HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

J Pain Symptom Manage. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 August 01.

Published in final edited form as:

J Pain Symptom Manage. 2019 August ; 58(2): 252–263. doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2019.04.029.

DELETERIOUS EFFECTS OF HIGHER BODY MASS INDEX ON SUBJECTIVE AND OBJECTIVE MEASURES OF CHEMOTHERAPY-INDUCED PERIPHERAL NEUROPATHY IN CANCER SURVIVORS

Iva Petrovchich, RN, MS[1], **Kord M. Kober, PhD**[1], **Laura Wagner, RN, PhD**[1], **Steven M. Paul, PhD**[1], **Gary Abrams, MD**[2], **Margaret A. Chesney, PhD**[2], **Kimberly Topp, PT, PhD**[2], **Betty Smoot, PT, DPTSc**[2], **Mark Schumacher, MD, PhD**[1], **Yvette P. Conley, PhD**[3], **Marilyn Hammer, RN, PhD**[4], **Jon D. Levine, MD, PhD**[2], **Christine Miaskowski, RN, PhD**[1]

[1]Schools of Nursing, University of California, San Francisco, CA,

[2]Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA,

[3]School of Nursing, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA,

[4]Mount Sinai Medical Center, New York, NY

Abstract

Context: Recent albeit limited evidence suggests that body mass index (BMI) may be a modifiable risk factor to reduce the deleterious effects of chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy (CIPN) in cancer survivors.

Objectives: Purpose was to evaluate for differences in demographic, clinical, pain, sensation, and balance characteristics among three BMI groups. We hypothesized that as BMI increased, survivors would report higher pain intensity scores and have significant decrements in measures of sensation and balance.

Methods: A total of 416 survivors with CIPN were evaluated using subjective and objective measures of CIPN. Survivors were divided into three BMI groups (i.e., normal weight, overweight, obese). Differences among the BMI groups were evaluated using parametric and non-parametric statistics.

Results: Of the 416 survivors, 45.4% were normal weight, 32.5% were overweight, and 22.1% were obese. Compared to the normal weight group, survivors in the other two groups had lower functional status scores, a higher comorbidity burden, higher pain intensity scores, and higher interference scores. In addition, compared to the normal weight group, survivors in the other two BMI groups had significantly worse balance scores.

Address correspondence to: Christine Miaskowski, RN, PhD, Department of Physiological Nursing, University of California, 2 Koret Way – N631Y, San Francisco, CA 94143-0610, 415-476-9407 (phone), 415-476-8899 (fax) chris.miaskowski@ucsf.edu.

Conclusion: Our findings support the hypothesis that as BMI increased, pain sensation and balance characteristics worsened. Our findings suggest that nutritional counseling, as well as exercise and weight management programs in survivors with CIPN may improve these clinically important problems.

Keywords

chemotherapy; peripheral neuropathy; body mass index; taxane; platinum; cancer survivor; balance

INTRODUCTION

Chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy (CIPN) is a common problem in cancer survivors with prevalence rates that range from 38% to 90%.[1] CIPN is associated with dose reductions of potentially curative chemotherapy (CTX); functional decline and decreases in quality of life; and increases in healthcare costs.[2,3] In a recent study of cancer survivors who had completed CTX over 5 years ago, 58.4% reported CIPN and nearly half reported moderate to severe symptoms.[4] In fact, CIPN is a chronic problem for many survivors, lasting months to years after CTX is completed.[5] Currently, no treatments are available to prevent CIPN and duloxetine is the only drug recommended for the management of pain associated CIPN.[6]

An important area for research is the identification of modifiable characteristics that are associated with deleterious effects in cancer survivors with CIPN. Recent, albeit limited evidence suggests that a higher body mass index (BMI) is one such characteristic. For example, in one study of breast cancer survivors,[4] women who were obese (i.e., BMI >30) were 1.94 times more likely to develop CIPN than women whose BMI was <25. In another study that evaluated for differences in pain and symptom burden between obese (BMI ≥30) and non-obese (BMI <30) cancer survivors,[7] obese patients reported a significantly higher number of pain descriptors. In addition, obesity was associated with a higher symptom burden. In a study of 1,237 breast cancer survivors who received taxanes,[8] differences in Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy - Taxane Neurotoxicity (FACT-NTX) scores among women with normal (< 25), overweight (≥25 to <30), and obese (≥30) BMIs at the initiation of treatment were evaluated. Compared to normal weight patients, patients who were overweight or obese were more likely to report an increase in FACT-NTX scores of >10% at 24 months after the initiation of CTX.

While these studies provide evidence of an association between BMI and CIPN, several limitations warrant consideration. All three studies used only subjective data on CIPN to examine this association. In addition, two of these studies focused only on breast cancer survivors who received a taxane.[7,8] No studies were found that evaluated for associations between both subjective and objective measures of CIPN and BMI. Therefore, the purpose of this study, in a sample of survivors with CIPN (n=416), was to evaluate for differences in demographic, clinical, pain, sensation, and balance characteristics among three BMI groups (i.e., normal weight, overweight, and obese) using subjective and objective measures of

CIPN. We hypothesized that as BMI increased, survivors would report higher pain intensity scores and have significant decrements in measures of sensation and balance.

METHODS

Survivors and Settings

The current analysis is part of a larger study, funded by the National Cancer Institute, that evaluated CIPN in cancer survivors. The methods for the larger study are described in detail elsewhere.[9] In brief, survivors were recruited from throughout the San Francisco Bay area. Survivors with CIPN met the following inclusion criteria: were ≥18 years of age; had received a platinum and/or a taxane compound; had completed their course of CTX ≥3 months prior to enrollment; had changes in sensation and/or pain in their feet and/or hands of ≥3 months duration following the completion of CTX; had a rating of ≥3 on a 0 to 10 numeric rating scale (NRS) for any one of the following sensations from the Pain Quality Assessment Scale (PQAS;(10) numb, tender, shooting, sensitive, electrical, tingling, radiating, throbbing, cramping, itchy, unpleasant); if they had pain associated with CIPN, had an average pain intensity score in their feet and/or hands of ≥3 on a 0 to 10 NRS; had a Karnofsky Performance Status (KPS) score of ≥50; and were able to read, write, and understand English. Survivors were excluded if they had: peripheral vascular disease, vitamin B12 deficiency, thyroid dysfunction, HIV neuropathy, another painful condition that was difficult for them to distinguish from their CIPN, a hereditary sensory or autonomic neuropathy, and/or a hereditary mitochondrial disorder. Of the 1450 survivors who were screened, 754 were enrolled, and 623 completed the self-report questionnaires and the study visit. For this analysis, only survivors with CIPN (n=416) were included.

