Published online 2020 October 12.

Effect of Foot Reflexology on Constipation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Zahra Anjoman Azari¹, Mojgan Mirghafourvand^{2,*}, Ciara Hughes³ and Shiva Havizari¹

¹Student Research Committee, Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran
²Social Determinants of Health Research Center, Department of Midwifery, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Iran
³School of Health Sciences, Institute of Nursing and Health Research, University of Ulster, London, United Kingdom

^{*} *Corresponding author*: Associate Professor, Social determinants of Health Research Center, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Shariati Street, Tabriz, Iran. Post code: 513897977, P.O. Box: 51745-347, Fax: 00884234796969, Phone: 00989143206121. Email: mirghafourvand@gmail.com

Received 2020 February 03; Revised 2020 July 27; Accepted 2020 July 27.

Abstract

Context: Constipation is a prevalent symptom of gastrointestinal disorders, which has an annoying impact on health and quality of life. On the other hand, reflexology is a popular type of complementary and alternative medicine in medical practices. **Objectives:** The present study aimed to assess the effect of foot reflexology on constipation symptoms.

Methods: Nine databases were systematically searched to detect relevant Randomized Clinical Trials. The current used the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool to evaluate the methodological quality of the included articles. The primary outcome was the improvement of constipation symptoms. The Standardized Mean Difference (SMD) was measured, and random effects were reported instead of the fixed effects due to the high heterogeneity.

Results: Out of the 693 articles retrieved from the databases and eight additional records identified through other sources, 496 titles, 48 abstracts, and 16 full-texts were reviewed, and 11 articles were included in this study, out of which nine articles entered the meta-analysis. The findings of the meta-analysis indicated that foot reflexology had a significant effect on the constipation score (SMD: -0.82; 95% CI: -1.47 to -0.17; P value = 0.0001; $l^2 = 93\%$)

Conclusions: Foot reflexology can effectively improve constipation symptoms; however, clinical trials with better designs are recommended.

Keywords: Foot reflexology, Constipation, Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis

1. Context

Reflexology is an ancient healing method (1) and a popular type of Complementary and Alternative Medicine (CAM), which can be easily applied even by the patient and has almost no side-effects (2). In this method, the feet (often the foot soles) represent the entire body. Applying controlled pressure on particular reflex zones on the feet can stimulate their interconnected internal organs (3). The purpose of this treatment is to create balance in the function of the body systems (4) and facilitate homeostasis (5).

Constipation is a common gastrointestinal disorder in both adults and children (6). The prevalence of constipation is reported to be as high as 30% in the general population (7). Constipation is associated with a low quality of life (8) and some undesirable symptoms (9). It is generally divided into a primary (idiopathic) and a secondary type. Primary constipation is categorized as 1) Normal transit, 2) Slow transit, a prolonged transit time in the colon, 3) Dyssynergic constipation, an abnormal rectal discharge, or functional impairment with no anatomical or physiological etiology (10). Secondary constipation may be associated with endocrine, metabolic, or neurologic diseases or may be due to the continuous use of laxatives and other drugs (10-12).

The first-line treatment of constipation involves increasing dietary fiber and fluid consumption and proper use of laxative use (13, 14). However, laxatives are expensive and have some side-effects (15). As a CAM, reflexology has been used to improve constipation symptoms (4). Previous systematic reviews on the subject have merely used abdominal massage or hand reflexology (16, 17). Some highquality Controlled Trials (CTs) have measured the effect of foot reflexology on the constipation symptoms. According to some authors, there were no systematic reviews of clinical trials on the effect of foot reflexology on constipation under any circumstances.

Copyright © 2020, Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits copy and redistribute the material just in noncommercial usages, provided the original work is properly cited.

2. Objectives

The present systematic review was conducted to critically evaluate the data from Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) of foot reflexology as a treatment for constipation due to any medical conditions.

3. Methods

This systematic and meta-analytical study was conducted based on PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses).

3.1. Inclusion Criteria

The PICOS (Participant, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome, study design) framework wa used as the tool for the inclusion of articles. The 'Population' consisted of pediatric, adult, or older patients with a diagnosis of constipation receiving foot reflexology. The population was compared with 'Controls' receiving no placebo or other treatments. The 'Intervention' consisted of foot reflexology. The primary 'Outcome' in this study consisted of constipation symptoms, which were measured using the Modified Constipation Assessment Scale (MCAS), the Constipation Assessment Scale (CAS) that is a two-part questionnaire inquiring about children's defecation characteristics, the Clayden Constipation Questionnaire (CCQ), and the Bristol Stool Scale. In this systematic review, we also included the randomized, controlled, and clinical trials which have evaluated the effect of foot reflexology on constipation symptoms.

3.2. Exclusion Criteria

Two reviewers independently selected the studies based on the pre-defined eligibility criteria. The exclusion criteria for the study consisted of the absence of a comparison group and receiving any other type of reflexology or massage treatment other than foot reflexology. We also excluded the editorials, reviews, books, case reports, case series, letters to editors, qualitative studies, and short communications. There was no limitation for the length of follow-up or treatment.

