Journal of Health and Education

Effectiveness of Telerehabilitation in Non-Operative Cancer Patient

Fahad Aziz, Physiatrix Clinics, Lahore

Faryal Safdar, Superior University, Lahore

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 10 November 2023
Revised 11 February 2024
Accepted 12 March 2024

Abstract

Background: People with non-operative cancer patient can be treated by tele rehabilitation. Tele rehabilitation can be done remotely, which means that patients don't have to travel to a clinic or hospital for their rehabilitation sessions. This can be especially helpful for patients who live in rural or remote areas, or who have mobility issues Additionally, tele rehabilitation can be more flexible than traditional in-person rehabilitation, as patients can often schedule sessions at times that are convenient for them

Objective: The objective of tele rehabilitation for non-operative cancer patients is to help them regain their strength, mobility, and quality of life after cancer treatments. It can also help to reduce pain and other symptoms associated with cancer and its treatments. By providing rehabilitation services remotely, tele rehabilitation can make it easier for patients to receive the care they need, which can improve their overall health outcomes.

Methodology: 10 patients were entered in the trial and were given treatment through the zoom video calling. A feasible case study with a matched historical comparison group was performed. Feasibility outcomes included willingness and adherence to participate, refusal rate, treatment duration, occurrence of adverse events, and patient satisfaction. Secondary outcome measures were measurements of musculoskeletal and cardiovascular functions and activities according to the domains of the International Classification of Functioning, disability and health.

Results: In present study, specific approach, named as tele rehabilitation was used for treatment of cancer and we assessed tele rehabilitation for patients with cancer .Our study can be used for patients with different types of cancer that can improve functional capacity ,cognitive functioning ,quality of life reduce of pain and hospital length of stay improvement of fatigue ,physical well being ,emotional well being .Through tele rehabilitation we improve quality of life and decrease mortality rate.

Conclusion: In present study, specific approach, named as tele rehabilitation was used for the treatment of cancer and we assessed the Tele rehabilitation, for patients with cancer. This study can be used for patients with different types of cancer that can improve functional capacity, cognitive functioning, quality of life reduce of pain and hospital length of stay improvement of fatigue, physical well-being, emotional well-being.

Key words:
Tele rehabilitation, non operative cancer patient, pain numeric scale, Borg RPE scale..

INTRODUCTION

Cancer, often referred to as the "emperor of all maladies," encompasses a wide array of conditions characterized by uncontrolled cell growth that can invade surrounding tissues and metastasize to distant organs. This complexity makes cancer not merely a singular disease but a multifaceted health challenge that significantly impacts individuals and societies globally. Despite advancements in medical science, cancer remains one of the leading causes of mortality worldwide, with profound implications for physical health, emotional stability, and social dynamics (Queen et al., 2016; Ligibel et al., 2011). The journey through cancer treatment is often marked by significant physical pain, emotional turmoil, and psychological distress, particularly for non-operative cancer patients, who represent a unique demographic within the cancer population.

Non-operative cancer patients are those who either cannot undergo surgical intervention due to the advanced stage of their disease, underlying health conditions, or personal choices against surgical options. For these patients, treatment modalities such as chemotherapy, radiation therapy, immunotherapy, and palliative care become critical. However, while these treatments aim to manage the disease and alleviate symptoms, they frequently fall short of addressing the broader implications of cancer on patients' functional and psychological well-being (McDonald et al., 2019; Delrieu et al., 2020). Research indicates that non-operative cancer patients often experience a progressive decline in physical activity levels, which exacerbates symptoms like fatigue, pain, and emotional distress, creating a vicious cycle of inactivity and deterioration that significantly undermines their quality of life (Chang & Yi, 2018; Queen et al., 2016).

Physical activity is a fundamental component of health and well-being, yet it is often one of the first casualties following a cancer diagnosis. The physical burden of the disease, combined with the side effects of treatments such as chemotherapy and radiation, can leave patients feeling weak, fatigued, and unable to engage in even basic daily activities. Non-operative cancer patients are particularly vulnerable to these challenges, as their treatment plans may not include aggressive interventions aimed at halting disease progression, leading to a gradual but significant loss of physical function (Cho et al., 2021; Jeon et al., 2013). This decline in physical activity not only affects their physical health but also their mental and emotional states, as feelings of helplessness and loss of independence become increasingly pronounced (Palesh et al., 2018; Tarachandani et al., 2023).

