

【4-9 メタアナリシス】

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																
P	乳癌患者	I	認知行動療法、支持-感情表出的グループ療法																																															
C	介入なし	O	生存期間																																															
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	7	コード	Anderson 2004, Kissane 2004, Stagl 2015, Classen 2001, Goodwin 2001, Kissane 2007, Spiegel 1989																																													
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Inverse-variance method (RevMan 5.4)																																															
効果指標	ハザード比	統合値	0.77 (0.43 - 1.40) P= 0.39																																															
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Study or Subgroup</th> <th>log[Hazard Ratio]</th> <th>SE</th> <th>Weight</th> <th>Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Anderson 2004</td> <td>-0.821</td> <td>0.2884</td> <td>19.1%</td> <td>0.44 [0.25, 0.77]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Classen 2001</td> <td>0.0862</td> <td>0.3976</td> <td>16.5%</td> <td>1.09 [0.50, 2.38]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Goodwin 2001</td> <td>-0.9163</td> <td>0.3798</td> <td>16.9%</td> <td>0.40 [0.19, 0.84]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kissane 2004</td> <td>0.3148</td> <td>0.3574</td> <td>17.5%</td> <td>1.37 [0.68, 2.76]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kissane 2007</td> <td>0.1989</td> <td>0.3883</td> <td>16.7%</td> <td>1.22 [0.57, 2.61]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spiegel 1989</td> <td>2.9407</td> <td>1.4659</td> <td>3.6%</td> <td>18.93 [1.07, 334.89]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Stagl 2015</td> <td>-1.5606</td> <td>0.7322</td> <td>9.8%</td> <td>0.21 [0.05, 0.88]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.77 [0.43, 1.40]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.39; Chi² = 19.29, df = 6 (P = 0.004); I² = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.85 (P = 0.39)</p>				Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Anderson 2004	-0.821	0.2884	19.1%	0.44 [0.25, 0.77]	Classen 2001	0.0862	0.3976	16.5%	1.09 [0.50, 2.38]	Goodwin 2001	-0.9163	0.3798	16.9%	0.40 [0.19, 0.84]	Kissane 2004	0.3148	0.3574	17.5%	1.37 [0.68, 2.76]	Kissane 2007	0.1989	0.3883	16.7%	1.22 [0.57, 2.61]	Spiegel 1989	2.9407	1.4659	3.6%	18.93 [1.07, 334.89]	Stagl 2015	-1.5606	0.7322	9.8%	0.21 [0.05, 0.88]	Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.77 [0.43, 1.40]	<p>コメント: 異質性がみられ、また生存期間に有意な差はみられない。</p>
Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI																																														
Anderson 2004	-0.821	0.2884	19.1%	0.44 [0.25, 0.77]																																														
Classen 2001	0.0862	0.3976	16.5%	1.09 [0.50, 2.38]																																														
Goodwin 2001	-0.9163	0.3798	16.9%	0.40 [0.19, 0.84]																																														
Kissane 2004	0.3148	0.3574	17.5%	1.37 [0.68, 2.76]																																														
Kissane 2007	0.1989	0.3883	16.7%	1.22 [0.57, 2.61]																																														
Spiegel 1989	2.9407	1.4659	3.6%	18.93 [1.07, 334.89]																																														
Stagl 2015	-1.5606	0.7322	9.8%	0.21 [0.05, 0.88]																																														
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.77 [0.43, 1.40]																																														
Funnel plot	<p>コメント: 報告バイアスを示唆する分布はほぼ認められない。</p>																																																	
その他の解析	実施せず			コメント:																																														
メタリグレーション																																																		
感度分析																																																		

【4-9 メタアナリシス】

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																																																																																																																
P	乳癌患者	I	認知行動療法																																																																																																																																															
C	介入なし	O	QOLの向上																																																																																																																																															
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	12	コード	Abrahams, 2017; Arving, 2007; Atema, 2019; Bordeleau, 2003; Dirksen, 2008; Dolbeault, 2009; Gudenkauf, 2015; Hummel, 2017; Lechner, 2014; Qiu, 2013; Qiu, 2018; Wu, 2018																																																																																																																																													
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Continuous method (RevMan 5.4)																																																																																																																																															
効果指標	Standard Mean Difference	統合値	0.34 (0.10 - 0.58) P = 0.006																																																																																																																																															
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Study or Subgroup</th> <th colspan="3">Experimental</th> <th colspan="3">Control</th> <th rowspan="2">Weight</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Abrahams 2017</td> <td>77.1</td> <td>16.5</td> <td>66</td> <td>63.9</td> <td>20.1</td> <td>66</td> <td>8.0%</td> <td>0.71 [0.36, 1.07]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arving 2007</td> <td>68</td> <td>22</td> <td>60</td> <td>60</td> <td>22</td> <td>59</td> <td>7.9%</td> <td>0.36 [-0.00, 0.72]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Atema 2019a</td> <td>79.42</td> <td>19.3</td> <td>82</td> <td>77.58</td> <td>19.31</td> <td>80</td> <td>8.3%</td> <td>0.09 [-0.21, 0.40]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Atema 2019b</td> <td>77.77</td> <td>16.26</td> <td>82</td> <td>75.35</td> <td>16.26</td> <td>80</td> <td>8.3%</td> <td>0.15 [-0.16, 0.46]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dirksen 2008</td> <td>118.8</td> <td>11.9</td> <td>34</td> <td>113.1</td> <td>18.2</td> <td>38</td> <td>7.1%</td> <td>0.36 [-0.10, 0.83]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dolbeault 2009</td> <td>1.76</td> <td>0.53</td> <td>102</td> <td>1.73</td> <td>0.55</td> <td>101</td> <td>8.5%</td> <td>0.06 [-0.22, 0.33]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gudenkauf 2015</td> <td>3.35</td> <td>0.69</td> <td>40</td> <td>3.09</td> <td>0.66</td> <td>49</td> <td>7.4%</td> <td>0.38 [-0.04, 0.80]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hummel 2017a</td> <td>79.64</td> <td>19.35</td> <td>69</td> <td>82.87</td> <td>16.65</td> <td>82</td> <td>8.2%</td> <td>-0.18 [-0.50, 0.14]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hummel 2017b</td> <td>74.14</td> <td>16.72</td> <td>69</td> <td>76.24</td> <td>16.47</td> <td>82</td> <td>8.2%</td> <td>-0.13 [-0.45, 0.19]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lechner 2014</td> <td>140.2</td> <td>24.6</td> <td>53</td> <td>139.57</td> <td>25.51</td> <td>57</td> <td>7.8%</td> <td>0.02 [-0.35, 0.40]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qiu 2013</td> <td>91.17</td> <td>13.35</td> <td>31</td> <td>86.13</td> <td>16.4</td> <td>31</td> <td>6.8%</td> <td>0.33 [-0.17, 0.83]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qiu 2018</td> <td>98.3</td> <td>13.76</td> <td>98</td> <td>81.64</td> <td>19.04</td> <td>196</td> <td>8.7%</td> <td>0.95 [0.70, 1.21]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wu 2018</td> <td>88.75</td> <td>8.24</td> <td>20</td> <td>70</td> <td>10.26</td> <td>20</td> <td>4.9%</td> <td>1.98 [1.21, 2.74]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td colspan="3">806</td> <td colspan="3">941 100.0%</td> <td></td> <td>0.34 [0.10, 0.58]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.16; Chi² = 72.12, df = 12 (P < 0.00001); I² = 83% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.77 (P = 0.006)</p>				Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Abrahams 2017	77.1	16.5	66	63.9	20.1	66	8.0%	0.71 [0.36, 1.07]	Arving 2007	68	22	60	60	22	59	7.9%	0.36 [-0.00, 0.72]	Atema 2019a	79.42	19.3	82	77.58	19.31	80	8.3%	0.09 [-0.21, 0.40]	Atema 2019b	77.77	16.26	82	75.35	16.26	80	8.3%	0.15 [-0.16, 0.46]	Dirksen 2008	118.8	11.9	34	113.1	18.2	38	7.1%	0.36 [-0.10, 0.83]	Dolbeault 2009	1.76	0.53	102	1.73	0.55	101	8.5%	0.06 [-0.22, 0.33]	Gudenkauf 2015	3.35	0.69	40	3.09	0.66	49	7.4%	0.38 [-0.04, 0.80]	Hummel 2017a	79.64	19.35	69	82.87	16.65	82	8.2%	-0.18 [-0.50, 0.14]	Hummel 2017b	74.14	16.72	69	76.24	16.47	82	8.2%	-0.13 [-0.45, 0.19]	Lechner 2014	140.2	24.6	53	139.57	25.51	57	7.8%	0.02 [-0.35, 0.40]	Qiu 2013	91.17	13.35	31	86.13	16.4	31	6.8%	0.33 [-0.17, 0.83]	Qiu 2018	98.3	13.76	98	81.64	19.04	196	8.7%	0.95 [0.70, 1.21]	Wu 2018	88.75	8.24	20	70	10.26	20	4.9%	1.98 [1.21, 2.74]	Total (95% CI)	806			941 100.0%				0.34 [0.10, 0.58]	<p>Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</p> <p>Favours [experimental] Favours [control]</p>
Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI																																																																																																																																										
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total																																																																																																																																												
Abrahams 2017	77.1	16.5	66	63.9	20.1	66	8.0%	0.71 [0.36, 1.07]																																																																																																																																										
Arving 2007	68	22	60	60	22	59	7.9%	0.36 [-0.00, 0.72]																																																																																																																																										
Atema 2019a	79.42	19.3	82	77.58	19.31	80	8.3%	0.09 [-0.21, 0.40]																																																																																																																																										
Atema 2019b	77.77	16.26	82	75.35	16.26	80	8.3%	0.15 [-0.16, 0.46]																																																																																																																																										
Dirksen 2008	118.8	11.9	34	113.1	18.2	38	7.1%	0.36 [-0.10, 0.83]																																																																																																																																										
Dolbeault 2009	1.76	0.53	102	1.73	0.55	101	8.5%	0.06 [-0.22, 0.33]																																																																																																																																										
Gudenkauf 2015	3.35	0.69	40	3.09	0.66	49	7.4%	0.38 [-0.04, 0.80]																																																																																																																																										
Hummel 2017a	79.64	19.35	69	82.87	16.65	82	8.2%	-0.18 [-0.50, 0.14]																																																																																																																																										
Hummel 2017b	74.14	16.72	69	76.24	16.47	82	8.2%	-0.13 [-0.45, 0.19]																																																																																																																																										
Lechner 2014	140.2	24.6	53	139.57	25.51	57	7.8%	0.02 [-0.35, 0.40]																																																																																																																																										
Qiu 2013	91.17	13.35	31	86.13	16.4	31	6.8%	0.33 [-0.17, 0.83]																																																																																																																																										
Qiu 2018	98.3	13.76	98	81.64	19.04	196	8.7%	0.95 [0.70, 1.21]																																																																																																																																										
Wu 2018	88.75	8.24	20	70	10.26	20	4.9%	1.98 [1.21, 2.74]																																																																																																																																										
Total (95% CI)	806			941 100.0%				0.34 [0.10, 0.58]																																																																																																																																										
	コメント: 異質性がみられるが、介入によるQOL向上効果は認められる。																																																																																																																																																	
Funnel plot					コメント: 報告バイアスを示唆する分布はほぼ認められない。																																																																																																																																													
その他の解析	実施せず			コメント:																																																																																																																																														
メタリグレーション																																																																																																																																																		
感度分析																																																																																																																																																		

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																																																																																					
P	乳癌患者	I	マインドフルネス																																																																																																																				
C	介入なし	O	QOLの向上																																																																																																																				
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	6	コード	Hoffman, 2012; Jang, 2016; Lengacher, 2016; Park, 2020; Reich, 2017; Rosen, 2018																																																																																																																		
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Continuous method (RevMan 5.4)																																																																																																																				
効果指標	Standard Mean Difference	統合値	0.43 (0.19 - 0.67) P < 0.010																																																																																																																				
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Study or Subgroup</th> <th colspan="3">Experimental</th> <th colspan="3">Control</th> <th rowspan="2">Weight</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Carlson 2013</td> <td>107.89</td> <td>25.21</td> <td>113</td> <td>101.02</td> <td>23.99</td> <td>54</td> <td>11.2%</td> <td>0.28 [-0.05, 0.60]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hoffman 2012</td> <td>103.6</td> <td>17.9</td> <td>101</td> <td>96.8</td> <td>19.4</td> <td>106</td> <td>11.9%</td> <td>0.36 [0.09, 0.64]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jang 2016</td> <td>81.31</td> <td>12.46</td> <td>12</td> <td>40.17</td> <td>19.37</td> <td>12</td> <td>3.5%</td> <td>2.44 [1.34, 3.54]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Johannsen 2016</td> <td>56.8</td> <td>16.6</td> <td>67</td> <td>45.5</td> <td>21.2</td> <td>62</td> <td>10.8%</td> <td>0.59 [0.24, 0.95]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lengacher 2009a</td> <td>50.3</td> <td>7.5</td> <td>40</td> <td>46.9</td> <td>7</td> <td>42</td> <td>9.5%</td> <td>0.46 [0.03, 0.90]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lengacher 2009b</td> <td>53</td> <td>10</td> <td>40</td> <td>50.1</td> <td>9.9</td> <td>42</td> <td>9.6%</td> <td>0.29 [-0.15, 0.72]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lengacher 2016</td> <td>67.93</td> <td>19.87</td> <td>152</td> <td>68.28</td> <td>21.28</td> <td>147</td> <td>12.5%</td> <td>-0.02 [-0.24, 0.21]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Park 2020</td> <td>84.94</td> <td>14.59</td> <td>38</td> <td>71.59</td> <td>18.73</td> <td>36</td> <td>9.0%</td> <td>0.79 [0.32, 1.26]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reich 2016</td> <td>65.76</td> <td>26.18</td> <td>152</td> <td>66.24</td> <td>24.76</td> <td>145</td> <td>12.5%</td> <td>-0.02 [-0.25, 0.21]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rosen 2018</td> <td>107</td> <td>14.86</td> <td>39</td> <td>91.47</td> <td>25.42</td> <td>48</td> <td>9.6%</td> <td>0.72 [0.28, 1.16]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td colspan="3">754</td> <td colspan="3">694</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.43 [0.19, 0.67]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.11; Chi² = 40.40, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); I² = 78% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.54 (P = 0.0004)</p>				Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Carlson 2013	107.89	25.21	113	101.02	23.99	54	11.2%	0.28 [-0.05, 0.60]	Hoffman 2012	103.6	17.9	101	96.8	19.4	106	11.9%	0.36 [0.09, 0.64]	Jang 2016	81.31	12.46	12	40.17	19.37	12	3.5%	2.44 [1.34, 3.54]	Johannsen 2016	56.8	16.6	67	45.5	21.2	62	10.8%	0.59 [0.24, 0.95]	Lengacher 2009a	50.3	7.5	40	46.9	7	42	9.5%	0.46 [0.03, 0.90]	Lengacher 2009b	53	10	40	50.1	9.9	42	9.6%	0.29 [-0.15, 0.72]	Lengacher 2016	67.93	19.87	152	68.28	21.28	147	12.5%	-0.02 [-0.24, 0.21]	Park 2020	84.94	14.59	38	71.59	18.73	36	9.0%	0.79 [0.32, 1.26]	Reich 2016	65.76	26.18	152	66.24	24.76	145	12.5%	-0.02 [-0.25, 0.21]	Rosen 2018	107	14.86	39	91.47	25.42	48	9.6%	0.72 [0.28, 1.16]	Total (95% CI)	754			694			100.0%	0.43 [0.19, 0.67]	<p>Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</p> <p>Favours [experimental] Favours [control]</p>
Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI																																																																																																															
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total																																																																																																																	
Carlson 2013	107.89	25.21	113	101.02	23.99	54	11.2%	0.28 [-0.05, 0.60]																																																																																																															
Hoffman 2012	103.6	17.9	101	96.8	19.4	106	11.9%	0.36 [0.09, 0.64]																																																																																																															
Jang 2016	81.31	12.46	12	40.17	19.37	12	3.5%	2.44 [1.34, 3.54]																																																																																																															
Johannsen 2016	56.8	16.6	67	45.5	21.2	62	10.8%	0.59 [0.24, 0.95]																																																																																																															
Lengacher 2009a	50.3	7.5	40	46.9	7	42	9.5%	0.46 [0.03, 0.90]																																																																																																															
Lengacher 2009b	53	10	40	50.1	9.9	42	9.6%	0.29 [-0.15, 0.72]																																																																																																															
Lengacher 2016	67.93	19.87	152	68.28	21.28	147	12.5%	-0.02 [-0.24, 0.21]																																																																																																															
Park 2020	84.94	14.59	38	71.59	18.73	36	9.0%	0.79 [0.32, 1.26]																																																																																																															
Reich 2016	65.76	26.18	152	66.24	24.76	145	12.5%	-0.02 [-0.25, 0.21]																																																																																																															
Rosen 2018	107	14.86	39	91.47	25.42	48	9.6%	0.72 [0.28, 1.16]																																																																																																															
Total (95% CI)	754			694			100.0%	0.43 [0.19, 0.67]																																																																																																															
	コメント: 異質性がみられるが、介入によるQOL向上効果は認められる。																																																																																																																						
Funnel plot					<p>コメント: 報告バイアスを示唆する分布はほぼ認められない。</p>																																																																																																																		
その他の解析	実施せず			コメント:																																																																																																																			
メタリグレーション																																																																																																																							
感度分析																																																																																																																							

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																																																																																																							
P	乳癌患者	I	ヨーガ																																																																																																																																						
C	介入なし	O	QOLの向上																																																																																																																																						
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	9	コード	Chadwani, 2010; Chandwani, 2014; Cramer, 2015; Danhauer, 2009; Kiecolt-Glaser, 2014; Loudon, 2014; Moadel, 2007; Ratcliff, 2016; Siedentopf, 2013																																																																																																																																				
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Continuous method (RevMan 5.4)																																																																																																																																						
効果指標	Standard Mean Difference	統合値	0.16 (0.01 - 0.32) P = 0.04																																																																																																																																						
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Study or Subgroup</th> <th colspan="3">Experimental</th> <th colspan="3">Control</th> <th rowspan="2">Weight</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Chandwani 2010a</td> <td>43.1</td> <td>9.3</td> <td>27</td> <td>39</td> <td>9.4</td> <td>31</td> <td>6.9%</td> <td>0.43 [-0.09, 0.95]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chandwani 2010b</td> <td>49.7</td> <td>8.8</td> <td>27</td> <td>49.9</td> <td>9.4</td> <td>31</td> <td>7.0%</td> <td>-0.02 [-0.54, 0.49]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chandwani 2014a</td> <td>47</td> <td>8.1</td> <td>39</td> <td>45.5</td> <td>7.8</td> <td>43</td> <td>9.1%</td> <td>0.19 [-0.25, 0.62]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chandwani 2014b</td> <td>46.2</td> <td>13.1</td> <td>39</td> <td>49.1</td> <td>9.8</td> <td>43</td> <td>9.0%</td> <td>-0.25 [-0.69, 0.19]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cramer 2015</td> <td>113.7</td> <td>20.5</td> <td>19</td> <td>102.1</td> <td>14.8</td> <td>21</td> <td>5.0%</td> <td>0.64 [0.00, 1.28]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Danhauer 2009</td> <td>114.8</td> <td>19.1</td> <td>13</td> <td>98.4</td> <td>31.8</td> <td>14</td> <td>3.6%</td> <td>0.60 [-0.17, 1.38]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kiecolt-Glaser 2014</td> <td>58.9</td> <td>23.5</td> <td>96</td> <td>50.7</td> <td>19.9</td> <td>90</td> <td>14.8%</td> <td>0.37 [0.08, 0.66]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Loudon 2014</td> <td>7.42</td> <td>1.24</td> <td>12</td> <td>7.45</td> <td>1.44</td> <td>11</td> <td>3.3%</td> <td>-0.02 [-0.84, 0.80]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moadel 2007</td> <td>75.2</td> <td>19</td> <td>84</td> <td>69.9</td> <td>19.4</td> <td>44</td> <td>11.3%</td> <td>0.28 [-0.09, 0.64]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ratcliff 2016a</td> <td>47</td> <td>8.1</td> <td>53</td> <td>45.4</td> <td>7.6</td> <td>54</td> <td>10.8%</td> <td>0.20 [-0.18, 0.58]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ratcliff 2016b</td> <td>46.2</td> <td>13.1</td> <td>53</td> <td>49</td> <td>10.1</td> <td>54</td> <td>10.8%</td> <td>-0.24 [-0.62, 0.14]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Siedentopf 2013</td> <td>59.1</td> <td>25.1</td> <td>33</td> <td>57.7</td> <td>20.5</td> <td>41</td> <td>8.4%</td> <td>0.06 [-0.40, 0.52]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>495</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>477</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.16 [0.01, 0.32]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.02; Chi² = 15.46, df = 11 (P = 0.16); I² = 29% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.05 (P = 0.04)</p>				Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Chandwani 2010a	43.1	9.3	27	39	9.4	31	6.9%	0.43 [-0.09, 0.95]	Chandwani 2010b	49.7	8.8	27	49.9	9.4	31	7.0%	-0.02 [-0.54, 0.49]	Chandwani 2014a	47	8.1	39	45.5	7.8	43	9.1%	0.19 [-0.25, 0.62]	Chandwani 2014b	46.2	13.1	39	49.1	9.8	43	9.0%	-0.25 [-0.69, 0.19]	Cramer 2015	113.7	20.5	19	102.1	14.8	21	5.0%	0.64 [0.00, 1.28]	Danhauer 2009	114.8	19.1	13	98.4	31.8	14	3.6%	0.60 [-0.17, 1.38]	Kiecolt-Glaser 2014	58.9	23.5	96	50.7	19.9	90	14.8%	0.37 [0.08, 0.66]	Loudon 2014	7.42	1.24	12	7.45	1.44	11	3.3%	-0.02 [-0.84, 0.80]	Moadel 2007	75.2	19	84	69.9	19.4	44	11.3%	0.28 [-0.09, 0.64]	Ratcliff 2016a	47	8.1	53	45.4	7.6	54	10.8%	0.20 [-0.18, 0.58]	Ratcliff 2016b	46.2	13.1	53	49	10.1	54	10.8%	-0.24 [-0.62, 0.14]	Siedentopf 2013	59.1	25.1	33	57.7	20.5	41	8.4%	0.06 [-0.40, 0.52]	Total (95% CI)			495			477	100.0%	0.16 [0.01, 0.32]	コメント: 異質性がみられるが、介入によるQOL向上効果は認められる。
Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI																																																																																																																																	
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total																																																																																																																																			
Chandwani 2010a	43.1	9.3	27	39	9.4	31	6.9%	0.43 [-0.09, 0.95]																																																																																																																																	
Chandwani 2010b	49.7	8.8	27	49.9	9.4	31	7.0%	-0.02 [-0.54, 0.49]																																																																																																																																	