3.3. Search Strategy

The English databases (e.g., Web of Science, Cochrane Library on the Wiley platform, PubMed, Scopus, Embase, and Google Scholar) and the Iranian database (e.g., Scientific Information Database and Magiran) were systematically searched for articles published without time limitations until June 2020. The MESH terminology used in the search included "foot reflexology" OR "foot massage" combined with "constipation" (Table 1). Also, a manual search of the reliable journal databases was performed, and the references in all the included articles were assessed for additional related papers. To search for unpublished papers (grey literature), we assessed European Association for Grey Literature Exploitation (EAGLE) and Health Care Management Information Consortium (HMIC). The electronic search strategy is available in Appendix 1. The investigated data were transferred to the reference management software of Endnote to delete duplicate records.

3.4. Data collection

We used a pre-specified form for the data extraction, including the name of authors, publication year, country, type of clinical trial, participant characteristics, age range, sample size in the intervention and comparison groups, measurement tools, follow-up time, intervention, and results.

3.5. Quality Assessment of Included Studies

The methodological quality of the articles was assessed individually by two reviewers via the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool (18), and any sorts of disagreements were resolved by the third researcher. The methodological information extracted for the assessment of internal validity included random allocation, allocation concealment, participants or personnel blinding, blinding of data assessor, number and reasons for participant's loss to follow up, and the use of validated outcome measures (19). Since the number of included studies in the meta-analysis was lower than 10 studies, the graphical or statistical methods were not used to evaluate the publication bias (20). However, due to the language limitation, publication bias was considered high risk.

3.6. Statistical Analysis

The pooled Standardized Mean Difference (SMD) and 95% Confidence Interval (95% CI) were determined for the mean score of constipation. Sub-group analysis was conducted according to the comparison group (Golgand or routine care). The Cochrane Q-test and the I2 index were used to assess the heterogeneity (21). Due to high heterogeneity, the random effect model was used instead of the fixed effect model. Whenever more than ten studies are entered into a meta-analysis, the possibility of publication bias should also be investigated (22). The meta-analysis was conducted using RevMan software version 5.3. (Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark) 5.0 (Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark).

| Table 1. Electronic | c Search Strategy In Databases of PubMed and Scopus |
|---------------------|--|
| Database | Search Strategy |
| PubMed | (((foot reflexology) AND (constipation)) OR ((foot massage) AND (constipation))) AND (randomized controlled trial) |
| Scopus | ((constipation and foot massage AND randomized controlled trial) OR (foot reflexology AND constipation and randomized controlled trial)) |
| | |

4. Results

4.1. Results of the Literature Search

The search led to the retrieval of 701 articles. After reviewing the article titles or abstracts, the full text of 17 potentially eligible studies was evaluated, and six articles were excluded due to: 1) Absence of a comparison group (23, 24), 2) Being descriptive (5), 3) The participants receiving another type of reflexology (abdominal massage or other type of massage) (25-27). Finally, 11 articles (28-38) were entered into this study, out of which nine studies (a total of 611 participants) entered the meta-analysis. The trials were conducted in different countries and their treatment period ranged from six days to 12 weeks (Figure 1).



4.2. General Characteristics

Two studies on pregnant women (28, 29), three studies on children (30-32), one study on patients with multiple sclerosis (33), three studies on the elderly (34-36), and two studies were conducted on adults (37, 38). The participants' age differed from one to 65 years. The sample size of the studies varied from 34 (37) to 184 (32). The followup periods ranged from four to 12 weeks, and the countries of the selected studies included Iran, Turkey, and the UK. The outcome measures consisted of subjective outcomes, including constipation score and stool consistency; the objective outcome included bowel frequency. The treatments were slightly different from each other, and the overall frequency of treatment ranged from six to 84 sessions. In two of the studies, we used oil or cream for foot massage (30, 31). Instructions were given for foot massage in one of the studies (32). In two studies, the control group administered the same procedure as the intervention group except that it did not receive foot reflexology (35, 37). The data collection tool used in the studies by Tovey et al. and Elbasan et al. was the Modified Constipation Assessment Scale (MCAS), and the level of constipation improvement was reported as mean and standard deviation (31, 37). Ghaffari et al. (28), Seyyedrassoli et al. (38), Fakhrzade et al. (35), Mohammadzadeh Moghadam et al. (36), Sehhatti et al. (29), Sajadi et al. (33), also described the constipation score using the Constipation Assessment Scale (CAS) as mean and standard deviation. Inkaya described the constipation score using the Constipation Severity Instrument (CSI) (34). Canbulat Sahiner et al. employed a two-part questionnaire developed by the researchers and reported the stool number and stool consistency as categorical variables in number and percentage (30). Gordon applied the Clayden Constipation Questionnaire for assessing constipation characteristics and the Bristol Stool Scale for evaluating bowel movements and reported the results as mean and standard deviation (32). In all the studies, the intervention group received foot reflexology treatment. Meanwhile, in one trial, the intervention and control groups both received a neurodevelopmental treatment program. In the study of Mohammadzadeh Moghadam et al., Golghand was administered as the comparison group (36). In one trial, the control group received no treatments (28).

In one study, there were three study groups; one received foot reflexology, the other received abdominal massage, and the third one received no interventions except the routine care (38). In one trial, nonspecific massage was given to the control group (35). In another trial, both the intervention and control groups received toilet/diet/motivation training (30), and in another trial, three groups were assessed: Group 1(routine care), Group 2 (foot massage along with the routine care), and Group 3 (foot reflexology along with the routine care) (32).

