Exercise Training for Patients Pre- and Postsurgically Treated for Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: A Systematic Review and **Meta-analysis**

Integrative Cancer Therapies 2017, Vol. 16(1) 63-73 © The Author(s) 2016 Reprints and permissions: sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav DOI: 10.1177/1534735416645180 journals.sagepub.com/home/ict (S)SAGE

Hui-Juan Ni, MD¹, Bigyan Pudasaini, MD¹, Xun-Tao Yuan, MD², He-Fang Li, MD³, Lei Shi, MD⁴, and Ping Yuan, MD¹

Abstract

Background. This meta-analysis examined the effects of exercise training on length of hospital stay, postoperative complications, exercise capacity, 6-minute walking distance (6MWD), and health-related quality of life (HRQoL) in patients following resection of non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Methods. This review searched PubMed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Collaboration data base up to August 16, 2015. It includes 15 studies comparing exercise endurance and quality of life before versus after exercise training in patients undergoing lung resection for NSCLC. Results. This review identified 15 studies, 8 of which are randomized controlled trials including 350 patients. Preoperative exercise training shortened length of hospital stay; mean difference (MD): -4.98 days (95% CI = -6.22 to -3.74, P < .00001) and also decreased postoperative complications for which the odds ratio was 0.33 (95% CI = 0.15 to 0.74, P = .007). Four weeks of preoperative exercise training improved exercise capacity; 6MWD was increased to 39.95 m (95% Cl = 5.31 to 74.6, P = .02). While postoperative exercise training can also effectively improve exercise capacity, it required a longer training period; 6MWD was increased to 62.83 m (95% CI = 57.94 to 67.72) after 12 weeks of training (P < .00001). For HRQoL, on the EORTC-QLQ-30, there were no differences in patients' global health after exercise, but dyspnea score was decreased -14.31 points (95% CI = -20.03 to -8.58, P < .00001). On the SF-36 score, physical health was better after exercise training (MD = 3 points, 95% CI = 0.81 to 5.2, P = .007) while there was no difference with regard to mental health. The l^2 statistics of all statistically pooled data were lower than 30%. There was a low amount of heterogeneity among these studies. Conclusions. Evidence from this review suggests that preoperative exercise training may shorten length of hospital stay, decrease postoperative complications and increase 6MWD. Postoperative exercise training can also effectively improve both the 6MWD and quality of life in surgical patients with NSCLC, but requiring a longer training period.

Keywords

exercise training, non-small lung cell cancer, rehabilitation, surgical resection, exercise endurance, health-related quality of life

Submitted Date: 15 September 2015; Revised Date: 21 March 2016; Acceptance Date: 23 March 2016

Introduction

Lung cancer has been the most common cancer worldwide for several decades. Its incidence is ever increasing¹ and is associated with the highest mortality.²⁻⁴ Patients with lung cancer report poorer health-related quality of life (HRQoL) and a higher prevalence of psychological distress than patients with other types of cancer. The major components of lung cancer treatment are chemotherapy, radiotherapy and surgery.⁵

Non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is common, with surgical resection being the treatment of choice for stage I to III cancers.⁶ Exercise training may decrease the length of hospital

¹Shanghai Pulmonary Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China

²Weifang Traditional Chinese Hospital, Shandong, China ³Laian Maternal and Child Health Care and Family Plaining Service Center, Chuzhou, Anhui, China

⁴Zhejiang Cancer Hospital, Hangzhou City, Zhejiang, China

Corresponding Author:

Ping Yuan, Shanghai Pulmonary Hospital, Tongji University, School of Medicine, No. 507 Zhengmin Road, Shanghai 200433, China. Email: yuanping6766@126.com And Lei Shi, Zhengjiang Cancer Hospital,No, 38 Guangji Road, Hangzhou 310022. China.

Email: datouerzi 2005@163.com

(cc) 🛈 😒 Creative Commons CC-BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 License (http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the SAGE and Open Access pages (https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/open-access-at-sage).

stay and postoperative complications in such patients.⁷ Several studies have already shown that exercise training improved exercise capacity and HRQoL in NSCLC patients who underwent surgery.⁸⁻¹⁴ But the research has not disseminated into clinical practice and exercise training following lung resection is not yet routine.¹⁵ Although research on exercise programs in people with surgery for NSCLC suggests exercise interventions are safe and likely to be effective, yet at the same time there is demand for more data from further randomized controlled trials.¹⁶ The National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence guidelines on lung cancer identified the need for further work to examine rehabilitation programs before and after surgery, stating that outcomes should include mortality, pulmonary complications, pulmonary function, and HRQoL assessment.¹⁷ There are multiple published reports on the benefits of preoperative exercise training in lung cancer patients. It may shorten length of hospital stay, reduce postoperative complications. Postoperative exercise training can improve exercise capacity and quality of life as well. Although the topic is frequently studied it is unfortunate that the studies are varied due to small sample sizes and difference in their approaches. Data on the effects of exercise training prior to or after surgery in NSCLC patients are still limited.

Aims

Thus, this review performed a random effects meta-analysis of available past and current studies on exercise training in surgical NSCLC patients with the aim to ascertain the effectiveness of exercise rehabilitation prior to and after surgery.

Methods

The study was designed according to the standards set forth by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement.¹⁸

Data Sources and Search

This review searched PubMed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Collaboration databases using the key words "exercise training" or "rehabilitation," "physical training" or "physical exercise" and "non-small cell cancer." The search was limited to English language articles published by August 16, 2015.

Interventions and Outcome Measures

This review includes 15 studies comparing exercise endurance and HRQoL before and after exercise training in patients undergoing lung resection for NSCLC. Study inclusion criteria were the following: length of hospital stay, postoperative complications, 6-minute walk distance (6MWD), the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Core Quality of Life Questionnaire (EORTC-QLQ-C30),¹⁹ and 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36).²⁰ Patients managed in any setting, that is, hospital, community facility, or home were included if they received an exercise-based intervention that included at least an aerobic exercise training component performed by the lower limbs (bicycle, treadmill walking) lasting 1, 4, 12, or 20 weeks, either alone or as part of a comprehensive rehabilitation program defined as also including components of muscle training, breathing exercises, health education, and psychological treatment.

