Journal Pre-proof

Relationship Between Kinesiophobia and Quality of Life Among Patients with Breast Cancer-Related Lymphedema: Chain-Mediating Effect of Self-Care and Functional Exercise Compliance

Qi Wang, Na Du

Please cite this article as: Wang Q, Du N, Relationship Between Kinesiophobia and Quality of Life Among Patients with Breast Cancer-Related Lymphedema: Chain-Mediating Effect of Self-Care and Functional Exercise Compliance, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Oncology Nursing*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apjon.2023.100346.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Article type: Original article

The Relationship Between Kinesiophobia and Quality of Life Among Patients with Breast Cancer-Related Lymphedema: Chain-Mediating Effect of Self-Care and Functional Exercise Compliance

Qi Wang, Na Du*

Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Shenging Hospital of China Medical University, 36 Sanhao St, Heping District, Shenyang 110000, Liaoning, China.

*Corresponding to**: Na Du, Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Shenging Hospital of China Medical University, 36 Sanhao St, Heping District, Shenyang 110000, Liaoning, China.

Email address: Nanad_gny@163.com

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0083-3323

Statement and Declaration

CRediT author statement

Qi Wang: Methodology, Software, Data curation, Data analysis, Writing-Original draft preparation; **Na Du:** Research conceptualization, Validation, Supervision, Writing-Reviewing and Editing. All authors had full access to all the data in the study, and the corresponding author had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that

no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Ethics statement

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Shengjing Hospital Affiliated to China Medical University (No.EC-2020-HS-030), and in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants provided written informed consent.

Funding

This study received no external funding.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author ND, upon reasonable request.

Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing

No AI tools/services were used during the preparation of this manuscript.

1　**Relationship Between Kinesiophobia and Quality of Life Among Patients with Breast**

2　**Cancer-Related Lymphedema: Chain-Mediating Effect of Self-Care and Functional**

3　**Exercise Compliance**

4　**Abstract**

5　**Objective:** Breast cancer-related lymphedema (BCRL) significantly impacts the quality of life

6　(QoL) of breast cancer survivors following treatment. This study explores the association

7　between kinesiophobia (fear of pain caused by movement) and QoL in post-surgical BCRL

8　survivors and examines whether self-care and compliance with functional exercise act as

9　mediators between these variables.

10　**Methods:** This cross-sectional study surveyed 274 BCRL patients at three tertiary hospitals in

11　Shenyang City, China, from May 2020 to October 2022. The participants completed self-

12　reported questionnaires on self-care, functional exercise compliance, kinesiophobia, and QoL.

13　Medication analysis was conducted using the PROCESS Macro (Model 6).

14　**Results:** Kinesiophobia was found to have negative association with self-care ($p < 0.001$),

15　functional exercise compliance ($p < 0.001$), and QoL ($p < 0.001$). Kinesiophobia indirectly

16　affected QoL through three mediating pathways: self-care (effect = -0.132), functional exercise

17　compliance (effect = -0.390), and a combination of self-care and functional exercise

18　compliance (effect = -0.220), collectively accounting for 7.9%, 23.3%, and 13.1% of the total

19　effect, respectively.

20　**Conclusions:** This study highlights the substantial chain-mediating role of self-care and

21　functional exercise compliance in the relationship between kinesiophobia and QoL. It provides

22   valuable evidence supporting the protective effects of self-care and functional exercise

23   compliance in mitigating kinesiophobia and enhancing the QoL of BCRL survivors.

24   **Keywords:** Breast cancer-related lymphedema; Chain-mediated effect; Functional exercise

25   compliance; Kinesiophobia; Quality of life; Self-care

1. Introduction

Breast cancer (BC) is recognized as the most prevalent malignancy affecting women in China.[1] The primary treatment for clinical BC often involves modified radical mastectomy (MRM) combined with chemoradiotherapy. However, BC survivors frequently endure a substantial burden of postoperative symptoms in the long term. Among these complications, breast cancer-related lymphedema (BCRL) is one of the most common, affecting around 5% to 50% of BC patients.[2] BC surgical procedures can disrupt the normal functioning of the lymph system, leading to the accumulation of excess fluid in the affected upper extremity. This condition is typically associated with severe swelling, pain, stiffness, and even limitations in shoulder and arm mobility.[3] Consequently, previous research has shown that the persistent upper extremity impairments caused by BCRL not only severely impact patients' daily physical activities, but also exacerbate their psychological distress, ultimately diminishing their overall quality of life (QoL).[4]

QoL is a crucial index for assessing the multidimensional aspects of patients' health outcomes in their daily lives during long-term rehabilitation of cancer survivors.[5] Kwan et al. verified that nearly 30% to 70% of BC patients experienced at least mild shoulder or arm symptoms after BC treatment, and 12.5% of patients developed lymphedema, as revealed through a survey of 744 BC patients. Furthermore, both symptomatic patients and BC patients with lymphedema had significantly worse QoL scores compared to asymptomatic patients.[6] In addition, a cross-sectional study conducted by Bulley et al. found that the prevalence of lymphedema peaked at 28% in the third year among 473 women who had undergone BC treatment. Moreover, the study revealed that persistent arm problems seriously impaired

48 patients' upper limb function and led to a decline in their QoL over time.[7] A recent review has

49 shown that patients with BCRL and poor QoL often experience feelings of weakness, financial

50 burden, concerns about disease progression, changes in body image, and reduced limb

51 function.[8] Therefore, considering that the essential aspects of QoL such as physical functioning,

52 psychological health, social support, and spiritual well-being experienced by BC patients are

53 strongly associated with lymphedema, QoL is widely perceived as a particularly significant

54 factor in measuring symptom relief and prognosis among BC survivors.[9]

55 Kinesiophobia refers to a situation where individuals have an irrational and intense fear of

56 physical activity to avoid painful re-injury.[10] Based on the fear avoidance model, this fear of

57 pain leads kinesiophobic patients to reduce their daily activities and physical movements,

58 ultimately resulting in the degradation of somatic functions and deterioration of mental

59 health.[11] Notably, Gencay et al. discovered that 76% of patients with kinesiophobia also had

60 upper extremity lymphedema among 81 BC patients who had undergone cancer-related surgery.

61 This suggests that those who develop lymphedema are more likely to limit the use and

62 movement of their upper extremities due to the fear of excessive pain, which can worsen the

63 severity of the edema.[12] Similarly, Karadibak et al. found that the severity of edema in upper

64 extremity lymphedema was positively correlated with a high level of kinesiophobia, but

65 negatively correlated with better QoL among 62 BC patients (all $p < 0.01$).[13] Furthermore, a

66 cross-sectional study of 54 BC survivors reported that a high incidence (66.7%) of

67 kinesiophobia was significantly correlated with poorer QoL scores among these patients.[14]

68 Therefore, kinesiophobia is considered to play an essential role in predicting QoL in patients

4

69   with chronic disorders.[15] However, the impact of kinesiophobia on QoL in BC patients with

70   lymphedema remains rarely studied.

