

# **Comparing mHealth-based Exercise and Offline Exercise for Chronic Neck Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis**

Xiaoya He, Hang Zhou, Yueshuai Jiang, Dachao Liu, Fei Qi, Junchao Ai, Zipu Wang

Submitted to: JMIR mHealth and uHealth  
on: March 22, 2025

**Disclaimer:** © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 5

Supplementary Files..... 18

Figures ..... 19

Figure 1..... 20

Figure 2..... 21

Figure 3..... 22

Figure 4..... 23

Figure 5..... 24

Multimedia Appendixes ..... 25

Multimedia Appendix 1..... 26

Multimedia Appendix 2..... 26

Multimedia Appendix 3..... 26

Multimedia Appendix 4..... 26

Multimedia Appendix 5..... 26

Multimedia Appendix 6..... 26

Multimedia Appendix 7..... 26

Multimedia Appendix 8..... 26

# Comparing mHealth-based Exercise and Offline Exercise for Chronic Neck Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Xiaoya He<sup>1\*</sup> PhD; Hang Zhou<sup>2\*</sup> PhD; Yueshuai Jiang<sup>3</sup> PhD; Dachao Liu<sup>4</sup> PhD; Fei Qi<sup>4</sup> PhD; Junchao Ai<sup>3</sup> MSc; Zipu Wang<sup>5</sup> PhD

<sup>1</sup> Sports & Medicine Integrative Innovation Center, Capital University of Physical Education and Sports Beijing CN

<sup>2</sup> Affiliated to Shenzhen University Experimental High School Shenzhen CN

<sup>3</sup> College of Physical Education and Arts Humanities, China University of Petroleum (Beijing) Beijing CN

<sup>4</sup> School of Sports Management and Communication, Capital University of Physical Education and Sports Beijing CN

<sup>5</sup> Periodical Department, Capital University of Physical Education and Sports Beijing CN

\*these authors contributed equally

## Corresponding Author:

Zipu Wang PhD

Periodical Department, Capital University of Physical Education and Sports  
11 North Third Ring West Road, Haidian District  
Beijing  
CN

## Abstract

**Background:** Chronic neck pain (CNP) ranks among the world's most prevalent musculoskeletal disorders, affecting 223 million individuals globally. While both mobile health (mHealth) - based exercise and traditional offline exercise have demonstrated efficacy in alleviating chronic neck pain, comparative evidence regarding their relative effectiveness remains unclear.

**Objective:** The aim of this study is to assess the effectiveness of mobile health (mHealth) exercise interventions in comparison to offline exercise methods for relieving pain intensity, decreasing functional disability, and improving the overall quality of life for individuals suffering from Chronic Neck Pain (CNP).

**Methods:** A systematic search was performed to identify randomized controlled trials (RCTs) published from their inception until December 25, 2024, across multiple databases, such as Cochrane, Embase, Medline, and Web of Science. Data extraction was carried out independently by pairs of reviewers, who also evaluated bias using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool.

**Results:** In total, six studies were identified, encompassing 381 participants with an average age of  $41.17 \pm 11.72$  years. No statistically significant differences were observed in pain relief when comparing mHealth-based exercise to offline exercise methods that did not incorporate mHealth (standard mean difference [SMD] = -0.31; 95% CI: -0.73 to 0.12,  $P=0.16$ ). Additionally, there were no significant differences concerning functional disability (SMD = -0.33; 95% CI: -0.68 to 0.02;  $P=0.06$ ) or quality of life (SMD = 0.19; 95% CI: -0.19 to 0.56;  $P=0.34$ ). Conversely, a significant difference was noted when comparing mHealth-supported exercise to unsupervised offline exercise regarding pain alleviation (SMD = -0.76; 95% CI: -1.06 to -0.45;  $P<0.001$ ) and functional disability (SMD = -0.66; 95% CI: -1.01 to -0.32;  $P<0.001$ ).

**Conclusions:** The results indicate that exercise facilitated by mHealth is more effective than offline unsupervised exercise in alleviating pain and enhancing functional capabilities in individuals experiencing CNP. In situations where face-to-face exercise intervention is unfeasible, mHealth-based exercise should be regarded as a feasible alternative in the rehabilitation process for CNP.

(JMIR Preprints 22/03/2025:74305)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.74305>

## Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.  
Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <http://www.jmir.org/preprint/74305>, my manuscript will be published in JMIR Publications.

No. Please do not make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone.



