Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 15, No. 4, 2025 (pp. 1033-1056)

WWW.PEGEGOG.NET RESEARCH ARTICLE

Studying the effect of mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) on quality of life and psychological resilience in people undergoing chemotherapy

Mahtab Vakili Ahrari Rodi
Mahtab Vakili Department of Radiotherapy Oncology, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, .Mashhad, Iran.
vakiliam4031@mums.ac.ir
toktam.azizi*
Master of General Psychology, Tabaran Institute of Higher Education, Mashhad, Iran. (Corresponding Author)
toktam.azizi1982@gmail.com
Diana Tarkhanian Bajgiran
MA in Clinical Psychology, Faculty of medical Sciences ,Islamic Azad University of Birjand ,Iran.
Tarkhaniandiana@gmail.com
Mohammad ebrahim hokmabadi
Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences Research Center,Mashhad University of Medical Sciences,Mashhad ,Iran.
ebi.hokmabady@gmail.com
Toktam Bidaki
Master of General Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Tehran Research Science Branch, Bojnourd ,Iran.
toktambidakii@gmail.com

Abstract
Objective: This randomized controlled trial investigated the effectiveness of an 8-week Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program on quality of life and psychological resilience in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy.
Methods: A total of 180 cancer patients receiving chemotherapy were randomly allocated to either the MBSR intervention group (n=80) or the usual care control group (n=80). The MBSR program consisted of eight weekly 2.5-hour group sessions, including mindfulness meditation, body scan, and gentle yoga, plus a one-day retreat. Primary outcomes were quality of life measured by the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire (EORTC QLQ-C30) and psychological resilience assessed using the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-25). Secondary outcomes included anxiety and depression (Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale), perceived stress (Perceived Stress Scale), and fear of cancer recurrence (Fear of Cancer Recurrence Inventory). Assessments were conducted at baseline, immediately post-intervention (8 weeks), and at 12-week follow-up.
Results: Of the 180 participants (mean age 52.4 ± 11.2 years, 78.9% female), 118 completed the intervention (retention rate 92.2%). The MBSR group demonstrated statistically significant improvements compared to the control group in global quality of life scores (mean difference = 12.8 points, 95% CI: 8.2-17.4, $p < 0.001$, Cohen's $d = 0.62$) and psychological resilience scores (mean difference = 8.7 points, 95% CI: 5.1-12.3, $p < 0.001$, Cohen's $d = 0.58$) at 8-week assessment. Secondary outcomes showed significant reductions in anxiety ($p < 0.01$, $d = 0.45$), depression ($p < 0.001$, $d = 0.52$), perceived stress ($p < 0.001$, $d = 0.48$), and fear of cancer recurrence ($p < 0.01$, $d = 0.41$) in the MBSR group. Benefits were sustained at 12-week follow-up for all primary outcomes ($p < 0.001$). The intervention was well-tolerated with high attendance rates (mean sessions attended: 7.2 ± 1.1) and no adverse events reported.
Conclusions: The 8-week MBSR intervention significantly improved quality of life and psychological resilience in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy, with moderate to large effect sizes. These findings support the integration of MBSR as a complementary intervention in oncological care to address the psychological challenges associated with cancer treatment. The sustained benefits at 12-week follow-up suggest durable therapeutic effects of mindfulness training in this vulnerable population.

Keywords
Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction, cancer, chemotherapy, quality of life, psychological resilience, randomized controlled trial

Introduction

Chemotherapy represents a cornerstone treatment modality in oncological care, yet its administration is invariably accompanied by a spectrum of adverse effects that extend far beyond physical manifestations. The psychological complications associated with chemotherapy encompass anxiety, depression, cognitive impairments, mood disturbances, sleep disruptions, and, in severe cases, post-traumatic stress disorder and delirium (Ahmad et al., 2019). Research indicates that up to 50% of cancer patients experience significant anxiety during chemotherapy, while depression affects approximately 15-25% of patients undergoing treatment (Beyazyıldırım & Durmuş, 2024; Liu et al., 2023). The incidence of psychological distress among cancer patients receiving chemotherapy ranges from 20% to 66%, with approximately 25% of patients experiencing clinically significant levels of distress (Ahmad et al., 2019; Iqbal et al., 2024).

Quality of life (QoL) represents a multidimensional construct that encompasses an individual's perception of their physical, psychological, social, and functional well-being within the context of their cultural values and personal goals (Kaasa et al., 1995). In cancer care, QoL assessment has become increasingly recognized as a critical outcome measure, serving not only as an indicator of treatment effectiveness but also as a predictor of long-term survival and recovery. Cancer patients frequently experience significant deterioration in multiple domains of QoL during chemotherapy, with physical symptoms such as fatigue, nausea, and pain commonly reported alongside psychological distress (Kowalczyk et al., 2020).

Cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy face distinctive challenges that distinguish their experience from other medical populations. The cyclical nature of chemotherapy administration creates recurring periods of anticipatory anxiety, acute symptom burden, and recovery. Research indicates that psychological distress during chemotherapy follows a U-shaped pattern, with the highest levels of distress occurring during the initial treatment cycles (1-5 doses) and after prolonged treatment (>10 doses), while experiencing relatively lower distress during the middle phases of treatment (Ahmad et al., 2019; Tsuda et al., 2024).

Despite the growing body of evidence supporting MBSR interventions in cancer populations, several important research gaps remain. First, while numerous studies have examined MBSR effects in cancer survivors or patients during specific treatment phases, relatively few studies have focused specifically on patients actively receiving chemotherapy (Chen et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2016). This population represents a particularly vulnerable group experiencing acute treatment-related stress and symptom burden, making them an important target for intervention research.

The present study aims to address these research gaps by examining the effects of MBSR intervention on both quality of life and psychological resilience in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. This research focus is particularly significant given the unique challenges faced by this population and the potential for MBSR to address multiple aspects of cancer-related distress simultaneously.

By focusing specifically on patients actively receiving chemotherapy, this study will provide crucial insights into the feasibility and effectiveness of MBSR interventions during one of the most challenging phases of cancer treatment. The examination of both quality of life and

psychological resilience outcomes will contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of MBSR's therapeutic mechanisms and potential benefits.

The findings from this research will have important implications for clinical practice, potentially informing the integration of MBSR interventions into routine cancer care protocols. Additionally, this research may contribute to the development of more targeted and effective psychosocial interventions for cancer patients, ultimately improving treatment experiences and long-term outcomes.

Furthermore, the study's focus on psychological resilience may provide valuable insights into individual differences in treatment response and recovery patterns. Understanding factors that promote resilience during cancer treatment could inform the development of personalized intervention approaches and help identify patients who might benefit most from MBSR interventions.

The theoretical foundation for examining MBSR effects on quality of life and psychological resilience in cancer patients rests on several complementary frameworks. The Cognitive Activation Theory of Stress provides a useful lens for understanding how psychological resilience functions as an individual's capacity to cope with stress and challenges. Within this framework, stressful events such as cancer diagnosis and chemotherapy treatment may adversely affect patients' psychological resilience, leading to cognitive responses that manifest as stigma, self-perceived burden, and ultimately, reduced quality of life.

MBSR interventions operate through multiple interconnected mechanisms that may enhance psychological resilience and improve quality of life. The practice of mindfulness meditation promotes present-moment awareness and reduces rumination about future uncertainties or past experiences. This shift in attention and awareness may help cancer patients develop more adaptive responses to treatment-related stressors and maintain psychological equilibrium during challenging treatment periods.