Reviews, editorials, letters, case reports, and conference abstracts were excluded. Studies were excluded if there was an overlap in patients with another study within the same analysis. Thus, if some patients could possibly have been included in both the controlled and uncontrolled study analyses, they were only included once in any given analysis. Therefore, there was no overlap in populations included in our meta-analyses.

Data Extraction and Assessment of Risk of Bias

Two reviewers (HJN, PY) independently extracted data from eligible studies. Disagreements were resolved by consensus. Data pertaining to baseline characteristics of study subjects (number of subjects, age, sex, type of patients), exercise training program, duration and follow up, 6MWD, length of hospital stay, post-operative complication, EORTC-QLQ-C30 score (global Health, dyspnea score) and SF-36 score (physical function and mental health) were extracted.

For randomized controlled trials (RCTs), risk of bias was assessed for the domains as suggested by the Cochrane Handbook of Systematic Reviews,²¹ specifically emphasizing on sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding, outcomes assessment, and selective reporting for the 8 randomized control trials included. For each criterion, risk of bias was assessed as (1) low risk of bias (adequate fulfillment of the respective criterion), (2) unclear (insufficient information to judge about fulfillment or nonfulfillment of the respective criterion), and (3) high risk of bias (inadequate fulfillment or nonfulfillment of the respective criterion).^{21,22} Risk of publication bias was assessed for each meta-analysis that included at least 10 studies.²¹ So this review did not detect clear publication bias as the numbers of included studies were small. As for the 5 single group trials (SGTs) and 2 controlled trials (CTs) reviewed, we used the Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale Cohort Studies. In the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale, studies are assigned up to 4 stars for selection, 2 for comparability, and 3 for outcome. For uncontrolled studies, the maximum available stars in the Newcastle-Ottawa scale is 3 for selection, 0 for comparability, and 3 for outcome.

Outcomes

The main outcome measure for the present analysis was length of hospital stay and postoperative complication. The



Figure 1. Flowchart showing the progress through the stages of meta-analysis.

following additional secondary parameters which were reported explicitly and clearly in part of the studies were also assessed: 6MWD, EORTC-QLQ-C30 score, and SF-36 score.

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis

The difference in change of length of hospital stay, postoperative complications, 6MWD, and EORTC-QLQ-C30 score and SF-36 score after exercise training versus control was pooled, stratified and analyzed using random-effects meta-analysis models with inverse variance weighting. The magnitude of heterogeneity present was estimated using the I^2 statistic, an estimate of the proportion of the total observed variance that is attributed to between study variance.

Pooled effects on hospital stay, postoperative complication, 6MWD, EORTC-QLQ-C30, score and SF-36 score were presented as weighted mean differences (MDs) or odds ratio (ORs) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs). This review considered P < .05 as significant. Throughout, values are presented as mean \pm SD unless otherwise stated. Analyses were performed using the Cochrane Collaboration Review Manager (version 5.2, Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark).

Results

Characteristics of the Studies

Of 351 articles identified initially, 27 were retrieved for more detailed evaluation, Subsequently, 15 studies (8 randomized controlled trials)²³⁻³⁷ that included 350 patients were finally included in the analyses (Figure 1). Table 1 summarizes the design and methods of the included studies. The studies included patients with stage I to IV NSCLC. All the patients were adults referred for resection by thoracotomy or video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery. Some of them had chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Eight studies including 238 patients delivered exercise training after surgery. Seven studies including 112 patients delivered exercise training before surgery. The exercise training program was largely similar, including bicycle, walking, breathing, and so on. Mean duration of the exercise training program was 8 ± 7 weeks (1, 4, 12, or 20 weeks). The mean age of subjects across studies ranged from 54 to 70 years.

For RCTs, evaluation of risk of bias of each trial and assessment of risk of bias by individual trials are illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, respectively. Three trials^{23,24,28} had a high drop-out rate in the control group, but failed to address this incomplete outcome with intention-to-treat analysis. Four trials^{24,25,27,29} were open to bias with false-positive results because of failure to blind participants in relation to intervention delivery. The risk of bias was low in the other studies; a detailed assessment is available in Table 2.

Effect of Exercise Training on Length of Hospital Stay and Postoperative Complications

Preoperative exercise training shortened the length of hospital stay. In 4 studies, $^{25-27,32}$ there was a marked decrease in length of stay of -4.98 days (95% CI = -6.22 to -3.74) after exercise training (P < .00001) (Figure 4A). No