Study procedures

Research nurses screened and consented the survivors over the phone; sent and asked them to complete the self-report questionnaires prior to their study visit; and scheduled the in person assessment. At this assessment, written informed consent was obtained, questionnaires were reviewed for completeness, and objective measurements were done.

Study Measures

Demographic and Clinical Characteristics ––Survivors provided information on demographic characteristics and completed the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test,[11] the KPS scale,[12] and the Self-Administered Comorbidity Questionnaire (SCQ).[13]

Pain questionnaires ––Separate assessments were completed for pain intensity and quality ratings for the hands and feet. A detailed history of CIPN was obtained using a questionnaire from our previous[14,15] and ongoing studies. Information was obtained on the date of onset of pain and its level of interference with function. Average and worst pain intensity over the past 24 hours were assessed using 0 (no pain) to 10 (worst pain imaginable) NRS.[16]

The 20-item PQAS was used to assess the qualities associated with CIPN.[10,17] Sixteen items evaluated the magnitude of the different pain quality descriptors (e.g., sharp, hot, aching,

cold) measured on a 0 to 10 NRS. Four items evaluated global and spatial qualities of pain. Three subscale scores were calculated (i.e., paroxysmal pain [shooting, sharp, electric, hot, radiating], surface pain [itchy, cold, numb, sensitive, tingling], deep pain [aching, heavy, dull, cramping, throbbing, tender]). The PQAS has well established validity and reliability in studies of various types of neuropathic pain.[10,17]

Sensation ––Light touch was evaluated using Semmes Weinstein monofilaments.[18] Cold sensation was evaluated using the Tiptherm Rod.[19,20] Pain sensation was evaluated using the Neurotip.[19] Vibration threshold was assessed using a biothesiometer.[21] For all of the measures of sensation, both the upper and lower extremities on the dominant side were tested.

Balance ––Self-report questions from the Chemotherapy-Induced Peripheral Neuropathy Assessment Tool (CIPNAT) were used to assess balance.[22] The objective measures of balance were the Timed Get Up and Go test (TUG)[23] and the Fullerton Advanced Balance (FAB) test.[24,25]

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 23.[26] Descriptive statistics and frequency distributions were calculated for survivors' demographic and clinical characteristics. Three BMI groups were created (i.e., normal weight (i.e., BMI <25 kg/m^2), overweight (i.e., BMI of 25 to 30 kg/m^2), and obese (i.e., BMI >30 kg/m^2)) using cut-offs established by the Centers for Disease Control.[27] For the four measures of sensation (i.e., light touch, cold, pain, vibration), composite scores, over all of the sites that were tested on the dominant upper and lower extremities, were created. For light touch, cold, and pain, the number of sites with loss of each sensation were summed. For vibration, the mean score across the sites was calculated. Differences among the three BMI groups in demographic and clinical characteristics, as well as subjective and objective measures of CIPN, were evaluated using analysis of variance, Chi square analyses, or Kruskal-Wallis tests with Bonferroni corrected post hoc contrasts. A p-value of <0.0167 (i.e., 0.05/3) was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Differences in demographic and clinical characteristics

As shown in Table 1, compared to normal weight survivors, obese survivors had fewer years of education. When compared to overweight survivors, obese survivors were more likely to live alone.

In terms of clinical characteristics (Table 2), compared to normal weight survivors, survivors in the other two groups had lower KPS scores and were less likely to exercise on a regular basis. In terms of number and burden of comorbidities, the differences were as follows: normal weight < overweight < obese. Of these comorbidities, obese survivors were more likely to report osteoarthritis, diabetes, and high blood pressure. In addition, compared to normal weight survivors, obese survivors were more likely to report kidney disease and pain

not related to cancer. Compared to normal weight survivors, overweight survivors were more likely to report an injury to their legs.

Of note, no differences were found among the three groups in cancer diagnoses, number of cancer treatments, number of metastatic sites or presence of metastatic disease, surgery to the upper or lower extremities, CTX regimens, doses of CTX drugs received, and number of dose reductions or delays due to CIPN.

Differences in pain characteristics

As shown in Table 3, for both the upper and lower extremities, compared to normal weight survivors, overweight and obese survivors reported higher current pain, average pain, and worst pain scores, as well as a higher number of days per week in pain. Of note, no differences were found among the three groups in the duration of CIPN in either the upper or lower extremities.

In terms of pain interference in the lower extremities, compared to normal weight survivors, overweight and obese survivors reported high interference scores for balance, walking ability, enjoyment of life, normal work, sleep, general activity, and relationships with other people, as well as a higher total interference score. In addition, compared to normal weight survivors, overweight survivors reported higher interference scores for mood and sexual activity.

In terms of pain interference in the upper extremities, compared to normal weight survivors, obese and overweight survivors reported higher interference scores for routine activities (i.e., dressing, 0toileting, typing), enjoyment of life, normal work, sleep, general activity, mood, relations with other people, and total interference scores. In addition, compared to normal weight survivors, overweight survivors reported higher interference scores for sexual activity.

In terms of self-reported pain qualities, for both the upper and lower extremities, compared to normal weight survivors, survivors who were overweight or obese reported higher scores for the following pain qualities: unpleasant, intense, hot, throbbing, and intense deep, as well as for the PQAS subscales of paroxysmal and surface pain. For this between group comparison, quality scores that were significantly higher only in the feet included: electrical, shooting, and sharp. For this between group comparison,quality scores that were significantly higher only in the hands included: dull, cramping, aching, heavy and tender, and the PQAS subscale score of deep.

Compared to the normal weight group, survivors who were overweight reported higher tingling scores in both their hands and their feet. For this comparison, quality scores that were significantly higher only in the feet included: dull, cramping, tender, and intense surface, and the PQAS subscale score of deep. For this between group comparison, quality scores that were significantly higher only in the hands included: electrical, shooting, and radiating.

Compared to the normal weight group, survivors in the obese group reported higher scores for numb and sensitive skin in their feet and higher scores for sharp in their hands.

Differences in sensation

As summarized in Table 4, compared to the normal weight group, both the overweight and obese survivors had a higher number of sites in their lower extremities that did not feel pain. No statistically significant differences were found among the three groups in the sensations of light touch, cold, or vibration in either the upper or lower extremities.

Differences in balance

Compared to the normal weight group, both overweight and obese survivors had higher scores for the self-reported severity of and frequency of balance problems (Table 4). In terms of objective measures of balance, compared to the normal weight group, obese survivors had higher TUG scores. In addition, compared to the normal and overweight groups, the obese group had lower FAB scores.

