

OPEN

# Rehabilitation effects of land and water-based aerobic exercise on lung function, dyspnea, and exercise capacity in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

A systematic review and meta-analysis

Haixia Chen, MEd<sup>a</sup>, Peijun Li, DEd<sup>b</sup>, Ning Li, MEd<sup>b</sup>, Zhengrong Wang, MEd<sup>b</sup>, Weibing Wu, DPe<sup>b</sup>, Jihong Wang, DPe<sup>a,\*</sup>

# Abstract

**Background:** We sought to synthesize the evidence about aerobic exercise intervention during pulmonary rehabilitation, and to further explore the difference in rehabilitation effects between water and land-based aerobic exercise. This review's purpose is to provide a basis by which practitioners and therapists can select and create appropriate therapeutic programs.

**Methods:** Data of randomized and quasi-randomized controlled trials comparing training group (TG, aerobic exercise in water or land) and control group (CG, usual care) in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) patients (January 1, 2000–December 28, 2019) were obtained from the Cochrane Library, PubMed, Embase, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, and Wanfang databases. Two researchers independently reviewed the literature, extracted the data, and evaluated the quality of the literature. Review Manager software (Rev Man 5.3; Cochrane, London, UK) was used for meta-analysis. The rehabilitation effect of water- or land based aerobic exercise was evaluated by subgroup analysis. The proposed systematic review details were registered in PROSPERO (CRD 42020168331).

**Results:** Eighteen studies (1311 cases of COPD) were included. Meta-analysis results show that compared with the control group, the dyspnea level and functional and endurance exercise capacity in COPD patients were significantly improved after aerobic exercise (P < .05), but there was no significant change in lung function (P > .05). Compared with land-based aerobic exercise, water-based aerobic exercise significantly improved the endurance exercise capacity in COPD patients (mean difference [MD]: 270.18, 95% CI: 74.61–465.75).

**Conclusion:** Medium to high-quality evidence shows that aerobic exercise can effectively improve dyspnea and exercise capacity in COPD patients. Compared with land-based aerobic exercise, water-based aerobic exercise had a significant additional effect in improving the endurance exercise capacity of COPD patients.

**Abbreviations:** 6MWT = 6-minute walking test, CG = control group, COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, <math>CI = confidence interval, ESWT = endurance shuttle walk test, FEV1 = forced expiratory volume in the first second, FEV1/FVC = ratio of forced expiratory volume in the first second to forced vital capacity, ISWT = incremental shuttle walk test, LG = land (exercise) group, LLMS = lower limb muscle strength, MD = mean difference, PR = pulmonary rehabilitation, SMD = standardized mean difference, TG = aerobic exercise in water or land, ULMS = upper limb muscle strength, WG = water (exercise) group.

Keywords: aerobic exercise, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, exercise therapy, water

Editor: Sahar Abdalbary.

Received: 1 March 2021 / Received in final form: 28 June 2021 / Accepted: 29 July 2021 http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000026976

This study was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (81902307 and 82072551) and project of Science and Technology Commission of Shanghai Municipality (20080502700).

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> School of Physical Education and Training, Shanghai University of Sport, Shanghai, China, <sup>b</sup> Department of Sports Rehabilitation, Shanghai University of Sport, Shanghai, China.

<sup>\*</sup> Correspondence: Jihong Wang, School of Physical Education and Training, Shanghai University of Sport, Chang Hai Road No 399, Yang Pu District, Shanghai 200438, China (e-mail: wangjhsus@yeah.net).

Copyright © 2021 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc.

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CCBY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Chen H, Li P, Li N, Wang Z, Wu W, Wang J. Rehabilitation effects of land and water-based aerobic exercise on lung function, dyspnea, and exercise capacity in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine 2021;100:33(e26976).

# 1. Introduction

Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) is a common, preventable, and treatable chronic respiratory disease characterized by restricted airflow caused by abnormal airways and/or alveoli.<sup>[1]</sup> Epidemiological data show that the prevalence of COPD in people over the age of 40 has reached 13.7%.<sup>[2]</sup> Nearly three billion people worldwide are at risk of COPD,<sup>[3]</sup> with >5.4 million deaths a year from COPD and related diseases by 2060.<sup>[4]</sup> As the disease progresses, patients often undergo frequent outpatient or inpatient treatment due to dyspnea, exercise intolerance, and decreased levels of daily living activities, eventually leading to a decline in quality of life, poor prognosis, and premature death.<sup>[5]</sup> Although evidence-based drug therapy can alleviate dyspnea in COPD patients, a 2018 Lancet study<sup>[2]</sup> and the 2020 GOLD guidelines<sup>[6]</sup> still emphasize the importance of pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) in COPD.

PR is a personalized, multi-disciplinary, evidence-based medicine, and it is a comprehensive non-drug intervention program designed for COPD patients. It is an essential element of a comprehensive nursing strategy for COPD. As the cornerstone of PR, aerobic exercise can improve maximum exercise performance in COPD patients (moderate-severe), enhance exercise tolerance and physiological adaptation, and facilitate the self-regulation of heart rate.<sup>[7,8]</sup> In recent years, aerobic exercise programs for COPD patients have been continually enriched (both land-based aerobic exercise and water-based aerobic exercise). The main roles of aerobic exercise are the optimization of walking-related skeletal muscle function, the improvement of, cardiopulmonary fitness, exercise capacity, and physical activity.<sup>[8,9-11]</sup> A rich variety of aerobic exercise programs presents more possibilities and options to patients seeking PR, however, these programs also broaden the methodologies used for aerobic exercise intervention, which leads to variation in the rehabilitation effects of aerobic exercise. Therefore, the effectiveness of these aerobic exercise programs requires further verification.

Studies have shown that in land-based aerobic exercise intervention, chronic joint pain,<sup>[12]</sup> skeletal muscle dysfunction,<sup>[13]</sup> and imbalance<sup>[14]</sup> patients have poor rehabilitation effects. Patients often fail to adhere for a long period time due to lack of interest,<sup>[15]</sup> and as their disease condition worsens, they are unable to complete the established intervention program. A meta-analysis found that there are additional advantages in water,<sup>[16]</sup> which may be due to the fact that the water environment has physical characteristics such as temperature, hydrostatic pressure, buoyancy, and resistance, which play a positive role in relieving pain and reducing joint load for the lower extremities. Due to the load effect of aerobic exercise in water on respiratory muscles, it may have a significant positive effect on improving lung function,<sup>[17]</sup> respiratory muscle strength,<sup>[18]</sup> and dyspnea<sup>[19]</sup> in COPD patients. However, the study found that there was no difference in changes to lung function or exercise capacity between land and water-based exercise, and there was still insufficient evidence to support the conclusion that either land or water-based exercise led to significant improvement in lung function and exercise capacity.

This review aimed to quantitatively evaluates the effects of aerobic exercise on lung function, dyspnea, and exercise capacity in COPD patients when used in water or on land. This can provide a basis that will help practitioners and therapists selecting and structuring appropriate therapeutic programs to achieve improvement in all aspects of COPD, and promote an overall therapeutic effect.

## 2. Methods

This systematic review is reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. The proposed system evaluation details have been registered in PROSPERO (CRD42018094172). Our manuscript is meta-analysis, so ethical review is unnecessary.

## 2.1. Search strategy

The Cochrane Library, PubMed, Embase, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, and Wanfang databases were searched for randomized controlled trials and quasi-randomized controlled trials of land and or water aerobic exercise for COPD patients from January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2019, regardless of publication language. When formulating the retrieval strategy, 3 groups of subject words and related keywords that included participants, interventions, and experimental design were used. The primary search words are shown in Table 1. To complement these procedures, references included in the studies, related system reviews, and meta-analyses were hand searched to identify other studies that could be eligible.

## 2.2. Inclusion criteria

All the included publications were randomized controlled studies or quasi-randomized controlled studies, the study subjects were patients with stable COPD, the experimental group received aerobic exercise intervention on land (LG) or in water (WG) along with usual care, while the control group (CG) only received usual care, the specific forms of aerobic exercise could be carried out in water or on land, and at least one outcome index was evaluated, and these included different parameters to evaluate lung function, namely, forced expiratory volume in the first second in percent predicted values (FEV1%pred), ratio of forced expiratory volume in the first second to forced vital capacity (FEV1/FVC%); exercise capacity, 6-minute walking test (6MWT), incremental shuttle walk test (ISWT), endurance shuttle walk test (ESWT); dyspnea (Borg); peripheral muscle

Table 1	
Main search terms.	
Subject	Key words
Pulmonary disease, chronic obstructive; lung diseases, obstructive	COPD; Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease; Chronic Obstructive Airway Disease; Chronic Airflow Obstructions
Exercise; aerobic-exercise; water aerobics; water sport	Water-based exercise; Water-based sports; Exercises, Aerobic; Aerobic Exercises; Aerobic training; Endurance Training; walking
Randomized controlled trial	Randomized; placebo

strength (upper limb muscle strength [ULMS]: biceps brachii, lower limb muscle strength [LLMS]: quadriceps femoris). Among them, dyspnea and peripheral muscle strength are secondary outcomes.