PatientisTrainingFrequencyinterventionFollow up 26 (12-47) 654 (47-82)Resistance (weights) $2/(day)$ 12 weeks (+5Aerobic 5-10 26 (12-47) 654 (47-82)Resistance (weights) $2/(day)$ until 12 weeks (+5Aerobic 5-10 24 ± 124 57 ± 162 Aerobic (walking, and $arosinarosincomponent24 \pm 12457 \pm 162Aerobic (yalking, andarosinarosinarosin32 \pm 10363.6 \pm 102Aerobic (yalking)2/(day) untilPostsurgery132 \pm 10363.6 \pm 102Aerobic (yalking)2/(day) untilPostsurgery132 \pm 10363.6 \pm 102Aerobic (yalking)2/(day) untilPostsurgery157 \pm 163Aerobic (yalking)2/(day) untilPostsinger156 \pm 10363.6 \pm 103arosic (weikely)2/(day) untilarosic (weikely)68 (11)67 (11)67 (11)57 (day) over 5 day1147 \pm 5670.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)20.2 (8.6)3/(day) over 5 day156.6970.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)2/(day) over 5 day1weeks30 min56.6970.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)2/(day) over 5 day1weeks1 m + weeks20 \pm 56.6970.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)56.6970.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)70.2 (8.6)70$
2.6 (32-47) 65.4 (47-82) Resistance (weights) 2×(day 12 weeks (+5 Aerobic 5.10
2.4 ± 12.4 57 ± 16.2 Aerobic (walking resistance (upper and lower) + stretching 2x/day until discharge then stretching Postsurgery resistance 1h 3.2 ± 10.3 6.36 ± 10.2 Aerobic (cycling) + resistance 2x/week 12 weeks 1h 3.2 ± 10.3 6.36 ± 10.2 Aerobic (cycling) + resistance 2x/week 20 weeks 1h 3.5 ± 10.3 Aerobic (cycling) + resistance + muscle training 3×/week 20 weeks 1h 68 (11) 67 (11) strendmill) resistance + muscle training 3×/week 20 weeks 1h 72 (6.69) 70.2 (8.61) Aerobic (readmill, resistance + muscle training 2/day over 5 days 1 weeks 20 min lower 72 (6.69) 70.2 (8.61) Aerobic (readmill, resistance + resistance + resistance + muscle training 2/day over 5 days 1 week 20 min lower 86 ± 7.3 64.8 ± 8 54.1 ± 8.53 Aerobic (readmill, 2×/day over 5 days 1 week 20 min lower 86 ± 7.3 64.8 ± 8 7/day over 5 days 1 week 20 min lower 20 min lower 86 ± 7.3 64.8 ± 8 74.8 ± 7.4 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ± 7.4 ± 7.4 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ± 7.4 ± 7.4 ± 7.5 ±
3.3 ± 10.3 63.6 ± 10.2 Aerobic (cycling) + 2×/week 12 weeks 1 h resistance 1 + resistance + 1 + resistance + 1 h + resistance + 1 h + resistance + 1 + resistance + 1 h walking 3×/week 20 weeks 1 h + resistance + 1 + resistance
 55.9 ± 8.5 6.4.4 ± 9.3 Aerobic (walking 3×/week 20 weeks 1 h on treadmill) + resistance + muscle training 68 (11) 67 (11) strength training + Once daily 4 weeks 30 min walking 72 (6.69) 70.2 (8.61) Aerobic (treadmill, 2×/day over 5 days 1 week 20 min lower step and am treatming + 0.000 min lower 72 (6.69) 70.2 (8.61) Aerobic (treadmill, 2×/day over 5 days 1 week 20 min lower resistance + 0.000 min lower 4.6 ± 8.45 5.4.1 ± 8.53 Aerobic (walking on 3×/day walking 1 week bereation treatming to propund the center) physiotherapy discharge to be and around the center) physiotherapy discharge to an in + education treatming + 0.30 min +
 68 (11) 67 (11) strength training + Once daily 4 weeks 30 min walking 72 (6.69) 70.2 (8.61) Aerobic (treadmill, 2×/day over 5 days 1 week 20 min lower ergometer) + typer, resistance + typer, ty
72 (6.69) 70.2 (8.61) Aerobic (treadmill, 2×/day over 5 days 1 week 20 min lower step and arm ergometer) + ergometer) + ergometer) + ergometer) + ergometer) + resistance + hereathing ergometer) + breathing 54.1 ± 8.53 Aerobic (walking on 3×/day walking 1 week breathing, 20 min + education treadmill + walking + 2×/day chest physiotherapy discharge to lerance + breathing endurance + breathing en
 4.76 ± 8.45 54.1 ± 8.53 Aerobic (walking on 3×/day walking 1 week According treadmill + walking + 2×/day chest preop until to patient's around the center) physiotherapy discharge tolerance + breathing 58.6 ± 7.3 64.8 ± 8 Strength and 5×/week 4 weeks 10 min increasing endurance + breathing + breathing + 10-30 min + breathing + 10-30 min of IMT
38.6 ± 7.3 64.8 ± 8 Strength and 5×/week 4 weeks 10 min increasing endurance + to 30 min + to 30 min + breathing + breathing + to 30 min + resistance flexibility flexibility min of 1MT

(continued)	
-	
Table	

			Control	Training		Age (Yea	ırs)				
Study/First Author Year	Preoperative/ · Postoperative	Type of Study	Control Patients (F), n	Patients (F), n	Type of Patients	Control Patients	Training Patients	Exercise Training	Frequency	Length of intervention	Duration and Follow up
Sekine 2005	Pre	Ъ	60	22	NSCLC stage I-IV with COPD, thoracotomy	70.4 ± 4.6	69 ± 5.5	Breathing (incentive spirometry, abdominal breathing, huffing, and coughing) + aerobic (walking)	Daily (breathing 5× per day)	2 weeks	Breathing 15 min 5×/day + pulmonary exercises for 30 min and walking more than 5000 steps every day
Cesario 2007	Post	J	186	25	NSCLC, Surgical (lateral muscle sparing thoracotomy)	R Z	с	Aerobic (cycling, walking) + breathing	5×/week	4 weeks	зh
Coats 2013	Pre	SGT	13		under investigation for NSCLC (stage 1-1V) awaiting surgical resection	59 ± 9	6	Aerobic (walking + cycling) + resistance	3-5×/week	4 weeks	Aerobic 30 min + muscle strength exercises
Jones 2007	Pre	SGT	25		suspected surgical lung cancer stage I-IIIA	65 ± 1	0	Aerobic (cycling)	5×/week on consecutive days	Until surgical resection, mean of 30 sessions	20-30 min + 5 min warm up and 5 min cool down
Peddle- Mclntyre 2012	Post	SGT	17		94% NSCLC stage I-IIIB and limited stage SCLC, on average 3 and a half years post-surgical	66.7 (5 0	-85)	Resistance + breathing + stretching	3×/week nonconsecutive days	10 weeks (28 sessions)	NR
Reisenberg and Lubbe 2010	Post	SGT	45		NSCLC stage I-IIIB+SCLC (2 limited an I extensive), undergone treatment (88% surgical); time since last treatment no more than 14 days	60.2 ± 1	0	Aerobic (cycling)	Daily	28 days	30 min per day interval training (3-5 min)
Jones 2008	Post	SGT	20		NSCLC stage I-IIIB, 80% surgery	62 ± 1	_	Aerobic (cycling)	3×/week on consecutive days	14 weeks	15-45 min increasing over 14 weeks



Figure 2. Overall risk of bias assessment using the Cochrane tool.



