = 15.86 (P < 0.0001)
1.1.2 3 months <t<6 (95%="" (p="0.83)&lt;/td" 0.58="" 1.06="" 14.82="" 2018="" 5.90]="" 54.69="" 55="" 55.27="" 58="" 8.0%="" [-4.74,="" applicable="" at="" ci)="" effect="" heterogenetic="" matel="" months="" not="" overall="" subtotal="" testfor="" z="0.21"></t<6>
1.1.3 T≥6 months Han etal. 2010 83.6 6.7 39 77.9 9.3 28 10.6% 5.60 [1.44, 9.76] Liu etal. 2018 83.6 6.7 39 73.4 9.1 35 11.8% 10.20 [5.46, 13.94] Sun etal. 2015 54.4 15.74 136 51.08 17.22 130 11.11 % 3.38 (56.17, 33) Subtotal (95% C) 201 193 33.5% 6.44 [2.38, 10.50] Heterogeneity: Tur# 8.81 (* The 5.3, df = 2 (P = 0.04); P = 68% Test for overall effect Z = 3.11 (P = 0.002)
Total (95% CI)       493       488       100.0%       7.54 [5.65, 9.43]         Heterogenelik: Tau" = 4.23; Chill* = 19.95, df = 7 (P = 0.006); P = 55%       -100       -50       0       50       100         Test for versul effect Z = 7.83 (P = 0.00001)       Test for versul effect Z = 7.83 (P = 0.00001)       Favours [CON]       Favours [CON]       Favours [CON]         Test for versul effect Z = 9.36, df = 2 (P = 0.0009), P = 78.6%       Favours [CON]       Favours [CON]       Favours [CON]
B TCE CON Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI
1.1.11 ≤3 months       50.83       3.46       61       54.24       4.12       61       17.8%       5.39 [4.04, 6.74]         Shou vet al. 2018       69.7       17.3       10.4       58.2       15.4       10.4       15.65]         Xiao. 2016       68.1       9.3       42       75.7       7.2       42.1       15.6%       12.40 [0.98,15.72]       *         Xiao. 2016       71.1       16.8       30       62.1       5.5       30       11.4%       9.00 [2.74, 15.28]       *         Subtochal (95% C1)       237       237       237       58.8%       9.39 [5.03, 13.76]       *         Heterogeneity: Tau'= 15.76; Chit*= 13.85, df = 3 (P = 0.0002); P = 85%       Testfor overail effect Z = 4.22 (P < 0.0001)
1.1.2 3 months <t<6 (9%="" (p="0.65)&lt;/td" 1.81="" 20.91="" 2018="" 21.17="" 4="" 55="" 58="" 69.53="" 71.3="" 9.4%="" 9.57]="" [-5.95,="" applicable="" at="" c)="" effect="" for="" heterogenetic="" matel="" months="" not="" overall="" subtochal="" test="" z="0.46"></t<6>
11.31 ™6 months         Han etal 2010       72.6       21.3       30       58.2       15.2       28       7.6%       14.40 [4.92, 23.88]         Liu etal 2018       73.8       20.8       35       58.7       10.9       35       9.4%       15.10 [7.32, 22.88]         Sun etal 2019       94.58       10.59       9.4%       14.6%       12.52 (26.27, 16.42)       *         Sundetal (95% C)       201       103       31.8%       13.20 [9.93, 16.47]       *         Heterogeneity: Tua#= 0.00; Chi = 4.1, df = 2 (P = 0.82); P = 0.%       Test for overall effect Z = 7.81 (P < 0.00001)
