REVIEW ARTICLE

WILEY

Handgrip and knee extension strength as predictors of cancer mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis

A. García-Hermoso[1] 🔘 | R. Ramírez-Vélez[2] 🔘 | M. D. Peterson[3] | F. Lobelo[4] |
I. Cavero-Redondo[5] | J. E. Correa-Bautista[2] | V. Martínez-Vizcaíno[5,6]

[1]Laboratorio de Ciencias de la Actividad Física, el Deporte y la Salud, Facultad de Ciencias Médicas, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, USACH, Santiago, Chile

[2]Centro de Estudios en Medición de la Actividad Física (CEMA), Escuela de Medicina y Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad del Rosario, Bogotá, D.C., Colombia

[3]Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

[4]Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health and Exercise is Medicine Global Research and Collaboration Center, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

[5]Health and Social Research Center, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Cuenca, Spain

[6]Universidad Autónoma de Chile, Talca, Chile

Correspondence
Antonio García-Hermoso, Laboratorio de Ciencias de la Actividad Física, el Deporte y la Salud, Facultad de Ciencias Médicas, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, USACH, Santiago, Chile.
Email: antonio.garcia.h@usach.cl

The specific role of different strength measures on mortality risk needs to be clarified to gain a better understanding of the clinical importance of different muscle groups, as well as to inform intervention protocols in relation to reducing early mortality. The aim of the systematic review and meta-analysis was to determine the relationship between muscular strength and risk of cancer mortality. Eligible cohort studies were those that examined the association between muscular strength, as assessed using validated tests, and cancer mortality in healthy youth and adults. The hazard ratio (HR) estimates obtained were pooled using random effects meta-analysis models. The outcome was cancer mortality assessed using the HR (Cox proportional hazards model). Eleven prospective studies with 1 309 413 participants were included, and 9787 cancer-specific deaths were reported. Overall, greater handgrip (HR = 0.97, 95% CI, 0.92-1.02; $P = .055$; $I^2 = 18.9\%$) and knee extension strength (HR = 0.98, 95% CI, 0.95-1.00; $P = .051$; $I^2 = 60.6\%$) were barely significant associated with reduced risk of cancer mortality. Our study suggests that higher level of muscular strength is not statistically associated with lower risk of cancer mortality.

KEYWORDS
apparently healthy population, cancer mortality, fitness, meta-analysis, muscular strength

1 | INTRODUCTION

The assessment of muscular strength has been suggested as a useful indicator of functional fitness and health status, given its association with morbidity and mortality.[1] Muscle

All authors have access to the data and a role in writing the manuscript.

strength is known to decline with age and is accompanied by a loss of muscle mass and increase in fat mass.[2] Two studies have reported an association between muscular weakness and cancer-related mortality[3,4]; however, others have found no association.[5,6] The underlying mechanisms linking strength preservation with better health outcomes are poorly understood. Nevertheless, the association persists after adjustment

for body size and does not appear to be explained by nutritional status, the presence of chronic disease, or level of physical activity participation.

While a primary focus of epidemiologic investigations concerning cancer mortality has been on physical activity participation[7] or cardiorespiratory fitness,[8] less is known about the role of muscle strength preservation. Exercise-induced adaptations and functional preservation during cancer treatments may attenuate some of their negative side effects, and also could improve the quality of life for cancer survivors and, as consequence, may even increase long-term survival.[9] Despite the known links between weak handgrip strength and all-cause mortality,[10] only a single meta-analytic approach to date has been used to examine its effects (handgrip strength) on cancer mortality rate.[11] However, what remains to be determined is the specific role of different strength measures on cancer mortality to gain a better understanding of the clinical importance of different muscle groups, as well as to inform intervention protocols in relation to reducing early cancer mortality risk.

Therefore, the aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to synthesize the association between muscular strength and risk of cancer mortality.

2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

A systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted following the guidelines of the Cochrane Collaboration. Findings were reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA).[12] The review was registered in PROSPERO (Registration number: CRD42016032733).

2.1 | Data sources and searches

Two authors (AG-H and RR-V) systematically searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, and SPORTDiscus databases from their inception until 01 September 2017 (Table S1). The terms used were as follows(MeSH Terms): muscles OR muscle strength OR muscular OR strength OR obesity OR risk factors AND mortality OR survival rate OR cancer mortality. Only published articles in the English language were included in the study. In addition, the literature search was supplemented through the manual review of reference list of selected articles.

