



Effect of Tai Chi Chuan in Breast Cancer Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Xiao-Chao Luo^{1†}, Jie Liu^{2†}, Jia Fu^{3†}, Hai-Yan Yin¹, Li Shen¹, Mai-Lan Liu⁴, Lei Lan^{1,5}, Jian Ying⁶, Xiu-Lan Qiao⁶, Chun-Zhi Tang⁷ and Yong Tang^{1,3,5*}

¹ Acupuncture and Tuina School, Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chengdu, China, ² Sichuan Provincial People's Hospital, Chengdu, China, ³ Medical & Nursing School, Chengdu University, Chengdu, China, ⁴ The School of Acupuncture, Moxibustion & Tuina, Hunan University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Changsha, China, ⁵ Key Laboratory of Sichuan Province for Acupuncture & Chronobiology, Chengdu, China, ⁶ Chongqing Traditional Chinese Medicine Hospital, Chongqing, China, ⁷ School of Acupuncture & Rehabilitation Medicine, Guangzhou University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Guangzhou, China

Background: Tai Chi Chuan(TCC), as a mind-body exercise, may have a positive impact on physical function and psychological well-being in breast cancer patients. The latest systematic review and meta-analysis of TCC for breast cancer was made 4 years ago and some new clinical trials about it were published. We remade a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the effect of TCC in breast cancer patients.

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by: Jisun Kim, University of Ulsan, South Korea

Reviewed by:

Jihyoun Lee, Soonchunhyang University Gumi Hospital, South Korea Peter M. Wayne, Massachusetts General Hospital, United States

> *Correspondence: Yong Tang tangyong@cdutcm.edu.cn

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Women's Cancer, a section of the journal Frontiers in Oncology

Received: 22 October 2019 Accepted: 02 April 2020 Published: 23 April 2020

Citation:

Luo X-C, Liu J, Fu J, Yin H-Y, Shen L, Liu M-L, Lan L, Ying J, Qiao X-L, Tang C-Z and Tang Y (2020) Effect of Tai Chi Chuan in Breast Cancer Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front. Oncol. 10:607. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.00607 **Methods:** In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we searched MEDLINE (via PubMed), EMBASE (via embase.com), CENTRAL, CNKI, COVIP, Wanfang, Chaoxing, CiNii, J-SSTAGE, DBpia, and ThaiJO with no language restrictions from inception to December 31, 2018 (updated on February 16, 2020), for randomized clinical trials comparing TCC with non-exercised therapy in breast cancer patients. The primary outcome was quality of life in patients with breast cancer and data pooled by a random-effects model. Subgroup analyses were conducted to estimate the effect of different durations of TCC for breast cancer patients. This study was registered in PROSPERO, number CRD 4201810326.

Results: Fifteen articles involving a total of 885 breast cancer participants were included in this review. Compared with non-exercised therapy, TCC had a significant effect on quality of life in breast cancer patients (SMD = 0.37, 95% Cl 0.15–0.59, p = 0.001), and subgroup analysis found that TCC showed beneficial effect in 12 weeks and 25 weeks (12 weeks: SMD = 0.40, 95% Cl 0.19–0.62, p = 0.0003; 25 weeks: SMD = 0.38, 95% Cl 0.15–0.62, p = 0.002). Meta-analyses of secondary outcomes showed that 3 weeks TCC increased shoulder function (SMD = 1.08, 95% Cl 0.28–1.87, p = 0.008), 12 weeks TCC improved pain (SMD = 0.30, 95% Cl 0.08–0.51, p = 0.007), shoulder function (SMD = 1.34, 95% Cl 0.43–2.25, p = 0.004), strength of arm (SMD = 0.44, 95% Cl 0.20–0.68, p = 0.0004), and anxiety (MD = –4.90, 95% Cl –7.83 to –1.98, p = 0.001) in breast cancer patients compared with the control group.

Conclusions: TCC appears to be effective on some physical and psychological symptoms and improves the quality of life in patients with breast cancer. Additional randomized controlled trials with a rigorous methodology and low risk of bias are needed to provide more reliable evidence.

Keywords: Tai Chi Chuan, breast cancer, physical and psychological symptoms, quality of life, meta-analysis

INTRODUCTION

Although breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer and being the leading cause of cancer-related mortality in female (1-3), the long-term survival rates after a diagnosis of breast cancer are steadily rising in recent years (4-6). In the meantime, more patients with breast cancer are facing persistent symptoms and side-effects after diagnosis and treatment, such as fatigue (7-10), cognitive limitations (7, 9), depression (7, 9), anxiety (9), sleep problems (7, 9), and pain (9, 11). To address the persistent symptoms, complementary and alternative medicine (CAM), a non-mainstream medicine used together with or in place of conventional medicine, is recommended as supportive care strategies during and following the treatment (12).

Complementary therapies, especially mind-body practices, are effective approaches to manage breast cancer symptoms, and side-effects of treatment (12). For breast cancer patients, physical and psychosocial therapies improve physical function, and emotional disorders (13-15), and moreover, post-diagnostic physical activity reduces cancer-related mortality (16-18). Tai Chi Chuan (TCC) and Qigong are complementary therapies involving physical and psychological aspects (19). They are ancient Chinese mind-body exercises that both combine meditation, breathing, relaxation, and physical activity (20-22). Traditional TCC is usually a series of elaborate, lengthy, and complex movements, while Qigong is a simpler and more repetitive exercise (22, 23). TCC is a martial art that was gradually simplified and made into a common sport in 1950s (24). Nowadays, TCC as a sport focuses more on body environment and mind-body interaction (25). When TCC is performed for health and energy enhancement, it is a form of Qigong (26). Qigong produces more than a dozen forms to keep people healthy (22). Because other forms of Qigong are different from the way of practicing TCC, this review only focused on the effects of TCC on breast cancer patients.

TCC with slow, supple, graceful, curved, spiral and sequential motions, is a mild-to-moderate intensive whole-body exercise incorporating meditation into breathing control (20, 27, 28). TCC improves pain and anxiety in patients with fibromyalgia (29), exercise self-efficacy and mood disturbance in patients with chronic heart failure (30), depression and physical function in patients with osteoarthritis (31), and balance and tumble in patients with Parkinson's disease (32). TCC for more than 8 weeks reduces cancer-related fatigue, especially in breast or lung cancer patients (33, 34). In senior female cancer survivors, TCC affects systolic blood pressure and cortisol area-under-curve which may regulate the endocrine system (35). In general, TCC plays a good role in improving the quality of life (QOL) in cancer patients (36). TCC is recommended to patients with chronic

conditions for multi-effects, easily learning, good safety, and low-cost (28).

Breast cancer is a chronical clinical setting with persistent symptoms of body and mind, and TCC may have a positive effect on it. Several clinical trials found TCC reduced inflammatory responses and improved quality of life, muscle strength, shoulder function, bone formation, and insomnia in breast cancer patients (37–41). Two early reviews published in 2007 and 2010, respectively, both found that the effect of TCC for breast cancer patients to improve QOL and symptoms was not definite (42, 43). In a systematic review and meta-analysis published in 2015, Pan and colleagues considered TCC had a significant effect on improving handgrip strength and limb elbow flexion, but failed to improve QOL, physical and emotional well-being, pain, and body mass index (44).

Previous reviews pooled studies ignoring the influence of diverse exercise durations and control therapies, and found limited evidence that TCC was beneficial on physical and psychosocial capacity in breast cancer patients. Additionally, some new clinical trials explored TCC for breast cancer have been published. Therefore, a systematic review and meta-analysis including the latest randomized clinical trials of TCC for breast cancer is necessary to be done. This systematic review and metaanalysis are performed to evaluate the effect of TCC on QOL and psychosomatic outcomes in breast cancer patients.

METHODS

Search Strategy

The report of this systematic review and meta-analysis is followed by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) (45). The checklist of PRISMA is in Supplement Table 1. We searched English databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, and CENTRAL), Chinese databases (CNKI, CQVIP, Wanfang, Chaoxing), Japanese databases (CiNii, and J-SSTAGE), Korean database (DBpia), and Thai database (ThaiJO) from inception to December 31, 2018 (updated on February 16, 2020). MEDLINE and EMBASE were available for consultation through PubMed and embase.com, respectively. The following search terms in various relevant combinations were used to screen potential studies: tai*ji*, tai*chi*, breast cancer, breast tumor, breast neoplasm, breast carcinoma. Example of search strategy is in **Supplement Table 2**. Language restrictions were not part of data searches. The reference lists of identified original or review studies were searched manually for further articles.

Selection Criteria

The following inclusive selection criteria were applied: (I) participants were adult female patients who were diagnosed breast cancer through pathology with any tumor stage; (II) intervention measure was TCC, such as Yang-style TCC, Chenstyle TCC, Wu-style TCC, Sun-style TCC, 24 simplified TCC, or movements of TCC; (III) compared intervention was nonexercised treatment, such as standard support therapy (a psychotherapy for education and peer discussion on nutrition, exercise, stress, cancer risk, and fatigue) (46, 47), usual health

Abbreviations: CAM, Complementary and alternative medicine; CON, Control; FACIT-F, Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy-Fatigue, FACT-B, Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Breast; GRADE, Grades of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; MOS SF-36, Medical Outcomes Study 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey; QOL, Quality of life; RRT, Routine rehabilitation training; TCC, Tai Chi Chuan; WHOQOL-BREF, World Health Organization Quality of Life Brief Questionnaire.

care (regular check-ups, medication, and health education by health care workers), or blank control; (IV) primary outcome was QOL and the measurement was not limited [e.g., the Medical Outcomes Study 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (MOS SF-36), the World Health Organization Quality of Life Brief Questionnaire (WHOQOL-BREF), the Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy-Fatigue (FACIT-F), the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Breast (FACT-B), and the Generic Quality of life Inventory 74 (GQOLL 74)]; secondary outcomes were pain, shoulder function, strength of arm, anxiety, and other clinical outcomes; (V) only randomized controlled trial (RCT) was included. Exclusive selection criteria: (I) participants were not only breast cancer patients; (II) experimental intervention was TCC combining other exercise; (III) control intervention included other exercise methods, such as yoga, physical activity, aerobics; (IV) data of outcomes couldn't be acquired; (V) non-randomized clinical trial.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Information extracted from each eligible study through electronic form containing the first author, year of publication, country of origin, number of participants, age, status of cancer, current treatment, experimental intervention, duration and frequency of TCC, controlled intervention, and outcomes. Data from eligible studies were extracted independently by two investigators (XL, LS). The risk of bias was assessed by the Cochrane Collaboration's tool with seven items: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other bias (48). We used the Grades of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system to evaluate the certainty of outcomes (49). Any disagreements were resolved by discussion and consensus.

