



Effects of Postoperative Pulmonary Tele-Rehab in Elderly Lung Cancer: A Randomized Controlled Trial



Jae Sik Seo1, Tae Woong Yang1, Cho Hui Hong2, Sungchul Huh3, Ra Yu Yun3, Jonggeun Lee4, Jeong Su Cho4, Myung Jun Shin5, Yong Beom Shin5, Sang Hun Kim1

1 Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Biomedical Research Institute, Pusan National University Hospital

2 Department of Physical Therapy, Graduate School, Kyungsung University, Biomedical Research Institute, Pusan National University Hospital

3 Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Pusan National University Yangsan Hospital

4 Department of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Biomedical Research Institute, Pusan National University Hospital,

Pusan National University School of Medicine

5 Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Biomedical Research Institute, Pusan National University Hospital, Pusan National University School of Medicine

Introduction

In previous studies on postoperative rehabilitation, exercise intervention was performed for 3 to 8 weeks after surgery, and significant improvements in exercise capacity and quality of life were confirmed. However, due to the long intervention period, outpatient supervised training has limitations that make it difficult to prescribe it in clinical practice. Therefore, in this study, we aim to examine effects of postoperative pulmonary tele-rehabilitation (PTR) using a well-known mobile instant messenger in elderly with lung cancer.

Participants and Methods

In the study, ambulatory participants aged 65 years or older who were diagnosed with lung cancer and were scheduled to undergo VATS were recruited. Eligible subjects were randomly assigned to the intervention group (IG) and control group (CG) in equal proportions. Participants in the IG utilized a mobile instant messenger (KakaoTalk) and phones for PTR three times a week for four weeks. The CG received only education on the home-based PR program on the second and third visit. Both groups maintained their exercise routine at least three times a week during a four-week follow-up period.

Results

Table 1 displayed comparable clinical variables between groups, with no statistically significant differences observed. Table 2 and 3 illustrated notable improvements in VO2peak and VO2peak% predicted within the Intervention Group (IG), with increases of 3.34 ml/kg/min and 13.81%, respectively, compared to the Control Group (CG). These enhancements were sustained after the four-weeks follow up period, with VO2peak registering at 3.84 ml/kg/min and 12.66% above than CG. In the within group comparison, significant improvement in the VO2peak was confirmed in the IG, but no significant difference was confirmed in the CG. In the comparison between groups, the IG exhibited a noteworthy decrease of 1.54 points in the EQ-5D index score during the intervention, which mean that healthrelated quality of life has increased, while other variables remained unchanged. In the within-group comparison, significant improvements in lung function parameters (Forced expiratory volume in one second, Forced vital capacity, Peak expiratory flow) over time, with EQ-VAS scores consistently enhanced in the IG.

Table 1. Pre-surge	ery characteristics
--------------------	---------------------

Variables		(n=64)	(n=29)	(n=35)	value	value
Sex	Male	36 (56.2)	15 (51.7)	21 (60.0)	0.681	0.615
Age, years		71.91 (4.69)	71.59 (4.52)	72.17 (4.87)	0.623	0.626
BMI, kg/m ²		24.18 (3.12)	24.39 (2.59)	24.00 (3.52)	0.621	0.325
FVC, % predicted		78.70 (11.85)	78.24 (12.08)	79.11 (11.83)	0.774	0.756
FEV1, % predicted		87.07 (14.72)	86.30 (15.87)	87.76 (13.83)	0.700	0.838
COPD		10 (15.6)	5 (17.2)	5 (14.3)	1.000	1.000
Heart diseases		9 (14.3)	7 (24.1)	2 (5.9)	0.089	0.068
Diabetes		18 (28.1)	10 (34.5)	8 (22.9)	0.453	0.404
Hypertension		33 (51.6)	18 (62.1)	15 (42.9)	0.201	0.141
mMRC (0-4)		0.83 (0.61)	0.83 (0.60)	0.83 (0.62)	0.995	0.910
Resection	Lobectomy	57 (89.1)	26 (89.7)	31 (88.6)	0.962	1.000
	Wedge resection	5 (7.8)	2 (6.9)	3 (8.6)		
	Segmentectomy	2 (3.1)	1 (3.4)	1 (2.9)		
Histologic type	Adenocarcinoma	52 (81.2)	23 (79.3)	29 (82.8)	0.569	0.654
	Squamous cell carcinoma	5 (7.8)	2 (6.9)	3 (8.6)		
	Others	7 (11.0)	4 (13.8)	3 (8.6)		
TNM_stage	 	39 (60.9)	20 (69.0)	19 (54.3)	0.475	0.566
		13 (20.3)	4 (13.8)	9 (25.7)		
	Unknown	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)		
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy		1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)	1.000	1.000
Adjuvant chemotherapy		17 (26.6)	7 (24.1)	10 (28.6)	0.908	0.780
Adjuvant radiotherapy		4 (6.2)	1 (3.4)	3 (8.6)	0.746	0.620