Quality of life (QoL) is a multidimensional construct that encompasses physical, emotional, and social well-being. For cancer patients, QoL is often severely compromised by the disease and its treatment. Physical symptoms such as pain, fatigue, and weakness are frequently compounded by psychological challenges, including anxiety, depression, and feelings of isolation (Caetano et al., 2020; Misiąg et al., 2022). Socially, patients may find themselves unable to participate in family activities, work, or hobbies, further contributing to a sense of detachment and loss. Non-operative cancer patients face these challenges acutely, as their prognosis often carries an additional psychological burden of limited treatment options and uncertainty about the future (Ramasubbu et al., 2020; Hardikar et al., 2015). Addressing these quality-of-life issues necessitates a holistic approach that transcends medical treatment to include supportive care and rehabilitation.

Physical therapy has emerged as a promising intervention to address the physical and psychological challenges faced by cancer patients. It offers a structured and individualized approach to rehabilitation, aiming to restore and enhance physical function, reduce pain, and improve overall well-being (Paolucci et al., 2019; Ture et al., 2015). For non-operative cancer patients, physical therapy can be particularly beneficial, as it provides a means to counteract the effects of inactivity and disease progression. By focusing on exercises that improve mobility, strength, and endurance, physical therapy helps patients regain a sense of control over their bodies and lives (Makluf et al., 2018; Lowe et al., 2016). Furthermore, the psychological benefits of physical therapy, such as reduced anxiety, improved mood, and enhanced self-efficacy, are equally significant, contributing to a better quality of life (Jung et al., 2019; Ubago-Guisado et al., 2019).

Despite its potential, the role of physical therapy in the care of non-operative cancer patients has been underexplored. While there is a growing body of evidence supporting the benefits of physical activity and rehabilitation in cancer care, much of this research has focused on post-operative patients or those undergoing active treatment (Park et al., 2017; Hong & Park, 2021). Non-operative patients, who may not fit neatly into these categories, are often overlooked in research and practice. This gap in the literature and care delivery highlights the need for studies that specifically address the unique needs of this population (Mok et al., 2019; Granger et al., 2018).

The integration of physical therapy into oncology care is not without its challenges. Barriers such as limited access to rehabilitation services, lack of awareness among patients and healthcare providers, and the financial burden of additional treatments often prevent patients from receiving the care they need (Yang et al., 2020). For non-operative cancer patients, these barriers are further compounded by the perception that rehabilitation may not be relevant or effective for their condition. Addressing these misconceptions and advocating for the inclusion of physical therapy in cancer care plans is essential to ensure that all patients have access to comprehensive, holistic care.

This study aims to address the gap in understanding the role of physical therapy for non-operative cancer patients. By focusing on a population often neglected in cancer research and care, this study seeks to shed light on how physical therapy can improve physical activity levels and quality of life in this group. The research is grounded in the understanding that cancer care should be patient-centered, addressing not only the disease itself but also the broader impact on the individual's life.

Conducted at Jinnah Hospital Lahore, this study evaluates the outcomes of an eight-week physical therapy program tailored to the needs of non-operative cancer patients. Through a combination of mobility exercises, strength training, and pain management techniques, the program aims to help patients regain physical function, reduce pain, and improve their overall quality of life. The findings of this study contribute to the growing recognition of rehabilitation as a critical component of oncology care and highlight the need for a more inclusive approach to cancer treatment that addresses the unique challenges of non-operative patients.

In conclusion, non-operative cancer patients face a unique set of challenges that significantly impact their physical activity levels and quality of life. While these challenges are well-documented, the role of physical therapy in addressing them remains underexplored. By focusing on this underserved population, this study aims to provide valuable insights into how physical therapy can be effectively integrated into cancer care plans, offering a pathway to improved outcomes and enhanced quality of life for non-operative cancer patients.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The role of physical activity and rehabilitation in cancer care has gained significant attention in recent years, yet its application to non-operative cancer patients remains underexplored. Much of the existing research has centered on post-operative patients, those undergoing active treatments such as chemotherapy or radiation, or survivors in the post-treatment phase. Non-operative cancer patients, who often face different trajectories of disease progression and quality-of-life challenges, represent a population that warrants distinct consideration. This review synthesizes available literature on the intersections of physical activity, quality of life, and physical therapy in oncology care, emphasizing the unique implications for non-operative cancer patients.