## Original Manuscript

# Comparing mHealth-based Exercise and Offline Exercise for Chronic Neck Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

## Abstract

**Background:** Chronic neck pain (CNP) ranks among the world's most prevalent musculoskeletal disorders, affecting 223 million individuals globally. While both mobile health (mHealth) - based exercise and traditional offline exercise have demonstrated efficacy in alleviating chronic neck pain, comparative evidence regarding their relative effectiveness remains unclear.

**Objective:** The aim of this study is to assess the effectiveness of mobile health (mHealth) exercise interventions in comparison to offline exercise methods for relieving pain intensity, decreasing functional disability, and improving the overall quality of life for individuals suffering from Chronic Neck Pain (CNP).

**Method:** A systematic search was performed to identify randomized controlled trials (RCTs) published from their inception until December 25, 2024, across multiple databases, such as Cochrane, Embase, Medline, and Web of Science. Data extraction was carried out independently by pairs of reviewers, who also evaluated bias using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool.

**Results:** In total, six studies were identified, encompassing 381 participants with an average age of  $41.17 \pm 11.72$  years. No statistically significant differences were observed in pain relief when comparing mHealth-based exercise to offline exercise methods that did not incorporate mHealth (standard mean difference [SMD] = -0.31; 95% CI: -0.73 to 0.12,  $P=0.16$ ). Additionally, there were no significant differences concerning functional disability (SMD = -0.33; 95% CI: -0.68 to 0.02;  $P=0.06$ ) or quality of life (SMD = 0.19; 95% CI: -0.19 to 0.56;  $P=0.34$ ). Conversely, a significant difference was noted when comparing mHealth-supported exercise to unsupervised offline exercise regarding pain alleviation (SMD = -0.76; 95% CI: -1.06 to -0.45;  $P<0.001$ ) and functional disability (SMD = -0.66; 95% CI: -1.01 to -0.32;  $P<0.001$ ).

**Conclusion:** The results indicate that exercise facilitated by mHealth is more effective than offline unsupervised exercise in alleviating pain and enhancing functional capabilities in individuals experiencing CNP. In situations where face-to-face exercise intervention is unfeasible, mHealth-based exercise should be regarded as a feasible alternative in the rehabilitation process for CNP.

**Keywords:** mHealth; Exercise; Chronic Neck Pain; Meta-analysis

## Introduction

Chronic neck pain (CNP) is a significant global health issue that is garnering increasing attention. Statistics indicate that approximately 223 million people worldwide are affected, leading to an estimated 22 million years lived with disability <sup>[1]</sup>. The annual incidence rate of CNP is approximately 8% globally <sup>[2]</sup>. It has become the fourth leading cause of years lived with disability and is a key factor contributing to reduced work productivity <sup>[3]</sup>.

Physical exercise is commonly used as a management strategy in the first-line treatment of neck pain <sup>[4]</sup>. The American College of Sports Medicine also provides corresponding exercise prescription recommendations for CNP <sup>[5]</sup>. Prior systematic reviews have demonstrated that conventional exercise therapies can effectively reduce pain in individuals with CNP <sup>[6, 7]</sup>. However, Cieza et al found that 2.4 billion people have rehabilitation needs, with this segment of the population experiencing a 63% increase in recent years <sup>[1]</sup>. This trend indicates that offline rehabilitation intervention methods may not be adequate to meet the rehabilitation needs of patients. Considering the limited per capita access to rehabilitation opportunities and the constraints on resources, exploring new technological solutions to enhance patients' rehabilitation interventions is of utmost importance.

Mobile health, commonly known as mHealth, encompasses medical and public health activities that utilize mobile technology <sup>[8]</sup>. Interventions in mHealth for exercise present a very realistic substitute for conventional in-person outpatient treatments <sup>[9]</sup>. Numerous research studies have demonstrated that exercise interventions based on mHealth significantly enhance pain relief and functional abilities in individuals suffering from CNP <sup>[6, 10, 11]</sup>.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, when individuals were confined to their homes and unable to access regular face-to-face rehabilitation, mHealth exercise interventions emerged as a primary form of rehabilitation. This transition has facilitated the development of mHealth exercise interventions as effective alternatives for pain management.

Despite the increasing focus on mHealth-driven exercise strategies for CNP, several concerns highlighted in earlier studies persist unresolved. Initially, it is crucial to conduct more research to evaluate how conventional exercise programs measure up against mHealth-based alternatives. Furthermore, questions remain regarding the impact of supervision on the results of offline exercise methods and the correlation between mHealth interventions and both supervised and unsupervised conventional techniques. Therefore, this review seeks to evaluate how effective mHealth-based exercise interventions are compared to conventional exercise techniques in enhancing pain intensity, functional disability, and overall quality of life for individuals suffering from CNP.