71   Self-care may play a role in the interaction between kinesiophobia and QoL in BC patients

72   with lymphedema. Self-care ability is recognized as a series of conscious activities that can

73   assist cancer survivors in returning to their normal lives after surgery or chemoradiotherapy by

74   enhancing proactive attitudes and voluntarily modifying health-related behaviors.[16] A prior

75   study revealed that low adherence to BCRL self-care modalities could accelerate the

76   development and progression of BCRL into more advanced stages. Therefore, it is imperative

77   to enhance the self-care abilities of these survivors to promote their QoL.[17] Additionally,

78   according to the Health Belief Model, individuals with kinesiophobia tend to subjectively

79   amplify obstacles they may encounter; consequently, they restrict their health-related behaviors,

80   such as self-care.[18] From this perspective, BC patients with postoperative upper extremity

81   lymphedema are advised to acquire adequate self-care practices from healthcare professionals

82   or nurses to enhance their management skills for BCRL and improve their QoL.[19]

83   Notably, previous researchers have suggested that BC survivors should actively engage in

84   postoperative functional exercise programs to prevent the progression of lymphedema in the

85   upper extremities.[20] However, it is a great challenge for the majority of patients to adhere to

86   long-term functional exercise programs after discharge.[21] Comparable studies have illustrated

87   that the adherence rate to functional exercise gradually decreases after discharge, especially

88   from the 105th day post-operation, which directly hinders the recovery of normal upper limb

89   function.[22] Accordingly, increasing numbers of scholars have demonstrated that fear of pain

90   and movement is the major barrier for BC survivors to utilize rehabilitation exercise.[23]

91 Interestingly, a randomized controlled trial study revealed that BC patients who underwent 8

92 weeks of rehabilitative exercise intervention following surgery showed a significant

93 improvement in kinesiophobia scores compared to those in the control group.[24] Moreover,

94 Keradibak et al. reported that adherence to a 12-week home-based exercise program had

95 significantly positive effects on improving kinesiophobia and QoL in patients with BCRL

96 following BC surgery.[13] However, the correlation between kinesiophobia, postoperative

97 exercise adherence, and QoL among survivors with BCRL has not yet been fully determined.

98   Self-care and adherence to functional exercises are closely interconnected, especially in

99 cases of chronic illnesses. Warehime et al. conducted a qualitative study that substantiated the

100 importance of confidently participating in self-care activities in patients with heart failure. The

101 study found that 59.1% of patients who engaged in self-care activities experienced improved

102 health outcomes and long-term excise adherence, suggesting that self-care might play a pivotal

103 role in adherence to functional exercise programs.[25] Interestingly, a randomized controlled

104 study confirmed that BC patients in the intervention group who participated in a 10-minute

105 holistic BCRL self-care program including gentle arm functional exercises for 6 months,

106 exhibited higher improvements in BCRL-related symptoms, self-care scores, and exercise

107 frequency (all $p < 0.05$) compared to those in the control group, highlighting the beneficial

108 effects of the BCRL self-care program among BC patients.[26] Additionally, a small sample

109 feasibility study confirmed that patients with BCRL who followed daily home-based exercise

110 combining with standard lymphedema self-care measures for 26 weeks experienced a clinically

111 meaningful improvement in the management of BCRL, adherence to the exercise program, and

112 QoL, compared to the control group that only practiced self-care measures.[27]

113   Currently, there has been no evidence regarding the evaluation of the underlying

114   mechanisms of self-care ability, compliance with functional exercise, kinesiophobia, or QoL in

115   patients with BCRL. Therefore, this study aimed to determine the correlation between

116   kinesiophobia and QoL, as well as the underlying mechanical roles of self-care ability and

117   functional exercise compliance among BC patients with lymphedema. We hypothesized that

118   (1) kinesiophobia would negatively predict and directly affect QoL; (2) self-care would act as

119   a mediator in the relationship between kinesiophobia and QoL; (3) functional exercise

120   compliance would play an intermediary role between kinesiophobia and QoL; and (4) both

121   self-care and functional exercise compliance would serve as chain mediators in the correlation

122   between kinesiophobia and QoL. The hypothesized framework is shown in Fig. 1 and provides

123   valuable evidence for the establishment of targeted interventions to improve the QoL of BC

124   survivors with lymphedema.

125   **2. Methods**

126   **2.1. Participants and design**

127   A cross-sectional study was conducted by surveying 300 patients with BCRL from three

128   tertiary hospitals in Shenyang City, China, between May 2020 and October 2022. The inclusion

129   criteria were as follows: (1) female patients diagnosed with BCRL; (2) at least 60 days after

130   completing their cancer-related treatments (including surgical procedures and postoperative

131   chemotherapy or radiotherapy); (3) had clear cognition and normal communication ability; (4)

132   aged > 18 years old; and (5) no preexisting upper extremity dysfunction before surgery. The

133   exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) psychiatric disorders and poor cooperation; (2) other

134   malignancies or breast diseases; (3) liver, heart, or kidney failure; and (4) had undergone

135   bilateral axillary lymphadenectomy.

2.2. Data collection and procedure

137   This study was conducted by qualified researchers who had received professional training

138   at each outpatient oncology clinic in the three tertiary hospitals. The participants were enrolled

139   using convenience sampling. To avoid potential response bias, all participants were

140   individually invited to participate in the survey in a private and quiet area within the nurses'

141   station without the companionship of family members or friends. At the outset, the purpose and

142   methodology of this investigation were thoroughly explained to each patient, and the

143   participants were assured that they could withdraw from the survey at any time without any

144   impact on their treatment. The paper-based Chinese version of the questionnaires were

145   distributed to participants by the researchers. Each respondent completed the questionnaire

146   both anonymously and independently. During the investigation, the researchers were alongside

147   the participants to help them understand any confusing survey items. It took the participants

148   approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete all the self-reported questionnaires. After the

149   survey, trained researchers immediately checked each participant's responses to guarantee that

150   all the required data were filled out. All the participants were informed that the collected data

151   would be confidential and would only be used for research purposes.

2.3. Sample size

153   The sample size was estimated by applying a metric of 5 to 10 respondents per item in a

154   validated survey to ensure sufficient statistical power.[28, 29] The instrument used in this study

155   with the largest number of items was the Chinese Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-

156 Breast version 4.0 (FACT-Bv4.0), which consists of 36 items. The required sample size was

157 180 participants. Considering a sample loss of 20%, a final sample size of 225 participants was

158 required. We approached 315 patients with BCRL, of whom 300 patients met the inclusion

159 criteria and agreed to participate in the study (response rate, 95.2%). Among the 300 eligible

160 participants, 26 were excluded because of withdrawal (7 cases) or missing data (19 cases).

161 Ultimately, 274 completed questionnaires were collected for final analysis, with a valid

162 recovery rate of 91.3% (Fig. 2).

163 **2.4. Measurements**

164 **2.4.1. Demographic and clinical characteristics**

165 The demographic data of the participants, including age, body mass index (BMI),

166 educational level, marital and employment status, monthly family income, and number of

167 children, and clinical data, such as disease duration, BC stage, treatment type, tumor location,

168 and comorbidities (e.g., hypertension, diabetes, thyroid, osteoporosis, or dyslipidemia), were

169 obtained either from self-designed surveys or available medical records in the hospitals by the

170 responsible nursing staff.