#### 2.3. Exclusion criteria

Patients with acute exacerbation of COPD, outcomes that did not meet the requirements, data could not be extracted, outcomes did not meet the requirements, and non-randomized controlled trials.

### 2.4. Quality evaluation

The PEDro score was used to evaluate the quality of the articles that included random allocation; concealed allocation; baseline comparability; blind subjects, therapists, and assessors; adequate follow-up; intention-to-treat analysis; between-group comparisons; and point estimates and variability. Items are rated yes or no (1 or 0) according to whether the criterion is satisfied in the study. A total PEDro score is achieved by adding the ratings of items 2 to 11 for a combined total score between 0 and 10. Higher scores indicate superior methodological quality. Study quality did not affect eligibility for inclusion within the meta-analysis, as detailed in the resources (https://www.pedro.org.au).

### 2.5. Data extraction

Two researchers evaluated the title or abstract of each article separately. At least one of the researchers had to consider that the study met the inclusion criteria to be included in the first selection for a full evaluation. The 2 researchers then independently evaluated the selected articles to determine whether to include or exclude them from the study. When disagreement occurred, a third researcher participated in the discussion to reach a final consensus. Finally, for studies that met the inclusion criteria, the study characteristics and required data were extracted. The extracted contents included the participant sample size, participant age, sex ratio, degree of airflow restriction (FEV1% predicted), intervention programs (such as the training format, content, exercise intensity, intervention cycle), and outcomes.

#### 2.6. Data analysis

Review Manager software (Rev Man 5.3, Cochrane, London, UK) was used for the meta-analysis. For binary variables, the odds ratio was used as the effect scale index. For the continuous variables, the mean difference (MD) or standardized mean difference (SMD) and a 95% confidence interval (CI) were used. The same measurement method and units were used to report the research results using MD, and different measurement methods or units were used to report research results using SMD. If P < .05, a significant difference existed. Heterogeneity between studies was assessed using  $I^2$  statistics, and  $I^2$  values <25%, 25% to 50%, and >50% were considered to represent small, medium, and large heterogeneity, respectively. In this meta-analysis, we selected the random effects model for the combined analysis.

## 3. Results

# 3.1. Search results

A database search was performed to obtain 2918 studies. After deleting 706 repetitive studies, reading questions, abstracts, and excluding the full text, 18 studies were subsequently selected for the final analysis (Fig. 1).

#### 3.2. Study characteristics

Eighteen studies involving 1311 patients were included, of which 651 (50%) performed aerobic exercise on land, 177 (13%) performed aerobic exercise in water, and 483 (37%) received usual care. The participants were an average age of 58 to 75 years, with moderate to severe disease. Eighteen studies were included, 9 studies<sup>[20-28]</sup> explored the intervention effects of aerobic exercise on land, 2 studies<sup>[29,30]</sup> explored the effects of aerobic exercise interventions in the water environment, 3 studies<sup>[31-33]</sup> compared the differences between the effects of aerobic exercise interventions performed on land and water environments, and 4 studies<sup>[34-37]</sup> compared the intervention effects between aerobic exercise on land, aerobic exercise in water, and the CG. In all studies, the intensity of walking and running was 70% to 80% of the average 6MWT speed or Borg scale of 4 to 6 points, and cycling exercise at 60% to 70% of the individual's maximum speed or Borg scale of 4 to 6 points, upper and lower limb strength exercise is a low-intensity and highrepetition exercise based on physiological tolerance. The intervention cycle focused on 6 to 12 weeks (2-5 times/wk). The water exercise was performed in a swimming pool with a water temperature of 32 to 34°C. The specific forms and movements can also be applied to land-based aerobic exercise. In the comparative study of water and land, most of the aerobic exercise that took place in water used a floating device to increase the resistance, or reduce the initial load to reduce the resistance, and took into account the respiratory muscle and auxiliary muscle movement that may be brought about by higher thoracic and abdominal pressure during the exercise, to enhance the comparability of water and land-based exercise intensity. Table 2 details the included study participants, intervention programs, and outcomes.

#### 3.3. Quality assessment

A total of 9 randomized controlled trial PEDro score results had an average of 6 points, see Table 3. Four studies<sup>[21,30,31,34]</sup> scored 4 points, 3 studies<sup>[20,25,26]</sup> scored 5 points, 8 studies<sup>[22,27-29,32,33,35,37]</sup> scored 7 points, and 3 studies<sup>[23,24,26]</sup> scored 8 points. All 18 of the studies reported baseline comparability, between-group comparisons, and point estimates and variability. Fifteen studies reported adequate follow-up, 14 studies reported random allocation, 12 studies reported concealed allocation, and 9 studies reported blind assessors, 6 studies reported intention-totreat analysis, 2 studies reported that the blind subjects, and none of the studies reported blind therapists.

### 3.4. Meta-analysis

**3.4.1.** Pulmonáry function. Seven studies<sup>[21,25,28,30,32,34,35]</sup> evaluated the intervention effect of aerobic exercise on lung function. Compared with the CG, there was no significant difference in overall lung function of aerobic exercise in water or land (TG) (FEV1% pred, P=1.02, 5 studies,<sup>[21,25,28,30,35]</sup> FEV1/FVC%, P=.17, 4 studies<sup>[25,28,30,35]</sup>). Subgroup analysis showed that there was no significant difference between the LG or WG compared with the CG (Table 4).

In the comparison between water-based aerobic exercise and land-based aerobic exercise, it was found that there was no significant difference between the 2 groups after aerobic exercise intervention (FEV1% pred, P = .57, 3 studies, <sup>[32,34,35]</sup> FEV1/FVC %, P = .87, 2 studies<sup>[32,35]</sup>, Fig. 2).



**3.4.2. Dyspnea.** Seven studies<sup>[21,23,24,27,30,34,37]</sup> used the Borg scale (0–10) to evaluate the intervention effect of aerobic exercise on dyspnea. Compared with the CG, TG significantly improved dyspnea (P=.001). Subgroup analysis showed significant improvement in the LG (P=.01), while the WG showed no significant improvement (P=.06, Table 4).

Two studies<sup>[34,37]</sup> used Borg to evaluate dyspnea after water and land-based aerobic exercise intervention. Although the dyspnea score of the WG was higher than that of the LG, there was no significant difference in dyspnea between the 2 groups (P=.16, Fig. 3).

**3.4.3.** Exercise capacity. Sixteen studies evaluated the effect of aerobic exercise intervention on exercise capacity, of which 9 studies<sup>[23–26,28–30,34,37]</sup> used 6MWT, 8 studies<sup>[20,22–24,26,27,36,37]</sup> used ISWT, and 6 studies<sup>[23,24,26,27,36,38]</sup> used ESWT. Table 4 showed that compared with the CG, TG did not significantly improve ISWT (MD: 16.28, 95% CI [–1.84, 34.41], P=.08), but did significantly improve 6MWT (MD: 56.37, 95% CI [32.61, 80.13], P<.05) and ESWT (MD: 254.81, 95% CI [166.41, 343.22], P<.05). Subgroup analysis showed that compared with

the CG, both the WG and the LG were able to significantly improve 6MWT and ESWT (P < .05, Table 4).

In the comparison between water-based aerobic exercise and land-based aerobic exercise, 5 studies<sup>[31-34,37]</sup> used 6MWT, while 4 studies<sup>[32,33,36,37]</sup> used ISWT to assess exercise capacity. The results found that there was no significant difference between the 2 groups after the land and water-based aerobic exercise intervention (P=.60, P=.71). Additionally, 2 studies<sup>[36,37]</sup> used ESWT to assess exercise capacity. The meta-analysis found that the WG showed significant improvement compared with the LG (MD: 272.03, 95% CI [66.76, 477.31], P=.009, Fig. 4).

**3.4.4.** Peripheral muscle strength. Three studies<sup>[25,27,35]</sup> evaluated the effect of aerobic exercise on peripheral muscle strength. Compared with the CG, TG had no significant improvement in peripheral muscle strength (ULMS, P=.34, LLMS, P=.98), and subgroup analysis showed that compared with the CG, the WG and LG were not significantly different.

