

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Effects of physical exercise during pregnancy on mothers' health: a protocol for an umbrella review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-030162
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	04-Mar-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Sanabria-Martínez, Gema; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha - Campus de Cuenca; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha - Campus de Cuenca Poyatos-León, Raquel; Servicio de Salud de Castilla-La Mancha, Hospital Virgen de la Luz, Cuenca Notario-Pachezo, Blanca; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha - Campus de Cuenca Álvarez-Bueno, Celia; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Health and Social Research Center Cavero-Redondo, Iván; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Health and Social Research Center Martinez-Vizcaino, Vicente; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Centro de Estudios Sociosanitarios
Keywords:	Exercise, Physical activity, Pregnancy, Pregnancy outcomes, Protocol

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Effects of physical exercise during pregnancy on mothers' health: a protocol**
4 **for an umbrella review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials**
5
6
7

8 **Authors and affiliations:**
9

10 Gema Sanabria-Mártínez,¹ Raquel Poyatos-León,¹ Blanca Notario-Pacheco,¹ Celia
11 Álvarez-Bueno,¹ Iván Caverero-Redondo,^{1*} Vicente Martínez-Vizcaíno.^{1,2}
12
13
14

15 ¹Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Health and Social Research Center, Cuenca,
16 Spain; ² Universidad Autónoma de Chile, Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Chile
17
18
19

20 ***Correspondence to:**
21

22 Iván Caverero-Redondo.
23

24 Author's address: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. c/ Santa Teresa Jornet, s/n,
25 16002. Cuenca. Spain.
26

27 Email: Ivan.Caverero@uclm.es
28

29 Telephone number: +34 969 17 91 00 ext: 4690
30
31
32

33 **Word count:** 2391
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Introduction

A growing interest has emerged on the effects of exercise during gestation. Several systematic reviews and meta-analyses have showed that prenatal exercise could reduce the mothers' risk for some disorders. Despite this, evidence regarding the risk of cesarean section, birth weight or Apgar score at delivery is still controversial. Furthermore, practitioners are reluctant to recommend exercise to pregnant women suffering from some disorders, such as hypertension or preeclampsia, or to obese pregnant women. Moreover, the scarcity of studies addressing the risk and benefits of exercise at higher intensity prevents practitioners from recommending it at higher dosages. Umbrella reviews represent an appropriate design to elucidate the reasons behind the contradictory findings of previous systematic reviews, and to provide clinicians an overall assessment of the evidence on effects of exercise during pregnancy on mothers' health.

Methods

This protocol was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) and the Cochrane Collaboration Handbook. Medline, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane database of systematic reviews, Epistemonikos, Prospero register and SPORTDiscuss databases will be searched to identify systematic reviews, meta-analyses and randomized controlled trials that examine the effect of exercise on pregnancy outcomes.

Statistical analysis

Methodological quality will be evaluated using the AMSTAR 2 tool. The certainty of evidence and strength of recommendations for meta-analyses will be assessed by the GRADE framework. The summary effect sizes will be calculated through the use of random and fixed-effects models. Heterogeneity among studies will be assessed using the I^2 statistic, and evidence of excess significance bias and evidence of small study effects will also be evaluated.

Ethics and dissemination

Ethical approval will not be needed for this review protocol because data will be extracted from published studies and there will be no concerns about privacy.

Trial registration number: CRD42019123410

Key words: Exercise; Physical activity; Pregnancy; Pregnancy outcomes; Protocol.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This protocol aims to overcome the lack of evidence about the effect of exercise on overweight and obese pregnant women.
- We aim to elucidate the safety and benefits of physical activity at intensity levels significantly higher than the moderate-intensity usually recommended.
- This umbrella review will provide a definitive support to the evidence to recommend exercise during pregnancy in some prevalent disorders, such as hypertension of pregnancy, preeclampsia or gestational diabetes.
- The main anticipated limitations include the low-medium quality level of some studies.
- Heterogeneity among the included studies could lead to bias in the results. Therefore, a random-effects model will be considered for medium-high heterogeneity reviews.

BACKGROUND

The need for this work

Regular physical exercise (PE) is associated with physical, psychological and social benefits in the general population.[1] In recent years, a growing interest has emerged on the beneficial effects of PE during gestation.[2–4] In fact, professional associations of obstetricians and gynecologists [5] and, more recently, international guidelines for physical activity (PA) [1,6] endorse PE throughout the gestational period recommending pregnant women to accumulate at least 150 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic activity per week, distributed over at least 3 days a week. However, being active every day is the most beneficial for maternal health.[5,7]

This evidence comes from several systematic reviews and meta-analyses supporting that prenatal exercise, besides benefiting newborn infants, could reduce the mothers' risk for some disorders, such as gestational diabetes mellitus, excessive maternal weight gain, preeclampsia and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, incontinence urinary or postpartum depression.[3,4,8,9] Furthermore, maternal PE reduces cesarean delivery rates in healthy pregnant women.[10] Despite this, less than 15% of pregnant women follow the physical activity recommendations.[11,12] Moreover, although numerous systematic reviews and meta-analyses have addressed the effects of PE on maternal health, evidence regarding the risk of cesarean section, birth weight or Apgar score at delivery is still controversial. In this sense, a recent systematic review and meta-analysis [13] did not find a significant association between prenatal exercise and the risk of cesarean section, while two meta-analyses indicated a decrease in the risk of cesarean delivery among pregnant women who exercised.[10,14] Likewise, another meta-analysis concluded that prenatal PE was not associated with birth weight or Apgar score at delivery,[15] whereas two previous meta-analyses supported that newborns of mothers who were active during pregnancy had a lower weight within the normal range and higher Apgar scores than their counterparts.[16,17]

If this happens when dealing with healthy pregnant women, it is not surprising that practitioners are reluctant to recommend exercise to pregnant women suffering

1
2
3 from some disorders, such as hypertension or preeclampsia, since guidelines
4 include these disorders as absolute or relative contraindications to exercising
5 during pregnancy.[5] Similarly, the PE recommendation for overweight and obese
6 pregnant women continues to be a debatable issue due to the low quality of evidence
7 regarding its benefits.[2]
8
9

10
11 Finally, the safety or additional benefits for pregnancy and fetus health of vigorous
12 exercise are widely debated, since although consistent evidence supports the
13 beneficial effects of moderate PE in healthy pregnant women, the scarcity of studies
14 addressing the risk and benefits of exercise at higher intensity prevents
15 practitioners from recommending PE at higher dosages in terms of frequency,
16 duration or intensity than the recommended in clinical guidelines.[2,6]
17
18

19 Therefore, considering the myriad of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of
20 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) addressing the impact of exercise during
21 pregnancy on different maternal health outcomes, and the contradictory findings of
22 these previous reviews, umbrella reviews represent an appropriate design to
23 elucidate the reasons behind the conflicting findings of previous systematic reviews,
24 and to provide clinicians and policymakers with an overall assessment of the
25 evidence on this issue, which is necessary for both practitioners and pregnant
26 women.[18]
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **OBJECTIVES**

39
40
41 This umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses aims to provide an
42 overview of the effect of PE during pregnancy on mothers' health. Additionally, an
43 updated meta-analysis of RCTs will be performed in order to assess the effect of PE
44 interventions on some pregnancy outcomes for which new RCTs have been
45 published and not included in previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

55
56
57 This protocol was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for
58 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) and the Cochrane
59
60

1
2
3 Collaboration Handbook,[19,20] and has been registered in the PROSPERO database
4 (registration number: CRD42019123410).
5
6
7

8 **Search strategy**

9

10 **Screening and selection**

11

12
13
14
15 Two investigators will independently and systematically search the following
16 databases, from inception to April 2019, in order to identify systematic reviews and
17 meta-analyses evaluating the effect of PE on mothers' health: Medline, EMBASE,
18 Web of Science, Cochrane database of systematic reviews, Epistemonikos, Prospero
19 register and SPORTDiscuss. Furthermore, these databases will be screened to
20 search for eligible RCTs published subsequently to the date the latest systematic
21 review was conducted. The references of eligible reviews will also be manually
22 searched. Study records will be managed through the use of the Mendeley reference
23 manager.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The search strategy will be conducted following the PICO components (see the
31 search strategy in Tables 1 and 2).
32
33
34
35

36 **Inclusion/exclusion criteria for study selection**

37

38
39 The inclusion criteria for this umbrella review will be: (i) systematic reviews
40 and meta-analyses of RCTs; (ii) RCTs not included in the most recently published
41 systematic reviews selected for the umbrella review; (iii) control groups receiving
42 no type of PE intervention and; (iv) studies written in any language.
43
44
45

46 Reviews that did not systematically search the literature or not providing
47 comprehensive data from individual studies will be excluded. Whenever more than
48 one meta-analysis on the same outcome is eligible, the one with the largest number
49 of included studies will be selected, but a sensitivity analysis will be conducted in
50 order to assess concordance in the pooled estimates in terms of magnitude and
51 direction of their duplicate analyses.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Participants

Women without absolute or relative contraindications to exercise as defined by the 2015 American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' recommendations for physical activity and exercise during pregnancy and the postpartum period.[5]

Types of intervention

PE programs including any level of exercise intensity will be considered. When a meta-analysis includes studies with an extra intervention, such as a nutritional or behavioral intervention, only information on RCTs with the PE intervention alone will be extracted.

Types of outcome measures

Pregnancy outcomes that will be included in this umbrella review and update of RCTs are:

1. Gestational diabetes mellitus;
2. Hypertensive disorders of pregnancy;
3. Gestational weight gain;
4. Type of delivery;
5. Postpartum depression;
6. Postpartum weight retention;
7. Abortion;
8. Maternal mortality.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Selection of studies and data extraction

First, record titles and abstracts will be independently evaluated to identify eligible studies according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Then, the full-texts of

1
2
3 possible eligible studies will be comprehensively reviewed by two investigators (GS-
4 M and RP-L). Disagreements will be solved by consensus between them, but if
5 disagreements persist, a third investigator will solve the conflict (BN-P). The two
6 investigators will extract data (authorship, date, study characteristics, type of
7 exercise, main outcome and quality assessment tool) from each included study. Data
8 extraction forms have been designed had hoc (Additional file 1 and 2).
9 Corresponding authors will be contacted when there are missing data or to clarify
10 unclear information.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Assessment of risk of bias and methodological quality of included studies**

20
21
22 The methodological quality of the included systematic reviews and meta-analyses
23 will be evaluated using the AMSTAR 2 tool,[21] which was developed and validated
24 to critically assess the quality of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. This
25 instrument includes 16 criteria referring to relevant methodological aspects of
26 studies. The quality of studies will be classified, according to the number of
27 approved criteria, as follows: excellent, 15-16; very good, 12-14; good, 9-11;
28 acceptable, 6-8; and deficient, 3-5.
29
30
31
32
33

34 The risk of bias (quality) for the RCTs selected for the updated systematic review
35 and meta-analysis will be assessed following the Cochrane Collaboration's
36 methodology. This tool is based on eight potential sources of bias: random sequence
37 generation; allocation concealment; blinding of participants, of the evaluator, of the
38 outcome assessment; incomplete outcome data; missing data and other.
39
40
41
42

43 Finally, the certainty of evidence and strength of recommendations for meta-
44 analyses will be assessed using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment,
45 Development and Evaluation (GRADE). This tool provides a rating of "high",
46 "moderate", "low" or "very low" quality, and will provide a "weak" or "strong"
47 recommendation. This will be accomplished using the GRADEpro software, and
48 output tables will be added.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Data analysis

Tables will be designed to summarize the key characteristics of the included studies. Additionally, forest plots will be used to show results extracted from each meta-analysis.

Assessment of summary effects and heterogeneity

For each meta-analysis, the summary meta-analytic estimates and corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) will be calculated using both fixed- and random-effects models.[22,23] The 95% prediction intervals will also be estimated for the summary random-effects estimates, which will account for the between-study heterogeneity and as well as explaining the uncertainty for the effect that could be expected if a new study examines the same association.[24–26] Thus, this 95% prediction interval indicates the range where the true effect is expected for 95% of studies from the population of the included studies in the meta-synthesis or similar studies potentially conducted in the future. Additionally, for the largest RCT of each meta-analysis, the standard deviation of the effect size will be calculated and scrutinized if the standard deviation is less than 0.10. When meta-analyses have continuous data, the estimated effect will be converted to their equivalent ORs using accepted calculation strategies. For other measures, such as the mean difference or the risk difference, a few general estimations will be needed, such as, Glass' Δ or RR, respectively.[27,28]

Among-study heterogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 statistic[29]. Usually, I^2 ranges between values of <25%, 25–50%, 50-75% and >75% which represent small, medium, large or very large amounts of heterogeneity, respectively[25]. The corresponding p-values will also be considered. Studies with insufficient data to perform the analyses will be omitted from the data synthesis. When substantial heterogeneity will prevent the calculation of pooled estimates of outcomes, a systematic review or narrative synthesis will be undertaken.