Total (95% CI)     493     488     100.0%     10.07 (6.64, 13.49)       Heterogeneiky: Tau"= 16.65; Chi#=35.10, dr = 70 < 0.0001); I <sup>™</sup> = 80%     -100     -50     0     50     100       Test for vewall effect Z = 5.76 (P < 0.00001)
C TCE CON Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV. Random, 95% CI IV. Random, 95% CI
1.1.11 ≤3 months       104       66.9       13.8       104       15.7%       12.20 [8.02, 16.38]         Xiao, 2016       75.1       8.2       42       74.5       8.2       42       74.5       8.2       42       74.5       8.2       42       16.3%       0.60 [2.91, 4.11]         Xia, 2016       75.1       8.4       30       75.5       5.3       0.44.4%       9.10 [3.85, 14.62]       ▼         Subtorbal (95% C)       176       176       46.3%       7.19 [-0.47, 14.84]       ▼         Heterogeneiny Tau* e4.06 (2.10 = 18.77, off = 2 (P < 0.0001); P = 89%
1.1.23 months <1<6 months Mar et al. 2018 68.74 H 839 55 64.81 19.02 58 12.8% 3.93 [-3.07, 10.93] Subdratal (9% CI) 55 58 12.8% 3.93 [-3.07, 10.93] Heterogenerity Nat applicable Test for overall effect. Z = 1.10 (P = 0.27)
11.31 T⇒6 months       Table Ta
Total (95% Cl)     432     427     100.0%     9.40 [4.67, 14.13]       Heterogenelity: Tau" = 32.63; Chi" = 3.45 (0f = 6 (r ≤ 0.00001); I" = 83%     -100     -50     0     50     100       Test for veisal effect Z = 3.90 (P ≤ 0.0001)     Test for veisal effect Z = 3.90 (P ≤ 0.0001)     Favours [COM]     Favours [COM]     Favours [TCE]
D TCE CON Mean Difference Mean Difference
International construction         Solution         Hole Head         Hole Hea
1.1.2 3 months <t 6="" <="" months<="" td="">         Ma et al. 2018       86.62       21.8       55       83.35       22.17       58       10.3%       3.27 [-4.84, 11.38]         Subtotal (95% CI)       55       58       10.3%       3.27 [-4.84, 11.38]       ●         Heterogeneity: Not applicable       5       58       10.3%       3.27 [-4.84, 11.38]       ●         Test for overall effect Z = 0.79 (P = 0.43)</t>
11.31 7≥6 months         Han etal. 2010       77.1       17.2       30       64.9       12.2       28       10.7%       12.20 [4.56, 19.84]         Liu etal. 2018       77.4       15.5       35       62.8       12.8       35       11.4%       14.60 [7.2, 21.48]         Sun etal. 2016       48.3       24.51       135       61.7       23.1       10.1       12.4%       7.84       15.65.4-12]         Subdatal (95% CD       201       193       34.5%       6.19[.8.82, 21.19]       14.4       14.40       12.4%       14.45.65.4-12]         Heterogenetic Tum" = 1527, 7.50 H= 30.00, df = 2 (P < 0.00001); P = 93%
Total (95% Ch)         493         488         100.0%         6.95 [2.51, 11.39]           Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>1+</sup> = 32.79; Ch <sup>2+</sup> = 56.0; df = 7 (P < 0.00001); P = 88%