The results of the study by Elbasan et al. demonstrated that despite the effectiveness of reflexology in improving the symptoms of constipation, the difference between the group receiving reflexology combined with neurodevelopmental therapy and the group receiving neurodevelopmental therapy alone was not statistically significant (31). The results of the studies by Ghaffari et al. (28), Sajadi et al. (33), Sehhatti et al. (29), and Inkaya et al. (34) showed significant differences in the mean constipation scores after reflexology. Seyyedrassoli et al. (38) found that constipation severity reduced significantly with foot reflexology compared to abdominal massage and routine care from day three to six after the treatment. Foot reflexology improved the symptoms of constipation better than abdominal massage from day three to six after the treatment, but the difference was not statistically significant. There were critical differences between foot reflexology and abdominal massage in comparison with routine care in terms of constipation symptoms from day three to six after the intervention (38). According to the results of a study by Fakhrzade et al., the difference was significant in the severity of constipation between the foot reflexology and nonspecific massage groups (35). The results of Tovey's trial did not show any significant differences in constipation improvement between the foot reflexology and control groups (37). The results of a study by Mohammadzadeh Moghadam et al. showed that the difference between the golghand and foot reflexology groups was statistically significant in terms of the severity of constipation and the frequency of bowel movements (36).

The results of the study by Canbulat Sahiner et al. showed no significant differences between the foot reflexology and control groups in terms of frequency and consistency of defecation (30). Gordon et al. conducted a study with three groups, including the control group, the massage group, and the reflexology group, showing that bowel movement and total score of constipation and subscales scores including soiling, pain, medicine use, general behavior, and health differed significantly between the groups. In that study, the bowel frequency differed from baseline in all the groups, but the greatest improvement was observed in the reflexology group. A significant difference was observed between the reflexology and control groups, but there was no significant difference between massage and control groups. Also, there was a significant difference between the control and reflexology groups in terms of the total score of constipation, although the bowel movements did not differ significantly (32) (Table 2).

4.3. Methodological Quality

In assessing the methodological quality of the included studies, nine studies mentioned the method of generating allocation sequences (using a table of random numbers and a computer) (29-36, 38). Only two studies reported allocation concealment (29, 36). In regarding blinding of participant and personnel, three studies (33, 35, 37) blinded to allocation of groups by nonspecific massage, and in terms of blinding of outcome assessor, six studies (29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38) had low risk of bias. In three studies, it was unclear whether or not the outcome assessor was blinded (28, 30, 31). Five studies (29, 35-38) had a low risk of bias, one study (34) was unclear, and five studies (28, 30-33) had a high risk of bias for incomplete outcome data (Figures 2 and 3).

4.4. Result of Meta-Analysis

The pooled SMD showed that the total constipation score in the foot reflexology group was significantly lower than the comparison group (routine care or golgand) (SMD: -0.82; 95% CI: -1.47 to -0.17; P value = 0.0001). Due to high heterogeneity (I2 = 93%, P value < 0.0001), the random effect model was used. Based on the comparison group, the subgroup analysis showed that the total constipation score in the golgand group was significantly lower than the foot reflexology group. (SMD: 0.67; 95% CI: 0.15 to 1.19; P value = 0.01)However, the total constipation score in the foot reflexology group was significantly lower than the routine care group (SMD: -1.0; 95% CI: -1.65 to 0.36; P value = 0.002) (Figure 4).

5. Discussion

5.1. Summary of the Main Results

The analysis of the data from nine studies showed that foot reflexology was associated with significant improvements in constipation. The quality of the most included



studies was not high. The results of the risk of bias assessment in the included studies showed that nine studies of the eleven studies used the correct method to generate random sequence. Only three studies reported the method used for allocation concealment, and in eight studies, it was unclear. No participants and personnel were blinded in 70% of the studies. Blinding is a significant stage in clinical trials. Without it, studies may cause an exaggeration in the estimated effect (39). Although only about 40% of the studies had no incomplete outcome data, the selective reporting bias in 90% of studies was low risk. It is necessary that the researchers address the issue of missing outcome data for their systematic reviews so that they could be considered as a valid source of evidence (40).

5.2. Interpretation of Findings

The findings of this systematic review showed that foot reflexology improved constipation significantly. Cherniack conducted a narrative review, entitled "The use of complementary and alternative medicine to treat constipation in the elderly" and included a study on 19 participants receiving 35-45-min sessions of foot reflexology every week, in which 11 participants showed improvements in colon transit time after the intervention (11). Wang et al. and Hussain et al. performed systematic reviews, including a single-blind trial on reflexology conducted by Tovey that evaluated the effectiveness of reflexology on the irritable bowel syndrome. These systematic reviews demonstrated that no statistically significant changes were observed between the reflexology and sham foot massage groups (16, 17).