Whenever possible, a meta-analysis will be conducted including the most recent RCTs on this issue not included in previous meta-analyses, and pooled effect size estimates were calculated with their 95% CIs. Additionally, new subgroup analyses

1
2
3 will be conducted using data from the original meta-analyses based on the main
4 factors that may cause heterogeneity, such as type of exercise, length of
5 intervention, exercise intensity level, and obesity and overweight vs normal weight
6 pregnant women. For outcomes of studies where a meta-analysis will not be
7 possible, a narrative synthesis of the results will be presented.
8
9
10
11
12

13 **Small studies effect assessment**

14
15
16
17 Small study effects usually indicate publication or other reporting biases, although
18 these effects may also reflect chance, genuine heterogeneity or other differences
19 between large and small studies[30] . The existence of a potential small study effect
20 will be assessed, thus if small studies tend to show larger estimates of effect size in
21 contrast to larger studies, using the regression asymmetry Egger's test for
22 continuous outcomes, and Harbord's test for dichotomous ones. A P value lower
23 than 0.10 will be used to show evidence of small-study effects.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Excess of significance evaluation**

32
33
34
35 The excess significance test will be used to evaluate whether the observed number
36 of studies (O) included in each meta-analysis with statistically significant results
37 (positive studies, $P < 0.05$) is different than the expected number of studies with
38 significant results (E).[31] The effect size of the largest study (smallest standard
39 error) in a meta-analysis will be used to calculate the statistical power of each
40 component study.[32] Furthermore, the largest study effect will be assumed to be
41 the true effect. A two-sided $P < 0.10$ will be considered.
42
43
44
45
46

47 Then, the comparison between the observed and the expected number of studies will
48 be done separately for each meta-analysis, and it will be amplified to groups
49 including many meta-analyses when the observed and the expected values from
50 each meta-analysis will be summed.
51
52
53

54 All statistical analyses and power calculations will be performed using STATA 15.1
55 software (College Station, Texas, USA).
56
57
58
59
60

DISCUSSION

Concluding remarks

A positive effect of PE on some pregnancy outcomes has been reported more or less consistently by recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses.[2–4,9,16] This umbrella review is expected to provide a comprehensive and rigorous review of the reported evidence regarding the influence of prenatal exercise on maternal health by synthesizing the results of previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses, and conducting an updated meta-analysis of RCTs.

The proposed umbrella review has several strengths. First, this protocol aims to overcome the lack of evidence about the effect of PE on overweight and obese pregnant women; for this, a subgroup analysis with these groups of women will be carried out. Secondly, we aim to elucidate the safety and benefits of physical activity at intensity levels significantly higher than the moderate-intensity usually recommended. Finally, this umbrella review will provide a definitive support to the evidence to recommend PE during pregnancy in some prevalent disorders, such as hypertension of pregnancy, preeclampsia or gestational diabetes.

Strengths and limitations

The main anticipated limitations of this umbrella review include the low-medium quality level of some studies due to small sample sizes or non-blinded data extraction. Furthermore, pregnant women who participate in these studies are volunteers, so they usually have higher levels of compliance than pregnant women from the general population. Thus, these facts could be potential sources of bias. Another potential limitation would be the heterogeneity among the included studies that could lead to bias in the results. Therefore, a random-effects model will be considered for medium-high heterogeneity reviews. Further, we will be cautious when conducting sensitivity analyses based on methodological quality, analysis and interpretation of the results.

Ethics and dissemination

Ethical approval will not be needed for this review protocol because data will be extracted from published studies and there will be no concerns about privacy. The best way to disseminate information will be through publishing the results of this umbrella review in a peer-reviewed international journal interested in improving clinical practices with scientific evidence.

Consequently, this umbrella review will have important clinical and public health implications, because it will aim to provide support for recommendations to advise mothers to engage in PE programs as an effective and safe strategy to experience healthier pregnancies, especially in populations at risk in their pregnancies, such as overweight or obese women and those with hypertensive disorders of pregnancy.

Author contributons

VM-V and GS-M designed the study. VM-V is the principal investigator and guarantor. RP-L, GS-M and VM-V are the main coordinators of the protocol. GS-M, RP-L, BN-P and IC-R will conduct the study. IC-R, VM-V and CA-B will provide statistical and epidemiological support. GS-M wrote this protocol manuscript with the support of VM-V, RP-L and BN-P. All the authors revised and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

This protocol was funded by the Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes- Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha and FEDER funds (SBPLY/17/180501/000533).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

COMPETING INTERESTS

None declared.

DATA SHARING

Extra data is available by emailing: Ivan.Cavero@uclm.es

TRANSPARENCY

The manuscripts guarantor (GS-M) affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

For peer review only

REFERENCES

- 1 AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SPORTS MEDICINE Lippincott Williams & Wilkins. *ACSM's guidelines for exercise testing and prescription*. 2013.
- 2 Davies GAL, Wolfe LA, Mottola MF, *et al*. No. 129-Exercise in Pregnancy and the Postpartum Period. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* 2018;**40**:e58–65. doi:10.1016/j.jogc.2017.11.001
- 3 Davenport MH, Ruchat S-M, Poitras VJ, *et al*. Prenatal exercise for the prevention of gestational diabetes mellitus and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2018;**52**:1367–75. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099355
- 4 Sanabria-Martínez G, García-Hermoso A, Poyatos-León R, *et al*. Effectiveness of physical activity interventions on preventing gestational diabetes mellitus and excessive maternal weight gain: a meta-analysis. *BJOG* 2015;**122**:1167–74. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.13429
- 5 Physical activity and exercise during pregnancy and the postpartum period. Committee Opinion No. 650. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. *Obs Gynecol* 2015;**126**:e135–42.
- 6 Bø K, Artal R, Barakat R, *et al*. Exercise and pregnancy in recreational and elite athletes : 2016 / 2017 evidence summary from the IOC expert group meeting , Lausanne . Part 5 . Recommendations for health professionals and active women. *Br J Sport Med* 2018;**52**:1080–5. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099351
- 7 Mottola MF, Davenport MH, Ruchat S-M, *et al*. No. 367-2019 Canadian Guideline for Physical Activity throughout Pregnancy. *J Obstet Gynaecol Canada* 2018;**40**:1339–46. doi:10.1016/j.jogc.2018.07.001
- 8 Davenport MH, Nagpal TS, Mottola MF, *et al*. Prenatal exercise (including but not limited to pelvic floor muscle training) and urinary incontinence during and following pregnancy : a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sport Med* 2018;**52**:1397–404. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099780
- 9 Poyatos-León R, García-Hermoso A, Sanabria-Martínez G, *et al*. Effects of exercise-based interventions on postpartum depression: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Birth* 2017;**44**:200–8. doi:10.1111/birt.12294
- 10 Poyatos-León R, García-Hermoso A, Sanabria-Martínez G, *et al*. Effects of exercise during pregnancy on mode of delivery: A meta-analysis. *Acta Obstet*

- 1
2
3 *Gynecol Scand* 2015;**94**. doi:10.1111/aogs.12675
4
- 5 11 Evenson KR, Wen F. Prevalence and correlates of objectively measured
6 physical activity and sedentary behavior among US pregnant women. *Prev*
7 *Med (Baltim)* 2011;**53**:39–43. doi:10.1016/J.YPMED.2011.04.014
8
9
- 10 12 Santo EC, Forbes PW, Oken E, *et al.* Determinants of physical activity
11 frequency and provider advice during pregnancy. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*
12 2017;**17**:286. doi:10.1186/s12884-017-1460-z
13
14
- 15 13 Davenport MH, Ruchat S, Sobierajski F, *et al.* Impact of prenatal exercise on
16 maternal harms , labour and delivery outcomes : a systematic review and
17 meta-analysis. *Br J Sport Med* 2019;**53**:99–107. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-
18 099821
19
20
21
- 22 14 Di Mascio D, Magro-Malosso ER, Saccone G, *et al.* Exercise during pregnancy
23 in normal-weight women and risk of preterm birth: a systematic review and
24 meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*
25 2016;**215**:561–71. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.06.014
26
27
28
- 29 15 Davenport MH, Meah VL, Ruchat S-M, *et al.* Impact of prenatal exercise on
30 neonatal and childhood outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br*
31 *J Sports Med* 2018;**52**:1386 LP-1396.
32
33
- 34 16 Sanabria-Martínez G, García-Hermoso A, Poyatos-León R, *et al.* Effects of
35 Exercise-Based Interventions on Neonatal Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis of
36 Randomized Controlled Trials. *Am J Heal Promot* 2016;**30**.
37 doi:10.1177/0890117116639569
38
39
40
- 41 17 da Silva SG, Ricardo LI, Evenson KR, *et al.* Leisure-Time Physical Activity in
42 Pregnancy and Maternal-Child Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-
43 Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials and Cohort Studies. *Sport. Med.*
44 2017;**47**:295–317. doi:10.1007/s40279-016-0565-2
45
46
47
- 48 18 Vargas C De, Coll N, Domingues MR, *et al.* Efficacy of Regular Exercise During
49 Pregnancy on the Prevention of Postpartum Depression The PAMELA
50 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2019;**2**:1–12.
51 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.6861
52
53
- 54 19 Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic
55 review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Rev Esp*
56 *Nutr Humana y Diet* 2016;**350**:148–60. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20 Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, *et al.* The Cochrane
4 Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised
5 trials. *BMJ* 2011;**343**. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928
6
7
8 21 Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, *et al.* AMSTAR 2: A critical appraisal tool for
9 systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of
10 healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ* 2017;**358**:1–9. doi:10.1136/bmj.j4008
11
12 22 DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials*
13 1986;**7**:177–88. doi:10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2
14
15 23 Lau J, JA I, CH S. QUantitative synthesis in systematic reviews. *Ann Intern Med*
16 1997;**127**:820–6.
17
18 24 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Spiegelhalter DJ. A re-evaluation of random-
19 effects meta-analysis. *J R Stat Soc Ser A (Statistics Soc* 2009;**172**:137–59.
20 doi:10.1111/j.1467-985X.2008.00552.x
21
22 25 Higgins JPT. Commentary: Heterogeneity in meta-analysis should be expected
23 and appropriately quantified. *Int J Epidemiol* 2008;**37**:1158–60.
24
25 26 Riley RD, Higgins JPT, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects meta-
26 analyses. *BMJ* 2011;**342**. doi:10.1136/bmj.d549
27
28 27 Fusar-Poli P, Radua J. Ten simple rules for conducting umbrella reviews. *Evid*
29 *Based Ment Health* 2018;**21**:95–100. doi:10.1136/ebmental-2018-300014
30
31 28 Chinn S. A simple method for converting an odds ratio to effect size for use in
32 meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2000;**19**:3127–31. doi:10.1002/1097-
33 0258(20001130)19:22<3127::AID-SIM784>3.0.CO;2-M
34
35 29 Cochran WG. The Combination of Estimates from Different Experiments.
36 *Biometrics* 1954;**10**:101. doi:10.2307/3001666
37
38 30 Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, *et al.* Recommendations for examining
39 and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised
40 controlled trials. *BMJ* 2011;**343**:d4002. doi:10.1136/bmj.d4002
41
42 31 Ioannidis JPA, Trikalinos TA. An exploratory test for an excess of significant
43 findings. *Clin Trials* 2007;**4**:245–53. doi:10.1177/1740774507079441
44
45 32 Ioannidis JPA. Clarifications on the application and interpretation of the test
46 for excess significance and its extensions. *J Math Psychol* 2013;**57**:184–7.
47 doi:10.1016/J.JMP.2013.03.002
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLE LEGENDS

Table 1: Search strategy Pubmed of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

Table 2: Search strategy Pubmed for randomized controlled trials.

ADDITIONAL FILE LEGENDS

Additional file 1: Data extraction form for systematic reviews and meta-analyses

Additional file 2: Data extraction form for included randomized controlled trials.

Table 1: Search strategy Pubmed of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

Search Set	Medline
#1	Pregnant
#2	Pregnancy
#3	Gravid
#4	Gestation*
#5	Maternal
#6	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5
#7	Aerobic
#8	Sport
#9	Exercise
#10	Fitness
#11	"Physical exercise"
#12	"Physical activity"
#13	"Motor activity"
#14	7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 OR 13
#15	Diabetes
#16	Diabetes mellitus
#17	DM
#18	"Gestational diabetes"
#19	"Glucose intolerance"
#20	Glucose
#21	Insulin
#22	Hyperglycemia
#23	Toxemia
#24	Preeclampsia
#25	Pre-eclampsia
#26	Eclampsia
#27	"Hypertensive disorders"
#28	"Blood pressure"
#29	"Weight retention"
#30	"Body Mass Index"
#31	BMI
#32	Labor

Search Set	Medline
#33	Labour
#34	Delivery
#35	Caesarean
#36	"Postpartum depression"
#37	"Post partum depression"
#38	"Post-partum depression"
#39	"Postnatal depression"
#40	"Post natal depression"
#41	"Post-natal depression"
#42	"Puerperal depression"
#43	"Peripartum depression"
#44	"Depressive disorder"
#45	Depression
#46	Abortion
#47	Stillbirth
#48	"Fetal death"
#49	15 OR 16 OR 17 OR 18 OR 19 OR 20 OR 21 OR 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31 OR 32 OR 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 OR 48
#50	Meta
#51	Meta-analysis
#52	Review
#53	"Systematic review"
#54	50 OR 51 OR 52 OR 53
#56	6 AND 14 AND 49 AND 54

Table 2: Search strategy Pubmed for randomized controlled trials.

