**Table E16. Data abstraction of randomized controlled trials of tai chi**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, Year** | **Country****Number of Centers and Setting** | **Inclusion Criteria** | **Number****Randomized, Analyzed Attrition** | **Intervention** | **Study Participants** | **Duration of Pain (acute, subacute, chronic)** | **Duration of****Followup** |
| Hall, 2011 | AustraliaCommunity setting | Age 18-70 years,with persistent nonspecific LBP and moderate pain or moderate activity limitationExcluded: known or suspected serious spinal pathology, scheduled for spinal surgery, or contraindicated for exercise | 160 randomized151 completed5.6% attrition | A. Tai chi, 18 sessionsover 10 weeks (n=80) B. Waitlist (n=80) | A vs. BMean age: 43 vs. 44 years Female sex: 79% vs. 70% Race: NRPain duration >3 months:100% vs. 100% | Chronic (100% withpain > 3 months) | 10 weeks |
| Weifen, 2013 | ChinaSingle center University medical center | Age 25-45 years,non-specific LBP with duration 1-5 years, mean VAS in previous week of 4, and not involved in physical therapy in previous 3 months | 320 randomizedNumber completed NR Attrition NR | A. Tai chi chuan (n=141)B. Backward walking(n=47)C. Jogging (n=47)D. Swimming (n=38) E. No exercise (n=47) | A vs. B vs. C vs. D vs. EMean age: 37.5 vs. 38.2 vs.37.2 vs. 37.5 vs. 38.1 years Female sex: 39% vs. 45% vs. 40% vs. 45% vs. 40% Race: NRMean VAS: 5.3 vs. 5.2 vs.5.0 vs. 5.2 vs. 5.1Mean duration of pain: 2.1 vs. 2.1 vs. 1.9 vs. 2.0 vs. 2.2 years | Chronic (meanduration 2.1 ± 0.8 years) | 26 weeks |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, Year** | **Results** | **Adverse Events Including Withdrawals** | **Funding****Source** | **Quality****Rating** | **Comments** |
| Hall, 2011 | A vs. BBothersomeness, NRS: 5.0-3.7 vs. 4.5-4.9; mean between- group difference 1.7 (95% CI 0.9 to 2.5)Pain, NRS: 4.4-3.4 vs. 4.4-4.7; mean between-group difference 1.3 (95% CI 0.7 to 1.9)PDI: 22.7-17.0 vs. 23.9-23.8; mean between-group difference 5.7 (95% CI 1.8 to 9.6)RDQ: 10.2-7.0 vs. 9.1-8.1; mean between-group difference2.6 (95% CI 1.1 to 3.7)QBPDS: 29.2-22.0 vs. 30.2-29.6; mean between-group difference 6.6 (95% CI 2.4 to 10.7)PSFS: 3.5-4.7 vs. 4.0-4.1; mean between-group difference -1.0 (95% CI -1.7 to -0.4)GPE: 0.4-1.6 vs. -0.1-0.4: mean between-group difference -0.8 (95% CI -1.5 to -0.0); p=0.05Proportion achieving ≥30% improvementBothersomeness, NRS: 50% vs. 17.5%; NNT 4Pain, NRS: 46.3% vs. 15%; NNT 4PDI, 45% vs. 17.5%; NNT 4RDQ: 50% vs. 23.8%; NNT 4QBPDS: 40% vs. 7.5%; NNT 4PSFS: 43.8% vs. 16.3%; NNT 4 | Three participants reported a small initialincrease in back pain symptoms that were alleviated by the third or fourth week, participant reported an increase in upper backpain that was alleviated once they corrected upper extremity posture. | ArthritisFoundation of Australia, Arthritis Care of the UK | Fair |  |
| Weifen, 2013 | A vs. B vs. C vs. D vs. EVAS, 3 months: 2.7 vs. 3.3 vs. 3.4 vs. 2.8 vs. 3.6; p<0.05 forA vs. all other groups except DVAS, 6 months: 2.3 vs. 2.9 vs. 3.1 vs. 2.4 vs. 3.2; p<0.05 forA vs. all other groups except D | No adverseevents were reported in any of the groups | NR | Fair | Poor reporting |

**Please see Appendix C. Included Studies for full study references.**