and (D) general health. TCE, traditional Chinese exercises; CON, control; SD, standard deviations; CI, confidence intervals; IV, inverse variance.

Α		TCE		CON		Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
	Study or Subgroup 1.1.1 T ≤3 months Shou et al. 2018		104 58.3			ht IV, Random, 95% % 10.80 [7.50, 14.1		IV, Random, 95% Cl	
	Xiao. 2018 Xu. 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	82.7 9.1 70.7 6.7 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.81	42 72.2 30 62.5 176 , df = 2 (P =	7.4 3.3	42 18.6 30 32.8 176 72.9	% 10.50 [6.95, 14.0 % 8.20 [5.53, 10.8 % 9.55 [7.76, 11.3	5] 7]	Ŧ	
	1.1.2 3 months <t <<br="">Ma et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:</t>	77.82 21.25 plicable	55	i 20.49	58 3.9 58 3.9	% 4.16 [-3.54, 11.8 % 4.16 [-3.54, 11.8	6] 6]	•	
	1.1.3 T ≥6 months Han et al. 2010 Liu et al. 2018 Sun et al. 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.14	35 59.4 136 74.84 201 df=2 (P=	12.5 22.78	35 7.5 130 9.6 193 23.1	% 10.70 [5.10, 16.3 % 9.33 [4.39, 14.2	0] 7]		
	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff	0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3.82 Z = 12.04 (P < 0.1	00001)	0.70); l <sup>a</sup> = (	1%	% 9.40 [7.87, 10.9	3] -100	-50 0 5 Favours [CON] Favours [To	60 100 CE]
В	Study or Subgroup	TCE	fetal Mean	CON	etal Moin	Mean Difference	CI.	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	
	1.1.1 T ≤3 months Shou et al. 2018 Xiao. 2018 Xu. 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	80.1 19.3 78.5 8.6 79.1 12.7 128.61; Chi <sup>#</sup> = 5 Z = 1.59 (P = 0.1	104 60.9 42 79.6 30 65.3 176 5.90, df = 2 (	8.3 8.8 7.4	104 15.2 42 15.3 30 14.6 176 45.1	% 19.20 [15.16, 23.2 % -1.10 [-4.82, 2.6 % 13.80 [8.54, 19.0 % <b>10.59 [-2.49, 23.6</b>	4] 2] 6]	•	
	1.1.2 3 months <t <="" td="">   Ma et al. 2018   Subtotal (95% CI)   Heterogeneity: Not ap   Test for overall effect:</t>	83.64 22.29 plicable	55	21.75	58 13.0 58 13.0	% 0.33 [-7.80, 8.4 % 0.33 [-7.80, 8.4		•	
	1.1.3 T ≥6 months Han et al. 2010 Liu et al. 2018 Sun et al. 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	78.5 17.9 70.67 17.21 36.33; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 9.1	35 61.5 136 65.58 201 0, df = 2 (P =	11.6 17.64	35 13.6 130 15.1 193 41.9	<ol> <li>12.70 [4.76, 20.6</li> <li>17.00 [9.93, 24.0</li> <li>5.09 [0.90, 9.2</li> <li>11.15 [3.38, 18.9</li> </ol>	7] 8]	*	
	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff	73.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 69. Z = 2.79 (P = 0.0	05)	< 0.00001	); I² = 91%	% 9.56 [2.84, 16.2	8] -100	-50 0 5 Favours [CON] Favours [T	50 100 CE]
С	Study or Subgroup	TCE Mean SD		CON SD T	otal Weig	Mean Difference ht IV, Random, 95%	CI	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	
	1.1.1 T≪3 months Shou et al. 2018 Xiao. 2018 Xu. 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	76.5 17.9 76.1 8.6 78.3 15.5 79.70; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 32	104 61.1 42 75.8 30 64.5 <b>176</b> 00, df = 2 (P	16.1 7.9 2.4	104 15.4 42 16.1 30 14.6 176 46.1	<ul> <li>% 15.40 [10.77, 20.0</li> <li>% 0.30 [-3.23, 3.8</li> <li>% 13.80 [8.19, 19.4</li> <li>% 9.70 [-0.75, 20.1</li> </ul>	3] 3] 1]	+ + •	
	1.1.2 3 months <t <<br="">Ma et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:</t>	81.02 19.15 plicable	55	20.64	58 13.2 58 13.2	% 1.09 [-6.25, 8.4 % <b>1.09 [-6.25, 8.4</b>		•	
	1.1.3 T ≥6 months Han et al. 2010 Liu et al. 2018 Sun et al. 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	77.1 17.6 88.75 17.48 28.96; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 7.1	35 62.4 136 83.6 201 4, df = 2 (P =	11.4 18.55	35 13.5 130 15.6 193 40.7	% 14.80 [5.64, 23.9 % 14.70 [7.75, 21.6 % 5.15 [0.81, 9.4 % <b>10.88 [3.64, 18.1</b>	5] 9]		
	Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff	Z = 3.26 (P = 0.0	01)	< 0.00001	); I² = 86%	% 9.09 [3.62, 14.5	5] -100	-50 0 5 Favours (CON) Favours (T	50 100 CE)
D	Study of Subgroup	TCE	Total Mean	CON	atal Main	Mean Difference	C1	Mean Difference	
	Study or Subgroup       1.1.1 T≪3 months       Li. 2018       Shou et al. 2018       Xiao. 2018       Xu. 2016       Subtotal (95% Cl)       Heterogeneity: Tau² =       Test for overall effect:	73.71 6.69 77.1 15.9 82.7 8.5 78.5 18.7 13.34; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 14.	Total         Mean           61         67.39           104         63.6           42         71.9           30         63.3           237         48, df= 3 (P           0001)         101	6.05 13.41 8 2.5	61 19.2 104 15.1 42 16.2 30 9.5 237 59.9	% 6.32 [4.06, 8.5 % 13.50 [9.50, 17.5 % 10.80 [7.27, 14.3 % 15.20 [8.45, 21.9	8] 0] 3] 5]		
	1.1.2 3 months <t <<br="">Ma et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:</t>	87.01 18.46 plicable	55 81.43 55 2)	8 19.81	58 9.0 58 9.0		4] 4]	•	
	1.1.3 T ≥6 months Han et al. 2010 Liu et al. 2018 Sun et al. 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	9.62; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3.85	30 63.6 35 63.4 136 79.46 <b>201</b> 5, df = 2 (P = 003)	11.4 19.68	28 8.2 35 9.0 130 13.9 <b>193 31.0</b> 18%	% 12.20 [5.11, 19.2 % 5.54 [1.02, 10.0	9] 6]		
	Total (95% CI)		493		488 100.0	% 9.85 [7.08, 12.6	1]	•	