Search Set	Medline
#1	Pregnant
#2	Pregnancy
#3	Gravid
#4	Gestation*
#5	Maternal
#6	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5
#7	Aerobic
#8	Sport
#9	Exercise
#10	Fitness
#11	"Physical exercise"
#12	"Physical activity"
#13	"Motor activity"
#14	7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 OR 13
#15	Diabetes

Search Set	Medline
#16	Diabetes mellitus
#17	DM
#18	"Gestational diabetes"
#19	"Glucose intolerance"
#20	Glucose
#21	Insulin
#22	Hyperglycemia
#23	Toxemia
#24	Preeclampsia
#25	Pre-eclampsia
#26	Eclampsia
#27	"Hypertensive disorders"
#28	"Blood pressure"
#29	"Weight retention"
#30	"Body Mass Index"
#31	BMI
#32	Labor
#33	Labour
#34	Delivery
#35	Caesarean
#36	"Postpartum depression"
#37	"Post partum depression"
#38	"Post-partum depression"
#39	"Postnatal depression"
#40	"Post natal depression"
#41	"Post-natal depression"
#42	"Puerperal depression"
#43	"Peripartum depression"
#44	"Depressive disorder"
#45	Depression
#46	Abortion
#47	Stillbirth
#48	"Fetal death"
#49	17 OR 18 OR 19 OR 20 OR 21 OR 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31 OR 32 OR 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 OR 48
#50	Effectiveness
#51	"Program evaluation"
#52	"Randomized controlled trial"
#53	RCT
#54	"Controlled trial"
#55	Trial
#56	50 OR 51 OR 52 OR 53 OR 54 OR 55
#50	6 AND 16 AND 51 AND 56

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 3: Data extraction form for systematic reviews and meta-analyses

Items	Extracted data
Reviewer	
First Author and Publication year	
Review title	
Year range considered for inclusion	
Journal name	
Last search date	
Region/state/country	
Source of funding	
Aim/objectives of the study	
Protocol registered	
Database searched	
Number of articles included	
Number of articles included in meta-analysis	
Participant characteristics (age, number of participants, parity, subgroups)	
Type of exercise	
Intensity of exercise	
Duration of intervention	
Main Outcome variable	
Total Sample size	
Quality assessment tool and source	
Cochrane Collaboration reviews Vs not	

Items	Extracted data
Type of analysis used in review	
Pooled effect	
Findings	
Adverse Events	
Sub-group analysis/sensitivity test criteria and findings	
Overall quality of included studies AMSTAR-2	
Quality of the evidence GRADE	
Reported heterogeneity of the studies, I ²	
Reporting guideline used (PRISMA)	
Key conclusions of study authors: Further study information requested	
Reviewers comments on methodology, limitations, generalisability that you have after reading the paper	
Reported publication bias	

Table 4: Data extraction form for included randomized controlled trials.

Items	Extracted data
Reviewer	
First Author and Publication year	
RCT title	
Setting	
Intervention Group Sample	
Control Group Sample	
Participant characteristics (parity, BMI)	
Protocol registered	
Intervention Characteristics	
Type of exercise	
Duration (weeks)	
Frequency (sessions per week)	
Session duration (min)	
Intensity of exercise	
Main Outcome variables	
Pooled effect	
Findings	
Adverse Events	
Risk of bias (Cochrane collaboration's tool)	
Sequence generation	
Allocation concealment	
Blinding of personnel and participants	
Blinding of outcome assessment	
Incomplete outcome data	
Selective outcome reporting	
Others	

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION		
Title:		
Identification: p. 1	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review
Update: NA	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such
Registration: p. 3	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number
Authors: pp. 1, 12		
Contact: p. 1	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author
Contributions: p. 12	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review
Amendments: NA	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments
Support:		
Sources p.12	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review
Sponsor p.12	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor
Role of sponsor or funder p.12	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol
INTRODUCTION		
Rationale: pp. 4, 5	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known
Objectives p. 5	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)
METHODS		
Eligibility criteria: p. 6	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review
Information sources: p. 6	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage
Search strategy: pp. 6,17,18,19	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated
Study records: pp. 7,8		
Data management: pp. 7,8	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review
Selection process: pp. 7,8	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

		review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)
Data collection process: p. 8	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators
Data items: p. 7	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications
Outcomes and prioritization: p. 7	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale
Risk of bias in individual studies: p. 8	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis
Data synthesis: pp. 9,10	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I ² , Kendall's τ)
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned
Meta-bias(es): NA	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)
Confidence in cumulative evidence: p.8	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)

***It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

BMJ Open

Effects of physical exercise during pregnancy on mothers and neonates' health: a protocol for an umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-030162.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Jun-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Sanabria-Martínez, Gema; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha - Campus de Cuenca; Hospital Virgen de la Luz, Obstetric Poyatos-León, Raquel; Servicio de Salud de Castilla-La Mancha, Hospital Virgen de la Luz, Cuenca Notario-Pacheco, Blanca; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha - Campus de Cuenca Álvarez-Bueno, Celia; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Health and Social Research Center Cavero-Redondo, Iván; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Health and Social Research Center Martinez-Vizcaino, Vicente; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Centro de Estudios Sociosanitarios
Primary Subject Heading:	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Keywords:	Exercise, Physical activity, Pregnancy, Pregnancy outcomes, Protocol, Neonatal outcomes

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 1 **Effects of physical exercise during pregnancy on mothers and neonates'**
4 **health: a protocol for an umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-**
5 **2 analysis of randomized controlled trials**
6
7
8
9 4

10 5 **Authors and affiliations:**

11
12 6 Gema Sanabria-Mártínez,¹ Raquel Poyatos-León,¹ Blanca Notario-Pacheco,¹ Celia
13 7 Álvarez-Bueno,¹ Iván Cavero-Redondo,^{1*} Vicente Martínez-Vizcaíno.^{1,2}
14
15 8

16
17 9 ¹Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Health and Social Research Center, Cuenca,
18 Spain; ² Universidad Autónoma de Chile, Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Chile
19
20
21 11

22 12 ***Correspondence to:**

23 13 Iván Cavero-Redondo.

24 14 Author's address: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. c/ Santa Teresa Jornet, s/n,
25 15 16002. Cuenca. Spain.

26 16 Email: Ivan.Cavero@uclm.es

27 17 Telephone number: +34 969 17 91 00 ext: 4690
28
29
30
31
32
33 18

34
35 19 **Word count:** 2685
36
37 20
38 21
39 22
40 23
41 24
42 25
43 26
44 27
45 28
46 29
47 30
48 31
49 32
50 33
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **ABSTRACT**

3 **Introduction**

4 A growing interest has emerged on the effects of exercise during gestation. Several
5 systematic reviews and meta-analyses have showed that prenatal exercise could
6 reduce the mothers' risk for some disorders. Despite this, evidence regarding the
7 risk of cesarean section, birth weight or Apgar score at delivery is still controversial.
8 Furthermore, practitioners are reluctant to recommend exercise to pregnant
9 women suffering from some disorders, such as hypertension, preeclampsia or obese
10 pregnant women. Moreover, the scarcity of studies addressing the risk and benefits
11 of exercise at higher intensity prevents practitioners from recommending it at
12 higher dosages. Umbrella reviews represent an appropriate design to elucidate the
13 reasons behind the contradictory findings of previous systematic reviews.

14 **Methods**

15 This protocol was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for
16 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) and the Cochrane
17 Collaboration Handbook. Medline, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane database of
18 systematic reviews, Epistemonikos, Prospero register and SPORTDiscuss databases
19 will be searched to identify systematic reviews, meta-analyses and randomized
20 controlled trials that examine the effect of exercise on pregnancy outcomes.
21 Searches will be conducted from September to November 2019.

22 **Statistical analysis**

23 Methodological quality will be evaluated using the AMSTAR-2 tool. The certainty of
24 evidence and strength of recommendations for meta-analyses will be assessed by
25 the GRADE framework. The summary effect sizes will be calculated through the use
26 of random and fixed-effects models. Heterogeneity among studies will be assessed
27 using the I^2 statistic, and evidence of excess significance bias and evidence of small
28 study effects will also be evaluated.

29 **Ethics and dissemination**

30 Ethical approval will not be needed for this review protocol. The results will be
31 disseminated to academic audiences by peer-reviewed publications. Furthermore,
32 to clinical audiences through professionals' associations and social networks, and

1
2
3 1 may influence guidelines developers in order to improve outcomes in mothers and
4
5 2 offspring.

6
7 3
8 4 **Trial registration number:** CRD42019123410

9
10 5 **Key words:** Exercise; Physical activity; Pregnancy; Pregnancy outcomes; Neonatal
11 6 outcomes; Protocol.

12
13 7
14 8
15 9 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

- 16 10
17 11 • This protocol aims to overcome the lack of evidence about the effect of
18 12 exercise on overweight and obese pregnant women.
19 13 • We aim to elucidate the safety and benefits of physical activity at intensity
20 14 levels significantly higher than the moderate-intensity usually
21 15 recommended.
22 16 • This umbrella review will provide a definitive support to the evidence to
23 17 recommend exercise during pregnancy in some prevalent disorders, such as
24 18 hypertension of pregnancy, preeclampsia or gestational diabetes.
25 19 • The main anticipated limitations include the low-medium quality level of
26 20 some studies.
27 21 • Heterogeneity among the included studies could lead to bias in the results.
28 22 Therefore, a random-effects model will be considered for medium-high
29 23 heterogeneity reviews.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 BACKGROUND

2 3 The need for this work

4
5 Regular physical exercise (PE) is associated with physical, psychological and
6 social benefits in the general population.[1] In recent years, a growing interest has
7 emerged on the beneficial effects of PE during gestation.[2–4] In fact, professional
8 associations of obstetricians and gynecologists [5] and, more recently, international
9 guidelines for physical activity (PA) [1,6] endorse PE throughout the gestational
10 period recommending pregnant women to accumulate at least 150 minutes of
11 moderate-intensity aerobic activity per week, distributed over at least 3 days a
12 week. However, being active every day is the most beneficial for maternal
13 health.[5,7]

14 This evidence comes from several systematic reviews and meta-analyses supporting
15 that prenatal exercise, besides benefiting newborn infants, could reduce the
16 mothers' risk for some disorders, such as gestational diabetes mellitus, excessive
17 maternal weight gain, preeclampsia and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy,
18 incontinence urinary or postpartum depression.[3,4,8,9] Furthermore, maternal PE
19 reduces cesarean delivery rates in healthy pregnant women.[10] Despite this, less
20 than 15% of pregnant women follow the physical activity recommendations.[11,12]
21 Moreover, although numerous systematic reviews and meta-analyses have
22 addressed the effects of PE on maternal health, evidence regarding the risk of
23 cesarean section, birth weight or Apgar score at delivery is still controversial. In this
24 sense, a recent systematic review and meta-analysis [13] did not find a significant
25 association between prenatal exercise and the risk of cesarean section, while two
26 meta-analyses indicated a decrease in the risk of cesarean delivery among pregnant
27 women who exercised.[10,14] Likewise, another meta-analysis concluded that
28 prenatal PE was not associated with birth weight or Apgar score at delivery,[15]
29 whereas two previous meta-analyses supported that newborns of mothers who
30 were active during pregnancy had a lower weight within the normal range and
31 higher Apgar scores than their counterparts.[16,17]

32 If this happens when dealing with healthy pregnant women, it is not surprising that
33 practitioners are reluctant to recommend exercise to pregnant women suffering

1
2
3 1 from some disorders, such as hypertension or preeclampsia, since guidelines
4 include these disorders as absolute or relative contraindications to exercising
5 during pregnancy.[5] Similarly, the PE recommendation for overweight and obese
6 pregnant women continues to be a debatable issue due to the low quality of evidence
7 regarding its benefits.[2]

8
9
10 5
11 6 Finally, the safety or additional benefits for pregnancy and fetus health of vigorous
12 exercise are widely debated, since although consistent evidence supports the
13 beneficial effects of moderate PE in healthy pregnant women, the scarcity of studies
14 addressing the risk and benefits of exercise at higher intensity prevents
15 practitioners from recommending PE at higher dosages in terms of frequency,
16 duration or intensity than the recommended in clinical guidelines.[2,6]

17
18
19 10
20 11
21 12 Therefore, considering the myriad of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of
22 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) addressing the impact of exercise during
23 pregnancy on different maternal health outcomes, and the contradictory findings of
24 these previous reviews, umbrella reviews represent an appropriate design to
25 elucidate the reasons behind the conflicting findings of previous systematic reviews,
26 and to provide clinicians and policymakers with an overall assessment of the
27 evidence on this issue, which is necessary for both practitioners and pregnant
28 women.[18]

21 **OBJECTIVES**

22
23 23 This umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses aims to provide an
24 overview of the effect of PE during pregnancy on mothers' and children health.
25 Additionally, an updated meta-analysis of RCTs will be performed in order to assess
26 the effect of PE interventions on some pregnancy outcomes for which new RCTs
27 have been published and not included in previous systematic reviews and meta-
28 analyses.

30 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

31
32 32 This protocol was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for
33 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) and the Cochrane

1
2
3 1 Collaboration Handbook,[19,20] and has been registered in the PROSPERO database
4
5 2 (registration number: CRD42019123410).
6
7 3

8 4 **Search strategy**

9
10 5

11 6 **Screening and selection**

12
13 7

14
15 8 Two investigators will independently and systematically search the following
16
17 9 databases, from inception to August 2019, in order to identify systematic reviews
18
19 10 and meta-analyses evaluating the effect of PE on mothers' and children health:
20
21 11 Medline, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane database of systematic reviews,
22
23 12 Epistemonikos, Prospero register and SPORTDiscuss. Furthermore, these databases
24
25 13 will be screened to search for eligible RCTs published subsequently to the date the
26
27 14 latest systematic review was conducted. The references of eligible reviews will also
28
29 15 be manually searched. As the dates of searches are planned from September 2019
30
31 16 to November 2019, the date of the last meta-analysis and RCT included will be
32
33 17 August 31, 2019. Since we aware that meta-analysis and RCT till this date will be no
34
35 18 included in the thesaurus search strategy, we will conduct both search techniques
36
37 19 with thesaurus mapping and with free-text search.

