

Anita Verma, MSc, JRF , Vikas Upadhyay, MA, JRF , and Vartika Saxena, MBBS, MD, MAMS

Effect of Yoga Therapy on Health Outcomes in Women With Polycystic Ovary Syndrome: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to assess the effect of yoga therapy (YT) on health outcomes of women suffering from polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS). Interventional studies, with postmenarchal and premenopausal females with PCOS who received YT, with any health outcome reported, were included. Scopus, Cochrane, PubMed, *Embase, and Medline databases* were electronically searched. Systematic review included 11 experimental studies, representing 515 participants with PCOS, out of which 2 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were included for meta-analysis. Random effects model was applied using Review Manager Software version 5.4.1 and strength of evidence was assessed using GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool, 2020. Meta-analysis showed that

YT may significantly decrease menstrual irregularity (MD - .41, 95% CI - .74 to - .08), clinical hyperandrogenism (MD - .70, 95% CI - 1.15 to - .26), fasting blood glucose (MD - .22 mmol/L, 95% CI - .44 to - .01), fasting insulin (MD - 28.21 pmol/L, 95% CI - 43.79 to - 12.63), and strength of evidence suggests need of conducting well-designed RCTs to assess the efficacy of YT for PCOS.

Keywords: yoga therapy; holistic health; mind-body intervention; polycystic ovary syndrome; lifestyle disorder

Yoga encompasses all the components of lifestyle modification, thereby promoting holistic health

homeostatic model assessmentinsulin resistance value (MD - .86, 95% CI - 1.29 to - .43). Strength of evidence was "low." In conclusion, YT may have beneficial effects on health outcomes in women suffering from PCOS. However, low

Introduction

Lifestyle changes have caused immense impact on overall health and well-being of an individual giving rise to several health disorders like polycystic ovary syndrome

For reprints and permissions queries, please visit SAGE's Web site at http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav.

Copyright © 2021 The Author(s)

DOI: 10.1177/15598276211029221. Department of AYUSH, All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS) Rishikesh, Uttarakhand, India. Address correspondence to: Anita Verma, MSc, JRF, PhD Scholar, Department of AYUSH, All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS) Rishikesh, Virbhadra Road, Rishikesh, Uttarakhand 249203, India; e-mail: anita.v.9@gmail.com.

(PCOS) among females. PCOS is emerging as one of the most common endocrine and metabolic disorder affecting 8–13% women¹ of reproductive age group worldwide causing significant health consequences for women impairing quality of life and increasing risk of comorbidity like glucose intolerance and diabetes mellitus, systemic inflammation, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, hypertension, and cardiovascular disease.² PCOS is also one of the leading causes of infertility among women of reproductive age group³ and also has an adverse impact on their psychological well-being.4,5

merican Journal of Lifestyle Me

The complexity of the disorder and its impact on quality of life requires timely diagnosis, screening for complications and management strategies. The most common diagnostic criteria for PCOS is Rotterdam criterion¹ defined as at least two of the following three features: oligomenorrhea or amenorrhea (cycle length of \geq 45 days and/or \leq 8 cycles per year); hyperandrogenism (score of ≥ 6 on modified Ferriman-Gallwey scale or serum testosterone level >82 ng/dL; and polycystic ovaries (presence of more than 10 cysts in each ovary or an ovarian volume greater than 10 cm³ on ultrasound) in the absence of other endocrine etiologies such as thyroid disease, non-classic congenital adrenal hyperplasia, and hyperprolactinemia.

Treatment goals in PCOS include improving hormonal imbalance, weight management, and improving quality of life. Lifestyle interventions (dietary, exercise, behavioral or combined) are recommended as first-line management according to latest evidence-based European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology-2018 guidelines for PCOS.¹ Several pharmacological and surgical options target individual reproductive, androgenic, metabolic, weight-related, and psychological symptoms in women of different age groups suffering from PCOS. These conventional

therapeutic options may have unwanted side effects, whereas lifestyle modifications offer a holistic treatment by improving underlying hormonal imbalance, optimizing weight, and improving quality of life of women suffering from PCOS.¹

Yoga, a form of mind-body intervention, encompasses all the components of lifestyle modification (diet, exercise, and behavior), thereby promoting holistic health of an individual.⁶ Several interventional trials have been conducted which assess the effectiveness of yoga therapy (YT) on neuroendocrine, anthropometric, metabolic, and quality of life factor in women with PCOS. However, to the best of author(s)' knowledge, currently there is no systematic review or metaanalysis assessing the evidence for effectiveness of specifically YT on health outcomes in women with PCOS. Thus, this review aims at specifically assessing the effect of YT on health outcomes in women with PCOS.

Materials and Methods

Protocol and Registration

This systematic review and metaanalysis was undertaken according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Metaanalyses (PRISMA) guidelines⁷ (PRISMA Checklist provided as Supplementary Tables S1a and S1b) and registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) with registration number CRD42021229619.

Eligibility Criteria

Criteria for Systematic Review. In this systematic review, all empirical research studies studying the effect of YT as an intervention for women diagnosed with PCOS were included. Theoretical research studies were excluded from this review in order to reduce heterogeneity. Studies were included if they measured the effect of any form of YT on PCOS-related reproductive, metabolic, anthropometric, or quality of life health outcomes either clinically or by using validated tools.

Criteria for Meta-Analysis. Studies were considered for meta-analysis if they met the following eligibility criteria:

- 1. Type of studies: randomized controlled trial (RCT).
- 2. Type of participants: postmenarchal and premenopausal females with PCOS diagnosed on the basis of Rotterdam criteria.
- 3. Type of interventions:
 - a. Intervention group: YT (defined as structured yogic postures, breathing, meditation, and relaxation techniques) for duration of 12 weeks or more.
 - b. Control group.
 - c. *Minimal treatment (MT)* (defined as either no treatment or standard unstructured minimal dietary, exercise or behavioral advice).
- 4. Type of outcome measures (measured at end of intervention):
 - a. Primary outcome: o. Reproductive:
 - Menstrual cycle regularity (initiation of menses or significant shortening of cycle length or increase in cycle frequency per month).
 - b. Secondary outcomes:
 - o. Reproductive:
 - Clinical hyperandrogenism (hirsutism assessed clinically by modified Ferriman–Gallwey (mFG) score).
 - o. Metabolic:
 - ➤ Fasting blood glucose (FBG) level,

- ➤ fasting insulin (FI) level, and
- homeostatic model assessment-insulin resistance (HOMA-IR).
- o. Anthropometric:
 - ➤ body mass index (BMI) and
 - ≫ waist-to-hip ratio (WHR).
- o. Quality of life (psychological):
 - ➤ anxiety and depression (measured by validated scales).

Information Sources and Search Terms

Electronic databases Cochrane, PubMed, Embase, Medline, and Scopus were searched for identification of relevant studies published till July 2020. Also, controlled trials registries Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) and Clinical Trials Registry of India (CTRI), conference abstracts, relevant journals, reference lists of relevant papers, and reviews were electronically hand searched to identify further eligible studies. Searches were re-run prior to the final analysis and submission. Yoga, lifestyle management, complementary and alternative therapy, PCOS, and randomized controlled trials were used as keywords and MeSH terms. Results were refined by selecting only interventional trials which primarily assessed the effect of YT on any health outcomes of women of any age group suffering from PCOS. Summary of search methods is provided in Supplementary Tables S2a and S2b.

Study Selection and Data Extraction

Relevant studies, searched from abovementioned databases, were then exported to citation manager (Mendeley version 1.19.4) for filtering and elimination of duplicates. Titles and abstracts of articles thus retrieved were screened individually, and verified and full text versions of potentially eligible studies were obtained. The following information was then extracted from each study: location of study, study design, number of subjects with their mean age, PCOS diagnosis criteria, intervention, follow-up period, and information related to outcomes. Main trial report was used as reference for studies which had multiple publications, and additional details were provided from their secondary research articles. Unit conversion factors applied in this review are provided in Supplementary TableS3.

Risk of Bias in Individual Studies

Quality of included studies were assessed using the Revised Cochrane Risk-of-Bias Tool for Randomized Trial (RoB2)⁸ and Risk-of-Bias in Non-Randomized Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) tool.⁹ Rating of studies were categorized as per abovementioned scales.