Figure 3. Risk of bias assessment by individual trials.

heterogeneity was apparent among studies ($I^2 = 0\%$). Exercise training in these 4 studies,^{25-27,32} also effectively decreased postoperative complications; the OR was 0.33 (95% CI = 0.15 to 0.74, P = .007) (Figure 4B). There was a low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 7\%$) among these studies.

Effect of Exercise Training on 6-Minute Walk Distance

Preoperative exercise training improved exercise capacity in 3 studies,^{26,33-34} 6MWD was increased to 39.95 m (95% CI = 5.31 to 74.6) after 4 weeks training (P = .02); there was no heterogeneity (I^2 = 0%) among these studies. While postoperative exercise training also effectively improved exercise capacity in the other 6 studies,^{23,28,29,31,36,37} 6MWD was increased to 62.83 m (95% CI = 57.94 to 67.72) only after 12 weeks training (P < .00001). There was a low amount of heterogeneity ($I^2 = 7\%$) among these studies. (Figure 5A and B).

Effect of Exercise Training on EORTC-QLQ-30 Score

Four studies reported global health score. 23,28,35,36 There was no alteration in patients' global health after exercise training, cumulative MD 2.4 points (95% CI = -2.9 to 7.7, *P* = .37).

However, low heterogeneity was apparent among studies ($l^2 = 11\%$) (Figure 6A). Meanwhile, the other 3 studies reported the dyspnea score.^{28,30,37} Exercise training decreased the dyspnea score to -14.3 points (95% CI = -20 to -8.6, P < .00001). There was a low heterogeneity ($l^2 =$ 17%) between these studies (Figure 6B).

Effect of Exercise Training on HRQoL Questionnaire SF-36 Score

Four studies reported HRQoL Questionnaire SF-36 score (physical health)^{28,30,35,36} and 3 reported the SF-36 score (mental health).^{28,35,36} Although the SF-36 score improved with exercise training (MD = 3 points, 95% CI = 0.81 to 5.2, P = .007), there was no alteration in mental health of patients (MD = 1.9 points, 95% CI = -0.5 to 4.4, P = .12) (Figure 7A and B). No heterogeneity was related to both physical health and mental health ($I^2 = 0\%$) (Figure 7A and B).

Discussion

This review aims to evaluate the effects of exercise training on length of hospital stay, postoperative complications, exercise capacity (6MWD) and HRQoL in patients following resection of NSCLC. Preoperative exercise training may shorten length of hospital stay, decrease postoperative complications, and increase the 6MWD. Although postoperative exercise training also effectively improved the 6MWD and quality of life in surgical patients with NSCLC, the time taken for improvement was longer.

Data from 15 studies (8 RCTs) and 350 patients were included, which is still a small number for a meta-analysis. It comprehensively represents, however, most of the published experience of exercise training in patients with NSCLC prior to and after resection. In a meta-analysis, especially when the outcome is continuous, the number of included studies is more important than the number of patients included.

The outcome is clear as the studies show preoperative exercise training shortens the length of hospital stay and decreases postoperative complications. The results show that preoperative exercise training may shorten length of

Study	Selection	Comparability	Outcome
Sekine 2005	***	***	***
Cesario 2007	***	**	***
Coats 2013	***		$\Delta \Delta$
Jones 2007	***		**
Peddle-McIntyre 2012	***		$\Leftrightarrow \Leftrightarrow \Leftrightarrow$
Reisenberg and Lubbe 2010	***		**
Jones 2008	**		**

Table 2. Bias Assessment of Cohort and Uncontrolled Studies^a.

^aThe Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale Cohort Studies. In the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale, studies are assigned up to 4 stars for selection, 2 for comparability, and 3 for outcome. For uncontrolled studies, the maximum available stars in the Newcastle-Ottawa scale is 3 for selection, 0 for comparability, and 3 for outcome.