Chandwani 2014a	47	8.1	39	45.5	7.8	43	9.1%	0.19 [-0.25, 0.62]																																																																																																																																	
Chandwani 2014b	46.2	13.1	39	49.1	9.8	43	9.0%	-0.25 [-0.69, 0.19]																																																																																																																																	
Cramer 2015	113.7	20.5	19	102.1	14.8	21	5.0%	0.64 [0.00, 1.28]																																																																																																																																	
Danhauer 2009	114.8	19.1	13	98.4	31.8	14	3.6%	0.60 [-0.17, 1.38]																																																																																																																																	
Kiecolt-Glaser 2014	58.9	23.5	96	50.7	19.9	90	14.8%	0.37 [0.08, 0.66]																																																																																																																																	
Loudon 2014	7.42	1.24	12	7.45	1.44	11	3.3%	-0.02 [-0.84, 0.80]																																																																																																																																	
Moadel 2007	75.2	19	84	69.9	19.4	44	11.3%	0.28 [-0.09, 0.64]																																																																																																																																	
Ratcliff 2016a	47	8.1	53	45.4	7.6	54	10.8%	0.20 [-0.18, 0.58]																																																																																																																																	
Ratcliff 2016b	46.2	13.1	53	49	10.1	54	10.8%	-0.24 [-0.62, 0.14]																																																																																																																																	
Siedentopf 2013	59.1	25.1	33	57.7	20.5	41	8.4%	0.06 [-0.40, 0.52]																																																																																																																																	
Total (95% CI)			495			477	100.0%	0.16 [0.01, 0.32]																																																																																																																																	
Funnel plot					コメント: 報告バイアスを示唆する分布はほぼ認められない。																																																																																																																																				
その他の解析	実施せず			コメント:																																																																																																																																					
メタリグレーション																																																																																																																																									
感度分析																																																																																																																																									

【4-9 メタアナリシス】

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																																																																										
P	乳癌患者	I	認知行動療法																																																																																																									
C	介入なし	O	抑うつ軽減																																																																																																									
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	12	コード	Arving, 2007; Ateama, 2019; Dirksen, 2008; Dolbeault, 2009; Fenlon, 2020; Ferguson, 2016; Groarke, 2013; Hummel, 2017; Lechner, 2014; Qiu, 2013; Ren, 2019; Wu, 2018																																																																																																							
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Continuous method (RevMan 5.4)																																																																																																									
効果指標	Standard Mean Difference	統合値	-0.42 (-0.67 - -0.16) P < 0.001																																																																																																									
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Study or Subgroup</th> <th colspan="2">Experimental</th> <th colspan="2">Control</th> <th rowspan="2">Weight</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Arving 2007</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>60</td> <td>4</td> <td>59</td> <td>8.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ateama 2019</td> <td>3.9</td> <td>3.49</td> <td>82</td> <td>4.27</td> <td>3.49</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dirksen 2008</td> <td>7.8</td> <td>7.3</td> <td>34</td> <td>9.1</td> <td>9.7</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dolbeault 2009</td> <td>8.9</td> <td>10.21</td> <td>102</td> <td>13.54</td> <td>12.56</td> <td>101</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fenlon 2020</td> <td>15.9</td> <td>5.37</td> <td>61</td> <td>17.2</td> <td>5.51</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ferguson 2016</td> <td>3.7</td> <td>4.27</td> <td>22</td> <td>7.27</td> <td>7.66</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Groarke 2013</td> <td>3.36</td> <td>2.77</td> <td>87</td> <td>3.6</td> <td>3.13</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hummel 2017</td> <td>4.55</td> <td>3.81</td> <td>69</td> <td>4.09</td> <td>3.49</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lechner 2014</td> <td>33.83</td> <td>11.2114</td> <td>53</td> <td>34.81</td> <td>11.6267</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qiu 2013</td> <td>6.03</td> <td>2.82</td> <td>31</td> <td>15.06</td> <td>5.09</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ren 2019</td> <td>5.7</td> <td>4</td> <td>98</td> <td>8.8</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>196</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wu 2018</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>1.99</td> <td>20</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>1.47</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>719</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>836</td> <td>100.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.16; Chi² = 62.33, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); I² = 82% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.21 (P = 0.001)</p>				Study or Subgroup	Experimental		Control		Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Arving 2007	3	3	60	4	59	8.8%	Ateama 2019	3.9	3.49	82	4.27	3.49	80	Dirksen 2008	7.8	7.3	34	9.1	9.7	38	Dolbeault 2009	8.9	10.21	102	13.54	12.56	101	Fenlon 2020	15.9	5.37	61	17.2	5.51	66	Ferguson 2016	3.7	4.27	22	7.27	7.66	14	Groarke 2013	3.36	2.77	87	3.6	3.13	92	Hummel 2017	4.55	3.81	69	4.09	3.49	82	Lechner 2014	33.83	11.2114	53	34.81	11.6267	57	Qiu 2013	6.03	2.82	31	15.06	5.09	31	Ren 2019	5.7	4	98	8.8	4.2	196	Wu 2018	2.8	1.99	20	4.5	1.47	20	Total (95% CI)			719			836	100.0%	コメント: 異質性がみられるが、介入による抑うつ軽減効果は認められる。
Study or Subgroup	Experimental		Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI																																																																																																					
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD																																																																																																								
Arving 2007	3	3	60	4	59	8.8%																																																																																																						
Ateama 2019	3.9	3.49	82	4.27	3.49	80																																																																																																						
Dirksen 2008	7.8	7.3	34	9.1	9.7	38																																																																																																						
Dolbeault 2009	8.9	10.21	102	13.54	12.56	101																																																																																																						
Fenlon 2020	15.9	5.37	61	17.2	5.51	66																																																																																																						
Ferguson 2016	3.7	4.27	22	7.27	7.66	14																																																																																																						
Groarke 2013	3.36	2.77	87	3.6	3.13	92																																																																																																						
Hummel 2017	4.55	3.81	69	4.09	3.49	82																																																																																																						
Lechner 2014	33.83	11.2114	53	34.81	11.6267	57																																																																																																						
Qiu 2013	6.03	2.82	31	15.06	5.09	31																																																																																																						
Ren 2019	5.7	4	98	8.8	4.2	196																																																																																																						
Wu 2018	2.8	1.99	20	4.5	1.47	20																																																																																																						