Synthesis of Results

Extraction and summarization of data for health outcome was done by meta-analysis for homogenous studies. Random effects model was used combining data from included studies. For continuous data, mean difference (MD) and related 95% confidence intervals (CIs) between treatment groups were calculated for measurement of treatment effect. Heterogeneity was estimated by Isquared statistics. Data management and analysis was performed using Review Manager (RevMan) version 5.4.1 (RevMan 2020, The Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK).

Overall Quality of Evidence

Strength of evidence for significant outcomes was assessed using GRADEpro and Cochrane methods.¹⁰ The quality of evidence was assessed on the basis of following GRADE criteria: *risk of bias* (lack of allocation concealment, lack of blinding, incomplete accounting of patients and outcome events, selective outcome reporting, other limitations); *inconsistency* (unexplained heterogeneity or variability in results across studies); *imprecision* (uncertainty in results due to few patients and events and wide CI around the estimate of the effect); *indirectness* (evidence does not directly answer the health care question asked); and *other considerations like publication bias* (selective publication of studies). Based on these criteria, the quality of evidence was assessed into one of the four categories: high, moderate, low, or very low.

American Journal of Lifestyle Med

Results

Search Results

Process of study selection is detailed in PRISMA flow diagram (Figure 1). Initial search retrieved 1302 articles from electronic databases [Scopus (n = 546), Cochrane CENTRAL (n = 249), PubMed (n = 135), and Embase (n =372)] and 668 trials from CTRI database. Duplicate records were removed to yield 1042 articles which were then screened for irrelevant studies (n = 1029) based on title and abstract. As a result, 13 full text articles were then assessed for eligibility, from which 2 articles were excluded as text of one research article was not available in English and only conference abstract was available for another article. The remaining 11 articles were included for systematic review. Out of these, 3 RCTs belonged to the same study (study by Nidhi et al had 3 publications). Hence, a total of 9 studies were available for this review. Further, 2 RCTs (Nidhi et al, 2012, 2013a, 2013b; Patel et al, 2020) were included for meta-analysis due to homogeneity.

Characteristics of Eligible Studies

Characteristics of eligible studies are provided in Table 1. A total of 11 studies were found eligible for this review which were conducted in

Figure 1.

Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses flow diagram for study selection.



India, Iran, and the United States. Out of these studies, 9 were included for this review among which 3 studies were RCTs, 5 were pre-post clinical trials, and 1 was case series. A total number of subjects were 515 which were diagnosed with PCOS on the basis of Rotterdam and other assessment criteria. Intervention provided in these studies primarily consisted of YT. Follow-up duration of these studies ranged from 6 weeks to 4 months. Effect of YT on health outcomes including reproductive, metabolic, anthropometric, and quality of life was assessed in these studies.

Risk of Bias in Individual Studies

Among RCT studies, 1 study was assessed with low overall risk of bias and the other 2 studies with moderate overall risk of bias. Among non-randomized studies, 3 studies were assessed with moderate overall risk of bias and 3 studies with serious overall risk of bias. Thus, among all 9 studies included for this review, 1 study was assessed to be of high quality, 5 were of moderate quality, and remaining 3 studies were of low quality. Risk of bias graph and summary for RCT and nonrandomized studies is shown in Figures 2A-2D.

Overall Quality of Evidence

Summary of findings presented in Table 2 evaluates the overall quality of body of evidence for review outcomes including menstrual regularity, clinical hyperandrogenism, glucose tolerance, BMI, WHR, and anxiety level. Outcome data were extracted from included studies and comparisons were formatted in data tables for preparation of "Summary of Findings" table. Evidence quality was then classified into high, moderate, low, or very low according to GRADE criteria and incorporated into reporting of the results for each outcome.

Systematic Review

Summary of effect of YT on health outcomes as mentioned in included studies among women suffering from PCOS is presented in Tables 3– 6.

Reproductive Outcomes. Menstrual cycle regularity significantly increased (P < .001) in the study by Shalini et al, 2019; right ovarian volume significantly decreased (P =.001) in the study by Vibhuti et al, 2018; mFG score significantly decreased (P = .002) in the study by Nidhi et al, 2012; testosterone levels significantly decreased (P = .002 and P = .041) in the study by Nidhi et al, 2012 and Patel et al, 2020, respectively; anti-Müllerian hormone (AMH) levels significantly decreased (P = .006 and P = .004) in the study by Nidhi et al, 2012 and Vibhuti et al, 2018, respectively; and luteinizing hormone (LH) levels significantly decreased (P = .005 and P = .006) in the study by Nidhi et al, 2012 and Vibhuti et al., 2018, respectively.

Metabolic Outcomes. FI level significantly decreased (P < .001) in the study by Nidhi et al, 2012; FBG level significantly decreased (P = .001) in the study by Vanitha et al, 2018; lipid profile significantly improved (P = .001) in the study by Nidhi et al, 2012 and Vanitha et al, 2018; and hemoglobin A1C (HbA1C) level significantly decreased (P = .0001 and P = .01) in the study by Vanitha et al, 2018 and Vibhuti et al, 2018, respectively.

Anthropometric Outcomes. Weight of the study participants significantly decreased (P < .001)

		1.5	at	~	2
	Included in systematic	eview or meta- nalysis or both	o; article text no valiable in nglish	s (included in rstematic reviev nd meta- nalysis)	s (included in rstematic reviev nd meta- nalysis) nalysis)
		ai 12	of Erav		nd ar as SS X
		Outcomes measured	<i>Primary:</i> Quality o life, hirsutism, no of follicles/ovary, no. embryos, and βHC <i>Secondary:</i> Weight acne, infertility, an menstrual disorder	<i>Primary:</i> Serum F FBG, AMH, serum lipids, ^a state anxiety, and trait anxiety BMI, <i>Secondary:</i> BMI, WHR, LH, FSH, ∏ prolactin, mFG score, and menstrual cycle length	<i>Primary:</i> Serum testosterone level <i>Secondary:</i> Menstrual cycle length, mFG scort DHEA, DHEAS, A4 FBG, FI, HOMA-IR BG, BAI score, al BMI, BAI score, al
	Follow-	up duration	6 weeks	3 months	3 months
	ntion	Control group	No intervention	Similar set of conventional physical exercises along with counseling session	Wait list, no intervention was given
	Interve	Yoga group	Yoga practices consisting of asanas, pranayama, and relaxation techniques	Yoga practices consisting of asanas, pranayama, relaxation techniques, meditation, and counseling	Yoga practices consisting of mental body scan, pranayama, asanas (vinyasa and restorative), and meditation
	SUUd	diagnosis criteria	Cannot be specified	Rotterdam criteria	Rotterdam criteria
	ge ± SD	Control group	30.35 ± 5.53	16.22 ± .93	31.2 ± 2.3
	Mean aç	Yoga group	30.77 ± 6.01	16.22 ± 1.13	30.9 ± 1.2
	iber of ojects nales)	Control group	30	43	σ
s.	Num sub (fen	Yoga group	31	42	13
ible Studie:		Study design	RCT	RCT	RCT
ils of Eligi		Country	Iran	India	States
ographic Detai		Study, year	Bahrami et al, ¹⁶ 2019	Nidhi et al, ¹¹⁻¹³ 2012	Patel et al, ¹⁴ 2020
Dem		#	-	2	ε

Table 1. Demographic D

vol. 17 • no. 1

(continued)