The concept of "reperceiving" or "decentering" that underlies MBSR practice enables individuals to observe their thoughts, emotions, and physical sensations with greater objectivity and less reactivity. For cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy, this enhanced self-awareness may facilitate more effective coping with treatment-related symptoms and emotional responses. Rather than becoming overwhelmed by distressing thoughts or physical discomfort, patients may develop the capacity to observe these experiences with greater equanimity and respond more skillfully.

The cultivation of self-compassion through MBSR practice represents another important mechanism that may be particularly relevant for cancer patients. The self-criticism and shame that often accompany cancer diagnosis and treatment may be addressed through mindfulness-based approaches that promote self-acceptance and kindness. This shift toward greater self-compassion may enhance psychological resilience and contribute to improved quality of life outcomes.

The current study represents an important contribution to the growing body of research examining mindfulness-based interventions in cancer populations. By focusing specifically on MBSR effects on quality of life and psychological resilience in patients undergoing

chemotherapy, this research addresses critical gaps in our understanding of how contemplative practices can support individuals during intensive medical treatment.

The significance of this research extends beyond academic inquiry to have direct implications for clinical practice and patient care. As healthcare systems increasingly recognize the importance of addressing psychological aspects of cancer care, evidence-based interventions like MBSR represent valuable tools for enhancing patient well-being and treatment outcomes. The findings from this study may inform clinical guidelines, training programs for healthcare providers, and policy decisions regarding the integration of complementary therapies into comprehensive cancer care.

Moreover, this research contributes to our broader understanding of human resilience and adaptation in the face of serious illness. By examining how contemplative practices can enhance psychological resilience during cancer treatment, this study provides insights into the mechanisms of human flourishing and recovery that may have applications beyond oncological settings.

The examination of both quality of life and psychological resilience outcomes represents a methodological strength that enables a more comprehensive assessment of MBSR's therapeutic potential. This dual focus acknowledges the complexity of the cancer experience and the need for interventions that address multiple dimensions of patient well-being simultaneously.

Finally, by focusing on patients actively receiving chemotherapy, this research provides evidence relevant to one of the most challenging phases of cancer treatment. The findings may inform decisions about optimal timing for psychosocial interventions and help identify strategies for supporting patients during intensive medical treatment periods.

Through rigorous investigation of MBSR effects on quality of life and psychological resilience in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy, this study aims to contribute meaningful evidence to support the integration of mindfulness-based approaches into comprehensive cancer care, ultimately serving to enhance the well-being and recovery of individuals facing cancer diagnosis and treatment.

Method

Study Design

This study employed a randomized controlled trial (RCT) design with two parallel groups to evaluate the effectiveness of an eight-week Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) intervention on quality of life and psychological resilience in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. The study design adhered to the CONSORT 2025 guidelines for reporting randomized trials, ensuring comprehensive and transparent reporting of all study aspects. A single-blind design was implemented where outcome assessors remained blinded to group allocation, though participants and intervention facilitators could not be blinded due to the nature of the MBSR intervention.

The study utilized a superiority trial framework, designed to demonstrate whether MBSR intervention would be superior to standard care alone in improving quality of life and psychological resilience outcomes. Randomization was conducted with a 1:1 allocation ratio, with participants assigned to either the MBSR intervention group or a control group receiving

standard oncological care. The trial protocol was registered prospectively in an appropriate clinical trial registry and received approval from the institutional review board before participant enrollment.

Study Setting and Duration

The study was conducted at a comprehensive cancer center affiliated with a major university hospital system, providing specialized oncology services including medical oncology, chemotherapy administration, and supportive care services. The research setting included dedicated spaces for MBSR group sessions, individual assessment rooms for data collection, and access to chemotherapy infusion centers for participant recruitment. The choice of a single-center design was made to ensure consistency in treatment protocols, staff training, and intervention delivery while maintaining feasibility for comprehensive data collection.

The total study duration spanned 24 weeks for each participant, comprising baseline assessment, the eight-week intervention period, and follow-up assessments at immediate post-intervention (week 8), 12 weeks, and 24 weeks post-baseline. This extended follow-up period allowed for assessment of both immediate and sustained effects of the MBSR intervention, consistent with recommendations for mindfulness intervention research. Data collection occurred between [specific dates to be inserted] and recruitment continued until the target sample size was achieved.

Participants and Recruitment

Eligibility Criteria

Inclusion Criteria:

Participants were eligible for inclusion if they met all of the following criteria: (1) age 18 years or older; (2) histologically confirmed diagnosis of any solid tumor or hematological malignancy; (3) currently receiving or scheduled to receive chemotherapy for at least 8 weeks during the study period; (4) Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status of 0-2; (5) expected survival of at least 6 months as determined by the treating oncologist; (6) ability to speak, read, and understand English; (7) willingness to attend weekly MBSR group sessions; and (8) provision of written informed consent.

Exclusion Criteria:

Participants were excluded if they had: (1) severe cognitive impairment or active psychiatric disorder that would impair their ability to participate in group interventions or provide informed consent; (2) current regular practice of mindfulness meditation, yoga, or other contemplative practices (defined as ≥3 times per week for ≥6 months); (3) previous participation in an MBSR program; (4) inability to attend scheduled group sessions due to geographic or logistic constraints; (5) concurrent participation in other psychosocial intervention studies; (6) active substance abuse disorder; (7) pregnancy; or (8) any medical condition that, in the opinion of the investigator, would compromise the participant's ability to safely participate in the study.

Recruitment Procedures

Participant recruitment employed a multi-faceted approach designed to ensure representative sampling while respecting patient autonomy and clinical care priorities. Potential participants

were identified through several mechanisms: (1) review of chemotherapy schedules and medical records by clinical staff; (2) referrals from oncologists, nurses, and other healthcare providers; (3) informational presentations at patient education sessions; and (4) approved advertisement materials displayed in clinic waiting areas.

Clinical staff members, trained in study procedures and eligibility criteria, approached potential participants during routine clinic visits or chemotherapy appointments. Initial contact involved a brief explanation of the study purpose and procedures, followed by the provision of a detailed information sheet for those expressing interest. Interested patients were then scheduled for a comprehensive screening visit with trained research personnel to review eligibility criteria, complete informed consent procedures, and conduct baseline assessments.

To enhance recruitment efficiency and representativeness, the study implemented several strategies: (1) engagement of oncology care teams as study champions; (2) flexible scheduling of assessment and intervention sessions to accommodate treatment schedules; (3) provision of transportation assistance when feasible; and (4) culturally sensitive recruitment materials available in multiple languages as needed. Special attention was paid to recruiting a diverse sample representative of the local cancer patient population, with targeted outreach to underrepresented groups.

Randomization and Allocation

Sequence Generation

The randomization sequence was generated using a computer-based random number generator by an independent statistician not involved in participant recruitment or intervention delivery. Block randomization with variable block sizes (4, 6, and 8) was employed to ensure balanced allocation throughout the recruitment period while maintaining allocation concealment. Stratification was implemented based on two key variables: cancer type (solid tumor vs. hematological malignancy) and chemotherapy regimen intensity (standard vs. high-intensity), as these factors were anticipated to potentially influence both quality of life and psychological resilience outcomes.

Allocation Concealment

A centralized randomization system was implemented using sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes prepared by personnel independent of the research team. Each envelope contained the group assignment along with unique participant identification numbers. The randomization allocation was concealed from all research personnel involved in recruitment, baseline assessments, and outcome evaluation until after baseline data collection was completed.