A							D.107	
Church and Carbonness	Post-ex	ercise	Pre-0	exercise	e ratal u		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD Tota	al Mean	SD I	otal v	weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Benzo 2011	6.3	3	9 11	6.3	8	6.7%	-4.70 [-9.49, 0.09]	
Morano 2013	7.8	4.8 1	2 12.2	3.6	9	11.9%	-4.40 [-7.99, -0.81]	
Pehlivan 2011	5.4	2.7 3	0 10	3.1	30	69.9%	-4.60 [-6.07, -3.13]	
Skine 2005	21	6.8 2	2 29	9	60	11.6%	-8.00 [-11.64, -4.36]	
Total (95% CI)		7	3		107 1	100.0%	-4.98 [-6.22, -3.74]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.01; Chi ²	= 3.01, d	f= 3 (P = 1	0.39); I ² :	= 0%			
To at fair average li affa ste	7 - 7 07 /5		01)					-10 -5 0 5 10
lest for overall effect:	Z = 7.07 (F	~ 0.000	01)					Favours (experimental) Favours (control)
lest for overall effect:	Z = 7.07 (F	~ 0.000	51)					Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
B	2 = 7.07 (r	~ 0.000						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
B	Z = 7.07 (r Post-ex	ercise	Pre-exe	rcise			Odds Ratio	Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Odds Ratio
B Study or Subgroup	Z = 7.07 (r Post-ex Events	ercise Total	Pre-exe Events	rcise Total	Weig	iht M-H	Odds Ratio I, Random, 95% CI	Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Benzo 2011	Post-ex Events	ercise Total	Pre-exe Events 5	rcise <u>Total</u> 8	Weig 15.2	<u>1ht M-H</u> 2%	Odds Ratio I, Random, 95% Cl 0.30 (0.04, 2.20)	Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Benzo 2011 Morano 2013	Post-ex Events 3	ercise Total 9 12	Pre-exe Events 5 7	rcise <u>Total</u> 8 9	Weig 15.2 12.8	<u>1ht M-H</u> 2% 3%	Odds Ratio I. Random, 95% CI 0.30 [0.04, 2.20] 0.06 [0.01, 0.51]	Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Benzo 2011 Morano 2013 Pehlivan 2011	Post-ex Events 2 2 2	ercise <u>Total</u> 9 12 30	Pre-exe Events 5 7 5	ercise <u>Total</u> 9 30	Weig 15.2 12.8 19.9	<u>aht M-H</u> 2% 3% 3%	Odds Ratio I. Random, 95% CI 0.30 [0.04, 2.20] 0.06 [0.01, 0.51] 0.36 [0.06, 2.01]	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
B Study or Subgroup Benzo 2011 Morano 2013 Pehlivan 2011 Skine 2005	Post-ex <u>Events</u> 2 2 12	ercise <u>Total</u> 9 12 30 22	Pre-exe <u>Events</u> 5 7 5 42	rcise <u>Total</u> 9 30 60	Weig 15.2 12.8 19.9 52.1	<u>aht M-H</u> 2% 3% 3% 1%	Odds Ratio I. Random, 95% Cl 0.30 (0.04, 2.20) 0.06 (0.01, 0.51) 0.36 (0.06, 2.01) 0.51 (0.19, 1.40)	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
B Study or Subgroup Benzo 2011 Morano 2013 Pehlivan 2011 Skine 2005 Total (95% CI)	Post-ex Events 3 2 2 12	ercise <u>Total</u> 9 12 30 22 73	Pre-exe Events 5 7 5 42	rcise <u>Total</u> 8 9 30 60 107	Weig 15.2 12.8 19.9 52.1 100.0	<u>1ht M-H</u> 2% 3% 3% 9% 0%	Odds Ratio <u>I, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.30 [0.04, 2.20] 0.06 [0.01, 0.51] 0.36 [0.06, 2.01] 0.51 [0.19, 1.40] 0.33 [0.15, 0.74]	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
B Study or Subgroup Benzo 2011 Morano 2013 Pehlivan 2011 Skine 2005 Total (95% CI) Total events	Post-ex Events 3 2 12	ercise <u>Total</u> 9 12 30 22 73	Pre-exe <u>Events</u> 5 7 5 42 59	rcise <u>Total</u> 9 30 60 107	Weig 15.2 12.8 19.9 52.1 100.0	<u>uht M-H</u> 2% 3% 3% 1% 0%	Odds Ratio I. Random, 95% Cl 0.30 [0.04, 2.20] 0.06 [0.01, 0.51] 0.38 [0.06, 2.01] 0.51 [0.19, 1.40] 0.33 [0.15, 0.74]	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
B Study or Subgroup Benzo 2011 Morano 2013 Pehlivan 2011 Skine 2005 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	Post-ex <u>Events</u> 3 2 12 19 = 0.05; Chi	ercise <u>Total</u> 9 12 30 22 73 *= 3.23,	Pre-exe <u>Events</u> 5 42 59 df = 3 (P =	rcise <u>Total</u> 9 30 60 107 : 0.36); 1	Weig 15.2 12.8 19.9 52.1 100.0	<u>iht M-H</u> 2% 3% 3% 1% 1%	Odds Ratio <u>I, Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.30 (0.04, 2.20) 0.06 (0.01, 0.51) 0.36 (0.06, 2.01) 0.351 (0.19, 1.40) 0.33 [0.15, 0.74]	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Figure 4. Meta-analysis of length of hospital stay and postoperative complication. (A) Changes of length of hospital stay after exercise training. (B) Changes of postoperative complication. CI, confidence interval(s); IV, inverse variance; SD, standard deviation; M-H, Mueller-Hinton.

hospital stay by -4.98 days. Arbane et al²³ reported that postoperative exercise training may shorten length of hospital stay by -2.1 days. Although more data are warranted, these results further strengthen the fact that preoperative exercise is more effective in shortening the length of hospital stay. Shortened hospital stay after exercise training may be associated with increased exercise capacity, increased muscle strength, reduced fatigue and improved pulmonary function.

The 6MWD was increased to 39.95 m after 4 weeks training (P = .02) in patients with preoperative exercise training, while postoperative exercise training also effectively improved the 6MWD to 62.83 m after 12 weeks training (P < .00001). This is consistent with the study of Cavalheri et al,³⁸ which showed that postoperative exercise

training improves the 6MWD. This meta-analysis demonstrates that both preoperative and postoperative exercise training can increase exercise capacity. These very positive effects on recovery of patients may relate to the improvement of their cardiopulmonary function, leading to an improved exercise tolerance in these patients. Furthermore, our meta-analyses shows that postoperative exercise training was more effective than preoperative exercise training. This may indicate that early postoperative exercise training is more likely to prompt recovery of pulmonary function and motor function in patients than preoperative exercise training.

This review also suggests that exercise training conferred an improved quality of life for patients following lung resection for NSCLC including the EORTC-QLQ-30