77

	8	~	8	8
	Included in systematic revie	Included in systematic revie	Included in systematic reviev	Included in systematic reviev
	AMH, prolactin, testosterone, FSH, LH, T3, T4, TSH, ovarian mass, HbA1C, weight, anxiety, and depression	<i>Primary:</i> Ovarian morphology <i>Secondary:</i> Body weight, BMI, chest circumference, hip circumference, and WHR	Irregular menstrual cycle, duration of bleeding, and BMI	FSH, LH, Hb, PP blood glucose, and cholesterol
	3 months	12 weeks	3 months	3 months
	Ayurvedic treatment consisting of Panchakarma practices and Ayurvedic medicines	Wait list, no intervention given	Ι	I
	Ayurvedic treatment consisting of Panchakarma practices and Ayurvedic medicines along with yoga practices consisting of asanas, pranayama, relaxation techniques, and meditation	Yoga intervention consisting of asanas, pranayama, relaxation techniques and kriyas and kriyas and naturopathic intervention consisting of hydrotherapy, mud therapy, fasting, and diet	Asanas along with varma stimulations and internal medication	Kayakalp yogic exercises
	Rotterdam criteria	Rotterdam criteria	Cannot be specified	Cannot be specified
	29.27 ± 5.06	25.05 ± 4.83	I	I
	5.34 ± 5.34	23.77 ± 5.33	Not provided	25 ± 5.23
	32	25	I	
	32	25	10	10
	RCT	Pre-post clinical trial	Case series	Pre-post clinical trial
ed)	India	India	India	India
e 1. (continue	2018 al, ¹⁹	Ratnakumari et al, ³³ 2018	Shalini et al, ¹⁷ 2019	Shanthi et al, ¹⁸ 2014
Table	4	Q	9	7

(continued)

ontinue
1.
able

Ð

vol. 17 • no. 1

Included in systematic review	Included in systematic review	Included in systematic review	No; only conference abstract available for this study
PCOS risk minimization	Level of depression	<i>Primary:</i> Blood glucose levels, lipid profile, and HbA1C <i>Secondary:</i> BMI, WHR, SBP, and DBP	FBG, FI, and HOMA- IR
4 months	1 month	3 months	3 months
No intervention			I
Yoga practices consisting of asanas, pranayama, relaxation techniques, meditation, counseling, and brisk walking	Yoga module comprising of asanas, pranayama, and meditation	Yoga nidra	Yoga
PCOS risk assessment questionnaire	Rotterdam criteria	Rotterdam criteria	Cannot be specified
22.87 ± 12.15			I
33.42 ± 7.33	Cannot be specified	26.13 ± 5.30	Cannot be specified
102			I
102	30	40	30
Pre-post clinical trial	Pre-post clinical trial	Pre-post clinical trial	Pre-post clinical trial
India	India	India	India
Selvaraj et al, ¹⁵ 2020	Sode et al, ²⁴ 2017	Vanitha et al, ²² 2018	Verma et al, ²¹ 2017
ω	0	10	1

Abbreviations: PCOS, polycystic ovarian syndrome; RCT, randomized controlled trial; pHCG, positive beta human chorionic gonadotropin; FI, fasting insulin; FBG, fasting blood glucose; AMH, anti-Müllerian hormone; BMI, body mass index; WHR, waist-to-hip ratio; LH, luteinizing hormone; FSH, follicle-stimulating hormone; TT, total testosterone; mFG, modified Ferriman–Gallwey; DHEAS, dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate; A4, androstenedione; HOMA-IR, homeostatic model assessment-insulin resistance; BAI, Beck Anxiety Inventory; BDI-II, Beck Depression Inventory-II; Hb, hemoglobin; PP, post-prandial; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; T3, triiodothyronine; T4, thyroxine; TSH, thyroid-stimulating hormone; HbA1C, glycated hemoglobin. ^aSerum lipids: total cholesterol (TC), triglycerides (TRIG), high-density lipoprotein (HDL), low-density lipoprotein (LDL), very low-density lipoprotein (VLDL).

Figure 2.

(A) Risk of bias graph (randomized controlled trial (RCT) studies). (B) Risk of bias summary (RCT studies). (C) Risk of bias graph (non-randomized studies). (D) Risk of bias summary (non-randomized studies).



in the study by Ratnakumari et al, 2018 and Vanitha et al, 2018; BMI significantly decreased (P < .001) in the study by Ratnakumari et al, 2018, Shalini et al, 2019, and Vanitha et al, 2018; and WHR significantly decreased (P < .02) in the study by Vanitha et al, 2018.

Quality of Life Outcomes. Anxiety level significantly decreased (P = .002, P < .001) in the study by Nidhi et al, 2012 and Vibhuti et al, 2018, respectively and depression level significantly decreased (P < .0001, P < .001) in the study by Patel et al, 2020, Sode et al, 2017, and Vibhuti et al, 2018, respectively.

Meta-Analysis

Meta-analysis was conducted for two of the included studies for primary and secondary health outcomes as defined in



this review and is presented as forest plots in Figure 3. Comparison of health outcomes of included studies is represented in Table 7.

Primary Outcome

Reproductive. Menstrual cycle regularity (defined as initiation of menses or significant shortening of cycle length or increase in cycle frequency per month): Only one study¹¹⁻¹³ reported on this outcome. This study reported the data as mean \pm SD menstrual cycle frequency per month for YT vs MT [2.38 \pm .64 vs 1.97 \pm .79, MD .41, 95% CI -.74 to -.08, *P* = .02] suggestive of YT resulting in a greater increase in menstrual cycle frequency per month as compared to MT (exercise).

Secondary Outcomes

Reproductive. Clinical Hyperandrogenism (hirsutism assessed clinically by mFG score) was assessed in both included studies by reporting changes in mFG scores. Pooled analysis of results show that YT may result in a greater decrease in hirsutism (mFG score) (MD -.70, 95%CI -1.15 to $-.26, I^2 = 0\%$) compared to MT, with very low heterogeneity.

Table 2.

Summary of Findings.

Vogo	thoropy	aamnarad	to minimal	trootmont for	womon wi	ith nolyoy	ntia avany	aundrama
ruua	literativ	compared	to minima	liealinent ior	women w		SUC OVAIV	synuronne

Patient or population: Women with polycystic ovary syndrome

Setting: Residential college, wellness center

Intervention: Yoga therapy

Comparison: Minimal treatment (exercise or no intervention)

Outcomes	Anticipated effects	Effect estimate [®] (95% Cl)	No. of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)
Reproductive outcome: Menstrual regularity (frequency in months)	YT may reduce menstrual irregularity (frequency in months) by .41 (improvement of .74 to .08)	MD41 [74,08]	72 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕OOLOW ^{b,c}
Reproductive outcome: Clinical hyperandrogenism (hirsutism) (mFG score)	YT may reduce clinical hyperandrogenism (hirsutism) (mFG score) by .70 (reduction of 1.15 to .26)	MD70 [-1.15,26]	94 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕OO LOW ^{c,d}
Metabolic outcome: FBG (mmol/ L)	YT may reduce FBG by .22 mmol/ L (reduction of .44 mmol/L to .01 mmol/L)	MD22 [44,01] mmol/L	93 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕OO LOW ^{c,d}
Metabolic outcome: FI (pmol/L)	YT may reduce FI by 28.21 pmol/ L (reduction of 43.79 pmol/L to 12.63 pmol/L)	MD -28.21 [-43.79, -12.63] pmol/L	93 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕OO LOW ^{c,d}
Metabolic outcome: HOMA-IR value	YT may reduce HOMA-IR value by .86 (reduction of 1.29 to .43)	MD86 [-1.29,43]	93 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕OO LOW ^{c,d}
Anthropometric outcome: BMI (kg/m ²)	YT may reduce BMI by 1.38 kg/ m^2 (reduction of 2.37 kg/m ² to .40 kg/m ²)	MD -1.38 [-2.37,40] kg/m ²	93 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕OO LOW ^{c,d}
Anthropometric outcome: WHR	YT may slightly reduce WHR by .02 (reduction of .03 to .01)	MD02 [03,01]	93 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕OO LOW ^{c,d}
Quality of life: Anxiety level score	Uncertain of effect of YT on anxiety level score	SMD13 [54, .28]	94 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕OO LOW ^{c,d}

Abbreviations: Cl, confidence interval; MD, mean difference; SMD, standardized mean difference; YT, yoga therapy; FBG, fasting blood glucose; Fl, fasting insulin; HOMA-IR, homeostatic model assessment-insulin resistance; BMI, body mass index; WHR, waist-to-hip ratio.

GRADE working group grades of evidence: $\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus$: True effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect. $\oplus \oplus \oplus \bigcirc$: True effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different. $\oplus \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc$: True effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect. $\oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$: True effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.

^aRisk in intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on assumed risk in comparison group and relative effect of intervention (and its 95% Cl). ^bDowngraded one level for inconsistency: only one study reported this outcome.

^cDowngraded one level for imprecision: few number of participants.

^dDowngraded one level for serious risk of bias: high attrition rate of participants.