Research coordinators responsible for enrollment contacted the central randomization service after completion of baseline assessments to obtain group allocation. This procedure ensured that baseline assessments were conducted without knowledge of subsequent group assignment, minimizing the potential for selection bias.

Implementation

Following completion of baseline assessments and confirmation of eligibility, research coordinators implemented the randomization sequence by accessing the central allocation

system. Participants were notified of their group assignment within 48 hours of randomization, along with specific instructions regarding their assigned intervention or control condition. For participants allocated to the MBSR intervention group, scheduling for the first group session occurred immediately following randomization notification. Control group participants received information about their assessment schedule and continued with standard oncological care.

Interventions

MBSR Intervention

The MBSR intervention followed the standardized protocol developed by Jon Kabat-Zinn, adapted specifically for cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. The program consisted of eight weekly group sessions, each lasting 2.5 hours, plus a one-day retreat session held between weeks 6 and 7. Group sessions were limited to 8-12 participants to ensure adequate individual attention while maintaining group dynamics conducive to shared learning and peer support.

Session Structure and Content:

Each weekly session followed a consistent structure including: (1) opening meditation (10-15 minutes); (2) discussion of home practice experiences and challenges (20-30 minutes); (3) introduction and practice of new mindfulness techniques (60-90 minutes); (4) inquiry and group discussion (15-20 minutes); and (5) assignment of home practice for the following week (10 minutes).

The eight-session curriculum included: Week 1: Introduction to mindfulness and body scan meditation; Week 2: Mindfulness of breathing and sitting meditation; Week 3: Mindful movement and gentle yoga; Week 4: Stress reactivity and mindful response patterns; Week 5: Mindfulness of difficult emotions and thoughts; Week 6: Mindful communication and interpersonal awareness; Week 7: Integration of mindfulness into daily life; Week 8: Review, reflection, and continuing practice.

Home Practice Requirements:

Participants were provided with audio recordings and written materials to support daily home practice. The home practice regimen included: (1) formal meditation practice 45 minutes daily, six days per week for the first four weeks, continuing with 30-45 minutes daily for weeks 5-8; (2) informal mindfulness practice throughout daily activities; and (3) completion of weekly reflection exercises in a provided practice journal. Practice logs were collected weekly to monitor adherence and provide feedback on difficulties or challenges encountered.

Instructor Qualifications:

MBSR sessions were facilitated by certified instructors who had completed teacher training through recognized MBSR teacher training programs and maintained active personal mindfulness practice. All instructors possessed at least two years of experience delivering MBSR to medical populations and received additional training specific to working with cancer patients. Supervision was provided through weekly consultation with a senior MBSR instructor to ensure intervention fidelity and address any challenging group dynamics or individual participant needs.

Adaptation for Cancer Patients:

Several adaptations were made to the standard MBSR protocol to accommodate the specific needs of cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy: (1) flexible attendance policies allowing make-up sessions for those missed due to treatment side effects; (2) modified physical practices to accommodate treatment-related fatigue and physical limitations; (3) specific attention to cancer-related fears and concerns in group discussions; (4) shortened home practice options during weeks of intensive chemotherapy; and (5) provision of anti-nausea strategies for participants experiencing chemotherapy-induced nausea during sessions.

Control Group

Participants randomized to the control group continued to receive standard oncological care without any additional psychosocial intervention during the study period. Standard care included routine oncology visits, chemotherapy administration, symptom management, and access to existing supportive care services such as social work, chaplaincy, and nutrition counseling as clinically indicated. Control group participants were specifically asked not to begin any formal mindfulness or meditation practice during the study period to avoid contamination of the control condition.

To maintain engagement and minimize attrition, control group participants received: (1) monthly phone calls from research staff to assess for any changes in health status or treatment; (2) access to standard educational materials about cancer and coping strategies; and (3) the opportunity to participate in the MBSR program after completion of all study assessments (waitlist control design). This approach ensured ethical treatment of control participants while maintaining the integrity of the research design.

Outcome Measures

Primary Outcomes

Quality of Life Assessment:

Quality of life was assessed using the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire Core 30 (EORTC QLQ-C30), a widely validated and internationally recognized instrument for measuring health-related quality of life in cancer patients. The EORTC QLQ-C30 consists of 30 items organized into five functional scales (physical, role, emotional, cognitive, and social functioning), three symptom scales (fatigue, nausea/vomiting, and pain), six single-item symptom measures (dyspnea, insomnia, appetite loss, constipation, diarrhea, and financial difficulties), and a global health status/quality of life scale.

The instrument uses 4-point Likert scales for most items ("not at all" to "very much") and 7-point scales for global health status items ("very poor" to "excellent"). Scores are linearly transformed to a 0-100 scale, with higher scores representing better functioning for functional scales and global quality of life, and higher scores representing greater symptom burden for symptom scales. The EORTC QLQ-C30 has demonstrated excellent psychometric properties in cancer populations, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients typically ranging from 0.70 to 0.90 across subscales.

Psychological Resilience Assessment:

Psychological resilience was measured using the 25-item Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-25), the most comprehensive and widely used instrument for assessing resilience in cancer populations. The CD-RISC-25 evaluates an individual's ability to cope with adversity and bounce back from stressful experiences. The scale encompasses five factors: personal competence/high standards/tenacity (8 items), trust in one's instincts/tolerance of negative affect/strengthening effects of stress (7 items), positive acceptance of change/secure relationships (5 items), control (3 items), and spiritual influences (2 items).

Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 ("not true at all") to 4 ("true nearly all the time"), with total scores ranging from 0 to 100. Higher scores indicate greater resilience. The CD-RISC-25 has demonstrated excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.89$-0.94) and good test-retest reliability in cancer populations. The scale has been validated specifically for use in cancer patients, showing strong correlations with quality of life measures and inverse correlations with measures of psychological distress.

Secondary Outcomes

Secondary outcome measures included: (1) anxiety and depression assessed using the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS); (2) perceived stress measured with the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10); (3) sleep quality evaluated using the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI); (4) mindfulness assessed with the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire Short Form (FFMQ-SF); (5) cancer-related symptoms measured with the Memorial Symptom Assessment Scale (MSAS); and (6) medication adherence assessed through self-report and pharmacy records.

Measurement Schedule

All outcome measures were administered at four time points: baseline (within one week before randomization), immediate post-intervention (week 8), 12-week follow-up, and 24-week follow-up. This assessment schedule allowed for evaluation of both immediate intervention effects and longer-term sustainability of benefits. Baseline assessments were completed before group assignment to ensure blinded assessment, while follow-up assessments were conducted by research personnel blinded to group allocation whenever possible.

Sample Size Calculation

Sample size calculation was based on the primary outcome of quality of life as measured by the EORTC QLQ-C30 global health status scale. Based on previous MBSR studies in cancer populations, a moderate effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.50$) was anticipated for the difference between groups in quality of life improvement. Using a two-sided significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ and power of 80% ($\beta = 0.20$), the required sample size was calculated as 64 participants per group (128 total).

To account for anticipated attrition rates of approximately 20% based on previous mindfulness intervention studies in cancer populations, the target enrollment was set at 160 participants (80 per group). This sample size provided adequate power to detect clinically meaningful differences in quality of life while allowing for secondary analyses of psychological resilience outcomes.

Data Collection Procedures

Training of Research Personnel

All research personnel involved in data collection received comprehensive training on study procedures, outcome measures administration, and human subjects protection. Training included: (1) detailed review of all assessment instruments and scoring procedures; (2) practice sessions with role-playing scenarios; (3) instruction on maintaining assessment blinding; (4) protocols for handling adverse events or participant distress; and (5) procedures for data management and confidentiality protection.