171 **2.4.2. Measurement of self-care ability**

172 Self-care ability was evaluated by the Appraisal of Self-Care Agency Scale-Revised

173 (ASAS-R), which contains 15 items and is classified into three dimensions: having self-care

174 capacity, developing self-care capacity, and lack of self-care capacity, of which the lack of self-

175 care capacity was adversely recorded. Total scores range from 15 to 75 using a 5-point Likert

176 type from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree). Higher scores indicate better self-care. The

177 Cronbach's α coefficient in this study was 0.80.

2.4.3. Evaluation of functional exercise adherence

The Postoperative Functional Exercise Adherence Scale (PFEAS) was used to measure functional exercise adherence according to previous Chinese researchers.[30] This self-report scale consists of 18 items on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (unable to accomplish) to 4 (competent to accomplish). The scale is divided into three domains: postoperative precautionary adherence, physical exercise adherence, and actively seeking advice adherence. The total score ranges from 18 to 72, with higher scores indicating higher levels of adherence. The Cronbach's α coefficient in this study was 0.87.

2.4.4. Measurement of Kinesiophobia

Kinesiophobia was measured using the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia-11 (TSK-11). It comprises 11 items rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree), to assess the patients' fear of movement or reinjury related to pain. The total score ranged from 11 to 44, with a higher score indicating a higher level of kinesiophobia: a score of ≤ 17 indicated no fear of movement; a score of 18-24 indicated mild fear; a score of 25-31 indicated moderate fear; a score of 32–38 indicated severe fear, and a score of 39-44 indicated extreme fear. The Cronbach's α coefficient in this study was 0.82.

2.4.5. Assessment of QoL

FACT-Bv4.0 was used to evaluate the QoL, which consists of 36 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 0 (totally disagree) to 4 (totally agree), with total scores ranging from 0 to 144. The assessment comprises five subscales: a general cancer subscale (FACT-G), including physical well-being (PWB, seven items), emotional well-being (EWB, six items), social/family well-being (SWB, seven items), and functional well-being (FWB, seven items); and a Breast

200 Cancer Subscale for additional concerns (BCS, nine items). Higher scores indicate better QoL.

201 In this study, the Cronbach's α for the above subscales was 0.82 (PWB), 0.83 (EWB), 0.87

202 (SWB), 0.80 (FWB), and 0.87 (BCS), and the Cronbach's α for the overall scale was 0.91.

2.5. Data analysis

204 All data were analyzed using SPSS Statistics software version 25 (IBM, Inc., Chicago, IL,

205 USA). The normal distribution of the variables was tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov

206 method. Continuous variables were expressed as mean ± standard deviation (SD), while

207 categorical data were presented as frequencies with percentages (%). Independent *t*-test and

208 one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were performed to determine the statistical

209 significance of the different demographic and clinical groups. Harman's single-factor test was

210 employed to mitigate the possibility of common method bias underlying the observed results,

211 which could be attributed to the single source of data collection in our study.[31] Pearson's

212 correlation analysis was performed to examine the relationships between kinesiophobia, self-

213 care, functional exercise compliance, and QoL. Model 6 of the PROCESS Macro was

214 employed to estimate the chain-mediating effect of self-care and functional exercise adherence

215 (two mediators) in the relationship between kinesiophobia (one independent variable) and QoL

216 (one dependent variable). Demographic and clinical characteristics, including age, marital

217 status, BC duration, BC stage, chemotherapy, radiotherapy, and comorbidities that had a

218 significant impact on kinesiophobia, self-care, functional exercise adherence, and QoL (Table

219 1) were incorporated into the model as control variables. Bootstrapping was performed using

220 5000 random samples to determine the significance of the mediating effect. If the

221 corresponding 95% bias-corrected confidence interval (CI) did not contain zero, the mediating

222　effect was considered statistically significant. A value of $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed) was considered

223　statistically significant.

2.6. Ethical considerations

225　　This study was approved by the Human Research Ethical Committee of Shengjing

226　Hospital of China Medical University (No.EC-2020-HS-030) and was conducted in accordance

227　with the Declaration of Helsinki. This study adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of

228　Observation Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE). Written informed consent was obtained from

229　each respondent before they participated in the study.

3.　Results

3.1.　Common method bias test

232　　Harman's single-factor test was used to detect possible common methodological biases.

233　The results showed that there were 22 factors with characteristic values greater than 1, and the

234　amount of variance explained by the first factor was 21.6%, which was less than the critical

235　criterion of 40%. Thus, the influence of common methodological deviations was excluded from

236　this study.

3.2.　Different variable scores according to characteristics of participants

238　　As shown in Table 1, the mean age of the participants was 48.76 ± 8.78 years old, ranging

239　from 27 to 76 years. More than half of the patients (55.1%) had been diagnosed with BC for

240　more than 4 years. Most patients were married (84.3%) and had children (86.9%). Nearly 44.2%

241　were employed and 35.4% had obtained a high school education degree or higher. The majority

242　of patients (77.4%) had T1 and TII stages, and approximately 62.4% of patients underwent

243　MRM therapeutic operation, while 30.7% underwent breast-protective surgery (BPS).

244 Approximately 55.8% of the patients received chemotherapy, and 50.4% underwent

245 radiotherapy. The other demographic and clinical characteristics were presented in Table 1.

246 Moreover, age ($p = 0.038$), marital status ($p = 0.007$), BC duration ($p = 0.015$), BC stage ($p =$

247 0.003), chemotherapy ($p = 0.008$), radiotherapy ($p = 0.006$), and comorbidities ($p = 0.040$)

248 were significantly associated with kinesiophobia (Table 1). Furthermore, older adult patients

249 ($p = 0.002$), those with prolonged BC duration ($p = 0.004$), and those who underwent

250 radiotherapy ($p = 0.019$) exhibited lower self-care scores than those who did not (Table 1).

251 Additionally, older adult patients ($p = 0.001$) who underwent chemotherapy ($p = 0.013$) were

252 less likely to adhere to postoperative functional exercises (Table 1). Regarding QoL, patients

253 who were older ($p = 0.004$), single ($p = 0.035$), had a prolonged BC duration ($p = 0.021$), had

254 an advanced BC stage ($p = 0.010$), received chemotherapy ($p = 0.006$) or radiotherapy ($p <$

255 0.001), and had comorbidities ($p = 0.042$) displayed worse QoL among these participants

256 (Table 1).

257 **3.3. Correlation analyses among the investigated variables**

258 As shown in Table 2, the total scores of kinesiophobia, self-care, functional exercise

259 adherence, and QoL were 29.27 ± 4.49, 40.95 ± 5.03, 43.09 ± 7.29, and 79.52 ± 11.93,

260 respectively (Table 2). Pearson's correlation analysis showed that kinesiophobia was

261 negatively associated with self-care ($r = -0.481$, $p < 0.001$), functional exercise adherence ($r =$

262 -0.564, $p < 0.001$), and QoL ($r = -0.680$, $p < 0.001$; Table 2). Additionally, self-care exhibited

263 a significantly positive correlation with functional exercise adherence ($r = 0.614$, $p < 0.001$)

264 and QoL ($r = 0.569$, $p < 0.001$; Table 2). A strong positive correlation was observed between

265 adherence to functional exercise and QoL ($r = 0.713$, $p < 0.001$; Table 2).