Data Analysis

We tried to make meta-analysis when the number of eligible studies was more than one in each outcome and data were combined by Review Manager (version 5.3, Cochrane Library). We selected a random-effect model to pool data (50–53). Mean difference (MD)/standardized mean difference (SMD) and 95% confidence interval (CI) were calculated. If outcome with the same measurement method, we selected MD, otherwise chosen SMD. Heterogeneity across studies was tested by the I^2 statistic. I^2 is regarded of 25, 50, and 75% as low, moderate, and high amount of heterogeneity, respectively (54). In the Cochrane Handbook, more than 50% of I^2 are regarded as may material heterogeneity (55). We did subgroup analysis based on different TCC durations. A two-tailed $p \leq 0.05$ was considered as a criterion for statistical significance.

Registration

This study was registered in PROSPERO, number CRD 4201810326.



RESULTS

Study Selection and Characteristics

By searching English, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Thai databases, we obtained 606 records, of which 409 records were excluded for irrelevance, or duplication through the titles and abstracts. The full-text of the remaining 197 articles were retrieved for more detailed evaluation, and 182 articles were excluded (Figure 1). Fifteen articles (40, 41, 56-68) met the inclusion criteria containing 885 participants (447 in the TCC group, 438 in the control group). Six articles (40, 41, 65-68) came from the USA, eight (56-61, 63, 64) from China and one (62) from Thailand. The types of TCC were 15-move short-form of Yang-style TCC (40, 65-68), Chen-style TCC (58, 60), Tai Chi Yunshou (63), 18-form TCC (62), 24-form TCC (57, 59, 61, 64), 8-form TCC (56), and the other article (41) didn't mention the specific form of TCC. Duration of TCC was from 12 weeks to 6 months. The frequency of TCC was 120 min per week (41), 40-60 min per session and three sessions a week (40, 61, 62, 65-68), 20-30 min per session and two sessions per day (57-60, 63, 64), and at least 40 min per session for twice a day (56). TCC was performed during chemotherapy or after conventional therapy. Some trials (56-58, 61, 63, 64) used TCC intervention after surgery to alleviate the side effects of operation. The interventions of control groups were cognitive behavioral therapy (41), standard or psychosocial support therapy (40, 65-68), usual care (56, 62), and routine rehabilitation training (57-61, 63, 64). The interest control treatments had cognitive behavioral therapy (41), standard or psychosocial support therapy (40, 65-68), and

TABLE 1 | Characteristics of the eligible articles.

Study	Country	Patien	ts (<i>N</i>)	Mean	age(y)	Status	Treatment condition	TCC intervention	Controlled intervention	Frequency Duration	Outcomes	
		тсс	TCC CON		CON							
Han et al. (56)	China	23	21	46.39	45.52	-	After modified radical mastectomy and chemotherapy	Usual care+8-form TCC	Usual care	At least 40 min/session and 2 sessions /day, 5 days/week, 12 weeks	1. Fatigue; 2. Adverse event	
Irwin et al. (41)	USA	45	45	59.6	60.0	_	Treatment at least 6 months before enrollment	Tai Chi Chih	Cognitive behavioral therapy	120 min/session, 3 sessions/week, 3 months	 Insomnia treatment response; 2. Insomnia remission; 3. Sleep quality; Sleep continuity 	
Wang et al. (57)	China	45	41	50).5	-	10 days after modified radical mastectomy	RRT + 24-form TCC	RRT	20 min/session, every morning and evening, 6 months	1. QOL(WHOQOLBREF); 2. Fatigue; 3. Sleep quality; 4. Anxiety; 5. Depression	
Wang et al. (58)	China	44	46	53.64	51.74	-	10 days after modified radical mastectomy	RRT + Chen-style TCC	RRT	20 min/session, every morning and evening, 3 months	1. QOL(FACT-B); 2. Neer shoulder function score	
Zhu et al. (59)	China	47	48	45.	.51	-	After modified radical mastectomy	RRT +24-form simplified TCC	RRT	20 min/session, every morning and evening , 3 months	 Pain; 2. Activities of daily living; 3. Range of motion; Strength of arm 	
Wang et al. (60)	China	75	74	51.4	50.58	_	10 days after modified radical mastectomy	RRT + Chen-style TCC	RRT	20 min/session, every morning and evening, 6 months	Self-rating anxiety scale	
Lv et al. (61)	China	50	49	48	61	-	After modified radical mastectomy and chemotherapy	RRT + 24-form simplified TCC	RRT	90 min/session, 3 sessions/week, 6 months	 QOL(MOSSF-36); 2. Pain; 3. Activities of daily living; 4. Range of motion; Strength of arm 	
Thongteratham et al. (62)	Thailand	15	15	-	-	0-IIIb	Completion of treatment at least 1 year before enrollment	Usual care + 18-form TCC	Usual care	60 min/session, 3 sessions/week, 12 weeks	 QOL(FACT-B); 2. Rosenberg Self-esteem; 3. Fatigue Symptom Inventory; 4. Cortisol 	
Li et al. (63)	China	29	28	47.	-56	0-IIIb	7 days after modified radical mastectomy	RRT + Tai Chi Yunshou	RRT	30 min/session, at 7:00 and 17:00, 6 months	 QOL(WHOQOLBREF); 2. Edema of upper extremity; Function of shoulder joint Muscle strength 	
Wang et al. (64)	China	63	71	47-	-19	-	10 days after modified radical mastectomy	RRT + 24-form simplified TCC	RRT	20 min/session, every morning and evening, 180 days	 QOL(WHOQOLBREF); 2. Pain; 3. Activities of daily living; 4. Range of motion; 5. Strength of arm 	

(Continued)

Tai Chi Chuan for Breast Cancer

TABLE 1 | Continued

Study Country		Patien	nts (<i>N</i>)	Mean	age(y)	Status	Treatment condition	TCC intervention	Controlled intervention	Frequency Duration	Outcomes
		тсс	CON	тсс	CON						
Sprod et al. (65)	USA	11	10	54.33	52.70	0–IIIb	Chemotherapy, radiotherapy, hormone therapy, or none	A 15-move short-form of Yang-style TCC	Standard support therapy	60 min/session, 3 sessions/week, 12 weeks	1. QOL(MOSSF-36); 2. Pair 3. Biomarkers (IL-6, IL-8, IGF-1, IGFBP-1, IGFBP-3, glucose, insulin, cortisol)
Janelsins et al. (66)	USA	9	10	54.33	52.70	0–IIIb	Chemotherapy, radiotherapy, hormone therapy, or none	A 15-move short-form of Yang-style TCC	Psychosocial support therapy	60 min/session, 3 sessions/week, 12 weeks	1. Biomarkers (insulin, IGF-1, IGFBP-1, IGFBP-3, IL-6, IL-2, IFN-γ); 2. BMI; 3. Body composition
Peppone et al. (40)	USA	7	9	53-8	52.6	0–IIIb	Treatment completed from 1 to 30 months before enrollment	A 15-move short-form of Yang-style TCC	Standard support therapy	60 min/session, 3 sessions/week, 12 weeks	 Bone-specific alkaline phosphatase; 2. N-telopeptides of type I collagen; 3. Bone Remodeling Index; 4. Biomarkers (IGFBP-1, IGFBP-3, cortisol, IL-2, IL-6 IL-8)
Mustian et al. (67)	USA	11	10	5	2	0–IIIb	Chemotherapy, radiotherapy, hormone therapy, or none	A 15-move short-form of Yang-style TCC	Psychosocial support therapy	60 min/session, 3 sessions/week, 12 weeks	1. QOL(FACIT-F); 2. Strength; 3. Flexibility; 4. Aerobic capacity
Mustian et al. (68)	USA	11	10	5	2	0–IIIb	Chemotherapy, radiotherapy, hormone therapy, or none	A 15-move short-form of Yang-style TCC	Psychosocial support therapy	60 min/session, 3 sessions/week, 12 weeks	1. Aerobic capacity; 2. Strength; 3. Flexibility; 4. Weight; 5. BMI;6. Body composition

TCC, Tai Chi Chuan; CON, control; SD, standard deviation; QOL, quality of life; MOSSF-36, Medical Outcomes Study 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey; IL-6, interleukin-6; IL-8, interleukin-8; IGF-1, insulin-like growth factor-1; IGFBP-1, insulin-like growth factor-binding protein-3; IL-2, interleukin-2; IFN-γ, interleor, γ; BMI, body mass index; FACIT-F, Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy-Fatigue; RRT, routine rehabilitation training; WHOQOLBREF, World Health Organization Quality of Life Brief Questionnaire; FACT-B, Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Breast.

blank control (56–64). The cognitive behavioral therapy involves re-establishing a consistent sleep-wake schedule, sleep restriction, relaxation, sleep hygiene education and cognitive procedures (69). The extracted information of eligible studies is in **Table 1**.