Metabolic

 FBG level was measured in both included studies. Pooled analysis of results show that YT may result in slight decrease in hirsutism (mFG score) (MD -.22 mmol/L, 95% CI -.44 to -.01, $I^2 = 85\%$) compared to MT, with high heterogeneity.

2. *FI level* was measured in both included studies. Pooled analysis of results show that YT may result in slight decrease in FI level (MD

က်
Ð
Q
_e

Systematic Review: Change in Reproductive Outcomes After Intervention Among Women with PCOS.

		Ρ	onEb	cnn.	SN	SN	NS	NS	SN	SN	.006 ^b	204
	н	Mean change ± SD	4.09 ± 9.99	3.00 ± 7.48	ស្ន	ស្	ស្	ស្	St	11.97 ± 3.67	2.77 ± 6.25	1.27 ± 5.06
		=	37 ↓	35 ↑	NS N	NS N	N NS	N N	NS N	10 6	30	→ 30
		٩	1	1 7 7	SI	SI	S	SI	SI	SI	728	218
	FSH	Mean change ± SD	.40 ±		A SV	SN	S	S	A SV	.17 ± №	.35 ±	(1.23 ±
		=	37	35	NS N	NS I	NS I	NS N	NS I	10	30	8
		٩	d on the		ស្	ស្	ស្	ស	S	S	004 ^b	006 ^b
	AMH	Mean change ± SD	2.51 ± 2.92	1.49 ±	N SV	NS N	SN	SN	NS N	NS N	12.86 ± .1 2.43	12.76 ±
		=	37	35	NS I	NS I	I SN	I SN	NS I	NS I	30	30
SS	ne	d	NS	NS	.041 ^a	.967	SN	NS	SN	SN	.003 ^b	.266
e outcome	[estostero	Mean change ± SD	NS	NS	↓1.72 ± .95	↓.03 ± 1.46	NS	NS	SN	NS	↓2.94 ± 6.86	↓1.11 ± 6.32
uctiv		E	NS	NS	13	6	NS	NS	SN	NS	30	30
leprod	сı	٩	quuu	700.	.95	66.	SN	NS	SN	SN	SN	N
æ	mFG score	Mean change ± SD	↓1.14 ± 1.44	↑.06 ± 1.51	0 ± 0.6	0 ± 0.6	NS	SN	SN	NS	SN	NS
		=	37	35	13	6	NS	N	NS	NS	NS	N
	ume	d	SN	NS	NS	NS	.307	.032 ^a	SN	NS	.003 ^b 089	.376 .167
	Ovarian vol	Mean change ± SD	SN	NS	NS	NS	Right ↓1.67 (-3.8, 7.04) Left ↓3.68 (1.1, 8.44)	Right ↑1.02 (-4.06, 3.7) Left ↑.79 (-4.5, 4.33)	SN	NS	Right ↓1.70 ± 4.38 Left ↓2.76 ± 3.86	Right ↓1.99 ± 4.58 Left ↓1.25 ± 5.59
		=	NS	NS	NS	NS	22	22	NS	NS	30	30
	cycle y	٩	010	.049	NS	NS	C C	+ 	<.001 ^b	NS	NS	SN
	Aenstrual d regularit	Mean change ±SD	↑.89 ± .66	↑.49 ± .98	SN	SN	29 days	33 days	↓1.80 ± .60	SN	SN	NS
		z	37	35	NS	NS	22	22	10	NS	NS	NS
		Group	۲	C	₽	с	YT + N	с	YT + S	₽	YT + A	A
		Study, year	Nidhi et al, ¹²	2012	Patel et al, ¹⁴	2020	Ratnakumari	et al, ²³ 2018°	Shalini et al, ¹⁷ 2019	Shanthi et al, 2014	Vibhuti et al,	2018
		#	Ţ	-	¢		ç	0	4	5	c.	•

A, Ayurveda; NS, not specified. ^aSignificant at P < .05. ^bSignificant at P < .01. ^oValues provided in median (quartile 1, quartile 3).

Sys	tematic Review:	Change	Ē	letabolic Outcom	es After	Inter	vention Among V	Vomen	with	I PCOS.							
										Metabolic out	tcomes						
				Е			FBG			HOMA-IR			Lipid profi	le		HbA1C	
#	Study, year	Group	=	Mean change ± SD	d	=	Mean change ± SD	P	E	Mean change ± SD	d	=	Mean change ± SD	٩	=	Mean change ± SD	٩
•	Nidhi et al, ¹²	ΥT	35	↓9.04 ± 32.31	< 100.	35	↓.24 ± .39	< .001 ^b	35	↓.38 ± .92	<.05 ^a	35	TRIG ↓.15 ± .12 TCHL ↓.24 ± .29 HDL ↑.03 ± .04 LDL ↓.21 ± .25 VLDL ↓.06 ± .05	<.001 ^b <.001 ^b <.001 ^b <.001 ^b <.001 ^b	NS I	SN	SN
-	2012	C	36	↑11.09 ± 56.85	<.001 ^b	36	↑.04 ± .44	.47	36	↑.29 ± 1.56	.19	36	TRIG \downarrow .07 ± .12 TCHL \downarrow .07 ± .46 HDL \uparrow .03 ± .58 LDL \downarrow .07 ± .39 VLDL \downarrow .03 ± .06	<.001 ^b .15 <.01 ^b .13 <.001 ^b	SN	SN	NS
ſ	Patel et al, ¹⁴	ΥT	13	↓6 ± 69.55	.824	13	↓.09 ± .11	.387	13	↓.3 ± 2.31	.693	NS	NS	SN	NS	I SN	NS
V	2020	C	6	↓12.6 ± 20.12	.328	6	↑.16 ± .21	.403	6	↓.48 ± .86	.382	NS	NS	SN	NS	I SN	NS
3	Shanthi et al, 2014	ΥT	NS	NS	SN	10	↓1.2 ± .40	NS	NS	SN	NS	10	TCHL ↓1.01 ± .37	SN	NS	NS SN	NS
4	Vanitha et al, ²² 2018	ΥT	SN	SN	SN	40	↓.42 ± .68	.001 ^b	NS	SN	SN	40	TRIG ↓.38 ± .69 TCHL ↓.31 ± .84 HDL ↑.11 ± .18 LDL ↓.46 ± .77 VLDL ↓.05 ± .15	.001 ^b .001 ^b .0001 ^b .0001 ^b .0001 ^b	40	↓.62 ± .57	.0001 ^a
5	Vibhuti et al,	ΥT + A	SN	NS	SN	NS	SN	SN	SN	SN	NS	NS	SN	SN	30	↓1.13 ± .54	.017 ^a
	2010	A	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	SN	NS	NS	NS	NS	30	↑2.11 ± .51	.035 ^a
Abbl not ^a Sigi	reviations: SD, stand specified. Inificant at $P < .05$. Inificant at $P < .01$.	lard deviat	tion; F	I, fasting insulin; FBI	G, fasting	blood	glucose; HOMA-IR, h	omeosta	atic m	odel assessment-ins	sulin resi:	stano	s; HbA1C, hemoglobi	in A1C; YT, yoga ti	nerap	y; C, control; A, Ayur	veda; NS,

Jan • Feb 2023

American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine

84

Table 5.

