**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 | Australia  Community setting | Age 18-70 years,  with persistent nonspecific LBP and moderate pain or moderate activity limitation  Excluded: known or suspected serious spinal pathology, scheduled for spinal surgery, or contraindicated for exercise | 160 randomized  151 completed  5.6% attrition | A. Tai chi, 18 sessions  over 10 weeks (n=80) B. Waitlist (n=80) | A vs. B  Mean age: 43 vs. 44 years Female sex: 79% vs. 70% Race: NR  Pain duration >3 months:  100% vs. 100% | Chronic (100% with  pain > 3 months) | 10 weeks |
| Weifen, 2013 | China  Single 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 randomized  Number 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. E  Mean 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: NR  Mean VAS: 5.3 vs. 5.2 vs.  5.0 vs. 5.2 vs. 5.1  Mean duration of pain: 2.1 vs. 2.1 vs. 1.9 vs. 2.0 vs. 2.2 years | Chronic (mean  duration 2.1 ± 0.8 years) | 26 weeks |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, Year** | **Results** | **Adverse Events Including Withdrawals** | **Funding**  **Source** | **Quality**  **Rating** | **Comments** |
| Hall, 2011 | A vs. B  Bothersomeness, 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 difference  2.6 (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=0.05  Proportion achieving ≥30% improvement  Bothersomeness, NRS: 50% vs. 17.5%; NNT 4  Pain, NRS: 46.3% vs. 15%; NNT 4  PDI, 45% vs. 17.5%; NNT 4  RDQ: 50% vs. 23.8%; NNT 4  QBPDS: 40% vs. 7.5%; NNT 4  PSFS: 43.8% vs. 16.3%; NNT 4 | Three participants reported a small initial  increase in back pain symptoms that were alleviated by the third or fourth week, participant reported an increase in upper back  pain that was alleviated once they corrected upper extremity posture. | Arthritis  Foundation of Australia, Arthritis Care of the UK | Fair |  |
| Weifen, 2013 | A vs. B vs. C vs. D vs. E  VAS, 3 months: 2.7 vs. 3.3 vs. 3.4 vs. 2.8 vs. 3.6; p<0.05 for  A vs. all other groups except D  VAS, 6 months: 2.3 vs. 2.9 vs. 3.1 vs. 2.4 vs. 3.2; p<0.05 for  A vs. all other groups except D | No adverse  events were reported in any of the groups | NR | Fair | Poor reporting |

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