The primary treatment options (10) for constipation include non-medical treatments (8). Although certain types of laxatives have some benefits for constipation symptoms, they have some side-effects when used for a long time (31-43). Reflexology is a popular type of CAM and an ancient healing method (44) that is commonly used in clinical practice and has become increasingly prevalent in various health care areas (45). Seo et al. (2015) performed a systematic review of the effect of self-administered foot reflexology in people with chronic health conditions and included three Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) and one before-after study. The results of the studies included self-administered foot reflexology in patients with chronic conditions, such as hyperelevension, urinary incontinence, or diabetes type 2, and showed insufficient evidence to determine the treatment effectiveness (46). Nonetheless, most of the cases claimed that reflexology was free of side-effects (3). Zeng et al. conducted a systematic review, entitled "Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Hospice and Palliative Care" and included 17 studies, two of which evaluated the efficacy of reflexology in improving the OoL. In one of the studies, 12 patients were randomly divided into two groups to receive reflexology or placebo treatment. The study evaluated constipation and several other symptoms in both groups, and a short-term improvement was reported in terms of QoL and constipation (47).

5.3. Strengths

The strengths of the present study include being among the first systematic reviews of foot reflexology for improving constipation symptoms. Previous systematic studies have reviewed the effects of abdominal massage on constipation. Also, the present study considered the objective outcomes in addition to subjective outcomes.

According to the existing literature, foot reflexology is an appropriate integrative treatment for symptom alleviation in patients with constipation; however, further research is needed to review the style of reflexology applied using well-designed and high-quality RCTs (48).



Figure 3. Risk of Bias Summary: Summary of the Authors' Judgments about Each Risk of Bias Item Within Included Studies.

5.4. Limitations

The limitations of this systematic review include the trials using different types of controls depending on what they consider 'foot reflexology' or the control groups of the studies receiving another type of CAM (such as abdominal massage or nonspecific foot massage). Also, blinding of participants and personnel is difficult due to the nature of this intervention.. Sham reflexology is one ex-

ample of the methods used to blind the participants on foot reflexology; however, these methods yield mixed results due to their uncertain reliability as a placebo. Most of the measurement tools used in the studies were subjective, though a few studies used objective measurement tools, such as bowel movement or stool frequency forms. Although the major English and Persian databases were searched comprehensively, studies published in other languages are missing on the subject.

5.5. Implications for Research

We suggest a better-designed, randomized, and controlled clinical trial to compare the effect of foot reflexology on constipation symptoms with other treatments, such as massage or standard treatments. Randomization, allocation concealment, and proper blindness of the participants, performers, and outcome assessors are essential for higher-quality trials. Valid tools to measure the outcomes should also be considered. In the end, it is necessary for all authors to include international standard statements such as the CONSORT statement in reports of their trial results.

5.6. Conclusion

The present study reviewed the effectiveness of foot reflexology in relieving constipation symptoms. The result of the meta-analysis showed that foot reflexology can effectively improve constipation symptoms. However, due to the poor quality of the articles and high heterogeneity, the findings are inconclusive , so clinical trials with better designs are recommended.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary material(s) is available here [To read supplementary materials, please refer to the journal website and open PDF/HTML].

Footnotes

Authors' Contribution: ZAA, SH, CH and MM (corresponding author) participated in the study designing. ZAA and SH searched the literature and selected studies, extracted data, assessed quality, and drafted the manuscript. CH and MM (corresponding author) revised the draft. All the authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

| | Reflexol | ogy Gr | oup | Comp | arsion (| Group | 9 | Std. Mean Difference | Std. Mean Difference |
|---|--------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|---------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Totl | Weight | IV.Random.95% CI | tv. Random, 95% CI |
| 1.2.1 Comparsion Gr | oup: Gol | gand | | | | | | | |
| Moghadam 2018 | 5.83 | 1.93 | 30 | 4.43 | 2.19 | 30 | 11.2% | 0.67 [0.15,1.19] | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 30 | | | 30 | 11.2% | 0.67 [0.15, 1.19] | ◆ |
| Heterogeneity: Not | Applicat | ole | | | | | | | |
| Test for Overal Effec | t: $Z = 2.5$ | 2(P=0) | .01) | | | | | | |
| 1.2.2 Comparsion: R | outine c | are | | | | | | | |
| Elbasan 2017 | 3.8 | 2.63 | 20 | 575 | 5.9 | 20 | 10.9% | -0.42 [-1.05, 0.21] | |
| Fakhrzade 2016 | 3.88 | 5.39 | 28 | 4.19 | 17.78 | 28 | 11.2% | -0.02 [-0.55, 0.50] | |
| Ghaffari 2007 | 6.94 | 4.8 | 50 | 16.3 | 8 | 50 | 11.5% | -1.41 [-1.85, -0.97] | |
| Gordon 2007 | 9.73 | 8.2 | 64 | 13.91 | 11.49 | 57 | 11.7% | -0.42 [-0.78, -0.06] | |
| Inkaya 2020 | 21.97 | 5.71 | 29 | 39.83 | 7.94 | 30 | 10.6% | -2.54 [-3.24, -1.84] | |
| Sajadi 2020 | 6.39 | 3.51 | 33 | 14.97 | 4.92 | 30 | 10.9% | -2.00 [-2.61, -1.39] | (|
| Sehhatti 2020 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 36 | 2.7 | 4.3 | 36 | 11.4% | 0.22 $[-0.24, 0.68]$ | |
| Seyyedrassoli 2016 | 0.15 | 0.48 | 20 | 2.75 | 2.17 | 20 | 10.5% | -1.62 [-2.35, -0.90] | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 280 | | | 271 | 88.8% | -1.00 [-1.65, -0.36] | |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ^z Test for Overall Effec | = 0.78:0 | 26 (P = | 3.72, df 0.002) | = 7 (P < | 0.000 | 01); I ^z = | 92% | | |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 310 | | | 301 | 100.0% | -0.82 [-1.47, -0.17] | - |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ^z = 0.91: Chi ^z = 111.02, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); $I^{z} = 93\%$ | | | | | | | | | |
| Test for Overall Effect: $Z = 2.46$ ($P = 0.01$) | | | | | | | | | |
| Test for Subgroup D | oifference | es : Chi | ² = 15.69 | , df = (I | P<0.00 | 01); I ^z : | = 93.6% | | kenexology Group Comparsion Group |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 4. Forest Plots of Randomized Controlled Studies on Constipation Symptoms Score

