Published in final edited form as:

Support Care Cancer. 2017 March ; 25(3): 783–793. doi:10.1007/s00520-016-3461-2.

Characteristics Associated with Inter-Individual Differences in the Trajectories of Self-Reported Attentional Function in Oncology Outpatients Receiving Chemotherapy

Juliet Shih, RN, MS¹, Heather Leutwyler, RN, PhD¹, Christine Ritchie, MD², Steven M. Paul, PhD¹, Jon D. Levine, MD, PhD², Bruce Cooper, PhD¹, Fay Wright, RN, PhD³, Yvette P. Conley, PhD⁴, and Christine Miaskowski, RN, PhD¹

¹School of Nursing, University of California, San Francisco, CA

²School of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA

³School of Nursing, Yale University, New Haven CT

⁴School of Nursing, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

Abstract

Purpose—Between 14% and 85% of patients report noticeable changes in cognitive function during chemotherapy (CTX). The purposes of this study were to determine which demographic, clinical, and symptom characteristics were associated with inter-individual variability in initial levels of attentional function as well as with changes in the trajectories of attentional function in a sample of oncology patients who received two cycles of CTX.

Methods—Oncology outpatients (n=1,329) were recruited from two Comprehensive Cancer Centers, one Veteran's Affairs hospital, and four community-based oncology programs. The Attentional Function Index (AFI) was used to assess perceived effectiveness in completing daily tasks that required working memory and attention. Hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) was used to evaluate for inter-individual variability in initial levels and in the trajectories of attentional function.

Results: D—demographic, clinical, and symptom characteristics associated with inter-individual differences of attentional function at enrollment (i.e., intercept) were: employment status, functional status, trait anxiety, depressive symptoms, sleep disturbance, evening fatigue, and morning energy. Gender was the only characteristic associated with inter-individual differences in the trajectories of attentional function. Morning fatigue was the only characteristic associated with both initial levels as well as the trajectories of attentional function.

Conclusions—Prior to their next dose of CTX, patients reported moderate levels of attentional function that persisted over two cycles of CTX. Many of the clinical and symptom characteristics associated with decrements in attentional function are amenable to interventions. Clinicians need

Address correspondence to: Christine Miaskowski, RN, PhD, Professor, Department of Physiological Nursing, University of California, Box 0610 – N631Y, San Francisco, CA 94143-0610, 415-476-9407 (phone), 415-476-8899 (fax), chris.miaskowski@ucsf.edu.

Disclosures: None to report.

to assess patients for changes in attentional function and associated characteristics and recommend evidence-based interventions.

Keywords

attentional function; chemotherapy; cognitive function; hierarchical linear modeling; executive function

Introduction

Between 14% and 85% of patients report noticeable changes in cognitive function during chemotherapy (CTX) [1]. These cognitive changes include alterations in memory, psychomotor speed, and executive functioning [2]. Executive function encompasses a person's ability to direct attention towards planning, decision-making, and abstract thinking [2]. While memory and psychomotor speed are important mental processes, changes in executive function during CTX are particularly important to evaluate because lower levels of executive function are associated with increases in anxiety, depression, and fatigue [3,4].

One self-report measure that has been used to evaluate changes in executive function in oncology patients is the Attentional Function Index (AFI). The AFI was developed by Cimprich and colleagues to evaluate changes in executive function in women undergoing breast cancer surgery [5]. More recently, changes in attentional function were evaluated in patients with breast and prostate cancer undergoing radiation therapy [6,7]; in patients who were followed for 6 months after breast cancer surgery [8]; and in cancer survivors [9,10]. However, no studies were found that evaluated for changes in self-reported attentional function in patients receiving multiple cycles of CTX.

Of note, no recommendations are available on the optimal method to use to evaluate changes in executive function in patients undergoing CTX [2]. However, both patients and clinicians need information about how CTX may impact patients' cognitive abilities. Therefore, the AFI which is relatively short and easy to complete, may provide important information on how executive function changes over time in oncology patients receiving CTX. In addition, given the paucity of longitudinal studies on self-reported changes in attentional function during CTX, additional research is warranted at this time. Therefore, the purposes of this study were to determine which demographic, clinical, and symptom characteristics were associated with inter-individual variability in initial levels of, as well as with changes in the trajectories of attentional function in a sample of oncology patients who received two cycles of CTX.

Methods

Patients and Settings

This study is part of a larger, longitudinal study of the symptom experience of oncology outpatients receiving CTX [11]. Eligible patients were 18 years of age; had a diagnosis of breast, gastrointestinal (GI), gynecologic (GYN), or lung cancer; had received CTX within the preceding four weeks; were scheduled to receive at least two additional cycles of CTX; were able to read, write, and understand English; and gave written informed consent.

Patients were recruited from two Comprehensive Cancer Centers, one Veteran's Affairs hospital, and four community-based oncology programs.

Instruments

A demographic questionnaire obtained information on age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, living arrangements, education, employment status, and income. The Karnofsky Performance Status (KPS) scale is widely used to evaluate functional status in patients with cancer and has well established validity and reliability [12]. Patients rated their functional status using the KPS scale that ranged from 30 (I feel severely disabled and need to be hospitalized) to 100 (I feel normal; I have no complaints or symptoms) [12,13].