 Table 2. Between-group differences in outcome measures

⁺ Independent t-test or Chi-squared test ⁺ Wilcoxon rank-sum test or Fisher's exact test

Values are presented as mean ± SD or numbers (%). BMI, body mass index; CG, control group; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; FEV1, forced expiratory volume in 1 second; FVC, forced vital capacity; IG, intervention group; FEV1, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; mMRC, Modified Medical Research Council dyspnea scale.

Table 3. Within-group changes in outcome measures in the IG and CG

		IG	-CG		IG		CG		
Variable		End rehabilitation (post-surgery 8 weeks-	12 weeks from baseline (post-surgery 12 weeks– 4 weeks)	Variable	End of rehabilitation (p ost-surgery 8 weeks–4 weeks)	12 weeks from baseline (post-surgery 12 weeks -4 weeks)	End of rehabilitation (post-surgery 8 week s-4 weeks)	12 weeks from baselin e (post-surgery, 12 we eks–4 weeks)	
					n=26	n=25	n=33	n=28	
				VO _{2peak} , mL/kg/min	2.53 (1.388, 3.679)*	2.72 (1.422, 4.015)*	-0.81 (-1.817, 0.203)	-1.12 (-2.273, 0.037)	
VO _{2peak} , mL/kg/min		3.34 (1.847, 4.835)*	3.84 (2.142, 5.531)*	VO _{2peak} , % predicted	10.96 (5.595, 16.328)*	10.2 (5.252, 15.148)*	-2.85 (-7.676, 1.979)	-2.46 (-7.848, 2.92)	
VO _{2peak} , % predicted		13.81 (6.75, 20.87)*	12.66 (5.529, 19.8)*	VE/VCO ₂ Slope	4 (1.064, 6.945)*	-0.05 (-2.531, 2.436)	0.59 (-2.987, 4.175)	1.38 (-1.441, 4.191)	
VE/VCO ₂ Slope		3.41 (-1.116, 7.937)	-1.42 (-5.07, 2.225)	FEV1, L	0.14 (0.071, 0.213)*	0.19 (0.092, 0.284)*	0.11 (0.061, 0.164)*	0.15 (0.066, 0.234)*	
FEV1, L		0.03 (-0.057, 0.115)	0.04 (-0.086, 0.162)	FEV1, % predicted	8.36 (3.286, 13.43)*	10.23 (4.197, 16.254)*	3.53 (1.14, 5.912)*	4.71 (1.127, 8.285)*	
FEV1, % predicted		4.83 (-0.688, 10.352)	5.52 (-1.356, 12.395)	FVC, L	0.17 (0.085, 0.247)*	0.25 (0.133, 0.37)*	0.18 (0.104, 0.259)*	0.23 (0.127, 0.326)*	
FVC, L		-0.02 (-0.125, 0.093)	0.03 (-0.126, 0.176)	FVC % predicted	6 77 (2 789 10 744)*	9 24 (3 787 14 685)*	4 11 (1 693 6 522)*	4 01 (0 821 7 197)*	
FVC, % predicted		2.66 (-1.902, 7.219)	5.23 (-0.966, 11.42)		0.77 (2.705, 10.744)	J.L.H (J.101, 14.003)	H.I.I. (1.000, 0.022)	H.OT (0.021, 1.131)	
PEF, L/min		-13.24 (-49.817, 23.32 7)	4.62 (-19.191, 28.431)	PEF, L/min	14.17 (-14.844, 43.18)	28.72 (12.403, 45.037)*	27.41 (3.796, 51.03)*	24.1 (6.011, 42.189)*	
MIP, cmH ₂ O		-3.13 (-11.66, 5.405)	2.53 (-7.317, 12.369)	MIP, cmH ₂ O	5.22 (-2.212, 12.647)	7.91 (0.415, 15.411)*	8.34 (3.8, 12.889)*	5.39 (-1.362, 12.136)	
MIP, % predicted		-1.99 (-15.753, 11.772)	6.5 (-7.796, 20.795)	MIP, % predicted	9.46 (-2.778, 21.697)	12.96 (1.426, 24.495)*	11.45 (4.598, 18.302)*	6.46 (-2.548, 15.47)	