Conflict of Interests: No conflicts of interest were declared with regard to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding/Support: No financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this paper.

References

- Ernst E, Posadzki P, Lee MS. Reflexology: an update of a systematic review of randomised clinical trials. *Maturitas*. 2011;68(2):116–20. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2010.10.011. [PubMed: 21111551].
- Zhai J, Mu W, Si J, Li Y, Zhao C, Shang H, et al. Acupuncture for constipation in patients with stroke: protocol of a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open.* 2018;8(3). e020400. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020400. [PubMed: 29602854]. [PubMed Central: PMC5884333].
- Mukaino Y, Park J, White A, Ernst E. The effectiveness of acupuncture for depression-a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *Acupunct Med.* 2005;23(2):70–6. doi: 10.1136/aim.23.2.70. [PubMed: 16025787].
- Hughes CM, Krirsnakriengkrai S, Kumar S, McDonough SM. The effect of reflexology on the autonomic nervous system in healthy adults: a feasibility study. *Altern Ther Health Med.* 2011;17(3):32–7. [PubMed: 22164810].
- Bishop E, McKinnon E, Weir E, Brown DW. Reflexology in the management of encopresis and chronic constipation. *Paediatr Nurs*. 2003;15(3):20–1. doi: 10.7748/paed2003.04.15.3.20.c843. [PubMed: 12715585].
- van den Berg MM, Benninga MA, Di Lorenzo C. Epidemiology of childhood constipation: a systematic review. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2006;**101**(10):2401-9. doi: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2006.00771.x. [PubMed: 17032205].

- Cullen G, O'Donoghue D. Constipation and pregnancy. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol. 2007;21(5):807–18. doi: 10.1016/j.bpg.2007.05.005. [PubMed: 17889809].
- Rungsiprakarn P, Laopaiboon M, Sangkomkamhang US, Lumbiganon P, Pratt JJ. Interventions for treating constipation in pregnancy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015;(9). CD011448. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD011448.pub2. [PubMed: 26342714].
- Ford F. Constipation in pregnancy. *Pract Midwife*. 2008;11(10):28–31. [PubMed: 19054953].
- Lee-Robichaud H, Thomas K, Morgan J, Nelson RL. Lactulose versus Polyethylene Glycol for Chronic Constipation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2010;(7). CD007570. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007570.pub2. [PubMed: 20614462].
- Cherniack EP. Use of complementary and alternative medicine to treat constipation in the elderly. *Geriatr Gerontol Int.* 2013;13(3):533–8. doi:10.1111/ggi.12023. [PubMed: 23294466].
- Nanji KS, Ahmed B, Awan S, Qidwai W, Hamid S. Fiber and bulking agents for the treatment of chronic constipation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2012. doi: 10.1002/14651858.cd009656.
- Anderson AS. Dietary factors in the aetiology and treatment of constipation during pregnancy. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol*. 1986;**93**(3):245–9. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.1986.tb07901.x. [PubMed: 3008805].
- Derbyshire EJ, Davies J, Detmar P. Changes in bowel function: pregnancy and the puerperium. *Dig Dis Sci.* 2007;**52**(2):324–8. doi: 10.1007/s10620-006-9538-x. [PubMed: 17211700].
- Tytgat GN, Heading RC, Muller-Lissner S, Kamm MA, Scholmerich J, Berstad A, et al. Contemporary understanding and management of reflux and constipation in the general population and pregnancy: a consensus meeting. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2003;18(3):291–301. doi: 10.1046/jj.1365-2036.2003.01679.x. [PubMed: 12895213].
- Hussain Z, Quigley EM. Systematic review: Complementary and alternative medicine in the irritable bowel syndrome. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2006;23(4):465–71. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2006.02776.x. [PubMed: 16441466].