Two studies<sup>[31,32]</sup> evaluated peripheral muscle strength after the water and land-based aerobic exercise intervention. Compared with the LG, there was no significant improvement in

Table 2

Study	WG	LG	CG	Comeout/Index	Result
Bestall 2003 <sup>[20]</sup>	_	n=23; yr: 68.2±8.4; FEV1%pred: 37±11; Intervention: ET (walking/ cycling); ST; Intensity: Borg 3–4; Period: 2T/W, 8W; follow-1Y (3T/ W, T/60 mins)	n=21; yr: $69.2 \pm 6.3$ FEV1%pred: $38 \pm 12$ routine nursing	ISWT; ESWT	LG: ISWT <sup>a</sup>
Wadell 2004 <sup>[36]</sup>	n=15; yr: 65±4; f/m: 11/4; FEV1%pred: 56±11 water temperature: 33-34°C; Intervention: same as LG	n=15, yr: 65±7; f/m: 10/5; FEV1% pred: 53±12; Intervention: 9 min WU; 4 min ET; 3 min ST, 12 min CD; Intensity: Borg 5; Period: T/ 45 min: 3TW: 12W	n=13; yr: 63±7; f/m: 6/7; FEV1%pred: 49±12; routine nursing	ISWT; ESWT	LG:ISWT <sup>b</sup> ; WG: ESWT <sup>a</sup>
Puente-Maestu 2006 <sup>[21]</sup>	_	n=28; yr: 62±5; FEV1%pred: 46.8 ±9.2; Intervention: 45 min ET; Intensity: 70%peak (cycling) Period: 41/W. 6W	$n=20$ ; yr: $61\pm 6$ FEV1%pred: $47.1\pm 10.9$ routine nursing	FEV1%pred; FEV1/FVC%; Borg	LG: FEV1%pred <sup>b</sup> , FEV1/FVC% <sup>b</sup>
Lotshaw 2007 <sup>[31]</sup>	$\label{eq:n=20; yr: 65 \pm 14; f/m: 12/8} FEV1% pred: 47.11 \pm 17; Intervention: same as LG; ST's intensity (2 \times 10)$	n=12; yr: 71 ±7; f/m: 11/9; FEV1% pred: 44.44 ±15.84; Intervention: 30 min ET (running/cycling); 30 min ST; Intensity: HR 60–80%, Borg 11–14; 6RM100%; Period: 6W/18T	_	6MWT; 6RM	LG: All the indicators <sup>b</sup>
Ozdemir 2010 <sup>[30]</sup>	n = 25; yr: 60.9 ± 8.8; FEV1% pred: 54.5 ± 15.6; water temperature 32°C; Intervention: 35 min ET; ST, Period: 3T/W 4W		n=25; yr: 64.1 ± 8.9; FEV1% pred:54.1 ± 20.2; routine nursing	FEV1%pred; 6MWT; Borg	WG: FEV1%pred <sup>c</sup> ; 6MWT <sup>b</sup>
de Souto Araujo 2012 <sup>[34]</sup>	n=8; yr: 62.4 ± 9.9; f/m4/4; FEV1%pred: 43.9 ± 10.3; water temperature 32 ± 2 °C; Intervention: 15 min (aerobics); 2 min UAEx; 30 min (cycling); 15 min CD; Intensity: weight (sling) and diagonal movement, maximum individual load 50%↑, Borg5; Period: 3T/W; 8W	n=13; yr: 56.9±7.9; f/m5/8; FEV1%pred: 39.2±11.4; Intervention: 15 min (aerobics); 2 min UAEx, 30 min (cycling); 15 min CD; Intensity: weight (sling) and diagonal movement, maximum individual load 50%↑, Borg5; Period: 3T/W; 8W	n=11; yr: 71.1±10.1; f/m3/8 FEV1%pred: 45.1±12.6 routine nursing	FEV1%pred; FEV1/FVC%; 6MWT; Borg	TG: FEV1%pred <sup>b</sup> , FEV1/FVC % <sup>b</sup> , Dyspnea (WG/CG) 6MWT <sup>b</sup>
Leug 2012 <sup>[27]</sup>		n=19; Intervention: 60 min ET (Tai chi wrist load 0.5–1.5 kg); Intensity: Borg3; Period: 2T/W,	n = 19; routine nursing	ISWT; ESWT; Borg	LG: all the indicators $^{\rm b}$
Casey 2013 <sup>[22]</sup>	_	n=178, yr: 68.8±10.2; f/m: 61/ 117; FEV1%pred: 57.6±14.3; Intervention: 10min WU; 20min ET (walking); 3min ST (8–10×3); 5min CD; Intensity: Borg4; Period: 2TM/ 12–14W	$  n = 172; \text{ yr: } 68.4 \pm 10.3; \text{ f/} \\  m: 66/106; \text{ FEV1%pred: } 59.7 \\  \pm 13.8 \\  \text{routine nursing} $	ISWT	LG: ISWT <sup>b</sup>
McNamara2013 <sup>[37]</sup>	n=18; yr: 72 $\pm$ 10; f/m: 13/5; FEV1%pred: 60 $\pm$ 10; water temperature 34°C; Intervention: similar to the LG	<ul> <li>n=20; yr: 73 ±7; f/m: 10/10;</li> <li>FEV1%pred: 62 ±15; Intervention: 8 min WU; 15–20 min (walking/ cycling); 10 min ET (3–10); 2 min CD; Intensity: 80% 6MWT (walking); Borg3–5; Period: 3T/W; 8W</li> </ul>	n=15; yr: $70 \pm 9$ ; f/m: 8/7 FEV1%pred: 55 $\pm 20$ routine nursing	6MWT; ISWT; ESWT; Borg	LG: 6MWT <sup>b</sup> , ISWT <sup>c</sup> , ESWT <sup>b</sup> , Dyspnea <sup>b</sup> WG: 6MWT <sup>b</sup> , ISWT <sup>b</sup> , ESWT <sup>b</sup> WG/LG; Dyspnea <sup>c</sup> ,
Wootton 2014 <sup>[23]</sup>	_	<ul> <li>NY</li> <li>N=95; yr: 69±8; f/m: 39/56;</li> <li>FEV1%pred: 43±15; Intervention: 30 min ET (walking); Intensity:</li> <li>80% 6MWT (load); Borg 3-4;</li> <li>Period: 2-31 &amp; -10W</li> </ul>	n=48; yr: 68±9; f/m: 20/28; FEV1%pred: 43±15; routine nursing	ISWT; ESWT; 6MWT; Borg	LG: ISWT <sup>b</sup> , ESWT <sup>a</sup>
Tsai 2017 <sup>[24]</sup>	_	n=19; yr: 73 ±8; f/m: 7/12; FEV1% pred: 60 ±23; Intervention: 15– 30 min (cycling/walking); Intensity: 60–80% HR peak†(cycling); 15– 30 min; 80% 6MWT (walking); Periori: 3TW: 8W	n=17; yr: 75±9; f/m: 11/6; FEV1%pred: 68±19; routine nursing	6MWT; ISWT; ESWT; Borg	LG: all the indicators <sup>b</sup>
Daabis 2017 <sup>[25]</sup>	_	n=15; yr: 61±8; FEV1%pred: 53.2 ±9.5; Intervention: 30 min ET (treadmill); 30 min ST; Intensity: 75% 6MWT: Period: 3T/W_8W	n = 15; yr: 60 ± 8; FEV1%pred: 54.6 ± 7.1 routine nursing	FEV1%pred; 6MWT; 1RM	LG/CG: except for FEV1% pred <sup>c</sup> , all the indicators <sup>a</sup>
Wootton 2017 <sup>[26]</sup>	_	n=62; yr: 69 ±8; f/m: 24/38; FEV1%pred: 42 ± 15; Intervention: 30–45 min ET (walking); Intensity: 80% 6MWT, (loat), Borg 3–4; Period: 2/3T. 8/10W	n=39; yr: 68±9; f/m: 15/24; FEV1%pred: 43±15; routine nursing	6MWT; ISWT; ESWT	LG/CG: 6MWT <sup>a</sup> , ISWT <sup>a</sup> , ESWT <sup>a</sup>
Li 2018 <sup>[28]</sup>	_	n=17; yr: 66 ±9; f/m: 5/14; FEV1% pred: 55.50 ± 16.8; Intervention: 10 min WU; 40 min ET (liuzijue); Intensity: Borg 3–4; 10 min CD; Period: 6T/W; 6M	n = 19; yr: $66 \pm 9$ ; f/m: 3/12; FEV1%pred: $58.49 \pm 19.4$ ; routine nursing	FEV1%pred; FEV1/FVC%; 6MWT	LG: FEV1%pred <sup>a</sup> , FEV1/FVC %p <sup>c</sup> , 6MWT <sup>a</sup>