38
39 20 Study records will be managed through the use of the Mendeley reference manager.
40
41 21 The search strategy will be conducted following the PICO components (see the
42
43 22 search strategy in Tables 1 and 2).
44
45 23

46 24 **Inclusion/exclusion criteria for study selection**

47
48 25

49
50 26 The inclusion criteria for this umbrella review will be: (i) systematic reviews
51
52 27 and meta-analyses of RCTs; (ii) RCTs not included in the most recently published
53
54 28 systematic reviews selected for the umbrella review; (iii) control groups receiving
55
56 29 no type of PE intervention and; (iv) studies written in any language.

57
58 30 Reviews that did not systematically search the literature or not providing
59
60 31 comprehensive data from individual studies will be excluded. Whenever more than
32
33 32 one meta-analysis on the same outcome is eligible, the one with the largest number
of included studies will be selected, but a sensitivity analysis will be conducted in

1
2
3 1 order to assess concordance in the pooled estimates in terms of magnitude and
4
5 2 direction of their duplicate analyses.
6
7 3

8 4 **Participants**

9
10 5
11
12 6 Women without absolute or relative contraindications to exercise as defined
13
14 7 by the 2015 American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists'
15
16 8 recommendations for physical activity and exercise during pregnancy and the
17
18 9 postpartum period.[5]
19

20 10 21 11 **Patient and Public Involvement**

22 12 No patient involved
23
24 13

25 14 **Types of intervention**

26 15
27
28 16 PE programs including any level of exercise intensity will be considered.
29
30 17 When a meta-analysis includes studies with an extra intervention, such as a
31
32 18 nutritional or behavioral intervention, only information on RCTs with the PE
33
34 19 intervention alone will be extracted. Women in the control group will be given usual
35
36 20 prenatal care.
37
38 21

39 22 **Types of outcome measures**

40 23
41
42 24 Pregnancy outcomes that will be included in this umbrella review and update
43
44 25 of RCTs are:

- 46 26 1. Gestational diabetes mellitus;
 - 47 27 2. Hypertensive disorders of pregnancy;
 - 48 28 3. Gestational weight gain;
 - 49 29 4. Type of delivery;
 - 50 30 5. Prenatal depression;
 - 51 31 6. Postpartum depression;
 - 52 32 7. Postpartum weight retention;
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 8. Spontaneous abortion (including stillbirths until 20 weeks of gestational age
4 and/or weight fetus minor 500 gr).

5 2
6 3 9. Maternal mortality.

7
8 4 Fetus and neonatal outcomes that will take part in this umbrella review and
9 update of RCTs are:

10 5
11 6 1. Gestational age;

12 7 2. Preterm delivery;

13 8 3. Birth weight;

14 9 4. Apgar score at one and five minutes;

15 10 5. pH of umbilical cord blood;

16 11 6. Stillbirth;

17 12 7. Neonatal death.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 14 **DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS**

27 15 28 16 **Selection of studies and data extraction**

29 17
30 18 First, record titles and abstracts will be independently evaluated to identify eligible
31 19 studies according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Then, the full-texts of
32 20 possible eligible studies will be comprehensively reviewed by two investigators (GS-
33 21 M and RP-L). Disagreements will be solved by consensus between them, but if
34 22 disagreements persist, a third investigator will solve the conflict (BN-P). The two
35 23 investigators will extract data (authorship, date, study characteristics, type of
36 24 exercise, main outcome and quality assessment tool) from each included study. Data
37 25 extraction forms have been designed had hoc (Additional file 1 and 2).
38 26 Corresponding authors will be contacted when there are missing data or to clarify
39 27 unclear information.
40 28

41 29 **Assessment of risk of bias and methodological quality of included studies**

42 30
43 31 The methodological quality of the included systematic reviews and meta-analyses
44 32 will be evaluated using the AMSTAR 2 tool,[21] which was developed and validated
45 33 to critically assess the quality of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. This
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 instrument includes 16 criteria referring to relevant methodological aspects of
2 studies. The quality of studies will be classified, according to the number of
3 approved criteria, as follows: excellent, 15-16; very good, 12-14; good, 9-11;
4 acceptable, 6-8; and deficient, 3-5.

5 The risk of bias (quality) for the RCTs selected for the updated systematic review
6 and meta-analysis will be assessed following the Cochrane Collaboration's
7 methodology. This tool is based on eight potential sources of bias: random sequence
8 generation; allocation concealment; blinding of participants, of the evaluator, of the
9 outcome assessment; incomplete outcome data; missing data and other.

10 Finally, the certainty of evidence and strength of recommendations for meta-
11 analyses will be assessed using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment,
12 Development and Evaluation (GRADE). This tool provides a rating of "high",
13 "moderate", "low" or "very low" quality, and will provide a "weak" or "strong"
14 recommendation. This will be accomplished using the GRADEpro software, and
15 output tables will be added.

17 **Data analysis**

19 Tables will be designed to summarize the key characteristics of the included studies.
20 Additionally, forest plots will be used to show results extracted from each meta-
21 analysis.

23 **Assessment of summary effects and heterogeneity**

25 For each meta-analysis, the summary meta-analytic estimates and corresponding
26 95% confidence interval (CI) will be calculated using both fixed- and random-effects
27 models.[22,23] The 95% prediction intervals will also be estimated for the summary
28 random-effects estimates, which will account for the between-study heterogeneity
29 and as well as explaining the uncertainty for the effect that could be expected if a
30 new study examines the same association.[24-26] Thus, this 95% prediction
31 interval indicates the range where the true effect is expected for 95% of studies from
32 the population of the included studies in the meta-synthesis or similar studies
33 potentially conducted in the future. Additionally, for the largest RCT of each meta-

1
2
3 1 analysis, the standard deviation of the effect size will be calculated and scrutinized
4
5 2 if the standard deviation is less than 0.10.[27,28] When meta-analyses have
6
7 3 continuous data, the estimated effect will be converted to their equivalent ORs using
8
9 4 accepted calculation strategies. For other measures, such as the mean difference or
10
11 5 the risk difference, a few general estimations will be needed, such as, Glass' Δ or RR,
12
13 6 respectively.[29,30]

14 7 Among-study heterogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 statistic[31]. Usually, I^2
15
16 8 ranges between values of <25%, 25–50%, 50-75% and >75% which represent small,
17
18 9 medium, large or very large amounts of heterogeneity, respectively[25]. The
19
20 10 corresponding p-values will also be considered. Studies with insufficient data to
21
22 11 perform the analyses will be omitted from the data synthesis. When substantial
23
24 12 heterogeneity will prevent the calculation of pooled estimates of outcomes, a
25
26 13 systematic review or narrative synthesis will be undertaken.

27 14 Whenever possible, a meta-analysis will be conducted including the most recent
28
29 15 RCTs on this issue not included in previous meta-analyses, and pooled effect size
30
31 16 estimates were calculated with their 95% CIs. Moreover, when several studies have
32
33 17 been published after the latest meta-analysis, we will firstly conduct an additional
34
35 18 meta-analysis including only the most recent studies, and then we will carry out the
36
37 19 umbrella review that will include the newest one. Additionally, for outcomes of
38
39 20 studies where a meta-analysis will not be possible, a narrative synthesis of the
40
41 21 results will be presented.

22 23 **Subgroup analysis and meta-regression**

24 24 In the new meta-analysis, we will carry out subgroup and meta-regression analyses
25
26 25 to examine influence of potential mediators such as gestational weight gain on the
27
28 26 main outcome. We will also conduct meta-regression analysis on some intervention
29
30 27 (length of intervention, duration of intervention sessions) and women (BMI,
31
32 28 gestational age at delivery or birth weight) related variables. Finally, subgroup
33
34 29 analyses by categorical variables as, type and intensity of exercise or weight status
35
36 30 will be conducted.

31 32 **Small studies effect assessment**

1
2
3 1 Small study effects usually indicate publication or other reporting biases, although
4 these effects may also reflect chance, genuine heterogeneity or other differences
5 2
6 3 between large and small studies[32] . The existence of a potential small study effect
7 4
8 5 will be assessed, thus if small studies tend to show larger estimates of effect size in
9 6
10 7 contrast to larger studies, using the regression asymmetry Egger's test for
11 8
12 9 continuous outcomes, and Harbord's test for dichotomous ones. A P value lower
13 10
14 11 than 0.10 will be used to show evidence of small-study effects.[33]
15 12
16 13
17 14
18 15
19 16
20 17
21 18
22 19
23 20
24 21
25 22
26 23
27 24
28 25
29 26
30 27
31 28
32 29

33 9 **Excess of significance evaluation**

34 10
35 11 The excess significance test will be used to evaluate whether the observed number
36 12
37 13 of studies (O) included in each meta-analysis with statistically significant results
38 14
39 15 (positive studies, $P < 0.05$) is different than the expected number of studies with
40 16
41 17 significant results (E).[34] The effect size of the largest study (smallest standard
42 18
43 19 error) in a meta-analysis will be used to calculate the statistical power of each
44 20
45 21 component study.[35] Furthermore, the largest study effect will be assumed to be
46 22
47 23 the true effect. A two-sided $P < 0.10$ will be considered.

48 24
49 25 Then, the comparison between the observed and the expected number of studies will
50 26
51 27 be done separately for each meta-analysis, and it will be amplified to groups
52 28
53 29 including many meta-analyses when the observed and the expected values from
54 30
55 31 each meta-analysis will be summed.

56 32 All statistical analyses and power calculations will be performed using STATA 15.1
57 33
58 34 software (College Station, Texas, USA).
59 35
60 36

61 25 **DISCUSSION**

62 27 **Concluding remarks**

63 28
64 29 A positive effect of PE on some pregnancy outcomes has been reported more
65 30
66 31 or less consistently by recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses.[2-4,9,16] This
67 32
68 33 umbrella review is expected to provide a comprehensive and rigorous review of the
69 34
70 35 reported evidence regarding the influence of prenatal exercise on maternal health
71 36

1
2
3 1 by synthesizing the results of previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses, and
4 2 conducting an updated meta-analysis of RCTs.

5 3 The proposed umbrella review has several strengths. First, this protocol aims to
6 4 overcome the lack of evidence about the effect of PE on overweight and obese
7 5 pregnant women; for this, a subgroup analysis with these groups of women will be
8 6 carried out. Secondly, we aim to elucidate the safety and benefits of physical activity
9 7 at intensity levels significantly higher than the moderate-intensity usually
10 8 recommended. Finally, this umbrella review will provide a definitive support to the
11 9 evidence to recommend PE during pregnancy in some prevalent disorders, such as
12 10 hypertension of pregnancy, preeclampsia or gestational diabetes.

11 12 **Strengths and limitations**

13
14 The main anticipated limitations of this umbrella review include the low-medium
15 15 quality level of some studies due to small sample sizes or non-blinded data
16 16 extraction. Furthermore, pregnant women who participate in these studies are
17 17 volunteers, so they usually have higher levels of compliance than pregnant women
18 18 from the general population. Thus, these facts could be potential sources of bias.
19 19 Another potential limitation would be the heterogeneity among the included studies
20 20 that could lead to bias in the results. Therefore, a random-effects model will be
21 21 considered for medium-high heterogeneity reviews. Further, we will be cautious
22 22 when conducting sensitivity analyses based on methodological quality, analysis and
23 23 interpretation of the results.

24 25 **Ethics and dissemination**

26
27 Ethical approval will not be needed for this review protocol because data will be
28 28 extracted from published studies and there will be no concerns about privacy. The
29 29 best way to disseminate information will be through conducting dissemination plan,
30 30 which include: i) to present findings of this umbrella review in international
31 31 obstetric conferences; ii) publishing the results in a peer-reviewed international
32 32 journal interested in improving clinical practices with scientific evidence and; iii) to

1
2
3 1 upload briefing entries to social networks in order to improve decision-makers and
4
5 2 guidelines developers.

6
7 3 Consequently, this umbrella review will have important clinical and public health
8
9 4 implications, because it will aim to provide support for recommendations to advise
10
11 5 mothers to engage in PE programs as an effective and safe strategy to experience
12
13 6 healthier pregnancies, especially in populations at risk in their pregnancies, such as
14
15 7 overweight or obese women and those with hypertensive disorders of pregnancy.

16 8

17 9 **Author contributions**

18
19 10
20
21 11 VM-V and GS-M designed the study. VM-V is the principal investigator and
22
23 12 guarantor. RP-L, GS-M and VM-V are the main coordinators of the protocol. GS-M,
24
25 13 RP-L, BN-P and IC-R will conduct the study. IC-R, VM-V and CA-B will provide
26
27 14 statistical and epidemiological support. GS-M wrote this protocol manuscript with
28
29 15 the support of VM-V, RP-L and BN-P. All the authors revised and approved the final
30
31 16 version of the manuscript.

32 17

33 18 **Funding**

34
35 19
36
37 20 This protocol was funded by the Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes- Junta
38
39 21 de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha and FEDER funds
40
41 22 (SBPLY/17/180501/000533).