Total (95% CI)			719			836	100.0%																																																																																																					
Funnel plot					コメント: 報告バイアスが疑われる分布が認められる。																																																																																																							
その他の解析	実施せず			コメント:																																																																																																								
メタリグレッション																																																																																																												
感度分析																																																																																																												

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																																																																												
P	乳癌患者	I		マインドフルネス																																																																																																										
C	介入なし	O		抑うつ軽減																																																																																																										
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	8	コード	Bower, 2015; Hoffman, 2012; Jang, 2016; Janusek, 2019; Lengacher, 2016; Park, 2020; Reich, 2017; Sarenmalm, 2017																																																																																																									
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Continuous method (RevMan 5.4)																																																																																																											
効果指標	Standard Mean Difference	統合値	-0.47 (-0.73 - -0.21) P < 0.001																																																																																																											
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Study or Subgroup</th> <th colspan="3">Experimental</th> <th colspan="3">Control</th> <th rowspan="2">Weight</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bower 2015</td> <td>10.1</td> <td>7.1</td> <td>35</td> <td>17.7</td> <td>11.4</td> <td>30</td> <td>9.8%</td> <td>-0.80 [-1.31, -0.30]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hoffman 2012</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>103</td> <td>15</td> <td>13.2</td> <td>111</td> <td>13.3%</td> <td>-0.42 [-0.69, -0.15]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jang 2016</td> <td>51.58</td> <td>8.29</td> <td>12</td> <td>71.5</td> <td>9.07</td> <td>12</td> <td>4.4%</td> <td>-2.21 [-3.27, -1.16]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Janusek 2019</td> <td>10.46</td> <td>10.4</td> <td>70</td> <td>11.42</td> <td>8.8</td> <td>67</td> <td>12.3%</td> <td>-0.10 [-0.43, 0.24]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lengacher 2009</td> <td>6.3</td> <td>6.5</td> <td>40</td> <td>9.6</td> <td>6.4</td> <td>42</td> <td>10.7%</td> <td>-0.51 [-0.95, -0.07]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lengacher 2016</td> <td>8.12</td> <td>5.45</td> <td>152</td> <td>8.82</td> <td>6.05</td> <td>147</td> <td>13.9%</td> <td>-0.12 [-0.35, 0.11]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Park 2020</td> <td>2.48</td> <td>2.82</td> <td>38</td> <td>7.11</td> <td>4.53</td> <td>36</td> <td>9.9%</td> <td>-1.22 [-1.72, -0.72]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reich 2017</td> <td>8.12</td> <td>5.45</td> <td>154</td> <td>8.82</td> <td>6.05</td> <td>146</td> <td>13.9%</td> <td>-0.12 [-0.35, 0.11]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sarenmalm 2017</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>62</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>52</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td>-0.14 [-0.51, 0.23]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td colspan="3">666</td> <td colspan="3">643</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>-0.47 [-0.73, -0.21]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.11; Chi² = 38.10, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); I² = 79% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.54 (P = 0.0004)</p>					Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Bower 2015	10.1	7.1	35	17.7	11.4	30	9.8%	-0.80 [-1.31, -0.30]	Hoffman 2012	10	10	103	15	13.2	111	13.3%	-0.42 [-0.69, -0.15]	Jang 2016	51.58	8.29	12	71.5	9.07	12	4.4%	-2.21 [-3.27, -1.16]	Janusek 2019	10.46	10.4	70	11.42	8.8	67	12.3%	-0.10 [-0.43, 0.24]	Lengacher 2009	6.3	6.5	40	9.6	6.4	42	10.7%	-0.51 [-0.95, -0.07]	Lengacher 2016	8.12	5.45	152	8.82	6.05	147	13.9%	-0.12 [-0.35, 0.11]	Park 2020	2.48	2.82	38	7.11	4.53	36	9.9%	-1.22 [-1.72, -0.72]	Reich 2017	8.12	5.45	154	8.82	6.05	146	13.9%	-0.12 [-0.35, 0.11]	Sarenmalm 2017	3.3	3.3	62	3.8	3.8	52	11.8%	-0.14 [-0.51, 0.23]	Total (95% CI)	666			643			100.0%	-0.47 [-0.73, -0.21]
Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI																																																																																																						
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total																																																																																																								
Bower 2015	10.1	7.1	35	17.7	11.4	30	9.8%	-0.80 [-1.31, -0.30]																																																																																																						
Hoffman 2012	10	10	103	15	13.2	111	13.3%	-0.42 [-0.69, -0.15]																																																																																																						
Jang 2016	51.58	8.29	12	71.5	9.07	12	4.4%	-2.21 [-3.27, -1.16]																																																																																																						
Janusek 2019	10.46	10.4	70	11.42	8.8	67	12.3%	-0.10 [-0.43, 0.24]																																																																																																						
Lengacher 2009	6.3	6.5	40	9.6	6.4	42	10.7%	-0.51 [-0.95, -0.07]																																																																																																						
Lengacher 2016	8.12	5.45	152	8.82	6.05	147	13.9%	-0.12 [-0.35, 0.11]																																																																																																						
Park 2020	2.48	2.82	38	7.11	4.53	36	9.9%	-1.22 [-1.72, -0.72]																																																																																																						
Reich 2017	8.12	5.45	154	8.82	6.05	146	13.9%	-0.12 [-0.35, 0.11]																																																																																																						
Sarenmalm 2017	3.3	3.3	62	3.8	3.8	52	11.8%	-0.14 [-0.51, 0.23]																																																																																																						
Total (95% CI)	666			643			100.0%	-0.47 [-0.73, -0.21]																																																																																																						
	コメント: 異質性がみられるが、介入による抑うつ軽減効果は認められる。																																																																																																													
Funnel plot																																																																																																														
	コメント: 報告バイアスが疑われる分布が認められる。																																																																																																													
その他の解析	実施せず			コメント:																																																																																																										
メタリグレーション																																																																																																														
感度分析																																																																																																														

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																																																																																					
P	乳癌患者	I	ヨーガ																																																																																																																				
C	介入なし	O	抑うつ軽減																																																																																																																				
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	10	コード	Chadwani, 2010; Chandwani, 2014; Cramer, 2015; Danhauer, 2009; Jong, 2018; Kiecolt-Glaser, 2014; Lanctot, 2016; Porter, 2019; Ratcliff, 2016; Taso, 2014																																																																																																																		
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Continuous method (RevMan 5.4)																																																																																																																				
効果指標	Standard Mean Difference	統合値	-0.07 (-0.21 - 0.07) P = 0.30																																																																																																																				