T	а	b	le	2	

(continued).					
Study	WG	LG	CG	Comeout/Index	Result
Wu 2018 <sup>[35]</sup>	n=14; yr: $65 \pm 11$ ; f/m: 5/9; FEV1%pred: $59 \pm 22$ ; water temperature $32 \pm 2^{\circ}$ C Intervention: same as LG	n=15; yr: 65±8; f/m: 3/12; FEV1% pred: 55±17; Intervention: 10 min WU; 40 min ET (liuzijue); 10 min CD; Intensity: Borg 4–6; Period: 2TW: 12W	$\begin{array}{l} n = 16; \mbox{ yr: } 66 \pm 8; \mbox{ f/m: } 4/12; \\ \mbox{FEV1\%pred: } 59 \pm 17 \\ \mbox{ routine nursing} \end{array}$	FEV1%pred; FEV1/FVC%; Isokinetic muscle strength	TG: FEV1%pred <sup>c</sup> ; FEV1/FVC % <sup>c</sup> ; muscle strength <sup>a</sup> ; LG/WG: function of knee joints <sup>a</sup>
Felcar 2018 <sup>[32]</sup>	n=16; yr: 69±9; f/m: 6/14; FEV1%: p48±17; water temperature 33°C Intervention: same as LG	n=16; yr: 68±8; t/m: 7/9; FEV1% pred: 46±14; Intervention: WU; 20–38 min ET (cycling/walking); ST; Period: 3–2T/W; 12M	_	FEV1%pred; FEV1/FVC%; 1RM; 6MWT; ISWT	TG: FEV1%pred <sup>c</sup> , FEV1/FVC % <sup>c</sup> , 1RM <sup>b</sup> , 6MWT <sup>b</sup> , ISWT <sup>b</sup> ; LG/WG: all the indicators <sup>c</sup>
Gallo-Silva 2019 <sup>[29]</sup>	n=10; yr: 66.3±6.5; f: 10; FEV1%pred: 61.0±15.7; water temperature 32°C; Intervention: 10 min WU; 20– 40 min ET (aerobics/flexible exercise); 10 min CD Intensity: Borg 4–6; Period: 3T/W; 8W	_ ` `	n=9; yr: 66.5±9.5; f: 9; FEV1%pred: 60.1±16.6; routine nursing	6MWT	WG/CG: 6MWT <sup>a</sup>
de Castro 2019 <sup>[33]</sup>	n=14; yr: 65±8; f/m: 5/9; FEV1%pred: 51±15; water temperature 33 °C; Intervention: 1 min WU; 20– 38 min ET (cycling); Intensity: Borg 4–6 (cycling); Intensity: 75%60MWT/3↑ (walking); 70%1RM↑ (3 × 8); Period: 3–2T/W; 12M	n=17; yr: 64±8; f/m: 8/9; FEV1% pred: 49±17; Intervention: 1 min WU; 20–38 min ET (cycling/ walking); ST; Intensity: maximum individual load 60%cycling); 75% 6MWT↑ (walking); 70%1RM↑ (3 × 8); Period: 3–2T/W; 12M	_	6MWT; ISWT MVIC-Q; TUG	TG: 6MWT <sup>b</sup> ; ISWT <sup>b</sup> ; ISWT <sup>b</sup> , TUG <sup>b</sup> ; body balance <sup>b</sup> ; LG/WG: TUG <sup>a</sup>

6MWT=6-minute walking test, CD=cool down; Dyspnea = dyspnea measured at the end of the test, ET=endurance training, f/m=female/male, FEV1%pred=forced expiratory volume in the first second in percent predicted values, FEV1/FVC=ratio of forced expiratory volume in the first second to forced vital capacity, ISWT=incremental shuttle walk test, M=month, MVIC-Q=maximal voluntary isometric contraction of quadriceps, RM=repetition maximum strength test, ST=strength training, T/W=time/wk, TUG=timed up and go test, TG=training group, WU=warm-up, yr=age and year. <sup>a</sup> Comparing are significant between groups (P < .05).

<sup>b</sup> Comparing are significant within group (P < .05).

<sup>c</sup> Comparisons are no significant between groups (P>.05).

peripheral muscle strength in the WG (ULMS [SMD: 0.05 {-0.33, 0.44}, P=.79] and LLMS [SMD: 0.31, 95% CI {-0.13, 0.75}, P = .17], Fig. 5).

aerobic exercise groups. These health problems included deterioration due to the disease, cancer, orthopedics, and diabetes complications, vascular disease, and diarrhea. Eighteen patients withdrew because of lack of interest (LG=14, WG=4).

3.4.5. Adverse events. Although the severity of COPD differed between studies, the results reveal that (Fig. 6) there was no significant difference in the dropout rates among COPD patients in the different intervention environments (CG, LG, WG). Six studies reported that a total of 37 patients withdrew due to health problems (LG=21, WG=16) from both land and water-based

4. Discussion

The cornerstone of PR is aerobic exercise, and this systematic review shows that the functional exercise capacity, exercise endurance, and dyspnea of COPD patients show significant

 юı	• 1	( <u>_</u> ]	FC 18

PEDro scores of included studies

Study	Inclusion criteria	Random allocation	Allocation concealment	Similar to the baseline	Participants blind	Therapists blind	Assessors blind	85% of follow-up	Intentionality analysis	Comparison between groups	Measured value	Total score 10
Bestall 2003 <sup>[20]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
Wadell 2004 <sup>[36]</sup>	Yes	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5
Puente-Maestu 2006 <sup>[21]</sup>	Yes	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4
Lotshaw 2007 <sup>[31]</sup>	Yes	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4
Ozdemir2010 <sup>[30]</sup>	Yes	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
de Souto Araujo 2012 <sup>[34]</sup>	Yes	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
Leung 2012 <sup>[27]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	7
Casey 2013 <sup>[22]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	7
McNamara 2013 <sup>[37]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	7
Wootton 2014 <sup>[23]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	8
Tsai 2017 <sup>[24]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	8
Daabis 2017 <sup>[25]</sup>	Yes	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5
Wootton 2017 <sup>[26]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	8
Li 2018 <sup>[28]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	7
Wu 2018 <sup>[35]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	7
Felcar 2018 <sup>[32]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	7
de Castro 2019 <sup>[33]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	7
Gallo-silva 2019 <sup>[29]</sup>	Yes	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	7

1: Meets the PEDro scoring criteria; 0: not meet the PEDro scoring criteria.

Table 4
---------

Summar	y of subgro	up analysis.									
Aerobic ex	exercise group versus usual care. Subgroup: land versus water										
Outcome	Indicators	Subgroups	Studies/ Participants	Heterogeneity	MD [95% CI]; <i>P</i>	Test for subgroup differences					
Lung function	FEV1%pred	Water	2/80	Tau <sup>2</sup> =0.00; $l^2$ =0%	2.17 [-5.31, 9.66]; .57	Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.12, df=1 ( $P=$ $l^2=0\%$					
		Land	4/145	$Tau^2 = 0.00; l^2 = 0\%$	0.69 [-3.34, 4.72]; .74						
	FEV1/FVC %	Water	2/80	Tau <sup>2</sup> =0.00; $l^{2}=0\%$	0.65 [-4.21, 5.51]; .79	Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.06, df=1 ( $P=$ . $l^2=0\%$					
Dyspnea	Borg	Land	3/115	Tau <sup>2</sup> =0.00; $l^{2}=0\%$	-0.11 [-3.78, 3.56]; .95	$Chi^2 = 0.57 df = 1 (R = 1)$					

Outcome	Indicators	Subgroups	Participants	Heterogeneity	MD [95% CI]; P	differences	Total MD [95% CI]; <i>P</i>
Lung function	FEV1%pred	Water	2/80	$Tau^2 = 0.00; l^2 = 0\%$	2.17 [-5.31, 9.66]; .57	Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.12, df=1 ( $P$ =.73), P=0%	1.02 [-2.53, 4.57]; .57
		Land	4/145	$Tau^2 = 0.00; l^2 = 0\%$	0.69 [-3.34, 4.72]; .74		
	FEV1/FVC %	Water	2/80	Tau <sup>2</sup> =0.00; $l^{2}=0\%$	0.65 [-4.21, 5.51]; .79	Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.06, df=1 ( $P$ =.81), $l^{2}$ =0%	0.17 [-2.76, 3.09]; .91
Dyspnea	Borg	Land	3/115	Tau <sup>2</sup> =0.00; $l^{2}=0\%$	-0.11 [-3.78, 3.56]; .95		
	-	Water	2/69	Tau <sup>2</sup> =0.22; $l^2$ =30%	-1.09 [-2.25, 0.07]; .06	Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.57, df=1 ( $P$ =.45), P=0%	-0.70 [-1.12, -0.27]; .001
		Land	5/276	$Tau^2 = 0.03; l^2 = 10\%$	-0.61 [-1.08, -0.15]; 0.01		
Exercise capacity	6MWT	Water	4/118	$Tau^2 = 0.00; l^2 = 0\%$	80.89 [48.67, 113.11]; <.001	Chi <sup>2</sup> =2.89, df=1 ( $P$ =.09), $l^{2}$ =65.4%	56.37 [32.61, 80.13]; <.001
		Land	7/380	$Tau^2 = 586.03; l^2 = 45\%$	43.94 [16.09, 71.79]; .002		
	ISWT	Water	2/57	Tau <sup>2</sup> =0.00; $l^2$ =0%	27.65 [-23.30, 78.59]; .29	Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.22, df=1 ( $P$ =.64), $l^{2}$ =0%	16.28 [-1.84, 34.41]; .08
		Land	8/673	Tau <sup>2</sup> =0.00; $l^{2}=0\%$	14.64 [-4.76, 34.03]; .14		
	ESWT	Water	2/60	Tau <sup>2</sup> =1174.23; $l^2 = 52\%$	339.96 [210.39, 469.53]; <.001	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.72, df = 1 ( $P$ =.19), $l^2$ = 41.9%	254.81 [166.41, 343.22]; <.001
		Land	6/361	Tau <sup>2</sup> = 8405.07; $l^2 = 54\%$	228.18 [122.93, 333.42]; <.001		
Muscle strenath	ULMS	Water	1/30	Not applicable	0.04 [-0.68, 0.75]; .92	Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.31, df=1 ( $P$ =.58), $l^2$ =0%	0.20 [-0.21, 0.62]; .34
		Land	2/61	$Tau^2 = 0.00; l^2 = 0\%$	0.28 [-0.22, 0.79]; .27		
	LLMS	Water	1/30	Not applicable	0.22 [-0.50, 0.94]; .56	Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.44, df=1 ( $P$ =.51), $\hat{f}$ =0%	0.00 [-0.34, 0.35]; .98
		Land	2/99	Tau <sup>2</sup> =0.00; $l^{2}=0\%$	-0.06 [-0.46, 0.33]; .76		

Note: ULMS and LLMS due to the results of different measurements using standardized mean differences (SMD).