## **Methods**

The meta-analysis was performed following the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-analyses <sup>[12]</sup> (**Supplementary PRISMA Checklist**). This study has been registered on PROSPERO (**CRD420250652524**)

### **Search strategies and study selection**

An extensive and thorough strategic literature search was conducted utilizing several reputable databases, including Web of Science, Medline (accessible via PubMed), the Excerpta Medica Database (Embase), and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), with the search extending up until December 25, 2024. This search was intentionally limited to scholarly articles that were published in the English language to maintain a focused and relevant compilation of study findings. To effectively screen the identified studies, Boolean logic operators were employed in combination with specific medical subject terms and pertinent keywords, such as “chronic neck pain,” “mobile health,” “sports intervention,” and “RCTs,” among others. This structured approach facilitated a comprehensive examination of the available literature. Moreover, in addition to the primary search methods, a series of recursive searches were carried out manually as a supplementary retrieval strategy. This was executed by reviewing leading academic journals, including notable publications like Sports Medicine and JAMA Network Open <sup>[13, 14]</sup>. The goal of these additional searches was to guarantee that no relevant articles meeting our predefined inclusion criteria were inadvertently overlooked. For a complete understanding of the search methodologies used across all databases, further details are available in the **Supplementary search strategy** provided.

The selection process was conducted independently by two researchers. In instances of discrepancies, a third expert was consulted for guidance. Duplicate entries were automatically eliminated. Each of the two authors assessed the titles and abstracts individually. Subsequently, a thorough evaluation of the complete articles was conducted to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the studies.

### **Inclusion criteria**

The study adhered to the criteria of population, interventions, comparators, outcomes, and study design for the included studies. First, only patients diagnosed with CNP were recruited. Second, the intervention group can be any mHealth-based exercise rehabilitation intervention. Third, the comparison group may consist of offline exercise interventions delivered through non-telemedicine methods, which include, but are not limited to, face-to-face outpatient interventions and self-practice. Fourth, the primary outcome indicator was pain, while the secondary outcome indicators included functional disability and quality of life (QOL). In instances where multiple assessment scales were utilized in a study, the main measurement was chosen. When the text failed to clearly define the

primary measure, the measurement from the most frequently utilized scale was incorporated instead. Ultimately, only RCTs published in English were selected, as data from English-language RCTs are generally considered to exhibit less bias compared to those derived from other study designs.

### **Data extraction and quality assessment**

We extracted the following data points using a predesigned form: study basic information (e.g., authors, publication year, intervention duration), participant baseline characteristics (e.g., sample size, age, gender ratio) and outcomes (e.g., pain, functional disability and QOL). If the papers did not report the necessary data, such as outcome measures, we would contact the corresponding authors via email to obtain this information.

The risk of bias (ROB) for each publication was assessed by two independent reviewers utilizing the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool<sup>[15]</sup>. This tool encompasses seven components: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, participant and personnel blinding, outcome assessment blinding, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other biases. Each element from the studies included was rated as uncertain, low, or high ROB.

### **Statistical analyses**

In accordance with the Cochrane Collaboration Handbook, a conventional pairwise meta-analysis was performed utilizing random effects models using STATA software version 14.0 (Stata, Inc., College Station, TX)<sup>[15]</sup>. Initially,  $I^2$  statistics were applied to assess the studies' heterogeneity, with  $I^2$  values of 25%, 50%, and 75% representing low, moderate, and high heterogeneity, respectively. Moreover, a Q statistical analysis was performed, in which P values that fell below 0.1 indicated notable heterogeneity<sup>[16]</sup>. Subsequently, we computed the standardized mean difference (SMD), which is defined as the mean difference divided by the standard deviation (SD), along with the corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI). In addition, a comparison-adjusted funnel plot was generated to visually assess potential publication bias by analyzing the plot for any signs of asymmetry. To further evaluate the funnel plot quantitatively, the Egger test was conducted to determine whether the P value was less than 0.05<sup>[17]</sup>. Finally, multiple subgroup analyses were carried out to investigate any differences or statistically meaningful variations among the trials. The subgroup analyses encompassed the following factors: duration of intervention ( $\geq 3$  months and  $< 3$  months), type of control group intervention (unsupervised exercise control group versus face-to-face exercise control group), geographical region (Asia contrasted with America and Europe) and so on.