Risk of Bias

According to the Cochrane Collaboration's tool, risk of bias analysis was assessed to evaluate the quality of included studies. For eligible articles, 80% had low risk of random sequence generation and 54% had low risk of allocation concealment in selection bias; 73% had unclear risk of blinding both in performance and detection bias; 87% had low risk of incomplete outcome data in attrition bias; reporting bias was unclear because the proposals of these trials were not available (**Figure 2**). Publication bias was not analyzed because the number of eligible studies in each meta-analysis was <10 and conceivable publication bias existed in each meta-analysis.

Meta-Analysis of TCC for QOL in Breast Cancer Patients

QOL were evaluated with different scales in studies that performed a meta-analysis. One study (65) used the MOS SF-36 to assess general QOL, and three studies (57, 63, 64) chosen the WHOQOL-BREF. One study (67) used the FACIT-F to assess QOL in chronic disease, while another study (62) measured cancer-special QOL with the FACT-B. In this meta-analysis, SMD were calculated for different measures of QOL. TCC had a positive effect on QOL in breast cancer patients compared with the non-exercised therapy (SMD = 0.37, 95% CI 0.15-0.59, p =0.001, $I^2 = 0\%$) (Figure 3). Subgroup meta-analyses of 12 and 25 weeks durations showed that TCC improved QOL in breast cancer patients (12 weeks: SMD = 0.40, 95% CI 0.19–0.62, p =0.0003, $I^2 = 0\%$; 25 weeks: SMD = 0.38, 95% CI 0.15–0.62, p =0.002, $I^2 = 0\%$), but meta-analyses of 3 and 6 weeks both were no statistical significance (3 weeks: SMD = 0.23, 95% CI -0.01 to 0.47, p = 0.06, $I^2 = 0\%$; 6 weeks: SMD = 0.04, 95% CI -0.52 to $0.60, p = 0.89, I^2 = 0\%$).

Meta-Analysis of TCC for Pain, Shoulder Function, Strength of Arm, Anxiety, and Fatigue in Breast Cancer Patients

For secondary outcomes, we did meta-analyses of pain, shoulder function, strength of arm, anxiety, and fatigue, respectively. The heterogeneity was high among the eligible studies in metaanalysis of TCC for shoulder function, even though we did sensitive analysis trying to delete one of the three included studies successively. In the meta-analyses of shoulder function and anxiety, the included studies were placed on one side of the no effect line, respectively. Therefore, we did meta-analyses of shoulder function and anxiety overlooking the heterogeneity. Meta-analyses showed that TCC was beneficial to alleviating pain (SMD = 0.30, 95% CI 0.08–0.51, p = 0.007, $I^2 = 0\%$) (**Figure 4**), recovering shoulder function (SMD = 1.34, 95% CI 0.43–2.25, p = 0.004, $I^2 = 92\%$) (**Figure 5**), increasing strength of arm (SMD = 0.44, 95% CI 0.20–0.68, p = 0.0004, $I^2 = 16\%$) (**Figure 6**), easing anxiety (MD = -4.25, 95% CI -5.87 to -2.63,



p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 80\%$) (**Figure 7**), and relieving fatigue (SMD = -1.11, 95% CI -1.53 to -0.69, p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 30\%$) (**Figure 8**) compared with non-exercised therapy in breast cancer patients. TCC increased shoulder function in 3 weeks duration, but improved pain, strength of arm, and anxiety in 12 weeks in breast cancer patients.

GRADE Evidence of Outcomes

GRADE system was used to assess the evidence quality of outcomes in this review. Risk of bias might exist because method of randomization, allocation concealment, and blinding were not definite. Outcomes measured by different methods might

		rimenta		-	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.1.1 QOL	-								
Li YQ 2013	3.77	1.35	29	3.25	1.25	28	17.4%	0.39 [-0.13, 0.92]	-
Mustain 2008		20.91	11	124.3		10	6.5%	-0.12 [-0.97, 0.74]	
Thongteratham2015	116.72			109.53		15	8.9%	0.56 [-0.17, 1.30]	
Wang YL 2012	3.83	1.57	63	3.21	1.83	71	41.0%	0.36 [0.02, 0.70]	
Wang YY 2017 Subtotal (95% CI)	3.93	1.17	45 163	3.28	1.89		26.2% 100.0%	0.41 [-0.01, 0.84] 0.37 [0.15, 0.59]	•
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 =$				4 (P = 0.	82); I ² =	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.29	(P = 0.0))01)						
1.1.2 QOL (3 weeks)									
Li YQ 2013	2.67	1.43	29	2.44	1.62	28	20.7%	0.15 [-0.37, 0.67]	
Wang YL 2012	3.56	1.86	63	3.13	1.47	71	48.3%	0.26 [-0.08, 0.60]	+
Wang YY 2017	3.66	1.82	45	3.24	1.62	41	31.0%	0.24 [-0.18, 0.67]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			137			140	100.0%	0.23 [-0.01, 0.47]	◆
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 =$	0.00; Chi	$^{2} = 0.12$	2, df =	2 (P = 0.	94); l ² :	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.90	(P = 0.0)	06)						
1.1.3 QOL (6 weeks)									
Spord 2012	108.17	24.96	9	109.36	42.22	10	38.7%	-0.03 [-0.93, 0.87]	
Thongteratham2015 Subtotal (95% CI)	109.93	15.79	15 24	108.77	10.05	15 25	61.3% 100.0%	0.09 [-0.63, 0.80] 0.04 [-0.52, 0.60]	
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 =$	0.00 [.] Chi	$^{2} = 0.04$	4. df =	1 (P = 0)	84): 1 ² :	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:				- (
1.1.4 QOL (12 weeks)									
Li YQ 2013	3.56	1.34	29	3.13	1.33	28	17.6%	0.32 [-0.21, 0.84]	
Mustain 2008		20.91	11	124.3		10	6.5%	-0.12 [-0.97, 0.74]	
Thongteratham2015	116.72	14.02	15	109.53	10.57	15	9.0%	0.56 [-0.17, 1.30]	
Wang YL 2012	3.66	1.21	63	3.12	1.39	71	40.9%	0.41 [0.07, 0.75]	
Wang YY 2017	3.89	1.24	45	3.21	1.3	41	25.9%	0.53 [0.10, 0.96]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			163			165	100.0%	0.40 [0.19, 0.62]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =				4 (P = 0.	73); I ² =	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.62	(P = 0.0))003)						
1.1.5 QOL (25 weeks)									
Li YQ 2013	3.77	1.35	29	3.25	1.25	28	20.6%	0.39 [-0.13, 0.92]	+
Wang YL 2012	3.83	1.57	63	3.21	1.83	71	48.4%	0.36 [0.02, 0.70]	
Wang YY 2017 Subtotal (95% CI)	3.93	1.17	45 137	3.28	1.89	41 140	31.0% 100.0%	0.41 [-0.01, 0.84] 0.38 [0.15, 0.62]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi	$^{2} = 0.04$	4, df =	2 (P = 0.	98); I ² =	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:			,		.,				
								_	
									Favours control Favours TCC
IRE 3 Meta-analysee	of Tai Chi	Chup fo	or qualit	v of life ir	hraant	cancor	nationto	compared with pop-overeig	sed therapy. Standardized mean difference and §
I Vieta-analyses	ulated.	Ghunn	n qualit	y Or me li	Dicast	Janoel	patients		שמי ההימף איז הימו המותמי מוצבים הופמו מווופופווטפ מוע מ

produce inconsistency. Although the heterogeneity in shoulder function and anxiety outcomes was high, inconsistency might not be downgraded because all the eligible studies in meta-analyses were on one side of the no effect line. The eligible studies and participants of each meta-analysis were small that imprecision and publication bias might exist. In general, the certainty of the six outcomes was very low (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

This systematic review and meta-analysis concentrated on the QOL and psychosomatic symptoms in women breast cancer patients comparing TCC with non-exercise therapy.

Compared with the prior reviews (43, 44), this study searched more different language databases, included more RCTs, and made subgroup analysis on the basis of TCC duration. Lee et al. (43) and Pan et al. (44) made a systematic review of TCC for breast cancer in 2010 and 2015, respectively. Lee retrieved English, Chinese, and Korean databases, and Pan searched four English databases neglecting the different types of control intervention. In this review, we searched English, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Thai databases setting nonexercised therapy as the control treatment. Lee's review included seven studies, of which three were RCTs and four were non-RCTs, and only one meta-analysis of two RCTs was conducted; nine RCTs met the inclusion criteria for the Pan's review, and two to six studies were included in the meta-analyses; 15 RCTs were eligible in this review, but no more than five RCTs included in each meta-analysis. This review included 10 new RCTs (41, 56-64) which did not presented by Pan et al. (44) and might affect the results of meta-analysis. Pan did not search Chinese databases, while we searched four Chinese databases and found

Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mein SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI 1.2.1 Pain (3 weeks) 13.32 3.29 63 12.42 3.06 71 61.2% 0.28 [-0.06, 0.62] Zhu JY 2016 12.42 3.15 47 11.82 3.13 38 38.8% 0.19 [-0.24, 0.62] Subtotal (95% CI) 110 109 100.0% 0.25 [-0.02, 0.51]		Std. Mean Differen	nce	itd. Mean Differe			ontrol	C	tal	rimen	Expe	
Wang YL 2012 13.32 3.29 63 12.42 3.06 71 61.2% 0.28 [-0.06, 0.62] Zhu JY 2016 12.42 3.15 47 11.82 3.13 38 38.8% 0.19 [-0.24, 0.62] Subtotal (95% CI) 110 109 100.0% 0.25 [-0.02, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.11, df = 1 (P = 0.74); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.81 (P = 0.07) 1.2.2 Pain (6 weeks) Spord 2012 9.44 3.39 9 9 3.32 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Subtotal (95% CI) 9 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P = 0.79) 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 [-0.18, 0.61] Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)	, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% (% CI	IV, Random, 95	Weight	Total	SD	Mean	Total	SD	Mean	Study or Subgroup
Zhu JY 2016 12.42 3.15 47 11.82 3.13 38 38.8% $0.19 [-0.24, 0.62]$ Subtotal (95% CI) 110 109 100.0% $0.25 [-0.02, 0.51]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.11, df = 1 (P = 0.74); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.81 (P = 0.07) 1.2.2 Pain (6 weeks) Spord 2012 9.44 3.39 9 9 3.32 10 100.0% $0.13 [-0.78, 1.03]$ Subtotal (95% CI) 9 10 100.0% $0.13 [-0.78, 1.03]$ Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P = 0.79) 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% $0.22 [-0.18, 0.61]$ Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% $0.01 [-0.89, 0.91]$ Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% $0.36 [0.01, 0.70]$ Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% $0.37 [-0.06, 0.80]$ Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% $0.30 [0.08, 0.51]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)												1.2.1 Pain (3 weeks)
Subtotal (95% CI) 110 109 100.0% 0.25 [-0.02, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.11, df = 1 (P = 0.74); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.81$ (P = 0.07) 1.2.2 Pain (6 weeks) Spord 2012 9.44 3.39 9 9 3.32 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Subtotal (95% CI) 9 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.27$ (P = 0.79) 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 [-0.18, 0.61] Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.71$ (P = 0.007)	F	+=-	0.62]	0.28 [-0.06,	61.2%	71	3.06	12.42	63	3.29	13.32	Wang YL 2012
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.00$; $Chi^2 = 0.11$, $df = 1 (P = 0.74)$; $l^2 = 0\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.81 (P = 0.07)$ 1.2.2 Pain (6 weeks) Spord 2012 9.44 3.39 9 9 3.32 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Subtotal (95% CI) 9 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.27 (P = 0.79)$ 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 [-0.18, 0.61] Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)$	<u> </u>		0.62]	0.19 [-0.24,	38.8%	38	3.13	11.82	47	3.15	12.42	Zhu JY 2016
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.81 (P = 0.07)$ 1.2.2 Pain (6 weeks) Spord 2012 9.44 3.39 9 9 3.32 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Subtotal (95% CI) 9 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.27 (P = 0.79)$ 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 [-0.18, 0.61] Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)$	▶	◆	0.51]	0.25 [-0.02,	100.0%	109			110			Subtotal (95% CI)
1.2.2 Pain (6 weeks) Spord 2012 9.44 3.39 9 9 3.32 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Subtotal (95% CI) 9 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.27$ (P = 0.79) 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 [-0.18, 0.61] Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.71$ (P = 0.007)					0%	4); $I^2 =$	= 0.74	f = 1 (P)	0.11, di	$hi^2 = 0$	0.00; C	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =
Spord 2012 9.44 3.39 9 9 3.32 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Subtotal (95% CI) 9 10 100.0% 0.13 [-0.78, 1.03] Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.27$ (P = 0.79) 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) LV F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 [-0.18, 0.61] Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.71$ (P = 0.007)									0.07)	1 (P =	Z = 1.8	Test for overall effect:
Subtotal (95% CI) 9 10 100.0% 0.13 $[-0.78, 1.03]$ Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P = 0.79) 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 $[-0.18, 0.61]$ Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 $[-0.89, 0.91]$ Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 $[0.01, 0.70]$ Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 $[-0.06, 0.80]$ Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 $[0.08, 0.51]$ \bullet Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007) \bullet \bullet												1.2.2 Pain (6 weeks)
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.27$ (P = 0.79) 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 [-0.18, 0.61] Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)	<u> </u>		1.03]	0.13 [-0.78,	100.0%	10	3.32	9	9	3.39	9.44	Spord 2012
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.27 (P = 0.79)$ 1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 [-0.18, 0.61] Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Subtotal (95% Cl) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)					100.0%	10						Subtotal (95% CI)
1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks) Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 $[-0.18, 0.61]$ Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 $[-0.89, 0.91]$ Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 $[0.01, 0.70]$ Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 $[-0.06, 0.80]$ Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 $[0.08, 0.51]$ \bullet Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007) \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet											plicable	Heterogeneity: Not app
Lv F 2015 80.69 8.48 50 78.96 7.39 49 29.7% 0.22 [-0.18, 0.61] Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Subtotal (95% Cl) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); $I^2 = 0\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)									0.79)	7 (P =	Z = 0.2	Test for overall effect:
Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% 0.01 [-0.89, 0.91] Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% 0.36 [0.01, 0.70] Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% 0.37 [-0.06, 0.80] Subtotal (95% Cl) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); $I^2 = 0\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)												1.2.3 Pain (12 weeks)
Spord 2012 9.11 1.35 9 9.1 1.65 10 5.7% $0.01[-0.89, 0.91]$ Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% $0.36[0.01, 0.70]$ Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% $0.37[-0.06, 0.80]$ Subtotal (95% Cl) 169 168 100.0% $0.30[0.08, 0.51]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)	<u> </u>		0.61]	0.22 [-0.18.	29.7%	49	7.39	78.96	50	8.48	80.69	Lv F 2015
Wang YL 2012 14.54 3.23 63 13.37 3.29 71 39.7% $0.36 [0.01, 0.70]$ Zhu JY 2016 14.42 3.22 47 13.25 3.04 38 24.9% $0.37 [-0.06, 0.80]$ Subtotal (95% Cl) 169 168 100.0% $0.30 [0.08, 0.51]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)				. ,		10				1.35	9.11	Spord 2012
Subtotal (95% CI) 169 168 100.0% 0.30 [0.08, 0.51] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)	-		0.701	0.36 [0.01.	39.7%	71	3.29	13.37	63	3.23	14.54	Wang YL 2012
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)			0.801	0.37 [-0.06.	24.9%	38	3.04	13.25	47	3.22	14.42	Zhu JY 2016
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)	•	•	0.51]	0.30 [0.08,	100.0%	168			169			Subtotal (95% CI)
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)					0%	5); $I^2 =$	= 0.8	f = 3 (P)	0.79, di	$hi^2 = 0$	0.00; C	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =
									0.007)	1 (P =	Z = 2.7	Test for overall effect:
		<u> </u>	+									
Favours control Favours TCC			-4									

FIGURE 4 | Meta-analyses of Tai Chi Chun for pain in breast cancer patients compared with non-exercised therapy. Standardized mean difference and 95% confidence interval are calculated.

		eriment			ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean		Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.3.1 Shoulder funct	ion (3 w	eeks)							
Lv F 2015	80.8	11.75	50	64.73	13.81	49	33.2%	1.24 [0.81, 1.68]	-
Wang HY 2016	85.64	3.28	44	80.13	3.26	46	32.4%	1.67 [1.19, 2.15]	-
Wang YL 2012	67.17	11.51	63	63.27	10.19	71	34.4%	0.36 [0.02, 0.70]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			157			166	100.0%	1.08 [0.28, 1.87]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.45; C	$2hi^2 = 2$	1.82, d	f = 2 (P)	< 0.00	01); I ² :	= 91%		
Test for overall effect	Z = 2.6	6 (P = 0)	0.008)						
1.3.2 Shoulder funct	ion (12	weeks)							
Lv F 2015	95.78	2.84	50	82.95	15.57	49	33.5%	1.14 [0.72, 1.57]	-
Wang HY 2016	93.11	2.59	44	86.57	2.98	46	32.1%	2.32 [1.78, 2.86]	
Wang YL 2012	91.38	12.28	63	83.11	13.75	71	34.4%	0.63 [0.28, 0.98]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			157			166	100.0%	1.34 [0.43, 2.25]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.59; C	$2hi^2 = 2$	6.66, d	f = 2 (P)	< 0.00	001); I ²	= 92%		
Test for overall effect									
									
									-4 -2 0 2 4
									Favours control Favours TCC

FIGURE 5 | Meta-analyses of Tai Chi Chun for shoulder function in breast cancer patients compared with non-exercised therapy. Standardized mean difference and 95% confidence interval are calculated.

eight new Chinese articles (56–61, 63, 64) that met the inclusion criteria. The other two new studies (41, 62) were published in English from Thai and English databases, respectively. We made subgroup analysis according to the exercise time of TCC, and found that 12 weeks TCC was more effective than 3 or 6 weeks TCC in improving QOL, pain, and strength of arm in breast cancer patients. However, the two previous reviews did not conduct subgroup analysis according to the characteristics of TCC.

The findings of these two published reviews are quite different from those of our study. Lee et al. (43) found that TCC had

no significant effect on QOL, physical outcomes (fatigue, body mass index, heart rate, and blood pressure) and psychological variables (self-esteem and depression) in patients with breast cancer. Pan et al. (44) discovered that TCC had a positive effect on handgrip dynamometer strength and limb elbow flexion, but had no significant difference in general health-related QOL, pain, and body mass index in breast cancer patients. In this review, TCC had an improvement on QOL in breast cancer patients. In the meta-analysis of TCC for QOL, Lee's review included two small sample trials, and Pan's review involved studies reporting the same trials, while we pooled data from five RCTs. Pan's review