Self-Administered Comorbidity Questionnaire (SCQ) consists of 13 common medical conditions simplified into language that can be understood without prior medical knowledge [14]. Patients indicated if they had the condition; if they received treatment for it (proxy for disease severity) and if it limited their activities (indication of functional limitations). For each condition, the patient can receive a maximum of 3 points. The total SCQ score ranges from 0 to 39. The SCQ has well established validity and reliability [14].

Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) is a 10-item questionnaire that assesses alcohol consumption, alcohol dependence, and the consequences of alcohol abuse in the last 12 months. The AUDIT gives a total score that ranges between 0 and 40. Scores of 8 are defined as hazardous use and scores of 16 are defined as use of alcohol that is likely to be harmful to health [15]. The AUDIT has well established validity and reliability [16]. In this study, its Cronbach's alpha was 0.63.

Attentional Function Index (AFI) consists of 16 items designed to measure attentional function [17]. A higher total mean score on a 0 to 10 numeric rating scale (NRS) indicates greater capacity to direct attention [17]. Total scores are grouped into categories of attentional function (i.e., <5.0 low function, 5.0 to 7.5 moderate function, >7.5 high function) [18]. The AFI has well established reliability and validity [17]. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha for the AFI total score was 0.93.

Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventories (STAI-T and STAI-S) each have 20 items that are rated from 1 to 4. The summed scores for each scale can range from 20 to 80. The STAI-T measures a person's predisposition to anxiety as part of one's personality. The STAI-S measures a person's temporary anxiety response to a specific situation or how anxious or tense a person is "right now" in a specific situation. Cutoff scores of 31.8 and 32.2 indicate high levels of trait and state anxiety, respectively. The STAI-S and STAI-T inventories have well established validity and reliability [19]. In the current study, the Cronbach's alphas for the STAI-T and STAI-S were 0.92 and 0.96, respectively.

Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression scale (CES-D) consists of 20 items selected to represent the major symptoms in the clinical syndrome of depression. A total score can range from 0 to 60, with scores of 16 indicating the need for individuals to seek clinical evaluation for major depression. The CES-D has well established validity and reliability [20]. In the current study, the Cronbach's alpha for the CES-D total score was 0.89.

Lee Fatigue Scale (LFS) consists of 18 items designed to assess physical fatigue and energy [21]. Each item was rated on a 0 to 10 NRS. Total fatigue and energy scores are calculated as the mean of the 13 fatigue items and the 5 energy items, respectively. Higher scores indicate greater fatigue severity and higher levels of energy. Using separate LFS questionnaires, patients were asked to rate each item based on how they felt within 30 minutes of awakening (i.e., morning fatigue, morning energy) and prior to going to bed (i.e., evening fatigue, evening energy). The LFS has established cut-off scores for clinically meaningful levels of fatigue (i.e., 3.2 for morning fatigue, 5.6 for evening fatigue) [22] and energy (i.e., 6.2 for morning energy, 3.5 for evening energy) [22]. It was chosen for this study because it is relatively short, easy to administer, and has well established validity and reliability [21]. In the current study, the Cronbach's alphas were 0.96 for morning and 0.93 for evening fatigue and 0.95 for morning and 0.93 for evening energy.

General Sleep Disturbance Scale (GSDS) consists of 21-items designed to assess the quality of sleep in the past week. Each item was rated on a 0 (never) to 7 (everyday) NRS. The GSDS total score is the sum of the seven subscale scores that can range from 0 (no disturbance) to 147 (extreme sleep disturbance). A GSDS total score of 43 indicates a significant level of sleep disturbance [22]. The GSDS has well established validity and reliability [23]. In the current study, the Cronbach's alpha for the GSDS total score was 0.83.

Occurrence of pain was evaluated using the Brief Pain Inventory [24]. Patients who responded yes to the question about having pain were asked to indicate if their pain was or was not related to their cancer treatment.

Study Procedures

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at each of the study sites. Eligible patients were approached in the infusion unit by a member of the research team to discuss participation in the study. Written informed consent was obtained from all patients. Depending on the length of their CTX cycles (i.e., 14-day, 21-day, or 28-day), patients completed study questionnaires in their homes, a total of six times over two cycles of CTX, namely: prior to CTX administration (i.e., recovery from previous CTX cycle at assessments 1 and 4), approximately 1 week after CTX administration (i.e., acute symptoms at assessments 2 and 5) and approximately 2 weeks after CTX administration (i.e., potential nadir at assessments 3 and 6).

Data Analyses

Descriptive statistics and frequency distributions were generated on the sample characteristics and symptom severity scores at enrollment using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 [25].

Hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) based on full maximum likelihood estimation was performed in two stages using software developed by Raudenbush and Bryk [26]. The HLM methods are described in detail elsewhere [27]. In brief, during stage 1, intra-individual variability in attentional function over time was examined (i.e., evaluation of the unconditional model). A piecewise model strategy was employed to evaluate the pattern of change in AFI scores over time because the six assessments encompassed two cycles of

CTX. The six assessments were coded into two pieces. Assessments 1, 2, and 3 comprised the first piece (PW1) that was used to model changes over time during the first CTX cycle. Assessments 4, 5, and 6 comprised the second piece (PW2) that was used to model changes over time during the second CTX cycle. A piecewise model can be more sensitive to the timing and sequencing of changes in a dependent variable than conventional HLM models that would have assessed linear, quadratic, or cubic changes over the six assessments and would not have paid attention to the two different CTX cycles [28].