3.4. Mediating effect of self-care and functional exercise adherence

Considering QoL as the dependent variable, kinesiophobia as the independent variable, and self-care and functional exercise adherence as the intermediary variables, the chain mediation model of the mediating effects of self-care and functional exercise adherence between kinesiophobia and QoL was shown in Fig. 2 and Table 3. Demographic and clinical characteristics such as age, marital status, BC duration, BC stage, chemotherapy, radiotherapy, and comorbidities were included as control variables. The regression analysis showed that the total effect of kinesiophobia on QoL was significant ($\beta = -0.630$, $t = -13.276$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 2 and Table 3). Furthermore, there was a significantly direct effect of kinesiophobia on QoL ($\beta = -0.351$, $t = -7.407$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 2 and Table 3), indicating that the higher levels of kinesiophobia were associated with worse QoL among BC patients with lymphedema. Moreover, kinesiophobia had a significant negative predictive effect on self-care ($\beta = -0.441$, $t = -7.751$, $p < 0.001$), and self-care positively predicted QoL ($\beta = 0.113$, $t = 2.322$, $p < 0.05$; Fig. 2 and Table 3), suggesting the mediating role of self-care played between kinesiophobia and QoL. Meanwhile, kinesiophobia had a negative impact on functional exercise adherence ($\beta = -0.349$, $t = -6.598$, $p < 0.001$), while functional exercise adherence had a positive effect on QoL ($\beta = 0.420$, $t = 8.237$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 2 and Table 3), implying that functional exercise adherence acted as a mediator between kinesiophobia and QoL. Furthermore, self-care exhibited a positive correlation with functional exercise adherence ($\beta = 0.446$, $t = 8.650$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 2 and Table 3), indicating that self-care and functional exercise adherence played a chain mediating role between kinesiophobia and QoL of BC survivors with lymphedema.

3.5. Bootstrap examination

288   We validated the mediating effect using a Bootstrap approach. The 95% CI for the

289   mediating effect was calculated based on a randomly selected sample of 5000 individuals to

290   assess the mediating role of self-care and functional exercise adherence as mediators between

291   kinesiophobia and QoL. As shown in Table 4, the direct effect pathway was as follows:

292   kinesiophobia → QoL, with a direct effect value of -0.933 (Bootstrap 95% CI: -1.181 to -0.685),

293   which accounted for 55.7% of the total effect (Table 4). The total indirect effect was -0.742

294   (Bootstrap 95% CI: -0.915 to -0.592), accounting for 44.3% of the total effect (Table 4). The

295   lower and upper Bootstrap 95% CI did not contain a value of zero, indicating that the effect

296   was significant. Meanwhile, there were three mediating effect pathways: kinesiophobia → self-

297   care → QoL, with an indirect effect value of -0.132 (Bootstrap 95% CI: -0.267 to -0.007),

298   accounting for 7.9% of the total effect (Table 4); kinesiophobia → functional exercise

299   adherence → QoL, with an indirect effect value of 0.390 (Bootstrap 95% CI: -0.516 to -0.269),

300   accounting for 23.3% of the total effect (Table 4); and kinesiophobia → self-care → functional

301   exercise adherence → QoL, with an indirect effect value of -0.220 (Bootstrap 95% CI: -0.320

302   to -0.142), accounting for 13.1% of the total effect (Table 4). Hence, Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4

303   are verified.

304   **4. Discussion**

305   The majority of BC survivors tend to avoid using their affected arms after treatment

306   because of kinesiophobia, which results in an increased risk of developing BCRL in the upper

307   extremity.[12] An accumulating stream of studies has demonstrated that sufficient self-care

308   capacity and adherence to functional exercises can help improve edema and have a potent effect

309   on the QoL of women with lymphedema. [26, 27] Nevertheless, the relationship between

15

310　kinesiophobia and QoL has rarely been examined in detail. Therefore, the present study aimed

311　to explore this hypothesized association, which may be connected to self-care and adherence

312　to functional exercise.

313　**4.1. Relationship between kinesiophobia and QoL**

314　Kinesiophobia is rather frequent and strongly correlated with lymphedema in BC survivors

315　after mastectomy.[32] In the current study, we found that all 274 patients with BCRL included in

316　this study exhibited varying degrees of kinesiophobia (TSK-11 score $\geq$ 18 points). Similarly,

317　Altas and Demirdel found that among 70 female patients with post-mastectomy lymphedema,

318　kinesiophobia was presented in 70% of these patients, as measured using the TSK.[32] These

319　findings highlights the high prevalence of kinesiophobia among patients with BCRL after

320　undergoing BC surgery.[12] Furthermore, our study confirmed a correlation between fear of

321　movement and impaired QoL in patients with BCRL. We also discovered that kinesiophobia

322　served as a direct predictor of QoL in BC survivors with lymphedema, as higher kinesiophobia

323　scores were negatively associated with better QoL among patients with BCRL (Hypothesis 1

324　was confirmed). These findings were consistent with those of several previous studies. For

325　instance, a cross-sectional study conducted by Sunar found a significant correlation between a

326　high score of kinesiophobia and worse QoL, and fatigue was found among BC patients from

327　Turkey.[14] Moreover, Gencay et al. confirmed that kinesiophobic patients had a significantly

328　lower physical QoL score in BC patients, although no significant correlation between

329　kinesiophobia and QoL scores was found.[12] Therefore, it is imperative for patients with BCRL

330　to receive appropriate training to help them promote pain management and overcome the fear

331　of movement, as well as improve their QoL. For example, a longitudinal cohort study

332   conducted by Velthuis et al. found that a high level of kinesiophobia was negatively associated

333   with the perceived global health status (QoL). However, this negative association was

334   significantly reduced by a 12-week graded activity rehabilitation program among cancer

335   survivors.[33] Therefore, professional medical staff should provide more practical and effective

336   support to help survivors overcome kinesiophobia and enhance their QoL.

337   **4.2. Mediating role of self-care on kinesiophobia and QoL**

338   The present study confirms Hypothesis 2, which states that self-care partially mediates the

339   relationship between kinesiophobia and QoL. The self-care ability of the patients with BCRL

340   in our study was relatively low, with a total score of 40.95 ± 5.03. These findings were also

341   confirmed by Jiang et al., who developed factor-based models to demonstrate that the severity

342   of lymphedema was associated with decreased limb activity and lower self-care ability in

343   patients with BCRL.[34] Therefore, it is necessary for patients with BCRL to adhere to

344   lymphedema self-care behaviors to improve lymph drainage capacity and enhance their QoL.

345   Unfortunately, the overall self-care capacity of patients at risk of lymphedema is considerably

346   poor, and the reasons for non-adherence to self-care consist of symptom burden, complicated

347   treatment regimens, and insufficient educational support.[35] Therefore, Tsuchiya et al.

348   suggested that in addition to providing basic instructions on self-care skills, it was essential to

349   implement continuous psycho-educational programs to encourage female cancer survivors to

350   engage in self-care behaviors after discharge.[36] Specifically, to improve the QoL of BC

351   survivors with lymphedema, enhancing patients' awareness by educating them about the risk

352   of lymphedema and knowledge about proper self-care behaviors for BC cancer survivors is

353   warranted.[37]

354 **4.3. Mediating role of functional exercise adherence on kinesiophobia and QoL**

355   The mediation model also showed that functional exercise adherence exhibited a significant

356 indirect effect on the relationship between kinesiophobia and QoL (Hypothesis 3 was verified).