	Expe	rimen	tal	C	ontrol		9	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 Strength of arr	n (3 wee	eks)							
Lv F 2015	20.74	3.68	50	20.04	4.03	49	31.3%	0.18 [-0.21, 0.57]	
Wang YL 2012	18.13	3.96	63	17.58	3.51	71	42.2%	0.15 [-0.19, 0.49]	
Zhu JY 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	16.21	3.88	47 160	15.48	3.56	38 158	26.5% 100.0%	0.19 [-0.24, 0.62] 0.17 [-0.05, 0.39]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; C	$hi^2 = 1$	0.03, d	f = 2 (P)	= 0.9	8); $I^2 =$	0%		
Test for overall effect	: Z = 1.5	1 (P =	0.13)						
1.4.2 Strength of arr	n (12 we	eks)							
-			50	21 41	4 85	49	29.1%	0.64 [0.24 1.05]	
_v F 2015	23.62	0.39		21.41		49 10	29.1%	0.64 [0.24, 1.05]	
_v F 2015 Mustain 2008	23.62 29.6	0.39 3.42	11	26.7	2.87	10	6.8%	0.88 [-0.03, 1.78]	
Lv F 2015 Mustain 2008 Wang YL 2012 Zhu JY 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	23.62	0.39 3.42 6.18	11 63		2.87 5.77				
Lv F 2015 Mustain 2008 Wang YL 2012 Zhu JY 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	23.62 29.6 22.58 22.92	0.39 3.42 6.18 6.37	11 63 47 171	26.7 21.31 20.31	2.87 5.77 5.67	10 71 38 168	6.8% 38.1% 26.0% 100.0%	0.88 [-0.03, 1.78] 0.21 [-0.13, 0.55] 0.43 [-0.01, 0.86]	
Lv F 2015 Mustain 2008 Wang YL 2012 Zhu JY 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	23.62 29.6 22.58 22.92 = 0.01; C	0.39 3.42 6.18 6.37 Chi ² =	11 63 47 171 3.56, d	26.7 21.31 20.31 f = 3 (P	2.87 5.77 5.67	10 71 38 168	6.8% 38.1% 26.0% 100.0%	0.88 [-0.03, 1.78] 0.21 [-0.13, 0.55] 0.43 [-0.01, 0.86]	
Lv F 2015 Mustain 2008 Wang YL 2012 Zhu JY 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	23.62 29.6 22.58 22.92 = 0.01; C	0.39 3.42 6.18 6.37 Chi ² =	11 63 47 171 3.56, d	26.7 21.31 20.31 f = 3 (P	2.87 5.77 5.67	10 71 38 168	6.8% 38.1% 26.0% 100.0%	0.88 [-0.03, 1.78] 0.21 [-0.13, 0.55] 0.43 [-0.01, 0.86]	•

FIGURE 6 | Meta-analyses of Tai Chi Chun for strength of arm in breast cancer patients compared with non-exercised therapy. Standardized mean difference and 95% confidence interval are calculated.

	Expe	rimen	tal	Co	ontrol			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 Anxiety (12 we	eks)								
Wang HY 2015	36.45	5.7	75	39.76	6.58	75	46.7%	-3.31 [-5.28, -1.34]	
Wang YY 2017	39.21	3.51	45	45.51	2.52	41	53.3%	-6.30 [-7.58, -5.02]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			120			116	100.0%	-4.90 [-7.83, -1.98]	
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 =$	= 3.75; C	$chi^2 = 0$	6.21, d	f = 1 (P)	= 0.0	1); $ ^2 =$	84%		
Test for overall effect	: Z = 3.2	P = (P = 1) P	0.001)						
1.6.2 Anxiety (25 we	eks)								
Wang HY 2015	31.48	4.84	75	35.84	6.92	75	71.9%	-4.36 [-6.27, -2.45]	
Wang YY 2017	35.82	6.44	45	39.8	7.87	41	28.1%	-3.98 [-7.04, -0.92]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			120			116	100.0%	-4.25 [-5.87, -2.63]	◆
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 =$	= 0.00; C	$chi^2 = 0$	0.04. d	f = 1 (P)	= 0.8	4); $I^2 =$	0%		
Test for overall effect	: Z = 5.1	4 (P <	0.0000	01)					
									<u>i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i </u>
									-4 -2 0 2 4
Test for subgroup dif	foroncos	· Chi ²	- 0 14	df = 1	(P - C)	70) 12	- 0%		Favours TCC Favours control
rescror subgroup un	rerences	. Cill	- 0.14,	ui – 1	(1 - 0)	., 0), 1	- 0/0		

FIGURE 7 | Meta-analyses of Tai Chi Chun for anxiety in breast cancer patients compared with non-exercised therapy. Mean difference and 95% confidence interval are calculated.

Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95%	6 CI
Han Q 2019	2.95	0.88	23	5.13	1.73	21	27.8%	-1.58 [-2.27, -0.90]		
Thongteratham2015	11.27	9.09	15	27.2	19.68	15	23.5%	-1.01 [-1.78, -0.24]		
Wang YY 2017	21.12	3.58	45	24.57	4.18	41	48.7%	-0.88 [-1.33, -0.44]	-	
Total (95% CI)			83			77	100.0%	-1.11 [-1.53, -0.69]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.04; C	$hi^2 = 2$.86, df	= 2 (P =	= 0.24)	$1^2 = 30$	0%			
Test for overall effect	Z = 5.1	6 (P <	0.0000	1)					Favours TCC Favou	rs control

confidence interval are calculated.

discovered that TCC failed to alleviate pain in breast cancer patients, whereas TCC had an inverse result in this systematic review. The meta-analysis of pain in this review included some new studies which influenced the result. Meta-analyses of fatigue and anxiety in this review were changed between the previous two reviews. Although this study discovered that TCC could reduce fatigue and anxiety in breast cancer patients compared with the non-exercised group, the result is uncertain because of a small number of eligible studies and high risk of selection bias, performance bias, detection bias, and publication bias. TCC was associated with positive effects on handgrip dynamometer strength and limb elbow flexion in Pan's review, and in this review

			Certainty a	ssessment				No. of	patients	Effect	Certainty
Outcomes	No. of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsis- tency	Indirect- ness	Impre- cision	Other considera- tions	тсс	CON	Absolute (95% Cl)	
QOL	5	RT	Serious*	Serious [†]	Not serious	Serious [‡]	Publication bias strongly suspected [§]	163	165	SMD 0.37 higher (0.15 higher to 0.59 higher)	⊕○○○○ VERY LOW
Pain	4	RT	Serious¶	Not serious	Not serious	Serious [‡]	Publication bias strongly suspected [§]	169	168	SMD 0·3 higher (0·08 higher to 0·51 higher)	⊕○○○○ VERY LOW
Shoulder function	3	RT	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious [‡]	Publication bias strongly suspected [§]	157	166	SMD 1.34 higher (0.43 higher to 2.25 higher)	⊕⊖⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW
Strength of arm	4	RT	Serious**	Serious [†]	Not serious	Serious [‡]	Publication bias strongly suspected [§]	171	168	SMD 0-44 higher (0-20 higher to 0-68 higher)	⊕○○○○ VERY LOW
Fatigue	3	RT	Serious ^{††}	Serious	Not serious	Serious [‡]	Publication bias strongly suspected [§]	83	77	SMD 1.11 lower (1.53 lower to 0.69 lower)	⊕○○○○ VERY LOW
Anxiety	2	RT	Serious ^{‡‡}	Not serious	Not serious	Serious [‡]	Publication bias strongly suspected [§]	120	116	MD 4·25 lower (5·87 lower to 2·63 lower)	⊕○○○○ VERY LOW

TCC, Tai Chi Chuan; CON, control; Cl, confidence interval; QOL, quality of life; RT, randomized trials; SMD, standardized mean difference; MD, mean difference.

1/4 studies didn't mention the method of randomization, 2/4 studies didn't mention allocation concealment, 3/4 studies didn't mention blinding.

*2/5 studies didn't mention the method of randomization, 4/5 studies didn't mention allocation concealment and blinding.

¹¹1/3 studies didn't mention the method of randomization, 2/3 studies didn't mention allocation concealment and blinding. ^{**}2/4 study didn't mention the method of randomization, 2/4 studies didn't mention allocation concealment and blinding.

Frontiers in Oncology | www.frontiersin.org

[†]Measured by different scales.
 [‡]The sample size was small.
 [§]Number of eligible studies was small.

⁺⁺ 1/3 study didn't mention the method of randomization.
⁺⁺ 1/2 study didn't mention allocation concealment and blinding.

also revealed that TCC improved strength of arm and shoulder function including range of motion.

QOL, a common gauge of cancer treatment effect, is widely used to measure the health of breast cancer patients (70) QOL is a multidimensional assessment with physical (including function/disability and symptoms/complications concepts), mental (including emotional distress, psychological well-being, perceived cognitive functioning, and spiritual/existential concerns concepts) and social (including socioeconomic challenges, role/relationship changes, perceived support/satisfaction, and social participation concepts) domains (70). Yan's and Tao's systematic reviews found TCC failed to improve QOL in breast cancer survivors (71, 72), but this study showed 12 weeks TCC had a positive influence on QOL. Three studies in Yan's systematic review were not included in this review because the intervention therapy of two studies (73, 74) was Tai Chi combining aerobics, and another study (75) was a prospective longitudinal study from a larger randomized controlled trial. We included some new studies that might produce the different pooled result. TCC improved the physical and mental health domains of QOL in cancer survivors at a low-level evidence in a recent review (76). Due to the limited number of included studies in the meta-analysis of QOL, we conducted a meta-analysis of overall QOL total score rather than a meta-analysis of each QOL domain in breast cancer patients, but obtained a very low-level evidence. Heather Greenlee and colleagues (12) recommends Qigong as C-graded therapy to improve QOL in breast cancer patients. TCC is one kind of Qigong and can be considered as a complementary health approach for QOL in breast cancer patients.

In this review, TCC also improved pain, shoulder function, strength of arm, anxiety, and fatigue in breast cancer patients. Pain is one of the most common symptoms in cancer patients and can be caused by tumors, surgery, chemotherapy, radiation therapy, targeted therapy, supportive care therapies, and diagnostic procedures (77). Half of breast cancer patients have mild pain and 16% have moderate to severe pain in 1 year after surgery (78). Pain has a psychological effect making patients product anxiety, nervousness, and anger (79). Control of surgery-related and non-operative pain in patients with breast cancer is essential. In addition to pain, side-effects of surgery include depressed shoulder function and arm strength (80). Decreased arm muscle strength in breast cancer patients after chemotherapy is also measured (81). Breast cancer patients have suffered psychological disorders as well as physical symptoms. About one-third of breast cancer survivors feel fatigue (82), and 40% patients are anxious in the year after diagnosis (83). Fatigue correlates with depression and sleep disturbance in breast cancer patients (84). Breast cancer patients experience persistent physical and mental disorders which influence QOL after or during cancer diagnosis and treatment. Three months exercise reduces fatigue, anxiety, and depression in breast cancer patients (85). American Society of Clinical Oncology Breast Cancer Survivorship Care Guideline recommends that primary care clinicians should counsel breast cancer patients to engage in regular physical activity to reduce cancer-related fatigue, musculoskeletal symptoms, pain, and obesity (86). Previous meta-analyses discovered that TCC improved psychological wellbeing including reduced stress, anxiety, depression and mood disturbance, and physical function in people with cancer (36, 87). In this review, TCC improved pain, shoulder function, strength of arm, and anxiety in breast cancer patients in 12 weeks, and also increased QOL in 12 and 25 weeks. We recommend breast cancer patients for more than 12 weeks TCC to manage symptoms and enhance QOL finally.