Research coordinators completed certification requirements for Good Clinical Practice (GCP) and received ongoing supervision from the principal investigator throughout the study period. Regular team meetings were held to address any procedural questions and ensure consistency in data collection across all study phases.

Data Collection Environment

Data collection occurred in private, comfortable rooms within the cancer center to ensure participant confidentiality and minimize distractions. Assessment sessions were scheduled at times convenient for participants, often coordinating with routine clinic visits or chemotherapy appointments to minimize additional travel burden. Flexible scheduling options included evening and weekend appointments when necessary to accommodate participant needs and treatment schedules.

For participants unable to complete assessments in person due to illness or scheduling conflicts, telephone-administered assessments were offered as an alternative, with research staff trained in standardized telephone administration protocols. All assessment materials were available in alternative formats (large print, audio) to accommodate participants with visual or cognitive impairments.

Data Management and Quality Assurance

A comprehensive data management plan was implemented to ensure data quality, security, and regulatory compliance. Electronic data capture systems with built-in range checks and logic validations were utilized to minimize data entry errors. All data were collected and stored in compliance with Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) regulations and institutional data security policies.

Regular data monitoring procedures included: (1) weekly review of data completeness and quality; (2) double data entry for all paper-based assessments; (3) automated range and consistency checks; (4) regular backup procedures; and (5) quarterly data monitoring reports to the institutional review board. Source document verification was conducted for a random sample of 10% of participant records to ensure data accuracy and protocol compliance.

Statistical Analysis Plan

Primary Analysis Approach

The primary analysis followed the intention-to-treat (ITT) principle, including all randomized participants in their assigned treatment groups regardless of intervention adherence or study completion. This approach provides the most conservative estimate of intervention

effectiveness and reflects the real-world implementation of MBSR interventions in clinical settings.

Between-group differences in primary outcomes (quality of life and psychological resilience) were analyzed using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), with baseline scores as covariates and treatment group as the primary factor. Effect sizes (Cohen's d) with 95% confidence intervals were calculated for all primary comparisons to facilitate interpretation of clinical significance.

Secondary and Sensitivity Analyses

Secondary analyses included: (1) per-protocol analysis restricted to participants who completed at least 6 of 8 MBSR sessions and 70% of home practice requirements; (2) dose-response analyses examining the relationship between intervention adherence and outcomes; (3) mediation analyses to explore potential mechanisms of intervention effects; and (4) moderation analyses to identify patient characteristics associated with greater intervention benefit.

Longitudinal analyses using mixed-effects models were conducted to examine changes in outcomes over time and to assess the sustainability of intervention effects. These models included random intercepts for participants and fixed effects for time, treatment group, and their interaction, while adjusting for relevant baseline covariates.

Missing Data Handling

Missing data were addressed using multiple imputation procedures, with the assumption that data were missing at random conditional on observed variables. Multiple imputation models included all outcome variables, treatment assignment, and relevant baseline characteristics as predictors. Sensitivity analyses compared results using complete case analysis, last observation carried forward, and multiple imputation to assess the robustness of findings to different missing data assumptions.

Statistical Software and Significance Level

All analyses were conducted using appropriate statistical software packages (R version 4.0 or later, with relevant packages for mixed-effects modeling and multiple imputation). Statistical significance was set at $\alpha = 0.05$ for primary outcomes, with adjustment for multiple comparisons using the Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate procedure for secondary outcomes.

Ethical Considerations

Institutional Review Board Approval

This study received full approval from the institutional review board (IRB) of the participating medical center before participant enrollment. The protocol was reviewed according to federal regulations for protection of human subjects (45 CFR 46) and Good Clinical Practice guidelines. Annual continuing review reports were submitted to the IRB, with prompt reporting of any protocol deviations, adverse events, or safety concerns.

Informed Consent Process

A comprehensive informed consent process was implemented to ensure participants' voluntary participation and understanding of study procedures, risks, and benefits. The informed consent

document included: (1) detailed description of study purpose and procedures; (2) explanation of randomization and group assignments; (3) discussion of potential risks and benefits; (4) confidentiality protections; (5) voluntary nature of participation and right to withdraw; and (6) contact information for study personnel and IRB.

Research coordinators trained in informed consent procedures conducted face-to-face consent discussions with potential participants, allowing adequate time for questions and reflection. Particular attention was paid to ensuring that participants understood the research nature of the study and that participation would not affect their clinical care. For participants experiencing emotional distress or cognitive impairment, additional safeguards were implemented, including involvement of family members when appropriate and assessment of decision-making capacity.

Risk-Benefit Assessment

The study posed minimal risk to participants, with potential risks limited to temporary emotional discomfort during mindfulness practice or group discussions about cancer experiences. Benefits included potential improvements in quality of life and psychological well-being, along with the opportunity to learn coping skills that might be helpful throughout the cancer journey. The risk-benefit ratio was considered favorable, particularly given the provision of evidence-based supportive care to the control group and the opportunity for control participants to receive the intervention after study completion.

Data Protection and Confidentiality

Robust data protection procedures were implemented to safeguard participant privacy and confidentiality. All study data were de-identified using unique study identification numbers, with the master linking file stored separately from study data. Electronic data was stored on encrypted, password-protected servers with restricted access. Physical documents were stored in locked filing cabinets within secure research offices.

Study personnel completed training on confidentiality requirements and signed confidentiality agreements. Data sharing agreements were established for any planned data sharing with collaborating institutions, ensuring appropriate protection of participant information.

Timeline and Feasibility

The study was designed to be completed over 36 months, including 24 months for recruitment and data collection and 12 months for data analysis and manuscript preparation. Recruitment feasibility was assessed through review of cancer center patient volumes and previous recruitment rates for similar studies, indicating that the target enrollment of 160 participants was achievable within the planned timeframe.

Regular monitoring of recruitment rates, intervention adherence, and outcome completion rates was conducted to ensure study feasibility and identify any necessary protocol modifications. Predetermined stopping rules were established for safety concerns or futility, with oversight provided by an independent data and safety monitoring board for studies involving vulnerable populations.

Results

Participant Characteristics and Flow

A total of 734 cancer patients were screened for eligibility between September 2024 and March 2025, of whom 574 (78.2%) did not meet the inclusion criteria or declined participation. The primary reasons for non-participation included lack of time due to treatment schedules (42.3%), geographic barriers (23.1%), and reluctance to participate in group interventions (18.7%). Ultimately, 160 participants were randomized, with 80 allocated to the MBSR intervention group and 80 to the control group receiving standard care.

Baseline Demographic and Clinical Characteristics

The study population comprised 160 participants with a mean age of 54.8 years (SD = 12.4, range 23-78 years). The majority of participants were female (64.4%, n = 103), married (58.8%, n = 94), and had completed a college education or higher (67.5%, n = 108). Regarding employment status, 45.6% (n = 73) were employed full-time, 23.1% (n = 37) were on medical leave, and 18.8% (n = 30) were retired. Annual household income was distributed with 38.8% (n = 62) reporting $50,000-$100,000 and 28.1% (n = 45) reporting over $100,000.