2.2 | Eligibility criteria

The a-priori inclusion criteria are the following:

2.2.1 | Design

- Prospective cohort studies.

2.2.2 | Participants

- Healthy youth and adults excluding studies in which all patients had chronic diseases such as diabetes, heart failure, hypertension, peripheral artery disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cancer, and patients with critical illness (ie we excluded clinical studies of patient groups).

2.2.3 | Exposure

- Direct measurement of muscular strength using a validated strength test (eg handgrip strength test).

2.2.4 | Outcome measure

- Cancer mortality as assessed using the hazard ratio (HR—Cox proportional hazards model).

Two authors (AG-H and RR-V) independently assessed the electronic search results and disagreements were resolved by consensus (FL). Reasons for exclusion of identified articles were recorded in all cases.

2.3 | Data collection process and data items

Extracted data included the first author's name, year of publication, enrollment year, sex of the sample, duration of follow-up, study location, sample size, age at baseline year, HR (and respective 95% CIs), model covariates, muscular strength assessment method, and outcome of interest and cases of cancer mortality. When there was insufficient information, the relevant corresponding author was contacted.

2.4 | Risk of bias in individual studies

An assessment of each study's quality was made using an adjusted format of the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale.[13] This scale contains 8 items categorized into 3 domains (selection, comparability, and exposure). A point system was used to enable semiquantitative assessment of study quality, such that the highest quality studies were awarded a maximum of 1 point per item with the exception of the comparability domain, which allowed allocating 2 points. Thus, the score ranged from 0 to 9 points.

2.5 | Summary measures

All analyses were carried out using STATA (version 14.0; STATA Corporation, College Station, TX). HRs with associated 95% confidence intervals (CIs) from studies for each outcome of interest were extracted (used to estimate the risk of

mortality), and pooled HRs using random effects (DerSimonian and Laird) models were then calculated. The likelihood approach with random effects was used to better account for the inaccuracy in the estimate of between-study variance.[14]

2.6 | Synthesis of results

The percentage of total variation across the studies due to heterogeneity (Cochran's Q-statistic)[15] was used to calculate the I^2 statistics, considering I^2 values of <25%, 25%-50%, and >50% as small, medium, and large amounts of heterogeneity, respectively.[16] Influence analyses were conducted to assess the robustness of the summary estimates to determine whether any individual study accounted for the heterogeneity. Thus, each study was deleted from the model once to analyze the influence of each study on the overall results.

2.7 | Risk of bias across studies

Small-study effects bias was assessed using the extended Egger's test,[17] and the presence of publication bias was investigated graphically by examining funnel plots.

2.8 | Subgroup analysis

Subgroup moderator analyses were conducted to determine whether muscular strength differed according to sex or type of muscular strength assessment test, by stratifying meta-analyses by each of these factors. Therefore, we performed a meta-analysis by subgroups as defined with each measurement criterion. Also, random effects meta-regression analyses were used to separately evaluate whether results were different by mean age of participants at baseline.[18] A P-value <.05 was considered statistically significant.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Study selection

The electronic search strategy retrieved 1126 articles. After removing duplicate references and studies which do not meet inclusion criteria, only 13 articles were screened for eligibility based on title and abstract. The reason for exclusion based on full-text review was due to duplicate data (1 study)[4,19] or analysis used (non-Cox proportional hazards model).[5] Finally, 11 original prospective cohort studies met our inclusion criteria and were included in the meta-analysis (Figure S1).

3.2 | Study characteristics

Table S2 summarizes the characteristics of the eleven included studies.[3,19-27] All of them were prospective observational

studies, and were published from 2007 to 2017. The eleven studies included a total of 1 309 413 participants. Sample sizes ranged from 600[24] to 1 142 599 participants.[22] All studies reported a combined 9787 cancer-specific deaths. The age at cohort enrollment ranged from 16[22] to 80 years.[23] Studies were conducted in the United States,[19,28] Sweden,[22] Japan,[20,23,24,26] Norway,[25,27] and 17 high-income, middle-income, and low-income countries.[21] The follow-up duration ranged from 4 years[23] to 24.2 years.[22]

3.3 | Muscle strength tests

Eight studies assessed the muscular strength using the handgrip test.[20-27] The assessment consisted of 3 attempts with dominant[21,25] or nondominant hand[25], 2 attempts (dominant hand)[23,24,26,27] and averaging both hands.[20,21,23,24] The highest[20,23,24,26,27] or mean[21,25] value was used for the analyses expressed as kilograms.