TCC is not only active in breast cancer, but also in other cancers. TCC improves vigor in patients with lung cancer undergoing chemotherapy (88). In addition, TCC can alleviate fatigue, enhance neck and shoulder joints mobility, and improves sleep in nasopharyngeal carcinoma patients (89, 90). For cancer survivors undergoing chemotherapy, TCC improves cancerrelated fatigue, self-efficacy, and QOL (91).

As an exercise of body and mind, the mechanism of TCC is complex and evidence from basic research is lacking, thus we roughly discuss it. Resting-state functional magnetic resonance images of TCC experts found that TCC practitioners had greater functional homogeneity in the right post-central gyrus (PosCG), and less functional homogeneity in the left anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) and the right dorsal lateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) (92). The PosCG affects pain that its partial resection reliefs of severe limb pain (93). The posterior cingulate cortex is activated by visuospatial imagery (94). The caudal ACC is associated with the complex social interactions (95). The left ACC regulates the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis (96). The prefrontal cortex is particularly important for cognitive control, and the DLPFC may reflect the expression of task goals (97, 98). In breast cancer patients, TCC may establish visuospatial imagery of the movements to posterior cingulate cortex, set task goals through the DLPFC, and reduce pain through the ACC. TCC may also mediate the HPA axis (99). The HPA axis plays a key role in suppressing and shaping immune responses (100, 101). Dysregulation of the HPA axis and the increased levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines [interleukin (IL)-6 and tumor necrosis factor (TNF- α)] could produce fatigue (102). TCC decreases cortisol, IL-6 and TNF- α in cancer survivors that might reduce cancer-related fatigue (35, 37, 103). TCC increases oxygen intake that might improve shoulder function and strength of in patients with breast cancer (104).

Limitations were also in this systematic review and metaanalyses. First, TCC interventions had Yang-style, Chen-style, simplified 24-action and some movements of TCC with different session length, weekly frequency and duration. The eligible studies had clinical heterogeneity because of different TCC interventions. Second, treatments such as chemotherapy, radiation therapy, hormone therapy, and surgery for breast cancer unlimited in this review might restrict the activity of patients to complete TCC. Third, the small quantity and low quality of eligible studies in each meta-analysis might produce risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision, and publication bias. Finally, although main English, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Thai databases were searched, some published or gray literatures might have been missed and all the meta-analyses included <10 studies that publication bias might exist.

CONCLUSION

In this systematic review and meta-analysis, TCC had positive effects on QOL, pain, shoulder function, strength of arm, anxiety, and fatigue in breast cancer patients compared with the nonexercise therapy. TCC may have an improvement on QOL, physical function and psychological health in breast cancer patients. Due to the risk of bias in each study, further additional randomized controlled trials with a rigorous methodology and low risk of bias are needed to provide more reliable evidence.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

YT designed the study, interpreted data, and wrote the manuscript. X-CL, JL, JF, and H-YY contributed to literature search, figures, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, and draft manuscript. LS, M-LL, LL,

REFERENCES

- Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin.* (2018) 6:394– 424. doi: 10.3322/caac.21492
- Fidler MM, Gupta S, Soerjomataram I, Ferlay J, Steliarova-Foucher E, Bray F. Cancer incidence and mortality among young adults aged 20–39 years worldwide in 2012: a population-based study. *Lancet Oncol.* (2017) 12:1579– 89. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30677-0
- Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2019. CA Cancer J Clin. (2019) 1:7–34. doi: 10.3322/caac.21551
- Bodai BI, Tuso P. Breast cancer survivorship: a comprehensive review of long-term medical issues and lifestyle recommendations. *Perm J.* (2015) 2:48–79. doi: 10.7812/TPP/14-241
- Allemani C, Matsuda T, Carlo VD, Harewood R, Matz M, Nikšić M, et al. Global surveillance of trends in cancer survival 2000-14 (CONCORD-3): analysis of individual records for 37513025 patients diagnosed with one of 18 cancers from 322 population-based registries in 71 countries. *Lancet.* (2018) 10125:1023–75. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)33 326-3
- Mollen EWJ, Ient J, Tjan-Heijnen VCG, Boersma LJ, Miele L, Smidt ML, et al. Moving breast cancer therapy up a notch. *Front Oncol.* (2018) 8:518. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2018.00518
- Ganz PA, Petersen L, Bower JE, Crespi CM. Impact of adjuvant endocrine therapy on quality of life and symptoms: observational data over 12 months from the mind-body study. J Clin Oncol. (2016) 8:816–24. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2015.64.3866
- Earl HM, Hiller L, Howard HC, Dunn JA, Young J, Bowden SJ, et al. Addition of gemcitabine to paclitaxel, epirubicin, and cyclophosphamide adjuvant chemotherapy for women with early-stage breast cancer (tAnGo): final 10year follow-up of an open-label, randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* (2017) 6:755–69. doi: 10.1016/s1470-2045(17)30319-4
- Jensen RE, Potosky AL, Moinpour CM, Lobo T, Cella D, Hahn EA, et al. United states population-based estimates of patient-reported outcomes measurement information system symptom and functional satus feference values for individuals with cancer. J Clin Oncol. (2017) 17:1913–20. doi: 10.1200/jco.2016.71.4410
- Grunfeld E, Dhesy-Thind S, Levine M. Clinical practice guidelines for the care and treatment of breast cancer: follow-up after treatment for breast cancer (summary of the 2005 update). *CMAJ.* (2005) 10:1319–20. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.045062
- 11. Ganz PA, Kwan L, Stanton AL, Krupnick JL, Rowland JH, Meyerowitz BE, et al. Quality of life at the end of primary treatment of breast cancer: first

JY, X-LQ, and C-ZT contributed to data analysis and data interpretation.

FUNDING

This work was financed by The Project First-Class Disciplines Development supported by Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine (CZYHW1901) and the Sichuan Science and Technology Program (2018HH0123, 2019YFH0108, and 2018SZ0257).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fonc. 2020.00607/full#supplementary-material

results from the moving beyond cancer randomized trial. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* (2004) 5:376–87. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djh060

- Greenlee H, DuPont-Reyes MJ, G.Balneaves L, Carlson LE, Cohen MR, Deng G, et al. Clinical practice guidelines on the evidence-based use of integrative therapies during and following breast cancer treatment. *CA Cancer J Clin.* (2017) 3:194–232. doi: 10.3322/caac.21397
- Goodwin PJ, Leszcz M, Ennis M, Koopmans J, Vincent L, Guther H, et al. The effect of group psychosocial support on survival in metastatic breast cancer. *N Engl J Med.* (2001) 24:1719–26. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa011871
- Duijts SF, van Beurden M, Oldenburg HS, Hunter MS, Kieffer JM, Stuiver MM, et al. Efficacy of cognitive behavioral therapy and physical exercise in alleviating treatment-induced menopausal symptoms in patients with breast cancer: results of a randomized, controlled, multicenter trial. *J Clin Oncol.* (2012) 33:4124–33. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2012.41.8525
- 15. van Waart H, Stuiver MM, van Harten WH, Geleijn E, Kieffer JM, Buffart LM, et al. Effect of low-Intensity physical activity and moderateto high-Intensity physical exercise during adjuvant chemotherapy on physical fitness, fatigue, and chemotherapy completion rates: results of the pACES randomized clinical trial. *J Clin Oncol.* (2015) 17:1918–27. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2014.59.1081
- Borch KB, Braaten T, Lund E, Weiderpass E. Physical activity before and after breast cancer diagnosis and survival-the norwegian women and cancer cohort study. *BMC Cancer*. (2015) 15:967. doi: 10.1186/s12885-015-1971-9
- Jones LW, Kwan ML, Weltzien E, Chandarlapaty S, Sternfeld B, Sweeney C, et al. Exercise and prognosis on the basis of clinicopathologic and molecular features in early stage breast cancer: the IACE and pathways studies. *Cancer Ras.* (2016) 18:5415–22. doi: 10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-15-3307
- Holmes MD, Chen WY, Feskanich D, Kroenke CH, Colditz GA. Physical activity and survival after breast cancer diagnosis. *JAMA*. (2005) 20:2479–86. doi: 10.1001/jama.293.20.2479
- Carlson LE, Zelinski E, Toivonen K, Flynn M, Qureshi M, Piedalue KA, et al. Mind-body therapies in cancer: what is the latest evidence? *Curr Oncol Rep.* (2017) 10:67. doi: 10.1007/s11912-017-0626-1
- Wayne PM, Kaptchuk TJ. Challenges inherent to t'ai chi research: part i-t'ai chi as a complex multicomponent intervention. J Altern Complement Med. (2008) 1:95–102. doi: 10.1089/acm.2007.7170A
- National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health. *Tai Chi and Qi Gong: In Depth.* Available online at: https://nccih.nih.gov/health/taichi/introduction.htm (accessed February 02, 2020)
- Jahnke R, Larkey L, Rogers C, Etnier J, Lin F. A comprehensive review of health benefits of qigong and Tai Chi. *Am J Health Promot.* (2010) 6:e1–25. doi: 10.4278/ajhp.081013-LIT-248
- 23. Lauche R, Wayne PM, Dobos G, Cramer H. Prevalence, patterns, and predictors of t'ai chi and qigong use in the United States: results of a

nationally representative survey. *J Altern Complement Med.* (2016) 4:336–42. doi: 10.1089/acm.2015.0356