Grip strength, kg		-0.45 (-2.038, 1.145)	-0.56 (-2.429, 1.312)	Grip strength, kg	-0.31 (-1.554, 0.929)	-0.73 (-2.297, 0.832)	0.13 (-0.919, 1.187)	-0.17 (-1.269, 0.922)	
BMI, kg/m ²		-0.03 (-0.86, 0.81)	0.35 (-0.468, 1.174)	BMI, kg/m ²	-0.16 (-0.888, 0.559)	0.27 (-0.295, 0.838)	-0.14 (-0.586, 0.308)	-0.08 (-0.702, 0.539)	
SMI, kg/m²		-0.07 (-0.348, 0.209)	0 (-0.148, 0.144)	SMI, kg/m ²	0.06 (-0.172, 0.3)	0.1 (-0.012, 0.22)	0.13 (-0.025, 0.291)	0.11 (0.013, 0.2)*	
Whole body phase angle,	degree	0.14 (-0.056, 0.334)	0.1 (-0.123, 0.321)	angle, degree	0.04 (-0.088, 0.16)	-0.02 (-0.174, 0.134)	-0.1 (-0.258, 0.052)	-0.12 (-0.285, 0.048)	
HADS	Anxiety, points	-0.98 (-2.818, 0.853)	-0.83 (-2.367, 0.708)	HADS Anxiety, points	-0.35 (-1.835, 1.143)	-0.92 (-2.23, 0.384)	0.64 (-0.502, 1.774)	-0.09 (-0.959, 0.772)	
	Depression, points	-0.48 (-2.292, 1.334)	0.12 (-1.829, 2.065)	HADS Depression points	-1.12 (-2.435, 0.204)	-1.04 (-2.548, 0.471)	-0.64 (-1.939, 0.666)	-1.16 (-2.455, 0.142)	
EQ-5D	Index, points	-1.54 (-2.972, -0.1)*	-2.6 (-6.463, 1.266)	EQ-5D	-1.38 (-2.578, -0.191)*				
	VAS, points	0.98 (-7.134, 9.099)	0.17 (-8.668, 9)	Index, points		-1.19 (-2.38, -0.005)	0.15 (-0.099, 1.002)	1.41 (-2.302, 3.115)	
Data are presented as mean difference (95% CI). *P<.05.		VAS, points	6.35 (0.259, 12.433)*	7.88 (0.655, 15.114)*	5.36 (-0.278, 11.005)	7.72 (2.323, 13.114)*			
BIVE DOOV MASS INDEX' ((1 CONTROL AROUD' E()-		OUESHODDAIRE FEVI TORCED						

mass much, CO, Control group, LQ-JD, Laroqui J-aimension questionnalle, expiratory volume in 1 second; FVC, forced vital capacity; HADS, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; IG, intervention group; MIP, maximal inspiratory pressure; PEF, peak expiratory flow; SMI, skeletal muscle index; VAS, visual analog scale; VE/VCO2, minute ventilation/carbon dioxide production; VO2peak, peak oxygen consumption.

Data are presented as mean difference (95% CI). * P within group changes <.05.

CG, control group; EQ-5D, EuroQol 5-dimension questionnaire; FEV1, forced expiratory volume in 1 second; FVC, forced vital capacity; HADS, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; IG, intervention group; MIP, maximal inspiratory pressure; PEF, peak expiratory flow; SMI, skeletal muscle index; VAS, visual analog scale; VE/VCO2, minute ventilation/carbon dioxide production; VO2peak, peak oxygen consumption.

Conclusion

The main finding of this randomized controlled trial was that **mobile messenger-based PTR significantly improved VO2peak in elderly lung cancer patients after surgery**, the effect was maintained 4 weeks later, and also improved quality of life. These findings mean that PTR is a key treatment strategy that is fully feasible even for elderly lung cancer patients.