357 After reviewing several papers on health-related QoL in BC published in the last decade,

358 scholars have summarized that appropriate physical activity interventions are effective in

359 managing symptoms of BCRL and improving QoL in BC survivors.[38] Nevertheless, previous

360 studies have suggested that women with BC often hold misconceptions that physical activity

361 can accelerate the spread of tumor cells and aggravate cancer metastases. Consequently, most

362 BC survivors refuse to adhere to the physical exercise recommendations provided by medical

363 professionals after treatment, which exacerbates the severity of BCRL.[39] In addition, it is

364 essential to provide proper education and implement a scientifically designed exercise program

365 to assist patients with BCRL in overcoming their fear of movement during rehabilitation. A

366 systematic review conducted by Baumann found that various types of exercise programs, such

367 as aerobic exercise, resistance exercise, aqua lymph training, yoga, and gravity-resistive

368 exercise, demonstrated a marked improvement in the severity of BCRL status, mood, and

369 QoL.[20] Cormie et al. conducted a randomized trial study in Australia to evaluate the safety and

370 efficacy of a prescribed resistance exercise program on 62 women with BCRL. They

371 discovered that patients who received appropriate upper-body resistance exercise intervention

372 for three months demonstrated significantly improved lymphedema management and higher

373 scores in the physical functioning domain of QoL than those in the usual care group (all $p <$

374 0.05).[40]

4.4. Chain-mediated role of self-care and functional exercise adherence on kinesiophobia and QoL

Regarding the relationship between kinesiophobia and QoL in patients with BCRL, this study is the first to find that self-care and adherence to functional exercise have a chain-mediating effect on the interaction between kinesiophobia and QoL in patients with BCRL. The indirect effect ratio was 13.13%, supporting Hypothesis 4. These findings imply that the fear of movement caused by a high level of kinesiophobia could impair self-care behaviors among patients with BCRL. Their limited self-care abilities further prevent them from actively participating in rehabilitative regimens, thereby resulting in low adherence to functional exercise and decreased QoL. Conversely, patients with BCRL would benefit from adopting adequate self-care behaviors, as this could assist them in overcoming the psychological obstacles associated with kinesiophobia. Proper self-care behaviors also promote subjective initiatives and perceived awareness of functional exercise adherence, thereby positively influencing all dimensions of QoL among patients with BCRL. Recent randomized controlled studies have emphasized the effectiveness of implementing proper self-care programs to alleviate symptoms related to BCRL, promote exercise adherence, and improve QoL in patients with BCRL.[26, 27] Given the hypothesized framework used in our study, we found a positive association between self-care and functional exercise adherence, suggesting that individuals with higher self-care abilities are more likely to comply with functional exercise. This finding was consistent with prior clinical studies conducted by Li et al.[41] who demonstrated that the implementation of self-controlled exercise programs could sustainably enhance the mobility of the affected shoulder joints and have a positive effect on the post-operative recovery process

397   in BC patients. Furthermore, our findings confirmed the positive correlation between

398   functional exercise adherence and QoL, a relationship supported by other researchers. Kim et

399   al. found that participation in physical activity for self-care showed a significant positive

400   correlation with increased mobility, reduced mental burden, and improved QoL among Korean

401   patients with BC.[42]

402   Notably, the chain mediating pathway of "self-care → functional exercise adherence" acted

403   as an essential bridge between kinesiophobia and QoL. Therefore, the results of the present

404   study extend our understanding of the potential variables that impact kinesiophobia and

405   uncover the pathways through which QoL can be promoted. These findings provide valuable

406   information for the development of effective clinical intervention strategies. Understanding the

407   psychological mechanisms in patients with BCRL contributes to promoting QoL by

408   emphasizing high-quality self-care practices and interventions that enhance adherence to

409   functional exercise. For instance, when addressing the challenges of kinesiophobia, nursing

410   staff should educate patients with BCRL on appropriate self-care practices that can improve

411   their health outcomes. Healthcare practitioners should provide tailored functional exercise

412   interventions during rehabilitation to enhance patient adherence. Moreover, effective

413   interventions that target the reduction of kinesiophobia can also improve patients' self-care

414   abilities and enhance their motivation to engage in rehabilitative programs, ultimately resulting

415   in improved QoL among patients with BCRL. Additionally, when considering the chain-

416   mediating effects of self-care and functional exercise adherence, it is critical for oncology

417   nursing staff to develop comprehensive interventions that address this pathway: diminish

418   kinesiophobia → enhance self-care ability → promote functional exercise adherence →

20

419 improve QoL, which would be more effective in improving the health benefits of patients with

420 BCRL than interventions that target only one factor.

4.5. Limitations

422 This study has some limitations. First, the data were collected from only three urban

423 hospitals in the city, which may challenge the generalizability of the results. Extended surveys

424 are required to investigate patients with BCRL in rural regions and other cities in China. Second,

425 this study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, which might have affected the

426 patients' self-estimated QoL and generated a response bias. Third, this study was cross-

427 sectional using self-reported data; thus, a longitudinal study should be conducted to further

428 identify the causal relationships of this framework and track changes in patients' attitudes

429 towards the aforementioned variables over the course of long-term cancer treatment. Fourth,

430 this study focused only on exploring the mechanism underlying the chain-mediating effects of

431 self-care capacity and functional exercise adherence on the relationship between kinesiophobia

432 and QoL in patients with BCRL. There may be other factors that affect QoL through different

433 mechanisms. Thus, a more comprehensive study should be conducted to further explore the

434 impact of kinesiophobia on the QoL of patients with BCRL.

5. Conclusion

436 To the best of our knowledge, the current study is the first to elucidate that kinesiophobia

437 has a negative impact on QoL in survivors of BCRL and the sequential mediating effect of self-

438 care and functional exercise adherence on the relationship between kinesiophobia and QoL in

439 patients with BCRL. The chain-mediating effect of self-care and adherence to functional

440 exercise represents potential practical significance in promoting the QoL of survivors with

441   BCRL. Therefore, clinical intervention programs that focus on improving self-care ability

442   should be developed and implemented to help diminish the detrimental impact of kinesiophobia

443   on QoL and expand the protective effects of adhering to functional exercise for survivors with

444   BCRL in the future.

Statement and Declaration

CRediT author statement

Qi Wang: Methodology, Software, Data curation, Data analysis, Writing-Original draft preparation; **Na Du:** Research conceptualization, Validation, Supervision, Writing-Reviewing and Editing. All authors had full access to all the data in the study, and the corresponding author had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Ethics statement

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Shengjing Hospital Affiliated to China Medical University (No.EC-2020-HS-030), and in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants provided written informed consent.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author ND, upon reasonable request.

467 **Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing**

468 No AI tools/services were used during the preparation of this manuscript.

References

1. Wang X, Wang C, Guan J, Chen B, Xu L, Chen C. Progress of Breast Cancer basic research in China. Int J Biol Sci. 2021;17:2069-2079. https://doi.org/10.7150/ijbs.60631.

2. Gillespie TC, Sayegh HE, Brunelle CL, Daniell KM, Taghian AG. Breast cancer-related lymphedema: risk factors, precautionary measures, and treatments. Gland Surg. 2018;7:379-403. https://doi.org/10.21037/gs.2017.11.04.