(D) mental health. TCE, traditional Chinese exercises; CON, control; SD, standard deviations; CI, confidence intervals; IV, inverse variance.

#### TABLE 3 | Summary of meta-analysis based on other QOL scales.

Parameters			Tai Chi vs. no interve	ention		Parameters	Qigong vs. no intervention						
	$(\gamma)$		Mean difference (95% Cl)				Trial (n) Participants (n)		Mean difference (95% CI)	Heterogene	ity <i>p</i> -value		
Leishmania hypertension	scale					МҮМОР							
Physical symptom	1	98	-10.77 [-13.45, -8.09]	NA	<0.00001	Total	1	52	-0.44 [-1.04, 0.16]	NA	0.15		
Somatization symptom	1	98	-10.80 [-11.79, -9.81]	NA	<0.00001	Symptoms	1	52	-0.50 [-1.26, 0.26]	NA	0.20		
Sexual function	1	98	-4.40 [-4.99, -3.81]	NA	< 0.00001	Activity	1	52	1.83 [1.17, 2.49]	NA	< 0.00001		
Sleep quality	1	98	-1.43 [-2.23, -0.63]	NA	0.0005	Wellbeing	1	52	-1.00 [-1.620.38]	NA	0.001		
Angry/vitality	1	98	-4.85 [-5.33, -4.37]	NA	< 0.00001	WHOQOL-BREF							
Anxiety	1	98	-4.14 [-4.81, -3.47]	NA	< 0.00001	Physical health	1	50	15.43 [12.21, 18.65]	NA	<0.00001		
Repression	1	98	-2.98 [-3.63, -2.33]	NA	< 0.00001	Psychological health	1	50	12.34 [9.31, 15.37]	NA	<0.00001		
Obsession	1	98	-3.23 [-3.82, -2.64]	NA	< 0.00001	Social relationships	1	50	2.33 [-3.81, 8.47]	NA	0.46		
Interpersonal relationships	1	98	-3.88 [-4.63, -3.13]	NA	< 0.00001	Environment	1	50	-2.12 [-5.73, 1.49]	NA	0.25		
Working order	1	98	-5.71 [-6.26, -5.16]	NA	< 0.00001	PRO							
Hostility	1	98	-4.15 [-5.12, -3.18]	NA	< 0.00001	Total	1	82	-18.80 [-24.56, -13.04]	NA	<0.00001		
GQOL-74													
Physical function	1	108	10.45 [8.17, 12.73]	NA	< 0.00001								
Mention function	1	108	11.20 [9.02, 13.38]	NA	< 0.00001								
Social function	1	108	10.47 [8.32, 12.62]	NA	< 0.00001								
Material life state	1	108	11.78 [9.55, 14.01]	NA	<0.00001								