							Anthropometric outcome	ŝ			
				Weight			BMI			WHR	
#	Study, year	Group	N	Mean change ± SD	μ	e	Mean change ± SD	Ρ	=	Mean change ± SD	d
Ţ	Mistri of al 12 004 0	ΥT	37	↓.04 ± 1.34	000	35	↓.11 ± .51	.32	35	↓.01 ± .05	.53
-	NIGHT EL AL, ZUIZ	С	35	↑.79 ± 4.13	700.	36	↑.31 ± 1.63	.66	36	0 ± .05	.42
c		ΥT	SN	SN	NS	13	↓.3 ± 1.95	.38	13	↓.013 ± .016	.32
N	ratel et al. 2020	C	SN	SN	NS	6	↑.2 ± 3.3	0.4	6	↑.011 ± .02	.34
c	Dottooloumont of ol 23 001 00	YT + N	22	↓6 (4, 8)	6 100 v	22	↓2.36 (1.6, 3.28)	, 0018	22	↑.01 (03, .02)	
ν	Kaliakumari el al, 2018	C	22	0 (-1.5, 2)	- 100.>	22	0 (49, 0.84)	<	22	↑.01 (04, .01)	
4	Shalini et al, ¹⁷ 2019	YT + S	SN	SN	NS	10	↓.6 ± .81	<.001 ^a	SN	SN	SN
5	Vanitha et al, ²² 2018	ΥT	40	↓ 4.34 ± 12.56	.001 ^a	40	↓1.83 ± 4.59	.001 ^a	40	↓.04 ± .03	.02 ^a
ų	1000 Port of 2000	YT + A	30	↓.51 ± 16.55	.607	NS	SN	SN	SN	SN	SN
0		А	30	1.85 ± 9.58	.396	NS	SN	SN	SN	SN	SN
Abbrevi ^a Signifiu ^b Signifiu ^c Values	ations: SD, standard deviation; BMI, lant at $P < .05$. ant at $P < .01$. ant at $P < .01$. provided in median (quartile 1, quan	body mass inc tile 3).	dex; WHR,	waist-to-hip ratio; YT, yoga t	herapy; C, co	ntrol; N, r	laturopathy; S, Siddha; A, Ay	urveda; NS, no	ot specifie	P	

American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine

Table 6.

Systematic Review: Change in Quality of Life Outcomes After Intervention Among Women with PCOS.

					Quality of li	ife outco	mes	
				Anxiety			Depression	
#	Study, year	Group	n	Mean change ± SD	Р	N	Mean change \pm SD	Р
4	Nidbi at al 12 2012	ΥT	35	↓14.97 ± 9.87	0008	NS	NS	NS
	Niulii et al, 2012	C	36	↓7.42 ± 7.57	.002	NS	NS	NS
	Potol at al ¹⁴ 2020	ΥT	13	↓3.1 ± 2.59	.037	13	↓8.75 ± 2.47	<.0001 ^a
2	Palei el al, 2020	С	9	↓1.1 ± 2.57	.633	9	↓6 ±1.91	.06 ^a
3	Sode et al, ²⁴ 2017	ΥT	NS	NS	NS	30	↓13.51 ± 7.37	<.0001 ^a
4	Vikhuti at al. 2010	YT + A	30	↓6.30 ± 3.54	<.001 ^a	30	↓6.08 ± 3.85	<.001 ^a
4	vibriuti et al, 2018	A	30	↓4.64 ± 3.12	<.001 ^a	30	↓3.79 ± 3.48	<.001 ^a

Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; YT, yoga therapy; C, control; A, Ayurveda; NS, not specified. ^aSignificant at P < .05.

^bSignificant at P < .01.

-28.21 pmol/L, 95% CI -43.79 to -12.63, $I^2 = 0\%$) compared to MT.

3. *HOMA-IR* was measured in both included studies. Pooled analysis of results show that YT may result in slight decrease in HOMA-IR value (MD -.86, 95% CI -1.29 to -.43, $I^2 = 0\%$) compared to MT.

Anthropometric

- 1. *BMI* was measured in both included studies. Both included studies observed no significant change in BMI in both groups. Pooled analysis of results show that YT may result in slight decrease in BMI (MD – 1.38 kg/m², 95% CI – 2.37 to – .40, $I^2 = 0\%$) compared to MT.
- 2. WHR was measured in both included studies. Both included studies observed no significant change in WHR in both groups. Pooled analysis of results show that YT may result in slight decrease in WHR (MD – .02, 95% CI – .03 to – .10, $I^2 = 0\%$) compared to MT.

Quality of Life (Psychological). Anxiety level was measured in both included studies. Both included studies observed significant change in experimental group. One study¹¹⁻¹³ showed significant changes in trait anxiety scores in experimental group. Other study¹⁴ showed significant change in Beck Anxiety Inventory scores in the experimental group. However, pooled analysis of results shows uncertainty about the effect of YT on anxiety levels (SMD - .13, 95% CI -.54 to .28, $I^2 = 0\%$) as compared to MT.

Discussion

Summary of Evidence

The current systematic review and meta-analysis was aimed at investigating the effect of YT on health outcomes in women with PCOS. Data from these studies showed evidence of beneficial effect of YT on reproductive (menstrual irregularity and clinical hyperandrogenism), metabolic (FBG, FI, and HOMA-IR values) and anthropometric outcomes (BMI and WHR) as compared to MT. However, pooled results show uncertainty about the effect of YT on quality of life outcome (anxiety level) as compared to MT.

Findings

Reproductive Outcomes. The RCTs included in meta-analysis are suggestive of beneficial effects of YT on reproductive health outcomes such as menstrual regularity and clinical hyperandrogenism.

Menstrual regularity was however reported as an outcome measure in only one¹³ of the studies included in meta-analysis. A recent study involving adolescent girls conducted in India¹⁵ reported slight improvement on menstrual conditions after 2 months of YT intervention along with 2 months of brisk walking. Another study involving females suffering from infertility in Iran¹⁶ reported a significant reduction in menstrual disorders (P < .001) after 6 weeks of YT intervention. Also, a case series study conducted in India¹⁷ reported

Figure 3.

Meta-analysis of health outcomes.