3. Shah C, Vicini FA. Breast cancer-related arm lymphedema: incidence rates, diagnostic techniques, optimal management and risk reduction strategies. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2011;81:907-914. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2011.05.043.

4. Nesvold IL, Fosså SD, Holm I, Naume B, Dahl AA. Arm/shoulder problems in breast cancer survivors are associated with reduced health and poorer physical quality of life. Acta Oncol. 2010;49:347-353. https://doi.org/10.3109/02841860903302905.

5. Licu M, Ionescu CG, Paun S. Quality of Life in Cancer Patients: The Modern Psycho-Oncologic Approach for Romania-A Review. Curr Oncol. 2023;30:6964-6975. https://doi.org/10.3390/curroncol30070504.

6. Kwan W, Jackson J, Weir LM, Dingee C, McGregor G, Olivotto IA. Chronic arm morbidity after curative breast cancer treatment: prevalence and impact on quality of life. J Clin Oncol. 2002;20:4242-4248. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2002.09.018.

7. Bulley C, Coutts F, Blyth C, et al. Prevalence and impacts of upper limb morbidity after treatment for breast cancer: a cross-sectional study of lymphedema and function. Cancer and Oncology Research. 2013;1:30-39. https://doi.org/10.13189/cor.2013.010203.

8. Kalemikerakis I, Evaggelakou A, Kavga A, Vastardi M, Konstantinidis T, Govina O.

491 Diagnosis, treatment and quality of life in patients with cancer-related lymphedema. J BUON.

492 2021;26:1735-1741. PMID: 34761576.

493 9. Abdo J, Ortman H, Rodriguez N, Tillman R, Riordan EO, Seydel A. Quality of Life Issues

494 Following Breast Cancer Treatment. Surg Clin North Am. 2023;103:155-167.

495 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.suc.2022.08.014.

496 10. Bordeleau M, Vincenot M, Lefevre S, et al. Treatments for kinesiophobia in people with

497 chronic pain: A scoping review. Front Behav Neurosci. 2022;16:933483.

498 https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2022.933483.

499 11. Vlaeyen JW, Kole-Snijders AM, Rotteveel AM, Ruesink R, Heuts PH. The role of fear of

500 movement/(re)injury in pain disability. J Occup Rehabil. 1995;5:235-252.

501 https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02109988.

502 12. Gencay Can A, Can SS, Ekşioğlu E, Çakcı FA. Is kinesiophobia associated with

503 lymphedema, upper extremity function, and psychological morbidity in breast cancer survivors?

504 Turk J Phys Med Rehabil. 2018;65:139-146. https://doi.org/10.5606/tftrd.2019.2585.

505 13. Karadibak D, Yavuzsen T, Saydam S. Prospective trial of intensive decongestive

506 physiotherapy for upper extremity lymphedema. J Surg Oncol. 2008;97:572-577.

507 https://doi.org/10.1002/jso.21035.

508 14. Sunar İ, Sunar V. Kinesiophobia in Breast Cancer Survivors and its Relationship with

509 Quality of Life, Comorbidity, and other clinical parameters. Acta Oncologica Turcica.

510 2021;54:198-205. https://doi.org/10.5505/aot.2021.38243.

511 15. Nederhand MJ, Ijzerman MJ, Hermens HJ, Turk DC, Zilvold G. Predictive value of fear

512 avoidance in developing chronic neck pain disability: consequences for clinical decision

513   making.   Arch   Phys   Med   Rehabil.   2004;85:496-501.

514   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2003.06.019.

515   16. Zhang Y, Kwekkeboom K, Petrini M. Uncertainty, Self-efficacy, and Self-care Behavior in

516   Patients With Breast Cancer Undergoing Chemotherapy in China. Cancer Nurs. 2015;38:E19-

517   26. https://doi.org/10.1097/NCC.0000000000000165.

518   17. Brown JC, Cheville Al, Tchou JC, Harris SR, Schmitz KH. Prescription and adherence to

519   lymphedema self-care modalities among women with breast cancer-related lymphedema.

520   Support Care Cancer. 2014;22:135-143. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-013-1962-9.

521   18. Zhang S, Wang Z, Lin X, et al. Kinesiophobia and self-management behaviour related to

522   physical activity in Chinese patients with coronary heart disease: The mediating role of self-

523   efficacy. Nurs Open. 2023;10:105-114. https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1283.

524   19. Deveci Z, Karayurt Ö, Eyigör S. Self-care practices, patient education in women with breast

525   cancer-related   lymphedema.   Turk   J   Phys   Med   Rehabil.   2021;67:187-195.

526   https://doi.org/10.5606/tftrd.2021.5022.

527   20. Baumann FT, Reike A, Reimer V, et al. Effects of physical exercise on breast cancer-related

528   secondary   lymphedema: a   systematic   review.   Breast   Cancer   Res   Treat.   2018;170:1-13.

529   https://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-018-4725-y.

530   21. Tao L, Wang M, Zhang X, Du X, Fu L. Exercise adherence in breast cancer patients: A

531   cross-sectional   questionnaire   survey.   Medicine   (Baltimore).   2020;99:e20427.

532   https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000020427.

533   22. Petito EL, Nazário AC, Martinelli SE, Facina G, De Gutiérrez MG. Application of a

534   domicile-based exercise program for shoulder rehabilitation after breast cancer surgery. Rev

535   Lat Am Enfermagem. 2012;20:35-43. https://doi.org/10.1590/s0104-11692012000100006.

536   23. Chen IH, Wang CH, Wang SY, Cheng SY, Yu TJ, Kuo SF. Mediating effects of shoulder-

537   arm exercise on the postoperative severity of symptoms and quality of life of women with

538   breast cancer. BMC Womens Health. 2020;20:101. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-020-00968-

539   w.

540   24. Yuan R, Wei X, Ye Y, et al. The effects of the mirror therapy on shoulder function in patients

541   with breast cancer following surgery: a randomized controlled trial. J Cancer Surviv. 2023;

542   Online ahead of print. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11764-023-01398-x.

543   25. Warehime S, Dinkel D, Alonso W, Pozehl B. Long-term exercise adherence in patients with

544   heart failure: A qualitative study. Heart Lung. 2020;49:696-701.

545   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrtlng.2020.08.016.

546   26. Arinaga Y, Piller N, Sato F, et al. The 10-Min Holistic Self-Care for Patients with Breast

547   Cancer-Related Lymphedema: Pilot Randomized Controlled Study. Tohoku J Exp Med.

548   2019;247:139-147. https://doi.org/10.1620/tjem.247.139.

549   27. Jeffs E, Wiseman T. Randomised controlled trial to determine the benefit of daily home-

550   based exercise in addition to self-care in the management of breast cancer-related

551   lymphoedema: a feasibility study. Support Care Cancer. 2013;21:1013-1023.

552   https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-012-1621-6.

553   28. Tsang S, Royse CF, Terkawi AS. Guidelines for developing, translating, and validating a

554   questionnaire in perioperative and pain medicine. Saudi J Anaesth. 2017;11:S80-S89.

555   https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_203_17.

556   29. Zhou K, Wang W, Li M, et al. Body image mediates the relationship between post-surgery

557   needs and health-related quality of life among women with breast cancer: a cross-sectional

558   study. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2020;18:163. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01400-5.

559   30. Chang L, Zhang S, Yan Z, Li C, Zhang Q, Li Y. Symptom burden, family resilience, and

560   functional exercise adherence among postoperative breast cancer patients. Asia Pac J Oncol

561   Nurs. 2022;9:100129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apjon.2022.100129.

562   31. Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee J-Y, Podsakoff NP. Common method biases in

563   behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. J Appl

564   Psychol. 2003;88:879-903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.

565   32. Altas EU, Demirdal Ü S. The effects of post-mastectomy lymphedema on balance,

566   Kinesiophobia and fear of falling. J Community Health Nurs. 2021;38:130-138.

567   https://doi.org/10.1080/07370016.2021.1887564.

568   33. Velthuis MJ, Peeters PH, Gijsen BC, et al. Role of fear of movement in cancer survivors

569   participating in a rehabilitation program: a longitudinal cohort study. Arch Phys Med Rehabil.

570   2012;93:332-338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2011.08.014.

571   34. Jiang W, Chen L. Analysis of the factors and moderating role of self-care ability among

572   patients with breast cancer-related lymphedema. J Clin Nurs. 2023;32:926-940.

573   https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.16495.

574   35. Karaca-Mandic P, Solid CA, Armer JM, Skoracki R, Campione E, Rockson SG.

575   Lymphedema self-care: economic cost savings and opportunities to improve adherence. Cost

576   Eff Resour Alloc. 2023;21:47. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12962-023-00455-7.

577   36. Tsuchiya M, Masujima M, Kato T, et al. Knowledge, fatigue, and cognitive factors as

578   predictors of lymphoedema risk-reduction behaviours in women with cancer. Support Care

579   Cancer. 2019;27:547-555. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-018-4349-0.

580   37. Shahsavari H, Matory P, Zare Z, Taleghani F, Kaji MA. Effect of self-care education on the

581   quality of life in patients with breast cancer. J Educ Health Promot. 2015;4:70.

582   https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-9531.171782.

583   38. Mokhtari-Hessari P, Montazeri A. Health-related quality of life in breast cancer patients:

584   review of reviews from 2008 to 2018. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2020;18:338.

585   https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01591-x.

586   39. Kim S, Han J, Lee MY, Jang MK. The experience of cancer-related fatigue, exercise and

587   exercise adherence among women breast cancer survivors: Insights from focus group

588   interviews. J Clin Nurs. 2020;29:758-769. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15114. .

589   40. Cormie P, Pumpa K, Galvão DA, et al. Is it safe and efficacious for women with

590   lymphedema secondary to breast cancer to lift heavy weights during exercise: a randomised

591   controlled trial. J Cancer Surviv. 2013;7:413-424. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11764-013-0284-8.

592   41. Li F, Liu W, Huo F, et al. Effect of Self-Controlled Exercise on Antioxidant Activity of Red

593   Blood Cells and Functional Recovery of Limbs in Patients with Breast Cancer after

594   Rehabilitation. Iran J Public Health. 2021;50:306-314.

595   https://doi.org/10.18502/ijph.v50i2.5345.

596   42. Kim M, So WY, Kim J. Relationships between Exercise Modality and Activity Restriction,

597   Quality of Life, and Hematopoietic Profile in Korean Breast Cancer Survivors. . Int J Environ

598   Res Public Health. 2020;17:6899. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17186899.

599 **Figure legends**

600 **Fig. 1.** Hypothesized model.

601 **Fig. 2.** Flow diagram of study recruitment process.

602 **Fig. 3.** The chain-mediating model of self-care and functional exercise adherence in the

603 correlation between kinesiophobia and QoL. $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$ was considered

604 statistically significant.

Table 1. Participants' characteristics and different variable scores (N = 274).

Variables	n (%)	Kinesiophobia score			Self-care score			PFEA score			QoL score		
		Mean	SD	Significant	Mean	SD	Significant	Mean	SD	Significant	Mean	SD	Significant
Age													
< 50 years	155 (56.6)	28.77	4.39	0.038*	41.78	5.02	0.002**	44.32	7.19	0.001**	81.32	12.19	0.004**
≥ 50 years	119 (43.4)	29.91	4.55		39.86	4.85		41.49	7.12		77.17	11.21	
BMI													
< 23 kg/m^2	92 (33.6)	28.99	4.33	0.468	40.98	5.06	0.918	42.48	7.57	0.323	79.20	12.29	0.751
≥ 23 kg/m^2	182 (66.4)	29.41	4.57		40.92	5.03		43.40	7.14		79.68	11.77	
Education level													
< senior high school	177 (64.6)	29.41	4.34	0.396	40.55	4.92	0.082	42.97	7.39	0.702	79.06	11.81	0.394
≥ senior high school	97 (36.4)	29.01	4.76		41.66	5.18		42.32	7.13		80.35	12.17	
Marital status													
Married/Partner	231 (84.3)	28.95	4.39	0.007**	41.05	5.00	0.436	43.30	7.30	0.266	80.17	11.91	0.035*
Single	43 (15.7)	30.95	4.65		40.40	5.21		41.96	7.19		76.00	11.56	
Monthly income													
< 2000 yuan	89 (32.5)	29.28	4.59	0.994	40.47	5.23	0.260	42.10	7.27	0.173	78.83	12.83	0.654
2000-5000 yuan	166 (60.6)	29.27	4.47		41.01	4.96		43.38	7.37		79.66	11.61	
> 5000 yuan	19 (6.9)	29.16	4.32		42.53	4.57		45.21	6.17		81.53	10.61	

	N (%)	Mean	SD	p	Mean	SD	p	Mean	SD	p	Mean	SD	p
Have children													
Yes	238 (86.9)	29.16	4.56	0.331	41.17	4.96	0.059	43.05	7.24	0.812	79.74	12.03	0.431
No	36 (13.1)	29.94	3.94		39.47	5.28		43.36	7.71		78.06	11.28	
Employment													
Unemployed	153 (55.8)	29.14	4.60	0.612	41.38	4.91	0.109	43.52	7.24	0.271	80.25	12.70	0.255
Employed	121 (44.2)	29.42	4.34		40.40	5.14		42.55	7.33		78.60	10.86	
BC duration													
< 4 years	123 (44.9)	28.54	4.71	0.015*	41.91	5.43	0.004**	43.72	7.49	0.195	81.36	12.01	0.021*
≥ 4 years	151 (55.1)	29.86	4.22		40.16	4.55		42.58	7.10		78.02	11.69	
Chemotherapy													
Yes	153 (55.8)	29.90	4.74	0.008**	40.56	4.85	0.157	42.12	6.99	0.013**	77.77	12.13	0.006**
No	121	28.46	4.02		41.43	5.23		44.32	7.50		81.73	11.34	
Radiotherapy													
Yes	138 (50.4)	30.01	4.46	0.006**	40.24	5.13	0.019*	42.33	7.38	0.080	76.80	10.56	<0.001***
No	136	28.51	4.40		41.66	4.84		43.87	7.13		82.27	12.63	
Tumor location													
Left	143 (52.2)	28.78	4.01	0.115	40.76	4.90	0.066	43.15	6.82	0.131	80.10	11.68	0.068
Right	126 (46.0)	29.72	4.93		41.34	5.14		43.28	7.83		79.33	12.16	
Bilateral	5 (1.8)	31.60	4.56		36.20	3.56		36.60	2.51		67.60	7.64	