## **Results**

### **Literature selection and characteristics of included studies**

A preliminary search of the database resulted in 5,454 publications, from which 1,972 studies were removed due to duplication. Upon examining the titles and abstracts, we found 3,461 studies that failed to meet the eligibility criteria. This led to the selection of 21 papers for an in-depth full-text review, consisting of 3 papers that were discovered through manual searches. After conducting a meticulous evaluation of the documents, we excluded 15 records for the following reasons: 6 studies were not RCTs, 4 studies did not have suitable outcomes, and 4 studies lacked pertinent data. As a result, our analysis focused on 6 studies<sup>[18-23]</sup>. The PRISMA screening process is depicted in **Figure 1**, and **Table 1** outlines the characteristics of the studies included.

**Table 1. Demographic characteristics of included studies**

| Study           | Sample size |    | Age, Mean (SD) |             | Female (%) |       | Intervention                                                      |                                                                 | Intervention duration | Assessment instrument  | Region  |
|-----------------|-------------|----|----------------|-------------|------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------|
|                 | EG          | CG | EG             | CG          | EG         | CG    | EG                                                                | CG                                                              |                       |                        |         |
| et al, 2022     | 22          | 22 | 36.23±1.245    | 34.18±1.303 | 72.73      | 77.27 | Remote supervised structured exercise therapy                     | Unsupervised structured exercise therapy based on self-practice | 4 weeks               | NPRS, NDI; WHOQOL-BREF | Turkey  |
| ck, et al, 2024 | 17          | 15 | 30.76±1.016    | 29.33±1.117 | 70.59      | 66.67 | Global Aerobic Exercise Program                                   | Global Aerobic Exercise Program                                 | 3 months              | NPRS, NDI              | America |
| et al, 2023     | 20          | 20 | 42.00±1.310    | 47.65±1.004 | NR         | NR    | Telerehabilitation                                                | Standard rehabilitation                                         | 8 weeks               | A-VAS, NDI; SF         | Turkey  |
| ella, 2017      | 47          | 47 | 56.0±14.00     | 60.1±11.0   | 89.36      | 89.36 | Home-based telemedicine program                                   | Exercising at home                                              | 6 months              | VAS, NDI               | Italy   |
| et al, 2023     | 15          | 16 | 37.40±1.058    | 39.5±10.96  | 26.67      | 31.25 | Spinal stabilization exercises delivered using telerehabilitation | Exercise at clinic                                              | 8 weeks               | VAS, NDI               | Turkey  |
| on, et al, 2023 | 70          | 70 | 40.40±1.160    | 40.5±11.4   | 21.43      | 21.43 | Neck-specific exercises with internet support                     | Neck-specific exercises                                         | 12 weeks              | VAS, NDI, GRS          | Sweden  |

Control group; EG, Experimental group; GRS, Global Rating Scale; NPRS, Numeric Pain Rating Scale; NDI; Neck Disability Index; SF; Social function; VAS, Visual analogue scale; WHOQoL, World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment Brief Form.

The six studies comprised a total of 381 participants, aged between 30 and 61 years, with findings published between 2017 and 2024. Notably, the majority of participants were women (56.68%), and most interventions lasted between 8 and 12 weeks. Of these studies, one was conducted in America, two in Europe, and three in Asia.

## Quality of the included studies

**Supplementary Figures 1 and 2** display the quality at both the individual and overall study levels. Each of the six trials indicated sufficient generation of random sequences, although only one RCT described its procedures for concealing allocations. Uncertainty regarding performance bias was noted in six RCTs. Three trials showed a significant risk of detection bias, while another three trials were marked by ambiguous risks of detection bias. Furthermore, six studies indicated a low risk of attrition bias. Additionally, two trials were considered to have a low risk concerning other bias factors.

## Primary Outcomes

### Effects of mHealth-based exercise on pain

In total, six studies explored the effect of mHealth - based exercise on pain, making a comparison between mHealth - centered exercise (involving 191 participants) and offline exercise (involving 190 participants). The findings showed no statistically significant differences in pain alleviation between mHealth-supported workouts and offline intervention techniques (SMD = -0.31, 95% CI: -0.74 to 0.12,  $I^2 = 74.1\%$ ,  $P_{\text{heterogeneity}} < 0.1$ ) (**Figure 2**). Furthermore, the funnel plot analysis did not indicate any asymmetry (**Figure 3**), implying an absence of potential publication bias ( $P_{\text{egger}} = 0.16$ ).