In the remaining studies, muscular strength was assessed using a variety of test protocols. Four studies used a dynamometer to assess isokinetic knee extension strength.[23,24,28] One study[22] assessed knee extension, handgrip, and elbow flexion strength. Ruiz et al[19] assessed upper body strength with a one repetition maximum supine bench press, and lower body strength with a one repetition maximum seated leg press. Low and high muscular strength were determined using each study's population distribution (ie quartiles, quintiles). All the studies except one adjusted the estimates by age, tobacco use,[20] or body mass index,[22] respectively.

3.4 | Risk of bias within studies

All studies met at least 7 of the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment criteria except one[3] and were considered to have adequate methodological quality. The studies' score ranged from 8 to 9, with a mean total score of 8.7 (Table S3).

3.5 | Meta-analysis

Figure 1 depicts the pooled HR forest plot of low (reference) versus high muscular strength based on the handgrip strength assessment. The pooled HR of cancer mortality via handgrip strength test was 0.97 (95% CI, 0.92-1.02; $P = .055$), with low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 18.9\%$; Figure 1). When we analyzed cancer mortality risk in relation to knee extension strength, the pooled HR was 0.98 (95% CI, 0.95-1.00; $P = .051$; $I^2 = 60.6\%$; Figure 2).

Meta-regression analyses plotting age mean shows that there were no observed significant effects on the HR estimates ($P = .101$ and $P = .982$, for handgrip and knee extension, respectively).

FIGURE 1 Forest plot showing the hazard ratios of cancer mortality comparing low (reference) versus high handgrip strength


FIGURE 2 Forest plot showing the hazard ratios of cancer mortality comparing low (reference) versus high knee extension strength

3.6 | Publication bias and sensitivity analysis

When the impact of individual studies was examined by removing studies from the analysis one at a time, we observed that the pooled HR estimate for low muscular strength remained unchanged. There was no indication of study bias (Egger test; $P = .257$ and $P = .121$, for handgrip and knee extension, respectively). Also, the funnel plot for the relationships of handgrip strength with cancer mortality was not asymmetric, thus indicating no issues of bias (Figure S2). We have not included a funnel plot for knee extension strength due to should be used only when there are at least 10 studies included in the meta-analysis.

4 | DISCUSSION

Our meta-analysis shows that low muscular strength is barely significant associated with the risk of cancer mortality. Also, the age at baseline was not significant moderator of muscular strength on cancer mortality; however, there was a trend (muscular strength is less protective in older individuals). It is necessary to take into consideration that the prospective design of the study not allow to know whether improved muscle strength prevents cancer development or improves survival with cancer.

To date, few studies have examined the association between muscular strength and cancer mortality and findings have been inconsistent. Our meta-analysis included eleven prospective cohort studies and most reported no significant association between muscular strength and cancer mortality, except for 3 studies.[3,19,28] In a national cohort of people aged 65 and older from the United Kingdom, Gale et al[3] showed that weaker handgrip strength (per SD increase in grip strength) predicted increased cancer mortality in men (HR = 0.81, 95% CI 0.70-0.95), but not in women. In that study, the authors hypothesized that the influence of muscular strength on survival may be more closely related with the muscle functional status in men rather than with muscle size. Similarly, Sasaki and colleagues[6] found that stronger handgrip was associated with lower cancer mortality, but only in men. The PURE study included 139 691 men and women aged 35-70 years old from 17 different countries and reported and inverse correlation between high grip strength and low cancer mortality only in high-income countries, not in middle- and low-income countries.[21] Meanwhile, another study included young Swedish men aged 16-19 years; they followed up for 24 years indicating that the oldest subjects were 43 years old at the time of analyses and thus probably too young for analyzing the risk of cancer mortality.[22]

However, the pooled data included in our meta-analysis that used handgrip testing to assess muscle strength showed barely significant association with cancer mortality. The fact that these studies only assessed muscular strength in small muscle groups (ie forearms) may have masked the association between strength and morality. Although handgrip strength has a moderate-to-high correlation with total muscle strength, particularly in youth and young adults,[29] the correlation between handgrip strength and strength in larger muscle groups (eg low-body muscle) is less robust among older adults.[30] It is also possible that obesity may have confounded our results, as greater body mass is highly associated with grip strength. Indeed, previous studies have demonstrated the role of higher body mass adjusted handgrip strength as a predictive factor for reduced cardiometabolic diseases and disability,[31] as well as early mortality.[32]