42 23

43 24 **Provenance and peer review**

44
45 25 Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

46 26

47 27 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

48
49 28 None declared.

50 29

51 30 **DATA SHARING**

52
53 31 Extra data is available by emailing: Ivan.Cavero@uclm.es
54
55 32
56
57 33
58
59
60

1
2
3 **1 TRANSPARENCY**
4
5 2
6
7 3 The manuscripts guarantor (GS-M) affirms that the manuscript is an honest,
8 4 accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important
9 5 aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study
10 6 as planned have been explained.
11
12
13
14 7
15 8

17 **9 REFERENCES**
18

- 19 1 AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SPORTS MEDICINE Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
20 *ACSM's guidelines for exercise testing and prescription*. 2013.
21
22 2 Davies GAL, Wolfe LA, Mottola MF, *et al*. No. 129-Exercise in Pregnancy and
23 the Postpartum Period. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* 2018;**40**:e58–65.
24 doi:10.1016/j.jogc.2017.11.001
25
26 3 Davenport MH, Ruchat S-M, Poitras VJ, *et al*. Prenatal exercise for the
27 prevention of gestational diabetes mellitus and hypertensive disorders of
28 pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*
29 2018;**52**:1367–75. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099355
30
31 4 Sanabria-Martínez G, García-Hermoso A, Poyatos-León R, *et al*. Effectiveness
32 of physical activity interventions on preventing gestational diabetes mellitus
33 and excessive maternal weight gain: a meta-analysis. *BJOG* 2015;**122**:1167–
34 74. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.13429
35
36 5 Physical activity and exercise during pregnancy and the postpartum period.
37 Committee Opinion No. 650. American College of Obstetricians and
38 Gynecologists. *Obs Gynecol* 2015;**126**:e135–42.
39
40 6 Bø K, Artal R, Barakat R, *et al*. Exercise and pregnancy in recreational and elite
41 athletes : 2016 / 2017 evidence summary from the IOC expert group meeting
42 , Lausanne . Part 5 . Recommendations for health professionals and active
43 women. *Br J Sport Med* 2018;**52**:1080–5. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099351
44
45 7 Mottola MF, Davenport MH, Ruchat S-M, *et al*. No. 367-2019 Canadian
46 Guideline for Physical Activity throughout Pregnancy. *J Obstet Gynaecol*
47 *Canada* 2018;**1339**–46. doi:10.1016/j.jogc.2018.07.001
48
49 8 Davenport MH, Nagpal TS, Mottola MF, *et al*. Prenatal exercise (including but
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 not limited to pelvic floor muscle training) and urinary incontinence during
2 and following pregnancy : a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sport*
3 *Med* 2018;**52**:1397–404. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099780
- 4 9 Poyatos-León R, García-Hermoso A, Sanabria-Martínez G, *et al.* Effects of
5 exercise-based interventions on postpartum depression: A meta-analysis of
6 randomized controlled trials. *Birth* 2017;**44**:200–8. doi:10.1111/birt.12294
- 7 10 Poyatos-León R, García-Hermoso A, Sanabria-Martínez G, *et al.* Effects of
8 exercise during pregnancy on mode of delivery: A meta-analysis. *Acta Obstet*
9 *Gynecol Scand* 2015;**94**. doi:10.1111/aogs.12675
- 10 11 Evenson KR, Wen F. Prevalence and correlates of objectively measured
11 physical activity and sedentary behavior among US pregnant women. *Prev*
12 *Med (Baltim)* 2011;**53**:39–43. doi:10.1016/J.YPMED.2011.04.014
- 13 12 Santo EC, Forbes PW, Oken E, *et al.* Determinants of physical activity
14 frequency and provider advice during pregnancy. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*
15 2017;**17**:286. doi:10.1186/s12884-017-1460-z
- 16 13 Davenport MH, Ruchat S, Sobierajski F, *et al.* Impact of prenatal exercise on
17 maternal harms , labour and delivery outcomes : a systematic review and
18 meta-analysis. *Br J Sport Med* 2019;**53**:99–107. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-
19 099821
- 20 14 Di Mascio D, Magro-Malosso ER, Saccone G, *et al.* Exercise during pregnancy
21 in normal-weight women and risk of preterm birth: a systematic review and
22 meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*
23 2016;**215**:561–71. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.06.014
- 24 15 Davenport MH, Meah VL, Ruchat S-M, *et al.* Impact of prenatal exercise on
25 neonatal and childhood outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br*
26 *J Sports Med* 2018;**52**:1386 LP – 1396.
- 27 16 Sanabria-Martínez G, García-Hermoso A, Poyatos-León R, *et al.* Effects of
28 Exercise-Based Interventions on Neonatal Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis of
29 Randomized Controlled Trials. *Am J Heal Promot* 2016;**30**.
30 doi:10.1177/0890117116639569
- 31 17 da Silva SG, Ricardo LI, Evenson KR, *et al.* Leisure-Time Physical Activity in
32 Pregnancy and Maternal-Child Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-
33 Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials and Cohort Studies. *Sport. Med.*

- 1
2
3 1 2017;**47**:295–317. doi:10.1007/s40279-016-0565-2
- 4
5 2 18 Vargas C De, Coll N, Domingues MR, *et al.* Efficacy of Regular Exercise During
6 3 Pregnancy on the Prevention of Postpartum Depression The PAMELA
7 4 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2019;**2**:1–12.
8 5 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.6861
- 9
10 6 19 Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic
11 7 review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Rev Esp*
12 8 *Nutr Humana y Diet* 2016;**350**:148–60. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1
- 13
14 9 20 Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, *et al.* The Cochrane
15 10 Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised
16 11 trials. *BMJ* 2011;**343**. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928
- 17
18 12 21 Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, *et al.* AMSTAR 2: A critical appraisal tool for
19 13 systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of
20 14 healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ* 2017;**358**:1–9. doi:10.1136/bmj.j4008
- 21
22 15 22 DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials*
23 16 1986;**7**:177–88. doi:10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2
- 24
25 17 23 Lau J, JA I, CH S. QUantitative synthesis in systematic reviews. *Ann Intern Med*
26 18 1997;**127**:820–6.
- 27
28 19 24 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Spiegelhalter DJ. A re-evaluation of random-
29 20 effects meta-analysis. *J R Stat Soc Ser A (Statistics Soc* 2009;**172**:137–59.
30 21 doi:10.1111/j.1467-985X.2008.00552.x
- 31
32 22 25 Higgins JPT. Commentary: Heterogeneity in meta-analysis should be expected
33 23 and appropriately quantified. *Int J Epidemiol* 2008;**37**:1158–60.
- 34
35 24 26 Riley RD, Higgins JPT, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects meta-
36 25 analyses. *BMJ* 2011;**342**. doi:10.1136/bmj.d549
- 37
38 26 27 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat*
39 27 *Med* 2002;**21**:1539–58. doi:10.1002/sim.1186
- 40
41 28 28 Ioannidis JPA, Patsopoulos NA, Evangelou E. Uncertainty in heterogeneity
42 29 estimates in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2007;**335**:914–6.
43 30 doi:10.1136/bmj.39343.408449.80
- 44
45 31 29 Fusar-Poli P, Radua J. Ten simple rules for conducting umbrella reviews. *Evid*
46 32 *Based Ment Health* 2018;**21**:95–100. doi:10.1136/ebmental-2018-300014
- 47
48 33 30 Chinn S. A simple method for converting an odds ratio to effect size for use in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2000;**19**:3127–31. doi:10.1002/1097-
2 0258(20001130)19:22<3127::AID-SIM784>3.0.CO;2-M
3 31 Cochran WG. The Combination of Estimates from Different Experiments.
4 *Biometrics* 1954;**10**:101. doi:10.2307/3001666
5 32 Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, *et al.* Recommendations for examining
6 and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised
7 controlled trials. *BMJ* 2011;**343**:d4002. doi:10.1136/bmj.d4002
8 33 Egger, M., Smith, G.D., Schneider, M., & Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis
9 detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;**315**:629–34.
10 34 Ioannidis JPA, Trikalinos TA. An exploratory test for an excess of significant
11 findings. *Clin Trials* 2007;**4**:245–53. doi:10.1177/1740774507079441
12 35 Ioannidis JPA. Clarifications on the application and interpretation of the test
13 for excess significance and its extensions. *J Math Psychol* 2013;**57**:184–7.
14 doi:10.1016/J.JMP.2013.03.002
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

19 TABLE LEGENDS

20 **Table 1:** Search strategy Pubmed of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

21 **Table 2:** Search strategy Pubmed for randomized controlled trials.

23 ADDITIONAL FILE LEGENDS

24 **Additional file 1:** Data extraction form for systematic reviews and meta-analyses

25 **Additional file 2:** Data extraction form for included randomized controlled trials.

1 **Table 1:** Search strategy Pubmed of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.
2

Search Set	Medline
#1	Pregnant
#2	Pregnancy
#3	Gravid
#4	Gestation*
#5	Maternal
#6	Fetus
#7	Neonate
#8	Newborn
#9	Child*
#10	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9
#11	Aerobic
#12	Sport
#13	Exercise
#14	Fitness
#15	"Physical exercise"
#16	"Physical activity"
#17	"Motor activity"
#18	11 OR 12 OR 13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17
#19	Diabetes
#20	Diabetes mellitus
#21	DM
#22	"Gestational diabetes"
#23	"Glucose intolerance"
#24	Glucose
#25	Insulin
#26	Hyperglycemia
#27	Toxemia
#28	Preeclampsia
#29	Pre-eclampsia
#30	Eclampsia
#31	"Hypertensive disorders"
#32	"Blood pressure"
#33	"Weight retention"
#34	"Body Mass Index"
#35	BMI
#36	Labor
#37	Labour
#38	Delivery
#39	Caesarean
#40	"Prenatal depression"
#41	"Pre-natal depression"
#42	"Pre natal depression"
#43	"Postpartum depression"
#37	"Post partum depression"
#38	"Post-partum depression"

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Search Set	Medline
#39	"Postnatal depression"
#40	"Post natal depression"
#41	"Post-natal depression"
#42	"Puerperal depression"
#43	"Peripartum depression"
#44	"Depressive disorder"
#45	Depression
#46	Abortion
#47	Stillbirth
#48	"Fetal death"
#49	"Gestational age"
#50	Preterm
#51	"Preterm delivery"
#52	Prematur*
#53	"Birth weight"
#54	Macrosoma
#55	"Apgar score"
#56	"umbilical cord blood"
#57	"pH umbilical cord"
#58	19 OR 20 OR 21 OR 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31 OR 32 OR 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 OR 48 OR 49 OR 50 OR 51 OR 52 OR 53 OR 54 OR 55 OR 56 OR 57
#59	Meta
#60	Meta-analysis
#61	Review
#62	"Systematic review"
#63	59 OR 60 OR 61 OR 62
#64	10 AND 18 AND 58 AND 63

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

1 **Table 2:** Search strategy Pubmed for randomized controlled trials.
2

Search Set	Medline
#1	Pregnant
#2	Pregnancy
#3	Gravid
#4	Gestation*
#5	Maternal
#6	Fetus
#7	Neonate
#8	Newborn
#9	Child*
#10	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9
#11	Aerobic
#12	Sport
#13	Exercise
#14	Fitness
#15	"Physical exercise"
#16	"Physical activity"
#17	"Motor activity"
#18	11 OR 12 OR 13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17
#19	Diabetes
#20	Diabetes mellitus
#21	DM
#22	"Gestational diabetes"
#23	"Glucose intolerance"
#24	Glucose
#25	Insulin
#26	Hyperglycemia
#27	Toxemia
#28	Preeclampsia
#29	Pre-eclampsia
#30	Eclampsia
#31	"Hypertensive disorders"
#32	"Blood pressure"
#33	"Weight retention"
#34	"Body Mass Index"
#35	BMI
#36	Labor
#37	Labour
#38	Delivery
#39	Caesarean
#40	"Prenatal depression"
#41	"Pre-natal depression"
#42	"Pre natal depression"
#43	"Postpartum depression"
#44	"Post partum depression"
#45	"Post-partum depression"

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Search Set	Medline
#46	"Postnatal depression"
#47	"Post natal depression"
#48	"Post-natal depression"
#49	"Puerperal depression"
#50	"Peripartum depression"
#51	"Depressive disorder"
#52	Depression
#53	Abortion
#54	Stillbirth
#55	"Fetal death"
#56	"Gestational age"
#57	Preterm
#58	"Preterm delivery"
#59	Prematur*
#60	"Birth weight"
#61	Macrosoma
#62	"Apgar score"
#63	"umbilical cord blood"
#64	"pH umbilical cord"
#65	19 OR 20 OR 21 OR 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31 OR 32 OR 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 OR 48 OR 49 OR 50 OR 51 OR 52 OR 53 OR 54 OR 55 OR 56 OR 57 OR 58 OR 59 OR 60 OR 61 OR 62 OR 63 OR 64
#66	Effectiveness
#67	"Program evaluation"
#68	"Randomized controlled trial"
#69	RCT
#70	"Controlled trial"
#71	Trial
#72	66 OR 67 OR 68 OR 69 OR 70 OR 71
#73	18 AND 18 AND 65 AND 72

1
2
3
4
5

Additional file 1: Data extraction form for systematic reviews and meta-analyses

Items	Extracted data
Reviewer	
First Author and Publication year	
Review title	
Year range considered for inclusion	
Journal name	
Last search date	
Region/state/country	
Source of funding	
Aim/objectives of the study	
Protocol registered	
Database searched	
Number of articles included	
Number of articles included in meta-analysis	
Participant characteristics (age, number of participants, parity, subgroups)	
Type of exercise	
Intensity of exercise	
Duration of intervention	
Main Outcome variable	
Total Sample size	
Quality assessment tool and source	
Cochrane Collaboration reviews Vs not	

Items	Extracted data
Type of analysis used in review	
Pooled effect	
Findings	
Adverse Events	
Sub-group analysis/sensitivity test criteria and findings	
Overall quality of included studies AMSTAR-2	
Quality of the evidence GRADE	
Reported heterogeneity of the studies, I^2	
Reporting guideline used (PRISMA)	
Key conclusions of study authors: Further study information requested	
Reviewers comments on methodology, limitations, generalisability that you have after reading the paper	
Reported publication bias	

Additional file 2: Data extraction form for included randomized controlled trials.