## Secondary Outcomes

### Functional Disability

A total of six studies evaluated the impact of mHealth-based exercise on functional disability, involving 381 participants. The findings revealed that those engaged in mHealth-based exercise did not show significant enhancements in functional disability when compared to individuals participating in conventional exercise programs (SMD: -0.33, 95% CI: -0.68 to 0.02,  $I^2 = 60.0\%$ ,  $P_{\text{heterogeneity}} < 0.1$ ) (see **Supplementary Figure 3**). Additionally, the funnel plot's observed asymmetry related to functional disability suggested a potential presence of publication bias (**refer to Supplementary Figure 4**).

### Quality of Life

Three investigations examined the impact of mHealth-based exercise on QOL. The combined results indicated that there was no notable difference between the groups involved in mHealth-based exercise and those participating in conventional exercise (SMD: -0.19, 95% CI: -0.19 to 0.56,  $I^2 = 41.2\%$ ,  $P_{\text{heterogeneity}} = 0.18$ ) (see **Supplementary Figure 5**). Furthermore, the funnel plot displayed a lack of symmetry, suggesting the possibility of publication bias (**refer to Supplementary Figure 6**).

### Pain

Subgroup analyses were performed based on the primary outcome of CNP, utilizing data from various factors including intervention type from the control group, duration of the intervention, methods of outcome measurement, and geographical region. Most of the analyses demonstrated consistency, showing no statistically significant differences among the subgroup factors. However, when analyzing the intervention types within the control group, notable differences were found in pain reduction between mHealth-supported exercise and unsupervised offline exercise interventions (SMD = -0.76, 95% CI = -1.06 to -0.45; **see Figure 4**).

### **Functional disability**

Subgroup analyses were additionally conducted based on secondary outcomes related to the duration of the intervention, geographical region, and the type of control group intervention. The findings indicated that exercise supported by mHealth considerably exceeded the effectiveness of unsupervised offline exercise interventions in enhancing functional disability (SMD = -0.66, 95% CI = -1.31 to -0.32). However, no significant differences were observed across subgroups when considering the region and duration of the intervention (**refer to Figure 5**).

### **Discussion**

From the statistical results, we conclude that CNP patients who engaged in mHealth exercise interventions did not demonstrate any significant improvement in pain intensity, functional disability, or QOL compared to those participating in conventional exercise programs. However, in comparison to unsupervised offline exercise interventions, mHealth exercise interventions have significantly improved pain and functional ability in patients suffering from CNP.

This meta-analysis revealed that there was no notable difference in the enhancement of pain relief between mHealth exercise interventions and conventional exercise interventions for individuals with chronic neck pain (SMD = -0.31; 95% CI: -0.73 to 0.12). Current research demonstrates that both remote exercise interventions and offline rehabilitation methods can effectively alleviate pain symptoms in this patient population <sup>[24-27]</sup>. The lack of significant difference in pain symptom improvement between the two intervention types may be attributed to the fact that both were conducted under the supervision of clinicians or rehabilitators <sup>[28-30]</sup>. Supervised exercise interventions ensure full participant engagement and minimize the likelihood that individuals will fail to achieve adequate exercise intensity due to personal inertia. Additionally, such supervision provides timely feedback, which may enhance patient compliance and facilitate the ongoing development of the exercise intervention <sup>[31, 32]</sup>. Given that both online and offline intervention modes effectively reduce pain levels in CNP patients, and that no significant differences in efficacy were observed, this finding expands the possibilities for exercise rehabilitation interventions in this

demographic. Furthermore, it offers a more convenient recovery option for patients who may find it difficult to attend outpatient clinics for treatment. For instance, patients with CNP residing in remote areas may face geographical barriers that prevent regular hospital visits for rehabilitation; thus, remote exercise rehabilitation interventions can provide consistent online guidance for these individuals<sup>[33]</sup>. Furthermore, our study revealed no significant differences in the improvement of functional disability and quality of life between remote and conventional exercise interventions. This similarity may also be linked to the strong supervision and high compliance associated with both intervention approaches. and functional disability.

Our subgroup analysis, based on the intervention forms within the control group, revealed that, for the two outcome measures of pain (SMD=-0.76; 95% CI: -1.06 to -0.45) and functional disability (SMD=-0.66; 95% CI: -1.01 to -0.32) in patients with CNP, remote exercise interventions exhibited a more significant effect than unsupervised offline exercise interventions. This finding aligns with previous research and emphasizes the critical role of supervised exercise<sup>[34, 35]</sup>, as discussed earlier. Therefore, in future exercise intervention trials, it is essential that interventions—whether delivered online or offline—are conducted under the supervision of sports rehabilitation professionals, as this may enhance their effectiveness. Furthermore, in the context of significant crises that prevent individuals from attending regular rehabilitation sessions at outpatient clinics, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, remote exercise interventions provide a viable alternative for healthcare providers to deliver rehabilitation services via telemedicine<sup>[36]</sup>.