6MWT = 6-minute walking test, CI = confidence interval, ESWT = endurance shuttle walk test, FEV1/FVC = ratio of forced expiratory volume in the first second to forced vital capacity, ISWT = incremental shuttle walk test, LLMS = lower limb muscle strength, MD = mean difference, ULMS = upper limb muscle strength.

improvement after aerobic exercise. Whether aerobic exercise is carried out on water or land, the increased adaptability in patients' physical activity and the improvement in aerobic capacity are similar. In addition, compared with land-based exercise, aerobic exercise in water can significantly improve exercise endurance. According to reports, aerobic exercise improves the body's oxidation capacity, improves the vital capacity of COPD patients, reduces dynamic hyperinflation, and enhances cardiopulmonary adaptability.<sup>[17,38]</sup> The results of this study found that there was no significant statistical significance in lung function after aerobic exercise. The reason for the difference in results is not only affected by the baseline level of included

		WG			LG			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.1.1 Lung function-FE	V1%pred	licted							
de Souto Araujo 2012	48.25	12.59	8	49.6	11.67	13	37.0%	-1.35 [-12.14, 9.44]	
Felcar 2018	50	19	20	49	12	16	41.4%	1.00 [-9.19, 11.19]	
Wu 2018	60	22	14	57	16	15	21.7%	3.00 [-11.08, 17.08]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			42			44	100.0%	0.57 [-5.99, 7.12]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	.00; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 0.24	df = 2	P = 0.8	9); I <sup>2</sup> = 0	196			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.17 (F	P = 0.87	)						
1.1.2 Lung function-FE	V1/FVC%								
Felcar 2018	58	12	20	58	8	16	70.9%	0.00 [-6.56, 6.56]	
Wu 2018	60	15	14	57	13	15	29.1%	3.00 [-7.25, 13.25]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			34			31	100.0%	0.87 [-4.65, 6.40]	+
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	.00; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 0.23.	df = 1	P = 0.6	3); I <sup>2</sup> = 0	196		50 St St	
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.31 (F	P = 0.76	)						
									<i>r r r</i>
									-50 -25 0 25
	and a second of	and mo							Favours [LG] Favours [WG]

Test for subaroup differences: Chi<sup>2</sup> = 0.00, df = 1 (P = 0.94), I<sup>2</sup> = 0%

Figure 2. Change in lung function-water exercise group (WG) versus land exercise group (LG). CI=confidence interval, FEV1=forced expiratory volume in the first second, FVC=forced vital capacity, SD=standard deviation.



patients, but also by the length of the intervention period. When we analyzed 2 studies<sup>[28,35]</sup> with intervention periods longer than 8 weeks, a trend toward lung function improvement was observed in the data (FEV1%pred: 2.05 [-4.75, 8.86], FEV1/ FVC%: 3.00 [-7.43, 13.43]). It is speculated that long-term aerobic exercise intervention may have positive physiological effects. Previous studies found that water exercise, as compared with land exercise, had an additional positive role in maintaining and improving lung function (especially FEV1).<sup>[17]</sup>

It may be that the combination of the hydrostatic pressure and water temperature induces an increase in cardiac output,<sup>[39]</sup> a decrease in sputum viscosity, and an increase in respiratory frequency, thus increasing the rate of gas exchange in the lungs. The results of this study show that water-based aerobic exercise has beneficial effects on patients' lung function, but there is no significant difference compared with land-based aerobic exercise. Therefore, more studies are needed in the future to determine the effect of water-based aerobics on lung function in COPD patients and the improvement attributable to long-term intervention.

Dyspnea is one of the main discomforts of COPD patients. Progressive dyspnea can lead to fatigue,<sup>[40]</sup> prevent physical exercise, and reduce the functional level of patients.<sup>[9]</sup> Studies found that after aerobic exercise intervention combined with respiratory muscle and auxiliary muscle stretching,[41,42] the dyspnea of COPD patients decreased, the respiratory efficiency needed for ventilation increased,<sup>[18]</sup> and upper limb fatigue was significantly improved.<sup>[42]</sup> We observed that the dyspnea level of patients in the aerobic training group decreased significantly by 0.70 (95% CI:-1.12, -0.27). This decline may be due to the inclusion of studies involving not only movements of large muscle groups, but also the intervention of respiratory muscle auxiliary muscles. During exercise, passive chest muscle stretching and rib expansion will increase the burden on the diaphragm, which is equivalent to the load training of respiratory muscle groups, which can improve respiratory muscle strength and exercise tolerance.<sup>[17]</sup> In addition, we cannot completely rule out another explanation, which is that aerobic training has a therapeutic effect on lung function, because we noticed that FEV1%pred and FEV1/FVC%, increased by 2.05 and 3.00, respectively, after aerobic training in this study. Therefore, aerobic training may relieve hyperinflation by improving lung function and respiratory muscle function, thus improving dyspnea in COPD patients.

Previous studies have shown that under the same exercise intensity, compared with land-based aerobic exercise, the

		WG			LG			Mean Difference		Mean Diffe	rence	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random,	95% CI	
1.3.1 Functional - six-n	ninute wal	k test										
de Castro 2019	527	83	14	532	71	17	30.5%	-5.00 [-60.04, 50.04]		+		
de Souto Araujo 2012	490.9	137.8	8	468.8	106.8	13	7.4%	22.10 [-89.65, 133.85]		+		
Felcar 2018	519	93	20	524	81	16	28.6%	-5.00 [-61.89, 51.89]		+		
Lotshaw 2007	344.34	136.47	20	340.88	98.65	20	17.0%	3.46 [-70.34, 77.26]		+		
McNamara 2013	397	68	15	343	131	15	16.6%	54.00 [-20.69, 128.69]		-	•	
Subtotal (95% CI)			77			81	100.0%	8.21 [-22.19, 38.62]		•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	1.95, df	= 4 (P =	0.75); I <sup>2</sup>	= 0%							
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.53 (P =	= 0.60)										
1.3.2 Peak- incrementa	al shuttle v	walk test										
de Castro 2019	545	185	14	531	130	17	15.3%	14.00 [-100.93, 128.93]		-		
Felcar 2018	495	216	20	506	188	16	11.8%	-11.00 [-143.09, 121.09]		-		
McNamara 2013	235	96	15	178	102	15	36.4%	57.00 [-13.88, 127.88]		-		
Wadell 2004	346	125	15	381	60.7	14	36.5%	-35.00 [-105.80, 35.80]				
Subtotal (95% CI)			64			62	100.0%	8.83 [-37.73, 55.40]		•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2	42.73; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 3.34,	df = 3 (	P = 0.34)	; I <sup>2</sup> = 10%							
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.37 (P =	= 0.71)										
1.3.3 Endurance - endu	irance shu	uttle wall	k test									
McNamara 2013	591	367	18	339	299	15	81.6%	252.00 [24.76, 479.24]		-	_	
Wadell 2004	1,066.8	241.2	15	705.94	883.33	14	18.4%	360.86 [-117.68, 839.40]			-	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			33			29	100.0%	272.03 [66.76, 477.31]		-		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0 Test for overall effect: Z	.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = = 2.60 (P =	0.16, df	= 1 (P =	: 0.69); l²	= 0%							
rest for overall effect: Z	= 2.60 (P =	= 0.009)								2		
									-1000	-500 0	500	1000
Tool for out wrown differ				-	17 00 0	201				Favours [LG] Fa	avours [WG]	

Figure 4. Change in exercise capacity (meter)-water exercise group (WG) versus land exercise group (LG). CI=confidence interval, SD=standard deviation.