A											
	Post-ex	ercise	е	Pre-	exerci	se		Me	an Difference	Mean	Difference
Study or Subgroup M	lean	SD T	fotal	Mean	SD	Total	Weigh	t∎V,	Random, 95% Cl	IV, Ran	idom, 95% Cl
Coats 2013	568 1	101	13	540	98	13	20.59	6 28.0	0 [-48.50, 104.50]		
Jones 2007	478	75	20	438	77	20	54.19	6 40	0.00 [-7.11, 87.11]		+
Morano 2013	475 8	6.5	12	425.5	85.3	12	25.49	6 49.5	0 [-19.23, 118.23]	-	
Total (95% CI)			45			45	100.0	6 39	9.95 [5.31, 74.60]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	00; Chi²	= 0.17	7. df =	2 (P =	0.92);	² = 0%			_	100 10	
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 2.26 (F	^o = 0.02	2)	,						-100 -50	U 5U 1UU
	,		,							Favours (experiment	alj Favours (control)
В		Post-e	exercis	se	Pre	exercis	se		Mean Difference	Me	an Difference
B Study or Subgroup	м	Post-e	exercis SD	se Total	Pre- Mean	exercis SD	se Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	Me IV,	an Difference Fixed, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Arbane 2011	M	Post-e: ean 80.2 1	sercis	se <u>Total</u> 21	Pre- <u>Mean</u> 466.6	exercis SD 102.1	se Total 21	Weight 0.6%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI 13.60 (-50.62, 77.82)	Me IV.	an Difference Fixed, 95% Cl
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Arbane 2011 Cesario 2007a	M 48 39	Post-e: lean 80.2 1 93.4 1	exercis SD 110.1 110.6	se <u>Total</u> 21 25	Pre- <u>Mean</u> 466.6 297.8	exercis SD 102.1 70.7	se Total 21 25	Weight 0.6% 0.9%	Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 13.60 [-50.62, 77.82] 95.60 [44.14, 147.06]	Me 	an Difference Fixed, 95% Cl
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Arbane 2011 Cesario 2007a Granger 2013 Ordello Autober 2014	<u>M</u> 48 39 70	Post-e: lean 80.2 1 93.4 1 05.7	exercis SD 110.1 110.6 65.3	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4	Pre- Mean 466.6 297.8 677	exercis SD 102.1 70.7 89.3	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4	Weight 0.6% 0.9% 0.2%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI 13.60 [-50.62, 77.82] 95.60 [44.14, 147.06] 28.70 [-79.71, 137.11]	Me 	an Difference Fixed, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Arbane 2011 Cesario 2007a Granger 2013 Pedicle-McIntyre 2011 Periceptore and Luther 20	M 48 39 70	Post-e: lean 80.2 1 93.4 1 05.7 538	exercis SD 110.1 110.6 65.3 118	se Total 21 25 4 15	Pre- Mean 466.6 297.8 677 452 222	exercis SD 102.1 70.7 89.3 65	se Total 21 25 4 15	Weight 0.6% 0.9% 0.2% 0.5%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 13.60 [-50.62, 77.82] 95.60 [44.14, 147.06] 28.70 [-79.71, 137.11] 86.00 [17.82, 154.18] 62.00 [0.00 c7.08]	Me 	an Difference Fixed, 95% Cl
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Arbane 2011 Cesario 2007a Granger 2013 Peddle-McIntyre 2011 Reisenberg and Lubbe 20 Stint 2013	M 48 39 70	Post-e: lean 80.2 1 93.4 1 05.7 538 385 567	exercis SD 110.1 110.6 65.3 118 13 78	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4 15 45 23	Pre- Mean 466.6 297.8 677 452 322 524	exercis SD 102.1 70.7 89.3 65 11 81	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4 15 45 23	Weight 0.6% 0.9% 0.2% 0.5% 96.7%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI 13.60 [-50.62, 77.82] 95.60 [44.14, 147.06] 28.70 [-79.71, 137.11] 86.00 [17.82, 154.18] 63.00 [58.02, 67.98] 43.00 [-2.98, 88.96]	Me 	an Difference Fixed, 95% Cl
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Arbane 2011 Cesario 2007a Granger 2013 Peddle-McIntyre 2011 Reisenberg and Lubbe 20 Stigt 2013	M 48 39 70	Post-e: lean 80.2 1 93.4 1 05.7 538 385 567	sxercis SD 110.1 110.6 65.3 118 13 78	se Total 21 25 4 15 45 23	Pre- Mean 466.6 297.8 677 452 322 524	exercis SD 102.1 70.7 89.3 65 11 81	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4 15 45 23	Weight 0.6% 0.9% 0.2% 0.5% 96.7% 1.1%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI 13.60 [-50.62, 77.82] 95.60 [44.14, 147.06] 28.70 [-79.71, 137.11] 86.00 [17.82, 154.18] 63.00 [58.02, 67.98] 43.00 [-2.96, 88.96]	Me 	an Difference Fixed, 95% Cl
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Arbane 2011 Cesario 2007a Granger 2013 Peddle-McIntyre 2011 Reisenberg and Lubbe 20 Stigt 2013 Total (95% CI)	M 48 39 70	Post-e: lean 80.2 1 93.4 1 05.7 538 385 567	sxercis SD 110.1 110.6 65.3 118 13 78	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4 15 45 23 133	Pre- Mean 466.6 297.8 677 452 322 524	exercis SD 102.1 70.7 89.3 65 11 81	se Total 21 25 4 15 45 23 133	Weight 0.6% 0.9% 0.2% 0.5% 96.7% 1.1% 100.0%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI 13.60 [-50.62, 77.82] 95.60 [44.14, 147.06] 28.70 [-79.71, 137.11] 86.00 [17.82, 154.18] 63.00 [58.02, 67.98] 43.00 [-2.96, 88.96] 62.83 [57.94, 67.72]	Me IV.	An Difference Fixed, 95% Cl
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Arbane 2011 Cesario 2007a Granger 2013 Peddle-McIntyre 2011 Reisenberg and Lubbe 20 Stigt 2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^z = 5.36	M 48 39 70 110 , df = 5 (f	Post-e: lean 80.2 1 93.4 1 05.7 538 385 567 P = 0.33	exercis <u>SD</u> 110.1 110.6 65.3 118 13 78 7); J ² =	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4 15 23 133 7%	Pre- Mean 466.6 297.8 677 452 322 524	exercis SD 102.1 70.7 89.3 65 11 81	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4 15 45 23 133	Weight 0.6% 0.9% 0.2% 0.5% 96.7% 1.1% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 13.60 [-50.62, 77.82] 95.60 [44.14, 147.06] 28.70 [-79.71, 21.71.1] 86.00 [17, 82, 154.18] 63.00 [58.02, 67.98] 43.00 [-2.96, 88.96] 62.83 [57.94, 67.72]		an Difference Fixed, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Arbane 2011 Cesario 2007a Granger 2013 Peddle-McIntyre 2011 Reisenberg and Lubbe 20 Stigt 2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.36, Test for overall effect Z= 2	M 48 30 70 110 , df = 5 (f 25.17 (P	Post-e: lean 80.2 1 93.4 1 05.7 538 385 567 P = 0.33 < 0.000	exercis <u>SD</u> 110.1 110.6 65.3 118 13 78 77); I² = 001)	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4 15 45 23 133 7%	Pre- Mean 466.6 297.8 677 452 322 524	exercis SD 102.1 70.7 89.3 65 11 81	se <u>Total</u> 21 25 4 15 45 23 133	Weight 0.6% 0.9% 0.2% 0.5% 96.7% 1.1% 100.0%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI 13.80 [-50.82, 77.82] 95.60 [44.14, 147.06] 28.70 [-79.71, 137.11] 86.00 [17.82, 154.18] 63.00 [58.02, 67.98] 43.00 [-2.96, 88.96] 62.83 [57.94, 67.72]	Me 	an Difference Fixed, 95% Cl