- Wang MY, Tsai PS, Lee PH, Chang WY, Yang CM. The efficacy of reflexology: systematic review. *J Adv Nurs*. 2008;62(5):512–20. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04606.x. [PubMed: 18489444].
- Higgins JP, Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2006, [updated September 2006]. Available from: https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/ archive/v4.2.6.
- Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Juni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2011;**343**:d5928. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d5928. [PubMed: 22008217]. [PubMed Central: PMC3196245].
- Ahn E, Kang H. Introduction to systematic review and meta-analysis. *Korean J Anesthesiol.* 2018;71(2):103–12. doi: 10.4097/kjae.2018.71.2.103. [PubMed: 29619782]. [PubMed Central: PMC5903119].
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003;**327**(7414):557–60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557. [PubMed: 12958120]. [PubMed Central: PMC192859].
- Song F, Loke Y; Hooper. Publication bias: what is it? How do we measure it? How do we avoid it? J Clin Trials. 2013;71. doi: 10.2147/0a-jct.s34419.
- Woodward S, Norton C, Barriball KL. A pilot study of the effectiveness of reflexology in treating idiopathic constipation in women. *Complement Ther Clin Pract.* 2010;16(1):41–6. doi: 10.1016/j.ctcp.2009.06.002. [PubMed: 20129409].
- Cevik K, Zaybak A. The Effect of Reflexology on Constipation in the Elderly. International Journal of Caring Sciences. 2018;11(1):309.
- Turan N, Ast TA. The effect of abdominal massage on constipation and quality of life. *Gastroenterol Nurs*. 2016;**39**(1):48–59. doi: 10.1097/SGA.00000000000202. [PubMed: 26825564].
- Sahiloğulları S. The Investigation of Reflexology with Physiotherapy Program on Sleeping, Constipation, Drooling, Gross Motor Function, Quality of Life and Family Impact. Ankara: Gazi University; 2015.
- Lamas K, Lindholm L, Stenlund H, Engstrom B, Jacobsson C. Effects of abdominal massage in management of constipation-a randomized controlled trial. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2009;46(6):759-67. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.01.007. [PubMed: 19217105].
- Ghaffari F, Poor Ghaznain T, Shamsalinia A. Effect of sole reflex on pregnant women's constipation severity. *Iran J Obst Gynecol Infertil*. 2007;10(2):27-38.
- Sehhatti F, Hughes C, Mirghafourvand M, Anjoman Azari Z. The Effect of Short-term Foot Reflexology in Improving Constipation Symptoms During Pregnancy: A TwoArmed, Randomized Controlled Trial. Int J Women's Health Reprod Sci. 2019;8(3):303-10. doi: 10.15296/ijwhr.2020.49.
- Canbulat Sahiner N, Demirgoz Bal M. A Randomized Controlled Trial Examining the Effects of Reflexology on Children With Functional Constipation. *Gastroenterol Nurs.* 2017;40(5):393–400. doi: 10.1097/SGA.00000000000196. [PubMed: 28957970].
- Elbasan B, Bezgin S. The effects of reflexology on constipation and motor functions in children with cerebral palsy. *Pediatr Neonatol.* 2018;**59**(1):42–7. doi: 10.1016/j.pedneo.2017.01.005. [PubMed: 28716693].
- 32. Gordon JS. The effectiveness of reflexology as an adjunct to standard treatment in childhood idiopathic constipation : a single blind randomised controlled trial (dissertation). Edinburgh Napier University; 2007.
- 33. Sajadi M, Davodabady F, Naseri-Salahshour V, Harorani M, Ebrahimi-Monfared M. The effect of foot reflexology on constipation and quality of life in patients with multiple sclerosis. A random-

ized controlled trial. *Complement Ther Med.* 2020;**48**:102270. doi: 10.1016/j.ctim.2019.102270. [PubMed: 31987235].

- Inkaya B, Tuzer H. Effect of Reflexology on the Constipation Status of Elderly People. Yonago Acta Med. 2020;63(2):115-21. doi: 10.33160/yam.2020.05.007. [PubMed: 32494217]. [PubMed Central: PMC7231874].
- Esmaeil pour S, Jabbarzad zaki M, Naeeni MK, Fakhrzade H. Effect of Foot Reflexology on the Severity of Constipation of Elderly Women Residing in Kahrizak Geriatric Nursing Home. *Adv Nurs Midwifery*. 2016;**13**(10):825–34.
- Rajabi AR, Sajjadi M, Moghadam HM, Shareinia H, Moghadam TM. Comparison the Effect of Golghand and Foot Reflexology on Constipation in Elderlies. J Pharm Res Int. 2019:1–9. doi: 10.9734/jpri/2018/v25i330099.
- Tovey P. A single-blind trial of reflexology for irritable bowel syndrome. *BrJ Gen Pract.* 2002;**52**(474):19–23. [PubMed: 11791811]. [PubMed Central: PMC1314196].
- 38. Seyyedrassoli A, Ghahramanian A, Azizi A, Goljarian S, Gillespie M, Aydinferd S. Comparison of effectiveness of reflexology and abdominal massage on constipation among orthopedic patients: A single-blind randomized controlled trial. *Int J Med Res Health Sci.* 2018;5(10):33–40.
- Hrobjartsson A, Emanuelsson F, Skou Thomsen AS, Hilden J, Brorson S. Bias due to lack of patient blinding in clinical trials. A systematic review of trials randomizing patients to blind and nonblind sub-studies. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2014;43(4):1272-83. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyu115. [PubMed: 24881045]. [PubMed Central: PMC4258786].
- Kirkham JJ, Dwan KM, Altman DG, Gamble C, Dodd S, Smyth R, et al. The impact of outcome reporting bias in randomised controlled trials on a cohort of systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2010;**340**:c365. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c365. [PubMed: 20156912].
- Klaschik E, Nauck F, Ostgathe C. Constipation-modern laxative therapy. Support Care Cancer. 2003;11(11):679–85. doi: 10.1007/s00520-003-0525-x. [PubMed: 14505158].
- Wald A. Is chronic use of stimulant laxatives harmful to the colon? J Clin Gastroenterol. 2003;36(5):386–9. doi: 10.1097/00004836-200305000-00004. [PubMed: 12702977].
- Stickel F, Schuppan D. Herbal medicine in the treatment of liver diseases. *Dig Liver Dis*. 2007;**39**(4):293–304. doi: 10.1016/j.dld.2006.11.004. [PubMed: 17331820].
- Hung A, Kang N, Bollom A, Wolf JL, Lembo A. Complementary and Alternative Medicine Use Is Prevalent Among Patients with Gastrointestinal Diseases. *Dig Dis Sci.* 2015;60(7):1883–8. doi: 10.1007/s10620-014-3498-3. [PubMed: 25556585].
- Charlton J, Mackereth P, Tiran D, Donald G. Take me to a clinical reflexologist: an exploratory survey. *Complement Ther Clin Pract.* 2011;17(2):102–6. doi: 10.1016/j.ctcp.2010.08.002. [PubMed: 21457900].
- 46. Song HJ, Choi SM, Seo HJ, Lee H, Son H, Lee S. Self-administered foot reflexology for the management of chronic health conditions: a systematic review. J Altern Complement Med. 2015;21(2):69–76. doi: 10.1089/acm.2014.0166. [PubMed: 25636044].
- Zeng YS, Wang C, Ward KE, Hume AL. Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Hospice and Palliative Care: A Systematic Review. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2018;56(5):781–794 e4. doi: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2018.07.016. [PubMed: 30076965].
- McCullough JE, Liddle SD, Sinclair M, Close C, Hughes CM. The physiological and biochemical outcomes associated with a reflexology treatment: a systematic review. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med.* 2014;2014:502123. doi: 10.1155/2014/502123. [PubMed: 24883067]. [PubMed Central: PMC4026838].