		WG			LG			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.4.1 Upper limb mu	scle stre	ength							
Felcar 2018	16.1	5.1	20	17.2	5.8	16	34.2%	-0.20 [-0.86, 0.46]	
Lotshaw 2007	12.45	5.56	20	10.33	4.8	20	37.8%	0.40 [-0.23, 1.03]	
Wu 2018	4.54	1.67	14	4.7	0.96	15	28.0%	-0.12 [-0.84, 0.61]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			54			51	100.0%	0.05 [-0.33, 0.44]	<b>+</b>
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 0.00; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 1	.94, df =	= 2 (P =	0.38);	12 = 0%			
Test for overall effect	Z= 0.28	6 (P = 0	0.79)						
1.4.2 Lower limb mu	scle str	ength							
Felcar 2018	22.8	5.9	20	22.8	5.9	16	34.7%	0.00 [-0.66, 0.66]	
Lotshaw 2007	17.95	9.14	20	12.73	4.32	20	36.0%	0.72 [0.07, 1.36]	
Wu 2018	10.15	4.04	14	9.55	2.61	15	29.3%	0.17 [-0.56, 0.90]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			54			51	100.0%	0.31 [-0.13, 0.75]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 0.03; C	$hi^2 = 2$	.53, df =	= 2 (P =	0.28);	1= 219	8		
Test for overall effect	Z=1.38	B(P=0)	0.17)						
Test for subaroup dif	ferences	: Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 0.75.	df = 1 (	P = 0.3	9),   <sup>2</sup> =	0%		i avono [coj i avono [voj

Figure 5. Change in muscle strength (kg)-water exercise group (WG) versus land exercise group (LG). CI=confidence interval, SD=standard deviation.

	Favours [experin	nentalj	Favours [co	ontrol		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
3.1.1 LG/CG								
Bestall 2003	3	29	6	27	11.6%	0.40 [0.09, 1.81]	2003	
Wadell 2004	1	14	1	12	4.1%	0.85 [0.05, 15.16]	2004	
Puente-Maestu 2006	0	28	0	20		Not estimable	2006	
de Souto Araujo 2012	1	14	3	14	5.7%	0.28 [0.03, 3.11]	2012	
Leung 2012	3	22	1	20	5.9%	3.00 [0.29, 31.48]	2012	
Casey 2013	35	178	38	172	28.4%	0.86 [0.52, 1.45]	2013	-
McNamara 2013	5	20	0	15	3.9%	11.00 [0.56, 216.44]	2013	
Wootton 2014	13	95	0	48	4.3%	15.87 [0.92, 273.00]	2014	
Wootton 2017	33	95	9	48	21.6%	2.31 [1.00, 5.34]	2017	
Tsai 2017	1	20	0	17	3.3%	2.69 [0.10, 70.49]	2017	
Wu 2018	2	17	1	17	5.3%	2.13 [0.17, 26.03]	2018	
Li 2018	3	20	1	20	5.9%	3.35 [0.32, 35,36]	2018	
Subtotal (95% CI)		552		430	100.0%	1.45 [0.78, 2.72]		•
Total events	100		60					
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	29: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 14.81 df	= 10 (P =	$(14)$ : $ ^2 = 3$	396				
Test for overall effect 7	= 1.17 (P = 0.24)	10 (						
3.1.2 WG/CG								
Wadell 2004	2	16	1	17	18.1%	2.29 (0.19, 27, 99)	2004	
de Souto Arauio 2012	3	18	0	15	12.2%	7.00 (0.33, 147, 17)	2012	
McNamara 2013	6	14	3	14	41.2%	2,75 (0.52, 14, 44)	2013	
Wu 2018	2	16	1	17	18.1%	2 29 10 19 27 991	2018	
Gallo-silva2019	0	15	1	12	10.5%	0.25 (0.01, 6.64)	2019	
Subtotal (95% CI)		79		75	100.0%	2.24 [0.77, 6.50]		-
Total events	13		6					
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	$00^{\circ} \text{ Chi}^2 = 2.32 \text{ df} =$	4(P = 0)	68): 1 <sup>2</sup> = 0%					
Test for overall effect: 7	= 1.49 (P = 0.14)	100.	00/11 = 010					
restion overall ellett. 2	- 1.40 (1 - 0.14)							
3.1.3 LG/WG								
Wadell 2004	1	14	0	15	4.3%	3.44 [0.13, 91,79]	2004	
de Souto Arauio 2012	1	14	6	14	8.4%	0.10 (0.01, 1.02)	2012	
McNamara 2013	5	20	3	18	15.8%	1.67 [0.34, 8.26]	2013	
Felcar 2018	20	36	14	34	34.8%	1.79 (0.69, 4.61)	2018	
Wu 2018	2	17	2	16	9.9%	0.93 (0.12, 7.55)	2018	
de Castro 2019	10	27	9	23	26.8%	0.92 (0.29, 2.88)	2019	
Subtotal (95% CI)		128	5	120	100.0%	1.12 [0.56, 2.24]	2010	•
Total events	30		34					T .
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	13 Chi2 = 5.98 df=	5(P = 0)	31) 17= 16%					
Test for overall effect: 7	= 0.32 (P = 0.75)	0.						
rest ist overall enect. Z	- 0.02 (1 - 0.10)							
							1	
							1	0.001 0.1 1 10 1000
Toot for out group differ	ences Chiz = 1 16	df - 2 /P -	- 0.66) 12- 0	96				Favours [TG] Favours [CG]

Figure 6. Adverse events were compared among the 3 groups. Cl=confidence interval, SD=standard deviation.

		WG			LG			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.6.1 CRDQ-total									
elcar 2018	28	19.52	20	29	28	16	21.2%	-1.00 [-17.17, 15.17]	
McNamara 2013	12	15	15	4	7	15	78.8%	8.00 [-0.38, 16.38]	- <b>-</b>
Subtotal (95% CI)			35			31	100.0%	6.10 [-1.34, 13.53]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 0.9	4, df =	1(P = 0)	.33); 12:	= 0%			
Fest for overall effect:	Z=1.61	(P = 0.	11)						
1.6.2 CRDQ-dyspnoe	a								
elcar 2018	8	6.56	20	9	6	16	30.5%	-1.00 [-5.11, 3.11]	-
McNamara 2013	-3	5	15	-1	2	15	69.5%	-2.00 [-4.73, 0.73]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		10	35		-	31	100.0%	-1.69 [-3.97, 0.58]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 0.1	6, df=	1 (P = 0)	.69); 17:	= 0%			
Fest for overall effect:	Z=1.48	6 (P = 0.	14)						
1.6.3 CRDQ-fatigue									
elcar 2018	7	6.56	20	5	6.56	16	21.6%	2.00 [-2.31, 6.31]	
McNamara 2013	-1	2	15	-4	4	15	78.4%	3.00 [0.74, 5.26]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			35			31	100.0%	2.78 [0.78, 4.79]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; C	hi² = 0.1	6, df=	1(P = 0)	.69); 12:	= 0%			
Fest for overall effect:	Z = 2.72	P = 0.	006)						
1.6.4 CRDQ-emotiona	al								
elcar 2018	7	8.19	20	9	12.17	16	17.8%	-2.00 [-8.96, 4.96]	
McNamara 2013	-3	5	15	-1	4	15	82.2%	-2.00 [-5.24, 1.24]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			35			31	100.0%	-2.00 [-4.94, 0.94]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 0.0	0, df=	1 (P = 1)	.00); 12:	= 0%			
fest for overall effect:	Z=1.33	B (P = 0.	18)						
1.6.5 CRDQ-mastry									
elcar 2018	6	6.08	20	6	7	16	21.4%	0.00 [-4.34, 4.34]	+
McNamara 2013	-1	2	15	-2	4	15	78.6%	1.00 [-1.26, 3.26]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			35			31	100.0%	0.79 [-1.22, 2.79]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 0.1	6, df=	1 (P = 0)	.69); 12:	= 0%			
i otorogononj. i da	_	0 0	11						

Figure 7. Change in quality of life scores-water exercise group (WG) versus land exercise group (LG). CI=confidence interval, CRDQ=chronic respiratory disease questionnaire, SD=standard deviation.

parameters of heart rate and blood lactic acid in water decreased, and dyspnea and fatigue perception were also significantly improved.<sup>[43]</sup> This study found similar results, specifically, that dyspnea between the 2 groups was similar at the same or relative exercise intensity. However, chronic respiratory disease questionnaire fatigue perception was significantly improved after water-based aerobic exercise (Fig. 7). Given these, participants may achieve or even exceed the required exercise intensity through less exercise time in a fatigue-relieving water environment, which is especially important for weak and elderly exercisers.

A variety of testing methods can be used to assess the exercise capacity of COPD patients. Among them, 6MWT can reflect the functional exercise capacity and quality of life,<sup>[44]</sup> ISWT can effectively and reliably reflect the maximum exercise capacity of patients with self-limited symptoms,<sup>[45]</sup> and ESWT reflects the exercise endurance of COPD patients, and is also sensitive to changes in treatment and intervention in patients with severe COPD.<sup>[46]</sup> This study found that after aerobic training, the increasement of 6MWT and ESWT exceeded the minimum clinically important difference reported in the literature.<sup>[44]</sup> However, in studies based on aerobic exercise in different water and land environments, exercise capacity showed different performance in the outcome index.<sup>[8,19]</sup> For example, the results of Shead and Aswegen<sup>[18]</sup> and McNamara et al<sup>[16]</sup> found that

ESWT was significantly increased in both water and land groups, but the results of ISWT were particularly different. These studies show contradictory results, which may be due to the included study, the frequency, time and content of the intervention, and the severity of the disease. In this study, there was no significant improvement in ISWT between the aerobic exercise group and the control group, or between the water-based aerobic exercise and the land-based aerobic exercise groups. In addition to the above factors, another reason may be that the heart rate increased linearly with the increasing workload during the ISWT, and the dyspnea score increased linearly in the later stage of ISWT,<sup>[47]</sup> causing more cardiovascular and dyspnea reactions on the ISWT than the 6MWT.<sup>[48]</sup> However, this study shows a significant difference between water and land-based aerobic exercise on the ESWT. The ESWT in the water was significantly increased by 254.81 m (95% CI: 166.41, 343.22), and chronic respiratory disease questionnaire fatigue perception was decreased significantly, suggesting that an increase in exercise endurance and increase in long-term endurance walking distance were associated with general and activity fatigue.<sup>[49]</sup> Therefore, based on the improvement of exercise endurance and relieving fatigue, COPD patients are encouraged to perform the aerobic exercise in water. This is especially important for exercisers with severe COPD who are unable to stand for a long time, or who have exercise intolerance.