The second stage of the HLM analysis examined inter-individual differences in the piecewise trajectories of attentional function by modeling the individual change parameters (i.e., intercept and slope parameters) as a function of a list of proposed predictors. Supplementary Table 1 lists the potential demographic, clinical, and symptom predictors that were developed based on a review of the literature on factors associated with changes in attentional function and cognitive in oncology patients undergoing CTX (for reviews see 10, 29–31).

To improve estimation efficiency and construct a parsimonious model, exploratory level 2 analyses were completed in which each potential predictor was assessed to determine whether it would result in a better fitting model if it alone were added as a level 2 predictor. Predictors with a t value of <2.0 were excluded from subsequent model testing. All potential significant predictors from the exploratory analyses were entered into the model to predict each individual change parameter. Only predictors that maintained a statistically significant contribution in conjunction with other predictors were retained in the final model. A p -value of $<.05$ indicated statistical significance.

Results

Sample Characteristics

The demographic, clinical, and symptom characteristics of the sample ($n=1,329$) are presented in Table 1. The sample was predominately female (78%) with a mean age of 57 years, was well educated (16 years), currently not employed (65%), partnered (65%), and did not have child care responsibilities (78%). On average, the patients were two years from their cancer diagnosis (median = 0.42 years), primarily being treated with 21-day CTX cycles (51%), and had one metastatic site. At enrollment, the mean scores on the GSDS, the STAI-T, and STAI-S were above the cut-off scores for clinically meaningful levels of sleep disturbance, trait anxiety, and state anxiety, respectively. In addition, morning energy scores were below the clinically meaningful cutoff score. The mean AFI score at enrollment (6.38 ± 1.82) was in a range that indicated a moderate level of attentional function.

Changes in Attentional Function Over Time

The first HLM analysis examined how AFI scores changed within the two cycles of CTX. The estimates for the initial piecewise model are presented in Table 2. Since the model was unconditional (i.e., no covariates), the intercept represents the average AFI score at enrollment (i.e., 6.385 on a scale of 0 to 10). The estimated linear piecewise rates of change were -0.605 and -0.425 (both $p<.0001$) for piecewise linear 1 and piecewise linear 2,

respectively. The estimated quadratic piecewise rates of change were 0.385 and 0.137 (both $p < .0001$) for piecewise quadratic 1 and piecewise quadratic 2, respectively. The combination of each coefficient determines the curves for the two piecewise components' changes in attentional function scores over time.

Figure 1A displays the mean AFI scores over the two cycles of CTX. From assessment 1 to 2, AFI scores declined over time and recovered by assessment 3. Over the second CTX cycle, while a similar pattern was observed, the decline in scores was less steep. The results indicate a sample-wide change in AFI scores over time. However, they do not indicate that all of the patients' AFI scores changed at the same rate over time. The variance components (Table 2) suggest that considerable inter-individual variability existed in the trajectories of attentional function. A spaghetti plot of a random sample of 50 patients demonstrates the inter-individual variability in AFI scores (Figure 1B). These results supported additional analyses of predictors of inter-individual differences in initial levels as well as in the trajectories of attentional function.

Predictors of Initial Levels of Attentional Function

As shown in the final model (Table 2), the demographic, clinical, and symptom characteristics that predicted inter-individual differences in initial levels of attentional function (i.e. intercept) were: employment status and KPS score, as well as enrollment levels of trait anxiety, depressive symptoms, sleep disturbance, evening fatigue, and morning energy. To illustrate the effects of the demographic and clinical characteristics, Figures 2A–B display the adjusted change curves for AFI scores that were estimated based on differences in employment status (i.e., employed or not employed) and functional status (i.e., lower/higher calculated as one SD above and below the mean KPS score). To illustrate the effects of the symptom characteristics, Figures 3A–E display the adjusted change curves for AFI scores that were estimated based on differences in trait anxiety (i.e., lower/higher calculated as one SD above and below the mean STAI-T score), depressive symptoms (i.e., lower/higher calculated as one SD above and below the mean CES-D score), sleep disturbance (i.e., lower/higher calculated as one SD above and below the mean GSDS score), evening fatigue (i.e., lower/higher calculated as one SD above and below the mean LFS evening fatigue score), and morning energy (i.e., lower/higher calculated as one SD above and below the mean LFS morning energy score).

Predictor of the Trajectories of Attentional Function

The only characteristic that predicted inter-individual differences in the trajectories of attentional function was gender. Figure 4A displays the adjusted change curves for AFI score for the male and female patients.

Predictor of Both Initial Levels of and the Trajectories of Attentional Function

The only characteristic that predicted inter-individual differences in initial levels and in the trajectories of attentional function was morning fatigue. Figure 4B displays the adjusted change curves for AFI scores that were estimated based on differences in morning fatigue (i.e. lower/higher calculated as one SD above and below the mean LFS morning fatigue score).