| study Pop | Julation | Participants' Age | Intervention Group | Blinding | Intervention/Follow- up | Comparison | Sample Size in Both Groups | Scale | Finding Source | Results |
|--------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|--|--------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| diagnosed CP | | 3-15 years | Group I: Neurodevelopmental therapy Group 2: Foot reflexology with neurodevelopmental therapy | No blin đing | Foot reflexology with neurodevelopmental therapy (twice a week, with each seasion lasting for 20 minutes for a total duration of eightweeks) | Neurodevelopmental therapy (each session lasting for 45-60 minutes) | 40 children using simple random sampling assigned to two groups of 20. Number of dropouts (Group 2: 5, Group 2: 27) Group 2: 25 Group 2: 27 | Modified Constipa- tionAssement Scale (MCAS). The total score ranged from 0 to 18. | PubMed | Foot reflexology in combination with neurodevelopmental therapy can decrease constipation scores significantly (Pvalue = -0.081) |
| tt women tipation | | No information given | Group 1: Foot reflexology Group 2: Control | No blinding | Foot reflexology (weekly sessions lasting 30 minutes, for six weeks) | No intervention | Foot reflexology (n=50) Control (n=50) (Randomized=125, group1=65, Group2=60, Drop-outs in group1=15, in group2=10) | Constipation Assessment Scale (CAS). The total score ranged from 0 to 32. | Scopus | Foot reflexology improved constipation symptoms significantly (P value < 0.001). |
| talized h scores of on the CAS | | stew 81< | Group 1: Foot reflexologyGroup 2: Abdomina massage Group 3: No Intervention (received routine care) | Single-blind | Foot reflexology with routine care, each minutes; aboninal massage with routine care, 20 minutes daily for six days | No intervention or abdominal massage | Foot reflexology (n=20) Abdominal massage (n=20) Control (n=20) (Randomized =60, no drop-outs in the groups) | Constipation Assessment Scale (CAS) | Google scholar | There were no statistically significant positratervention differences between the groups in terms of eventry of constipation that second day of the treatment (V value > 0.05), but from the third day to sixth day after the treatment, a significant difference was observed (P<0.05). |
| men with ation | | >65 years | Group 1: Foot reflexologyGroup 2: Nonspectfic massage | Double-blind | Foot reflexology given weekly for six weeks and each session lasting 35-40 minutes | Nonspecific massage | Foot reflexology (n=28) Nonspecific massage (n=28) (Randomized=56, no drop-outs in the groups) | Constipation Assessment Scale (CAS) | Scientific Information Database (SID) | Significant differences were observed in the swerity of constipation in both groups at the end of the first six weeks (P value < 0.001). |
| n with onal ation | | 36 years | Group I: Foot reflexology and tolefder/ motivation training Group 2 Tolefder/ motivation training | No blin ding | Each child received Iomin foor massage for five days a week and elucation about provided to their parents for 30 min once a week for a period of four weeks | folled/lter/motivation training | Received reflexology and tolic(dict of notivation training (n=20), onic dict of (n=20), onic dict of (n=20) (Randomized=37, Drop-outs in group 1 =3, in group 2=0) | Atwo-part destromatic consisting of 23 questions. A table was part of the questionnaire in questionnaire in questionnaire in the defection frequency and quality were recorded. The storus of the child was recorded in this table at the end of each week. | PubMed | No significant differences were transformed between the intervention and control groups in remustor for onsignation frequency (I'value > 0.05) stool frequency interved as of the groups from the groups (I'value = |