A growing body of evidence underscores the importance of physical activity in cancer care. Numerous studies have demonstrated that regular physical activity can alleviate common cancer-related symptoms, such as fatigue, pain, and depression, while improving physical function, mood, and overall well-being. For example, Courneya et al. (2019) found that exercise interventions significantly reduced fatigue in patients undergoing cancer treatment, with moderate-to-vigorous physical activity showing the greatest benefits. Similarly, a meta-analysis by Fong et al. (2021) highlighted the role of structured exercise programs in improving cardiovascular fitness and muscular strength among cancer patients, thereby enhancing their ability to perform daily activities.

However, the literature on physical activity predominantly focuses on patients who are actively undergoing or have completed treatment. For non-operative cancer patients, the application of these findings is less clear. Unlike their counterparts who may benefit from surgery or aggressive treatment regimens, non-operative patients often face progressive functional decline and are less likely to be enrolled in exercise programs. As a result, they may not experience the same benefits of physical activity, highlighting a critical gap in the research.

Quality of life (QoL) is a multidimensional construct encompassing physical, emotional, and social domains. Cancer and its treatments significantly affect these domains, with physical symptoms such as pain and fatigue compounding psychological distress and social isolation. A systematic review by Horneber et al. (2020) identified fatigue as the most frequently reported symptom affecting QoL in cancer patients, followed closely by pain and sleep disturbances. Emotional challenges, including anxiety and depression, were also prevalent, particularly among patients with advanced or non-curable cancers.

For non-operative cancer patients, QoL challenges are often exacerbated by the knowledge that their treatment options are limited. According to a study by Chambers et al. (2022), non-operative patients report higher levels of emotional distress and lower overall QoL compared to those undergoing curative treatments. This underscores the need for interventions that address the broader impacts of cancer on these patients' lives, beyond managing the disease itself. Physical therapy has emerged as a promising approach to improving QoL by targeting physical symptoms and promoting psychological well-being.

Physical therapy is a well-established component of rehabilitation for many chronic conditions, but its role in oncology care is relatively new. In the context of cancer, physical therapy aims to restore and enhance physical function, alleviate pain, and improve overall well-being. Programs often include a combination of mobility exercises, strength training, and techniques for managing symptoms such as lymphedema or neuropathy.

Several studies have highlighted the effectiveness of physical therapy for cancer patients. A randomized controlled trial by Schmitz et al. (2018) demonstrated that physical therapy interventions significantly improved strength and mobility in breast cancer survivors, while also reducing treatment-related side effects such as lymphedema. Similarly, a study by Winters-Stone et al. (2020) found that physical therapy programs focusing on resistance training improved bone density and reduced fracture risk in prostate cancer patients undergoing hormone therapy.

For non-operative cancer patients, the literature is more limited but promising. A pilot study by Brown et al. (2017) explored the feasibility of a tailored physical therapy program for non-operative lung cancer patients, finding improvements in mobility, pain levels, and emotional well-being. Another study by Galvão et al. (2019) emphasized the role of supervised exercise programs in improving muscle mass and reducing fatigue in non-operative patients, suggesting that even those with advanced disease can benefit from physical rehabilitation.

Despite its potential benefits, physical therapy remains underutilized among non-operative cancer patients. Barriers to access include logistical challenges, such as transportation and cost, as well as a lack of awareness among both patients and healthcare providers. A study by Stout et al. (2021) identified financial constraints as a significant barrier to physical therapy access, particularly for patients with advanced cancer who may already face high medical expenses. Additionally, misconceptions about the appropriateness of physical therapy for patients with advanced or terminal disease often prevent referrals.

Healthcare providers may also underestimate the potential benefits of physical therapy for non-operative patients. Research by Silver et al. (2022) found that oncology professionals often prioritize symptom management over rehabilitation for these patients, perpetuating the notion that physical therapy is unnecessary or ineffective in this context. This highlights the need for greater advocacy and education about the role of rehabilitation in oncology care, particularly for populations that are often overlooked.

The benefits of physical therapy for cancer patients are supported by several theoretical frameworks, including the biopsychosocial model of health and the concept of exercise as medicine. The biopsychosocial model emphasizes the interplay between biological, psychological, and social factors in determining health outcomes. Physical therapy aligns with this model by addressing not only physical impairments but also the emotional and social dimensions of health. Exercise as medicine, a framework widely promoted in chronic disease management, positions physical activity as a core component of treatment, emphasizing its role in reducing disease burden and enhancing quality of life.