DISCUSSION

This study is the first to evaluate for differences in demographic and clinical characteristics as well as subjective and objective measures of CIPN among normal weight, overweight and obese cancer survivors who received platinum and/or taxane chemotherapeutic compounds. Our findings are congruent with previous reports[4,7,28] and support our hypothesis that as BMI increased, pain, sensation, and balance characteristics worsened. However, it should be noted that not all of the differences occurred in a linear fashion (i.e., normal weight < overweight < obese).

In terms of BMI distributions, our sample had the highest percentage of normal weight survivors (i.e., 45.4% versus 32.2%[4] and 33.7%[8]) compared to previous reports. While the percentages of overweight survivors were comparable across studies (i.e., 32.5% versus 36.4%[4] and 31.9%[8]), higher percentages of obese individuals were evaluated in previous studies (i.e., 31.4%[4] and 34.4%[8] versus our 22.1%). Reasons for these differences in BMI distributions are not readily apparent.

In terms of regular exercise, while the President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition reported that less than 5% of adults participate in 30 minutes of physical activity per day,[29] comparable data on cancer survivors are not available. As expected, compared to the normal weight group, a significantly lower percentage of overweight and obese survivors exercised on a regular basis. Given the growing body of evidence on the beneficial effects of exercise on CIPN symptoms,[30–33] the relative contribution of lack of exercise to the overweight and obese patients increased symptoms and decrements in sensation and balance warrant consideration.

In our study, compared to normal weight survivors, obese survivors had fewer years of education and a lower annual household income. These characteristics were not evaluated in previous studies that examined the association between BMI and CIPN. However, while the relationships among the social determinants of health are complex, recent evidence suggests that in the general population, less education[34] and lower income[35] are associated with an increased likelihood of obesity.

Consistent with our previous report that compared survivors with and without CIPN,[9] we observed a “dose response” effect for the number and impact of comorbidities across the BMI groups. In terms of specific comorbidities, compared to the normal weight and overweight groups, survivors in the obese group reported higher occurrence rates for osteoarthritis, high blood pressure, and diabetes. The co-occurrence of these chronic conditions needs to be considered in the evaluation of differences, among the BMI groups, in our subjective and objective measures of CIPN.

While findings from two previous studies suggest that a higher BMI is associated with worse CIPN,[4,7] specific details on pain intensity, pain qualities, and pain interferences were not reported. In our study, no differences were found among the BMI groups in the duration of CIPN. For both the upper and lower extremities, compared to the normal weight group, the overweight and obese survivors reported significantly higher pain intensity scores. A similar pattern was found for our survivors’ pain interference and quality scores. These findings are consistent with studies of individuals with non-cancer pain, in that a higher BMI was associated with higher levels of pain interference[36,37] and that weight loss was associated with a reduction in pain interference.[38]

In contrast to the subjective measures, loss of pain sensation in the lower extremities was the only objective measure that differentiated between the normal weight versus the overweight and obese survivors. A limited body of evidence suggests that compared to normal weight individuals, obese individuals in the general population[39,40] and those with diabetes[41] have higher pain thresholds. While controversy exists on the relative contribution of alterations in small and large diameter fibers in the development of CIPN,[42–44] our finding regarding changes in only pain sensations in the lower extremity suggests that obesity may have differential effects on small diameter fibers in cancer survivors who received neurotoxic CTX.

One of the most important findings in our study is the deleterious effect that being overweight or obese had on survivors’ balance. While the self-reported occurrence rates for and distress from balance problems did not differ among the three BMI groups, overweight and obese survivors reported higher severity and frequency scores for balance problems. In addition, compared to the normal weight group, survivors who were obese had significantly worse scores on both objective measures of balance. While a recent study of obese community dwelling older adults identified an association between a higher BMI and balance problems,[45] recent data suggest that survivors with CIPN are at increased risk for balance problems and are 1.8 times more likely to fall compared to survivors without CIPN.[3,46,47]

Several limitations warrant consideration. Because our study recruited only survivors who had received a platinum and/or a taxane containing regimen, these findings may not generalize to survivors who received other types of neurotoxic CTX. However, it should be noted that no differences were found among the three groups in the types of CTX regimens (i.e., only platinum, only taxane, or both) or in the doses of the platinum and/or taxanes they received. Because pretreatment weight and changes in weight during CTX were not available, these relationships need to be evaluated in future studies.

Despite these **limitations**, our findings suggest that compared to normal weight survivors, overweight and obese survivors have more severe pain, as well as higher pain interference scores and balance problems. These differences could be explained by two potential mechanisms. Given the deleterious effects of an increased BMI on lower extremity sensations and function, our weight group differences in the subjective and objective measures of pain may be related to increased mechanical force on the weight bearing joints. In addition, as compared to the normal (23.3%) and overweight (28.9%) groups, a higher percentage of obese survivors (46.7%) reported osteoarthritis which may contribute to lower extremity pain.[48–50] However, this mechanism does not explain the higher pain and interference scores in the upper extremities reported by overweight and obese individuals. An alternative explanation for both the upper and lower extremity findings is chronic inflammation. It is well documented that obesity is associated with chronic inflammation.[51,52] In addition, one of the underlying mechanisms for CIPN is neuroinflammation.[53–55] In order to determine the causal relationships between increasing weight and CIPN characteristics, prospective longitudinal studies are needed that evaluate these relationships and underlying mechanisms. In terms of clinical practice, our findings suggest that nutritional counseling, as well as exercise and weight management programs for survivors with CIPN may decrease pain, improve balance, and reduce the risk of falls.

Acknowledgements:

This study was funded by the National Cancer Institute (NCI, CA151692) and the American Cancer Society (ACS, IRG-97-150-13). Dr. Miaskowski is supported by a grant from the ACS and NCI (CA168960). This project was supported by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, National Institutes of Health, through UCSF-CTSI Grant Number UL1 TR000004. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. Recruitment was facilitated by Dr. Susan Love Research Foundation's Army of Women® Program.