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Study or Subgroup</th> <th colspan="3">Experimental</th> <th colspan="3">Control</th> <th rowspan="2">Weight</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Chandwani 2010</td> <td>6.6</td> <td>10.9</td> <td>27</td> <td>7</td> <td>12.2</td> <td>31</td> <td>7.5%</td> <td>-0.03 [-0.55, 0.48]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chandwani 2014</td> <td>13.1</td> <td>10.6</td> <td>39</td> <td>12.3</td> <td>8.5</td> <td>43</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>0.08 [-0.35, 0.52]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cramer 2015</td> <td>8.5</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>19</td> <td>8.4</td> <td>1.7</td> <td>21</td> <td>5.2%</td> <td>0.06 [-0.56, 0.68]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Danhauer 2009</td> <td>8.1</td> <td>8.9</td> <td>13</td> <td>17.8</td> <td>16.9</td> <td>14</td> <td>3.3%</td> <td>-0.69 [-1.47, 0.09]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jong 2018</td> <td>4.7</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>40</td> <td>5.1</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>29</td> <td>8.7%</td> <td>-0.10 [-0.57, 0.38]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kiecolt-Glaser 2014</td> <td>8.1</td> <td>8.6</td> <td>96</td> <td>9.8</td> <td>8.2</td> <td>90</td> <td>23.9%</td> <td>-0.20 [-0.49, 0.09]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lanctot 2016</td> <td>11.5</td> <td>0.83</td> <td>58</td> <td>11.43</td> <td>0.99</td> <td>43</td> <td>12.8%</td> <td>0.08 [-0.32, 0.47]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Porter 2019</td> <td>4</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>35</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>20</td> <td>6.6%</td> <td>-0.04 [-0.59, 0.51]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ratcliff 2016</td> <td>13.1</td> <td>10.7</td> <td>53</td> <td>12.3</td> <td>8.3</td> <td>54</td> <td>13.8%</td> <td>0.08 [-0.30, 0.46]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Taso 2014</td> <td>13.63</td> <td>10.85</td> <td>30</td> <td>16.03</td> <td>2.56</td> <td>30</td> <td>7.7%</td> <td>-0.30 [-0.81, 0.21]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>410</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>375</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>-0.07 [-0.21, 0.07]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 5.84, df = 9 (P = 0.76); I² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.03 (P = 0.30)</p>					Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Chandwani 2010	6.6	10.9	27	7	12.2	31	7.5%	-0.03 [-0.55, 0.48]	Chandwani 2014	13.1	10.6	39	12.3	8.5	43	10.6%	0.08 [-0.35, 0.52]	Cramer 2015	8.5	1.5	19	8.4	1.7	21	5.2%	0.06 [-0.56, 0.68]	Danhauer 2009	8.1	8.9	13	17.8	16.9	14	3.3%	-0.69 [-1.47, 0.09]	Jong 2018	4.7	4.1	40	5.1	4.2	29	8.7%	-0.10 [-0.57, 0.38]	Kiecolt-Glaser 2014	8.1	8.6	96	9.8	8.2	90	23.9%	-0.20 [-0.49, 0.09]	Lanctot 2016	11.5	0.83	58	11.43	0.99	43	12.8%	0.08 [-0.32, 0.47]	Porter 2019	4	2.6	35	4.1	2.3	20	6.6%	-0.04 [-0.59, 0.51]	Ratcliff 2016	13.1	10.7	53	12.3	8.3	54	13.8%	0.08 [-0.30, 0.46]	Taso 2014	13.63	10.85	30	16.03	2.56	30	7.7%	-0.30 [-0.81, 0.21]	Total (95% CI)			410			375	100.0%	-0.07 [-0.21, 0.07]
Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI																																																																																																															
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total																																																																																																																	
Chandwani 2010	6.6	10.9	27	7	12.2	31	7.5%	-0.03 [-0.55, 0.48]																																																																																																															
Chandwani 2014	13.1	10.6	39	12.3	8.5	43	10.6%	0.08 [-0.35, 0.52]																																																																																																															
Cramer 2015	8.5	1.5	19	8.4	1.7	21	5.2%	0.06 [-0.56, 0.68]																																																																																																															
Danhauer 2009	8.1	8.9	13	17.8	16.9	14	3.3%	-0.69 [-1.47, 0.09]																																																																																																															
Jong 2018	4.7	4.1	40	5.1	4.2	29	8.7%	-0.10 [-0.57, 0.38]																																																																																																															
Kiecolt-Glaser 2014	8.1	8.6	96	9.8	8.2	90	23.9%	-0.20 [-0.49, 0.09]																																																																																																															
Lanctot 2016	11.5	0.83	58	11.43	0.99	43	12.8%	0.08 [-0.32, 0.47]																																																																																																															
Porter 2019	4	2.6	35	4.1	2.3	20	6.6%	-0.04 [-0.59, 0.51]																																																																																																															
Ratcliff 2016	13.1	10.7	53	12.3	8.3	54	13.8%	0.08 [-0.30, 0.46]																																																																																																															
Taso 2014	13.63	10.85	30	16.03	2.56	30	7.7%	-0.30 [-0.81, 0.21]																																																																																																															
Total (95% CI)			410			375	100.0%	-0.07 [-0.21, 0.07]																																																																																																															
	コメント: 介入による抑うつ軽減効果は認められない。																																																																																																																						
Funnel plot																																																																																																																							
	コメント: 報告バイアスを示唆する分布はほぼ認められない。																																																																																																																						
その他の解析	実施せず			コメント:																																																																																																																			
メタリグレーション																																																																																																																							
感度分析																																																																																																																							

【4-9 メタアナリシス】

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																																																																																																	
P	乳癌患者	I	認知行動療法																																																																																																																																
C	介入なし	O	不安の軽減																																																																																																																																
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	10	コード	Arving, 2007; Atema, 2019; Dirksen, 2008; Dolbeault, 2009; Ferguson, 2016; Groarke, 2013; Hummel, 2017; Qiu, 2013; Ren, 2019; Wu, 2018																																																																																																																														
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Continuous method (RevMan 5.4)																																																																																																																																
効果指標	Standard Mean Difference	統合値	-0.36 (-0.54 - -0.19) P < 0.001																																																																																																																																
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Study or Subgroup</th> <th colspan="3">Experimental</th> <th colspan="3">Control</th> <th rowspan="2">Weight</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Arving 2007</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>80</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>59</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>-0.50 [-0.86, -0.13]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Atema 2019</td> <td>5.76</td> <td>3.95</td> <td>82</td> <td>6.24</td> <td>3.95</td> <td>80</td> <td>12.2%</td> <td>-0.12 [-0.43, 0.19]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dirksen 2008</td> <td>29</td> <td>8.8</td> <td>34</td> <td>33.7</td> <td>13.3</td> <td>38</td> <td>8.2%</td> <td>-0.41 [-0.88, 0.06]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dolbeault 2009</td> <td>10.58</td> <td>6.89</td> <td>102</td> <td>14.71</td> <td>8.35</td> <td>101</td> <td>13.0%</td> <td>-0.54 [-0.82, -0.26]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ferguson 2016</td> <td>5.2</td> <td>4.74</td> <td>22</td> <td>5.27</td> <td>5.53</td> <td>14</td> <td>5.1%</td> <td>-0.01 [-0.68, 0.66]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Groarke 2013</td> <td>5.13</td> <td>3.33</td> <td>87</td> <td>5.82</td> <td>3.76</td> <td>92</td> <td>12.6%</td> <td>-0.19 [-0.49, 0.10]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hummel 2017</td> <td>6.02</td> <td>3.46</td> <td>69</td> <td>5.85</td> <td>3.91</td> <td>82</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td>0.05 [-0.27, 0.37]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qiu 2013</td> <td>40.23</td> <td>6.4</td> <td>31</td> <td>45.39</td> <td>11.42</td> <td>31</td> <td>7.4%</td> <td>-0.55 [-1.06, -0.04]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ren 2019</td> <td>6.3</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>98</td> <td>8.8</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>196</td> <td>14.0%</td> <td>-0.63 [-0.87, -0.38]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wu 2018</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>20</td> <td>4.25</td> <td>2.57</td> <td>20</td> <td>5.3%</td> <td>-0.86 [-1.51, -0.21]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td colspan="3">605</td> <td colspan="3">713</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>-0.36 [-0.54, -0.19]</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.04; Chi² = 20.11, df = 9 (P = 0.02); I² = 55% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.07 (P < 0.0001)</p>					Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Arving 2007	4	4	80	6	4	59	10.6%	-0.50 [-0.86, -0.13]		Atema 2019	5.76	3.95	82	6.24	3.95	80	12.2%	-0.12 [-0.43, 0.19]		Dirksen 2008	29	8.8	34	33.7	13.3	38	8.2%	-0.41 [-0.88, 0.06]		Dolbeault 2009	10.58	6.89	102	14.71	8.35	101	13.0%	-0.54 [-0.82, -0.26]		Ferguson 2016	5.2	4.74	22	5.27	5.53	14	5.1%	-0.01 [-0.68, 0.66]		Groarke 2013	5.13	3.33	87	5.82	3.76	92	12.6%	-0.19 [-0.49, 0.10]		Hummel 2017	6.02	3.46	69	5.85	3.91	82	11.8%	0.05 [-0.27, 0.37]		Qiu 2013	40.23	6.4	31	45.39	11.42	31	7.4%	-0.55 [-1.06, -0.04]		Ren 2019	6.3	3.5	98	8.8	4.2	196	14.0%	-0.63 [-0.87, -0.38]		Wu 2018	2.4	1.5	20	4.25	2.57	20	5.3%	-0.86 [-1.51, -0.21]		Total (95% CI)	605			713			100.0%	-0.36 [-0.54, -0.19]	
Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI																																																																																																																										
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total																																																																																																																													
Arving 2007	4	4	80	6	4	59	10.6%	-0.50 [-0.86, -0.13]																																																																																																																											
Atema 2019	5.76	3.95	82	6.24	3.95	80	12.2%	-0.12 [-0.43, 0.19]																																																																																																																											
Dirksen 2008	29	8.8	34	33.7	13.3	38	8.2%	-0.41 [-0.88, 0.06]																																																																																																																											
Dolbeault 2009	10.58	6.89	102	14.71	8.35	101	13.0%	-0.54 [-0.82, -0.26]																																																																																																																											
Ferguson 2016	5.2	4.74	22	5.27	5.53	14	5.1%	-0.01 [-0.68, 0.66]																																																																																																																											
Groarke 2013	5.13	3.33	87	5.82	3.76	92	12.6%	-0.19 [-0.49, 0.10]																																																																																																																											
Hummel 2017	6.02	3.46	69	5.85	3.91	82	11.8%	0.05 [-0.27, 0.37]																																																																																																																											
Qiu 2013	40.23	6.4	31	45.39	11.42	31	7.4%	-0.55 [-1.06, -0.04]																																																																																																																											
Ren 2019	6.3	3.5	98	8.8	4.2	196	14.0%	-0.63 [-0.87, -0.38]																																																																																																																											
Wu 2018	2.4	1.5	20	4.25	2.57	20	5.3%	-0.86 [-1.51, -0.21]																																																																																																																											
Total (95% CI)	605			713			100.0%	-0.36 [-0.54, -0.19]																																																																																																																											
	コメント: 異質性がみられるが、介入による不安軽減効果は認められる。																																																																																																																																		
Funnel plot																																																																																																																																			
	コメント: 報告バイアスを示唆する分布はほぼ認められない。																																																																																																																																		
その他の解析	実施せず				コメント:																																																																																																																														
メタリグレーション																																																																																																																																			
感度分析																																																																																																																																			

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																																																																					
P	乳癌患者	I		マインドフルネス																																																																																																			
C	介入なし	O		不安の軽減																																																																																																			
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	7	コード	Hoffman, 2012; Jang, 2016; Lengacher, 2016; Park, 2020; Reich, 2017; Sarenmalm, 2017; Zhang, 2017																																																																																																		
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Continuous method (RevMan 5.4)																																																																																																				
効果指標	Standard Mean Difference	統合値	-0.43 (-0.73 - -0.14) P = 0.004																																																																																																				
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Study or Subgroup</th> <th colspan="3">Experimental</th> <th colspan="3">Control</th> <th rowspan="2">Weight</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hoffman 2012</td> <td>10.3</td> <td>7</td> <td>103</td> <td>13.4</td> <td>7.2</td> <td>111</td> <td>15.0%</td> <td>-0.43 [-0.71, -0.16]</td> <td rowspan="9"> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jang 2016</td> <td>44.67</td> <td>5.12</td> <td>12</td> <td>64.67</td> <td>9.77</td> <td>12</td> <td>5.0%</td> <td>-2.48 [-3.58, -1.37]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lengacher 2009</td> <td>28.3</td> <td>8.7</td> <td>40</td> <td>33</td> <td>8.9</td> <td>42</td> <td>12.4%</td> <td>-0.53 [-0.97, -0.09]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lengacher 2016</td> <td>30.62</td> <td>12.8</td> <td>152</td> <td>31.76</td> <td>13.2</td> <td>147</td> <td>15.6%</td> <td>-0.09 [-0.31, 0.14]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Park 2020</td> <td>3.49</td> <td>2.62</td> <td>38</td> <td>6.89</td> <td>3.98</td> <td>36</td> <td>11.7%</td> <td>-1.00 [-1.49, -0.52]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reich 2017</td> <td>30.62</td> <td>12.8</td> <td>159</td> <td>31.76</td> <td>13.2</td> <td>152</td> <td>15.7%</td> <td>-0.09 [-0.31, 0.13]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sarenmalm 2017</td> <td>6</td> <td>3.9</td> <td>62</td> <td>5.5</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>52</td> <td>13.5%</td> <td>0.12 [-0.24, 0.49]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zhang 2017</td> <td>41.68</td> <td>3.32</td> <td>28</td> <td>43.53</td> <td>4.24</td> <td>30</td> <td>11.1%</td> <td>-0.48 [-1.00, 0.05]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>594</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>582</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>-0.43 [-0.73, -0.14]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.13; Chi² = 36.79, df = 7 (P < 0.00001); I² = 81% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.91 (P = 0.004)</p>					Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Hoffman 2012	10.3	7	103	13.4	7.2	111	15.0%	-0.43 [-0.71, -0.16]		Jang 2016	44.67	5.12	12	64.67	9.77	12	5.0%	-2.48 [-3.58, -1.37]	Lengacher 2009	28.3	8.7	40	33	8.9	42	12.4%	-0.53 [-0.97, -0.09]	Lengacher 2016	30.62	12.8	152	31.76	13.2	147	15.6%	-0.09 [-0.31, 0.14]	Park 2020	3.49	2.62	38	6.89	3.98	36	11.7%	-1.00 [-1.49, -0.52]	Reich 2017	30.62	12.8	159	31.76	13.2	152	15.7%	-0.09 [-0.31, 0.13]	Sarenmalm 2017	6	3.9	62	5.5	4.1	52	13.5%	0.12 [-0.24, 0.49]	Zhang 2017	41.68	3.32	28	43.53	4.24	30	11.1%	-0.48 [-1.00, 0.05]	Total (95% CI)			594			582	100.0%	-0.43 [-0.73, -0.14]
Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI																																																																																														
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total																																																																																																	
Hoffman 2012	10.3	7	103	13.4	7.2	111	15.0%	-0.43 [-0.71, -0.16]																																																																																															
Jang 2016	44.67	5.12	12	64.67	9.77	12	5.0%	-2.48 [-3.58, -1.37]																																																																																															
Lengacher 2009	28.3	8.7	40	33	8.9	42	12.4%	-0.53 [-0.97, -0.09]																																																																																															
Lengacher 2016	30.62	12.8	152	31.76	13.2	147	15.6%	-0.09 [-0.31, 0.14]																																																																																															
Park 2020	3.49	2.62	38	6.89	3.98	36	11.7%	-1.00 [-1.49, -0.52]																																																																																															
Reich 2017	30.62	12.8	159	31.76	13.2	152	15.7%	-0.09 [-0.31, 0.13]																																																																																															
Sarenmalm 2017	6	3.9	62	5.5	4.1	52	13.5%	0.12 [-0.24, 0.49]																																																																																															
Zhang 2017	41.68	3.32	28	43.53	4.24	30	11.1%	-0.48 [-1.00, 0.05]																																																																																															
Total (95% CI)			594			582	100.0%	-0.43 [-0.73, -0.14]																																																																																															
	コメント: 異質性がみられるが、介入による不安軽減効果は認められる。																																																																																																						
Funnel plot																																																																																																							
	コメント: 報告バイアスが疑われる分布が認められる。																																																																																																						
その他の解析	実施せず				コメント:																																																																																																		
メタリグレーション																																																																																																							
感度分析																																																																																																							

CQ		心理社会的介入は乳癌患者に有用か																																																																																																			
P	乳癌患者	I	ヨーガ																																																																																																		
C	介入なし	O	不安の軽減																																																																																																		
研究デザイン	RCT	文献数	8	コード	Chadwani, 2010; Cramer, 2015; Jong, 2018; Kovacic, 2013; Lanctot, 2016; Moadel, 2007; Porter, 2019; Taso, 2014																																																																																																
モデル	ランダム効果	方法	Continuous method (RevMan 5.4)																																																																																																		
効果指標	Standard Mean Difference	統合値	-0.47 (-0.87 - -0.07) P = 0.02																																																																																																		
Forest plot	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Study or Subgroup</th> <th colspan="3">Experimental</th> <th colspan="3">Control</th> <th rowspan="2">Weight</th> <th rowspan="2">Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Chadwani 2010</td> <td>28</td> <td>11.4</td> <td>27</td> <td>30.2</td> <td>13.4</td> <td>31</td> <td>13.0%</td> <td>-0.17 [-0.69, 0.34]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cramer 2015</td> <td>11.4</td> <td>1.9</td> <td>19</td> <td>11.2</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>21</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td>0.11 [-0.51, 0.73]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jong 2018</td> <td>6.8</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>40</td> <td>6.7</td> <td>3</td> <td>29</td> <td>13.4%</td> <td>0.03 [-0.45, 0.51]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kovacic 2013</td> <td>25.3</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>16</td> <td>53</td> <td>11.9</td> <td>16</td> <td>7.6%</td> <td>-3.10 [-4.17, -2.03]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lanctot 2016</td> <td>36.07</td> <td>1.37</td> <td>58</td> <td>37.1</td> <td>1.63</td> <td>43</td> <td>14.1%</td> <td>-0.69 [-1.09, -0.28]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moadel 2007</td> <td>8.1</td> <td>7.6</td> <td>84</td> <td>10.3</td> <td>8.1</td> <td>44</td> <td>14.5%</td> <td>-0.28 [-0.65, 0.09]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Porter 2019</td> <td>5.5</td> <td>3.2022</td> <td>35</td> <td>6.2</td> <td>2.7777</td> <td>20</td> <td>12.6%</td> <td>-0.23 [-0.78, 0.33]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Taso 2014</td> <td>13.33</td> <td>10.14</td> <td>30</td> <td>16.93</td> <td>2.06</td> <td>30</td> <td>13.0%</td> <td>-0.49 [-1.00, 0.03]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (95% CI)</td> <td colspan="3">309</td> <td colspan="3">234</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>-0.47 [-0.87, -0.07]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.25; Chi² = 33.69, df = 7 (P < 0.0001); I² = 79% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.30 (P = 0.02)</p>				Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Chadwani 2010	28	11.4	27	30.2	13.4	31	13.0%	-0.17 [-0.69, 0.34]	Cramer 2015	11.4	1.9	19	11.2	1.8	21	11.8%	0.11 [-0.51, 0.73]	Jong 2018	6.8	3.5	40	6.7	3	29	13.4%	0.03 [-0.45, 0.51]	Kovacic 2013	25.3	3.2	16	53	11.9	16	7.6%	-3.10 [-4.17, -2.03]	Lanctot 2016	36.07	1.37	58	37.1	1.63	43	14.1%	-0.69 [-1.09, -0.28]	Moadel 2007	8.1	7.6	84	10.3	8.1	44	14.5%	-0.28 [-0.65, 0.09]	Porter 2019	5.5	3.2022	35	6.2	2.7777	20	12.6%	-0.23 [-0.78, 0.33]	Taso 2014	13.33	10.14	30	16.93	2.06	30	13.0%	-0.49 [-1.00, 0.03]	Total (95% CI)	309			234			100.0%	-0.47 [-0.87, -0.07]	コメント: 異質性がみられるが、介入による不安軽減効果は認められる。
Study or Subgroup	Experimental			Control			Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI																																																																																													
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total																																																																																															
Chadwani 2010	28	11.4	27	30.2	13.4	31	13.0%	-0.17 [-0.69, 0.34]																																																																																													
Cramer 2015	11.4	1.9	19	11.2	1.8	21	11.8%	0.11 [-0.51, 0.73]																																																																																													
Jong 2018	6.8	3.5	40	6.7	3	29	13.4%	0.03 [-0.45, 0.51]																																																																																													
Kovacic 2013	25.3	3.2	16	53	11.9	16	7.6%	-3.10 [-4.17, -2.03]																																																																																													
Lanctot 2016	36.07	1.37	58	37.1	1.63	43	14.1%	-0.69 [-1.09, -0.28]																																																																																													
Moadel 2007	8.1	7.6	84	10.3	8.1	44	14.5%	-0.28 [-0.65, 0.09]																																																																																													
Porter 2019	5.5	3.2022	35	6.2	2.7777	20	12.6%	-0.23 [-0.78, 0.33]																																																																																													
Taso 2014	13.33	10.14	30	16.93	2.06	30	13.0%	-0.49 [-1.00, 0.03]																																																																																													
Total (95% CI)	309			234			100.0%	-0.47 [-0.87, -0.07]																																																																																													
Funnel plot					コメント: 報告バイアスが疑われる分布が認められる。																																																																																																
その他の解析	実施せず			コメント:																																																																																																	
メタリグレーション																																																																																																					
感度分析																																																																																																					