- 24. Yu AP, Tam BT, Lai CW, Yu DS, Woo J, Chung K-F, et al. Revealing the neural mechanisms underlying the beneficial effects of Tai Chi: a Neuroimaging perspective. Am J Chinese Med. (2018) 02:231–59. doi: 10.1142/s0192415x18500131
- Wolf SL, Coogler C, Xu T. Exploring the basis for Tai Chi chuan as a therapeutic exercise approach. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. (1997) 886-92. doi: 10.1016/s0003-9993(97)90206-9
- Klein PJ, Schneider R, Rhoads CJ. Qigong in cancer care: a systematic review and construct analysis of effective qigong therapy. *Support Care Cancer*. (2016) 7:3209–22. doi: 10.1007/s00520-016-3201-7
- Lan C, Lai JS, Chen SY. Tai Chi chuan an ancient wisdom on exercise and health promotion. *Sports Med.* (2002) 4:217–24. doi: 10.2165/00007256-200232040-00001
- Lan C, Chen SY, Lai JS, Wong AM. Tai Chi chuan in medicine and health promotion. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med.* (2013) :502131. doi: 10.1155/2013/502131
- Wang C, Schmid CH, Fielding RA, Harvey WF, Reid KF, Price LL, et al. Effect of Tai Chi versus aerobic exercise for fibromyalgia: comparative effectiveness randomized controlled trial. *BMJ*. (2018) 360:k851. doi: 10.1136/bmj.k851
- 30. Yeh GY, McCarthy EP, Wayne PM, Stevenson LW, Wood MJ, Forman D, et al. Tai Chi exercise in patients with chronic heart failure: a Randomized clinical trial. *Arch Intern Med.* (2011) 8:750–7. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2011.150
- Wang C, Schmid CH, Iversen MD, Harvey WF, Fielding RA, Driban JB, et al. Comparative effectiveness of Tai Chi versus physical therapy for knee osteoarthritis: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med.* (2016) 2:77. doi: 10.7326/m15-2143
- Li F, Harmer P, Fitzgerald K, Eckstrom E, Stock R, Galver J, et al. Tai Chi and postural stability in patients with parkinson's disease. N Engl J Med. (2012) 6:511–9. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1107911
- Song S, Yu J, Ruan Y, Liu X, Xiu L, Yue X. Ameliorative effects of Tai Chi on cancer-related fatigue: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Support Care Cancer.* (2018) 7:2091–102. doi: 10.1007/s00520-018-4136-y
- 34. Hilfiker R, Meichtry A, Eicher M, Nilsson Balfe L, Knols RH, Verra ML, et al. Exercise and other non-pharmaceutical interventions for cancerrelated fatigue in patients during or after cancer treatment: a systematic review incorporating an indirect-comparisons meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med. (2018) 10:651–8. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096422
- 35. Campo RA, Light KC, O'Connor K, Nakamura Y, Lipschitz D, LaStayo PC, et al. Blood pressure, salivary cortisol, and inflammatory cytokine outcomes in senior female cancer survivors enrolled in a Tai Chi chih randomized controlled trial. *J Cancer Surviv.* (2015) 1:115–25. doi: 10.1007/s11764-014-0395-x
- Chen YW, Hunt MA, Campbell KL, Peill K, Reid WD. The effect of Tai Chi on four chronic conditions-cancer, osteoarthritis, heart failure and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a systematic review and meta-analyses. Br J Sports Med. (2016) 7:397–407. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2014-094388
- Irwin MR, Olmstead R, Breen EC, Witarama T, Carrillo C, Sadeghi N, et al. Tai Chi, cellular inflammation, and transcriptome dynamics in breast cancer survivors with insomnia: a randomized controlled trial. J Natl Cancer Inst Monogr. (2014) 50:295–301. doi: 10.1093/jncimonographs/ lgu028
- Fong SSM, Liu KPY, Luk WS, Leung JCY, Chung JWY. Tai Chi qigong for survivors of breast cancer: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. (2017) 360:S32. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)33170-7
- 39. Fong SS, Ng SS, Luk WS, Chung JW, Chung LM, Tsang WW, et al. Shoulder mobility, muscular strength, and quality of life in breast cancer survivors with and without Tai Chi qigong training. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med.* (2013) 2013:787169. doi: 10.1155/2013/787169
- Peppone LJ, Mustian KM, Janelsins MC, Palesh OG, Rosier RN, Piazza KM, et al. Effects of a structured weight-bearing exercise program on bone metabolism among breast cancer survivors: a feasibility trial. *Clin Breast Cancer*. (2010) 3:224–9. doi: 10.3816/CBC.20 10.n.030
- 41. Irwin RM, Olmstead R, Carrillo C, Sadeghi N, Nicassio P, Ganz PA, et al. Tai Chi chih compared with cognitive behavioral therapy for the treatment

of insomnia in survivors of breast cancer: a randomized, partially blinded, noninferiority trial. J Clin Oncol. (2017) 23:2656–65. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2016

- Lee MS, Pittler MH, Ernst E. Is Tai Chi an effective adjunct in cancer care? a systematic review of controlled clinical trials. *Support Care Cancer*. (2007) 6:597–601. doi: 10.1007/s00520-007-0221-3
- Lee MS, Choi T-Y, Ernst E. Tai Chi for breast cancer patients: a systematic review. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* (2010) 2:309–16. doi: 10.1007/s10549-010-0741-2
- 44. Pan Y, Yang K, Shi X, Liang H, Zhang F, Lv Q. Tai Chi chuan exercise for patients with breast cancer: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med.* (2015) 2015:535237. doi: 10.1155/2015/535237
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group TP. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* (2009) 7:e1000097. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097
- Monti DA, Kash KM, Kunkel EJ, Moss A, Mathews M, Brainard G, et al. Psychosocial benefits of a novel mindfulness intervention versus standard support in distressed women with breast cancer. *Psychooncology.* (2013) 11:2565–75. doi: 10.1002/pon.3320
- Prioli KM, Pizzi LT, Kash KM, Newberg AB, Morlino AM, Matthews MJ, et al. Costs and effectiveness of mindfulness-based art therapy versus standard breast cancer support group for women with cancer. *Am Health Drug Benefits*. (2017) 6:288–95.
- Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni 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
- Group GW. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ. (2004) 7454:1490. doi: 10.1136/bmj.328.7454.1490
- Riley RD, Higgins JPT, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects metaanalyses. *BMJ*. (2011) 342:d549. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d549
- 51. Hedges LV. A random effects model for effect sizes. *Psychol Bull.* (1983) 2:388–395.
- Barili F, Parolari A, Kappetein PA, Freemantle N. Statistical primer: heterogeneity, random- or fixed-effects model analyses? *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg.* (2018) 3:317–21. doi: 10.1093/icvts/ivy163
- DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials revisited. Contemp Clin Trials. (2015) 45:139–45. doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2015.09.002
- Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. (2003) 7414:557–60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
- Higgins JPT, Green S. (editors.). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Version 5.1.0. Oxford: The Cochrane Collaboration (2011).
- Han Q, Yang L, Huang S-Y, Zhen M-H, Huang S-M, Xei H. Effect of eight forms of taijiquan on cancer fatigue in breast cancer patients. *J. Guangxi* Univers. Chin. Med. (2019) 4:30–4. doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2016.08.002
- 57. Wang YY. Effect of Tai Chi Chuan on Cancer-Related Fatigue And Quality Of Life in Postoperative Breast Cancer Patients Wirh Middle and Elderly Age. Wuhu: Anhui Normal University. (2017). p. 16-27.
- Wang HY, Dai SJ, Hu M, Yu H, Liu SQ. Taiji exercise on patients with breast cancer after surgery impact of shoulder function and quality of life. J New Med. (2016) 3:231–3.
- Zhu JY. The Effect Of Rehabilitation On Limb Function Of Patients With Breast Cancer And Analysis Of 24 Taijiquan. Wuhu: Anhui Normal University. (2016) 13-28.
- Wang HY. Effects of taichi exercise pattern on anxiety among postoperative breast cancer patients. *Chin J Mod Nurs*. (2015) 28:3386–8. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.isn.16742907.2015.28.010
- Lv F, Yu Y, Liang D, Li Z-M, You W, Zhang B. Effect of baduanjin exercise and shadowboxing on quality of postoperati0n life for breast cancer patients. *J Wuhan Inst Phy Educ.* (2015) 7:80–3.
- 62. Thongteratham N, Pongthavornkamol K, Olson K, Ratanawichitrasin A, Nityasuddhi D, Wattanakitkrilert D. Effectiveness of Tai Chi qi qong program for thai women with breast cancer: a randomized control trial. *Pacific Rim Int J Nurs Res.* (2015) 4:280–94.
- Li YQ, LI LL, Wei W. Influence of taichi yunshou on functional recovery of limbs in postoperative patients with breast cancer. *Fujian J TCM*. (2013) 5:57–8.
- 64. Wang YL, Sun XY, Wang YB, Niu F, Liu Y, Zhou LH, et al. Effects of different exercise patterns on upper limb function and quality of life in

postoperative patients with breast cancer. Chin J Phy Med Rehabil. (2012) 1:64–6. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.isn.0254-1424.2012.01.021