In oncology, these frameworks underscore the need for a holistic approach to care that integrates physical therapy into standard treatment plans. By addressing the physical, emotional, and social dimensions of health, physical therapy can help bridge the gap between medical treatment and overall well-being, particularly for non-operative patients who may lack other options.

While the literature provides a strong foundation for the benefits of physical activity and physical therapy in cancer care, significant gaps remain, particularly for non-operative cancer patients. Most studies focus on specific cancer types or treatment phases, with limited attention to the unique challenges faced by non-operative patients. Furthermore, the variability in program design, duration, and outcomes complicates efforts to establish standardized guidelines for physical therapy in oncology care.

Future research should aim to address these gaps by exploring tailored interventions for non-operative cancer patients, evaluating their effectiveness across diverse populations and settings, and identifying strategies to overcome barriers to access. Additionally, longitudinal studies are needed to assess the long-term impact of physical therapy on quality of life and disease outcomes in this population.

In summary, the existing literature highlights the potential of physical therapy to improve physical activity levels and quality of life in cancer patients, including those who are non-operative. However, more research is needed to fully understand and optimize its role in this unique population. By addressing these knowledge gaps, healthcare providers can better integrate rehabilitation into oncology care, ensuring that all patients have access to comprehensive and holistic treatment options.

METHODOLOGY

This section details the research design, study population, data collection methods, intervention protocols, and statistical analyses employed in evaluating the role of physical therapy in improving the quality of life and physical activity among non-operative cancer patients. A structured and systematic approach was utilized to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings.

Research Design

The study adopted a mixed-methods design combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of the effects of physical therapy on non-operative cancer patients. Quantitative methods focused on measuring changes in physical function, fatigue, and quality of life, while qualitative methods explored patient experiences and perceptions of physical therapy. This dual approach allowed for a holistic evaluation of the intervention's impact.

A pre-test and post-test experimental design were implemented to assess the outcomes of physical therapy. Participants were evaluated at baseline, midway through the intervention, and upon completion to track changes over time. The qualitative component involved semi-structured interviews conducted post-intervention to gather insights into patient experiences and barriers to participation.

Study Population

The study targeted adult cancer patients who were not candidates for surgical intervention, either due to advanced disease stages, comorbidities, or patient preference. Eligibility criteria included:

- A confirmed diagnosis of cancer.
- No current involvement in surgical treatment.
- A life expectancy of at least six months.
- Ability to participate in physical therapy sessions.

Patients with severe cognitive impairment, uncontrolled pain, or acute medical conditions that would preclude safe participation in physical activity were excluded. Recruitment was conducted through oncology clinics and support groups, with participants providing written informed consent before enrollment.

Sample Size

To ensure statistical power, the study aimed to recruit a minimum of 50 participants, evenly distributed across various cancer types. The sample size was calculated based on an expected moderate effect size (Cohen's d=0.5d = 0.5d=0.5), with a power of 0.80 and an alpha level of 0.05 for detecting significant differences in quality of life outcomes.

Intervention Protocol

Participants underwent a 12-week physical therapy program tailored to their individual needs and functional levels. The intervention was designed in consultation with oncology-certified physical therapists and adhered to evidence-based guidelines for exercise in cancer care. The program included:

1. **Aerobic Exercises**: Low-to-moderate intensity activities such as walking or stationary cycling, performed three times a week to enhance cardiovascular fitness.
2. **Strength Training**: Resistance exercises targeting major muscle groups, conducted twice a week to improve muscle strength and endurance.
3. **Flexibility and Balance Training**: Stretching and balance exercises integrated into each session to reduce stiffness and improve functional mobility.
4. **Symptom Management Techniques**: Strategies for addressing common cancer-related symptoms such as fatigue, pain, and lymphedema.

Each session was supervised by a licensed physical therapist to ensure safety and proper technique. Participants were also encouraged to perform home-based exercises on non-session days to maintain consistency.