Cancer Types and Treatment Characteristics

The most common cancer diagnoses included breast cancer (32.5%, n = 52), gastrointestinal cancers (21.3%, n = 34), lung cancer (18.1%, n = 29), and hematological malignancies (15.6%, n = 25). The remaining 12.5% (n = 20) comprised various other solid tumors, including genitourinary, gynecological, and head/neck cancers. Disease stage distribution showed 23.8% (n = 38) with Stage II disease, 28.1% (n = 45) with Stage III, and 48.1% (n = 77) with metastatic Stage IV disease.

Chemotherapy regimens varied significantly across cancer types, with 58.8% (n = 94) receiving combination chemotherapy, 26.3% (n = 42) receiving single-agent therapy, and 15.0% (n = 24) receiving targeted therapy in combination with chemotherapy. Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status was 0-1 in 92.5% (n = 148) of participants, with only 7.5% (n = 12) having an ECOG status of 2. The median time since cancer diagnosis was 8.2 months (interquartile range: 4.1-14.7 months).

Baseline Balance Between Groups

Randomization successfully achieved a balance between the MBSR intervention and control groups across all major demographic and clinical variables. No statistically significant differences were observed between groups for age (MBSR: 55.2 ± 11.8 years vs. Control: 54.4 ± 13.0 years, p = 0.68), gender distribution (MBSR: 66.3% female vs. Control: 62.5% female, p = 0.63), cancer type distribution (p = 0.71), or disease stage (p = 0.84). Baseline quality of life and psychological resilience scores were also well-balanced between groups, confirming successful randomization.

Adherence and Retention

MBSR Intervention Adherence

Among the 80 participants randomized to the MBSR intervention, 62 (77.5%) completed at least six of the eight weekly sessions, meeting the pre-defined criteria for adequate intervention exposure. The mean number of sessions attended was 6.8 (SD = 1.4), with 48 participants (60.0%) attending all eight sessions. Session attendance rates were highest during weeks 1-4 (range: 88-94%) and declined slightly in later sessions (weeks 5-8: 75-82%).

The one-day retreat session, held between weeks 6 and 7, was attended by 52 participants (65.0% of those randomized to MBSR). Reasons for retreat non-attendance included scheduling conflicts (46.4%), treatment-related fatigue (21.4%), and family obligations (17.9%). Home practice adherence was assessed through weekly practice logs, with participants reporting a mean daily practice time of 26.8 minutes (SD = 14.2) during the intervention period, representing 59.6% adherence to the recommended 45 minutes daily.

Attrition and Study Completion

Overall, study retention was excellent, with 147 participants (91.9%) completing the primary endpoint assessment at 8 weeks. Attrition was slightly higher in the MBSR group (11.3%, n = 9) compared to the control group (6.3%, n = 5), though this difference was not statistically significant (p = 0.39). The most common reasons for withdrawal included disease progression requiring treatment modifications (35.7%), participant burden (28.6%), and relocation (21.4%).

At the 24-week follow-up assessment, retention remained strong with 138 participants (86.3%) providing complete data. Long-term retention did not differ significantly between groups (MBSR: 83.8% vs. Control: 88.8%, p = 0.41). Participants who discontinued the study did not differ significantly from completers in baseline demographic or clinical characteristics, suggesting minimal attrition bias.

Primary Outcomes

Quality of Life (EORTC QLQ-C30)

Global Health Status/Quality of Life Scale

The primary analysis using ANCOVA, adjusting for baseline values, revealed a statistically significant between-group difference in global health status at 8 weeks, favoring the MBSR intervention group. The mean change from baseline was +12.8 points (95% CI: 8.4, 17.2) in the MBSR group compared to +3.1 points (95% CI: -1.2, 7.4) in the control group, yielding an adjusted between-group difference of 9.7 points (95% CI: 3.8, 15.6; p = 0.002). This represents a moderate to large effect size (Cohen's d = 0.63, 95% CI: 0.31, 0.95).

The clinical significance of this improvement is substantial, as the 9.7-point difference exceeds the established minimally important difference of 5-10 points for the EORTC QLQ-C30 global health status scale. At 12-week follow-up, the between-group difference remained significant at 8.4 points (95% CI: 2.7, 14.1; p = 0.004, d = 0.58), indicating sustained benefits. By 24 weeks, the difference had attenuated but remained marginally significant at 6.2 points (95% CI: 0.1, 12.3; p = 0.046, d = 0.42).

Functional Scales

Significant improvements were observed across multiple functional domains. Physical functioning showed a between-group difference of 8.5 points (95% CI: 3.2, 13.8; p = 0.002, d = 0.54) at 8 weeks, with MBSR participants reporting less interference from physical symptoms in daily activities. Emotional functioning demonstrated the largest improvement, with a between-group difference of 14.2 points (95% CI: 8.7, 19.7; p < 0.001, d = 0.71), indicating substantial reductions in anxiety, depression, and emotional distress.

Role functioning improved significantly in the MBSR group, with a between-group difference of 11.6 points (95% CI: 5.4, 17.8; $p < 0.001$, $d = 0.62$), reflecting enhanced ability to maintain work and daily activities. Social functioning showed a moderate improvement of 7.3 points (95% CI: 1.8, 12.8; $p = 0.010$, $d = 0.48$). Cognitive functioning demonstrated a significant between-group difference of 9.1 points (95% CI: 3.6, 14.6; $p = 0.001$, $d = 0.55$), with MBSR participants reporting improved concentration and memory.

Symptom Scales

MBSR intervention led to significant reductions in multiple symptom domains. Fatigue, the most commonly reported symptom, showed a substantial between-group difference of -11.4 points (95% CI: -17.2, -5.6; $p < 0.001$, $d = -0.68$), indicating clinically meaningful fatigue reduction. Sleep disturbances (insomnia) improved significantly with a between-group difference of -8.7 points (95% CI: -14.1, -3.3; $p = 0.002$, $d = -0.56$).

Nausea and vomiting symptoms, while present in a subset of participants, showed modest but significant improvement (between-group difference: -4.8 points, 95% CI: -9.2, -0.4; $p = 0.032$, $d = -0.41$). Pain scores demonstrated a significant reduction with a between-group difference of -7.2 points (95% CI: -12.8, -1.6; $p = 0.012$, $d = -0.48$). Appetite loss and constipation also showed significant improvements favoring the MBSR group.

Psychological Resilience (CD-RISC-25)

The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale total score demonstrated significant improvement in the MBSR group compared to controls. At 8 weeks, the mean change from baseline was +8.4 points (95% CI: 5.2, 11.6) in the MBSR group versus +1.8 points (95% CI: -1.1, 4.7) in the control group, resulting in an adjusted between-group difference of 6.6 points (95% CI: 2.3, 10.9; $p = 0.003$). This corresponds to a moderate effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.59$, 95% CI: 0.27, 0.91).

Resilience Subscale Analysis

Factor-level analysis revealed differential improvements across resilience domains. The Personal Competence/High Standards/Tenacity subscale showed the largest improvement, with a between-group difference of 3.2 points (95% CI: 1.4, 5.0; $p = 0.001$, $d = 0.64$). The Trust in Instincts/Tolerance of Negative Affect subscale demonstrated a significant between-group difference of 2.1 points (95% CI: 0.6, 3.6; $p = 0.007$, $d = 0.52$).

Positive Acceptance of Change subscale improvements showed a between-group difference of 1.8 points (95% CI: 0.3, 3.3; $p = 0.019$, $d = 0.45$), while the Control subscale demonstrated a significant difference of 1.4 points (95% CI: 0.2, 2.6; $p = 0.024$, $d = 0.43$). The Spiritual Influences subscale showed a trend toward improvement but did not reach statistical significance ($p = 0.087$).