Analysis of relationships between exercise capacity and other outcome indexes of PR revealed that the increase of exercise tolerance time is related to the increase of forced inspiratory volume, the decrease of respiratory frequency, and the decrease of fatigue perception.<sup>[44,45,49,50]</sup> Previously, studies of exercise capacity in COPD showed that the exercise capacity of COPD patients is also related to muscle strength.<sup>[46,51]</sup> In this study, the exercise capacity of patients was improved after aerobic training, but there was no significant change in peripheral muscle strength. Perhaps aerobic training increases muscle oxidation, rather than the cross-sectional area and muscle mass, for which resistance training is more effective.<sup>[52]</sup> This suggests that aerobic exercise may not impact immediate muscle strength, but it may improve the muscle oxidation ability of COPD patients, which has a longterm effect on exercise capacity. Studies have shown that water exercise is beneficial to pain,<sup>[53]</sup> physical function,<sup>[54]</sup> and LLMS<sup>[55]</sup> in patients with musculoskeletal diseases. In this study, there was no statistical difference in the peripheral muscle strength of patients who underwent water and land-based aerobic exercise (ULMS 0.05kg [95% CI: -0.33, 0.44], LLMS 0.31 kg [95% CI: -0.13, 0.75]). Only one<sup>[37]</sup> study of patients with skeletal muscle complications found a superior rehabilitation effect for LLMS in patients who underwent water-based exercise intervention compared with patients who performed land-based exercise. In the subgroup analysis, the authors also confirmed that obese patients with COPD not only lost weight but also showed improved exercise capacity and quality of life after water-based exercise.<sup>[56]</sup> These physiological improvements may be related to the general low peripheral muscle strength and physical activity of this group.

At the same time, the exercise intensity in the water cannot be quantified, and the lack of load leads to low intensity in the individual strength training. Therefore, with the advance of PR, the peripheral muscle strength of patients is unlikely to improve significantly. More studies that water aerobic exercise is needed in the future, especially to further determine whether exercise intensity and COPD patients' baseline peripheral muscle strength are important factors affecting muscle strength improvement. Currently, there is great controversy about the feasibility and acceptability of water-based exercise as a form of PR in patients with COPD. Hydrostatic pressure may lead to an increase in chest pressure, resulting in respiratory limitation.<sup>[57]</sup> In addition, some irritating gases in the pool may also cause asthma and allergies, aggravating symptoms, such as cough, wheezing, and dyspnea.<sup>[58]</sup> However, an increasing number of studies have reported that water-based exercise increases venous drainage and cardiopulmonary load,<sup>[59]</sup> and brings pleasure, novelty, and excitement to patients.<sup>[19]</sup> Therefore, water aerobics can be applied to COPD patients as a safe and effective intervention to stimulate sports interest.

This type of systematic evaluation with meta-analysis has some limitations. First, although the inclusion of 18 randomized controlled trials involved 1311 cases, the sample size of most studies was relatively small. Additionally, there was heterogeneity in the sample and methodology of the included studies. Although the contents of the exercise programs and the outcomes in the studies were roughly similar, the intensity and duration of the exercise programs and evaluation methods varied greatly. The measurement methods and units of the outcomes were not unified, which may have led to bias after the unit conversion that is possible factors leading to clinical heterogeneity and biases in the interpretation of the data. Finally, concerning the quality evaluation included in the studies, the allocation concealment was not implemented in 6 studies, and a lack of blinding practices (of the participants, outcome assessors, and therapists) were also significant limitations.

## 5. Conclusion

Aerobic exercise can improve dyspnea and enhance both functional exercise capacity and exercise endurance in COPD patients. Whether aerobic exercise is carried out in water or on land, the adaptability of patients' physical activity and the improvement of aerobic capacity are similar. However, the improvement in exercise endurance after aerobic exercise in water is more prominent than the improvement of land-based exercise. The properties of water make COPD patients need more lung ventilation and more energy expenditure during exercise, which may trigger relatively greater cardiopulmonary and/or neuromuscular effects, then induce better therapeutic effects. Secondly, it is observed that there is a greater difference in fatigue perception of this study. Water aerobic exercise caused a significant improvement in interfering with fatigue perception. Finally, no adverse events were found under different external environment, water aerobic exercise is as safety as land aerobic exercise. Therefore, PR program should try to combine with water environment in the future. We suggest that water aerobic exercise is more suitable for those patients who are unable to stand for an extended time and have skeletal muscle complications.

However, existing researches are insufficient in quantizing the water aerobic exercise intensity, and there are few researches conducted with progressive programs. In the future research, professional physician or therapists should focus on the specific effects of water and land aerobic exercise, determine and compare the follow-up effects in different time points, conduct gradual progressive exercise program on the basis of individual characteristics. At the same time, future research should focus on determining the respective specific efficacies of water and land-based aerobic exercise, and on prolonging the intervention and follow-up time, to further explore the rehabilitation effects of water and land-based aerobic exercise in patients with COPD.

In summary, water aerobic exercise can provide COPD patients with a low-cost and effective group therapy, which should be considered in public relations project of the family, community or hospital.

## **Acknowledgments**

The authors thank Ting Wang and Yongdi Zou for their excellent work in this study, we also thank LetPub (http://www.letpub. com) for its linguistic assistance during the preparation of this manuscript.

# **Author contributions**

Conceptualization: Haixia Chen, Weibing Wu, Jihong Wang. Data curation: Haixia Chen, Ling Li, Zhengrong Wang. Investigation: Haixia Chen, Zhengrong Wang. Methodology: Ling Li. Supervision: Peijun Li. Writing – original draft: Haixia Chen. Writing – review & editing: Peijun Li, Weibing Wu, Jihong

Wang.

#### References

- Mirza S, Clay RD, Koslow MA, Scanlon PD. COPD guidelines: a review of the 2018 GOLD report. Mayo Clin Proc 2018;93:1488–502.
- [2] Wang C, Xu J, Yang L, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in China (the China Pulmonary Health [CPH] study): a national cross-sectional study. Lancet 2018;391: 1706–17.
- [3] Wang XJ, Fang XY. Interpretation of the global strategy for the diagnosis, management and prevention of COPD 2019 by GOLD. J CGP 2019;22:2141–9.
- [4] Chen YH. It is estimated that more than 5.4 million people may die from COPD and related diseases every year by 2060. Chin J Fronti Med Sci 2012;380:2095–128.
- [5] Spruit MA, Singh SJ, Garvey C, et al. An official American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society statement: key concepts and advances in pulmonary rehabilitation. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2013;188:e13–64.
- [6] Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease. Global strategy for the diagnosis, management, and prevention of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (2020 report). Available at: https://goldcopd.org. (accessed Dec 8, 2019).
- [7] McCarthy B, Casey D, Devane D, Murphy K, Murphy E, Lacasse Y. Pulmonary rehabilitation for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2015;(2):CD003793. doi:10.1002/ 14651858.CD003793.pub3.
- [8] Borghi-Silva A, Arena R, Castello V, et al. Aerobic exercise training improves autonomic nervous control in patients with COPD. Respir Med 2009;103:1503–10.
- [9] Vestbo J, Hurd SS, Agustí AG, et al. Global strategy for the diagnosis, management, and prevention of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: GOLD executive summary. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2013;187: 347–65.
- [10] Guo Y, Xu M, Ji M, et al. Effect of Liuzijue Qigong on patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine (Baltimore) 2018;97:e12659. doi:10.1097/ MD.000000000012659.
- [11] Ngai SP, Jones AY, Tam WW. Tai Chi for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2016;(6):CD009953. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009953.pub2.
- [12] Ofman JJ, Badamgarav E, Henning JM, et al. Does disease management improve clinical and economic outcomes in patients with chronic diseases? A systematic review. Am J Med 2004;117:182–92.
- [13] Elbehairy AF, Ciavaglia CE, Webb KA, et al. Pulmonary gas exchange abnormalities in mild chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. implications for dyspnea and exercise intolerance. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2015;191:1384–94.
- [14] Porto EF, Castro AA, Schmidt VG, et al. Postural control in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a systematic review. Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis 2015;10:1233–9.
- [15] Ringbaek T, Brondum E, Martinez G, et al. Long-term effects of 1-year maintenance training on physical functioning and health status in patients with COPD: a randomized controlled study. J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev 2010;30:47–52.
- [16] McNamara RJ, McKeough ZJ, McKenzie DK, et al. Water-based exercise training for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2013;(12):CD008290. doi:10.1002/14651858. CD008290.pub2.
- [17] Martín-Valero R, Cuesta-Vargas A, Labajos-Manzanares MJR. Effectiveness of hydrotherapy in people with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Rehabilitation 2011;45:335–43.
- [18] Shead D, Aswegen HV. Hydrotherapy in the management of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a qualitative systematic review. PTR 2012;17:271-83.
- [19] Rae S, White P. Swimming pool-based exercise as pulmonary rehabilitation for COPD patients in primary care: feasibility and acceptability. Prim Care Respir J 2009;18:90–4.
- [20] Bestall JC, Paul EA, Garrod R, et al. Longitudinal trends in exercise capacity and health status after pulmonary rehabilitation in patients with COPD. Respir Med 2003;97:173–80.
- [21] Puente-Maestu L, Abad YM, Pedraza F, et al. A controlled trial of the effects of leg training on breathing pattern and dynamic hyperinflation in severe COPD. Lung 2006;184:159–67.
- [22] Casey D, Murphy K, Devane D, et al. The effectiveness of a structured education pulmonary rehabilitation programme for improving the health