REFERENCES

1. Kerckhove N, Collin A, Conde S, et al. Long-term effects, pathophysiological mechanisms, and risk factors of chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathies: A comprehensive literature review. Front Pharmacol 2017;8:86. [PubMed: 28286483]
2. Schneider BP, Zhao F, Wang M, et al. Neuropathy is not associated with clinical outcomes in patients receiving adjuvant taxane-containing therapy for operable breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2012;30:3051–3057. [PubMed: 22851566]
3. Winters-Stone KM, Horak F, Jacobs PG, et al. Falls, functioning, and disability among women with persistent symptoms of chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy. J Clin Oncol 2017:Jco2016713552.
4. Bao T, Basal C, Seluzicki C, et al. Long-term chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy among breast cancer survivors: prevalence, risk factors, and fall risk. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2016;159:327–333. [PubMed: 27510185]
5. Cavaletti G, Marmiroli P. Chemotherapy-induced peripheral neurotoxicity. Nat Rev Neurol 2010;6:657–666. [PubMed: 21060341]
6. Hershman DL, Lacchetti C, Dworkin RH, et al. Prevention and management of chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy in survivors of adult cancers: American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline. J Clin Oncol 2014;32:1941–1967. [PubMed: 24733808]
7. Cox-Martin E, Trahan LH, Cox MG, et al. Disease burden and pain in obese cancer patients with chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy. Support Care Cancer 2017;25:1873–1879. [PubMed: 28124735]

8. Greenlee H, Hershman DL, Shi Z, et al. BMI, lifestyle factors and taxane-induced neuropathy in breast cancer patients: The pathways study. J Natl Cancer Inst 2017;109:1–8.
9. Miaskowski C, Mastick J, Paul SM, et al. Chemotherapy-induced neuropathy in cancer survivors. J Pain Symptom Manage 2017;54:204–218. [PubMed: 28063866]
10. Jensen MP, Gammaitoni AR, Olaleye DO, et al. The pain quality assessment scale: assessment of pain quality in carpal tunnel syndrome. J Pain 2006;7:823–832. [PubMed: 17074624]
11. Babor TF, Higgins-Biddle JC, Saunders JB, Monteiro MG. AUDIT: The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test: Guidelines for Use in Primary Care. In: Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2001.
12. Karnofsky D Performance scale, New York: Plenum Press, 1977.
13. 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;49:156–163. [PubMed: 12687505]
14. Posternak V, Dunn LB, Dhruva A, et al. Differences in demographic, clinical, and symptom characteristics and quality of life outcomes among oncology patients with different types of pain. Pain 2016;157:892–900. [PubMed: 26683234]
15. Langford DJ, Schmidt B, Levine JD, et al. Preoperative breast pain predicts persistent breast pain and disability after breast cancer surgery. J Pain Symptom Manage 2015;49:981–994. [PubMed: 25527442]
16. Downie WW, Leatham PA, Rhind VM, et al. Studies with pain rating scales. Ann Rheum Dis 1978;37:378–381. [PubMed: 686873]
17. Jensen MP, Dworkin RH, Gammaitoni AR, et al. Assessment of pain quality in chronic neuropathic and nociceptive pain clinical trials with the Neuropathic Pain Scale. J Pain 2005;6:98–106. [PubMed: 15694876]
18. Bell-Krotoski JA. Sensibility testing with Semmes-Weinstein monofilaments In: Hunter JM, Mackin EJ, Callahan ED, eds. Rehabilitation of the Hand and Upper Extremity, 5th ed. St. Louis: Mosby, Inc., 2002
19. Papanas N, Ziegler D. New diagnostic tests for diabetic distal symmetric polyneuropathy. J Diabetes Complications 2011;25:44–51. [PubMed: 19896871]
20. Viswanathan V, Snehalatha C, Seena R, Ramachandran A. Early recognition of diabetic neuropathy: evaluation of a simple outpatient procedure using thermal perception. Postgrad Med J 2002;78:541–542. [PubMed: 12357015]
21. Garrow AP, Boulton AJ. Vibration perception threshold--a valuable assessment of neural dysfunction in people with diabetes. Diabetes Metab Res Rev 2006;22:411–419. [PubMed: 16741996]
22. Tofthagen CS, McMillan SC, Kip KE. Development and psychometric evaluation of the chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy assessment tool. Cancer Nurs 2011;34:E10–20.
23. Mathias S, Nayak US, Isaacs B. Balance in elderly patients: the “get-up and go” test. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1986;67:387–389. [PubMed: 3487300]
24. Hernandez D, Rose DJ. Predicting which older adults will or will not fall using the Fullerton Advanced Balance scale. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008;89:2309–2315. [PubMed: 18976981]
25. Rose DJ, Lucchese N, Wiersma LD. Development of a multidimensional balance scale for use with functionally independent older adults. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2006;87:1478–1485. [PubMed: 17084123]
26. SPSS. IBM SPSS for Windows (Version 23), Armonk, NY: SPSS, Inc., 2015.
27. Centers for Disease, Control. About adult BMI, healthy weight. 2016 Available from: http://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assing/bmi/adult_bmi/index.html. Accessed May 15, 2015.
28. Ottaiano A, Nappi A, Tafuto S, et al. Diabetes and body mass index are associated with neuropathy and prognosis in colon cancer patients treated with capecitabine and oxaliplatin adjuvant chemotherapy. Oncology 2016;90:36–42. [PubMed: 26731722]
29. President’s Council on ports, Fitness, and Nurtrition. Available from: www.hhs.gov/fitness/resource-center/facts-and-statistics/index.html.