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to examine changes in self-reported attentional function over the course of two cycles of CTX and the first to use HLM to determine demographic, symptom, and clinical characteristics associated with inter-individual differences in initial levels and in the trajectories of attentional function during CTX. Of note, the initial AFI scores at enrollment into the current study were in the moderate range (i.e., 6.385). This score is somewhat lower than the AFI score reported by women prior to the initiation of radiation therapy for breast cancer (i.e., 6.56) [6] and similar to the score reported by women prior to breast cancer surgery (i.e., 6.32) [8]. While the HLM analyses determined that a piecewise model fit the data best, the changes in AFI scores over the two cycles of CTX were relatively stable over time. Taken together, these findings suggest that across various cancer treatments, oncology patients experience decrements in executive function. Given the substantial increases in the number of cancer survivors [32], additional research is warranted to determine how long these decrements persist following the completion of CTX.

As part of the HLM analysis, a number of non-modifiable and modifiable characteristics were identified that were associated with decrements in initial levels and/or the trajectories of attentional function during CTX. The remainder of the discussion focuses on these non-modifiable and modifiable characteristics.

Non-modifiable Characteristics

Two non-modifiable characteristics (i.e., gender, employment status) were associated with decrements in attentional function. While no gender differences in initial levels of attentional function were found in the current study, females had slightly worse attentional function scores over the two cycles of CTX (Figure 4A). While the majority of the studies that used the AFI evaluated patients with breast cancer, findings regarding gender differences in attentional function during and following cancer treatment are inconclusive. For example, in one study [33], no gender differences in AFI scores were reported. In contrast, in another study, compared to men with prostate cancer [6], women with breast cancer reported lower AFI scores. Given the extremely modest gender differences in AFI scores found in our study, additional research is warranted on gender differences in self-reported attentional function because several lines of evidence suggest that the impact of gender on cognitive function is complex. For example, in the general population, gender differences in cognitive function are noted in a number of domains [34]. In addition, sex steroid hormones are known to modulate cognitive function [35].

Employment status was classified as a non-modifiable characteristic in this study because it is unlikely that patients can easily change their employment status during CTX treatment. Consistent with a previous report of women undergoing radiation therapy for breast cancer [7], patients who were employed at the time of enrollment into the current study reported higher levels of attentional function (Figure 2A). However, in other studies [33,36], no association was found between employment status and AFI scores. As noted by Williams and colleagues [37], being employed may condition the mechanisms involved in directing attention to function more efficiently. Therefore, when patients are not working, they do not

experience this routine conditioning. This deficit may contribute to the perception of decreases in attentional function.

Modifiable Characteristics

A number of modifiable characteristics were associated with lower AFI scores (i.e., poorer functional status, higher trait anxiety, higher depression, higher sleep disturbance, higher evening fatigue, higher morning fatigue, lower morning energy). First, poorer functional status at enrollment was associated with lower levels of attentional function at enrollment (Figure 2B). This association is not surprising given that a growing body of evidence in the gerontology literature suggests that cognition and mobility are intertwined (for review see 38). For example, attention is a necessary cognitive resource for maintaining one's ability to walk. In addition, attentional deficits are independently associated with postural instability, impairments in the performance of activities of daily living, and future falls [39]. These findings suggest that oncology patients undergoing CTX may need referrals to physical therapy for exercise interventions to improve both cognition and physical function.

While the current study is the first to evaluate the impact of a number of common symptoms on initial levels as well as changes in attentional function at multiple points over two cycles of CTX, our findings are consistent with a number of cross-sectional studies that reported associations between these symptoms and cognitive function. For example, higher levels of trait anxiety and depression were associated with lower levels of attentional function in women newly diagnosed with breast cancer [36]. In addition, in a study of patients with breast and prostate cancer [6], higher levels of sleep disturbance were associated with lower levels of attentional function.

Morning fatigue was the only modifiable symptom characteristic that was associated with both initial levels of as well as the trajectories of attentional function over the two cycles of CTX (Figure 4B). Our findings are consistent with data from several studies [31,40,41], and a systematic review [29], that found that increases in physical fatigue in oncology patients were associated with decrements in cognitive function. This association may be explained by the fact that recent evidence suggests that cancer and its treatments trigger inflammatory processes that contribute to increased levels of physical fatigue and cognitive dysfunction in oncology patients [31].

In terms of these modifiable symptom characteristics, it should be noted that at the time of enrollment into the current study, patients had levels of trait anxiety and sleep disturbance that were above the clinically meaningful cutoff scores. In addition, levels of depression, morning and evening fatigue, and decrements in morning and evening energy were in the moderate range. Therefore, for patients whose scores for these latter six symptoms were one standard deviation above the mean score for the entire sample, the severity of their symptoms were at clinically meaningful levels. Our findings suggest that oncology patients undergoing CTX warrant a comprehensive symptom assessment and management plan. The exact relationships among these symptoms and decrements in cognitive function are undoubtedly complex and warrant investigation in future studies.

Limitations

Several study limitations warrant consideration. First, our evaluation of cognitive function was limited to a self-report measure that primarily evaluated changes in executive function [17]. Therefore, our findings regarding changes in attentional function over time, as well as the characteristics associated with decrements in attentional function warrant confirmation using objective measures of various components of cognitive function. Although our findings suggest that a number of characteristics are associated with decrements in attentional function, future studies need to consider the impact of multiple co-occurring symptoms or symptoms clusters on attentional function [41–43].