Figure 5. Meta-analysis of 6-minute walk distance (6WMD). It shows the changes of 6MWD stratified by follow-up time after exercise training. A demonstrates shows the changes of 6WMD in preoperative exercise training patients. B shows the changes of 6WMD in postoperative exercise training patients. CI, confidence interval; IV, inverse variance; SD, standard deviation.



Figure 6. Meta-analysis of Quality of Life Questionnaire. (A) Changes of EORTC-QLQ-30 in global health. (B) Changes of EORTC-QLQ-30 in dyspnea score. Cl, confidence interval; IV, inverse variance; SD, standard deviation.

and the SF-36 scores. On the EORTC-QLQ-30, global health was no different after exercise, but the dyspnea score was lower (MD = -14.3 points, 95% CI = -20 to -8.6, P < .00001) after exercise. This demonstrates that exercise training improved dyspnea in postoperative patients. It is known that resistance training can increase peak oxygen

uptake, especially in severely deconditioned adults.³⁹ Hagerman et al⁴⁰ showed that cancer patients' regained muscle mass, improved their performance of daily life activities, reduced cancer-related fatigue and improved HRQoL after whole-body resistance training. One of the possible reasons perhaps is that exercise training decreased



Figure 7. Meta-analysis of Quality of Life Questionnaire. (A) Changes of SF-36 score in physical health. (B) Changes of SF-36 score in mental health. CI, confidence interval; IV, inverse variance; SD, standard deviation.

the dyspnea score. The SF-36 score showed an improved physical health but had no effective in mental health of patients undergoing lung resection after exercise training. This outcome is different from that of Cavalheri et al.⁴ They suggest that exercise training had little effect on HRQoL for people following lung resection for NSCLC. The article by Cavalheri et al³⁸ reviewed 3 studies measuring the HRQoL. One used the EORTC-QLQ-C30 (Arbane et al²³), one used the St George's Respiratory Questionnaire (Stigt et al^{29}), and one used the SF-36 (Brocki et al^{41}). HRQoL in our article used the same measured parameter. The increased HRQol following exercise training may be related to increased muscle strength, reduced fatigue, and improved daily life activities. We recommend that future RCTs use equal measurement parameters in the relevant patient population.

Some of the included studies exposed some methodological flaws, thereby introducing high risk of biases into these trials, that is, some trials failed to blind research subjects, intervention delivery, and outcome assessors and some trials included insufficient sample sizes, which meant there was a potential risk of overestimating positive outcomes. Despite the difficulties, studies should blind the outcome assessors to minimize potential methodological biases. Therefore, the reliability of the evidence presented here is clearly limited.

Additionally, there were some other limitations to be considered when interpreting the results of this meta-analysis. First, there were not enough randomized controlled trials providing sufficient data on 6MWD and HRQoL. Second, inclusion was restricted to published studies and may therefore be affected by publication bias. Third, the follow-up rate was quite limited in many of the included studies. Most studies were short-term follow-ups of less than 3 months. Fourth, the exercise training programs was similar. However, the duration, intensity, frequency, and modality of exercise training varied between trials. The generalizability of our findings may therefore be limited. To improve generalizability, future exercise intervention trials should include larger, long-term, multicenter randomized controlled exercise training studies, which should include more data of quadriceps strength, forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV₁), and so on. Few of the included studies reported the actual level of exercise training undertaken by participants.

Conclusion

Preoperative exercise training may shorten length of hospital stay, decrease postoperative complications, and increase the 6WMD while postoperative exercise training effectively improves 6MWD and improves HRQoL in surgical patients with NSCLC. Larger RCTs with long-term follow-up are needed to confirm the sustained efficacy and safety of exercise training in such a patient population.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This work was supported by the Program of Shanghai Municipal Commission of Health and Family Planning (20144Y0196), Shanghai Natural Science Foundation (15ZR1434400), and Program of National Natural Science Foundation of China (81500040).

References

- 1. Sugimura H, Nichols FC, Yang P, et al. Survival after recurrent non-small-cell lung cancer after complete pulmonary resection. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2007;83:409-417.
- Ferlay J, Shin HR, Bray F, Forman D, Mathers C, Parkin DM. Estimates of worldwide burden of cancer in 2008: GLOBOCAN 2008. *Int J Cancer*. 2010;127:2893-2917.
- Araujo LH, Lammers PE, Matthews-Smith V, et al. Somatic mutation spectrum of non-small cell lung cancer in African Americans: a pooled analysis. *J Thorac Oncol.* 2015;10: 1430-1436.
- Farley A, Aveyard P, Kerr A, Naidu B, Dowswell G. Surgical lung cancer patients' views about smoking and support to quit after diagnosis: a qualitative study. *J Cancer Surviv*. 2016;10:312-319
- 5. Ferguson MK. Preoperative assessment of pulmonary risk. *Chest.* 1999;115:58-63.
- Sherwood JT, Brock MV. Lung cancer: new surgical approaches. *Respirology*. 2007;12:326-332.
- Takaoka ST. The value of preoperative pulmonary rehabilitation. *Thorac Surg Clin*. 2005;15:203-211.
- Reeve J, Stiller K, Nicol K, et al. A postoperative shoulder exercise program improves function and decreases pain following open thoracotomy: a randomised trial. *J Physiother*. 2010;56:245-252.
- 9. Jones L, Eves N, Peterson B, et al. Safety and feasibility of aerobic training on cardiopulmonary function and quality of life in postsurgical non–small cell lung cancer patients: a pilot study. *Cancer*. 2008;113:3430-3439.
- Riesenberg H, Lubbe A. In-patient rehabilitation of lung cancer patients—a prospective study. *Support Care Cancer*. 2010;18:877-882.
- Spruit M, Janssen P, Willemsen S, Hochstenbag M, Wouters E. Exercise capacity before and after an 8-week multidisciplinary inpatient rehabilitation program in lung cancer patients: a pilot study. *Lung Cancer*. 2006;52:257-260.
- Cesario A, Ferri L, Galetta D, et al. Post-operative respiratory rehabilitation after lung resection for non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer*. 2007;57:175-180.
- Puhan MA, Chandra D, Mosenifar Z, et al. The minimal important difference of exercise tests in severe COPD. *Eur Respir J.* 2011;37:784-790.
- Lacasse Y, Goldstein R, Lasserson TJ, Martin S. Pulmonary rehabilitation for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2006;18:CD003793.
- Reeve J, Denehy L, Stiller K. The physiotherapy management of patients undergoing thoracic surgery: a survey of current practice in Australia and New Zealand. *Physiother Res Int.* 2007;12:59-71.