30. Zimmer P, Trebing S, Timmers-Trebing U, et al. Eight-week, multimodal exercise counteracts a progress of chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy and improves balance and strength in metastasized colorectal cancer patients: a randomized controlled trial. Support Care Cancer 2018;26:615–624. [PubMed: 28963591]
31. Streckmann F, Lehmann HC, Balke M, et al. Sensorimotor training and whole-body vibration training have the potential to reduce motor and sensory symptoms of chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy-a randomized controlled pilot trial. Support Care Cancer 2018.
32. Kleckner IR, Kamen C, Gewandter JS, et al. Effects of exercise during chemotherapy on chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy: a multicenter, randomized controlled trial. Support Care Cancer 2018;26:1019–1028. [PubMed: 29243164]
33. Duregon F, Vendramin B, Bullo V, et al. Effects of exercise on cancer patients suffering chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy undergoing treatment: A systematic review. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol 2018;121:90–100. [PubMed: 29198853]
34. Kim TJ, Roesler NM, von dem Knesebeck O. Causation or selection - examining the relation between education and overweight/obesity in prospective observational studies: a meta-analysis. Obes Rev 2017;18:660–672. [PubMed: 28401630]
35. Kim TJ, von dem Knesebeck O. Income and obesity: what is the direction of the relationship? A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open 2018;8:e019862.
36. Allen SA, Dal Grande E, Abernethy AP, Currow DC. Two colliding epidemics - obesity is independently associated with chronic pain interfering with activities of daily living in adults 18 years and over; a cross-sectional, population-based study. BMC Public Health 2016;16:1034. [PubMed: 27716147]
37. Pells JJ, Presnell KE, Edwards CL, et al. Moderate chronic pain, weight and dietary intake in African-American adult patients with sickle cell disease. J Natl Med Assoc 2005;97:1622–1629. [PubMed: 16396054]
38. Shapiro JR, Anderson DA, Danoff-Burg S. A pilot study of the effects of behavioral weight loss treatment on fibromyalgia symptoms. J Psychosom Res 2005;59:275–282. [PubMed: 16253617]
39. Torensma B, Oudejans L, van Velzen M, et al. Pain sensitivity and pain scoring in patients with morbid obesity. Surg Obes Relat Dis 2017;13:788–795. [PubMed: 28216116]
40. Torensma B, Thomassen I, van Velzen M, In ‘t Veld BA. Pain experience and pPerception in the obese subject systematic review (Revised Version). Obes Surg 2016;26:631–639. [PubMed: 26661107]
41. Miscio G, Guastamacchia G, Brunani A, et al. Obesity and peripheral neuropathy risk: a dangerous liaison. J Peripher Nerv Syst 2005;10:354–358. [PubMed: 16279984]
42. Dougherty PM, Cata JP, Cordella JV, Burton A, Weng HR. Taxol-induced sensory disturbance is characterized by preferential impairment of myelinated fiber function in cancer patients. Pain 2004;109:132–142. [PubMed: 15082135]
43. Sharma S, Venkitaraman R, Vas PR, Rayman G. Assessment of chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy using the LDIFLARE technique: a novel technique to detect neural small fiber dysfunction. Brain Behav 2015;5:e00354. [PubMed: 26221574]
44. Saad M, Psimaras D, Tafani C, et al. Quick, non-invasive and quantitative assessment of small fiber neuropathy in patients receiving chemotherapy. J Neurooncol 2016;127:373–380. [PubMed: 26749101]
45. Frames CW, Soangra R, Lockhart TE, et al. Dynamical properties of postural control in obese community-dwelling older adults (dagger). Sensors (Basel) 2018;18.
46. Kolb NA, Smith AG, Singleton JR, et al. The association of chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy symptoms and the risk of falling. JAMA Neurol 2016;73:860–866. [PubMed: 27183099]
47. Tofthagen C, Overcash J, Kip K. Falls in persons with chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy. Support Care Cancer 2012;20:583–589. [PubMed: 21380613]
48. Deveza LA, Melo L, Yamato TP, et al. Knee osteoarthritis phenotypes and their relevance for outcomes: a systematic review. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2017;25:1926–1941. [PubMed: 28847624]
49. Lee R, Kean WF. Obesity and knee osteoarthritis. Inflammopharmacology 2012;20:53–58. [PubMed: 22237485]

50. Owens C, Conaghan PG. Improving joint pain and function in osteoarthritis. Practitioner 2016;260:17–20.

51. Xue W, Fan Z, Li L, et al. The chemokine system and its role in obesity. J Cell Physiol 2019;234:3336–3346. [PubMed: 30375006]

52. Cox AJ, West NP, Cripps AW. Obesity, inflammation, and the gut microbiota. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol 2015;3:207–215. [PubMed: 25066177]

53. Lees JG, Makker PG, Tonkin RS, et al. Immune-mediated processes implicated in chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy. Eur J Cancer 2017;73:22–29. [PubMed: 28104535]

54. Makker PG, Duffy SS, Lees JG, et al. Characterisation of immune and neuroinflammatory changes associated with chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy. PLoS One 2017;12:e0170814. [PubMed: 28125674]

55. Wang XM, Lehky TJ, Brell JM, Dorsey SG. Discovering cytokines as targets for chemotherapy-induced painful peripheral neuropathy. Cytokine 2012;59:3–9. [PubMed: 22537849]

Table 1 –

Differences in Demographic Characteristics Among the Body Mass Index Groups

Characteristic	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Test, p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Age (years)	60.56 (11.42)	61.00 (10.26)	61.15 (9.41)	F=0.12, p=.884
Education (years)	16.57 (2.53)	16.56 (2.90)	15.70 (2.92)	F=3.50, p=.031 0>2
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
Female	88.8 (167)	80.0 (108)	91.3 (84)	X^2=7.58, p=.023 No significant pairwise contrasts
Married/partnered (% yes)	61.3 (114)	63.8 (83)	55.7 (49)	X^2=1.49, p=.474
Lives alone (% yes)	26.7 (50)	24.2 (32)	40.4 (36)	X^2=7.59, p=.022 1<2
Employed (% yes)	45.0 (85)	42.2 (57)	37.4 (34)	X^2=1.46, p=.482
Ethnicity				
White	77.8 (147)	79.3 (107)	71.7 (66)	
Asian/Pacific Islander	9.0 (17)	6.7 (9)	3.3 (3)	X^2=10.19, p=.117
Black	4.2 (8)	3.7 (5)	9.8 (9)	
Hispanic/Mixed/Other	9.0 (12)	10.4 (14)	15.2 (14)	
Annual household income				
<$30,000	20.5 (35)	23.1 (30)	29.4 (25)	
$30,000 – $69,999	19.9 (34)	19.2 (25)	25.9 (22)	KW=.035 0>2
$70,000 – $99,999	14 6 (25)	17 7 (23)	16 5 (14)	
>$100,000	45.0 (77)	40.0 (52)	28.2 (24)	
Child care responsibilities (% yes)	16.1 (30)	13.5 (18)	8.7 (8)	X^2=2.89, p=.236
Adult care responsibilities (% yes)	3.5 (6)	4.0 (5)	4.8 (4)	X^2=0.24, p=.885