,	<u>e regulari</u>	ty						
	Yogath	erapy [YT]	Minimal	treatment	[MT]		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD Tota	l Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Nidhi 2013	-2.38	0.64 37	-1.97	0.79	35	100.0%	-0.41 [-0.74, -0.08]	
Patel 2020	0	0 0	0 0	0	0		Not estimable	
Total (95% CI)		37			35	100.0%	-0 41 [-0 74 -0 08]	•
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable							`
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.41 (P	= 0.02)						-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [YT] Favours [MT]
b) <u>Clinical hypera</u>	ndrogenia	<u>sm (hirsuti</u>	sm - mFG	score)				
	Yogath	erapy [YT]	Minimal	treatment	t [MT]		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD Tota	l Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Nidhi 2013	3.38	1.8 37	4.09	2.06	35	24.5%	-0.71 [-1.61, 0.19]	
Patel 2020	3.3	0.6 13	3 4	0.6	9	15.5%	-0.70 [-1.21, -0.19]	-
Total (95% CI)		50)		44	100.0%	-0.70 [-1.15, -0.26]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ² :	= 0.00, df = 1	(P = 0.98);	$ ^2 = 0\%$				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.11 (P	<i>i</i> = 0.002)						-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [YT] Favours [MT]
Metabolic outco	me							
a) <u>FBG</u>								
	Yoga	therapy [YT]		Minimal t	treatment [MT]	Mean Differe	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup M	lean [mmol/L]	SD[mmol/L]	Total Mea	n [mmol/L]	SD [mmo	/L] Tota	al Weight IV, Random, S	5% CI IV, Random, 95% CI
Nidhi 2012 b	4.1	0.18	35	4.21	0	.34 3	6 49.2% -0.11 [-0.24	, 0.02] -
Patel 2020	4.83	3 0.106	13	5.16	0	.15	9 50.8% -0.33 [-0.44,	-0.22]
Total/95% CI)			49			4	5 100 0% _0.22 [_0.44	-0.011
Heterogeneity: Tau ² - 0.0	2: Chi2 - 6.45	df = 1 /D = 0.0	1): 12 - 85%			-	5 100.076 -0.22 [-0.44,	
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.02 (P = 0.0	(4)	1), 1 = 05 %					4 05 0 05 4
								Favours [YT] Favours [MT
b) <u>FI</u>								-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT
b) <u>Fl</u>	Yogati	herapy [YT]		Minimal tre	eatment [M	тј	Mean Differen	-1 -0.3 0 0.3 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT
b) <u>FI</u> Study or Subgroup M	Yogati lean [pmol/L]	herapy [YT] SD[pmol/L]	Total Mear	Minimal tre [pmol/L]	eatment [M SD [pmol/L	T]] Total	Mean Differen Weight IV, Random, 9	-1 -0.3 0 0.3 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT ce Mean Difference 5% CI IV, Random, 95% CI
b) <u>Fl</u> Study or Subgroup M Nidhi 2012 b	Yogati lean [pmol/L] 51.58	herapy [YT] SD[pmol/L] 17.53	Total Mear 35	Minimal tre [pmol/L] 81.4	eatment [M SD [pmol/L 47.55	T]] <u>Total</u> 9 36	Mean Differen Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, -	-1 -0.3 0 0.3 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT ce Mean Difference 5% CI IV, Random, 95% CI 13.22]
b) <u>FI</u> Study or Subgroup M Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020	Yogat lean [pmol/L] 51.58 60	herapy [YT] SD[pmol/L] 17.53 81	<u>Total Mean</u> 35 13	Minimal tre [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2	eatment [M SD [pmol/L 47.5 16.3	T]] Total 9 36 2 9	Mean Differen Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, - 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT ce Mean Difference 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22]
b) <u>Fl</u> <u>Study or Subgroup M</u> Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% Cl)	Yogat lean [pmol/L] 51.58 60	herapy [YT] SD[pmol/L] 17.53 81	<u>Total Mear</u> 35 13 48	Minimal tro [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2	eatment [M SD [pmol/L 47.5 16.2	T]] Total 9 36 2 9 45	Mean Differen Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, - 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79 -1	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT ce Mean Difference 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22] 29.09]
b) <u>Fl</u> <u>Study or Subgroup</u> <u>M</u> Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ^e = 0.0	Yogat lean [pmol/L] 51.58 60 0: Chi² = 0.31	herapy [YT] <u>SD[pmol/L]</u> 17.53 81 df = 1 (P = 0.5	Total Mear 35 13 48 8): I ² = 0%	Minimal tro [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2	eatment [M SD [pmol/L 47.5 16.2	T] <u>] Total</u> 9 36 2 9 45	Mean Different Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, - 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79, -1	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT ce Mean Difference 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22] 29.09] 2.63]
b) <u>FI</u> <u>Study or Subgroup</u> <u>M</u> Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z =	Yogat lean [pmol/L] 51.58 60 0; Chi ² = 0.31 3.55 (P = 0.0	herapy[YT] <u>SD[pmol/L]</u> 17.53 81 , df = 1 (P = 0.5 004)	Total Mear 35 13 48 8); 1² = 0%	Minimal tro [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2	eatment [M SD [pmol/L 47.59 16.3	T]] Total 9 36 2 9 45	Mean Differen Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, - 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79, -1	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT ce Mean Difference 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22] 2.63] -100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [YT] Favours [MT]
b) <u>FI</u> <u>Study or Subgroup M</u> Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = c) <u>HOMA-IR</u>	Yogat <u>lean [pmol/L]</u> 51.58 60 0; Chi ² = 0.31 3.55 (P = 0.0	therapy [YT] <u>SD[pmol/L]</u> 17.53 81 , df = 1 (P = 0.5 004)	<u>Total Mear</u> 35 13 48 8); I ² = 0%	Minimal tro [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2	eatment [M SD [pmol/L 47.5t 16.2	T] <u>Total</u> 3 36 2 9 45	Mean Differen Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, -11.8% 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2] 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79, -11]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22] 29.09] 2.63] -100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [YT] Favours [MT]
b) <u>FI</u> <u>Study or Subgroup</u> <u>M</u> Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = c) <u>HOMA-IR</u>	Yogat lean [pmol/L] 51.58 60 0; Chi ² = 0.31 3.55 (P = 0.0 Yoga th	therapy[YT] <u>SD[pmol/L]</u> 17.53 81 , df = 1 (P = 0.5 004) herapy[YT]	<u>Total Mear</u> 35 13 48 8); 1 ² = 0% Minimal	Minimal tro [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2 treatmen	eatment [M SD [pmol/L 47.5t 16.2 16.2	T] <u>Total</u> 3 36 2 9 45	Mean Differen Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, - 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79, -1 Mean Difference	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22] 29.09] 2.63] -100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [YT] Favours [MT] Mean Difference
b) <u>FI</u> Study or Subgroup M Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = c) <u>HOMA-IR Study or Subgroup</u>	Yogat lean [pmol/L] 51.58 60 0; Chi ² = 0.31 3.55 (P = 0.0 Yoga th Mean	therapy[YT] <u>SD[pmol/L]</u> 17.53 81 , df = 1 (P = 0.5 004) 1erapy[YT] <u>SD</u> Tota	<u>Total Mear</u> 35 13 48 8); 1² = 0% Minimal al Mean	Minimal tro [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2 treatmen SD	eatment [M SD[pmol/L 47.5t 16.2 t [MT] Total	T] <u>1 Total</u> 9 36 2 9 45 Weight	Mean Differen Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, - 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79, -1 Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22] 29.09] 2.63] -100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [YT] Favours [MT] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
b) Fl Study or Subgroup M Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = C) HOMA-IR Study or Subgroup Nidhi 2012 b N	Yogat lean [pmol/L] 51.58 60 0; Chi² = 0.31 3.55 (P = 0.0 Yogath <u>Mean</u> 1.31	therapy[YT] <u>SD[pmol/L]</u> 17.53 81 , df = 1 (P = 0.5 004) terapy [YT] <u>SD Tota</u> 0.44 3	<u>Total Mear</u> 35 13 48 8); I ² = 0% <u>Minimal</u> al <u>Mean</u> 5 2.16	Minimal tre [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2 treatmen SD 1.28	eatment [M SD[pmol/L 47.5% 16.3 16.3 t [MT] Total 36	T] <u>1 Total</u> 9 36 2 9 45 <u>Weight</u> 94.5%	Mean Different Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, -7 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79, -1 Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.85 [-1.29, -0.41] -0.85 [-1.29, -0.41]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22] 29.09] 2.63] -100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [YT] Favours [MT] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
b) <u>FI</u> Study or Subgroup M Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = c) <u>HOMA-IR</u> <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020	Yogat lean (pmol/L) 51.58 60 0; Chi ² = 0.31 3.55 (P = 0.0 Yogath Mean 1.31 2	therapy [YT] <u>SD[pmol/L]</u> 17.53 81 , df = 1 (P = 0.5 004) therapy [YT] <u>SD</u> Tota 0.44 3 3.27 1	Total Mear 35 13 48 3); 1² = 0% Minimal Mean 5 2.16 3 3	Minimal trr [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2 treatmen SD 1.28 0.66	eatment [M SD[pmol/L 47.5t 16.2 t [MT] <u>Total</u> 36 9	T] <u>Total</u> 3 36 2 9 45 <u>Weight</u> 94.5% 5.5%	Mean Different Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, -1 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79, -1 Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.85 [-1.29, -0.41] -1.00 [-2.83, 0.83]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22] 2.63] -100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [YT] Favours [MT] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
b) <u>FI</u> Study or Subgroup M Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = c) <u>HOMA-IR</u> <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Nidhi 2012 b Patel 2020 Total (95% CI)	Yogat lean (pmol/L) 51.58 60 10; Chi ² = 0.31 3.55 (P = 0.0 Yogath Mean 1.31 2	therapy [YT] <u>SD[pmol/L]</u> 17.53 81 , df = 1 (P = 0.5 004) therapy [YT] <u>SD</u> Tota 0.44 3 3.27 1 4	Total Mear 35 13 48 3); 1² = 0% Minimal Mean 5 2.16 3 3 8	Minimal trr [pmol/L] 81.4 76.2 treatmen SD 1.28 0.66	eatment [M SD[pmol/L 47.5t 16.2 t [MT] Total 36 9 45	T] <u>Total</u> 3 36 2 9 45 <u>Weight</u> 94.5% 5.5% 100.0%	Mean Different Weight IV, Random, 9 88.2% -29.82 [-46.42, -1 11.8% -16.20 [-61.49, 2 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79, -1 100.0% -28.21 [-43.79, -1 Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.85 [-1.29, -0.41] -1.00 [-2.83, 0.83] -0.86 [-1.29, -0.43] -0.86 [-1.29, -0.43]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [YT] Favours [MT 5% Cl IV, Random, 95% Cl 13.22] 2.63] -100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [YT] Favours [MT] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl

Continued

Figure 3. Continued.