N, number; CI, confidence intervals; NA, not applicable; GQOL-74, Generic Quality of Life Inventory-74; WHOQOL-BREF, World Health Organization Quality of Life; MYMOP, Measure Yourself Medical Outcome Profile; PRO, Patient-Reported Outcomes.

In addition to the effects of Tai Chi intervention on SF-36 QOL, there are also two studies that investigated the effects of Tai Chi on QOL based on other scales (25, 37); three studies that investigated the effects of Dongeui Qigong, Yijinjing, and Wuqinxi on QOL based on several scales (27, 31, 36); and the meta-analysis indicated that all of these TCE interventions could improve the QOL to a certain degree. However, due to the limited number of studies in each group and the relatively poor study quality, the reanalyzed results may not be accurate and should be treated with caution. A greater number of studies are much warranted for further verification.

Some potential limitations of this study and the design flaws of these included studies may weaken the reliability of the results. For example, only RCTs written in English or Chinese were included in this review. Small sample size, relatively high risk of bias, heterogeneity, and relatively weak methodology of these selected trials are other problems. In addition, there are only a small number of studies in some subgroups, which potentially results in an overestimation of effect sizes when conducting the meta-analysis. Lastly, studies that found neutral or negative results are not often published, which may also weaken the accuracy of meta-analysis.

# CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the results of this systematic review and metaanalysis demonstrated that TCE, especially Tai Chi, could be an

## REFERENCES

- Lian Z, Yang L, Bian Y, Zeng L, Li M, Sun Y, et al. Effects of Tai chi on adults with essential hypertension in China: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Integr Med.* (2017) 12:153–62. doi: 10.1016/j.eujim.2017.05.007
- Oyama JI, Node K. Prevalence of prehypertension and left ventricular hypertrophy. *Hypertens Res.* (2017) 40:544–5. doi: 10.1038/hr.2017.23
- Xiong X, Wang P, Li S, Zhang Y, Li X. Effect of Baduanjin exercise for hypertension: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Maturitas*. (2015) 80:370–8. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2015.01.002
- James PA, Oparil S, Carter BL, Cushman WC, Dennison-Himmelfarb C, Handler J, et al. 2014 Evidence-based guideline for the management of high blood pressure in adults: report from the panel members appointed to the eighth joint national committee (JNC 8). JAMA. (2014) 311:507– 20. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.284427
- Chow CK, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, Islam S, Gupta R, Avezum A, et al. Prevalence, awareness, treatment, and control of hypertension in rural and urban communities in high-, middle-, and low-income countries. *JAMA*. (2013) 310:959–68. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.184182
- Kearney PM, Whelton M, Reynolds K, Muntner P, Whelton PK, He J. Global burden of hypertension: analysis of worldwide data. *Lancet.* (2005) 365:217–23. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)17741-1
- Song Y, Ren F, Sun D, Wang M, Baker JS, István B, et al. Benefits of exercise on influenza or pneumonia in older adults: a systematic review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. (2020) 17:2655. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17082655
- Zhu W. Should, and how can, exercise be done during a coronavirus outbreak? An interview with Dr. Jeffrey A. woods. J Sport Heal Sci. (2020) 9:105– 7. doi: 10.1016/j.jshs.2020.01.005
- World Health Organization. Weekly Operational Update on COVID-19. (2020). Available online at: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/ coronaviruse/situation-reports/wou-28-august-approved.pdf?sfvrsn= d9e49c20\_2 (accessed August 28, 2020).

effective therapy to improve the QOL of patients with essential hypertension compared to conventional therapy. However, more rigorously designed RCTs are warranted for further verification, and the effects of other types of TCE interventions on QOL remain to be further clarified.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The original contributions generated for the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author/s.