Abbreviations: KW = Kruskal Wallis test, SD = standard deviation

Table 2 –

Differences in Clinical Characteristics Among the Body Mass Index Groups

Characteristic	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Test, p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Karnofsky Performance Status score	85.52 (9.39)	81.65 (10.31)	81.20 (10.78)	F=8.28, p<.001 0>1 and 2
Body mass index (kg/m^2)	22.21 (1.78)	27.10 (1.44)	34.70 (4.89)	F=659.20, p<.001 0<1<2
Number of comorbidities	1.63 (1.32)	2.05 (1.45)	2.73 (1.57)	F=18.55, p<.001 0<1<2
Self-Administered Comorbidity Questionnaire score	3.31 (3.17)	4.35 (3.25)	5.68 (3.54)	F=16.49, p<.001 0<1<2
Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test score	2.44 (2.28)	2.24 (2.29)	1.88 (1.90)	F=1.96, p=.142
Years since cancer diagnosis	4.53 (5.01)	4.69 (4.53)	5.18 (4.59)	F=0.58, p=.560
Number of prior cancer treatments	3.10 (0.97)	3.11 (1.00)	3.15 (0.96)	F=0.09, p=.915
Number of current cancer treatments	0.41 (0.64)	0.43 (0.57)	0.39 (0.53)	F=0.12, p=.891
Number of metastatic sites (out of 7)	0.74 (0.83)	0.81 (0.75)	0.70 (0.75)	F=0.71, p=.492
Number of metastatic sites without lymph node involvement	0.24 (0.58)	0.19 (0.57)	0.23 (0.56)	F=0.32, p=.728
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
Smoker (ever)	31.6 (59)	42.5 (57)	42.4 (39)	X^2=5.21, p=.074
Exercise on a regular basis (% yes)	92.6 (175)	82.2 (111)	75.8 (69)	X^2=15.75, p<.001 0>1 and 2
Born prematurely (% yes)	8.7 (15)	4.2 (5)	6.8 (6)	X^2=2.26, p=.323
Surgery on arms (% yes)	20.1 (38)	21.8 (29)	22.8 (21)	X^2=0.31, p=.857
Surgery on hands (% yes)	10.1 (19)	8.1 (11)	13.2 (12)	X^2=1.51, p=.469
Surgery on legs (% yes)	25.8 (48)	22.9 (30)	26.7 (24)	X^2=0.50, p=.777
Surgery on feet (% yes)	12.9 (24)	22.0 (29)	16.7 (15)	X^2=4.57, p=.102
Injury to arms (% yes)	23.8 (44)	30.1 (40)	24.2 (22)	X^2=1.78, p=.411
Injury to hands (% yes)	30.4 (55)	37.7 (49)	36.3 (33)	X^2=2.05, p=.359
Injury to legs (% yes)	16.8 (31)	31.3 (41)	20.9 (19)	X^2=9.35, p=.009 0<1

Characteristic	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Test, p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Injury to feet (% yes)	24.2 (44)	30.8 (40)	30.0 (27)	X^2=1.98, p=.372
Comorbid conditions (% yes)				
Osteoarthritis	23.3 (44)	28.9 (39)	46.7 (43)	X^2=16.31, p<.001 0 and 1 <2
Back pain	31.2 (59)	37.0 (50)	35.9 (33)	X^2=1.35, p=.511
Depression	19.0 (36)	26.7 (36)	30.4 (28)	X^2=5.15, p=.076
High blood pressure	12.7 (24)	26.7 (36)	53.3 (49)	X^2=52.67, p<.001 0<1 and 2, 1<2
Heart disease	6.3 (12)	8.9 (12)	7.6 (7)	X^2=0.74, p=.690
Diabetes	1.6 (3)	3.7 (5)	16.3 (15)	X^2=26.9, p<.001 0 and 1 <2
Lung disease	3.2 (6)	4.4 (6)	6.5 (6)	X^2=1.68, p=.431
Anemia or blood disease	4.2 (8)	5.9 (8)	8.7 (8)	X^2=2.28, p=.320
Ulcer or stomach disease	5.3 (10)	3.0 (4)	2.2 (2)	X^2=2.05, p=.359
Kidney disease	0.5 (1)	3.0 (4)	5.4 (5)	X^2=6.16, p=.037 0<2
Liver disease	3.7 (7)	3.7 (5)	2.2 (2)	X^2=0.52, p=.773
Rheumatoid arthritis	1.6 (3)	3.7 (5)	4.3 (4)	X^2=2.16, p=.339
Pain not related to cancer	48.7 (92)	61.9 (83)	70.3 (64)	X^2=13.24, p=.001 0<2
Type of cancer				X^2=5.58, p=.694
Breast	54.5 (103)	49.6 (67)	62.0 (57)	
Colon	11.1 (21)	8.9 (12)	8.7 (8)	
Lung	1.6 (3)	2.2 (3)	2.2 (2)	
Ovarian	11.6 (22)	11.1 (15)	7.6 (7)	
Other	21.2 (40)	28.1 (38)	19.6 (18)	
Any metastatic disease	56.2 (104)	69.2 (92)	56.5 (52)	X^2=6.22, p=.045 No significant pairwise contrasts
Chemotherapy regimen				X^2=2.84, p=.585

Characteristic	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Test, p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Only a platinum compound	23.8 (45)	25.2 (34)	16.3 (15)	
Only a taxane compound	45.5 (86)	45.9 (62)	50.0 (46)	
Both a platinum and a taxane compound	30.7 (58)	28.9 (39)	33.7 (31)	
Dose of platinum compound for patients who received only a platinum (mg/m^2)	688.87 (389.92)	795.62 (649.72)	546.89 (295.75)	F=1.30, p=.277
Dose of taxane compound for patients who received only a taxane (mg/m^2)	863.44 (963.09)	674.32 (281.56)	693.11 (288.51)	F=1.62, p=.201
Dose of drugs for patients who received both a platinum and a taxane compound				
Platinum dose (mg/m^2)	1696.95 (918.62)	1894.09 (659.07)	1815.46 (693.92)	F=0.71, p=.492
Taxane dose (mg/m^2)	831.16 (522.43)	935.77 (372.18)	962.71 (439.21)	F=0.99, p=.375
Patients who had a dose reduction or delay due to neuropathy (% (n))	14.5 (26)	15.4 (20)	11.4 (10)	X^2=0.75, p=.688

Abbreviations: kg = kilograms, m^2 = meters squared, mg = milligrams, SD = standard deviation

J Pain Symptom Manage. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 August 01.

Table 3 –

Differences in Pain Characteristics Among the Body Mass Index Groups

Characteristic	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Test, p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Pain Characteristics – Lower Extremity				
Duration of CIPN (years)	3.56 (4.10)	4.09 (4.35)	4.09 (3.88)	F=0.81, p=.448
Pain now	3.21 (2.14)	3.88 (2.25)	4.04 (2.42)	F=5.35, p=.005 0<1 and 2
Average pain	3.52 (2.00)	4.34 (2.17)	4.37 (2.04)	F=7.79, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Worst pain	5.50 (2.56)	6.46 (2.37)	6.57 (2.49)	F=7.98, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Days per week in pain	2.83 (2.98)	4.23 (2.95)	4.22 (2.89)	F=10.75, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Hours per day in pain	14.35 (9.55)	15.83 (9.44)	14.66 (9.25)	F=0.92, p=.401
Pain Characteristics – Upper Extremity				
Duration of CIPN (years)	3.18 (3.90)	3.97 (4.60)	3.73 (3.67)	F=1.15, p=.318
Pain now	2.27 (1.89)	3.17 (2.04)	3.27 (2.32)	F=8.01, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Average pain	2.53 (1.89)	3.47 (2.03)	3.79 (2.43)	F=10.52, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Worst pain	4.02 (2.41)	4.99 (2.68)	5.39 (2.79)	F=7.50, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Days per week in pain	2.83 (2.99)	4.34 (2.85)	3.90 (2.93)	F=7.85, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Hours per day in pain	11.41 (9.87)	14.55 (9.65)	12.79 (9.69)	F=2.68 p=.071
Pain Interference Scale – Lower Extremity				
Balance	2.77 (2.83)	4.12 (2.92)	4.35 (3.24)	F=11.56, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Walking ability	2.32 (2.56)	4.15 (3.00)	4.30 (3.23)	F=20.92, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Enjoyment of life	2.17 (2.44)	3.32 (2.85)	3.54 (3.04)	F=10.25, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Normal work	1.84 (2.43)	3.30 (2.94)	3.43 (2.88)	F=14.95, p<.001 0<1 and 2