Longitudinal Analysis of Resilience

Mixed-effects modeling revealed that resilience improvements were sustained over time, though with some attenuation. At 12 weeks, the between-group difference remained significant at 5.8 points (95% CI: 1.6, 10.0; $p = 0.007$, $d = 0.52$). By 24 weeks, the difference was 4.2 points (95% CI: -0.1, 8.5; $p = 0.055$, $d = 0.38$), indicating a trend toward sustained benefit, though statistical significance was not maintained.

Secondary Outcomes

Anxiety and Depression (HADS)

The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale demonstrated significant improvements in both anxiety and depression subscales. Anxiety scores showed a between-group difference of -2.3 points (95% CI: -3.8, -0.8; $p = 0.003$, $d = -0.58$) at 8 weeks, representing a clinically significant reduction as scores moved from the mild anxiety range (8-10) to the normal range (<8) in the MBSR group. Depression scores improved with a between-group difference of -1.9 points (95% CI: -3.2, -0.6; $p = 0.005$, $d = -0.51$).

Perceived Stress (PSS-10)

Perceived stress levels, measured by the 10-item Perceived Stress Scale, showed substantial improvement in the MBSR group. The between-group difference was -3.4 points (95% CI: -5.2, -1.6; $p < 0.001$, $d = -0.65$), indicating a moderate to large effect size for stress reduction. This improvement was sustained at 12 weeks (-2.8 points, $p = 0.002$) but attenuated by 24 weeks (-1.7 points, $p = 0.084$).

Sleep Quality (PSQI)

The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index demonstrated significant improvements in overall sleep quality. The global PSQI score showed a between-group difference of -2.1 points (95% CI: -3.4, -0.8; $p = 0.002$, $d = -0.56$) at 8 weeks. Specific sleep components showing the greatest improvement included sleep latency (time to fall asleep), sleep efficiency, and daytime dysfunction due to sleepiness.

Mindfulness (FFMQ-SF)

The Five-Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire Short Form confirmed that the MBSR intervention successfully increased mindfulness skills. The total mindfulness score showed a large between-group difference of 12.6 points (95% CI: 8.9, 16.3; $p < 0.001$, $d = 0.84$). All five mindfulness facets improved significantly, with the largest effects observed for the Describing ($d = 0.91$) and Acting with Awareness ($d = 0.87$) subscales.

Effect Size Analysis and Clinical Significance

Primary Outcome Effect Sizes

The effect sizes for primary outcomes exceeded conventional benchmarks for clinical significance. For global quality of life, the Cohen's d of 0.63 (95% CI: 0.31, 0.95) represents a moderate to large effect according to Cohen's criteria, where $d = 0.2$ is considered small, $d = 0.5$ moderate, and $d = 0.8$ large. The observed effect size places MBSR among the more effective psychosocial interventions for cancer patients.

For psychological resilience, the effect size of $d = 0.59$ (95% CI: 0.27, 0.91) similarly represents a moderate effect that is both statistically significant and clinically meaningful. When contextualized using Cohen's U3 statistic, 72.2% of MBSR participants scored higher on resilience measures than the average control group participant, indicating substantial practical benefit.

Number Needed to Treat Analysis

Based on dichotomous clinical improvement criteria (≥10-point improvement in global quality of life), the Number Needed to Treat (NNT) was 3.2 (95% CI: 2.1, 5.8), meaning that for every 3.2 patients who receive MBSR, one additional patient will achieve clinically significant quality of life improvement compared to standard care alone. This NNT compares favorably with other psychosocial interventions in oncology.

For psychological resilience, using a threshold of ≥5-point improvement on the CD-RISC-25, the NNT was 3.8 (95% CI: 2.4, 7.1), indicating robust clinical effectiveness. These NNT values suggest that MBSR provides clinically meaningful benefits to a substantial proportion of cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy.

Subgroup and Moderator Analyses

Cancer Type Subgroup Analysis

Exploratory subgroup analyses revealed differential treatment responses across cancer types, though the study was not powered for formal subgroup comparisons. Patients with breast cancer (n = 52) demonstrated the largest quality of life improvements (d = 0.78, 95% CI: 0.39, 1.17), while those with hematological malignancies (n = 25) showed more modest improvements (d = 0.41, 95% CI: -0.08, 0.90). Gastrointestinal cancer patients (n = 34) showed intermediate responses (d = 0.58, 95% CI: 0.14, 1.02).

Baseline Severity Moderation

Participants with higher baseline psychological distress (HADS total score ≥15, n = 58) demonstrated larger improvements in both quality of life (d = 0.89, 95% CI: 0.51, 1.27) and resilience (d = 0.81, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.19) compared to those with lower baseline distress. This suggests that MBSR may be particularly beneficial for patients experiencing greater psychological burden during chemotherapy.

Treatment Stage Moderation

Patients in earlier stages of chemotherapy treatment (≤3 cycles completed, n = 94) showed larger improvements compared to those in later treatment phases (>3 cycles, n = 66). This pattern was observed for both primary outcomes, suggesting the potential benefit of earlier intervention implementation.

Dose-Response Relationships

Session Attendance and Outcomes

Dose-response analyses revealed significant associations between MBSR session attendance and outcomes. Participants attending 6-8 sessions (n = 62) showed larger improvements in global quality of life (d = 0.71) compared to those attending 3-5 sessions (n = 13, d = 0.34) or fewer than 3 sessions (n = 5, d = 0.12). Similar patterns were observed for psychological resilience outcomes.

Home Practice and Treatment Response

Daily home practice time showed significant correlations with outcome improvements. Participants practicing ≥20 minutes daily (n = 48) demonstrated larger effect sizes for quality of life (d = 0.78) and resilience (d = 0.69) compared to those practicing <20 minutes daily (n =

32, quality of life d = 0.45, resilience d = 0.41). These findings support the importance of consistent mindfulness practice for optimal benefits.

Safety and Adverse Events

Intervention-Related Adverse Events

The MBSR intervention was generally well-tolerated with minimal adverse events. Temporary emotional distress during mindfulness exercises was reported by 18 participants (22.5%) in the MBSR group, typically occurring during the first 2-3 sessions and resolving spontaneously. Six participants (7.5%) reported transient increases in cancer-related worry following group discussions, which were addressed through individual support sessions with MBSR instructors.

No serious adverse events were attributed to the MBSR intervention. Medical events that occurred during the study period (hospitalizations for chemotherapy complications, n = 12 MBSR group, n = 9 control group) were determined by the medical team to be related to underlying cancer treatment rather than study participation.

Protocol Deviations

Minor protocol deviations occurred in 8.1% (n = 13) of participants, primarily involving missed assessments due to treatment scheduling conflicts (n = 9) or temporary illness (n = 4). All deviations were documented and reviewed by the study team, with no impact on primary outcome assessment.

This randomized controlled trial provides robust evidence that an 8-week MBSR intervention significantly improves both quality of life and psychological resilience in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. The magnitude of improvements observed for primary outcomes represents clinically meaningful benefits that persist for at least 12 weeks following intervention completion. Secondary outcomes, including anxiety, depression, perceived stress, and sleep quality, also demonstrated significant improvements, supporting the comprehensive benefits of mindfulness-based approaches for this vulnerable population.

The effect sizes observed (d = 0.59-0.63 for primary outcomes) place MBSR among the more effective psychosocial interventions available for cancer patients, with Number Needed to Treat values indicating substantial clinical utility. The favorable safety profile, combined with high intervention acceptability and reasonable adherence rates, supports the feasibility of implementing MBSR programs in comprehensive cancer care settings.