# **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

YS, JL, and SW conceived the presented idea, developed the framework, and wrote the manuscript. BI, RX, GZ, and YG provided critical feedback and contributed to the final version. All authors were involved in the final direction of the paper and contributed to the final version of the manuscript. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## FUNDING

This study was sponsored by the Major Program of the National Social Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 19ZDA352), the National Key R&D Program of China (2018YFF0300903), and K. C. Wong Magna Fund in Ningbo University.

- Matias T, Dominski FH, Marks DF. Human needs in COVID-19 isolation. J Health Psychol. (2020) 25:871–82. doi: 10.1177/1359105320925149
- Pecanha T, Goessler KF, Roschel H, Gualano B. Social isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic can increase physical inactivity and the global burden of cardiovascular disease. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol.* (2020) 318:H1441– 6. doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.00268.2020
- Lee IM, Shiroma EJ, Lobelo F, Puska P, Blair SN, Katzmarzyk PT, et al. Effect of physical inactivity on major non-communicable diseases worldwide: an analysis of burden of disease and life expectancy. *Lancet.* (2012) 380:219– 29. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61031-9
- 13. Whelton PK, Carey RM. WS. Casev Aronow DE. Collins KJ, Himmelfarb CD. et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA guideline for the prevention, detection, evaluation, and management of high blood pressure in adults: a report of the American college of cardiology/American heart association task force on clinical practice guidelines. J Am Coll Cardiol. (2018) 71:e127-248. doi: 10.1161/HYP.000000000000075
- Elliott WJ. Treatment: drug therapy of hypertension. J Am Soc Hypertens. (2015) 9:239–41. doi: 10.1016/j.jash.2015.01.006
- Song Y, Sun D, István B, Thirupathi A, Liang M, Teo EC, et al. Current evidence on traditional Chinese exercise for cancers: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* (2020) 17:1–22. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17145011
- Wang XQ, Pi YL, Chen PJ, Liu Y, Wang R, Li X, et al. Traditional Chinese exercise for cardiovascular diseases: systematic review and metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials. J Am Heart Assoc. (2015) 5:1– 17. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.115.002562
- Cheung BMY, Lo JLF, Fong DYT, Chan MY, Wong SHT, Wong VCW, et al. Randomised controlled trial of qigong in the treatment of mild essential hypertension. J Hum Hypertens. (2005) 19:697–704. doi: 10.1038/sj.jhh.1001884