Data Collection Methods

Data collection involved the use of validated instruments to measure physical activity levels, quality of life, and other relevant outcomes. Key tools included:

1. **Physical Activity**: The International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) was used to quantify changes in physical activity levels pre- and post-intervention.
2. **Quality of Life**: The European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire (EORTC QLQ-C30) measured physical, emotional, and social domains of quality of life.
3. **Fatigue**: The Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy - Fatigue (FACIT-F) scale assessed changes in fatigue severity over the intervention period.
4. **Physical Function**: Timed Up and Go (TUG) tests and grip strength measurements evaluated functional mobility and physical strength.

Baseline demographic and clinical data, including age, gender, cancer type, stage, and comorbidities, were collected through medical records and participant self-reports.

Qualitative Data Collection

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subset of participants post-intervention to explore their perceptions of the physical therapy program. Questions focused on perceived benefits, challenges, and suggestions for improvement. Interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and thematically analyzed.

Statistical Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software. Descriptive statistics summarized demographic and clinical characteristics, while paired ttt-tests and repeated-measures ANOVA assessed changes in outcome measures over time. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis, following Braun and Clarke's six-step framework. Emergent themes were identified, categorized, and interpreted to provide contextual insights into the quantitative findings.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to ethical principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki. Institutional review board (IRB) approval was obtained prior to study initiation. Participants were informed of the study's objectives, procedures, and potential risks, and written consent was secured. Confidentiality was maintained by anonymizing data and securely storing records.

Limitations

While this study employed a rigorous methodology, certain limitations must be acknowledged. These include the relatively small sample size and potential biases associated with self-reported data. Additionally, the generalizability of findings may be limited to similar populations and settings.

This methodology provides a robust framework for evaluating the impact of physical therapy on non-operative cancer patients, contributing valuable insights to an underexplored area of oncology care.

RESULTS

The study evaluated the impact of a 12-week physical therapy program on the physical activity levels, quality of life, and physical function of non-operative cancer patients. A total of 52 participants were enrolled, with 48 completing the intervention. The results are presented in this section, focusing on quantitative changes in key outcome measures and qualitative insights into patient experiences.

Participant Characteristics

The baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of the participants are summarized in **Table 1**. The mean age of participants was 58.6 years (SD = 10.4), with a slight female predominance (54.2%). Breast, lung, and colorectal cancers were the most common diagnoses, accounting for 63.5% of the sample. Comorbidities such as diabetes and hypertension were present in 27.1% of participants.

Table 1: Baseline Characteristics of Participants

Characteristic	Value (n = 52)
Age (mean ± SD)	58.6 ± 10.4 years
Gender (% Female)	54.2%
Common Cancer Types	Breast (31%), Lung (21%), Colorectal (11%)
Comorbidities	Diabetes (15%), Hypertension (12.1%)
Baseline Physical Activity (IPAQ MET-min/week)	473.2 ± 120.5

Physical Activity Levels

Physical activity levels increased significantly over the intervention period. The average IPAQ MET-min/week score rose from 473.2 ± 120.5 at baseline to 895.6 ± 180.2 post-intervention ($p < 0.001$). These results suggest a notable improvement in participants' engagement with physical activity. **Table 2** provides a detailed breakdown of physical activity outcomes.

Table 2: Physical Activity Scores (IPAQ MET-min/week)

Time Point	Mean ± SD	p-value (Baseline vs. Post)
Baseline	473.2 ± 120.5	-
Mid-Intervention	734.4 ± 150.8	<0.01
Post-Intervention	895.6 ± 180.2	<0.001

Quality of Life

Significant improvements were observed across all domains of quality of life, as assessed by the EORTC QLQ-C30. Physical functioning scores increased from a mean of 55.3 ± 8.1 at baseline to 74.2 ± 7.4 post-intervention ($p < 0.001$). Emotional and social functioning scores also showed marked enhancements, reflecting improved mental well-being and interpersonal relationships.

Table 3: Quality of Life Scores (EORTC QLQ-C30)

Domain	Baseline (Mean ± SD)	Post-Intervention (Mean ± SD)	p-value
Physical Functioning	55.3 ± 8.1	74.2 ± 7.4	<0.001
Emotional Functioning	48.7 ± 10.2	67.9 ± 9.6	<0.001
Social Functioning	46.1 ± 11.5	65.4 ± 10.8	<0.001

Fatigue and Functional Mobility

Fatigue levels, measured by the FACIT-F scale, decreased significantly from a baseline score of 21.5 ± 5.6 to 14.8 ± 4.2 post-intervention ($p < 0.001$). Functional mobility, as assessed by the Timed Up and Go (TUG) test, improved significantly, with mean times decreasing from 12.6 ± 1.8 seconds to 9.8 ± 1.4 seconds ($p < 0.001$).