Items	Extracted data
Reviewer	
First Author and Publication year	
RCT title	
Setting	
Intervention Group Sample	
Control Group Sample	
Participant characteristics (parity, BMI)	
Protocol registered	
Intervention Characteristics	
Type of exercise	
Duration (weeks)	
Frequency (sessions per week)	
Session duration (min)	
Intensity of exercise	
Main Outcome variables	
Pooled effect	
Findings	
Adverse Events	
Risk of bias (Cochrane collaboration's tool)	
Sequence generation	
Allocation concealment	
Blinding of personnel and participants	
Blinding of outcome assessment	
Incomplete outcome data	
Selective outcome reporting	
Others	

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION		
Title:		
Identification: p. 1	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review
Update: NA	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such
Registration: pp. 3,6	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number
Authors: pp. 1,12		
Contact: p. 1	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author
Contributions: p. 12	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review
Amendments: NA	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments
Support: p. 12		
Sources: p. 12	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review
Sponsor: p.12	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor
Role of sponsor or funder:p.12	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol
INTRODUCTION		
Rationale: pp. 4,5	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known
Objectives: p. 5	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)
METHODS		
Eligibility criteria: p. 6	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review
Information sources: p. 6	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage
Search strategy: pp. 6,17-20	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated
Study records: pp. 7,8		
Data management: p.7,8	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review

Selection process: p. 8	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)
Data collection process: p. 8	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators
Data items: p. 7	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications
Outcomes and prioritization: p. 7	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale
Risk of bias in individual studies: p. 8	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis
Data synthesis: pp. 9,10	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2 , Kendall's τ)
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned
Meta-bias(es): NA	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)
Confidence in cumulative evidence: p. 8	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

BMJ Open

Effects of physical exercise during pregnancy on mothers and neonates' health: a protocol for an umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-030162.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Jul-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Sanabria-Martínez, Gema; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha - Campus de Cuenca; Hospital Virgen de la Luz, Obstetric Poyatos-León, Raquel; Servicio de Salud de Castilla-La Mancha, Hospital Virgen de la Luz, Cuenca Notario-Pacheco, Blanca; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha - Campus de Cuenca Álvarez-Bueno, Celia; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Health and Social Research Center Cavero-Redondo, Iván; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Health and Social Research Center Martinez-Vizcaino, Vicente; Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Centro de Estudios Sociosanitarios
Primary Subject Heading:	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Keywords:	Exercise, Physical activity, Pregnancy, Pregnancy outcomes, Protocol, Neonatal outcomes

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 1 **Effects of physical exercise during pregnancy on mothers and neonates'**
4 **health: a protocol for an umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-**
5 **2 analysis of randomized controlled trials**
6
7
8
9 4

10 5 **Authors and affiliations:**

11 6 Gema Sanabria-Mártínez,¹ Raquel Poyatos-León,¹ Blanca Notario-Pacheco,¹ Celia
12 7 Álvarez-Bueno,^{1,2} Iván Caverro-Redondo,^{1,2*} Vicente Martínez-Vizcaíno.^{1,3}

13 8
14 9 ¹Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Health and Social Research Center, Cuenca,
15 10 Spain; ²Universidad Politécnica y Artística del Paraguay, Asunción, Paraguay;
16 11 ³Universidad Autónoma de Chile, Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Chile
17 12

18 13 ***Correspondence to:**

19 14 Iván Caverro-Redondo.

20 15 Author's address: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. c/ Santa Teresa Jornet, s/n,
21 16 16002. Cuenca. Spain.

22 17 Email: Ivan.Caverro@uclm.es

23 18 Telephone number: +34 969 17 91 00 ext: 4690
24 19

25 20 **Word count:** 2791
26 21
27 22
28 23
29 24
30 25
31 26
32 27
33 28
34 29
35 30
36 31
37 32
38 33
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **ABSTRACT**

3 **Introduction**

4 A growing interest has emerged on the effects of exercise during gestation. Several
5 systematic reviews and meta-analyses have showed that prenatal exercise could
6 reduce the mothers' risk for some disorders. Despite this, evidence regarding the
7 risk of cesarean section, birth weight or Apgar score at delivery is still controversial.
8 Furthermore, practitioners are reluctant to recommend exercise to pregnant
9 women suffering from some disorders, such as hypertension, preeclampsia or obese
10 pregnant women. Moreover, the scarcity of studies addressing the risk and benefits
11 of exercise at higher intensity prevents practitioners from recommending it at
12 higher dosages. Umbrella reviews represent an appropriate design to elucidate the
13 reasons behind the contradictory findings of previous systematic reviews.

14 **Methods**

15 This protocol was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for
16 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) and the Cochrane
17 Collaboration Handbook. Medline, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane database of
18 systematic reviews, Epistemonikos, Prospero register and SPORTDiscuss databases
19 will be searched to identify systematic reviews, meta-analyses and randomized
20 controlled trials that examine the effect of exercise on pregnancy outcomes from
21 inception to August 2019. Searches will be conducted from September to November
22 2019.

23 **Statistical analysis**

24 Methodological quality will be evaluated using the AMSTAR 2 tool. The certainty of
25 evidence and strength of recommendations for meta-analyses will be assessed by
26 the GRADE framework. The summary effect sizes will be calculated through the use
27 of random and fixed-effects models. Heterogeneity among studies will be assessed
28 using the I^2 statistic, and evidence of excess significance bias and evidence of small
29 study effects will also be evaluated.

30 **Ethics and dissemination**

31 Ethical approval will not be needed for this review protocol. The results will be
32 disseminated to academic audiences by peer-reviewed publications. Furthermore,
33 to clinical audiences through professionals' associations and social networks, and

1
2
3 1 may influence guidelines developers in order to improve outcomes in mothers and
4
5 2 offspring.

6
7 3
8 4 **Trial registration number:** CRD42019123410

9
10 5 **Key words:** Exercise; Physical activity; Pregnancy; Pregnancy outcomes; Neonatal
11 6 outcomes; Protocol.

12
13 7
14 8
15 9 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

- 16 10
17 11 • This protocol aims to overcome the inconclusive evidence about the effect of
18 12 exercise on overweight and obese pregnant.
19 13 • We aim to elucidate the safety and benefits of physical activity at intensity
20 14 levels significantly higher than the moderate-intensity usually
21 15 recommended.
22 16 • This umbrella review will provide a definitive support to the evidence to
23 17 recommend exercise during pregnancy in some prevalent disorders, such as
24 18 hypertension of pregnancy, preeclampsia or gestational diabetes.
25 19 • The main anticipated limitations include the low-medium quality level of
26 20 some studies.
27 21 • Heterogeneity among the included studies could lead to bias in the results.
28 22 Therefore, a random-effects model will be considered for medium-high
29 23 heterogeneity reviews.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 BACKGROUND

2 3 The need for this work

4
5 Regular physical exercise (PE) is associated with physical, psychological and
6 social benefits in the general population.[1] In recent years, a growing interest has
7 emerged on the beneficial effects of PE during gestation.[2–4] In fact, professional
8 associations of obstetricians and gynecologists [5] and, more recently, international
9 guidelines for physical activity (PA) [1,6] endorse PE throughout the gestational
10 period recommending pregnant women to accumulate at least 150 minutes of
11 moderate-intensity aerobic activity per week, distributed over at least 3 days a
12 week. However, being active every day is the most beneficial for maternal
13 health.[5,7]

14 This evidence comes from several systematic reviews and meta-analyses supporting
15 that prenatal exercise, besides benefiting newborn infants, could reduce the
16 mothers' risk for some disorders, such as gestational diabetes mellitus, excessive
17 maternal weight gain, preeclampsia and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy,
18 incontinence urinary or postpartum depression.[3,4,8,9] Furthermore, maternal PE
19 reduces cesarean delivery rates in healthy pregnant women.[10] Despite this, less
20 than 15% of pregnant women follow the physical activity recommendations.[11,12]
21 Moreover, although numerous systematic reviews and meta-analyses have
22 addressed the effects of PE on maternal health, evidence regarding the risk of
23 cesarean section, birth weight or Apgar score at delivery is still controversial. In this
24 sense, a recent systematic review and meta-analysis [13] did not find a significant
25 association between prenatal exercise and the risk of cesarean section, while two
26 meta-analyses indicated a decrease in the risk of cesarean delivery among pregnant
27 women who exercised.[10,14] Likewise, another meta-analysis concluded that
28 prenatal PE was not associated with birth weight or Apgar score at delivery,[15]
29 whereas two previous meta-analyses supported that newborns of mothers who
30 were active during pregnancy had a lower weight within the normal range and
31 higher Apgar scores than their counterparts.[16,17] However, despite these
32 inconclusive findings, because the effects of exercise in women with excess of weight
33 continue to be an unresolved question for both clinicians and pregnant women, it is

1
2
3 1 worthwhile to conduct other broader research approaches, such as an umbrella
4
5 2 review, which increases the likelihood of providing more consistent evidence on this
6
7 3 issue.

8
9 4 If this happens when dealing with healthy pregnant women, it is not surprising that
10
11 5 practitioners are reluctant to recommend exercise to pregnant women suffering
12
13 6 from some disorders, such as hypertension or preeclampsia, since guidelines
14
15 7 include these disorders as absolute or relative contraindications to exercising
16
17 8 during pregnancy.[5] Similarly, the PE recommendation for overweight and obese
18
19 9 pregnant women continues to be a debatable issue due to the low quality of evidence
20
21 10 regarding its benefits.[2]

22
23 11 Finally, the safety or additional benefits for pregnancy and fetus health of vigorous
24
25 12 exercise are widely debated, since although consistent evidence supports the
26
27 13 beneficial effects of moderate PE in healthy pregnant women, the scarcity of studies
28
29 14 addressing the risk and benefits of exercise at higher intensity prevents
30
31 15 practitioners from recommending PE at higher dosages in terms of frequency,
32
33 16 duration or intensity than the recommended in clinical guidelines.[2,6]

34
35 17 Therefore, considering the myriad of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of
36
37 18 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) addressing the impact of exercise during
38
39 19 pregnancy on different maternal health outcomes, and the contradictory findings of
40
41 20 these previous reviews, umbrella reviews represent an appropriate design to
42
43 21 elucidate the reasons behind the conflicting findings of previous systematic reviews,
44
45 22 and to provide clinicians and policymakers with an overall assessment of the
46
47 23 evidence on this issue, which is necessary for both practitioners and pregnant
48
49 24 women.[18]

50
51 25

52 26 **OBJECTIVES**

53
54 27

55
56 28 This umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses aims to provide an
57
58 29 overview of the effect of PE during pregnancy on mothers and children's health.
59
60 30 Additionally, an updated meta-analysis of RCTs will be performed in order to assess
31
32 31 the effect of PE interventions on some pregnancy outcomes for which new RCTs
33
34 32 have been published and not included in previous systematic reviews and meta-
35
36 33 analyses.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

This protocol was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) and the Cochrane Collaboration Handbook, [19,20] and has been registered in the PROSPERO database (registration number: CRD42019123410).

Search strategy

Screening and selection

Two investigators will independently and systematically search the following databases, from inception to August 2019, in order to identify systematic reviews and meta-analyses evaluating the effect of PE on mothers and children's health: Medline, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane database of systematic reviews, Epistemonikos, Prospero register and SPORTDiscuss. Furthermore, these databases will be screened to search for eligible RCTs published subsequently to the date the latest systematic review was conducted. The references of eligible reviews will also be manually searched. As the dates of searches are planned from September 2019 to November 2019, the date of the last meta-analysis and RCT included will be August 31, 2019. Since we aware that meta-analysis and RCT till this date will be no included in the thesaurus search strategy, we will conduct both search techniques with thesaurus mapping and with free-text search.

Study records will be managed through the use of the Mendeley reference manager. The search strategy will be conducted following the PICO components (see the search strategy in Tables 1 and 2).

Inclusion/exclusion criteria for study selection

The inclusion criteria for this umbrella review will be: (i) systematic reviews and meta-analyses of RCTs; (ii) RCTs not included in the most recently published systematic reviews selected for the umbrella review; (iii) control groups receiving

1 usual prenatal care or another type of PE intervention and; (iv) studies written in
2 any language.

3 Reviews that did not systematically search the literature or not providing
4 comprehensive data from individual studies will be excluded. Whenever more than
5 one meta-analysis on the same outcome is eligible, the one with the largest number
6 of included studies will be selected, but a sensitivity analysis will be conducted in
7 order to assess concordance in the pooled estimates in terms of magnitude and
8 direction of their duplicate analyses.