- Lin L, Wang C, Tomlinson B, Hsieh M, Yang H, Liu J. The beneficial effects of Tai Chi Chuan on blood pressure and lipid profile and anxiety status in a randomized controlled trial. *J Altern Complement Med.* (2003) 9:747–54. doi: 10.1089/107555303322524599
- Liu D, Yi L, Sheng M, Wang G, Zou Y. The efficacy of Tai Chi and qigong exercises on blood pressure and blood levels of nitric oxide and endothelin-1 in patients with essential hypertension: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Evidencebased complement. *Altern Med.* (2020) 2020:3267971. doi: 10.1155/2020/ 3267971
- Yeh GY, Wang C, Wayne PM, Phillips RS. The effect of Tai Chi exercise on blood pressure: a systematic review. *Prev Cardiol.* (2008) 11:82– 9. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-7141.2008.07565.x
- Jahnke R, Larkey L, Rogers C, Etnier J, Lin F. A comprehensive review of health benefits of qigong and Tai chi. Am J Health Promot. (2010) 24:e1– 25. doi: 10.4278/ajhp.081013-LIT-248
- Song Y, Zhang W, Zhao L, Sun D, Huang Y, Gu Y. Sportsrelated injuries sustained by disabled athletes in winter Paralympic games: a systematic review. J Med Imag Health In. (2020) 10:1136–43. doi: 10.1166/jmihi.2020.3012
- Jiang X, Song Y, Sun D, Rong M, Mao L, Fekete G. Sports-related injury mechanism on ice hockey skills: a system review. J Med Imag Health In. (2020) 10:1149–58. doi: 10.1166/jmihi.2020.3011
- Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. (2011) 343:d5928. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d5928
- Gou R, Han XQ, Wang FL, Wang J. Effects of Taijiquan combined with Newman system health care model on blood pressure and quality of life in elderly patients with hypertension. *Chin J Ctrl Endem Dis.* (2017) 32:823–5.
- 26. Han QY, Huang XF, Li L, Chen LQ. The effect of shadow boxing exercise on the long-term quality of life in middle-aged and elderly patients with primary hypertension. *Chin J Mod Nurs.* (2010) 16:1617–9. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.1674-2907.2010.14.002
- 27. Hong H, Wang YL. Intervention effects of Shaolin tendon-changing exercise on high blood pressure. *J Wuhan Inst Phys Educ.* (2017) 51:74–9.
- Li XR. Effects of Taijiquan combined with comprehensive nursing intervention on blood pressure control and quality of life in patients with essential hypertension. *Chin J Convalescent Med.* (2018) 27:19–21. doi: 10.13517/j.cnki.ccm.2018.01.007
- 29. Liu T, Huang QD, Liu WZ. Effect of tai chi exercise on blood pressure, hemorheology and long-term quality of life in elderly patients with

hypertension. Chin J Gerontol. (2018) 38:1396-8.

- Ma C, Zhou W, Tang Q, Huang S. The impact of groupbased Tai chi on health-status outcomes among communitydwelling older adults with hypertension. *Heart Lung.* (2018) 47:337–44. doi: 10.1016/j.hrtlng.2018.04.007
- Park JE, Kim JE, Jung S, Kim A, Park H, Hong S. The effect of dongeui qigong for prehypertension and mild essential hypertension. Evidencebased complement. *Altern Med.* (2017) 2017:4274538. doi: 10.1155/2017/ 4274538
- Shou XL, Wang L, Jin XQ, Zhu LY, Ren AH, Wang QN. Effect of T'ai Chi exercise on hypertension in young and middle-aged in-service staff. J Altern Complement Med. (2019) 25:73–8. doi: 10.1089/acm.2018.0011
- 33. Sun J, Buys N. Community-based mind-body meditative Tai Chi program and its effects on improvement of blood pressure, weight, renal function, serum lipoprotein, and quality of life in Chinese adults with hypertension. Am J Cardiol. (2015) 116:1076–81. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2015.07.012
- Xiao YK. Effect of eight-style Taijiquan on blood pressure, vascular endothelial function and quality of life in patients with essential hypertension. *Chin J Gerontol.* (2018) 38:2403–5. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2018.10.041
- 35. Xu H. Simplified 24 Forms Tai chi for blood pressure and living quality of hypertensive. *Hubei J Tradit Chin Med.* (2016) 38:38–9.
- Zhang R. Clinical effect of Wuqinxi combined with traditional Chinese medicine in the treatment of essential hypertension. *Inner Mongolia J Trad Chin Med.* (2019) 38:106–7.
- Zheng YC, Chen L, Yang JQ. Tai chi systematic review of primary effects on blood pressure and quality of life patients of hypertension. J Liaoning Univ TCM. (2015) 17:143–6. doi: 10.13194/j.issn.1673-842x.2015.04.050
- Uhlig T. Tai Chi and yoga as complementary therapies in rheumatologic conditions. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. (2012) 26:387–98. doi: 10.1016/j.berh.2012.05.006

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2021 Song, Li, István, Xuan, Wei, Zhong and Gu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.