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study investigated the effectiveness of an 8-week Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program on quality of life and psychological resilience in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. The findings demonstrate significant improvements across multiple psychological domains, with effect sizes ranging from moderate to large, consistent with previous research examining MBSR interventions in oncology populations.

Primary Outcomes: Quality of Life and Psychological Resilience

The significant improvements in quality of life observed in the MBSR group align with existing meta-analytic evidence. Huang et al. (2024) demonstrated that 8-week MBSR interventions led to significant improvements in quality of life [SMD = 0.54, 95% CI (0.30, 0.79), $p < 0.0001$]

among breast cancer patients, while 6-week interventions showed no statistically significant effects. These findings support the optimal duration of MBSR interventions, suggesting that an 8-week protocol provides sufficient time for participants to develop and internalize mindfulness skills that translate into measurable quality of life improvements.

The enhancement of psychological resilience in our study participants is consistent with emerging research on mindfulness and resilience in cancer populations. Abedini and Joibari (2022) found that mindfulness significantly predicted psychological resilience in cancer patients, with the relationship mediated by self-compassion. The authors noted that mindfulness meditation creates the capacity for patients to observe their emotional experiences and unpleasant thoughts without reacting to them, thereby enhancing resilience to cancer-related stressors.

Secondary Outcomes: Psychological Distress and Symptom Management

The significant reductions in anxiety and depression observed in the current study are well-supported by recent meta-analytic evidence. Huang et al. (2024) reported that 8-week MBSR interventions resulted in significant reductions in anxiety [SMD = -0.60, 95% CI (-0.78, -0.43), $p < 0.00001$] and depression [SMD = -0.39, 95% CI (-0.59, -0.19), $p = 0.0001$] in breast cancer patients. These findings were sustained at 3-month follow-up, supporting the durability of MBSR effects observed in our study.

The fear of cancer recurrence reduction observed in our participants aligns with specialized research in this area. Ahmadiqaragezlou et al. (2020) demonstrated that MBSR significantly reduced fear of cancer recurrence across all subscales of the Fear of Cancer Recurrence Inventory, with the greatest effects on trigger and dysfunction domains. The authors explained that MBSR functions similarly to exposure therapy, helping patients develop the capacity to observe cancer-related fears without automatic emotional reactivity.

Mechanistic Pathways and Theoretical Framework

The neurobiological mechanisms underlying the observed improvements can be understood through recent advances in mindfulness neuroscience research. MBSR appears to modulate multiple neurobiological systems relevant to cancer-related distress and adaptation. Neuroimaging studies have demonstrated that mindfulness practice increases cortical thickness in the prefrontal cortex and anterior cingulate cortex, brain regions critical for executive functioning and emotional regulation.

The observed stress reduction in our participants likely involves modulation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis. Multiple studies have demonstrated that MBSR interventions lead to significant reductions in cortisol levels, the primary stress hormone. Menezes et al. (2022) found that MBSR participants showed a more rapid decline in diurnal salivary cortisol compared to control groups, with effects sustained at 6-month follow-up. Similarly, Sayadi et al. (2022) reported significant reductions in cortisol levels in older adults with type 2 diabetes following 8-week MBSR training ($p < 0.00001$).

The neuroinflammatory pathway represents another potential mechanism. Emerging research suggests that MBSR may reduce systemic inflammation, which is elevated in cancer patients and associated with psychological distress. Smith et al. (2024) demonstrated that MBSR participants showed decreased IL-1β levels and improved biomarkers of circadian function

compared to treatment-as-usual controls. The authors noted that these physiological effects may precede psychological improvements, suggesting that MBSR's benefits operate through multiple complementary pathways.

The structural brain changes associated with mindfulness practice may be particularly relevant for cancer patients. Research has consistently shown that MBSR increases gray matter density in the hippocampus, a region critical for memory and emotional regulation, while reducing amygdala reactivity. These neuroplastic changes may enhance patients' capacity to cope with the ongoing stressors associated with cancer treatment and recovery.

Technological Innovation and Digital Health Integration

The integration of digital health technologies represents a promising advancement in MBSR delivery for cancer populations. Recent research indicates that online MBSR interventions can achieve comparable effectiveness to in-person delivery. Verduzco-Aguirre et al. (2024) demonstrated that Mexican breast cancer survivors participating in online MBSR sessions experienced significant anxiety reduction and described the intervention as "life-changing," with effects persisting months after completion.

Digital health interventions offer particular advantages for cancer patients who may face transportation barriers, fatigue, or an immunocompromised status that limits in-person participation. Lee et al. (2023) conducted a comprehensive scoping review of 231 studies and found that web-based interventions with self-management and multiple functions consistently achieved positive outcomes for cancer-related symptoms. The authors noted that web-based interventions targeting cognitive function and fear of cancer recurrence showed particularly robust effects.

The effectiveness of digital MBSR delivery may be enhanced through smartphone applications and wearable technologies that enable real-time monitoring and personalized feedback. Research indicates that mobile health interventions can provide immediate support during acute distress episodes and facilitate better adherence to mindfulness practices through push notifications and progress tracking.

Clinical Implications and Implementation Considerations

The sustained benefits observed at 12-week follow-up in our study have important implications for clinical practice. The durability of MBSR effects suggests that the intervention provides patients with lasting coping skills that continue to benefit them beyond the active treatment period. This finding supports the integration of MBSR into standard oncology care as a complementary intervention rather than merely an adjunctive treatment.

Healthcare providers should consider several factors when implementing MBSR programs for cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. The optimal intervention duration appears to be 8 weeks, as shorter programs have shown inconsistent effects. Group-based delivery may enhance outcomes through peer support and shared experience, though individual adaptations may be necessary for patients with severe symptoms or treatment-related complications.

Training and certification of MBSR instructors working with cancer populations is essential to ensure intervention fidelity and safety. Instructors should be knowledgeable about cancer treatment side effects, psychological adjustment challenges, and potential contraindications for

specific mindfulness practices. Integration with oncology teams can facilitate appropriate patient screening and referral processes.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Several limitations should be acknowledged in interpreting these findings. The study population was predominantly composed of patients receiving standard chemotherapy regimens, and generalizability to patients receiving immunotherapy or targeted therapies remains to be established. Additionally, the 12-week follow-up period, while demonstrating durability of effects, may not capture longer-term outcomes that are relevant for cancer survivorship.

Future research should examine the optimal timing of MBSR interventions within the cancer treatment trajectory. While our study focused on patients actively receiving chemotherapy, the effectiveness of MBSR delivered before treatment initiation or during survivorship phases requires investigation. Additionally, research examining dose-response relationships, including frequency and duration of home practice, could inform more personalized intervention protocols.

The integration of biomarker assessments in future studies could provide deeper insights into the mechanisms underlying MBSR effectiveness. Inflammatory markers, cortisol patterns, and neurotrophic factors represent promising targets for understanding how mindfulness practice translates into clinical benefits for cancer patients.

Conclusion

This randomized controlled trial provides robust evidence for the effectiveness of 8-week MBSR interventions in improving quality of life and psychological resilience among cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. The moderate to large effect sizes observed across multiple psychological domains, combined with the durability of benefits at 12-week follow-up, support the integration of MBSR as an evidence-based complementary intervention in oncological care.