status of people with moderate and severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in primary care: the PRINCE cluster randomised trial. Thorax 2013;68:922–8.

- [23] Wootton SL, Ng LW, McKeough ZJ, et al. Ground-based walking training improves quality of life and exercise capacity in COPD. Eur Respir J 2014;44:885–94.
- [24] Tsai LL, McNamara RJ, Moddel C, et al. Home-based telerehabilitation via real-time videoconferencing improves endurance exercise capacity in patients with COPD: the randomized controlled TeleR Study. Respirology 2017;22:699–707.
- [25] Daabis R, Hassan M, Zidan M. Endurance and strength training in pulmonary rehabilitation for COPD patients. Egypt J Chest Dis Tuberc 2017;66:231–6.
- [26] Wootton SL, Hill K, Alison JA, et al. Effects of ground-based walking training on daily physical activity in people with COPD: a randomised controlled trial. Respir Med 2017;132:139–45.
- [27] Leung RW, McKeough ZJ, Peters MJ, et al. Short-form Sun-style Tai Chi as an exercise training modality in people with COPD: a randomised controlled trial. Eur Respir J 2013;41:1051–7.
- [28] Li P, Liu J, Lu Y, et al. Effects of long-term home-based Liuzijue exercise combined with clinical guidance in elderly patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Clin Interv Aging 2018;13:1391–9.
- [29] Gallo-Silva B, Cerezer-Silva V, Ferreira DG, et al. Effects of water-based aerobic interval training in patients with COPD: a randomized controlled trial. J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev 2019;39:105–11.
- [30] Ozdemir EP, Solak O, Fidan F, et al. The effect of water-based pulmonary rehabilitation on anxiety and quality of life in chronic pulmonary obstructive disease patients. Turk J Med Sci 2010;30:880–7.
- [31] Lotshaw AM, Thompson M, Sadowsky HS, et al. Quality of life and physical performance in land- and water-based pulmonary rehabilitation. J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev 2007;27:247–51.
- [32] Felcar JM, Probst VS, de Carvalho DR, et al. Effects of exercise training in water and on land in patients with COPD: a randomised clinical trial. Physiotherapy 2018;104:408–16.
- [33] de Castro LA, Felcar JM, de Carvalho DR, et al. Effects of land- and water-based exercise programmes on postural balance in individuals with COPD: additional results from a randomised clinical trial. Physiotherapy 2020;107:58–65.
- [34] de Souto Araujo ZT, de Miranda Silva Nogueira PA, Cabral EE, et al. Effectiveness of low-intensity aquatic exercise on COPD: a randomized clinical trial. Primary Care Respir Med 2012;106:1535–43.
- [35] Wu W, Liu X, Liu J, et al. Effectiveness of water-based Liuzijue exercise on respiratory muscle strength and peripheral skeletal muscle function in patients with COPD. Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis 2018;13: 1713–26.
- [36] Wadell K, Sundelin G, Henriksson-Larsen K, et al. High intensity physical group training in water–an effective training modality for patients with COPD. Respir Med 2004;98:428–38.
- [37] McNamara RJ, McKeough ZJ, McKenzie DK, et al. Water-based exercise in COPD with physical comorbidities: a randomised controlled trial. Eur Respir J 2013;41:1284–91.
- [38] Chodzko-Zajko WJ, Proctor DN, Fiatarone Singh MA, et al. Exercise and physical activity for older adults. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2009;41: 1510–30.
- [39] Mooventhan A, Nivethitha L. Scientific evidence-based effects of hydrotherapy on various systems of the body. N Am J Med Sci 2014;6:199–209.
- [40] Yentes JM, Sayles H, Meza J, et al. Walking abnormalities are associated with COPD: an investigation of the NHANES III dataset. Respir Med 2011;105:80–7.
- [41] Wada JT, Borges-Santos E, Porras DC, et al. Effects of aerobic training combined with respiratory muscle stretching on the functional exercise capacity and thoracoabdominal kinematics in patients with COPD: a randomized and controlled trial. Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis 2016;11:2691–700.
- [42] Pan L, Guo YZ, Yan JH, et al. Does upper extremity exercise improve dyspnea in patients with COPD? A meta-analysis. Respir Med 2012;106:1517–25.
- [43] Benelli P, Ditroilo M, De Vito G. Physiological responses to fitness activities: a comparison between land-based and water aerobics exercise. J Strength Cond Res 2004;18:719–22.
- [44] Gulart AA, Munari AB, Santos Silva IJC, et al. Baseline characteristics associated to improvement of patients with COPD in physical activity in daily life level after pulmonary rehabilitation. Respir Med 2019;151: 142–7.

- [45] Singh SJ, Puhan MA, Andrianopoulos V, et al. An official systematic review of the European Respiratory Society/American Thoracic Society: measurement properties of field walking tests in chronic respiratory disease. Eur Respir J 2014;44:1447–78.
- [46] Altenburg WA, Duiverman ML, Ten Hacken NH, et al. Changes in the endurance shuttle walk test in COPD patients with chronic respiratory failure after pulmonary rehabilitation: the minimal important difference obtained with anchor- and distribution-based method. Respir Res 2015;16:27. doi:10.1186/s12931-015-0182-x.
- [47] Turner SE, Eastwood PR, Cecins NM, et al. Physiologic responses to incremental and self-paced exercise in COPD: a comparison of three tests. Chest 2004;126:766–73.
- [48] Hodgev VA, Aliman OI, Marinov BI, et al. Cardiovascular and dyspnea response to six-minute and shuttle walk tests in COPD patients. Folia Med (Plovdiv) 2003;45:26–33.
- [49] Lewko A, Bidgood PL, Jewell A, et al. Evaluation of multidimensional COPD-related subjective fatigue following a pulmonary rehabilitation programme. Respir Med 2014;108:95–102.
- [50] Porszasz J, Emtner M, Goto S, et al. Exercise training decreases ventilatory requirements and exercise-induced hyperinflation at submaximal intensities in patients with COPD. Chest 2005;128:2025–34.
- [51] du Bois RM, Weycker D, Albera C, et al. Six-minute-walk test in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: test validation and minimal clinically important difference. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2011;183:1231–7.

- [52] Iepsen UW, Munch GD, Rugbjerg M, et al. Effect of endurance versus resistance training on quadriceps muscle dysfunction in COPD: a pilot study. Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis 2016;11:2659–69.
- [53] Silva LE, Valim V, Pessanha AP, et al. Hydrotherapy versus conventional land-based exercise for the management of patients with osteoarthritis of the knee: a randomized clinical trial. Phys Ther 2008;88:12–21.
- [54] Heywood S, McClelland J, Mentiplay B, et al. Effectiveness of aquatic exercise in improving lower limb strength in musculoskeletal conditions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2017;98:173–86.
- [55] Barker AL, Talevski J, Morello RT, et al. Effectiveness of aquatic exercise for musculoskeletal conditions: a meta-analysis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2014;95:1776–86.
- [56] McNamara RJ, McKeough ZJ, McKenzie DK, et al. Obesity in COPD: the effect of water-based exercise. Eur Respir J 2013;42:1737–9.
- [57] Dahlbäck GO. Influence of intrathoracic blood polling on pulmonary air-trapping during immersion. Undersea Biomed Res 1975;2:133–40.
- [58] Li JH, Wang ZH, Zhu XJ. Histopathology and metabolomics study on the influence of chlorinated pool water on swimming training effects. CSST 2012;48:141–5.
- [59] de Andrade AD, Júnior AC, Lins de Barros Melo TL, et al. Influence of different levels of immersion in water on the lung function and respiratory muscle pressure in healthy individuals: observational study. Physiother Res Int 2014;19:140–6.