Characteristic	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Test, p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Sleep	2.20 (2.67)	3.12 (3.00)	3.25 (2.93)	F=5.64, p=.004 0<1 and 2
General activity	1.87 (2.21)	3.22 (2.92)	3.34 (2.76)	F=14.18, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Mood	1.98 (2.28)	2.77 (2.68)	2.64 (2.57)	F=4.32, p=.014 0<1
Relations with other people	1.04 (1.77)	2.01 (2.52)	1.81 (2.60)	F=7.78, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Sexual activity	0.47 (1.28)	1.53 (2.72)	1.11 (2.40)	F=8.68, p<.001 0<1
Mean interference score	1.89 (1.83)	3.07 (2.29)	3.11 (2.40)	F=15.37, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Pain Interference Scale – Upper Extremity				
Routine activities [+]	1.84 (2.31)	3.08 (2.79)	2.97 (2.91)	F=7.59, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Walking ability	0.23 (0.80)	0.49 (1.54)	0.67 (1.86)	F=2.60, p=.076
Enjoyment of life	1.37 (2.07)	2.63 (2.71)	2.78 (3.13)	F=9.89, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Normal work	2.07 (2.43)	3.25 (2.77)	3.24 (2.87)	F=7.21, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Sleep	1.01 (1.76)	2.09 (2.70)	1.96 (2.72)	F=7.18, p=.001 0<1 and 2
General activity	1.72 (2.37)	3.05 (2.74)	3.07 (2.78)	F=9.78, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Mood	1.27 (1.85)	2.41 (2.30)	2.39 (2.70)	F=9.53, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Relations with other people	0.43 (1.05)	1.01 (1.72)	1.03 (2.10)	F=5.14, p=.006 0<1 and 2
Sexual activity	0.27 (0.94)	1.15 (2.45)	0.97 (2.51)	F=5.92, p=.003 0<1
Mean interference score	1.17 (1.38)	2.13 (1.92)	2.16 (2.22)	F=11.06, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Pain Quality Assessment Scale Scores – Lower Extremity				
Numb	4.94 (3.06)	5.67 (2.99)	6.03 (2.85)	F=4.54, p=.011 0<2

Characteristic	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Test, p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Unpleasant	3.88 (2.23)	4.90 (2.49)	5.10(2.52)	F=10.58, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Tingling	3.91 (3.06)	4.88 (3.01)	4.25 (7.85)	F=3.86, p=.022 0<1
Intense	2.71 (2.27)	3.60 (2.50)	3.80 (2.70)	F=7.76, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Dull	2.82 (2.72)	3.67 (2.83)	3.03 (2.62)	F=3.66, p=.027 0<1
Cramping	2.51 (2.99)	3.48 (3.39)	2.60 (3.15)	F=3.85, p=.022 0<1
Electrical	1.86 (2.64)	3.04 (3.37)	3.10 (3.16)	F=7.66, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Shooting	1.70 (2.46)	3.07 (3.11)	3.08 (3.15)	F=11.29, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Sharp	1.71 (2.41)	2.67 (3.07)	3.03 (3.22)	F=7.78, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Aching	1.85 (2.51)	2.56 (2.92)	2.48 (2.86)	F=3.02, p=.050
Heavy	1.78 (2.44)	2.40 (2.93)	2.43 (3.01)	F=2.56, p=.079
Cold	1.82 (2.61)	2.22 (3.05)	2.32 (2.84)	F=1.20, p=.302
Radiating	1.74 (2.61)	2.47 (2.98)	2.05 (2.47)	F=2.74, p=.066
Hot	1.43 (2.28)	2.39 (2.82)	2.53 (3.06)	F=7.19, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Tender	1.46 (2.13)	2.45 (2.75)	2.17 (2.67)	F=6.41, p=.002 0<1
Sensitive skin	1.47 (2.05)	2.08 (2.57)	2.21 (2.45)	F=4.05, p=.018 0<2
Throbbing	1.22 (2.12)	2.11 (2.77)	2.33 (3.03)	F=7.30, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Itchy	0.78 (1.79)	1.22 (2.16)	1.25 (2.20)	F=2.45, p=.088
Intense – surface pain	2.86 (2.66)	3.65 (2.65)	3.51 (2.70)	F=3.71, p=.025 0<1
Intense – deep pain	2.68 (2.64)	3.66 (2.81)	3.94 (2.99)	F=7.66, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Pain Quality Assessment Scale – Subscale Scores – Lower Extremity				

Characteristic	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Test, p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Paroxysmal	1.69 (1.90)	2.75 (2.40)	2.78 (2.43)	F=11.33, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Surface	2.58 (1.61)	3.22 (1.80)	3.22 (1.68)	F=6.98, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Deep	2.02 (1.85)	2.86 (2.22)	2.56 (2.05)	F=6.52, p=.002 0<1
Pain Quality Assessment Scale Scores – Upper Extremity				
Numb	3.46 (2.75)	4.03 (2.97)	4.44 (2.90)	F=2.99, p=.052
Unpleasant	3.02 (2.16)	4.06 (2.60)	4.18 (2.74)	F=7.39, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Tingling	2.67 (2.58)	3.73 (2.91)	3.42 (3.11)	F=4.19, p=.016 0<1
Intense	1.89 (1.90)	3.19 (2.30)	3.29 (2.66)	F=13.53, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Dull	1.79 (2.11)	2.80 (2.52)	2.89 (2.80)	F=6.94, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Cramping	1.23 (2.01)	2.07 (2.86)	2.53 (3.17)	F=6.57, p=.002 0<1 and 2
Electrical	1.29 (2.16)	2.40 (3.01)	2.10 (2.85)	F=5.30, p=.005 0<1
Shooting	1.20 (2.06)	2.04 (2.87)	1.78 (2.55)	F=3.51, p=.031 0<1
Sharp	0.97 (1.79)	1.63 (2.45)	1.82 (2.77)	F=4.05, p=.018 0<2
Aching	1.30 (2.14)	2.18 (2.64)	2.42 (2.92)	F=5.90, p=.003 0<1 and 2
Heavy	0.86 (1.73)	1.66 (2.59)	1.71 (2.71)	F=4.82, p=.009 0<1 and 2
Cold	1.17 (1.91)	1.57 (2.70)	1.85 (2.64)	F=2.03, p=.133
Radiating	0.74 (1.60)	1.93 (2.61)	1.50 (2.56)	F=8.46, p<.001 0<1
Hot	0.53 (1.25)	1.32 (2.18)	1.51 (2.46)	F=8.04, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Tender	1.08 (1.76)	1.95 (2.48)	2.13 (2.76)	F=6.59, p=.002 0<1 and 2
Sensitive skin	1.04 (1.73)	1.59 (2.35)	1.71 (2.50)	F=2.97, p=.053