- Spord LK, Janelsins MC, Palsh OG, Carroll JK, Heckler CE, Peppone JL. Health-related quality of life and biomarkers in breast cancer survivors participating in Tai Chi chuan. J Cancer Surviv. (2012) 2:146–54. doi: 10.1007/s11764-011-0205-7
- Janelsins MC, Davis PG, Wideman L, Katula JA, Sprod LK, Peppone LJ, et al. Effects of Tai Chi chuan on insulin and cytokine levels in a randomized controlled pilot study on breast cancer survivors. *Clin Breast Cancer*. (2011) 3:161–70. doi: 10.1016/j.clbc.2011.03.013
- Mustian KM, Palesh OG, Flecksteiner SA. Tai Chi chuan for breast cancer survivors. *Med Sport Sci.* (2008) 52:209-17. doi: 10.1159/000134301
- Mustin KM, Katula JA, Zhao HW. A pilot study to assess the influence of Tai Chi chuan on functional capacity among breast cancer survivors. J Support Oncol. (2006) 3:139–45.
- Morin CM, Bootzin RR, Buysse DJ, Edinger JD, Espie CA, Lichstein KL. Psychological and behavioral treatment of insomnia:update of the recent evidence (1998-2004). SLEEP. (2006) 11:1398–414. doi: 10.1093/sleep/29.11.1398
- Victorson D, Cella D, Wagner L, Kramer, Smith ML. Measuring quality of life in cancer survivors. In: Feuerstein M, editor. *Handbook of Cancer* Survivorship. Boston: Springer. (2007) p. 79–110.
- Yan J-H, Pan L, Zhang X-M, Sun C-X, Cui G-H. Lack of efficacy of Tai Chi in improving quality of life in breast cancer survivors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* (2014) 8:3715–20. doi: 10.7314/apjcp.2014.15.8.3715
- 72. Tao WW, Jiang H, Tao XM, Jiang P, Sha LY, Sun XC. Effects of acupuncture, tuina, Tai Chi, qigong, and traditional chinese medicine five-Element music therapy on symptom management and quality of life for cancer patients: a meta-analysis. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. (2016) 4:728–47. doi: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2015.11.027
- He J-H, Yao L, Yao Z, Liu G-N. Rehabilitation effect of systematic exercise in adjuvant chemotherapy for breast cancer patients. *Chin J Rehabil.* (2011) 3:204–6. doi: 10.3870/zgkf.2011.03.019
- 74. Qiang W-M, Dong F-Q, Yan L, Chen Y-H, Tang L. Comparison of two different exercise program in breast cancer patients after postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy. *Chin J Nurs.* (2011) 6:537–40. doi: 10.3761/j.issn.0254-1769.2011.06.002
- 75. Rausch SM. Evaluating psychosocial effects of two intervention, Tai Chi and spiritual growth groups, in women with breast cancer. In *College of Humanities and Sciences*. Virginia: Virginia Commonwealth University (2007).
- Ni X, Javan R, Yates P, Hu W, Huang X. The effects of Tai Chi on quality of life of cancer survivors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Support Care Cancer*. (2019) 10:3701–16. doi: 10.1007/s00520-019-04911-0
- National Cancer Institute. Cancer Pain (PDQ)-Health Professional Version (2020). Available online at: https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/ treatment/side-effects/pain-pdq (accessed February 02, 2020).
- Huang J, Lim MY, Zhao B, Shao L. PM10 mass concentration and oxidative capacity of moxa smoke. QIM. (2015) 9:705–10. doi: 10.1093/qjmed/hcv008
- Butler DL, Koopman C, Neri E, Giese-Davis J, Palesh O. Effects of supportive-expressive group therapy on pain in women with metastatic breast cancer. *Health Psychol.* (2009) 5:579–87. doi: 10.1037/a0016124
- Ribeiro IL, Camargo PR, Alburquerque-Sendín F, Ferrari AV, Arrais CL, Salvini TF. Three-dimensional scapular kinematics, shoulder outcome measures and quality of life following treatment for breast cancer – a case control study. *Musculoskelet Sci and Pract.* (2019) 40:72-79. doi: 10.1016/j.msksp.2019.01.012
- Klassen O, Schmidt ME, Ulrich CM, Schneeweiss A, Potthoff K, Steindorf K, et al. Muscle strength in breast cancer patients receiving different treatment regimes. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. (2017) 2:305–16. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12165
- Bower JE, Ganz PA, Desmond KA, Rowland JH, Meyerowitz BE, Belin TR. Fatigue in breast cancer survivors occurrence, correlates, and impact on quality of life. *J Clin Oncol.* (2000) 4:743–53. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2000.1 8.4.743
- 83. Hill J, Holcombe C, Clark L, Boothby MRK, Hincks A, Fisher J, et al. Predictors of onset of depression and anxiety in the year

after diagnosis of breast cancer. *Phychol Med.* (2011) 7:1429-36. doi: 10.1017/S0033291710001868

- 84. Bower JE, Ganz PA, Irwin MR, Kwan L, Breen EC, Cole SW. Inflammation and behavioral symptoms after breast cancer treatment: do fatigue, depression, and sleep disturbance share a common underlying mechanism? *J Clin Oncol.* (2011) 26:3517–22. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2011.36.1154
- Rogers LQ, Courneya KS, Anton PM, Verhulst S, Vicari SK, Robbs RS, et al. Effects of a multicomponent physical activity behavior change intervention on fatigue, anxiety, and depressive symptomatology in breast cancer survivors: randomized trial. *Psychooncology*. (2017) 11:1901–6. doi: 10.1002/pon.4254
- Runowicz CD, Leach CR, Henry NL, Henry KS, Mackey HT, Cowens-Alvarado RL, et al. American cancer society/American society of clinical oncology breast cancer survivorship care guideline. *J Clin Oncol.* (2016) 6:611–35. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2015.64.3809
- Wang C, Bannuru R, Ramel J, Kupelnick B, Scott T, Schmid CH. Tai Chi on psychological well-being: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Comlement ALten Med.* (2010) 10:23. doi: 10.1186/1472-6882-10-23
- Zhang LL, Wang SZ, Chen HL, Yuan AZ. Tai Chi exercise for cancer-Related fatigue in patients with lung cancer undergoing chemotherapy: a Randomized controlled trial. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. (2016) 3:504–11. doi: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2015.11.020
- Zhou W, Wan Y-H, Qiu Y-R, Luo X-M. Effects of Tai Chi exercise on cancerrelated fatigue in patients with nasopharyngeal carcinoma undergoing chemoradiotherapy: a randomized controlled trial. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. (2017) 3:737–44. doi: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2017.10.021
- 90. Fong SS, Ng SS, Lee HW, Pang MY, Luk WS, Chung JW, et al. The effects of a 6-month Tai Chi qigong training program on temporomandibular, cervical, and shoulder joint mobility and sleep problems in nasopharyngeal cancer survivors. *Integr Cancer Ther.* (2015) 1:16–25. doi: 10.1177/1534735414556508
- Murley B, Haas B, Hermanns M, Wang YT, Stocks E. Influence of Tai Chi on self-efficacy, quality of life, and fatigue among patients with cancer receiving chemotherapy: a pilot study brief. J Holist Nurs. (2019) 4:354–63. doi: 10.1177/0898010119867557
- Wei G-X, Dong H-M, Yang Z, Luo J, Zuo X-N. Tai Chi chuan optimizes the functional organization of the intrinsic human brain architecture in older adults. *Front Aging Neurosci.* (2014) 6:74. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2014.00074
- Lewin W, Philips CG. Observations on partial removal of the postcentral gyrus for pain. J neurol Neurosurg Psychiat. (1952) 15:143–7. doi: 10.1136/jnnp.15.3.143
- Whittingstall K, Bernier M, Houde JC, Fortin D, Descoteaux M. Structural network underlying visuospatial imagery in humans. *Cortex*. (2014) 56:85– 98. doi: 10.1016/j.cortex.2013.02.004
- Shinozaki J, Hanakawa T, Fukuyama H. Heterospecific and conspecific social cognition in the anterior cingulate cortex. *Neuroreport.* (2007) 10:993–7. doi: 10.1097/WNR.0b013e3281ac2161
- MacLullich AM, Ferguson KJ, Wardlaw JM, Starr JM, Deary IJ, Seckl JR. Smaller left anterior cingulate cortex volumes are associated with impaired hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis regulation in healthy elderly men. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. (2006) 4:1591–4. doi: 10.1210/jc.2005-2610
- Miller EK, Cohen JD. An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function. *Annu Rev Neurosci.* (2001) 24:167–202. doi: 10.1146/annurev.neuro.24.1.167
- 98. Swann NC, Tandon N, Pieters TA, Aron AR. Intracranial electroencephalography reveals different temporal profiles for dorsaland ventro-lateral prefrontal cortex in preparing to stop action. *Cereb Cortex.* (2013) 10:2479–88. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhs245
- Hamasaki H. Exercise and gut microbiota: clinical implications for the feasibility of Tai Chi. J Integr Med. (2017) 4:270–81. doi: 10.1016/s2095-4964(17)60342-x
- 100. Bodera P, Stankiewicz W, Kocik J. Interactions of orphanin fQ/nociceptin (OFQ/N) system with immune system factors and hypothalamicpituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis. *Pharmacol Rep.* (2014) 2:288–91. doi: 10.1016/j.pharep.2013.12.003
- 101. Yeh SH, Chuang H, Lin LW, Hsiao CY, Eng HL. Regular Tai Chi chuan exercise enhances functional mobility and cD4CD25 regulatory t cells. Br J Sports Med. (2006) 3:239–43. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.2005. 22095

- Louati K, Berenbaum F. Fatigue in chronic inflammation a link to pain pathways. Arthritis Res Ther. (2015) 17:254. doi: 10.1186/s13075-015-0784-1
- 103. Jiang XP, Yang DC, Elliott RL, Head JF. Reduction in serum iL-6 after vacination of breast cancer patients with tumour-associated antigens is related to estrogen receptor status. *Cytokine*. (2000) 5:458–65. doi: 10.1006/cyto.1999.0591
- 104. Lan C, Lai J-S, Wong M-K, Yu M-L. Cardiorespiratory function, flexibility, and body composition among geriatric Tai Chi chuan practitioners . *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* (1996) 6:612–6. doi: 10.1016/s0003-9993(96) 90305-6

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2020 Luo, Liu, Fu, Yin, Shen, Liu, Lan, Ying, Qiao, Tang and Tang. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.