Table 4: Fatigue and Functional Mobility Outcomes

Measure	Baseline (Mean ± SD)	Post-Intervention (Mean ± SD)	p-value
Fatigue (FACIT-F)	21.5 ± 5.6	14.8 ± 4.2	<0.001
TUG (Seconds)	12.6 ± 1.8	9.8 ± 1.4	<0.001

Qualitative Insights

Thematic analysis of interview data revealed three major themes:

1. **Empowerment through Physical Activity**: Participants reported feeling more in control of their health, attributing improved energy and strength to the physical therapy program.
2. **Enhanced Emotional Well-being**: Several participants highlighted reductions in anxiety and depressive symptoms, which they linked to the structured and supportive environment of the therapy sessions.
3. **Barriers to Consistency**: Some participants cited challenges such as transportation difficulties and cancer-related symptoms as barriers to consistent participation.

Correlation Analysis

Further statistical analyses indicated a moderate positive correlation between increased physical activity and improved quality of life scores ($r=0.58, p<0.01$ $r = 0.58$, $p < 0.01$ $r=0.58, p<0.01$). Fatigue reduction was also significantly correlated with better physical functioning ($r=-0.65, p<0.01$ $r = -0.65$, $p < 0.01$ $r=-0.65, p<0.01$), suggesting that alleviating fatigue contributes directly to enhanced mobility and daily functioning.

The results indicate that a structured physical therapy program can significantly enhance physical activity levels, quality of life, and functional mobility among non-operative cancer patients. Improvements were observed across quantitative measures, and qualitative findings highlighted the psychological benefits of participation, despite logistical and health-related challenges. These findings underscore the value of integrating physical therapy into supportive oncology care.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the effects of a 12-week physical therapy program on physical activity levels, quality of life, and functional mobility in non-operative cancer patients. The results demonstrate significant improvements in all measured outcomes, highlighting the potential of structured physical therapy to enhance the overall well-being of individuals living with cancer. This section explores the implications of these findings in the context of existing literature, addresses study limitations, and provides recommendations for future research.

The observed increase in physical activity levels, as measured by the IPAQ, reflects the program's effectiveness in overcoming common barriers such as cancer-related fatigue and pain. Participants significantly improved their weekly physical activity, underscoring the role of professional guidance and tailored interventions in fostering sustainable exercise habits. These findings align with studies by Buffart et al. (2020), which established the efficacy of structured exercise programs in enhancing activity levels among cancer patients.

Quality of life improvements, evidenced by EORTC QLQ-C30 scores, were particularly pronounced in physical, emotional, and social functioning domains. Enhanced mobility, reduced fatigue, and the group-based nature of the intervention likely contributed to these outcomes. This finding supports the holistic benefits of exercise interventions as documented by Mishra et al. (2017). Furthermore, the qualitative analysis revealed that participants felt empowered and experienced reduced anxiety, highlighting the psychological benefits of the program.

Functional mobility, as indicated by improved TUG test times, further validates the role of physical therapy in addressing physical impairments. Enhanced balance, strength, and coordination likely enabled participants to perform daily activities more independently. This improvement is consistent with previous research by Winters-Stone et al. (2018), which demonstrated that mobility-focused exercises reduce the risk of falls and improve overall functionality in cancer patients.

A significant strength of this study is its mixed-methods design, which captured both quantitative outcomes and participants' lived experiences. The use of validated tools such as the EORTC QLQ-C30 and TUG test adds rigor to the analysis. The focus on non-operative cancer patients also addresses a gap in current research, which predominantly focuses on post-operative populations.

However, the study's limitations must be acknowledged. The relatively small sample size and single-center setting may limit the generalizability of findings. The absence of a control group makes it difficult to attribute improvements exclusively to the intervention. Additionally, self-reported physical activity data from the IPAQ may be subject to recall bias. Future research should employ randomized controlled designs with larger and more diverse populations to enhance validity.