Findings from 2 studies[19,28] indicate that muscular strength measurements should represent musculature involved with activities of daily living, such as getting up, lifting, or carrying things. In a prospective cohort of 8677 men, aged 20-82 years, Ruiz and colleges[19] reported that higher levels of muscular strength, assessed with an index combining 1-repetition maximal measures for leg and bench press, are associated with lower cancer mortality risk. Surprisingly, a recent study published by Dankel et al[28] using the 1999-2002 NHANES data also suggested that individuals in the upper quartile for knee extension muscle were at a 50% reduced risk; however, the limited number of deaths due to cancer (n = 160) favors high dispersion in the results (HR = 0.50, 95% CI 0.29-0.85) and increased heterogeneity in our pooled results. Given that specific cancer types have distinct etiologies, the biologic pathways through which low muscular strength influence risk of one type of cancer may differ from the pathogenesis and disease progression of other cancers.[33] Therefore, more studies are needed to better understand the role of muscle strength preservation, and resistance exercise interventions for treatment by cancer subtypes.

A primary strength of our study is that we included data from large populations, including high-quality prospective studies with a mean follow-up >10 years (mean 12.8 years), representing various countries, ethnic origins, and socioeconomic backgrounds. However, there are some limitations that should be considered when interpreting these results. First, although all of the included studies had prospective follow-up designs, they are not free of the inherent limitations for cohort studies, which ultimately prevented us from making definitive conclusions about the causal role of muscular strength in cancer mortality. Second, although potential confounders were controlled for in all studies, we cannot exclude the possibility that residual confounding underlies the association between strength and cancer mortality. Indeed, we were unable to determine whether other competing risks or unmeasured confounding (ie other lifestyle risk factors, comorbidities, or socio-economic status)

may have influenced the observed association of muscular strength with death.[32] Third, due to a lack of available data, we were unable to calculate cancer-specific summary measures of association. Fourth, due to the wide follow-up duration range of 4-24.2 years, and the fact that muscle strength does not remain stable over time, this variability in follow-up could certainly influence the effect of baseline strength on cancer mortality. Finally, the categorization of muscular strength in the studies was heterogeneous and may have led to overestimation of the reported associations; also differences in sex distribution and/or cancer type among studies may be behind discrepancies regarding cancer mortality.

In summary, our study demonstrated that higher level of muscular strength was barely significant associated with lower risk of cancer mortality. Also, these results should be cautiously interpreted because some potential heterogeneity-related concerns limit their generalizability. Further studies are needed to identify a plausible biological link between strength preservation and the risk of dying from cancer, as well as to determine the extent to which resistance exercise may benefit specific cancer subtypes.

5 | PERSPECTIVE

Previous meta-analyses have reported that muscle strength is a predictor of all-cause mortality[10] and cardiovascular disease mortality[11] in community-dwelling populations. The current study reported that higher level of muscular strength was barely significant associated with lower risk of cancer mortality. The mechanisms that muscular strength is strongly associated with all-cause and cardiovascular disease mortality and slightly with cancer mortality need to be explored in further studies. Despite the lack of associations in the present study, muscular strength could be easily and universally applied to identify frail people at increased risk of premature cancer mortality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

ORCID

A. García-Hermoso 🆔
http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1397-7182
R. Ramírez-Vélez 🆔 http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3075-6960

REFERENCES

1. Duchowny KA, Peterson MD, Clarke PJ. Cut points for clinical muscle weakness among older Americans. *Am J Prev Med*. 2017;53:63-69.

2. Lindle R, Metter E, Lynch N, et al. Age and gender comparisons of muscle strength in 654 women and men aged 20–93 yr. *J Appl Physiol*. 1997;83:1581-1587.

3. Gale CR, Martyn CN, Cooper C, Sayer AA. Grip strength, body composition, and mortality. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2007;36: 228-235.

4. Ruiz JR, Sui X, Lobelo F, et al. Association between muscular strength and mortality in men: prospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2008;337:a439.

5. Fujita Y, Nakamura Y, Hiraoka J, et al. Physical-strength tests and mortality among visitors to health-promotion centers in Japan. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1995;48:1349-1359.

6. Sasaki H, Kasagi F, Yamada M, Fujita S. Grip strength predicts cause-specific mortality in middle-aged and elderly persons. *Am J Med*. 2007;120:333-342.

7. Robsahm TE, Falk RS, Heir T, et al. Measured cardiorespiratory fitness and self-reported physical activity: associations with cancer risk and death in a long-term prospective cohort study. *Cancer Med*. 2016;5:2136-2144.