9 10 **Participants**

11
12 Women without absolute or relative contraindications to exercise as defined
13 by the 2015 American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists'
14 recommendations for physical activity and exercise during pregnancy and the
15 postpartum period.[5]

16 17 **Patient and Public Involvement**

18
19 No patient involved.

20 21 **Types of intervention**

22
23 PE programs including any level of exercise intensity will be considered.
24 When a meta-analysis includes studies with an extra intervention, such as a
25 nutritional or behavioral intervention, only information on RCTs with the PE
26 intervention alone will be extracted. Women in the control group will be given usual
27 prenatal care.

28 29 **Types of outcome measures**

30
31 Pregnancy outcomes that will be included in this umbrella review and update
32 of RCTs are:

33 1. Gestational diabetes mellitus;

- 1
- 2
- 3 1 2. Hypertensive disorders of pregnancy;
- 4
- 5 2 3. Gestational weight gain;
- 6
- 7 3 4. Type of delivery;
- 8
- 9 4 5. Prenatal depression;
- 10
- 11 5 6. Postpartum depression;
- 12
- 13 6 7. Postpartum weight retention;
- 14
- 15 7 8. Spontaneous abortion (including stillbirths until 20 weeks of gestational age
- 16 8 and/or weight fetus minor 500 gr).
- 17 9 9. Maternal mortality.
- 18

19 10 Fetal and neonatal outcomes that will take part in this umbrella review and
20
21 11 update of RCTs are:

- 22 12 1. Gestational age;
- 23 13 2. Preterm delivery;
- 24 14 3. Birth weight;
- 25 15 4. Apgar score at one and five minutes;
- 26 16 5. pH of umbilical cord blood;
- 27 17 6. Stillbirth;
- 28 18 7. Neonatal death.
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

20 **DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS**

22 **Selection of studies and data extraction**

24 First, record titles and abstracts will be independently evaluated to identify eligible
25 studies according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Then, the full-texts of
26 possible eligible studies will be comprehensively reviewed by two investigators (GS-
27 M and RP-L). Disagreements will be solved by consensus between them, but if
28 disagreements persist, a third investigator will solve the conflict (BN-P). The two
29 investigators will extract data (authorship, date, study characteristics, type of
30 exercise, main outcome and quality assessment tool) from each included study. Data
31 extraction forms have been designed had hoc (Additional file 1 and 2).
32 Corresponding authors will be contacted when there are missing data or to clarify
33 unclear information.

1 2 3 1 4 5 2 **Assessment of risk of bias and methodological quality of included studies** 6 7 3

8 4 The methodological quality of the included systematic reviews and meta-analyses
9 5 will be evaluated using the AMSTAR 2 tool,[21] which was developed and validated
10 6 to critically assess the quality of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. This
11 7 instrument includes 16 criteria referring to relevant methodological aspects of
12 8 studies. The quality of studies will be classified, according to the number of
13 9 approved criteria, as follows: excellent, 15-16; very good, 12-14; good, 9-11;
14 10 acceptable, 6-8; and deficient, 3-5.

11 11 The risk of bias (quality) for the RCTs selected for the updated systematic review
12 12 and meta-analysis will be assessed following the Cochrane Collaboration's
13 13 methodology. This tool is based on eight potential sources of bias: random sequence
14 14 generation; allocation concealment; blinding of participants, of the evaluator, of the
15 15 outcome assessment; incomplete outcome data; missing data and other.

16 16 Finally, the certainty of evidence and strength of recommendations for meta-
17 17 analyses will be assessed using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment,
18 18 Development and Evaluation (GRADE). This tool provides a rating of "high",
19 19 "moderate", "low" or "very low" quality, and will provide a "weak" or "strong"
20 20 recommendation. This will be accomplished using the GRADEpro software, and
21 21 output tables will be added.

22 23 23 **Data analysis** 24

25 25 Tables will be designed to summarize the key characteristics of the included studies.
26 26 Additionally, forest plots will be used to show results extracted from each meta-
27 27 analysis.

28 29 29 **Assessment of summary effects and heterogeneity** 30

31 31 For each meta-analysis, the summary meta-analytic estimates and corresponding
32 32 95% confidence interval (CI) will be calculated using both fixed- and random-effects
33 33 models.[22,23] The 95% prediction intervals will also be estimated for the summary

1 random-effects estimates, which will account for the between-study heterogeneity
2 and as well as explaining the uncertainty for the effect that could be expected if a
3 new study examines the same association.[24–26] Thus, this 95% prediction
4 interval indicates the range where the true effect is expected for 95% of studies from
5 the population of the included studies in the meta-synthesis or similar studies
6 potentially conducted in the future. Additionally, for the largest RCT of each meta-
7 analysis, the standard deviation of the effect size will be calculated and scrutinized
8 if the standard deviation is less than 0.10.[27,28] Since a higher accuracy on
9 detecting publication bias has been empirically demonstrated using 0.1 as the
10 threshold for significance in the most well-known publication bias tests, [29] in our
11 study the significance p values for Egger's test is setup at 0.1. When meta-analyses
12 have continuous data, the estimated effect will be converted to their equivalent ORs
13 using accepted calculation strategies. For other measures, such as the mean
14 difference or the risk difference, a few general estimations will be needed, such as,
15 Glass' Δ or RR, respectively.[30,31]

16 Among-study heterogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 statistic[32]. Usually, I^2
17 ranges between values of <25%, 25–50%, 50-75% and >75% which represent small,
18 medium, large or very large amounts of heterogeneity, respectively[25]. The
19 corresponding p-values will also be considered. Studies with insufficient data to
20 perform the analyses will be omitted from the data synthesis. When substantial
21 heterogeneity will prevent the calculation of pooled estimates of outcomes, a
22 systematic review or narrative synthesis will be undertaken.

23 Whenever possible, a meta-analysis will be conducted including the most recent
24 RCTs on this issue not included in previous meta-analyses, and pooled effect size
25 estimates were calculated with their 95% CIs. Moreover, when several studies have
26 been published after the latest meta-analysis, we will firstly conduct an additional
27 meta-analysis including only the most recent studies, and then we will carry out the
28 umbrella review that will include the newest one. Additionally, for outcomes of
29 studies where a meta-analysis will not be possible, a narrative synthesis of the
30 results will be presented.

31 32 **Subgroup analysis and meta-regression**

33

1
2
3 1 In the new meta-analysis, we will carry out subgroup and meta-regression analyses
4
5 2 to examine influence of potential mediators such as gestational weight gain on the
6
7 3 main outcome. We will also conduct meta-regression analysis on some intervention
8
9 4 (length of intervention, duration of intervention sessions) and women (BMI,
10
11 5 gestational age at delivery or birth weight) related variables. Finally, subgroup
12
13 6 analyses by categorical variables as, type and intensity of exercise or weight status
14
15 7 will be conducted.

8 9 **Small studies effect assessment**

10
11 11 Small study effects usually indicate publication or other reporting biases, although
12
13 12 these effects may also reflect chance, genuine heterogeneity or other differences
14
15 13 between large and small studies[33] . The existence of a potential small study effect
16
17 14 will be assessed, thus if small studies tend to show larger estimates of effect size in
18
19 15 contrast to larger studies, using the regression asymmetry Egger's test for
20
21 16 continuous outcomes, and Harbord's test for dichotomous ones. A P value lower
22
23 17 than 0.10 will be used to show evidence of small-study effects.[34]

18 19 **Excess of significance evaluation**

20
21 21 The excess significance test will be used to evaluate whether the observed number
22
23 22 of studies (O) included in each meta-analysis with statistically significant results
24
25 23 (positive studies, $P < 0.05$) is different than the expected number of studies with
26
27 24 significant results (E).[35] The effect size of the largest study (smallest standard
28
29 25 error) in a meta-analysis will be used to calculate the statistical power of each
30
31 26 component study.[36] Furthermore, the largest study effect will be assumed to be
32
33 27 the true effect. A two-sided $P < 0.10$ will be considered.

34
35 28 Then, the comparison between the observed and the expected number of studies will
36
37 29 be done separately for each meta-analysis, and it will be amplified to groups
38
39 30 including many meta-analyses when the observed and the expected values from
40
41 31 each meta-analysis will be summed.

42
43 32 All statistical analyses and power calculations will be performed using STATA 15.1
44
45 33 software (College Station, Texas, USA).

DISCUSSION

Concluding remarks

A positive effect of PE on some pregnancy outcomes has been reported more or less consistently by recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses.[2–4,9,16] This umbrella review is expected to provide a comprehensive and rigorous review of the reported evidence regarding the influence of prenatal exercise on maternal health by synthesizing the results of previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses, and conducting an updated meta-analysis of RCTs.

The proposed umbrella review has several strengths. First, this protocol aims to overcome the inconclusive evidence about the effect of PE on overweight and obese pregnant women; for this, a subgroup analysis with these groups of women will be carried out. Secondly, we aim to elucidate the safety and benefits of physical activity at intensity levels significantly higher than the moderate-intensity usually recommended. Finally, this umbrella review will provide a definitive support to the evidence to recommend PE during pregnancy in some prevalent disorders, such as hypertension of pregnancy, preeclampsia or gestational diabetes.

Strengths and limitations

The main anticipated limitations of this umbrella review include the low-medium quality level of some studies due to small sample sizes or non-blinded data extraction. Furthermore, pregnant women who participate in these studies are volunteers, so they usually have higher levels of compliance than pregnant women from the general population. Thus, these facts could be potential sources of bias. Another potential limitation would be the heterogeneity among the included studies that could lead to bias in the results. Therefore, a random-effects model will be considered for medium-high heterogeneity reviews. Further, we will be cautious when conducting sensitivity analyses based on methodological quality, analysis and interpretation of the results.

Ethics and dissemination

Ethical approval will not be needed for this review protocol because data will be extracted from published studies and there will be no concerns about privacy. The best way to disseminate information will be through conducting dissemination plan, which include: i) to present findings of this umbrella review in international obstetric conferences; ii) publishing the results in a peer-reviewed international journal interested in improving clinical practices with scientific evidence and; iii) to upload briefing entries to social networks in order to improve decision-makers and guidelines developers.

Consequently, this umbrella review will have important clinical and public health implications, because it will aim to provide support for recommendations to advise mothers to engage in PE programs as an effective and safe strategy to experience healthier pregnancies, especially in populations at risk in their pregnancies, such as overweight or obese women and those with hypertensive disorders of pregnancy.

Author contributions

VM-V and GS-M designed the study. VM-V is the principal investigator and guarantor. RP-L, GS-M and VM-V are the main coordinators of the protocol. GS-M, RP-L, BN-P and IC-R will conduct the study. IC-R, VM-V and CA-B will provide statistical and epidemiological support. GS-M wrote this protocol manuscript with the support of VM-V, RP-L and BN-P. All the authors revised and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

This protocol was funded by the Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes- Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha and FEDER funds (SBPLY/17/180501/000533).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 2 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

3 None declared.

5 **DATA SHARING**

6 Extra data is available by emailing: Ivan.Cavero@uclm.es

9 **TRANSPARENCY**

11 The manuscripts guarantor (GS-M) affirms that the manuscript is an honest,
12 accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important
13 aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study
14 as planned have been explained.

17 **REFERENCES**

- 18 1 AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SPORTS MEDICINE Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
19 *ACSM's guidelines for exercise testing and prescription*. 2013.
- 20 2 Davies GAL, Wolfe LA, Mottola MF, *et al*. No. 129-Exercise in Pregnancy and
21 the Postpartum Period. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* 2018;**40**:e58–65.
22 doi:10.1016/j.jogc.2017.11.001
- 23 3 Davenport MH, Ruchat S-M, Poitras VJ, *et al*. Prenatal exercise for the
24 prevention of gestational diabetes mellitus and hypertensive disorders of
25 pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*
26 2018;**52**:1367–75. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099355
- 27 4 Sanabria-Martínez G, García-Hermoso A, Poyatos-León R, *et al*. Effectiveness
28 of physical activity interventions on preventing gestational diabetes mellitus
29 and excessive maternal weight gain: a meta-analysis. *BJOG* 2015;**122**:1167–
30 74. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.13429
- 31 5 Physical activity and exercise during pregnancy and the postpartum period.
32 Committee Opinion No. 650. American College of Obstetricians and
33 Gynecologists. *Obs Gynecol* 2015;**126**:e135–42.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 6 Bø K, Artal R, Barakat R, *et al.* Exercise and pregnancy in recreational and
2 elite athletes : 2016 / 2017 evidence summary from the IOC expert group
3 meeting , Lausanne . Part 5 . Recommendations for health professionals and
4 active women. *Br J Sport Med* 2018;**52**:1080–5. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-
5 099351
- 6 7 Mottola MF, Davenport MH, Ruchat S-M, *et al.* No. 367-2019 Canadian
7 Guideline for Physical Activity throughout Pregnancy. *J Obstet Gynaecol*
8 *Canada* 2018;**13**:1339–46. doi:10.1016/j.jogc.2018.07.001
- 9 8 Davenport MH, Nagpal TS, Mottola MF, *et al.* Prenatal exercise (including
10 but not limited to pelvic floor muscle training) and urinary incontinence
11 during and following pregnancy : a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J*
12 *Sport Med* 2018;**52**:1397–404. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099780
- 13 9 Poyatos-León R, García-Hermoso A, Sanabria-Martínez G, *et al.* Effects of
14 exercise-based interventions on postpartum depression: A meta-analysis of
15 randomized controlled trials. *Birth* 2017;**44**:200–8. doi:10.1111/birt.12294
- 16 10 Poyatos-León R, García-Hermoso A, Sanabria-Martínez G, *et al.* Effects of
17 exercise during pregnancy on mode of delivery: A meta-analysis. *Acta Obstet*
18 *Gynecol Scand* 2015;**94**. doi:10.1111/aogs.12675
- 19 11 Evenson KR, Wen F. Prevalence and correlates of objectively measured
20 physical activity and sedentary behavior among US pregnant women. *Prev*
21 *Med (Baltim)* 2011;**53**:39–43. doi:10.1016/J.YPMED.2011.04.014
- 22 12 Santo EC, Forbes PW, Oken E, *et al.* Determinants of physical activity
23 frequency and provider advice during pregnancy. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*
24 2017;**17**:286. doi:10.1186/s12884-017-1460-z
- 25 13 Davenport MH, Ruchat S, Sobierajski F, *et al.* Impact of prenatal exercise on
26 maternal harms , labour and delivery outcomes : a systematic review and
27 meta-analysis. *Br J Sport Med* 2019;**53**:99–107. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-
28 099821
- 29 14 Di Mascio D, Magro-Malosso ER, Saccone G, *et al.* Exercise during pregnancy
30 in normal-weight women and risk of preterm birth: a systematic review and
31 meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*
32 2016;**215**:561–71. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.06.014
- 33 15 Davenport MH, Meah VL, Ruchat S-M, *et al.* Impact of prenatal exercise on