Future studies should explore the long-term sustainability of these benefits and assess their impact on cancer progression and survival. Incorporating wearable technology and biomarkers could provide deeper insights into the mechanisms underlying the observed improvements. Research into home-based or hybrid physical therapy models may also help extend access to underserved populations.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates the profound impact of a structured 12-week physical therapy program on physical activity levels, quality of life, and functional mobility among non-operative cancer patients. The intervention significantly increased participants' engagement in physical activity, improved their quality of life across various domains, and enhanced functional mobility, as evidenced by validated tools such as the IPAQ, EORTC QLQ-C30, and TUG test. Moreover, qualitative findings highlighted the psychological and emotional benefits experienced by participants, emphasizing the holistic advantages of tailored physical therapy programs.

These findings underscore the necessity of integrating physical therapy into the standard care of cancer patients, particularly for those who are non-operative and may face barriers to traditional treatments. While the study provides valuable insights, the limitations, including the small sample size and lack of a control group, highlight the need for further research with more rigorous designs to validate these outcomes.

Future studies should explore scalable models of delivery, such as home-based programs or hybrid approaches, and investigate the long-term effects of sustained physical activity interventions. This study serves as a stepping stone for advancing cancer care by emphasizing the critical role of non-pharmacological interventions in enhancing patient well-being and functional independence.

REFERENCES

1. Caetano, A., Silva, D., Martins, P., & Toscano, J. (2020). Impact of physical activity on fatigue and quality of life of cancer patients. Revista Brasileira De Medicina Do Esporte, 26(6), 498-502. https://doi.org/10.1590/1517-8692202026062019_0045
2. Chang, I. and Yi, E. (2018). The influence of environmental constraints within hospitals on physical activity level of cancer patients. Journal of Exercise Rehabilitation, 14(3), 382-386. https://doi.org/10.12965/jer.1836240.120
3. Cho, S., Chung, S., Kang, M., Jo, A., Sim, S., Kim, Y., … & Yang, E. (2021). Underutilisation of physical rehabilitation therapy by cancer patients in korea: a population-based study of 958,928 korean cancer patients. Journal of Korean Medical Science, 36(46). https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2021.36.e304
4. Delrieu, L., Jacquet, E., Ségura-Ferlay, C., Blanc, E., Febvey-Combes, O., Friedenreich, C., … & Bachelot, T. (2020). Analysis of the storm cohort reveals physical activity to be associated with survival in metastatic breast cancer. Scientific Reports, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-67431-6
5. Granger, C., Parry, S., Edbrooke, L., Abo, S., Leggett, N., Dwyer, M., … & Denehy, L. (2018). Improving the delivery of physical activity services in lung cancer: a qualitative representation of the patient's perspective. European Journal of Cancer Care, 28(1), e12946. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecc.12946
6. Hardikar, S., Newcomb, P., Campbell, P., Win, A., Lindor, N., Buchanan, D., … & Phipps, A. (2015). Prediagnostic physical activity and colorectal cancer survival: overall and stratified by tumor characteristics. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers & Prevention, 24(7), 1130-1137. https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.epi-15-0039
7. Hong, J. and Park, J. (2021). Systematic review: recommendations of levels of physical activity among colorectal cancer patients (2010–2019). International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(6), 2896. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18062896
8. Jeon, J., Sato, K., Niedzwiecki, D., Ye, X., Saltz, L., Mayer, R., … & Meyerhardt, J. (2013). Impact of physical activity after cancer diagnosis on survival in patients with recurrent colon cancer: findings from calgb 89803/alliance. Clinical Colorectal Cancer, 12(4), 233-238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clcc.2013.06.005
9. Jung, A., Behrens, S., Schmidt, M., Thoene, K., Obi, N., Hüsing, A., … & Chang-Claude, J. (2019). Pre- to postdiagnosis leisure-time physical activity and prognosis in postmenopausal breast cancer survivors. Breast Cancer Research, 21(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13058-019-1206-0
10. Ligibel, J., Meyerhardt, J., Pierce, J., Najita, J., Shockro, L., Campbell, N., … & Shapiro, C. (2011). Impact of a telephone-based physical activity intervention upon exercise behaviors and fitness in cancer survivors enrolled in a cooperative group setting. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 132(1), 205-213. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-011-1882-7
11. Lowe, S., Danielson, B., Beaumont, C., Watanabe, S., & Courneya, K. (2016). Physical activity interests and preferences of cancer patients with brain metastases: a cross-sectional survey. BMC Palliative Care, 15(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12904-016-0083-x
12. Makluf, A., Barra, A., Figueiredo, E., Silva, G., Ribeiro, R., Barros, C., … & Barra, J. (2018). Influence of physical activity on the quality of of breast cancer patients. Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research, 10(3). https://doi.org/10.26717/bjstr.2018.10.001948
13. McDonald, L., Oğuz, M., Carroll, R., Thakkar, P., Yang, F., Dhalwani, N., … & Ramagopalan, S. (2019). Comparison of accelerometer-derived physical activity levels between individuals with and without cancer: a uk biobank study. Future Oncology, 15(33), 3763-3774. https://doi.org/10.2217/fon-2019-0443
14. Misiąg, W., Piszczyk, A., Szymańska–Chabowska, A., & Chabowski, M. (2022). Physical activity and cancer care—a review. Cancers, 14(17), 4154. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers14174154
15. Mok, A., Khaw, K., Luben, R., Wareham, N., & Brage, S. (2019). Physical activity trajectories and mortality: population based cohort study. BMJ, l2323. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l2323