### ***Strengths and limitations***

This meta-analysis emphasizes several key advantages. As far as we know, it represents the first comprehensive review to examine the effects of mHealth exercise interventions versus offline exercise approaches on pain levels in individuals suffering from CNP. The findings suggest that mHealth exercise interventions did not produce a significant enhancement in pain relief when compared to their offline alternatives. Furthermore, remote rehabilitation approaches, unlike conventional rehabilitation strategies, are less constrained by geographical limitations and the availability of medical resources, potentially enhancing continuity and adherence to rehabilitation practices for individuals with CNP. Consequently, this study may serve as a vital reference point for policymakers, healthcare providers, and caregivers in making informed decisions and shaping clinical practices, thereby facilitating future research and clinical applications.

Several constraints need to be recognized. To begin with, the findings arise from a rather small pool of included research (merely six studies), which might yield inadequate evidence for our assessment. Moreover, the poor quality of certain qualifying studies might undermine the

dependability of the results, as a number of the studies failed to utilize blinding for either participants or personnel. Moreover, due to limitations in the original data, no subgroup analyses were performed based on age, gender, disease type, intervention frequency, or publication year. The types of subgroup analyses were restricted to the type of control group and the intervention duration. Therefore, further studies with larger sample sizes, a multi-center design, and diverse treatment types are necessary to yield additional insights and evidence, ultimately offering more specific and detailed guidance for clinical application.

### **Conclusions and implications**

mHealth-based exercise interventions represent a valuable alternative therapy aimed at enhancing pain management and functional capabilities in patients suffering from CNP. These interventions appear to be as effective as offline exercise programs, indicating that patients may benefit from either approach without a notable difference in outcomes. Furthermore, when compared specifically to unsupervised offline exercise regimens, mHealth-based exercise interventions demonstrate more pronounced benefits, suggesting that the structured and guided nature of mHealth can lead to superior results for individuals undergoing rehabilitation for CNP.

### **Figure captions**

**Figure.1 Literature review flowchart.** WOS, Web of Science.

**Figure. 2 Literature review forest plot based on primary outcome.**

**Figure. 3 Literature review funnel plot based on primary outcome.**

**Figure. 4 Primary results based on pain and subgroup analyses.**

**Figure. 5 Secondary results based on functional disability and subgroup analyses**

### **Contribution**

Xiaoya He served as principal author and had full access to all the data in the study, takes responsibility for the accuracy of the data analysis, and the integrity of the data. Hang Zhou and Yueshuai Jiang contributed to the conception and design. Fei Qi, Dachao Liu and Junchao Ai contributed to data acquisition and interpretation. Zipu Wang contributed to revise of the article and final approval.

### **Data Availability**

Some or all data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article or in the data repositories listed in References.

### **Acknowledgement**

We affirm that the Work submitted for publication is original and has not been published other than as an abstract or preprint in any language or format and has not been submitted elsewhere for print or electronic publication consideration.

We affirm that each person listed as authors participated in the Work in a substantive manner, in accordance with ICMJE authorship guidelines, and is prepared to take public responsibility for it. All authors consent to the investigation of any improprieties that may be alleged regarding the Work. Each author further releases and holds harmless the Endocrine Society from any claim or liability that may arise therefrom.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

### **Funding sources**

This research was supported by the NA.

### **Abbreviations**

CI: confidence interval

CNP: chronic neck pain

mHealth: mobile health

PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

QOL: quality of life

RCTs: randomized controlled trials

ROB: risk of bias

SD: standard deviation

SMD: standardized mean difference

### **Reference**

- [1] CIEZA A, CAUSEY K, KAMENOV K, et al. Global estimates of the need for rehabilitation based on the Global Burden of Disease study 2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019 [J]. Lancet (London, England), 2021, 396(10267): 2006-17.
- [2] SAFIRI S, KOLAH A A, HOY D, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of neck pain in the general population, 1990-2017: systematic analysis of the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017 [J]. BMJ (Clinical research ed), 2020, 368: m791.
- [3] HOY D, MARCH L, WOOLF A, et al. The global burden of neck pain: estimates from the global burden of disease 2010 study [J]. Ann Rheum Dis, 2014, 73(7): 1309-15.
- [4] CHILDS J D, CLELAND J A, ELLIOTT J M, et al. Neck pain: Clinical practice guidelines linked to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health from the Orthopedic Section of the American