) BMI										
., <u>Dim</u>										
	Yogat	herapy [Y]	1	1	Ainimal 1	treatment [MT]		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean [kg/m2]	SD [kg/m	2] Tota	al Mean	[kg/m2]	SD [kg/m2	2] Tota	al Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Random, 95% CI
Nidhi 2012 b	20.11	1.	74 3	5	21.59	2.7	8 3	6 83.4%	-1.48 [-2.56, -0.40] 🛨
Patel 2020	34.7		2 1	3	35.6	3.	.3	9 16.6%	-0.90 [-3.31, 1.51	1 -
Total (95% CI)			4	8			4	5 100.0%	-1.38 [-2.37, -0.40]	1 ◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	0.00; Chi ² = 0.1	8, df = 1 (P	= 0.67);	² = 0%						
est for overall effect: Z	z = 2.76 (P = 0.	006)								-10 -5 0 5 Eavoure IVTL Eavoure IMT
) WHR										
	Vogath	erapyIVT	1 1	linimalt	reatme	nt [MT]		Mean F	ifference	Mean Difference
Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD .	I III	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV Ran	dom 95% Cl	IV Random 95% Cl
	0.70	0.04	25	0.70	0.05	200	24.00/	0.00		
Nichi 2012 D	0.70	0.04	30	0.70	0.05	30	54.9% GE 10/	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	
Palei 2020	-0.0319	0.015	15 -0	0.0114	0.02	9	05.1%	-0.02	-0.04, -0.01]	-
Total (95% CI)			48			45	100.0%	-0.02	-0.03, -0.01]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.00; Chi ² =	= 0.00, df =	= 1 (P = (),97); l ² :	= 0%				+	the last of
Test for overall effec	t: Z = 3.21 (P	= 0.001)							-0.1	-0.05 0 0.05 0.1
										Favours [Y1] Favours [W1]
Quality of life o	utcome									
Anxiety level										
	Yogathe	erapy [YT]	Mi	nimal tr	eatmen	t [MT]		Std. Mear	Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	otal I	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Ran	dom, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% CI
Nidhi 2012 a	46.39	7.28	37 4	47.21	6.99	35	77.2%	-0.11	[-0.58, 0.35]	
Patel 2020	-11.3	2.1	13	-10.9	2.2	9	22.8%	-0.18	[-1.03, 0.67]	
fotal (95% CI)			50			44	100.0%	-0.13	[-0.54, 0.28]	•
					and the second					

significant improvement in menstrual cycle regularity (P < .001) after 3 months of YT intervention along with Siddha medication among females suffering from PCOS.

The effect of YT intervention on biochemical hyperandrogenism (in the form of androgen excess) was reported for different endocrine hormones and showed reduction in serum and total testosterone, dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate, LH, and AMH levels of participants in the intervention group. A clinical trial conducted on females with PCOS reported significant decrease in LH level (P < .001) after 3 months of YT intervention.¹⁸ Also, a RCT reported significant decrease in levels of LH (P = .006), testosterone (P = .003), and AMH (P = .004) in females with PCOS after 3 months of YT along with Ayurveda treatment.¹⁹

This meta-analysis assessed the effect of YT intervention on clinical features of hyperandrogenism, mainly hirsutism, in the form of reduction in mFG scores. Findings of metaanalysis are suggestive of beneficial effect of YT in reducing hirsutism. This is consistent with the results of latest Cochrane review²⁰ on lifestyle changes in women with PCOS which suggests that lifestyle treatment may improve biochemical and clinical hyperandrogenism which is in agreement with recommendations of international ESHRE-2018 guidelines for PCOS.¹

Metabolic Outcomes. In terms of metabolic outcomes, the included trials showed positive effects of YT in reduction of levels of FBG, FI, and HOMA-IR. The results are similar to the findings of another study conducted in India which reported significant reduction in these metabolic outcomes (P < .01) after 12 weeks of YT intervention.²¹ A clinical trial conducted on females with PCOS reported significant decrease in post-prandial blood sugar (PPBS) level (P < .001) after 3 months of YT

Та	ble 7.																										
S	mparison	n of Health Ou	utcon	les.																							
													Outco	mes													
			Me	nstrual c regularit	y		mFG score	c)		FBG			Ξ		ЭН	MA-IR va	alue		BMI			WHR			Anxiety le	javel	
#	Study, year	Group	E	Mean change	٩	=	Mean change	٩	=	Mean change	Α	=	Mean change	٩	E	Mean change	٩	=	Mean change	٩	=	Mean change	Ρ	=	Mean change	Ρ	
-	Patel et al, ¹⁴ 2020	Yoga therapy				13	0 + 0	.95	13	↓.09 ± .11	.387	13	↓6 ± 69.55	.824	13	↓.3 ± 2.31	.693	13	↓.3 ± 1.95	.38	13	L.013 ± .016	.32	13	↓3.1 ± 2.59	.037	
		No intervention				6	0 ± .6	66.	6	↑.16 ± .21	.403	6	↓12.6 ± 20.12	.328	6	↓.48 ± .86	.382	6	↑.2 ± 3.3	.40	6	1111 ±.02	.34	6	↓1.1 ± 2.57	.633	
5	Nidhi et al, ¹² 2012	Yoga therapy	37	↑.89 ± .66	.049	37	↓1.14 ± 1.44	.002		↓.24 ± .39	<.001	35	↓9.04 ± 32.21	<:001	35	↓.38 ± .92	<.05	35	↓.11 ± .51	.32	35	J.01 ± 05	.53	35	↓14.97 ± 9.87	.002	
		Exercise	35	.49 ± ↑.98		35	↑.06 ± 1.15			↑.04 ± .44	.47	36	↑11.09 ± 56.85	<.001	36	↑.29 ± 1.56	.19	36	↑.31 ± 1.63	.66	36 () ± .05	.42	36	↓7.42 ± 7.57		
Abt	previations:	: mFG, modified	l Ferrir	nan-Gallw	vey; FB	3G, fas	sting blood	glucos	е; Еl,	fasting in:	sulin; HC	I-AM	R, homeost	tatic mo	del a:	ssessment	-insulir	n resi	stance; BMI	, bod	v mas	s index; \	WHR,	waist	-to-hip rati	O	

intervention.¹⁸ An RCT reported significant decrease in HbA1C level (P = .017) in females with PCOS after 3 months of YT along with Ayurveda treatment.¹⁹ Also, another study similarly reported significant improvement in metabolic outcomes (FBG, PPBS, and HbA1C) (P < .001) of study participants after 3 months of YT intervention.²² This is consistent with the evidence-based recommendation of ESHRE-2018 guidelines¹ that multicomponent lifestyle intervention should be recommended in all those with PCOS and excess weight, for reductions in weight, central obesity, and insulin resistance.

erican Journal of Lifestyle M

Similarly, changes in lipid profile after YT intervention was reported in only one¹³ of the studies included in meta-analysis which reported significant improvement in lipid profile of participants in the intervention group. A clinical trial conducted on females with PCOS reported significant decrease in cholesterol level (P <.001) after 3 months of YT intervention.¹⁸ A similar trial reported significant improvement in lipid profile (P < .001) of study participants after 3 months of YT intervention.²²

Anthropometric Outcomes.

Anthropometric outcomes including BMI and WHR were found to be modestly affected by YT intervention provided in the studies included in meta-analysis. This is consistent with the findings of other studies^{15,17,19,23} which assessed the effect of YT intervention and reported slight reduction in BMI and WHR of participants. This may be due to presence of heterogeneity in baseline anthropometric parameters of included participants across studies. Only one clinical trial reported significant reduction in BMI (p < .001) of study participants after 3 months of YT intervention.²²

Quality of Life Outcomes. Both studies included in meta-analysis \reported significant improvement in quality of life as measured by level of anxiety or depression. A study which evaluated the effect of 4 months of YT intervention along with brisk walking on PCOS risk reduction also reported similar finding.¹⁵ Similarly, a clinical trial reported significant change in level of depression (p < .01) among study participants after 1 month of YT intervention.²⁴ Also, a RCT reported significant decrease in level of anxiety and depression (p < .001) in females with PCOS after 3 months of YT along with Ayurveda treatment.¹⁹ Similar findings were reported in latest Cochrane review²⁰ which suggests that lifestyle intervention may improve quality of life scores in the domains of emotions and infertility in women with PCOS. This is consistent with the clinical consensus recommendations ESHRE-2018 guidelines¹ that lifestyle interventions could include behavioral strategies to optimize weight management, healthy lifestyle, and emotional well-being in women with PCOS.