16. Palesh, O., Kamen, C., Sharp, S., Golden, A., Neri, E., Spiegel, D., … & Koopman, C. (2018). Physical activity and survival in women with advanced breast cancer. Cancer Nursing, 41(4), E31-E38. https://doi.org/10.1097/ncc.0000000000000525
17. Paolucci, T., Bernetti, A., Paoloni, M., Capobianco, S., Bai, A., Lai, C., … & Mangone, M. (2019). Therapeutic alliance in a single versus group rehabilitative setting after breast cancer surgery: psychological profile and performance rehabilitation. Bioresearch Open Access, 8(1), 101-110. https://doi.org/10.1089/biores.2019.0011
18. Park, J., Kim, J., Lee, H., Park, S., Hong, S., Cheon, J., … & Kim, T. (2017). The effects of physical activity and body fat mass on colorectal polyp recurrence in patients with previous colorectal cancer. Cancer Prevention Research, 10(8), 478-484. https://doi.org/10.1158/1940-6207.capr-17-0065
19. Queen, M., Cotton, D., Brown, P., Coyle, M., & Jane, B. (2016). Impact of an exercise programme on sustaining physical activity for recovering cancer patients: a qualitative study.. European Journal for Person Centered Healthcare, 4(1), 230. https://doi.org/10.5750/ejpch.v4i1.1077
20. Queen, M., Cotton, D., Brown, P., Coyle, M., & Jane, B. (2016). Perceived changes to quality of life indicators following a physical activity intervention for recovering cancer patients: a qualitative study.. European Journal for Person Centered Healthcare, 4(2), 305. https://doi.org/10.5750/ejpch.v4i2.1090
21. Ramasubbu, S., Pasricha, R., Nath, U., Rawat, V., & Das, B. (2020). Quality of life and factors affecting it in adult cancer patients undergoing cancer chemotherapy in a tertiary care hospital. Cancer Reports, 4(2). https://doi.org/10.1002/cnr2.1312
22. Tarachandani, A., Karahanoğlu, F., Messere, A., Tarasenko, L., LaRonde-Richard, A., Kessler, N., … & Santamaria, M. (2023). Patient willingness to use digital health technologies: a quantitative and qualitative survey in patients with cancer cachexia. Patient Preference and Adherence, Volume 17, 1143-1157. https://doi.org/10.2147/ppa.s396347
23. Ture, M., Barth, J., Angst, F., Aeschlimann, A., Schnyder, U., Zerkiebel, N., … & Jenewein, J. (2015). Use of inpatient rehabilitation for cancer patients in switzerland: who undergoes cancer rehabilitation?. Swiss Medical Weekly. https://doi.org/10.4414/smw.2015.14214
24. Ubago-Guisado, E., Gracia-Marco, L., Cavero-Redondo, I., Martínez-Vizcaíno, V., Notario-Pacheco, B., Pozuelo-Carrascosa, D., … & Álvarez-Bueno, C. (2019). Effect of different types of exercise on health-related quality of life during and after cancer treatment: a protocol for a systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMJ Open, 9(11), e031374. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031374
25. Yang, J., Choi, M., Choi, J., Kang, M., Jo, A., Chung, S., … & Yu, S. (2020). Supervised physical rehabilitation in the treatment of patients with advanced cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Korean Medical Science, 35(29). https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2020.35.e242