	n (%)												
BC stages													
Stage I-II	212 (77.4)	28.84	4.48	0.003**	41.24	5.15	0.077	43.57	7.40	0.044*	80.51	11.95	0.010*
Stage III-IV	62 (22.6)	30.73	4.24		39.95	4.47		41.45	6.70		76.11	11.31	
Surgery type													
MRM	171 (62.4)	29.16	4.41	0.714	41.28	5.00	0.364	43.60	7.34	0.288	80.20	11.98	0.209
BCS	84 (30.7)	29.30	4.58		40.37	5.17		42.42	7.16		79.11	12.06	
Others[b]	19 (6.9)	30.05	4.88		40.47	4.64		41.47	7.29		75.21	10.42	
Comorbidities[c]													
Yes	195 (71.2)	29.62	4.49	0.040*	40.71	5.10	0.230	42.67	7.12	0.130	78.59	11.70	0.042*
No	79 (28.8)	28.39	4.39		41.52	4.83		44.14	7.63		81.82	12.25	

Note. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$. Abbreviations: BC, breast cancer; BMI, Body Mass Index; BCS, breast conserving surgery; MRM, modified radical mastectomy; PFEA, postoperative functional exercise adherence; QoL, quality of life; SD, Standard deviation.

[a]One-way ANOVA test/independent *t*-test.

[b]Lumpectomy and axillary dissection or total mastectomy.

[c]Hypertension, diabetes, thyroid, osteoporosis, or dyslipidemia.

Table 2. Correlation between kinesiophobia, self-care, functional exercise adherence, and QoL in patients with BCRL (r).

Variables	Mean	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. Kinesiophobia	29.27	4.49	1								
2. Self-care	40.95	5.03	-0.481***	1							
3. PFEA	43.09	7.29	-0.564***	0.614***	1						
4. QoL	79.52	11.93	-0.680***	0.569***	0.713***	1					
5. PWB	14.82	2.69	-0.194***	0.198***	0.230***	0.464***	1				
6. EWB	13.80	2.96	-0.520***	0.366***	0.508***	0.749***	0.241***	1			
7. SWB	15.31	3.49	-0.441***	0.476***	0.492***	0.696***	0.155***	0.383***	1		
8. FWB	13.46	3.01	-0.355***	0.317***	0.341***	0.586***	0.700***	0.379***	0.342***	1	
9. BCS	18.78	4.88	-0.569***	0.447***	0.629***	0.802***	0.176***	0.538***	0.372***	0.311**	1

Note. ***$p < 0.001$. Abbreviations: BCRL, breast cancer related lymphedema; BCS, Breast Cancer Subscale for additional concerns; EWB, emotional well-being; FWB, functional well-being; PFEA, postoperative functional exercise adherence; PWB, physical well-being; QoL, quality of life; SD, standard deviation; SWB, social/family well-being.

**Table 3.** Regression model of the relationship between factors (N = 274).

Variables	QoL β (95%CI)	QoL t	Self-care β (95%CI)	Self-care t	PFEA β (95%CI)	PFEA t	QoL β (95%CI)	QoL t
Age	-0.084 (-0.233, 0.004)	-1.896	-0.115 (-0.126, -0.006)	-2.160*	-0.063 (-0.126, 0.022)	-1.394	-0.032 (-0.132, 0.069)	-0.619
Marital status	-0.019 (-3.507, 2.294)	-0.412	0.040 (-0.911,2.021)	0.746	0.010 (-0.118, 0.624)	1.341	-0.035 (-3.558, 1.292)	-0.920
BC duration	-0.031 (-0.806, 0.389)	-0.689	-0.001 (-0.651, -0.047)	-2.276*	0.062 (-1.596, 1.977)	0.210	-0.020 (-0.640, 0.371)	-0.523
BC stage	-0.024 (-3.232, 1.885)	-0.518	-0.001 (-1.307,1.279)	-0.021	-0.013 (-1.796, 1.352)	-0.278	-0.018 (-2.648, 1.626)	-0.471
Chemotherapy	0.038 (-1.242, 3.045)	0.828	0.002 (-1.064,1.103)	0.035	0.053 (-0.536, 2.102)	1.169	0.015 (-1.446, 2.143)	0.383
Radiotherapy	0.113 (0.567, 4.808)	2.395*	0.067 (-0.395,1.749)	1.243	-0.031 (-1.760, 0.857)	-0.680	0.106 (0.739, 4.294)	2.787**
Comorbidities	0.030 (-1.511, 3.107)	0.680	0.004 (-1.127,1.207)	0.068	0.011 (-1.250, 1.591)	0.236	0.025 (-1.277, 2.580)	0.666
Kinesiophobia	-0.630 (-1.923, -1.427)	-13.276***	-0.441 (-0.620, -0.369)	-7.751***	-0.349 (-0.736, -0.398)	-6.598***	-0.351 (-1.181, -0.685)	-7.407***
Self-care					0.446 (0.500, 0.794)	8.650***	0.113 (0.041, 0.493)	2.322*
PFEA							0.420 (0.524, 0.853)	8.237***
R^2	0.488		0.264		0.483		0.646	
F	31.5845***		11.895***		27.355***		37.946***	

Note. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$. Abbreviations: BC, breast cancer; CI, confidence interval; PFEA, postoperative functional exercise adherence; QoL, quality of life.

Table 4. Bootstrap analysis of the mediating effect of kinesiophobia and QoL (N = 274).

Paths	Effect	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI	Effect ratio
Total effect	-1.675	0.126	-1.923	-1.427	
Direct effect	-0.933	0.126	-1.181	-0.685	55.7%
Total indirect effect	-0.742	0.082	-0.915	-0.592	44.3%
Ind1: Kinesiophobia → Self-care → QoL	-0.132	0.065	-0.267	-0.007	7.9%
Ind2: Kinesiophobia → PFEA → QoL	-0.390	-0.064	-0.516	-0.269	23.3%
Ind 3: Kinesiophobia → Self-care → PFEA → QoL	-0.220	-0.046	-0.320	-0.142	13.1%
Comparison1 (Indirect1 - Indirect2)	0.258	0.104	0.053	0.457	
Comparison2 (Indirect1 - Indirect3)	0.088	0.088	-0.081	0.273	
Comparison3 (Indirect2 - Indirect3)	-0.170	0.077	-0.313	-0.009	

Note. Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; PFEA, postoperative functional exercise adherence; QoL, quality of life.

```
┌──────────────┐          +          ┌────────────────────┐
│  Self-care   │ ─────────────────►  │    Functional      │
└──────────────┘                     │ Exercise Adherence │
       ▲  ╲                          └────────────────────┘
     - │    ╲  -                          ▲         │ +
       │      ╲                    +    ╱           ▼
┌──────────────┐ ╲                    ╱        ┌──────────┐
│ Kinesiophobia│ ──────────────────────────►  │   QoL    │
└──────────────┘          -                   └──────────┘
```

Flow Diagram

Fig. 2. Flow diagram of study recruitment process.