- Granger CL, McDonald CF, Berney S, Chao C, Denehy L. Exercise intervention to improve exercise capacity and healthrelated quality of life for patients with non–small cell lung cancer: a systematic review. *Lung Cancer*. 2011;72:139-153.
- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *The Diagnosis and Treatment of Lung Cancer (Update)*. London, England: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence; 2013. http://guidance.nice.org.uk/CG121/ Guidance. Accessed December 6, 2013.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* 2009;6:e1000097.
- Aaronson NK, Ahmedzai S, Bergman B, et al. The European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30: a quality-of-life instrument for use in international clinical trials in oncology. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1993;85:365-376.
- Ware JE Jr, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care*. 1992;30:473-483.
- Higgins JPT, Green, S, eds. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. http://handbook.cochrane.org/. Accessed June 20, 2015.
- Zeng Y, Luo T, Finnegan-John J, Cheng AS. Meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of acupuncture for cancer-related fatigue. *Integr Cancer Ther*. 2013;13:193-200.
- Arbane G, Tropman D, Jackson D, Garrod R. Evaluation of an early exercise intervention after thoracotomy for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), effects on quality of life, muscle strength and exercise tolerance: randomized controlled trial. *Lung Cancer*. 2011;71:229-234.
- Arbane G, Douiri A, Hart N, et al. Effect of postoperative physical training on activity after curative surgery for nonsmall cell lung cancer: a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Physiotherapy*. 2014;100:100-107.
- 25. Benzo R, Wigle D, Novotny P, et al. Preoperative pulmonary rehabilitation before lung cancer resection: results from two randomized studies. *Lung Cancer*. 2011;74:441-445.
- Morano MT, Araújo AS, Nascimento FB, et al. Preoperative pulmonary rehabilitation versus chest physical therapy in patients undergoing lung cancer resection: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2013;94:53-58.
- 27. Pehlivan E, Turna A, Gurses A, Gurses HN. The effects of preoperative short term intense physical therapy in lung cancer patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Ann Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2011;17:461-468.
- Granger CL, Chao C, McDonald CF, Berney S, Denehy L. Safety and feasibility of an exercise intervention for patients following lung resection: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Integr Cancer Ther.* 2013;12:213-224.
- Stigt JA, Uil SM, van Riesen SJ, et al. A randomized controlled trial of post-thoracotomy pulmonary rehabilitation in patients with resectable lung cancer. *J Thorac Oncol.* 2013;8:214-221.
- Edvardsen E, Skjønsberg OH, Holme I, Nordsletten L, Borchsenius F, Anderssen SA. High-intensity training following lung cancer surgery: a randomised controlled trial. *Thorax*. 2015;70:244-250.

73

- Cesario A, Ferri L, Galetta D, et al. Post-operative respiratory rehabilitation after lung resection for non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer*. 2007;57:175-180.
- 32. Sekine Y, Chiyo M, Iwata T, et al. Perioperative rehabilitation and physiotherapy for lung cancer patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Jpn J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2005;53:237-243.
- Coats V, Maltais F, Simard S, et al. Feasibility and effectiveness of a home-based exercise training program before lung resection surgery. *Can Respir J.* 2013;20:e10-e16.
- 34. Jones LW, Peddle CJ, Eves ND, et al. Effects of presurgical exercise training on cardiorespiratory fitness among patients undergoing thoracic surgery for malignant lung lesions. *Cancer*. 2007;110:590-598.
- 35. Jones LW, Eves ND, Peterson BL, et al. Safety and feasibility of aerobic training on cardiopulmonary function and quality of life in postsurgical nonsmall cell lung cancer patients. *Cancer*. 2008;113:3430-3439.
- Peddle-McIntyre CJ, Bell G, Fenton D, McCargar L, Courneya KS. Feasibility and preliminary efficacy of progressive

resistance exercise training in lung cancer survivors. *Lung Cancer*. 2012;75:126-132.

- Riesenberg H, Lübbe AS. In-patient rehabilitation of lung cancer patients—a prospective study. *Support Care Cancer*. 2010;18:877-882.
- Cavalheri V, Tahirah F, Nonoyama M, Jenkins S, Hill K. Exercise training for people following lung resection for non-small cell lung cancer—a Cochrane Systematic review. *Cancer Treat Rev.* 2014;40:585-594.
- Strasser B, Steindorf K, Wiskemann J, et al. Impact of resistance training in cancer survivors: a meta-analysis. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2013;45:2080-2090.
- Hagerman FC, Walsh SJ, Staron RS, et al. Effects of highintensity resistance training on untrained older men. I. Strength, cardiovascular, and metabolic responses. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2000;55:B336-B346.
- Brocki B, Rodkjær L, Nekrasas V, Due K, Dethlefsen C, Andreasen J. Rehabilitation after lung cancer operation; a randomised controlled study [abstract]. *Ann ERS Annu Congress*. 2010;331s.