- Physical Therapy Association [J]. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy*, 2008, 38(9): A1-a34.
- [5] LIGUORI G, MEDICINE A C O S. ACSM's guidelines for exercise testing and prescription [M]. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2020.
- [6] DE ZOETE R M, ARMFIELD N R, MCAULEY J H, et al. Comparative effectiveness of physical exercise interventions for chronic non-specific neck pain: a systematic review with network meta-analysis of 40 randomised controlled trials [J]. *British journal of sports medicine*, 2020.
- [7] MIYAMOTO G C, LIN C C, CABRAL C M N, et al. Cost-effectiveness of exercise therapy in the treatment of non-specific neck pain and low back pain: a systematic review with meta-analysis [J]. *British journal of sports medicine*, 2019, 53(3): 172-81.
- [8] ORGANIZATION W H. mHealth: new horizons for health through mobile technologies: based on the findings of the second global survey on eHealth [J]. (No Title), 2011.
- [9] MIKOLASEK M, WITT C M, BARTH J. Adherence to a Mindfulness and Relaxation Self-Care App for Cancer Patients: Mixed-Methods Feasibility Study [J]. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 2018, 6(12): e11271.
- [10] MUELLER J, WEINIG J, NIEDERER D, et al. Resistance, Motor Control, and Mindfulness-Based Exercises Are Effective for Treating Chronic Nonspecific Neck Pain: A Systematic Review With Meta-Analysis and Dose-Response Meta-Regression [J]. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy*, 2023, 53(8): 420–59.
- [11] WILHELM M P, DONALDSON M, GRISWOLD D, et al. The Effects of Exercise Dosage on Neck-Related Pain and Disability: A Systematic Review With Meta-analysis [J]. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy*, 2020, 50(11): 607-21.
- [12] PAGE M J, MCKENZIE J E, BOSSUYT P M, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews [J]. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*, 2021, 372: n71.
- [13] FRITZ J M. East or West-Manual Therapy As a Viable Nonpharmacologic Option for Chronic Neck Pain [J]. *JAMA network open*, 2021, 4(7): e2114784.
- [14] YAMATO T P, SARAGIOTTO B T, MAHER C. Therapeutic exercise for chronic non-specific neck pain: PEDro systematic review update [J]. *British journal of sports medicine*, 2015, 49(20): 1350.
- [15] HIGGINS J P, ALTMAN D G, GøTZSCHE P C, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials [J]. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*, 2011, 343: d5928.
- [16] HIGGINS J P, THOMPSON S G. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis [J]. *Stat Med*, 2002, 21(11): 1539-58.
- [17] EGGER M, JUNI P, BARTLETT C, et al. How important are comprehensive literature searches and the assessment of trial quality in systematic reviews? Empirical study [J]. *Health technology assessment (Winchester, England)*, 2003, 7(1): 1-76.
- [18] GIALANELLA B, ETTORI T, FAUSTINI S, et al. Home-Based Telemedicine in Patients with Chronic Neck Pain [J]. *American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation*, 2017, 96(5): 327-32.
- [19] ÖZEL M, KAYA CİDDİ P. The effectiveness of telerehabilitation-based structured exercise therapy for chronic nonspecific neck pain: A randomized controlled trial [J]. *Journal of telemedicine and telecare*, 2022: 1357633X221095782.
- [20] ONAN D, ULLGER O, MARTELLETTI P. Effects of spinal stabilization exercises delivered using telerehabilitation on outcomes in patients with chronic neck pain: a randomized controlled trial [J]. *EXPERT REVIEW OF NEUROTHERAPEUTICS*, 2023, 23(3): 269-80.
- [21] ÖZDEN F, ÖZKESKİN M, TüMTÜRK I, et al. The effect of exercise and education combination via telerehabilitation in patients with chronic neck pain: A randomized controlled trial [J]. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL INFORMATICS*, 2023, 180.
- [22] PETERSON G, PEOLSSON A. Efficacy of Neck-Specific Exercise With Internet Support Versus Neck-Specific Exercise at a Physiotherapy Clinic in Chronic Whiplash-Associated Disorders: Multicenter Randomized Controlled Noninferiority Trial [J]. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 2023, 25.
- [23] BONTINCK J, MEEUS M, VOOGT L, et al. Online Exercise Programs for Chronic Nonspecific Neck Pain: A Randomized Controlled Trial Reveals Comparable Effects of Global, Local, and Combined Approaches [J]. *Physical therapy*, 2024, 104(6).
- [24] ZOU H, LU Z P, ZHAO P, et al. Efficacy of telerehabilitation in patients with nonspecific neck pain: A meta-analysis [J]. *Journal of telemedicine and telecare*, 2024: 9.
- [25] WU B B, YUAN H Y, GENG D Y, et al. The Impact of a Stabilization Exercise on Neck Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis [J]. *Journal of Neurological Surgery Part a-Central European Neurosurgery*, 2020, 81(04): 342-7.
- [26] HENRÍQUEZ-JURADO J M, OSUNA-PÉREZ M C, GARCÍA-LÓPEZ H, et al. Virtual reality-based therapy for chronic low back and neck pain: a systematic review with meta-analysis [J]. *EFORT open reviews*, 2024, 9(7): 685-99.
- [27] VALENZA-PENA G, CALVACHE-MATEO A, VALENZA M C, et al. - Effects of Telerehabilitation on Pain and Disability in Patients with Chronic Neck Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis [J]. 2024, - 12(- 7).