Characteristic	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Test, p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Throbbing	0.86 (1.88)	1.62 (2.37)	1.76 (2.65)	F=5.07, p=.007 0<1 and 2
Itchy	0.51 (1.47)	1.00 (1.99)	1.13 (2.33)	F=3.20, p=.042 no significant pairwise contrasts
Intense – surface pain	2.55 (2.52)	3.16 (2.52)	3.39 (2.64)	F=3.00, p=.052
Intense – deep pain	1.63 (2.05)	2.97 (2.77)	3.14 (3.11)	F= 11.11, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Pain Quality Assessment Scale – Subscale Scores – Upper Extremity				
Paroxysmal	0.92 (1.24)	1.85 (2.12)	1.74 (2.13)	F=9.05, p<.001 0<1 and 2
Surface	1.74 (1.42)	2.38 (1.83)	2.51 (1.75)	F=6.66, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Deep	1.21 (1.49)	2.07 (2.02)	2.26 (2.33)	F=9.31, p<.001 0<1 and 2

[+] Dressing, toileting, typing

Abbreviations: CIPN = chemotherapy-induced neuropathy, SD = standard deviation

Table 4 –

Differences in Sensation Measures and Balance Measures Among the Body Mass Index Groups

Characteristic*	Normal Weight (0) 45.4% (n=189)	Overweight (1) 32.5% (n=135)	Obese (2) 22.1% (n=92)	Statistic; p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Sensation Measures+				
Light touch - upper extremity sites (out of 7)[a]	0.12 (0.60)	0.23 (0.87)	0.30 (1.01)	F=1.78, p=1.69
Light touch - lower extremity sites (out of 9)[b]	2.00 (2.33)	2.07 (2.06)	2.50 (2.54)	F=1.55, p=.214
Cold - upper extremity sites out of 4[c]	0.77 (0.98)	0.83 (0.98)	0.91 (0.99)	F=0.64, p=.529
Cold - lower extremity sites out of 4[d]	2.26 (1.20)	2.30 (1.17)	2.18 (1.25)	F=0.24, p=.788
Pain - upper extremity sites (out of 7)[e]	1.09 (1.35)	1.29 (1.50)	1.11 (1.55)	F=0.81, p=.446
Pain - lower extremity sites (out of 9)[f]	3.01 (2.05)	3.67 (2.06)	3.87 (2.44)	F=6.46, p=.002 0<1 and 2
Vibration - upper extremity sites (volts)[g]	7.39 (4.03)	8.32 (4.79)	8.12 (4.30)	F=2.02, p=.134
Vibration - lower extremity sites (volts)[h]	8.50 (4.24)	9.69 (5.06)	9.29 (4.20)	F=2.87, p=.058
Balance Measures				
Trouble with balance (% yes (n))[i]	62.8 (118)	71.6 (96)	70.3 (64)	X^2=3.28, p=.194
Severity of balance trouble (0 to 10)[j]	4.09 (2.57)	5.33 (2.65)	5.31 (2.64)	F=7.36, p=.001 0<1 and 2
Frequency of balance trouble (0 to 10)[k]	3.78 (2.66)	5.11 (2.97)	4.89 (2.98)	F=6.58, p=.002 0<1 and 2
Distress from balance trouble (0 to 10)[l]	4.71 (2.98)	5.60 (2.92)	5.47 (2.74)	F=2.82, p=.061
Timed get up and go test (>13.5 seconds = higher risk for falls)	7.45 (2.50)	7.69 (2.00)	8.47 (3.02)	F=5.23, p=.006 0<2
Fullerton Advanced Balance test (≤25 is associated with a higher risk of falls)	34.68 (5.75)	33.52 (5.80)	29.75 (8.52)	F=18.03, p<.001 0 and 1 <2

*When available, the clinically meaningful cut-point score is provided in parentheses next to the characteristic.

+Changes in sensation are reported for the dominant extremity

[a]Upper extremity sites for light touch were: pad of thumb, thumb webspace, tip of index finger, tip of little finger, midway base of palm, one third up anterior arm, two thirds up anterior arm

[b] Lower extremity sites for light touch were: pad of great toe, pad of 3rd toe, pad of 5th toe, base of heel, metocarpophalangeal (MP) joint of great toe, MP joint of 3rd toe, MP joint of 5th toe, midway along tibia, patella

[c] Upper extremity sites for cold were: pad of index finger, pad of little finger, dorsal MP area of the hand, wrist

[d] Lower extremity sites for cold were: top of great toe at 1st MP joint, pad of great toe, dorsum of foot midpoint, medial malleolus

[e] Upper extremity sites for pain were: pad of thumb, thumb webspace, tip of index finger, tip of little finger, midway base of palm, one third up anterior arm, two thirds up anterior arm

[f] Lower extremity sites for pain were: pad of great toe, pad of 3rd toe, pad of 5th toe, base of heel, metocarpophalangeal (MP) joint of great toe, MP joint of 3rd toe, MP joint of 5th toe, midway along tibia, patella

[g] Upper extremity sites for vibration were: dorsal interphalangeal (IP) joint of thumb, dorsal IP joint of index finger, ulnar prominence, lateral epicondyle

[h] Lower extremity sites for vibration were: dorsal IP joint of great toe, medial malleolus, patella

[i] Since your chemotherapy, have you had trouble with your balance?

[j] At its worst, how severe is the trouble with your balance (0 = not at all severe to 10 = extremely severe)?

[k] How often do you have trouble with your balance (0 = never to 10 = always)?

[l] At its worst, how distressing is the trouble with your balance (0 = not at all distressing to 10 = extremely distressing)?

Abbreviation: SD = standard deviation