Some studies of cognitive changes during cancer treatment compared patients undergoing cancer treatment with healthy controls [17, 44]. In some of these studies [17], levels of cognitive function in patients beginning cancer treatment were lower than those of the healthy controls. In the current study, AFI scores at enrollment were in the moderate range and the majority of the patients had received previous treatment for their cancer. Future studies should evaluate patients prior to the initiation of CTX and compare findings to healthy controls.

Clinical Implications and Directions for Future Research

All of the modifiable characteristics associated with decrements in attentional function are amenable to clinical interventions. Clinicians need to assess patients for decrements in attentional function and associated risk factors and prescribe evidenced-based interventions to improve cognitive function and/or reduce co-occurring symptoms. Of note, a number of studies demonstrated that increased physical activity has beneficial effects on both physical and cognitive function [38,45]. In addition, increased physical activity may reduce sleep disturbance and fatigue and improve mood in these patients [46,47].

Additional research is warranted on changes in cognitive function from prior to through and following the completion of CTX. Findings from longitudinal studies with both subjective and objective measures of cognitive function and associated demographic, clinical, and symptom characteristics will provide important information to educate patients about changes in cognitive function during and following treatment. Studies are needed that evaluate the efficacy of multimodal interventions to reduce symptom burden and enhance cognitive function.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This study was funded by the National Cancer Institute (NCI, CA134900). Dr. Miaskowski is supported by a grant from the American Cancer Society and NCI (CA168960). Ms. Shih was supported by grants from the Graduate Division of the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) and from Associated Students of the UCSF School of Nursing to present her thesis findings at the Oncology Nursing Society's 41st Annual Congress.

References

1. Joly F, Giffard B, Rigal O, De Ruiter MB, Small BJ, Dubois M, LeFel J, Schagen SB, Ahles TA, Wefel JS, Vardy JL, Pancre V, Lange M, Castel H. Impact of cancer and its treatments on cognitive function: Advances in Research From the Paris International Cognition and Cancer Task Force Symposium and Update Since 2012. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2015; 50(6):830–841. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2015.06.019 [PubMed: 26344551]
2. Hess LM, Insel KC. Chemotherapy-related change in cognitive function: a conceptual model. *Oncol Nurs Forum*. 2007; 34(5):981–994. doi:W5348N73K3603L2N. [PubMed: 17878127]
3. Merriman JD, Von Ah D, Miaskowski C, Aouizerat BE. Proposed mechanisms for cancer- and treatment-related cognitive changes. *Semin Oncol Nurs*. 2013; 29(4):260–269. DOI: 10.1016/j.soncn.2013.08.006 [PubMed: 24183157]
4. Bender CM, Merriman JD. Cancer- and treatment-related cognitive changes: what can we do now? What lies ahead? *Oncology (Williston Park)*. 2014; 28(9):806–808. doi:201379. [PubMed: 25224482]
5. Cimprich B. Attentional fatigue following breast cancer surgery. *Res Nurs Health*. 1992; 15(3):199–207. [PubMed: 1354883]
6. Merriman JD, Dodd M, Lee K, Paul SM, Cooper BA, Aouizerat BE, Swift PS, Wara W, Dunn L, Miaskowski C. Differences in self-reported attentional fatigue between patients with breast and prostate cancer at the initiation of radiation therapy. *Cancer Nurs*. 2011; 34(5):345–353. DOI: 10.1097/NCC.0b013e318202520a [PubMed: 21252643]
7. Merriman JD, Jansen C, Koettters T, West C, Dodd M, Lee K, Paul SM, Aouizerat BE, Cooper BA, Swift PS, Wara W, Miaskowski C. Predictors of the trajectories of self-reported attentional fatigue in women with breast cancer undergoing radiation therapy. *Oncol Nurs Forum*. 2010; 37(4):423–432. doi:44X38GM23218Q033. [PubMed: 20591802]
8. Merriman JD, Aouizerat BE, Cataldo JK, Dunn L, Cooper BA, West C, Paul SM, Baggott CR, Dhruva A, Kober K, Langford DJ, Leutwyler H, Ritchie CS, Abrams G, Dodd M, Elboim C, Hamolsky D, Melisko M, Miaskowski C. Association between an interleukin 1 receptor, type I promoter polymorphism and self-reported attentional function in women with breast cancer. *Cytokine*. 2014; 65(2):192–201. DOI: 10.1016/j.cyto.2013.11.003 [PubMed: 24315345]
9. Johns SA, Von Ah D, Brown LF, Beck-Coon K, Talib TL, Alyea JM, Monahan PO, Tong Y, Wilhelm L, Giesler RB. Randomized controlled pilot trial of mindfulness-based stress reduction for breast and colorectal cancer survivors: effects on cancer-related cognitive impairment. *J Cancer Surviv*. 2015; doi: 10.1007/s11764-015-0494-3
10. Myers JS, Wick JA, Klemp J. Potential factors associated with perceived cognitive impairment in breast cancer survivors. *Support Care Cancer*. 2015; 23(11):3219–3228. DOI: 10.1007/s00520-015-2708-7 [PubMed: 25832894]
11. Miaskowski C, Cooper BA, Melisko M, Chen LM, Mastick J, West C, Paul SM, Dunn LB, Schmidt BL, Hammer M, Cartwright F, Wright F, Langford DJ, Lee K, Aouizerat BE. Disease and treatment characteristics do not predict symptom occurrence profiles in oncology outpatients receiving chemotherapy. *Cancer*. 2014; 120(15):2371–2378. DOI: 10.1002/cncr.28699 [PubMed: 24797450]
12. Karnofsky D, Abelmann WH, Craver LV, Burchenal JH. The use of nitrogen mustards in the palliative treatment of carcinoma. *Cancer*. 1948; 1:634–656.
13. Schnadig ID, Fromme EK, Loprinzi CL, Sloan JA, Mori M, Li H, Beer TM. Patient-physician disagreement regarding performance status is associated with worse survivorship in patients with advanced cancer. *Cancer*. 2008; 113(8):2205–2214. DOI: 10.1002/cncr.23856 [PubMed: 18780322]
14. Sangha O, Stucki G, Liang MH, Fossel AH, Katz JN. The Self-Administered Comorbidity Questionnaire: a new method to assess comorbidity for clinical and health services research. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2003; 49(2):156–163. DOI: 10.1002/art.10993 [PubMed: 12687505]
15. Babor, TF., Higgins-Biddle, JC., Saunders, JB., Monteiro, MG. AUDIT: The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test: Guidelines for Use in Primary Care. World Health Organization; Geneva, Switzerland: 2001.