- 1 neonatal and childhood outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br*
2 *J Sports Med* 2018;**52**:1386 LP – 1396.
- 3 16 Sanabria-Martínez G, García-Hermoso A, Poyatos-León R, *et al*. Effects of
4 Exercise-Based Interventions on Neonatal Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis of
5 Randomized Controlled Trials. *Am J Heal Promot* 2016;**30**.
6 doi:10.1177/0890117116639569
- 7 17 da Silva SG, Ricardo LI, Evenson KR, *et al*. Leisure-Time Physical Activity in
8 Pregnancy and Maternal-Child Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-
9 Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials and Cohort Studies. *Sport. Med.*
10 2017;**47**:295–317. doi:10.1007/s40279-016-0565-2
- 11 18 Vargas C De, Coll N, Domingues MR, *et al*. Efficacy of Regular Exercise During
12 Pregnancy on the Prevention of Postpartum Depression The PAMELA
13 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2019;**2**:1–12.
14 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.6861
- 15 19 Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, *et al*. Preferred reporting items for
16 systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement.
17 *Rev Esp Nutr Humana y Diet* 2016;**350**:148–60. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1
- 18 20 Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, *et al*. The Cochrane
19 Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised
20 trials. *BMJ* 2011;**343**. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928
- 21 21 Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, *et al*. AMSTAR 2: A critical appraisal tool for
22 systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of
23 healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ* 2017;**358**:1–9.
24 doi:10.1136/bmj.j4008
- 25 22 DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials*
26 1986;**7**:177–88. doi:10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2
- 27 23 Lau J, JA I, CH S. QUantitative synthesis in systematic reviews. *Ann Intern*
28 *Med* 1997;**127**:820–6.
- 29 24 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Spiegelhalter DJ. A re-evaluation of random-
30 effects meta-analysis. *J R Stat Soc Ser A (Statistics Soc* 2009;**172**:137–59.
31 doi:10.1111/j.1467-985X.2008.00552.x
- 32 25 Higgins JPT. Commentary: Heterogeneity in meta-analysis should be
33 expected and appropriately quantified. *Int J Epidemiol* 2008;**37**:1158–60.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 26 Riley RD, Higgins JPT, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2011;**342**. doi:10.1136/bmj.d549
- 2
- 3 27 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2002;**21**:1539–58. doi:10.1002/sim.1186
- 4
- 5 28 Ioannidis JPA, Patsopoulos NA, Evangelou E. Uncertainty in heterogeneity estimates in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2007;**335**:914–6. doi:10.1136/bmj.39343.408449.80
- 6
- 7
- 8 29 Hayashino Y, Noguchi Y, Fukui T. Systematic evaluation and comparison of statistical tests for publication bias. *J Epidemiol* 2005;**15**:235–43.
- 9
- 10 30 Fusar-Poli P, Radua J. Ten simple rules for conducting umbrella reviews. *Evid Based Ment Health* 2018;**21**:95–100. doi:10.1136/ebmental-2018-300014
- 11
- 12 31 Chinn S. A simple method for converting an odds ratio to effect size for use in meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2000;**19**:3127–31. doi:10.1002/1097-0258(20001130)19:22<3127::AID-SIM784>3.0.CO;2-M
- 13
- 14
- 15 32 Cochran WG. The Combination of Estimates from Different Experiments. *Biometrics* 1954;**10**:101. doi:10.2307/3001666
- 16
- 17 33 Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, *et al*. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2011;**343**:d4002. doi:10.1136/bmj.d4002
- 18
- 19
- 20 34 Egger, M., Smith, G.D., Schneider, M., & Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;**315**:629–34.
- 21
- 22 35 Ioannidis JPA, Trikalinos TA. An exploratory test for an excess of significant findings. *Clin Trials* 2007;**4**:245–53. doi:10.1177/1740774507079441
- 23
- 24 36 Ioannidis JPA. Clarifications on the application and interpretation of the test for excess significance and its extensions. *J Math Psychol* 2013;**57**:184–7. doi:10.1016/J.JMP.2013.03.002
- 25
- 26

1
2
3 **1 TABLE LEGENDS**
4

5 **2 Table 1:** Search strategy Pubmed of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.
6

7 **3 Table 2:** Search strategy Pubmed for randomized controlled trials.
8
9

10 **5 ADDITIONAL FILE LEGENDS**
11

12 **6 Additional file 1:** Data extraction form for systematic reviews and meta-analyses
13

14 **7 Additional file 2:** Data extraction form for included randomized controlled trials.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Table 1:** Search strategy Pubmed of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.
2

Search Set	Medline
#1	Pregnant
#2	Pregnancy
#3	Gravid
#4	Gestation*
#5	Maternal
#6	Fetus
#7	Neonate
#8	Newborn
#9	Child*
#10	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9
#11	Aerobic
#12	Sport
#13	Exercise
#14	Fitness
#15	"Physical exercise"
#16	"Physical activity"
#17	"Motor activity"
#18	11 OR 12 OR 13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17
#19	Diabetes
#20	Diabetes mellitus
#21	DM
#22	"Gestational diabetes"
#23	"Glucose intolerance"
#24	Glucose
#25	Insulin
#26	Hyperglycemia
#27	Toxemia
#28	Preeclampsia
#29	Pre-eclampsia
#30	Eclampsia
#31	"Hypertensive disorders"
#32	"Blood pressure"
#33	"Weight retention"
#34	"Body Mass Index"
#35	BMI
#36	Labor
#37	Labour
#38	Delivery
#39	Caesarean
#40	"Prenatal depression"
#41	"Pre-natal depression"
#42	"Pre natal depression"
#43	"Postpartum depression"
#37	"Post partum depression"
#38	"Post-partum depression"

Search Set	Medline
#39	"Postnatal depression"
#40	"Post natal depression"
#41	"Post-natal depression"
#42	"Puerperal depression"
#43	"Peripartum depression"
#44	"Depressive disorder"
#45	Depression
#46	Abortion
#47	Stillbirth
#48	"Fetal death"
#49	"Gestational age"
#50	Preterm
#51	"Preterm delivery"
#52	Prematur*
#53	"Birth weight"
#54	Macrosoma
#55	"Apgar score"
#56	"umbilical cord blood"
#57	"pH umbilical cord"
#58	19 OR 20 OR 21 OR 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31 OR 32 OR 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 OR 48 OR 49 OR 50 OR 51 OR 52 OR 53 OR 54 OR 55 OR 56 OR 57
#59	Meta
#60	Meta-analysis
#61	Review
#62	"Systematic review"
#63	59 OR 60 OR 61 OR 62
#64	10 AND 18 AND 58 AND 63

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Table 2:** Search strategy Pubmed for randomized controlled trials.
 2

Search Set	Medline
#1	Pregnant
#2	Pregnancy
#3	Gravid
#4	Gestation*
#5	Maternal
#6	Fetus
#7	Neonate
#8	Newborn
#9	Child*
#10	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9
#11	Aerobic
#12	Sport
#13	Exercise
#14	Fitness
#15	"Physical exercise"
#16	"Physical activity"
#17	"Motor activity"
#18	11 OR 12 OR 13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17
#19	Diabetes
#20	Diabetes mellitus
#21	DM
#22	"Gestational diabetes"
#23	"Glucose intolerance"
#24	Glucose
#25	Insulin
#26	Hyperglycemia
#27	Toxemia
#28	Preeclampsia
#29	Pre-eclampsia
#30	Eclampsia
#31	"Hypertensive disorders"
#32	"Blood pressure"
#33	"Weight retention"
#34	"Body Mass Index"
#35	BMI
#36	Labor
#37	Labour
#38	Delivery
#39	Caesarean
#40	"Prenatal depression"
#41	"Pre-natal depression"
#42	"Pre natal depression"
#43	"Postpartum depression"
#44	"Post partum depression"
#45	"Post-partum depression"

Search Set	Medline
#46	"Postnatal depression"
#47	"Post natal depression"
#48	"Post-natal depression"
#49	"Puerperal depression"
#50	"Peripartum depression"
#51	"Depressive disorder"
#52	Depression
#53	Abortion
#54	Stillbirth
#55	"Fetal death"
#56	"Gestational age"
#57	Preterm
#58	"Preterm delivery"
#59	Prematur*
#60	"Birth weight"
#61	Macrosoma
#62	"Apgar score"
#63	"umbilical cord blood"
#64	"pH umbilical cord"
#65	19 OR 20 OR 21 OR 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31 OR 32 OR 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 OR 48 OR 49 OR 50 OR 51 OR 52 OR 53 OR 54 OR 55 OR 56 OR 57 OR 58 OR 59 OR 60 OR 61 OR 62 OR 63 OR 64
#66	Effectiveness
#67	"Program evaluation"
#68	"Randomized controlled trial"
#69	RCT
#70	"Controlled trial"
#71	Trial
#72	66 OR 67 OR 68 OR 69 OR 70 OR 71
#73	18 AND 18 AND 65 AND 72

1
2
3
4
5

Additional file 1: Data extraction form for systematic reviews and meta-analyses

Items	Extracted data
Reviewer	
First Author and Publication year	
Review title	
Year range considered for inclusion	
Journal name	
Last search date	
Region/state/country	
Source of funding	
Aim/objectives of the study	
Protocol registered	
Database searched	
Number of articles included	
Number of articles included in meta-analysis	
Participant characteristics (age, number of participants, parity, subgroups)	
Type of exercise	
Intensity of exercise	
Duration of intervention	
Main Outcome variable	
Total Sample size	
Quality assessment tool and source	
Cochrane Collaboration reviews Vs not	

Items	Extracted data
Type of analysis used in review	
Pooled effect	
Findings	
Adverse Events	
Sub-group analysis/sensitivity test criteria and findings	
Overall quality of included studies AMSTAR-2	
Quality of the evidence GRADE	
Reported heterogeneity of the studies, I^2	
Reporting guideline used (PRISMA)	
Key conclusions of study authors: Further study information requested	
Reviewers comments on methodology, limitations, generalisability that you have after reading the paper	
Reported publication bias	

Additional file 2: Data extraction form for included randomized controlled trials.

Items	Extracted data
Reviewer	
First Author and Publication year	
RCT title	
Setting	
Intervention Group Sample	
Control Group Sample	
Participant characteristics (parity, BMI)	
Protocol registered	
Intervention Characteristics	
Type of exercise	
Duration (weeks)	
Frequency (sessions per week)	
Session duration (min)	
Intensity of exercise	
Main Outcome variables	
Pooled effect	
Findings	
Adverse Events	
Risk of bias (Cochrane collaboration's tool)	
Sequence generation	
Allocation concealment	
Blinding of personnel and participants	
Blinding of outcome assessment	
Incomplete outcome data	
Selective outcome reporting	
Others	

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION		
Title:		
Identification: p. 1	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review
Update: NA	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such
Registration: pp. 3,6	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number
Authors: pp. 1,13		
Contact: p. 1	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author
Contributions: p. 13	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review
Amendments: NA	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments
Support: p. 13		
Sources: p. 13	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review
Sponsor: p.13	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor
Role of sponsor or funder:p.13	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol
INTRODUCTION		
Rationale: pp. 4,5	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known
Objectives: p. 5	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)
METHODS		
Eligibility criteria: p. 6,7	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review
Information sources: p. 6	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage
Search strategy: pp. 6,19-22	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated
Study records: pp. 7,8		
Data management: p.7,8	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review

1			
2			
3	Selection process: p. 8	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)
4			
5	Data collection process: p. 8	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators
6			
7	Data items: p. 7,8	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications
8			
9	Outcomes and prioritization: p. 7,8	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale
10			
11	Risk of bias in individual studies: p. 9	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis
12			
13	Data synthesis: pp. 9-11	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised
14		15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2 , Kendall's τ)
15		15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)
16		15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned
17			
18	Meta-bias(es): NA	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)
19			
20	Confidence in cumulative evidence: p. 9	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)
21			
22			

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.