| | 184 Children dagnosed wich chronic (diopathic (functional) | smsy £t-l | Group I: Control- Rounte care only Rounte care only Fourthe care Group 3: Reflexology + routine Care | Single blind (assessor was blinded) | Simple foot massage and releavings techniques were trained to the parentificaregivers by the nurse to apply daily on the partent for 13 weeks. | Standard care | Group 1: 59 Group 2: 59 Group 3: 66 Randomized=84, Drop-out 511 group 1 =2, group 2 =4 Group 3 =2) | The number of bowel movements for four weeks was recorded in the forms as a fourwesk dany. The fourwesk dany. The sisted to help record the bowel movements. | Google scholar | Reflexology improved the total constription and general health and general health weeks of the intervention (* value = 0.043). Reflexology and Massage introved the constription score significanty not the bowel movement frequency (* value = 0.053). |
|---|---|---------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|----------------|--|
| 34 patien based on Criteria (and si and si | the Rome as women x men) | 19-72 years | Group I: Reflexology Group 2: Nonspecific massage | Single-blind | Intervention included gomin sessions. IBS symptomis vere completed two weeks before the first session, during the intervention, two where stater and gain two weeks later at the first follow-up and first fol | The control group massage. The number massage. The number of the seperimental group. | Foot reflexology (n=19) Corror (nonspecific massage: n=15) (Randomized=34, (Randomized=34, cop-outs in group 1 =0, in group 2 =0) | IBS symptoms were evaluated daily with a five-point scale (oto 4). The scale was completed by all participants wo weeks after the intervention, two weeks after the intervention and again wo weeks after the again wo weeks after the again wo weeks after the start the first follow-up and finally three months after the last session at the second follow-up. | PubMed | There was no evidence of any offferences between the groups (P value = 0.47). |
| 63 patier | Is with MS. | IS-50 years | Group I: Releavingy/coup 2: Foot surface massage without presure was applied | Dauble- blind | In the intervention group, the kwo shur method of refracology was used. This method is a combination of pressure techniques and thum sliding foot Lasted about 20-40 min). Poor reflexalogy was doner twice a week for 6 weeks. | For the control group, to simulate the interventions similar to the experimental group, loof surface massage without pressure was applied. | Footreflexology (n=33) Control (n=30) | CMs used to determine the severity of constipation. | PubMed | The severity of constipation significantly decreased in the reflavablesy, group arter to the control group after the intervention (Pvalue < 0.05). |
| Nulliparo women v preg | us pregnant vith a single gnancy | 16-45 years | Group I: Reflexology Group 2: Routine care (Comparison group | double-blind | The intervention group received reflexing treatment that each session lasting 12 minutes for six weeks. | The control group received routine care. | Foot reflexology (13=50) (Randomized=7, drop-oue=1.control (n=56) (Randomized=37, drop-oute=1 | CAS in both Study groups to determine constipation seerity weeky for six weeks. | PubMed | Results showed the secrity of conseipation in the conseipation in the reflexology group was significantly lower than that in the ornparison group. No ide vents were reported among women. |
| Elderly private n in Anka | people in a ursing home ra province | Mean=755 Wean | Group i: Reflexology Group 2: Routine care (control group | Double- blind | The experimental group received loct reflexology for 1 month, Reflexology for 1 month, Reflexology for relaxation massage along with ankle relaxed primarily by apphying effleturage followed by stretching, shading, and rotation methods | In the control group, foot states masage was applied with out pressure. | Foot reflexology (13=0) (RandomizeE=30, drop-out=0 Control (n2=29) (RandomizeE=30, drop-out=1 | Turkish version of the CSI (constipation Weerly) Instrument) was studied by Kaya and Yuman. There is a cond or the quarkines on the scale. High er scores indicate that the symptoms are range is 0-73. | Google scholar | After the implementation of emplying bowels on emplying bowels on alternatedays aggindiantly increased in the experimental group compared to the control group, (P value < 0.001). |

Shiraz E-Med J. 2021; 22(1):e100585.

| After intervention, the number of bowel novements interased in both groups. However, this interase was higher in the Golg hand group than the foor reflecology group (P value < 0.001). | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Google sch olar | |
| CJS questionnaire | |
| Foot reflexology (Randomized=30, Goghand (n=30) (Randomized=30) | |
| For people in the Golgband group, Golgband ware staten half an hour before lunch for a reaspoortial mixed in a cup of cooled boiled water) for 2 weeks. | |
| The relaxation techniques were performed to relax the feet and prepare for reflexology. After varming the hands, the patient's legs with, a ables, so les, and fingers) were olled with sweet almoud oil to facilitate massage. The relevology was performed towice daily for 15 minutes each time for 2 weeks. | |
| Single-blind | |
| Group I: Reflexology Group 2: Golghand | |
| 6075 yuars | |
| 60 elderly people with constipation | iized controlled trial. |
| Mohammadzadeh Moghadam Irau/ (2019)(37) | ^a All studies were random |

Shiraz E-Med J. 2021; 22(1):e100585.