16. Berks J, McCormick R. Screening for alcohol misuse in elderly primary care patients: a systematic literature review. *Int Psychogeriatr*. 2008; 20(6):1090–1103. DOI: 10.1017/S1041610208007497 [PubMed: 18538045]
17. Cimprich B, Visovatti M, Ronis DL. The Attentional Function Index--a self-report cognitive measure. *Psychooncology*. 2011; 20(2):194–202. DOI: 10.1002/pon.1729 [PubMed: 20213858]
18. Cimprich B, So H, Ronis DL, Trask C. Pre-treatment factors related to cognitive functioning in women newly diagnosed with breast cancer. *Psychooncology*. 2005; 14(1):70–78. [PubMed: 15386786]
19. Spielberger, CG., Gorsuch, RL., Suchene, R., Vagg, PR., Jacobs, GA. Manual for the State-Anxiety (Form Y): Self Evaluation Questionnaire. Consulting Psychologists Press; Palo Alto, CA: 1983.
20. Radloff LS. The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*. 1977; 1(3):385–401.
21. Lee KA, Hicks G, Nino-Murcia G. Validity and reliability of a scale to assess fatigue. *Psychiatry Res*. 1991; 36(3):291–298. [PubMed: 2062970]
22. Fletcher BS, Paul SM, Dodd MJ, Schumacher K, West C, Cooper B, Lee K, Aouizerat B, Swift P, Wara W, Miaskowski CA. Prevalence, severity, and impact of symptoms on female family caregivers of patients at the initiation of radiation therapy for prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2008; 26(4):599–605. DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2007.12.2838 [PubMed: 18235118]
23. Lee KA. Self-reported sleep disturbances in employed women. *Sleep*. 1992; 15(6):493–498. [PubMed: 1475563]
24. Daut RL, Cleeland CS, Flanery RC. Development of the Wisconsin Brief Pain Questionnaire to assess pain in cancer and other diseases. *Pain*. 1983; 17(2):197–210. [PubMed: 6646795]
25. IBM. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 22. IBM Corp; Armonk, NY: Released 2013
26. Raudenbush, SW., Bryk, A. Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods. 2. Sage Publications; Thousand Oaks, CA: 2002.
27. Miaskowski C, Paul SM, Cooper BA, Lee K, Dodd M, West C, Aouizerat BE, Swift PS, Wara W. Trajectories of fatigue in men with prostate cancer before, during, and after radiation therapy. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2008; 35(6):632–643. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2007.07.007 [PubMed: 18358683]
28. Osborne C, Berger LM, Magnuson K. Family structure transitions and changes in maternal resources and well-being. *Demography*. 2012; 49(1):23–47. DOI: 10.1007/s13524-011-0080-x [PubMed: 22215507]
29. Henneghan A. Modifiable factors and cognitive dysfunction in breast cancer survivors: a mixed-method systematic review. *Support Care Cancer*. 2016; 24(1):481–497. DOI: 10.1007/s00520-015-2927-y [PubMed: 26416490]
30. Ono M, Ogilvie JM, Wilson JS, Green HJ, Chambers SK, Ownsworth T, Shum DH. A meta-analysis of cognitive impairment and decline associated with adjuvant chemotherapy in women with breast cancer. *Front Oncol*. 2015; 5:59.doi: 10.3389/fonc.2015.00059 [PubMed: 25806355]
31. Bower JE, Ganz PA. Symptoms: Fatigue and Cognitive Dysfunction. *Adv Exp Med Biol*. 2015; 862:53–75. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-16366-6_5 [PubMed: 26059929]
32. Miller KD, Siegel RL, Lin CC, Mariotto AB, Kramer JL, Rowland JH, Stein KD, Alteri R, Jemal A. Cancer treatment and survivorship statistics, 2016. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2016; 66(4):271–289. DOI: 10.3322/caac.21349 [PubMed: 27253694]
33. Merriman JD, Aouizerat BE, Langford DJ, Cooper BA, Baggott CR, Cataldo JK, Dhruva A, Dunn L, West C, Paul SM, Ritchie CS, Swift PS, Miaskowski C. Preliminary evidence of an association between an interleukin 6 promoter polymorphism and self-reported attentional function in oncology patients and their family caregivers. *Biol Res Nurs*. 2014; 16(2):152–159. DOI: 10.1177/1099800413479441 [PubMed: 23482714]
34. Hyde JS. Sex and cognition: gender and cognitive functions. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 2016; 38:53–56. doi:S0959-4388(16)30008-3. [PubMed: 26953847]
35. Durdiakova J, Ostatnikova D, Celec P. Testosterone and its metabolites--modulators of brain functions. *Acta Neurobiol Exp (Wars)*. 2011; 71(4):434–454. doi:7147. [PubMed: 22237492]
36. Cimprich B. Pretreatment symptom distress in women newly diagnosed with breast cancer. *Cancer Nurs*. 1999; 22(3):185–194. [PubMed: 10376379]