Strengths and Limitations

This systematic review and metaanalysis add to the knowledge about effects of YT on health outcomes of women with PCOS. YT encompasses all domains of lifestyle modification, that is, diet, exercise, and behavioral modifications. Published reviews on the effect of lifestyle modification on PCOS also include studies with YT as an intervention, but the need for this systematic review is supported by the fact that sufficient number of research studies have been published which exclusively assess the effect of YT on PCOS. Hence, to the best of author(s)' knowledge, this study is the first and most updated and

comprehensive data analysis on this topic.

This review is, however, limited by the fact that only two RCTs could be included in meta-analysis as inclusion of other non-RCT studies could result in high heterogeneity in results due to varying study designs. The sample size of both included studies was not large enough and the participants could not be blinded due to intervention characteristics. However, the objective outcomes including menstrual cycles, clinical hyperandrogenism, FBG, FI, HOMA-IR, BMI, and WHR were unaffected by the lack of blinding of participants.

Research Recommendations

More well-designed randomized clinical trials for participants of varied age groups with diverse control group interventions, sufficient sample size, and longer follow-up duration need to be conducted to assess the efficacy of YT as a form of complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) treatment for PCOS. As hormonal profile varies considerably among women of different age groups, efficacy of YT intervention should be assessed likewise. For development of standard YT intervention pertaining to a specific health problem, studies of differing duration with variety of YT interventions comprising a combination of asana (physical posture), pranayama (breathing exercise) and dhyana (meditation technique) will apprise the development of clinical guidelines relating to the use of YT as treatment for a range of reproductive health problems.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this systematic review and meta-analysis, YT may have beneficial effects on some reproductive (menstrual cycle regularity and clinical hyperandrogenism), metabolic (FBG, FI, and HOMA-IR), and anthropometric (BMI and WHR) health outcomes in women suffering from PCOS. Effect of YT on other health outcomes of women with PCOS could not be assessed due to insufficient number of studies. Based on these preliminary results, YT may be suggested as a safer and affordable form of CAM treatment for PCOS. Further, more clinical trials are warranted in order to strengthen the therapeutic role of YT for PCOS.

/ol. 17 • no. 1

Author Contributions

AV and VS were involved in defining research question and the study design of the review. AV and VU were involved in conducting search strategy and assessing eligibility of studies for inclusion. AV, VU, and VS were involved in extracting and analyzing data, assessing quality of studies, drafting manuscript, and critical discussion. All authors read and approved the final version of manuscript.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iDs

Anita Verma (0) https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6250-2335 Vikas Upadhyay (0) https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5074-1494

Supplementary Material

Supplementary material for this article is available online.

References

1. Teede H, Misso M, Costello M, et al. International evidence-based guideline for the assessment and management of polycystic ovary syndrome. *Fertil Steril.* 2018;110(3): 364-379.

- Anagnostis P, Tarlatzis BC, Kauffman RP. Polycystic ovarian syndrome: Long-term metabolic consequences. *Metabolism.* 2018;86:33-43. doi:10. 1016/j.metabol.2017.09.016.
- 3. Neven A, Laven J, Teede H, Boyle J. A summary on polycystic ovary syndrome: Diagnostic criteria, prevalence, clinical manifestations, and management according to the latest international guidelines. *Semin Reprod Med.* 2018;36(1):005-012. doi:10.1055/s-0038-1668085.
- Deeks AA, Gibson-Helm ME, Paul E, Teede HJ. Is having polycystic ovary syndrome a predictor of poor psychological function including anxiety and depression? *Hum Reprod.* 2011;26(6):1399-1407. doi:10.1093/ humrep/der071.
- Teede H, Deeks A, Moran L. Polycystic ovary syndrome: A complex condition with psychological, reproductive and metabolic manifestations that impacts on health across the lifespan. *BMC Med.* 2010;8:41. doi:10.1186/1741-7015-8-41.
- Sat Bir K, Cohen L, McCall Timothy TS. *The Principles and Practice of Yoga in Health Care*. 1st ed. Scotland, UK: Handspring Publishing Limited; 2016.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71.
- Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I. RoB 2: A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2019;366:14898. doi:10.1136/bmj.14898.
- Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, et al. ROBINS-I: A tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ*. 2016;355:i4919. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4919.
- GRADEpro GDT: GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool [Software]. 2020. gradepro.org.
- Nidhi R, Padmalatha V, Nagarathna R, Amritanshu R. Effect of yoga program on quality of life in adolescent polycystic ovarian syndrome: a randomized control trial. *Appl Res Qual Life*. 2013;8(3): 373-383. doi:10.1007/s11482-012-9191-9.
- 12. Nidhi R, Padmalatha V, Nagarathna R, Ram A. Effect of a yoga program on

glucose metabolism and blood lipid levels in adolescent girls with polycystic ovary syndrome. *Int J Gynecol Obstet*. 2012;118(1):37-41. doi: 10.1016/j.ijgo.2012.01.027.

- 13. Nidhi R, Padmalatha V, Nagarathna R, Amritanshu R. Effects of a holistic yoga program on endocrine parameters in adolescents with polycystic ovarian syndrome: A randomized controlled trial. *J Alternative Compl Med*. 2013;19(2): 153-160. doi:10.1089/acm.2011. 0868.
- Patel V, Menezes H, Menezes C, Bouwer S, Bostick-Smith CA, Speelman DL. Regular mindful yoga practice as a method to improve androgen levels in women with polycystic ovary syndrome: A randomized, controlled trial. *J Osteopath Med.* 2020;120(5): 323-335. doi:10.7556/jaoa.2020. 050.
- Selvaraj V, Vanitha J, Dhanaraj FM, Sekar P, Babu AR. Impact of yoga and exercises on polycystic ovarian syndrome risk among adolescent schoolgirls in South India. *Health Science Reports*. 2020;3(4):e212. doi: 10.1002/hsr2.212.
- Bahrami H, Mohseni M, Amini LKZ. The effect of six weeks yoga exercises on quality of life in infertile women with polycystic ovary syndrome. *Iran J Obstet Gynecol Infertil*. 2019;22(5): 18-26. http://ijogi.mums.ac.ir/article_ 13578.html.
- Shalini B, Mirunaleni P, Suresh K, Sundharam MM, Banumathi V. The effect of Siddha Internal Medicine with Asanam & Varmam on Sinaipaineerkatti (PCOS)-a case series. *World J Pharm Res.* 2019; 8(2):1122-1129. doi:10.20959/ wjpr20192-14112.
- Shanthi S, Perumal K. Kayakalpa yoga, a treasure hunt for women with PCOS and infertility: a pilot trial. *Res Rev A J Unani, Siddha Homeopath*. 2015;1(3): 12-23.
- Rao V, Metri K, Rao SNR. Improvement in biochemical and psychopathologies in women having PCOS through yoga combined with herbal detoxification. *J Stem Cells*. 2018;13(4):213-222.
- Lim SS, Hutchison SK, Van Ryswyk E, Norman RJ, Teede HJ, Moran LJ. Lifestyle changes in women with polycystic ovary syndrome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2019;

3(3):CD007506. doi:10.1002/ 14651858.CD007506.pub4.

- Verma A, Gandhi A, Gautam S, Biswas R, Jain AMS. Effect of yoga on insulin resistance in PCOS patients. *Indian J Physiol Pharmacol.* 2017;61(5): 193-194.
- 22. Vanitha A, Pandiaraja M, Maheshkumar KVS. Effect of yoga nidra on resting

cardiovascular parameters in polycystic ovarian syndrome women. *Natl J Physiol Pharm Pharmacol.* 2018; 8(9):1505. doi:10.5455/njppp.2018.8. 0411112082018.

23. Ratnakumari M, Manavalan N, Sathyanath D, Ayda Y, Reka K. Study to evaluate the changes in polycystic ovarian morphology after naturopathic and yogic interventions *Int J Yoga*. 2018; 11(2):139-147. doi:10.4103/ijoy.IJOY.

 Sode JA, Bhardwaj MA. Effect of yoga on level of depression among females suffering from polycystic ovarian syndrome. *Int J Arts Manag Humanit*. 2017;6(2):178-181. https://pdfs. semanticscholar.org/7154/c114c4eccbf04f 2a0444b88b789c1423b77d.pdf.