- [28] MOORE A J, HOLDEN M A, FOSTER N E, et al. Therapeutic alliance facilitates adherence to physiotherapy-led exercise and physical activity for older adults with knee pain: a longitudinal qualitative study [J]. *Journal of physiotherapy*, 2020, 66(1): 45-53.
- [29] HAGEMAN D, FOKKENROOD H J, GOMMANS L N, et al. Supervised exercise therapy versus home-based exercise therapy versus walking advice for intermittent claudication [J]. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*, 2018, 4(4): Cd005263.
- [30] VAN DER KOLK N M, DE VRIES N M, KESSELS R P C, et al. Effectiveness of home-based and remotely supervised aerobic exercise in Parkinson's disease: a double-blind, randomised controlled trial [J]. *The Lancet Neurology*, 2019, 18(11): 998-1008.
- [31] VAN DEN HOUTEN M M L, HAGEMAN D, GOMMANS L N M, et al. The Effect of Supervised Exercise, Home Based Exercise and Endovascular Revascularisation on Physical Activity in Patients With Intermittent Claudication: A Network Meta-analysis [J]. *European journal of vascular and endovascular surgery : the official journal of the European Society for Vascular Surgery*, 2019, 58(3): 383-92.
- [32] KHOURY S R, RATCHFORD E V, STEWART K J. Supervised exercise therapy for patients with peripheral artery disease: Clinical update and pathways forward [J]. *Progress in cardiovascular diseases*, 2022, 70: 183-9.
- [33] SCOTT A C, MCDONALD A, ROBERTS T, et al. Cardiovascular Telemedicine Program in Rural Australia [J]. *The New England journal of medicine*, 2020, 383(9): 883-4.
- [34] LO W L A, LEI D, LI L, et al. The Perceived Benefits of an Artificial Intelligence-Embedded Mobile App Implementing Evidence-Based Guidelines for the Self-Management of Chronic Neck and Back Pain: Observational Study [J]. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 2018, 6(11): e198.
- [35] MORENO-LIGERO M, MORAL-MUNOZ J A, SALAZAR A, et al. mHealth Intervention for Improving Pain, Quality of Life, and Functional Disability in Patients With Chronic Pain: Systematic Review [J]. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 2023, 11: e40844.
- [36] TANG L, WANG M M, WANG H X, et al. mHealth-based exercise vs. traditional exercise on pain, functional disability, and quality of life in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials [J]. *Front Physiol*, 2024, 15: 1511199.


## Supplementary Files

## Figures


## Flow Chart.



Literature review forest plot based on pain.




Literature review funnel plot based on pain.




Primary results based on pain and subgroup analyses.

**Figure 4 Primary results based on pain and subgroup analyses**



Secondary results based on functional disability and subgroup analyses.

**Figure 5** Secondary results based on functional disability and subgroup analyses



## Multimedia Appendixes

Supplement search strategy.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/48c432eafe5a4d98f260bbf834c91f5d.docx>

Supplementary figure 1 Risk of bias graph.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/af7fa971353e05c8d148adceb357ac74.png>

Supplementary figure 2 Risk of bias summary.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/f69ea23c31086241ed5186a40f54e1e8.png>

Supplementary figure 3 Literature review forest plot based on physical disability.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/3a7c90488b7e3e28a00bba91a021ccea.png>

Supplementary Figure 4 Literature review funnel plot based on physical disability.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/2210878876a905e0ef4487d2ba202440.png>

Supplementary figure 5 Literature review forest plot based on quality of life.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/e705b4743b23229883c08e46133c50e2.png>

Supplementary figure 6 Literature review funnel plot based on quality of life.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/ced87016b97994eb00cd1a49f322a735.png>

Supplementary Appendix PRISMA checklist.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/f927b3ce9352e5136c833503dc8fc20e.pdf>