37. Williams RA, Hagerty BM, Cimprich B, Therrien B, Bay E, Oe H. Changes in directed attention and short-term memory in depression. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2000; 34(3):227–238. [PubMed: 10867118]
38. Falck RS, Davis JC, Liu-Ambrose T. What is the association between sedentary behaviour and cognitive function? A systematic review. *Br J Sports Med.* 2016 doi:bjsports-2015-095551.
39. Woollacott M, Shumway-Cook A. Attention and the control of posture and gait: a review of an emerging area of research. *Gait Posture.* 2002; 16(1):1–14. doi:S0966636201001564. [PubMed: 12127181]
40. Visovatti MA, Reuter-Lorenz PA, Chang AE, Northouse L, Cimprich B. Assessment of cognitive impairment and complaints in individuals with colorectal cancer. *Oncol Nurs Forum.* 2016; 43(2): 169–178. DOI: 10.1188/16.ONF.43-02AP [PubMed: 26906128]
41. Dong ST, Costa DS, Butow PN, Lovell MR, Agar M, Velikova G, Teckle P, Tong A, Tebbutt NC, Clarke SJ, van der Hoek K, King MT, Fayers PM. Symptom clusters in advanced cancer patients: An empirical comparison of statistical methods and the impact on quality of life. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2016; 51(1):88–98. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2015.07.013 [PubMed: 26300025]
42. Dodd MJ, Miaskowski C, Paul SM. Symptom clusters and their effect on the functional status of patients with cancer. *Oncol Nurs Forum.* 2001; 28(3):465–470. [PubMed: 11338755]
43. Kim HJ, McGuire DB, Tulman L, Barsevick AM. Symptom clusters: concept analysis and clinical implications for cancer nursing. *Cancer Nurs.* 2005; 28(4):270–282. [PubMed: 16046888]
44. Piacentine LB, Miller JF, Haberlein S, Bloom AS. Perceived cognitive changes with chemotherapy for breast cancer: A pilot study. *Appl Nurs Res.* 2016; 29:9–11. DOI: 10.1016/j.apnr.2015.03.015 [PubMed: 26856481]
45. Montero-Odasso M, Bherer L, Studenski S, Gopaul K, Oteng-Amoako A, Woolmore-Goodwin S, Stooles P, Wells J, Doherty T, Zecevic AA, Galinsky D, Rylett RJ, Jutai J, Muir-Hunter S, Speechley M, Camicioli R. Mobility and Cognition in Seniors. Report from the 2008 Institute of Aging (CIHR) Mobility and Cognition Workshop. *Can Geriatr J.* 2015; 18(3):159–167. DOI: 10.5770/cgj.18.188 [PubMed: 26495050]
46. Meneses-Echavez JF, Gonzalez-Jimenez E, Ramirez-Velez R. Effects of supervised multimodal exercise interventions on cancer-related fatigue: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Biomed Res Int.* 2015; 2015:328636.doi: 10.1155/2015/328636 [PubMed: 26167483]
47. Tomlinson D, Diorio C, Beyene J, Sung L. Effect of exercise on cancer-related fatigue: a meta-analysis. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2014; 93(8):675–686. DOI: 10.1097/PHM.0000000000000083 [PubMed: 24743466]

Figure 1.

Figure 1. A – Piecewise model of mean Attentional Function Index scores for six assessment points over two cycles of chemotherapy (CTX).

Figure 1. B - Spaghetti plots of individual attentional function trajectories for a random sample of 50 patients over two cycles of CTX. Abbreviation: AFITOT = Attentional Function Index score.

Figure 2.
A–B - Influence of employment status (A) and Karnofsky Performance Status (KPS) score at enrollment (B) on inter-individual differences in the intercept for attentional function.

Figure 3.

A–E - Influence of enrollment scores for trait anxiety (A), depressive symptoms (B), sleep disturbance (C), evening fatigue (D), and morning energy (E) on inter-individual differences in the intercept for attentional function.

Figure 4.

A–B - Influence of gender (A) on inter-individual differences in the slope parameters for attentional function and influence of enrollment scores for morning fatigue on inter-individual differences in the intercept and slope parameters for attentional fatigue (B).