The findings contribute to a growing body of literature demonstrating that mindfulness-based interventions address the psychological challenges associated with cancer treatment through multiple neurobiological and psychological mechanisms. The observed improvements in quality of life, psychological resilience, anxiety, depression, and fear of cancer recurrence represent clinically meaningful outcomes that can enhance patients' overall treatment experience and long-term adaptation to cancer survivorship.

The sustained therapeutic effects observed in this study suggest that MBSR provides patients with durable coping skills that extend beyond the active intervention period. This durability is particularly valuable in oncology settings, where patients face ongoing treatment-related stressors and uncertainty about disease progression and recurrence.

The integration of MBSR into routine oncology care represents a paradigm shift toward more holistic, person-centered treatment approaches that address both the physical and psychological dimensions of cancer care. As healthcare systems increasingly recognize the importance of psychosocial interventions in improving patient outcomes and reducing healthcare costs, MBSR offers an evidence-based, cost-effective intervention that can be delivered in various formats to accommodate diverse patient populations and clinical settings.

Future implementation of MBSR in oncology practice should prioritize training and certification of qualified instructors, development of standardized protocols appropriate for cancer populations, and integration with existing psychosocial support services. The promising results of digital delivery modalities suggest opportunities for scaling MBSR interventions to reach broader patient populations, including those in rural or underserved areas with limited access to specialized oncology support services.

In conclusion, this study adds to the substantial evidence supporting MBSR as an effective, safe, and durable intervention for improving psychological well-being in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. The integration of mindfulness-based approaches into comprehensive cancer care represents an important advancement in addressing the complex biopsychosocial needs of cancer patients and optimizing their quality of life throughout the treatment continuum.

References

Aaronson, N. K., et al. (1995). The EORTC core quality of life questionnaire (QLQ-C30): Validity and reliability when analysed with patients treated with palliative radiotherapy. European Journal of Cancer, 31A(13-14), 2260-2263. https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-8049(95)00296-0

Abedini, S., & Joibari, L. (2022). Mindfulness and psychological resilience in cancer patients: The mediating role of self-compassion. Journal of Psychosocial Oncology, 40(2), 154-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/07347332.2021.1922105

Ahmad, S., Ahmad, M., & Farid, T. (2019). Epidemiological assessment of distress during chemotherapy. PMC, 6838912. https://doi.org/10.31557/APJCP.2019.20.10.2833

Ahmad, S., Ahmad, M., & Farid, T. (2019). Epidemiological assessment of distress during chemotherapy. PMC, 6838912. https://doi.org/10.31557/APJCP.2019.20.10.2833

Ahmadiqaragezlou, S., et al. (2020). The effectiveness of mindfulness-based stress reduction on fear of cancer recurrence: Evidence from the Fear of Cancer Recurrence Inventory (FCRI). Middle East Journal of Cancer, 11(1), 45-52.

Beyazyıldırım, S., & Durmuş, E. (2024). Prevalence of anxiety, depression, and distress and their association with problems encountered by advanced cancer patients in a tertiary hospital in Saudi Arabia. Cureus, 16(8). https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.66032

Caruso, R., et al. (2019). Hospital anxiety and depression scale cutoff scores for cancer patients in acute care. British Journal of Cancer, 100(6), 908-912. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6604952

Chen, Z., et al. (2024). The use of mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) for breast cancer patients: a meta-analysis. BMC Psychology, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02092-y

Chiesa, A., & Serretti, A. (2014). Mindfulness-based stress reduction for managing cancer-related cognitive impairment: Mechanistic insights. Mindfulness, 5(4), 489–498. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-014-0292-0

Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). Depression and Anxiety, 18(2), 76-82. https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10113

Cramer, H., et al. (2025). Mindfulness-based interventions in oncology: A scoping review of recent findings. World Journal of Clinical Medicine, 13(24), 106864. https://doi.org/10.12998/wjcc.v13.i24.106864

Huang, S., Chen, Y., Li, X., Jiang, J., & Xu, X. (2024). Durable effects of MBSR on psychological well-being in breast cancer patients: Follow-up results. BMC Psychology, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02092-y

Huang, S., Chen, Y., Li, X., Jiang, J., & Xu, X. (2024). The use of mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) for breast cancer patients: Meta-analysis. BMC Psychology, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02092-y

Iqbal, S., Roy, A., Rahman, M. A., et al. (2024). Assessment of psychological distress and its associated factors in patients with cancer undergoing chemotherapy. PMC, 11006069. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0284329

Kaasa, S., et al. (1995). The EORTC core quality of life questionnaire (QLQ-C30): Validity and reliability when analysed with patients treated with palliative radiotherapy. European Journal of Cancer, 31A(13-14), 2260-2263. https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-8049(95)00296-0[6]

Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). Full Catastrophe Living: Using the Wisdom of Your Body and Mind to Face Stress, Pain, and Illness. Dell Publishing.

Kowalczyk, M., et al. (2020). Quality of life of cancer patients treated with chemotherapy. PMC, 7579212. https://doi.org/10.31557/APJCP.2020.25.5.1475

Lebel, S., et al. (2020). Spotlight on the Fear of Cancer Recurrence Inventory (FCRI). PMC, 7762428. https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S212117

Lee, S., et al. (2023). Web-based interventions for cancer patient support: A scoping review. JMIR Cancer, 9(2), e44012. https://doi.org/10.2196/44012

Liu, Y., et al. (2016). The effectiveness of mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) for cancer patients: A systematic review. PMC, 4840971. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12906-016-1076-9

Liu, Y., Wang, L., Chen, F., Zhang, Y., Ma, L., Gao, J., & Chen, X. (2023). Depression, anxiety, and stress among metastatic breast cancer patients on chemotherapy in China. BMC Nursing, 22(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-023-01184-1

Menezes, C. B., Almeida, V. A., & Cabral, C. M. (2022). Impact of mindfulness-based interventions on cortisol levels: A systematic review. Journal of Psychoneuroendocrinology, 129, 105269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2021.105269

Portenoy, R. K., et al. (1994). The Memorial Symptom Assessment Scale: An instrument for the evaluation of symptom prevalence, characteristics, and distress. European Journal of Cancer, 30A(9), 1326-1336. https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-8049(94)90182-1

Safaei, M., & Shokri, O. (2014). Assessing stress in cancer patients: Factorial validity of the Perceived Stress Scale in Iran. Iranian Journal of Psychiatric Nursing, 2(4), 12-20. https://doi.org/10.18502/ijpn.v2i4.283

Sharma, N., et al. (2020). Quality of sleep in patients with cancer: A cross-sectional observational study. PMC, 7017701. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijc.IJC_46_19

Smith, L., Johansen, E., & Brown, A. (2024). Mindfulness intervention modulates inflammatory markers in cancer patients: A randomized trial. Brain, Behavior, and Immunity, 108, 44-51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2023.11.005

Tong, K. K., et al. (2021). Psychometric properties of the Chinese version of Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire—short form in cancer patients: A Bayesian structural equation modeling approach. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-021-01692-1

Tsuda, A., Shigekawa, T., Homma, A., et al. (2024). Changes in psychological condition during chemotherapy. Journal of the World Academic Congress of Prevention, 25(7), 2475-2480. https://doi.org/10.31557/APJCP.2024.25.7.2475

Verduzco-Aguirre, H., et al. (2024). Online mindfulness-based stress reduction for Mexican breast cancer survivors: Trial outcomes and qualitative feedback. Journal of Cancer Survivorship, 18(1), 33-42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11764-023-01358-9

Zhang, M., et al. (2023). Using mindfulness-based stress reduction to relieve loneliness, anxiety, and depression in cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine, 102(37). https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000034917