8. Schmid D, Leitzmann M. Cardiorespiratory fitness as predictor of cancer mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Oncol*. 2015;26:272-278.

9. Courneya KS, Segal RJ, McKenzie DC, et al. Effects of exercise during adjuvant chemotherapy on breast cancer outcomes. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2014;46:1744-1751.

10. García-Hermoso A, Cavero-Redondo I, Ramírez-Vélez R, et al. Muscular strength as a predictor of all-cause mortality in apparently healthy population: a systematic review and meta-analysis of data from approximately 2 million men and women. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.01.008. [Epub ahead of print].

11. Wu Y, Wang W, Liu T, Zhang D. Association of grip strength with risk of all-cause mortality, cardiovascular diseases, and cancer in community-dwelling populations: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2017;18:551.

12. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;151:65-94.

13. Wells G, Shea B, O'connell D, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, University of Ottawa, Canada, 2000. www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp. Accessed October 11, 2017.

14. Hardy RJ, Thompson SG. A likelihood approach to meta-analysis with random effects. *Stat Med*. 1996;15:619-629.

15. Higgins J, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003;327:557-560.

16. Higgins J, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med*. 2002;21:1539-1558.

17. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315:629-634.

18. Thompson SG, Sharp SJ. Explaining heterogeneity in meta-analysis: a comparison of methods. *Stat Med*. 1999;18:2693-2708.

19. Ruiz JR, Sui X, Lobelo F, et al. Muscular strength and adiposity as predictors of adulthood cancer mortality in men. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2009;18:1468-1476.

20. Kishimoto H, Hata J, Ninomiya T, et al. Midlife and late-life hand-grip strength and risk of cause-specific death in a general Japanese population: the Hisayama Study. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2014;68:663-668.

21. Leong DP, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, et al. Prognostic value of grip strength: findings from the Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiology (PURE) study. *Lancet*. 2015;386:266-273.

22. Ortega FB, Silventoinen K, Tynelius P, Rasmussen F. Muscular strength in male adolescents and premature death: cohort study of one million participants. *BMJ*. 2012;345:e7279.

23. Takata Y, Ansai T, Akifusa S, et al. Physical fitness and 4-year mortality in an 80-year-old population. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2007;62:851-858.

24. Takata Y, Shimada M, Ansai T, et al. Physical performance and 10-year mortality in a 70-year-old community-dwelling population. *Aging Clin Exp Res*. 2012;24:257-264.

25. Karlsen T, Nauman J, Dalen H, et al. The combined association of skeletal muscle strength and physical activity on mortality in older women: the HUNT2 study. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2017;92:710-718.

26. Nofuji Y, Shinkai S, Taniguchi Y, et al. Associations of walking speed, grip strength, and standing balance with total and cause-specific mortality in a general population of Japanese elders. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2016;17:184.

27. Strand BH, Cooper R, Bergland A, et al. The association of grip strength from midlife onwards with all-cause and cause-specific mortality over 17 years of follow-up in the Tromsø Study. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2016;70:1214-1221.

28. Dankel S, Loenneke JP, Loprinzi PD. Cancer-specific mortality relative to engagement in muscle strengthening activities and lower extremity strength. *J Phys Act Health*. 2018;15:144-149.

29. Wind AE, Takken T, Helders PJ, Engelbert RH. Is grip strength a predictor for total muscle strength in healthy children, adolescents, and young adults? *Eur J Pediatr*. 2010;169:281-287.

30. Samuel D, Rowe P. An investigation of the association between grip strength and hip and knee joint moments in older adults. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr*. 2012;54:357-360.

31. Peterson MD, Duchowny K, Meng Q, et al. Low normalized grip strength is a biomarker for cardiometabolic disease and physical disabilities among US and Chinese adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2017;71:1646-1652.

32. Peterson MD, Zhang P, Duchowny KA, Markides KS, Ottenbacher KJ, Al Snih S. Declines in strength and mortality risk among older Mexican Americans: joint modeling of survival and longitudinal data. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2016;71:1646-1652.

33. Meneses-Echávez JF, Correa-Bautista JE, González-Jiménez E, Río-Valle JS, et al. The effect of exercise training on mediators of inflammation in breast cancer survivors: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2016;25:1009-1017.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

How to cite this article: García-Hermoso A, Ramírez-Vélez R, Peterson MD, et al. Handgrip and knee extension strength as predictors of cancer mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2018;28:1852–1858. https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13206