Table 1

Demographic, clinical, and symptom characteristics of patients (n=1329)

Demographic Characteristics		
Age (years; mean (SD))		57.13 (12.39)
Gender (% female (n))		78.0 (1036)
Ethnicity (% (n))		
White		69.5 (923)
Black		9.9 (132)
Asian/Pacific Islander		9.6 (128)
Hispanic/Mixed/Other		11.0 (146)
Education (years; mean (SD))		16.20 (2.97)
Married or partnered (% yes (n))		65.0 (864)
Lives alone (% yes (n))		21.2 (282)
Currently employed (% yes (n))		34.8 (462)
Child care responsibilities (% yes (n))		21.7 (289)
Income (% yes (n))		
Less than \$30,000		18.3 (217)
\$30,000 to <\$70,000		21.2 (252)
\$70,000 to < \$100,000		17.0 (202)
More than \$100,000		43.6 (518)
Clinical Characteristics		
Number of comorbidities (mean (SD))		2.40 (1.43)
Self-administered Comorbidity Questionnaire score (mean (SD))		5.47 (3.20)
Body mass index (kg/m ² ; mean (SD))		26.16 (5.62)
Hemoglobin (gm/dL; mean (SD))		11.54 (1.43)
Karnofsky Performance Status score (mean (SD))		79.98 (12.38)
Have you ever considered yourself a smoker (% yes (n))		34.8 (462)
Exercise on a regular basis (% yes (n))		71.6 (951)
Specific comorbidities reported (% yes (n))		
High blood pressure		30.0 (399)
Back pain		25.7 (342)
Depression		19.3 (256)
Osteoarthritis		12.0 (160)
Anemia or blood disease		12.3 (164)
Lung disease		11.3 (150)
Diabetes		9.0 (119)
Liver disease		6.4 (85)
Heart disease		5.6 (75)
Rheumatoid arthritis		3.1 (41)
Ulcer or stomach disease		4.9 (65)
Kidney disease		1.4 (19)
Cancer diagnosis (% yes (n))		

Breast	40.4 (537)
Gastrointestinal	30.4 (404)
Gynecological	17.5 (232)
Lung	11.7 (156)
Time since cancer diagnosis (years; mean (SD))	1.97 (3.87)
Time since cancer diagnosis (years; median)	0.42
Any prior cancer treatments (% yes (n))	75.7 (1006)
Number prior cancer treatments (mean (SD))	1.59 (1.50)
Chemotherapy cycle length (% (n))	
14 days	41.7 (438)
21 days	51.0 (678)
28 days	7.3 (97)
Presence of metastatic disease (% yes (n))	67.0 (891)
Number of metastatic sites including lymph node involvement (mean (SD))	1.24 (1.23)
Number of metastatic sites excluding lymph node involvement (mean (SD))	0.78 (1.05)
Symptom Characteristics at Enrollment	
Attentional Function Index score (mean (SD))	6.38 (1.82)
Lee Fatigue Scale: evening fatigue score (mean (SD))	5.33 (2.15)
Lee Fatigue Scale: morning fatigue score (mean (SD))	3.13 (2.25)
Lee Fatigue Scale: evening energy score (mean (SD))	3.54 (2.04)
Lee Fatigue Scale: morning energy score (mean (SD))	4.40 (2.25)
Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression Scale score (mean (SD))	13.0 (9.77)
General Sleep Disturbance Scale score (mean (SD))	52.6 (20.21)
Trait Anxiety score (mean (SD))	35.15 (10.40)
State Anxiety score (mean (SD))	33.97 (12.34)
Pain present (% yes (n))	72.8 (968)

Abbreviations: gm/dL = grams per deciliter; kg/m² = kilograms per meters squared; SD = standard deviation; RT = radiation therapy.

Table 2**Hierarchical Linear Model for Attentional Function**

Attentional Function	Coefficient (SE)	
	Unconditional Model	Final Model
Fixed effects		
Intercept	6.385 (.050) ⁺	6.387 (.039) ⁺
Piecewise 1 – linear rate of change	−0.605 (.067) ⁺	−0.602 (.067) ⁺
Piecewise 1 – quadratic rate of change	0.385 (.032) ⁺	0.384 (.032) ⁺
Piecewise 2 – linear rate of change	−0.425 (.044) ⁺	−0.423 (.044) ⁺
Piecewise 2 – quadratic rate of change	0.137 (.014) ⁺	0.136 (.014) ⁺
Time invariant covariates		
Intercept		
Working		0.201 (.067) [*]
Karnofsky Performance Status		0.014 (.003) ⁺
Trait anxiety		−0.037 (.005) ⁺
Depressive symptoms		−0.023 (.006) ⁺
Sleep disturbance		−0.008 (.002) ⁺
Morning fatigue		−0.181 (.023) ⁺
Evening fatigue		−0.099 (.017) ⁺
Morning energy		0.093 (.015) ⁺
Piecewise 1 – linear rate of change		
Female		−0.388 (.151) [*]
Morning fatigue		0.124 (.030) ⁺
Piecewise 1 – quadratic rate of change		
Female		0.209 (.076) [*]
Morning fatigue		−0.044 (.014) [*]
Piecewise 2 – linear rate of change		
Female		−0.263 (.106) [*]
Piecewise 2 – quadratic rate of change		
Female		0.073 (.034) [*]
Variance components		
In intercept	1.582 ⁺	1.049 ⁺
Goodness-of-fit deviance (parameters estimated)	22222.406 (7) ⁺	21197.420 (21)
Model comparison χ^2 (df)		1024.986 (14) ^{**}

*
p<.05,**
p<.001,+
p<.0001

Abbreviations: df = degrees of freedom; SE = standard error

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript